CONCORDIA
THEOLOGICAL
QUARTERLY

CTQ

Volume 55: Number 4

OCTOBER 1991

CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY

CTQ

ISSN 0038-8610

Issued Quarterly by the Faculty of
Concordia Theological Seminary

The *Concordia Theological Quarterly*, a continuation of the *The Springfielder*, is a theological journal of the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, published for its ministerium by the faculty of Concordia Theological Seminary, Fort Wayne, Indiana.

The CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY is indexed in *Religion Index One: Periodicals* and abstracted in *Old Testament Abstracts* and *New Testament Abstracts.*

The CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY is published in January, April, July, and October. All changes of address (including Missouri Synod clergymen), subscription payments, and other correspondence concerning business matters should be sent to Concordia Theological Quarterly, Concordia Theological Seminary, 6600 North Clinton Street, Fort Wayne, Indiana 46825. The annual subscription rate is $10.00 within the United States, $15.00 Canadian in Canada, and $20.00 U.S. elsewhere ($30.00 if dispatch by airmail is desired).

The Symposia of Concordia Theological Seminary (January 1992)

THE SEVENTH ANNUAL SYMPOSIUM ON EXEGETICAL THEOLOGY

"Fellowship and Separation"

Tuesday, January 21, 1992

1:00 p.m.	Welcome and Introduction
1:15 p.m.	"An Exegesis of Romans 16:17-18." Dr. Robert G. Hoerber, Professor Emeritus of Exegetical Theology (New Testament Exegesis), Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Missouri
2:15 p.m	"The Relationship Between Orthodoxy and Heterodoxy in the Old Testament." Dr. Douglas McC. L. Judisch, Professor of Exegetical Theology (Old Testament Exegesis), Concordia Theological Seminary
3:00 p.m.	Afternoon Tea
3:30 p.m.	"The Relationship Between Israel and the Gentiles in the Old Testament." Dr. Walter A. Maier III, Assistant Professor of Exegetical Theology (Old Testament Exegesis), Concordia Theological Seminary
4:15 p.m.	"Fellowship and Exegesis in the Missouri Synod since 1847." Dr. Raymond F. Surburg, Professor Emeritus of Exegetical Theology (Old Testament Exegesis), Concordia Theological Seminary

Wednesday, January 22, 1992

8:30 a.m.	"Table Fellowship in Judaism of the Second Temple: Context for the Last Supper." Prof. Dean O. Wenthe, Associate Professor of Exegetical Theology (Old Testament Exegesis), Concordia Theological Seminary
9:15 a.m.	"Fellowship in John." Dr. G. Waldemar Degner, Professor of Exegetical Theology (New Testament Exegesis), Chairman of the Department of Exegetical Theology, Concordia Theological Seminary

10:00 a.m.	Chapel Service
11:00 a.m.	"An Exegesis of Titus 3:9-11." Dr. Walter A. Maier, Professor of Exegetical Theology (New Testament Exegesis), Academic Dean, Concordia Theological Seminary
11:45 a.m.	Close of the Symposium

THE FIFTH ANNUAL SYMPOSIUM ON THE LUTHERAN LITURGY AND HYMNODY

"Worship: The Setting for God's Means of Grace"

Wednesday, January 22, 1992

1:00 p.m.	Welcome and Introduction
1:15 p.m.	"The Biblical View of Worship: The Real Presence." Dr. John W. Kleinig, Luther Seminary, North Adelaide, Australia
2:15 p.m.	"The Need for Hymnody to Teach the Faith." The Reverend Richard C. Resch, Kantor and Part-Time Instructor, Concordia Theological Seminary
3:15 p.m.	Coffee Break
3:45 p.m.	Panel Discussion: "Expectations and Standards for Lutheran Worship: Are They Possible or Necessary?" Dr. Kleinig, Kantor Resch, Prof. Daniel Reuning (Moderator)
4:30 p.m.	Organ Recital. Dr. John Behnke, Concordia University, Mequon, Wisconsin
5:30 p.m.	Dinner
7:30 p.m.	Choral Vespers: Schola Cantorum, Prof. Daniel G. Reuning, Dean of the Chapel, Director
8:30 p.m.	Reception in the Student Commons

THE FIFTEENTH ANNUAL SYMPOSIUM ON THE LUTHERAN CONFESSIONS

"Our Language and Concepts of God: Are They Still Adequate?"

Thursday, January 23, 1992

8:30 a.m.	"The Employment of Philosophical Terminology in the Doctrine of God." Dr. Alan W. Borcherding, Assistant Professor of Systematic Theology, Concordia Theological Seminary
10:00 a.m.	Choral Matins: Seminary Kantorei
10:30 a.m.	Coffee Break
11:00 a.m.	"The Thomistic Contribution to Language about God." Dr. John F. Johnson, Professor of Systematic Theology, President, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Missouri
12:15 p.m.	Lunch
2:00 p.m.	"Mother Zion and Mother Church." Dr. John Kleinig
3:15 p.m.	Coffee Break
3:30 p.m.	"The Biblical Language about God: Do We Have any Latitude?" The Reverend Leonard Klein, Book Review Editor, *Lutheran Forum*; Senior Pastor, Christ Lutheran Church (ELCA), York, Pennsylvania
6:30 p.m.	Symposium Banquet. Speaker: Prof. Richard Muller, Associate Professor of Systematic Theology, Concordia Theological Seminary

Friday, January 24, 1992

8:30 a.m.	"Naming God--Can We Do It Another Way?" Dr. Thomas Hopko, Professor of Theology, St. Vladimir's Seminary, Crestwood, New York
10:00 a.m.	Chapel Service
10:30 a.m.	Coffee Break

11:00 a.m.	Panel Discussion: "God, His Revelation in Language, and the Ordination of Women" Professors Hopko, Borcherding, Johnson, Marquart, and Scaer (Moderator), and Dr. Klein
12:15 p.m.	Adjournment and Lunch

Information on registration fees, accommodations, and meals with respect to one or more of the symposia described above may be obtained from the Office of Seminary Relations, Concordia Theological Seminary, 6600 North Clinton Street, Fort Wayne, Indiana 46825. The telephone number of the seminary is 219-481-2100.

The Relation of Matthew 28:16-20 to the Rest of the Gospel

David P. Scaer

The importance of Matthew 28:16-20 in the life of the church is demonstrated by its frequent use. It is the pericope used more than any other to show the necessity of baptism, and it is used in the liturgy for baptism. Infant baptism is supported by this pericope also. The same pericope is used in the liturgy for ordination to show that God has established the office of the ministry. This pericope is also used to demonstrate that God is tri-personal. Accordingly, the traditional service of the church begins with its words, "in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost," and, according to the Small Catechism, morning and evening devotions and those offered at meals should begin the same way. Its words have been incorporated into the Gloria Patri, and thus it is spoken or sung with the Psalms of Matins and Vespers and the Introit of the main service of the church. In more recent times it has become the rallying point of the Church Growth Movement, which takes one of its characteristic words, "discipling," from this pericope. Matthew 28:16-20 comes as close to being the universal proof text as any other.[1]

I. Initial Considerations

A. The Authenticity of Matthew 28

The confessional Lutheran scholar Edmund Schlinck adopted the then popular opinion that this pericope was so theologically advanced, with its Father-Son-Holy Spirit formula, that it could hardly have been spoken by Jesus.[2] He held that its trinitarian theology was so advanced that it was read back into the mouth of Jesus by the early church. Others have held that this passage, as well as the chapter in general, was not even part of the earliest forms of Matthew's Gospel. Some years later erstwhile LCMS New Testament scholar Jack Kingsbury undermined that theory by showing that Matthew 28:16-20 did not contain anything which could not be linguistically integrated with the rest of the gospel.[3] Kingsbury showed that the evangelist was capable of a trinitarian theology in other parts of his gospel. In 11:27, for example, the Father and the Son each has exclusive knowledge of the other. The language of 11:27 is so advanced in its theology that to many

scholars it seemed strangely out of place in Matthew--something which would have been more comfortable in John. Kingsbury's study was sufficiently exhaustive to demonstrate that Matthew 28:16-20 was so similar to the rest of the gospel that one author was responsible for the entire gospel.

Not only is Matthew 28:16-20 an integral part of the entire gospel, but indeed the evangelist intended it as a summary and an endorsement of the gospel. No other book in the entire Scripture comes to such a satisfactory conclusion as does Matthew with Jesus' command to preserve His words and make disciples through baptism and His promise to be with the church until the current epoch has ended. The evangelist never informs his readers whether the apostles actually followed the command to make disciples of the Gentiles. Perhaps Luke-Acts was written to tell the reader that the church did follow this command, but that idea is a matter for discussion at another time. If there were Gentiles in Matthew's first audience, they would have been living evidence that the command had been fulfilled at least in some way.

B. The Organization of Matthew 28

Matthew's final chapter consists of three recognizably separate sections or pericopes: (1.) the events concerning the discovery of the empty tomb with the appearances of the angel and Jesus to the women (vv. 1-10); (2.) the Jewish allegation that the disciples had stolen the body of Jesus (vv. 11-15); and (3.) the commissioning of the disciples (vv. 16-20). Compare Matthew's final chapter with Luke's. In Luke, as in Matthew, the women discover the empty tomb (24:1-7), but the narratives of the Emmaus Road (24:13-32) and Jerusalem (24:36-53) with Jesus as the center of each are uniquely Lucan, with no parallels in Matthew. Mark has only the discovery of the empty tomb with the angel's annunciation to the women (16:1-8). John is not unlike Luke in giving us narratives in which Jesus appears and speaks to His followers, namely, the Magdalene (20:11-18), the disciples (20:19-23) and Thomas (20:26-29), and the disciples and Peter (21:1-22). In comparison with the conversing Jesus of Luke and John, Matthew's resurrection narrative is more formal. In Luke and John Jesus engages in extensive

conversations with His followers. He converses for what must have been several hours with the Emmaus disciples and then later with the Jerusalem disciples (according to Luke). There is a dialogue or conversation with the Magdalene and Peter (according to John). Nothing in Matthew parallels this type of conversation between the resurrected Lord and His followers. Jesus speaks. Those who hear His words do not respond. The absence in Matthew's resurrection narratives of any conversation with Peter (as in John 21:9-22) or even mention of Peter (as in Mark 16:7 and Luke 24:34) is all the more surprising, since that disciple plays a prominent role for Matthew before the crucifixion (16:16-18; 17:1, 4; 18:21; 26:33-35, 69-75). Those who argue for Petrine supremacy, as the Church of Rome does and must do, on the basis of 16:17-19, must answer the question of why Peter is singled out for no special role in the final commissioning of the apostles.[4]

In Matthew 28 the events accompanying the resurrection are reported, namely, the earthquake (v. 2), the coming and appearance of the angel (v. 3), the trembling of the guards (v. 4), and the annunciation to the women that the Crucified One is risen and that they are to report this back to His disciples (vv. 5-7), though the reader is never informed when and how this resurrection was accomplished (v. 8). Jesus then appears, is worshipped (v. 9), and repeats the angelic command that the women are to inform His disciples to go to Galilee, where He will be seen (v. 10). Unlike Luke and John, Matthew has no record of what the women said either to the angel or to Jesus. What is central is that the tomb is empty, that Jesus has appeared to the women, and that the disciples are to see Him in Galilee, a message which is repeated twice (vv. 7, 10). Matthew makes no mention of how the disciples responded to the women. They do, as Jesus told the women, see Him in Galilee.

The record of the Jewish allegation of the disciples stealing the body of Jesus (vv. 11-15) is remarkable, since it is without parallel any place in the rest of the New Testament. The words of the Jewish officials to the soldiers are preserved, but not in the sense of a dialogue. Matthew's inclusion of the allegation of body-stealing has implications for dogmatical theology and hence for the church's mission. The resurrection may be more than merely a historical

event (as the resurrected body is a *soma pneumatikon*, a body which by the Holy Spirit has been brought into the realm of God [I Cor. 15:44]), but not in the sense that its reality is beyond ordinary historical investigation. After all, the women are invited to examine the empty tomb (v. 6), and the guards, who are not believers, are in fact the first *historical* reporters of the resurrection (v. 11). In the scheme of his gospel Matthew seems to have included this pericope to show that the proclamation of the gospel could not continue among those who denounced as untenable the resurrection, a characteristic feature of the Christian proclamation. Those who were creating and spreading lies, saying that the resurrection of Jesus was a fiction created by the disciples, could not expect their allegations to remain unanswered. The church would have no hesitancy in engaging them in debate. (Christian apologetics was born, so to speak, here in Matthew.)

We note again that, unlike Luke and John, who devoted considerable space to the appearances of the resurrected Jesus, Matthew has only two brief appearances of Jesus. Besides his recording of the commissioning of the disciples, Matthew preserves only these words: "Hail"; "Do not be afraid; go and tell My brethren to go to Galilee, and there *they* will see Me." Mark, of course, has no appearance or word of Jesus.

Matthew connects verse 10, the declaration to the women that His disciples, who are now called His brothers, are to see Him in Galilee, with verses 16-17, where they do in fact see Him. The disciples have obeyed the command of Jesus delivered by the women to go to Galilee (v. 16), although, as mentioned, we are not told under what circumstances the command was relayed.[5]

Upon seeing Jesus in Galilee, the disciples worship Him, that is, recognize Him as God (v. 20).[6] The reference to doubting (v. 18 RSV) should be not understood as meaning that the disciples had questions about the nature or actuality of His resurrection. Rather this doubting of theirs involved confusion in the sense of not fully understanding the significance of the resurrection for them and the reason why Jesus had commanded them to come to Galilee.[7] The command which follows to make disciples of the Gentiles is intended to answer such questions.[8] Although Matthew 28 opens in

Jerusalem, the evangelist thrusts the center of attention away from there to Galilee with the two nearly identical commands, one by the angel (v. 7) and the other by Jesus (v. 10), that His disciples will see Him there to receive a significant message.

C. The Audience

Matthew is very careful in identifying the commission's original hearers as the "eleven disciples" (v. 16), a noteworthy distinction, since the original disciples even after the death of Judas were called "the twelve" (I Cor. 15:5), a designation which the evangelist himself knew (10:1-2). Matthew knew his options but chose the restrictive "eleven disciples." Any idea that Jesus was speaking to a huge crowd, such as confronted Him in the giving of the Sermon on the Mount or in the feeding of the four or the five thousand, is simply without support. Matthew deliberately intends the limited audience of the eleven as the recipients of the command to make disciples of the Gentiles. Luke speaks of a larger group of disciples present for the ascension, but Matthew 28:16-20, which is situated in Galilee, dare not be confused with an event which took place on the outskirts of Jerusalem in Bethany (Luke 24:50) at the Mount of Olives (Acts 1:12).

The eleven disciples (28:16), known to Matthew's readers as apostles (10:2), may have stood in the place of the church in hearing the command, but there is no suggestion that the church, as it was constituted at that time (the other followers or the wider community) were present.[9] If others were present, Matthew does not mention it. Matthew has already informed his readers in 10:2-4 of the identity of the eleven and has prepared them for the reduction of twelve (10:2) to eleven (28:16) by saying that Judas would betray Jesus (10:4). Thus, the reader already has the answer to the question of why there were eleven and not twelve present. Chapter 10 names the twelve and refers to their first status as "disciples" when Jesus enlisted them and their current status in the church as "apostles" (vv. 1-2). Matthew 10:2, while referring to Jesus' selection of the twelve, clearly presupposes the events of 28:16-20 by which the disciples were authorized as apostles. To put it in other words, already in chapter 10 the evangelist knew the outcome of his story.

The gospel was not composed as the events were taking place, but after and in the light of the resurrection. The eleven are already named in 10:1-2 and the evangelist expects that his readers already know the names.

In chapter 10 the disciples are also given their mission. Thus, chapter 10 is the presupposition for 28:16-20. Jesus first regarded the twelve (10:1-2; eleven, 28:16) as His disciples, but the church is to understand them as His apostles, men authorized by Christ to represent Him. From these pericopes, 10 and 28:16-20, the church could rightfully understand itself as Christian--that is, consisting in followers of Christ--but also as apostolic--that is, taught by the apostles.

Jesus' designation of His disciples as "My brothers" (v. 10) is not without significance. Those who have been His students have been raised to a status almost equal with Him as teachers of His message to the church because they accomplish the will of the Father of Jesus (12:50), which is the proclamation of His death and resurrection. The apostles are not the originators of the church's teachings, but they stand in His place as *the* teachers of the church. The "Apostolic Mandate" (a term used by the Reverend Charles J. Evanson) may have been intended at first for the ears of the apostles only, but the gospel in which Matthew recorded them was intended for the ears of the entire church. This intention hardly means that all those who were baptized could consider themselves as apostles, but they were aware of the special role that the apostles had in regard to the church and the church had in regard to the apostles. The apostles stood in Christ's place (10:40), and the church was obligated to support the apostolic mission with material means (10:11).

D. Galilee as the Place of Matthew 28:16-20

Compare Matthew's concentration on seeing Jesus in Galilee with Luke's resurrection appearances and ascension of Jesus in and around Jerusalem. Galilee is mentioned three times in Matthew 28 (vv. 7, 10, 16), with the one significant resurrection appearance taking place there. This concentration on Galilee belongs to Matthew's purpose of having the gospel preached among the Gentiles, a purpose which he states just prior (4:15) to the introduc-

tion of Jesus' ministry (4:17).[10] Isaiah 9:1-2, cited by Matthew (4:15), speaks about the lands of Zebulon and Naphtali as "Galilee of the Gentiles." Here the Revised Standard Version and perhaps other translations are less than satisfactory in conveying the evangelist's intentions when the command is understood as making disciples of nations and not Gentiles--the preferred and, yes, correct translation. The word commonly rendered "Gentiles" in 4:15, *ethnē*, is the same as the one which most translations render "nations" (28:19). The evangelist is referring to the same group of people in both pericopes (4:15 and 28:19), and he intends that the reader make the connection. To be as faithful as possible to the evangelist's intention, the English translations should consistently use the word "Gentiles" and not "nations" for *ethnē*.[11] Northern Palestine is "Galilee of the Gentiles" (4:15) and not "Galilee of the nations."[12] What is important and, yes, even shocking for Matthew's Jewish audience is that the new followers of Jesus are to come from the Gentiles and that they, the descendants of the patriarchs, have lost their special status (8:11-12). Jesus had given command to His disciples to go to the lost sheep of the house of Israel and to avoid the Gentiles (10:5-6). In sharp distinction to this prohibition is Matthew 28:19, where the Jews as a distinct people are not even mentioned. Disciples are to be made of the Gentiles.[13] No longer is the mission only to the Jews or first to the Jews and then to the Greeks (Rom. 1:16; Gal. 3:28) but simply to the Gentiles. It is noteworthy that *ethnē* is a neuter plural, and *auta* would thus be expected as the proper form in apposition to it. Matthew uses *autous* so as to specify that the reference is to people and not groups.

The early church squabbled about whether Gentiles had to become Jews first before becoming Christians (Acts 15:5). They were debating about the place in the church of non-Jews and not nations! The evangelist's use of Isaiah's "Galilee of the Gentiles" indicates its status as a border province from the time of the captivity of the northern kingdom. Gentiles were mixing with Jews, and this integration had given Galileans inferior status. Jesus, whose commission from His Father, limited Him to the Jews (15:24), not only had come into casual contact with the Gentiles, but His message had met with unintended success among them (8:10; 15:28),

even those who had only heard reports of His preaching (4:24). The command given to the eleven to make disciples of the Gentiles was reenforced by His giving it in Galilee, the land where Jew and Gentile were already mixing.[14] The Galilean ministry of Jesus is the prototype and prologue for the Gentile mission of the apostles.[15]

II. Central Considerations

A. Jesus as the Revealer and Revelation of God

The Galilean mountain scene culminates for Matthew a number of previous episodes in which Jesus is designated as the revealer and revelation of God. It is reminiscent of Deuteronomy 34. The first discourse of Jesus is given from the mount to which Jesus ascends (5:1) and from which He descends (8:1) in the fashion of Moses.[16] God declares Him to be His Son on a very high mountain in the presence of Moses (17:1-2). Matthew 28:16-20 is the last in a series of scenes which the evangelist sees as significant in understanding who Jesus is.[17] Unlike the scenes of the Sermon on the Mount and the transfiguration, no mention of Moses is made. Jesus has totally replaced him as God's oracle (cf. Heb. 1:1-2 and John 1:17). With almost unnecessary precision Matthew informs his readers that, not only did the disciples follow the command, given first by the angel and then by Jesus Himself (by way of the women visiting the tomb), that they should go to Galilee, but they indeed went "to the *mountain* where Jesus had directed them" (28:16). As Moses, in Deuteronomy 34, transfers his authority from God to Joshua, Jesus puts the disciples in His place. Moses who was refused admittance by God into the land of the Jews had to end his ministry on the border of the promised land, without entering it. In reverse fashion Jesus, whose ministry is limited by divine command to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, can similarly look into the Gentile country from the Galilean mountain, without entering it. As Joshua went in the place of Moses, so the disciples go in the place of Jesus. Whereas the Israelites to experience success must adhere to the written Mosaic revelation, the disciples are promised the presence of Jesus Himself: "And behold I am with you all the days until this age comes to an end [to the close of the age]" (28:20). The difference here is startling. Moses goes with Joshua and the tribes

only in the sense that the Pentateuch serves them as commissioning orders. Jesus actually goes personally with the eleven to the Gentiles! Unlike Moses His body does not lie buried (Deut. 34:6) or taken by assumption into heaven (Jude 9). Jesus may ascend into heaven (Acts 1:9), but He is not assumed. The difference between ascension and assumption is crucial.[18] The Jesus who promises to return to His church (Matt. 25:31-46) actually never forsakes her (28:20).

Not only does Matthew arrange his gospel to point to Jesus as the final, ultimate, and complete revelation of God, but this arrangement is then punctuated by Jesus' own words: "All authority is given to Me in heaven and earth." This passage can with good reason refer to Jesus in almost Pauline terms as the one in whom heaven and earth have their completion, the new Adam in which God establishes His new creation (Col. 1:15-16). God establishes Christ as the new Adam, the man from heaven (I Cor. 15:45), in whom His new humanity is joined together, not by blood, but by the proclamation of the gospel, baptism, and faith. The church has become God's new creation and hence cosmology has been replaced by ecclesiology. God's real world has become those who follow Christ, that is, the church. Matthew's thrust in this chapter is to move rapidly from the resurrection, as the first event, to the transfer of His *teaching* authority to the apostles. Luke and John, by interspersing other historical narratives, are less hurried in accomplishing this transfer of authority to the apostles. In Matthew's commission of the disciples Jesus maintains the full possession of this authority. There is no real transfer in the sense of relinquishing it; the apostles exercise it in His place. The apostolic authority is no different than Christ's. Matthew 28:16-20 serves as an ecclesiological pericope which defines God's people no longer exclusively as Israel but inclusively by bringing in the Gentiles.[19]

B. Making Disciples of the Gentiles

In the English language the word "disciple" is listed as a noun. More recently it has been used as a verb, and people speak of "discipling." At least since Shakespeare using nouns as verbs has been common, and thus the English language is innately more

capable of expanding its vocabulary than are other modern languages such as German and French. Rendering *mathēteusate* "teach" (KJV) would be permissible in Matthew 28 if verse 19 were the end of the pericope. However, the ordinary translation of *didaskontes* in verse 20 is similarly "teaching" (v. 20), and the English reader is thus given the false impression that the same Greek word occurs in both instances: "teach the Gentiles" (v. 19) and "teaching them" (v. 20). To "make disciples" (v. 19) refers to the entire Christian life of faith, life, and faithful adherence to the apostolic teachings, not merely to conversion and instruction, although obviously they are embraced as primary in point of time.

During His ministry Jesus had gathered followers around Himself who regarded Him as the Christ. Now the responsibility for accomplishing this end is transferred to the apostles. In brief, to be a follower of Jesus means to take Jesus at His word and to make that word normative for one's entire life. To make disciples is the very purpose for which Matthew wrote the gospel. What is involved in making Gentiles into disciples is described by "baptizing them" and "teaching them." In hearing this gospel read, the baptized follower of Jesus is in that act continuing to fulfill this command.

The argument has been offered that baptizing and teaching (vv. 19, 20) are complementary so that it matters little which activity precedes the other. Some Lutherans, especially those associated with the nineteenth-century Erlangen school, have found support for infant baptism in the position of baptism preceding teaching in Matthew 28 (vv. 19-20). On the other hand, they have felt free to reverse the order in regard to adults with the preaching of the gospel preceding the application of the water.[20] As theologically convenient as the argument may be, the question is whether the pericope is properly used in this way.

The command of Jesus to baptize did not come upon deaf or unprepared ears (28:19). The ministries of John and Jesus were characterized by baptizing, so much so in the case of John that he was called "the Baptist" (3:1). Though others had engaged in this practice,[21] he more than anyone else was associated with this ritual. The disciples had been baptized, probably all of them by John (John 1:38), and they themselves had acted as surrogates of Jesus (John

4:2) in baptizing the wider group of His followers, which had grown to such large proportions that, in the eyes of the religious authorities, His death was required. Neither the original eleven nor the first readers of the gospel had to be informed about what Jesus meant by commanding baptism. "Baptize" was not an alien word from a strange language, but had been part of their experience. They did not understand baptism as an isolated sacrament, but as a proclamation in water and word calling for faith and creating it. Baptism had meant for them that the kingdom of the heavens was coming in Jesus (3:1; 4:17). In Jesus' death and resurrection that kingdom had come. Baptism itself (the application of the water and word) gave the baptized what was promised in the *kerygma* (the preaching), namely, the forgiveness of sins (Mark 1:4). The command of the disciples to baptize had to mean that what John, Jesus, and their disciples had done before the crucifixion was now going to continue basically in the same way. The real and only difference--and it was a significant difference--was that baptism, practiced before by John, Jesus, and their disciples, was transformed by the one who had been both crucified and resurrected. The command to baptize had to mean to the disciples that they were to preach about the one who had been promised as coming with the kingdom of heaven and had, indeed, now come and manifested that kingdom in His death and resurrection. John's and Jesus' baptisms before His death involved the baptized in the promised and coming work of salvation. The post-resurrection baptism of Matthew 28:19 involved the baptized in the accomplished work. He who was both king and kingdom was now drawing the Gentiles into that kingship and kingdom through the preaching about Him and the application of the water which worked contrition for sins and faith in the one who gave the command. Yes, it was the same, but not the identical baptism. The empty tomb had raised it to a higher dimension (cf. Rom. 6:3-4).

Baptism worked through (*not* because of) the intellect in the sense that the law and the gospel--that is, the preaching of repentance--are addressed to moral and hence in some sense rational human beings in the proclamation accompanying and involved in baptism. By this proclamation in the water Jesus incorporates believers into Himself and makes them disciples. Baptism is *the* proclamation (gospel) in its pure form.[22] Without baptism there are no disciples! What then

is the role of teaching (*didaskontes*, v. 20)?

The "teaching" of verse 20 refers to the communication of the total revelation which God has given in Jesus and not only the call to faith. The call to repentance (i.e., contrition and faith) is the call to be baptized. The teaching (*didaskontes*) goes beyond that call. The twelve (now eleven) disciples had been placed in a relationship to Jesus in which other believers had not been placed. Just as baptism does not make pastors, so it does not make apostles. They are singled out as those who have received from Jesus His revelation (13:16-17). Regardless of the quality of their faith and their ability or inability to apply His revelation to themselves (as noted above in regard to "doubting"), they are entrusted with mysteries which they intellectually understand (13:11, 51). This teaching does not refer to that necessary preaching which must precede baptism and in a sense is comprehended by baptism, but rather to the continued exposition of the gospel in the church among those who have become disciples through baptism. Those who are made disciples remain disciples by listening to the *apostolic* teaching, which is nothing else than preaching the complete counsel of God.[23]

The content of the teaching is "all things whatsoever" Jesus has "commanded." Matthew is not making reference here to the Old Testament, as from the beginning he assumes that it is the divine word, an assumption shared by the Jews who may have happened upon his gospel. Neither is he speaking of a completed New Testament canon, although his gospel may very well have followed other apostolic writings. Unlike Luke (1:1-4) or John (21:25), Matthew does not acknowledge any other prior writings about Jesus. Matthew is clearly referring to what he has just set down in his gospel and nothing else. His written gospel is the "all things whatsoever" which Jesus taught. The reader is invited, not to go on to any other writings, but to return in a circular fashion to reread what he has just finished reading. "Scripture interprets Scripture," but here Matthew's gospel, in the mind of the evangelist, is a satisfactorily complete document in itself. Here in his gospel are collected the sayings of Jesus, the institutions of the sacraments, and the record of the Lord's life, death, and resurrection. When Matthew reports Jesus as saying that the Gentiles are "to observe all

things whatsoever" He has "commanded," he is not speaking about the law as an negative condemnation in the sense of Paul and Luther. The terminology of commanding is here applied to the words of Jesus as divine words. What is spoken by God is by its very nature imperative. With God the indicative is the imperative. Matthew's words are as much God's word as those spoken and preserved by Moses.[24] These words, the ones which Jesus spoke, are the authoritative word of God recorded by Matthew, which gives his gospel its authority in the church. Only in so far as these words are spoken and believed does the promise of Jesus come true that He will be with His church to the close of the age. Jesus' promise to be present is made specifically to the apostles. Although the doctrine of the omnipresence of the human nature of Jesus may properly be deduced from these words, the promise is addressed to the apostolic community.

III. Additional Considerations

A. A Word about the Evangelist

Unlike Luke (1:1-4), there is no hint that Matthew sees himself as a third-generation Christian. No sources are acknowledged outside of the Old Testament Scriptures. In the first gospel there is no one who resembles the nearly ubiquitous beloved disciple of the Fourth Gospel, who has been favored with a special and close relationship with Jesus. Although the authors of Matthew and Mark resemble each other in remaining in the background of their accounts, the attitudes of these two evangelists are noticeably different. While Mark enters the story of the life of Jesus midstream at His baptism, he also leaves the story with an apparently unsatisfactory conclusion, with no resurrection appearances. His abbreviated life of Jesus is matched by the lack of any claim to comprehensiveness. We may compare this approach to Matthew's almost all-embracing approach, which begins the story of the life of Jesus with Abraham (Genesis 11:27) and ends with the promise that Jesus will remain until the end of time (28:20). The history of salvation is magnificently embraced. To be sure, Matthew does not provide the details of Jesus' working with the church in the time between His promise and His visible return, as Luke does in Acts. The time between the commissioning

of the apostles and the close of the age is still part of the story of Jesus. Luke, in writing Acts, has filled in a small portion of the lacuna between these points. The story is still being told in the life of the Christian Church wherever it is found!

Matthew's commissioning of the apostles involves more than an isolated oral command; it involves the gospel which he has written. The disciples are to teach the Gentiles "all things whatsoever" Jesus has taught them. The first evangelist has written his gospel precisely for the purpose of preserving all the teachings of Jesus. In fact, this is his own self-conscious claim to fame. Matthew is not simply dashing off a long document with disconnected words and events from the Lord's life among which was His command to the apostles to teach the Gentiles all that He Himself had taught. Rather the first evangelist sees himself as one who has been given the task of doing so.

Determining the circumstances of time, place, and events which moved Matthew to write the gospel is another matter, but he was self-conscious of exactly what he was doing and what the importance of his manuscript in the church would be. No one would suggest that he knew that he was writing the book which would later be placed first in the New Testament canon, but he was aware of this book's relationship to the Old Testament. He was thinking and writing "canonically." The claims of his document are too great for it to be otherwise.

The easiest conclusion to reach is that the writer is among those eleven who heard the command to teach and preserve all things. So that the names of these eleven did not remain a mysterious unknown to the listeners, Matthew, as mentioned, has named them in 10:2-3 as "disciples" and "apostles." If he was not one of these twelve, then he had to be someone else who had been authorized to act in behalf of one of them or all of them. Of course, it is most natural to conclude that it was one of the eleven who was acting not as an independent author, but on behalf of the others, even those who had been martyred by this time (e.g., James, the son of Zebedee) and for that matter Judas, whose treacherous act did not destroy the validity of his apostleship (10:4). The apostleship is like baptism in that its validity does not rest upon the faith of him who receives it.

The personality of one single author is as evident in the Gospel of Matthew as in Luke and John, but in Matthew there is more suggestion of multiple authority. The closing scene authorizes the eleven and does not single out anyone, Peter, for special attention, even though the author has not been hesitant in other sections of his gospel to elevate Peter to a position of prominence, as mentioned above. Before we put a name on the author of the gospel, it is important to recognize first that he belongs to the twelve and that he understands himself as possessing the authority which belongs to all the apostles collectively. He speaks as much for the others as he speaks for himself. His writing shares in the same authority inherent in his preached word. The written gospel is only an extension and not a discontinuance of the preached gospel. The evangelist also understands that his gospel possesses unique authority in the church because it consists in the words of Jesus entrusted to all the apostles. He would agree with the second verse of Hebrews: "Now in these last days He has spoken to us by His Son."

B. A Word about the Inspiration of the Gospel

Matthew is so complete that he also sets forth a doctrine of inspiration which is rarely approached in fullness by other books of the New Testament. The apostles are, for Matthew, not merely led (2 Peter 1:21) or taught (Luke 12:12; John 14:26) by the Holy Spirit; the Holy Spirit actually speaks through them in such a way that their words are no longer theirs but the Spirit's. "For you are not the ones who are speaking, but the Spirit of your Father speaking in you" (10:32). It is scarcely necessary to choose between describing the apostolic message as given the apostles by Jesus and describing it as spoken through them by the Spirit. Apart from any other considerations, the Spirit possesses all that He has from the Son and thus cannot operate independently from the Son. The Spirit does not work independently of Christ. His words are Christ's. The Holy Spirit is sent into the world by Him who lived, died, and arose again, and He continually ponders and delivers to the church the profound mysteries of incarnation and atonement. The Spirit is christocentric even to the point of being christomonistic in His purposes. Even Paul could say, "We preach not ourselves, but Christ and Him crucified." What is not about and from Christ is not

from the Spirit! Forcing a choice between describing the words of Matthew as those of Jesus and describing them as those of the Spirit reveals a deficient theology of the Trinity. With this dogmatic excursus behind us, it is best to follow the evangelist's own thinking.

The apostles have been selected by Jesus (10:2-3), to speak the words of the Spirit of their Father (10:20), and have been entrusted with the authority to preserve and teach Jesus' words within the trinitarian context of baptism (28:19-20). Jesus refers to the Spirit as "the Spirit of your Father" (10:20) and not "My Father" to show that the apostles are not lifeless instruments, but those led by the Father to confess who Jesus really is (10:32; 16:17). The apostolic message does not proceed with sovereign fury and irresistible majesty from heaven. Rather it proceeds from the one who from the humility of His heart invites the heavy laden to find rest in Him and learn from Him. Only He knows the Father and is authorized to give a revelation of Him (11:25-30). He humbled Himself through crucifixion for our sakes and expects a similar humility in His followers who speak His word (20:26-28). The apostolic speaking of the Spirit's words does not stand outside of the theology of the cross but is included in it. In the hour of their affliction and suffering for confessing the name of Jesus (10:16-20; cf. 32), the apostles speak the words of Jesus given by the Spirit. In their suffering they are most like Christ. The Spirit who enabled Christ to offer Himself as a sacrifice speaks now through them as living sacrifices. The Gospel of Matthew is written about the one who was put to death and martyred for all and is written by those who in confessing faith in Him were martyred for Him. The same can be said of the other gospels also. Any message or writing which is not written by martyrs for martyrs about the Martyred One is neither a saving nor an authorized gospel. The Spirit who speaks through martyred apostles proceeds from the mystery of the atonement which is hidden away in the event of the cross. For this reason the Gnostic gospels were rejected as fraudulent, and the message of many modern preachers, regardless of how much glory they give to Christ, falls under the same condemnation.

C. A Word about the Person of Jesus

In Matthew 28 no title is either appended to the name of Jesus or addressed to Him. He is referred to simply as "Jesus" (vv. 9, 18) or "Jesus the one who was crucified" (v. 5). From the other parts of the gospel it is clear that He is the Son in whose name baptism is administered and who is equal with the Father (11:27). The promise to be with the disciples is reminiscent of His being called Emmanuel, "the God who is with us." Thus, the argument is certainly valid that the resurrection shows that Jesus was the Christ, the Son of God, God Himself; but the evangelist expects the reader to make these conclusions by himself. Matthew used the divine titles of Jesus during His suffering and crucifixion. Faith recognizes the transcendental deity of Jesus in the moment of the cross and not in the glories of the miracles. True faith accepts Jesus' invitation, spoken in His humility, to come to Him: "I am gentle and lowly in heart" (11:29). The Son of Man in His humility, not the Resurrected Lord in His glory, is the example given to Christians. Matthew's careful avoidance of divine titles in recording the resurrection of Jesus and his reference to Him who was crucified (28:5) must at least have the purpose of identifying the Resurrected One with the Crucified One. The crucifixion is a past event, but He remains known to His followers as "Jesus the Crucified One."

Conclusion

Matthew 28:16-20 is as noteworthy a passage as any in the New Testament. Nothing is found here which cannot be found in or deduced from the previous twenty-seven chapters. No new revelation is made by the resurrected Jesus; He only hands over to the church through the apostles the message which He preached and they heard before His crucifixion. No other New Testament writing offers such a satisfactory conclusion as Matthew in summarizing and requiring faith in what was set down in the document itself and giving the church a mandate. This mandate does not say that, as the church preaches the gospel, the church is relieved of the obligation of preserving the words of Jesus. Quite to the contrary, the command of Jesus requires careful and continued attention to His words. It also means that the church in reaching out does not give

the world a little of this and a little of that; the church preaches the entire message of Jesus and it does so without embarrassment, without excuse, and without subtraction or addition.

We can only regard ourselves as the *apostolic* church when we are committed to preserving the words of Jesus and reaching out with those words to the unbelieving world for which the Son of Man gave His life as a ransom (20:20). Matthew 28:16-20 requires that the church, to be apostolic, must have an apostolic ministry in regard to office and function. The office of the ministry must be preserved and the qualifications for this office must be carefully maintained. The seminaries of the church must remain true to the apostolic mission, since they are under obligation to preserve the word of Jesus by preparing the next generations of pastors to keep that word as the apostles kept it and by that word to bring to a rightful and dreadful conclusion the kingdom of Satan.[25] By this word the gates of hell are torn down and its prisoners released.[26]

ENDNOTES

1. This article was first presented as an essay to the faculty of Concordia Theological Seminary in September of 1987. Since then *The Structure of Matthew's Gospel* by David R. Bauer (Sheffield, England: Almond Press, 1988) has appeared in the *Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series* (31). From the preface it seems as if this work evolved out of a dissertation written for Jack Dean Kingsbury of Union Theological Seminary (Virginia). Although my essay was presented without the benefit of endnotes, references to Bauer's work have been added. Many of the lines of argument and conclusions are strikingly similar, although I did not have the advantage of his work at the time of writing.

2. *The Doctrine of Baptism*, trans. Herbert J. A. Bouman (Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1972), p. 28. "Most probably baptism was originally performed upon (in) the name of Christ and this was later expanded, as in the expansion of the christological confession into the tripartite creeds. In that case the baptismal command in its Matt. 28:19 form cannot be the

historical origin of Christian baptism. At the very least it must be assumed that the text has been transmitted in a form expanded by the church."

3. "The Composition and Christology of Matt. 28:16-20," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 93 (1974), pp. 573-584.

4. See Joseph A. Burgess, *A History of the Exegesis of Matthew 16:17-19 from 1781 to 1965* (Ann Arbor, Michigan: Edwards Brothers, Inc., 1976).

5. A comparison with Luke 24:36-43, where Jesus meets His disciples in Jerusalem on the evening following the resurrection, does not answer the question of when the women delivered the command to the disciples. John 21:1-23 records a post-resurrection appearance of Jesus to five of the disciples in Galilee which may have taken place in connection with the appearance to the eleven disciples mentioned in Matthew 28:16. Consider that Matthew does not report the disciples going to the empty tomb or receiving any specific word from an angel or Jesus. Luke and John, both of whom have appearances to the disciples in Jerusalem on that first day of the week, leave no clue as to whether Jesus Himself confirmed His command directly to His disciples that they were to go to Galilee.

6. Bauer (p. 117) rightly says, "The term 'worship' designates the recognition of divine authority." He connects the worship of the disciples with that of the wise men (2:11).

7. Bauer mentions the contradiction that some scholars have seen between the concepts of worshipping and doubting. Along with most recent scholars he rejects the idea that it was not the disciples who doubted, but those who were with them. All worshipped, but either some or all doubted. Their doubting is to be understood in the light of 14:31-33, where they are identified as those of "little faith." It is difficult to disagree with Bauer's assessment: "This doubt expresses a wavering, which hinders disciples from appropriating the full possibilites of endurance, power, and mission which are offered through Christ." Op. cit., p. 110.

8. Bauer must be saluted for this suggestion: "The problem of doubt is answered by the declarations of Jesus in vv. 18b-20, and especially by His promise to be with them always (v. 20b)."

9. While Luke makes no mention of Jesus meeting the disciples in Galilee and Mark only anticipates it, John does parallel Matthew in this point. Although John 21:1-22 takes place by the Sea of Tiberias (v. 1), it does happen in Galilee and there would be no problem in designating any number of mountains in that area which would fit Matthew 28:16. John does not refer to the "eleven," as does Matthew, but he does list Peter, Thomas, Nathaniel, and the sons of Zebedee (James and John), for a total of five.

10. In commenting on 28:16-20, Bauer correctly uses this subtitle: "The Notion of Universalism Which Comes to Climax in 28.16-20" (op. cit., p. 121). By "universalism" he clearly means the universality of the gospel and not the notion that all men are eventually saved. He sees this universal theme beginning in the title of Jesus as "son of Abraham," since in Abraham all the nations or Gentiles will be blessed (pp. 76, 122).

11. Luther's *Heiden* ("heathen") probably comes closest of any German or English translation to the Greek *ethnē*; that is, they are the people without the saving knowledge of the true God. This view is supported by Louw and Nida, who says that, while *ta ethnē* "may be rendered as 'those who do not believe in God,' it is often more appropriate [to think] in terms of belief in other gods or in false gods." Johannes P. Louw and Eugene A. Nida, eds., *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains*, 2 vols. (New York: United Bible Societies, 1988), 1:127.

12. The mention of Galilee in 4:15 as part of a quotation from Isaiah 8:23-9:1-2 is all the more striking since it appears right before what many commentators (e.g., Kingsbury) see as the beginning of the first major action of Matthew at 4:17. Bauer, pp. 41-45.

13. There is no support here for the mass baptizing of political entities called nations, for state-related churches, or for mass conversions of politically or ethnically united groups of people to form them into ethnically related or national churches. The command of Jesus focuses on individuals and not nations.

14. Again apropos is the excellent sub-chapter of Bauer noted above, "The Notion of Universalism Which Comes to Climax in 28.16-20," pp. 121-123.

15. The similarity to Paul's "first to the Jew and then to the Greek" (e.g., Rom. 2:10), by which he means Gentiles (Rom. 2:14, 24), must be noted. It is not impossible that both Matthew and Paul were addressing the same problem from different perspectives.

16. Robert H. Gundry, *Matthew: A Commentary on His Literary and Theological Art* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 1982), pp. 593-594.

17. Bauer states: "In Matthew, the mountain is the place of revelation (cf. 5:1; 17:1-8)."

18. The Reformed hold rather to an assumption of Jesus into heaven, not unlike the Roman Catholic doctrine of the assumption of Mary.

19. Bauer states (p. 124): "Here universalism is made explicit and binding. Indeed, this universalism could come to full expression only in 28:16-20, since it is linked to the universal authority of the exalted Christ."

20. See David P. Scaer, "The Doctrine of Infant Baptism in the German Protestant Theology of the Nineteenth Century" (Th.D. dissertation, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, 1963), pp. 53-156.

21. James H. Charlesworth, *Jesus Within Judaism* (New York: Doubleday, 1988), p. 79. "For decades we have known that John the Baptist was only one well-known representative of baptizing groups who congregated especially along the Jordan."

22. There is no support for the virtually dualist view of the nineteenth-century Erlangen theologians that baptism mystically addresses the body while the teaching addresses the mind. See note 20 above.

23. The reference in Acts 2 to the early Christians remaining in the "teaching of the apostles" is such a haunting reminder of Jesus' command in Matthew 28:19-20 that it is not impossible that Luke is making a clear allusion to Matthew's collection of the sayings of Jesus in his gospel.

24. See Joshua 1 in the Septuagint, where the words of Moses are spoken of in a similar way.

25. Cf. Martin Chemnitz, *Examination of the Council of Trent* 2, trans. Fred Kramer (Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House,

1978). Throughout this volume Chemnitz placed Matthew 28:19-20 alongside other passages regularly used of the office of the pastor; e.g., 2, pp. 468, 680, 695.

26. So far as curricular matters are concerned, as the most comprehensive of the four canonical gospels, Matthew should be placed in the required column. The early church, by using it more than the other gospels, gave Matthew the place of highest honor in the New Testament canon.

Cyprian, Donatism, Augustine, and Augustana VIII: Remarks on the Church and the Validity of Sacraments

William C. Weinrich

According to Melanchthon in the Apology, the eighth article of the Augustana was added to allay any fear on the part of the Romanists that the Lutherans were sixteenth century Donatists.[1] The Roman Confutation had rejected Augustana 7 because the definition of the church as the "assembly of saints" appeared to suggest that the true church was so abstracted from the visible, sacramental church that one could not speak of evil persons or hypocrites as in any way associated with the church. As the Confutation makes clear, the Romanists had especially in mind the doctrine of the church enunciated by John Hus a century earlier. Hus had taught that the church, as the body of those predestined by God, was essentially invisible and had no head on earth, its head being Christ in heaven. The Council of Constance (1414-1418) had condemned this view as heretical, and now the Romanists smelled the odor of the same view in Augustana 7. No doubt Luther's early insistence on the spiritual and inward character of the church in opposition to the papal, institutional definition of the church fueled Rome's suspicions in this regard. It was, therefore, with regard to Rome's sensitivities to "Donatist" notions that Melanchthon added Augustana 8. However, practical considerations also raised the question of "Donatist" exclusivism for the Lutherans. The "evil men and hypocrites" which Augustana 8 had in mind were not just any sinful minister. They were the Roman bishops and especially the pope who, in areas unprotected by evangelical civil authorities, were not allowing the free preaching of the gospel of justification and who were in fact persecuting those who did. The question raised then by many was: "Are we allowed to partake of the sacraments administered by these bishops and their subordinate priests." Augustana 8 in effect answers: "Yes, you may with clear conscience partake at the tables where Roman priests and bishops preside, and you may with complete faith believe that there the true sacraments are being administered. For not the personal quality of the administrant, but the command and ordinance of Christ constitute and make efficacious the sacraments."

I. The Thinking of the Early Church

A. General Considerations

The historical context which makes sense of the inclusion of Article Eight in the Augustana informs us that Donatism is not an abstract posture but takes shape ever anew as new contingencies arise and raise anew the question of Peter, "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life" (John 6:68). Indeed, in the history of the church the answer to Peter's question--"Where can the truth be found?"--has often been as important as the question, "What is the truth?" In fact, to locate the truth goes a long way toward defining the truth. It was not accidental, therefore, that struggles in the early church against the over-spiritualization of the Gnostics resulted in definitions of the truth that were intimately and also inseparably bound to institutional formation, whether that be the canonical shape of the Scriptures, the shape of the creed, or the office of bishop. Indeed, in their application the words of Peter do not distinguish between Jesus, who has the words of eternal life, and someone else to whom the disciples might go. Rather, the question is this: "To whom might we go in order that **there** we may hear the words of eternal life which are none other than the words of Jesus?" To whom shall we go in order that the words of Jesus ("who hears you, hears Me," Luke 10:16) may be recognized and heard. Where is Jesus--and with Him the Holy Spirit--to be located?

For the early church the answer to the question of where were Christ and the Holy Spirit was simply the church in which apostolic men preach and teach the message of the apostles and distribute the sacraments given to the church by Christ. Apart from that church Christ and the Holy Spirit simply were not accessible, and therefore apart from that church there was no salvation and life. In a passage, complex but wholly typical of the thinking of the early church, Irenaeus writes as follows:

> [The dispensation of God which gives the Holy Spirit] has been entrusted to the Church, as breath was to the first created man, for this purpose, that all the members receiving it may be vivified and the communion with Christ has been distributed throughout it, that is, the Holy Spirit. . . . "For in

> the Church," it is said, "God has set apostles, prophets, teachers," and all the other means through which the Spirit works; of which all those are not partakers who do not join themselves to the Church, but defraud themselves of life through their perverse opinions and infamous behavior. For where the Church is, there is the Holy Spirit of God; and where the Spirit of God is, there is the Church, and every kind of grace; but the Spirit is truth.[2]

For our purposes it suffices to note that the church is the place of God's dispensation for our salvation. It is the place where, in analogy with the creation of Adam, those in sin and death receive the life of the Holy Spirit. Furthermore, this life-giving Spirit is dispensed through the various offices which Christ has set in the church (see 1 Corinthians 12:28). Apart from this church there is no life, for apart from this church God is not present in His salvific dispensation of word and Holy Spirit through which He brings to pass what He intended from the beginning. What this means in practice is that the church is founded upon and itself dispenses baptism wherein the name of the Triune God is invoked as that God whose full salvific activity is given in the church. In his commentary on the Lord's Prayer, Tertullian recognized that in the words "Our Father" the Son and the church were already implied: "In the Father the Son is invoked, for 'I and the Father are one.' Nor is even our mother the Church passed by, if, that is, in the Father and the Son is recognized the mother, from whom arises the name both of Father and of Son."[3] In his treatise on baptism, Tertullian speaks of the church simply as the place of the Trinity: "wherever there are three (that is, the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit), there is the Church, which is a body of three."[4] And similarly, in his treatise on modesty, Tertullian speaks as though the church is the divine presence itself: "The very Church itself is properly and principally spirit, in which there is the Trinity of the one divinity, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit."[5]

The early church, therefore, thought of the church in what might be called baptismal terms. The church is the place of the Triune God in the dispensation of His salvific purpose; it is the place where the Father gives His Son through the ministrations of apostolic

preachment and baptism and therein creates sons anew through the vivification of the Holy Spirit. Unless we understand this theological and baptismal understanding of the reality of the church, it will remain a mystery why in the very earliest of creeds both church and baptism for the forgiveness of sins are indispensable elements.[6]

B. Cyprian of Carthage

The answer to Peter's question--"Lord, to whom shall we go?"--can, therefore, be recast: "Lord, where is the church and its baptism unto eternal life?" And that question became an issue in the middle of the third century when the question arose whether the baptisms performed among schismatics (Novatian) and heretics (Marcion) were to be recognized as true baptisms. Historically, the discussion revolved principally around two central figures of the mid-third-century western church, Stephen, bishop of Rome, and Cyprian, bishop of Carthage. Some discussion of their respective positions will be helpful, since this dispute provides meaningful background for the Donatist question which would arise at the beginning of the fourth century and which would so significantly engage the energies of St. Augustine of Hippo.

In 255 A.D. and 256 A.D. people from the schism of Novatian and people from the heretical sect of Marcion sought reunion with the catholic church. There was no difficulty with those who had been baptized within the orthodox church and later had entered into heresy or schism. Such persons were received back into the church as were any sinner; they received the laying on of hands as a sign of their reconciliation to the true church. However, the question was different for those who claimed to have been baptized within the schismatic or heretical churches. Were those "baptisms" in fact true baptisms, or were they not? Here the western tradition represented by Rome and the western tradition represented by Carthage (at least since Agrippinus, c. 213) parted company. While both Stephen of Rome and Cyprian agreed that true baptism was with water and in the name of the Triune God, they differed concerning whether that was in itself sufficient. For Stephen of Rome water and the triune name were sufficient to have a real baptism.[7] The "effect of baptism" is attributed to "the majesty of the Name," so that "they

who are baptized anywhere and anyhow, in the name of Jesus Christ, are judged to be renewed and sanctified."[8] Thus, the identity of the officiant giving baptism was unimportant, even if the one giving baptism was a heretic. In a letter sent to him by a certain Jubianus which contained the thoughts of Stephen, Cyprian had read that "it should not be asked who baptized, since he who is baptized might receive remission of sins according to what he believed." The letter had also indicated that "even those who came from him [Marcion] did not need to be baptized because they seemed to have been already baptized in the name of Jesus Christ."[9] Furthermore, concerning those coming from the schism of Novatian, some argued that certainly the baptisms performed among the Novatianists were to be accepted because they used the same baptismal creed and the same baptismal interrogatory as did the catholic church.[10] However, according to Stephen of Rome, that Novatianists and Marcionites could baptize did not mean that their baptisms bestowed the Holy Spirit. Those baptized among the schismatics or the heretics must be joined to the true church, which is the temple of the Spirit, and there receive the laying on of hands for them to receive the Holy Spirit. Baptism among the schismatics and heretics, therefore, does not grant the Holy Spirit and remains barren until such time as it is completed by the laying on of hands through which the Holy Spirit is given. Although Stephen himself did not (presumably) use these terms, there is here an operative distinction between a "valid" baptism and an "efficacious" one, that is, a baptism which is sound in itself and one which actually works what it promises. This distinction would become especially important for St. Augustine in his polemic against the Donatists.

We turn now to Cyprian, whose person and thought became the pre-eminent authority of the North African Church and whose thought on church and sacrament is especially important for understanding both the later position of the Donatists and also the dynamics and implications of the question of the relationship between church and sacrament.[11] Common opinion often holds that what characterizes Cyprian's doctrine of church and sacraments is the centrality of the bishop and the idea that the personal holiness of the bishop is necessary for the rightful and effective administration of the sacraments. This opinion is not false in itself, but it must be

understood correctly, and, more importantly, it must be understood within the more fundamental concerns of Cyprian. As general background to his thought two observations can be made. (1.) First of all, Cyprian continues that early Christian thought concerning the church which has its biblical basis in the Holiness Code of Leviticus. As God is separate and other from the world of idols and false gods, so too are the people of God to be separate and distinct from the world. As God is holy, so the people are to be holy. Central to the Holiness Code is the idea that certain sins--murder, adultery, idolatry--exclude from the people of God, for the commission of them enmeshes a person with the pagan world and destroys the demarcation of otherness which arises from the election of Israel to be God's holy people. (2.) Historically, Cyprian is bishop at a time when the church was still a martyr church, and the need to demark the church over against the culture of the day was a primary task of preaching and discipline. In the third century the Holiness Code served well as a basis for the church's understanding of its status and purpose in the broader political, religious, and cultural world.

We cannot here fully delineate Cyprian's doctrine of church and sacraments. But we do wish to highlight three central and determinative elements within his total thought: (1.) Cyprian's insistence on the unity of baptism; (2.) Cyprian's insistence on the rightful bishop; and (3.) Cyprian's insistence on the relation between true baptism and right faith.

(1.) We noted above the view, represented by Irenaeus and Tertullian, that the church is the place of the unity of the three divine persons, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. We noted as well that this view was given voice in the baptismal creed which confessed the work of the three persons. The creed expresses the baptismal reality which is nothing other than the life of the church. Baptism, in which and by which the church is constituted, is in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, indicating that it is the work of the one God who is Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Baptism necessarily includes the work of the Holy Spirit, otherwise it would not be the work of the one God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. The unity of the church, therefore, was not understood to be merely a social unity of persons, but to be a unity which arises from

the reception of the work of the one God, the Father, Son, and Spirit. The unity of the church is founded ultimately upon the unity of God Himself. The unity of God, the unity of baptism (i.e., that it includes both Christ and the Holy Spirit), and the unity of the church were correlative realities.

This correlation was Cyprian's fundamental conviction too and goes far to explain why he quotes so frequently Paul's words to the Ephesians: "there is one body and one spirit, . . . one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of us all" (Ephesians 4:4). It was on the basis of the same perspective that Cyprian could not accept Stephen's claim that, while there was baptism among the schismatics and heretics, the Holy Spirit was not among them, but only with the true catholic church. Cyprian was aware of the gospel accounts of John the Baptist and of John 3, according to which the specific gift of Christ's baptism is the Holy Spirit. To speak of the reality of baptism without including necessarily the bestowal of the Holy Spirit was, therefore, nonsense. Baptism is one, writes Cyprian, "for therein a part cannot be void and a part be valid. If one could baptize, he could also give the Holy Spirit. But if he cannot give the Holy Spirit, because he that is appointed without is not endowed with the Holy Spirit, he cannot baptize those who come; since both baptism is one and the Holy Spirit is one and the church . . . is one."[12] The assertion of Stephen, therefore, that it suffices for a true and valid baptism among schismatics and heretics that the name of Christ or of the Triune God be spoken even though it is denied that they possess the Holy Spirit is impossible for Cyprian to accept. Cyprian was not alone. In a letter of strong support, Firmilian, bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, likewise ties the reality of baptism to the presence of the Spirit. There is, he says, neither the forgiveness of sins nor the sanctification of baptism unless "he who baptizes has the Holy Spirit, and the baptism itself is not ordained without the Holy Spirit."[13] The unity of baptism (that is, that a true baptism includes both Christ and the Spirit) was then a major concern of Cyprian and was ultimately grounded in the unity of God which the baptismal creed confesses.[14]

(2.) "The church is constituted upon the bishops, and every act of the church is governed through those placed at the head."[15] This is

a common and well-known theme in Cyprian. What is his point? At its simplest Cyprian's point is that the church rests upon the work of Christ and the Holy Spirit and that, therefore, for the church to exist the work of Christ and the Holy Spirit must actually be administered. For Cyprian the word of Christ which establishes the church is the self-same word which establishes the office of the bishop. Here two passages are of pre-eminent importance. The first is Matthew 16:18, in which Christ founds the church upon Peter. Here in the identical saying Christ establishes the church *and* establishes the office of Peter, which is the office of the binding and loosing of sins. There is, then, by Christ's own ordination an office within the church whose power it is to forgive sins. It is well-known that for Cyprian the office of Peter is the office of every bishop, not simply that of the bishop of Rome. Each bishop, by what Cyprian calls a *vicaria ordinatio*, a "replacing appointment" or an "appointment with fully delegated power," steps in relation to the people of his place into the place of Peter to whom Christ first and alone gave the keys of binding and loosing. Therefore, when Christ said to the apostles, "He who hears you hears Me, and he who hears Me hears Him who sent Me. And he who despises you despises Me and Him who sent Me" (Luke 10:16), Christ was speaking not only to the apostles but to all future bishops.[16] The second passage is John 20:22-23, where Christ, again speaking to the apostles and by extension to all future bishops, says "Receive the Holy Spirit. If you forgive the sins of any, they are forgiven; if you retain the sins of any, they are retained." This passage indicates that reception of the Holy Spirit is prerequisite for the forgiving of sins and, therefore, implies that only those "who are set over the Church and established in the Gospel law and in the ordinance of the Lord are allowed to baptize and to give remission of sins."[17] Each bishop, therefore, as the one placed into the office of bishop by Christ's ordinance for and on behalf of the people of the church is the one who alone can lawfully and in power administer the things of Christ. It is not then the personal, ethical holiness of the bishop which is significant for Cyprian when he comes to judge the reality of the baptisms of schismatics or heretics. It is a question of who has rightly been established bishop and, therefore, who has been entrusted to administer the things of the Spirit in the church at any one place.

Therefore, although the Novatianist schismatics may have the same baptismal creed and the same baptismal interrogation, yet, argues Cyprian, the Novationists lie in their baptismal questions because they do not in fact possess the church.[18] They are just like Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, who knew the right God and invoked the true God and yet they set themselves up "in opposition to Aaron the Priest, who had received the legitimate priesthood by the condescension of God and the ordination of the Lord, and claimed to themselves the power of sacrificing."[19] The church as the temple of the Holy Spirit is established with the office of the bishop, and the office of bishop is the source from which the service of Christ and of the Holy Spirit come. As an office established by Christ in and with the church, the office of bishop is holy and is empowered to bestow the Holy Spirit. Those not lawfully, according to Christ's ordination and judgment, placed into the office of bishop do not hold the Spirit's office and, therefore, not only ought not but cannot give the Holy Spirit. This is the meaning of Cyprian's oft-repeated phrase that one cannot give that which one does not possess. The false and unlawful bishops of the schismatics and the heretics are not in the church, do not possess the Holy Spirit, and therefore cannot give the Spirit in their baptisms.[20] Their baptisms are profane and adulterous, not holy and not of the bride of Christ. For Cyprian it is, therefore, rather clear-cut what the boundaries of the church are and what therefore the boundaries of the true sacraments are. The office of Peter established in the church is the well-spring of the Spirit's ministrations, and therefore the church is the people of God united with their bishop. To be with the rightful bishop is to be in the church. Cyprian quotes Peter's question, "Lord, to whom shall we go?" (John 6:68), and answers the question thus:

> here is Peter speaking, upon whom the church had been built, and in the name of the church he is teaching and revealing that, even when a whole host of proud and presumptuous people may refuse to listen and go away, the church herself does not go away from Christ and that, in his view, the church consists of the people who remain united with their bishop; it is the flock that stays by its shepherd. By that you ought to realize that the bishop is in the church and the church is in the bishop, and whoever is not with the

bishop is not in the church.[21]

The sacraments are ecclesial realities and, therefore, can be given only where the church is, that is, where the Holy Spirit is. Therefore, the necessary presupposition for the reality of the sacrament is unity with the church in the person of its bishop. The integrity of the officiant of the sacrament, therefore, is that of the church, not that of the personal holiness of the bishop.

(3.) Finally, it is essential for Cyprian that true baptism be related to right faith. In response to the claim of Stephen of Rome that even the baptisms of the Marcionites be accepted, Cyprian asserts that the Lord instructed "in what manner they ought to baptize," namely, in the triune name (he quotes Matthew 28:18-19). "Does Marcion maintain the Trinity?" asks Cyprian. "Does [Marcion] assert the same Father, the Creator, as we do? Does he know the same Son, Christ born of the Virgin Mary, who as the Word was made flesh, who bare our sins, who conquered death by dying, who by Himself first of all originated the resurrection of the flesh, and showed to His disciples that He had risen in the same flesh? . . . How then can one who is baptized among them seem to have obtained remission of sins, and the grace of the divine mercy by his faith, when he has not the truth of the faith itself?"[22] The logic of Cyprian is that from baptism "springs the whole origin of faith and the saving access to the hope of life eternal, and the divine condescension for purifying and quickening the servants of God."[23] Baptism is an act of the church whereby one is brought into the presence of the acting Triune God. What one receives in baptism is the faith itself, and by this faith Cyprian means not the subjective faith by which we believe but the reality of which the baptismal creed is a summary. What then one receives is what one confesses, and to confess a false creed is indicative of not having received a right baptism. Baptism grants the faith and, therefore, issues forth in a faith which confesses the creed. Against the Marcionites Cyprian's argument is that, if in fact they were baptized by the true minister of the true God, they would believe in the Creator, in the incarnate Word, and in the Holy Spirit who raises the dead:

> For if any one could be baptized among heretics, certainly he could also obtain remission of sins. If he attained

> remission of sins, he was also sanctified. If he was sanctified, he was also made the temple of God. I ask, of what God? If of the Creator; he could not be because he has not believed in Him. If of Christ; he could not become His temple, since he denies that Christ is God. If of the Holy Spirit; since the three are one, how can the Holy Spirit be at peace with him who is the enemy either of the Son or of the Father?[24]

For Cyprian, just as there is no "outside" of the unity of the Triune God, so too there is no "outside" to the place of His salvific activity, that is, there is no "outside" to the church except that which establishes itself against God and is contrary to His will. Outside God and outside the church there is only sin, not the forgiveness of sin nor the holiness of the Holy Spirit. *Extra ecclesiam non salus est*; "outside the church there is no salvation," and therefore outside the church there is no baptism.

In 303 the Emperor Diocletian, faced with external threat and constitutional crisis, attempted to restore traditional Roman values and with them traditional Roman religion. In the way of this program was the growing Christian church with its increasingly well-organized system of bishops. The result was the most severe persecution which the church had experienced up to that time, with the bishops of the church being the especial targets of Rome's fury. Central to the persecuting policy of Diocletian was the demand that bishops hand over to the authorities the holy books including copies of the Bible. Those bishops which complied with this demand were called *traditores* (those who had handed over something) and were held by most Christians to be guilty of the sin of apostasy. Such was certainly the view of the majority of Christians in North Africa, which from the beginning had had a strong piety of martyrdom. Apostasy in the face of persecution was the great sin according to North African popular piety, and bishops who were guilty of this sin were no longer regarded as bishops and were to be avoided.

This situation was the context for the rise of Donatism which was characterized by a narrow application of Cyprian's doctrine of the church to the problem of the *traditor* bishops. The history of Donatism begins in 312 A.D. in the aftermath of the Diocletian

persecution. The bishop of Carthage, Mensurius, died and was replaced by a certain Caecilian. However, a number of neighboring bishops, especially from Numidia, made the claim that one of the bishops who had ordained Caecilian had been a *traditor* in the persecution of Diocletian and that, therefore, the ordination of Caecilian was null and void. A bishop who was guilty of the serious sin of apostasy was for that reason outside the church and could not bestow the Holy Spirit upon another. We see here the specific focus and interest of the Donatist application of Cyprianic thought: since the church is of the Spirit and the office of bishop is established in the church to bestow the Spirit, one who by serious sin has removed himself from the church cannot be the church's instrument in the ordination of a new bishop. The church is strictly the communion of holy people and cannot abide a serious sinner within it. As in Cyprian, the question is not so much concerning the personal ethical holiness of a bishop as concerning the bishop's legal standing within the church as the temple of the Holy Spirit. The Donatists often appealed to 1 John 2:18-20, where certain people, called antichrists, are said to have "gone out" from the church because "they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would have continued with us." The apostate bishops by their sin had gone out from the church, were not now in the church, and therefore were not lawfully empowered to perform the acts of the church. However, the Donatists went further and insisted that anyone who remained in communion with an apostate bishop participated in his sin and rendered himself also outside the church. The practical result of this Donatist position was that the Donatists believed that the true, holy church existed only in Africa within the Donatist churches; all other churches were false and adulterous communions, devoid of the Holy Spirit and therefore devoid of the sacraments. This category included the catholic church of North Africa which, containing as it did both saints and sinners, was mixed with the world and had lost its own holy character. It is unnecessary for our purposes to describe more fully the Donatist discussions concerning church and sacrament.[25] Essentially, Donatist views were those of Cyprian, albeit much more narrowly applied and without the charity of Cyprian, who was prepared to remain in communion with other churches and other bishops even if he disagreed with them on

matters of ecclesiastical discipline. However, it is within the context of Donatist schism that St. Augustine developed his own distinctive views about the church and its sacraments, and it is to his views that we now turn.

C. Augustine of Hippo

The thought of St. Augustine on the church and the sacraments is extremely complex and multifaceted, and not easy to organize. Furthermore, the writings of Augustine which are of significance for this topic issued not only from his engagement with the Donatists but also from his engagement with the Pelagians. That is, Augustine's thought is formulated and developed over a considerable period of time and makes any purely systematic treatment of his views slightly anachronistic. Nonetheless, in summary we wish to emphasize three central aspects of his thought which are found throughout his writings and which certainly belong to the core of his doctrine of church and sacrament. These are (1.) the idea of the church as *ecclesia permixta*, that is, the church as encompassing both sinners and saints; (2.) the idea of the Holy Spirit as the bond of unity apart from which there is no salvation; and (3.) the idea of the sacramental officiant as minister of the sacrament and not as its giver.[26]

(1.) When Cyprian thought about the church, Christians were still a minority group in the midst of persecution and martyrdom. When Augustine came to think about the church, that situation had changed and Christianity was politically and socially ascendant. Robert Evans makes the point that St. Augustine wanted to adjust the doctrine of the church, which was largely that of his North African homeland, in order to make it serve the new situation created in the fourth centry when Christianity became the religion of the empire.[27] The Cyprianic doctrine, maintaining the strong accents of the church's otherness from the world, was not so serviceable in a world in which the worship of the empire was that of the church itself. Also the narrow vision of the sectarian Donatists, which saw the true church as a martyr-church resident only in North Africa, was especially ill-suited to a world where martyrdom was no longer required and the church had taken on truly universal proportions.

Already early on Augustine expressed the enthusiasm of many Christians that the Roman Empire evinced the conversion of the whole world to Christianity and that this was a manifest sign that God was fulfilling His promise in Psalm 2:7-8 that He would give to His Son "the Gentiles for Thine inheritance and the utmost parts of the earth for Thy possession."[28] Indeed, the universal extent of the church was what Augustine primarily had in mind when he spoke of the "catholicity" of the church. Yet the official character of the church within the Roman Empire entailed the fact that the people who attended the church's worship could not be regarded as equally committed to the faith or even as believers at all. The official and universal character of the church required of Augustine that he reflect on the nature of the church and of the sacraments in a context where the holiness of the church was not so visible as it once seemed to have been.

But it was not the apologetic claim that the church's universality was the fulfillment of God's promises which was most important for Augustine's conviction that the church was a mixed society of saints and sinners. Much more important was Augustine's fundamental philosophical and theological perspective. We mention briefly two different aspects of this perspective. First of all, we must be aware that Augustine never fully abandoned his Platonism. For the Christian Platonist the perfect unity and form of every reality exists in God. In empirical reality, therefore, we have but intimations and approximations of that perfect unity and form--also in the empirical church which has its reality in the flux of historical change. In its empirical, historical manifestation the church only imperfectly imitates and participates in Christ. In Christ "the church can be said to 'participate,' just as all the beings of this world possess their identity only through their 'participation' in their intelligible forms. The participation of the empirical church in Christ may be an only imperfect realization of its true nature, but this imperfection the church shares with all empirical entities relative to their archetypes."[29] Thus, Augustine's Platonism made it difficult for him to think of the church as presently holy and one in any but a partial and preliminary way. In this age the church must possess within it both the holy and the impious. Secondly, Augustine's distinction between the *ecclesia sancta* and the *ecclesia permixta* is not a

distinction between distinct or separated realities. It is a distinction between perspectives from which to view and to understand the church. The *ecclesia permixta* is the church viewed in its present reality--mixed, not yet perfect, containing both saints and sinners--and the *ecclesia sancta* is the church viewed from its eschatological end--as it shall be, pure, containing only the saints.[30] For Augustine the church is essentially a pilgrim church, a community in sojourn, on the way, and on the way to becoming what it shall be. Here, too, in typical Platonic fashion Augustine understands the movement which unites God and man to be the movement of man toward God, not the condescension of God toward man. The church, then, is on the way toward unity with God. It has not yet arrived at its end and, therefore, possesses within it both the saints, those destined to arrive at the end, and the sinners, those destined not to arrive at the end.

In any case, for Augustine there is an ecclesiological reality in which both saints and sinners participate. Augustine calls this reality the "communion of the Church and the most holy bond of unity and the most excellent gift of charity," meaning the empirical church in its administration and reception of the sacraments.[31] In this church both saints and sinners partake.

(2.) For Augustine unity of charity and communion is the essential mark of the church, for the unity of mutual love is the distinctive reality of the Holy Spirit who even within the Trinity unites the Father and Son as the bond of charity. Apart from this bond of charity there is no Holy Spirit and no salvation. However, this bond of unity in love is nothing other than the church catholic in which alone the Holy Spirit dwells.[32] The Donatist schismatics, therefore, having left the church catholic and thus being outside it, are devoid of the Holy Spirit. Quoting Romans 5:5 to demonstrate that love for God has been poured into our hearts through the Holy Spirit which has been given to us, Augustine adds: "For this is that very love which is lacking in all who are cut off from the communion of the Catholic Church."[33] Schismatics and even heretics may administer valid baptisms, but they do not have the Holy Spirit, so that their baptisms remain profitless and useless until one returns to the catholic unity and there receives the Holy Spirit who gives efficacy to that which had been without benefit:

> We say that that is Christ's baptism, even outside the Catholic communion, which they confer who are cut off from that communion. . . . [The profit of baptism] God really confers and bestows through the Catholic communion on those who come from any heresy or schism in which they received the baptism of Christ; . . . not that they should begin to receive the sacrament of baptism as not possessing it before, but that what they already possessed should now begin to profit them.[34]

The distinctive gift of Christian baptism--namely, the Holy Spirit who forgives sins--is, according to Augustine, not given in schismatic or heretical baptism but is given only in the church catholic. Therefore, in his large anti-Donatist treatise *On Baptism*, Augustine writes:

> Men may be baptized in communions severed from the Church, in which Christ's baptism is given and received in the said celebration of the sacrament, but it will only then be of avail for the remission of sins, when the recipient, being reconciled to the unity of the Church, is purged from the sacrilege of deceit, by which his sins were retained and their remission prevented.[35]

Baptism *for the remission of sins* is, therefore, neither among the heretics nor among the schismatics, but only among those who were baptized within the church catholic or who, baptized outside the church catholic, have returned to the unity of the Holy Spirit, that is, the church.

Augustine distinguishes between a sacrament in itself and the right use or benefit of a sacrament. The sacrament in itself is the rite of baptism as such--the water and the baptismal invocation of the divine name; the right use of baptism is the reception of baptism within the catholic unity, which then bestows the Holy Spirit. In one context Augustine calls baptism in itself the baptism "by means of a minister" (*per ministerium*) and baptism with the Holy Spirit the baptism "by means of power" (*per potestatem*).[36] In another context Augustine calls baptism conferred outside the church catholic a baptism "unto destruction" (*ad perniciem*) and baptism conferred

within the church a baptism "unto salvation" (*ad salutem*).[37]

We should add here that the distinction between those who receive baptism apart from the bond of charity and those who receive baptism within the bond of charity is not a distinction only between those within the empirical church catholic and those in schism or heresy. Also the impious within the "sacramental communion and the most holy bond of charity" are in reality "outside" the holy church. For there are many who do not participate rightly but are deceitful and do not receive the sacrament to their profit any more than do the Donatists or other schismatics.[38] Finally, those who receive the Holy Spirit and so partake in the bond of charity unto salvation are known only to God and are the community of those predestined to salvation by the inscrutable electing will of God.[39]

(3.) Finally, Augustine thinks of baptism and all sacraments as a direct working of God in which the officiant is but a "minister," or, as Optatus of Milevis had earlier said, an *operarius*, one who simply performs the function. The sacraments in themselves belong to God, not to the church, and therefore they are incapable of being defiled even when administered outside the church by schismatics or heretics.[40] Indeed, *who* baptizes is a totally indifferent matter to Augustine, for God in His freedom is in no way bound to the sign of the external working. In fact, when God wills to bestow His Spirit through the baptismal sign upon those whom He has elected, it is in an interior and imperceptible act that He does so. Thus Augustine writes against the Donatist Petilian:

> For when we say Christ baptizes, we do not mean by a visible ministry . . . but by a hidden grace, by a hidden power in the Holy Spirit [*occulta gratia, occulta potentia in spiritu sancto*]. . . . Nor has . . . [Christ] ceased to baptize; but He still does it, not by any ministry of the body, but by the invisible working of His majesty. For in that we say He Himself baptizes, we do not mean He Himself holds and dips in the water the bodies of the believers; but He Himself invisibly cleanses, and that He does to the whole Church without exception.[41]

In this quotation we see quite clearly how uncommitted Augustine

thought God was to what Lutherans are wont to call the external marks of the church. God, through a hidden providence, secretly bestows His Spirit upon those whom He has elected. Baptism administered to any but these unknown elect does not and cannot be the bearer of the Holy Spirit. Baptism given to the unelect remains a mere *sacramentum*, a sign which has no power.

Augustine's total emphasis on God as the direct author of baptism produces some questionable results. First of all, Augustine asserts without reservation that heretics can administer valid baptisms. In his *Epistle 93* he writes: "Between the baptism of Christ which an apostle administers and the baptism of Christ which a heretic administers, there is no difference. For the form of the sacrament is acknowledged to be the same even when there is a great difference in point of worth between the men by whom it is administered."[42] We mentioned earlier that at the time of Cyprian, Bishop Stephen of Rome appeared to accept the baptisms of Marcion, while Cyprian, thinking organically of what was given and what was received, could not believe that communions with heretical belief were giving true baptisms. In this context it is interesting to note that Athanasius, roughly a contemporary of Augustine, is an important opponent of accepting the baptism of heretics. In his *Second Oration against the Arians* Athanasius comes to speak of Arian baptisms and denies that they, believing falsely about the Trinity, can truly baptize in the name of the Trinity:

> For if the consecration is given to us into the Name of Father and Son, and they [the Arians] do not confess a true Father, because they deny what is from Him and like His Essence, and deny also the true Son, and name another of their own framing as created out of nothing, is not the rite administered by them altogether empty and unprofitable [*kenon kai alusiteles*], making a show, but in reality being no help towards religion? . . . So the baptism, which is supposed to be given by them, is other than the truth, though they pretend to name the Name of the Father and the Son, because of the words of Scripture. For not he who simply says, "O Lord," gives baptism; but he who with the Name has also the right faith [*pistin orthēn*]. On this

> account therefore our Savior also did not simply command to baptize, but first says, "Teach," then thus: "Baptize into the Name of Father, and Son, and Holy Ghost"; that the right faith might follow upon learning, and together with faith might come the consecration of baptism.[43]

Here it is clear that although the proper ecclesiastical form of baptism was apparently being used by the Arians, in the view of Athanasius their heretical faith indicated the emptiness of their rite. The mere naming of the names was not sufficient. "Baptisms" administered in assemblies where the right faith--with regard to the names--was absent were void.[44]

Finally, the particular Augustinian emphasis upon God as the direct worker of baptism has the strange result of making Augustine virtually incapable of conceiving any occasion in which the triune name is invoked which could not be used by God for the outpouring of His Holy Spirit. In his treatise *On Baptism* Augustine comes to the questions of whether there is a true baptism which is received from someone who does not possess the Holy Spirit and who "from some promptings of curiosity" has chanced to learn how it ought to be administered and whether there is baptism if the recipient receives it in mockery, in deceit, or in jest "as in a play." Augustine's general answer is that, since baptism administered within the church is recognized irregardless of whether it was given or received in deceit or in mockery, so also baptism performed outside the church, even if done in deceit or in mockery or in a play, ought be accepted as valid. For there is always the chance that, even "in the midst of acting," someone might "be moved by a sudden feeling of religion" and receive baptism rightly.[45] Behind this general stance of Augustine is his view of the fundamental hiddenness of God's elect upon whom God might pour His Holy Spirit at any time, in any place, and on any occasion. Yet Augustine says he is willing "as the safe course for us" not to advance to any rash judgments about this matter, since neither a regional nor ecummenical council has expressed itself on it. Nonetheless, he says, "if anyone were to press me . . . to declare what my own opinion was . . . I should have no hesitation in saying that all men possess baptism who have received it in any place, from any sort of men, provided that it were conse-

crated in the words of the gospel, and received without deceit on their part with some degree of faith; although it would be of no profit to them for the salvation of their souls if they were without charity by which they might be grafted into the Catholic Church."[46] But what of that circumstance "when there was no society of those who so believed, and when the man who received it did not himself hold such belief, but the whole thing was done as a farce, or a comedy, or a jest"? Even here Augustine finds himself unable to declare such a formal activity not to be a baptism. Yet he is circumspect: "If I were asked whether the baptism which was thus conferred should be approved, I should declare my opinion that we ought to pray for the declaration of God's judgment through the medium of some revelation, seeking it with united prayer and earnest groanings of suppliant devotion."[47] Here it is plainly to be discerned that within the thought of Augustine any thought of determining the proper ecclesial boundaries for valid baptism is impossible. He leaves that question "to the utterance of more diligent research or authority higher than my own."[48] Of course, the "boundary" of effective, beneficial baptism is the unity of the church catholic, which, to be sure, in this age is to be identified with the church in the "sacramental communion and the most holy bond of charity," that is, in the church with its sacramental administrations.

II. The Thinking of the Lutheran Confessions

Turning now to Article 8 of the Augustana, there is no intention here of anything like a commentary on its contents. However, in the light of the previous discussion of Cyprian, the Donatists, and Augustine, it seems appropriate to mention a few central aspects of Augustana 7 and 8 and to suggest that, while the emphases differ and to some extent also the structure of thought, the Augustana shares interest with Cyprian every bit as much as it does with Augustine. This point is hardly ever appreciated because of the emphasis on the inherent power of the word in Lutheran thinking. Nevertheless, other interests, closer to Cyprian than to Augustine, are also at work in Augustana 8.

We noted that for Cyprian the idea that the work of Christ and the work of the Holy Spirit could be separated was not acceptable. For

him there could be no operative distinction between a valid sacrament and an efficacious and beneficial sacrament. The Lutheran Confessions also lack that distinction, although they are aware that the Holy Spirit works when and where He will. The fundamental reason for the eschewing of any distinction between validity and efficacy is the determinative conviction concerning the power of the word, that is, that the word bestows the Spirit and the Spirit is bound to the word. This conviction is evident already in Article 3 in reference to the person of Christ. There we learn the goal and purpose of Christ's resurrection and exaltation to the right hand of God; it is "that through the Holy Spirit he [Christ] may sanctify, purify, strengthen, and comfort all who believe in him."[49] The work of Christ is not to be viewed apart from its benefits, that is, apart from the work of the Holy Spirit. Furthermore, the unity of word and Spirit in the confessions is evidenced by the focus upon the external marks of preaching and the administration of the sacraments and by the focus upon the institution and command of Christ. In writing to Ambrosius Catharinus in 1521, Luther had stated that "the entire life and substance of the church is in the word of God,"[50] and elsewhere he had written that "there is the church where the word of God sounds forth . . . for it is the word of God which constitutes the church."[51] When we read then in the Apology that, properly speaking, the church is "that which has the Holy Spirit," we understand better the significance of the words of Augustana 8 that "both the sacraments and the Word are effectual by reason of the institution and commandment of Christ, even if they are administered by evil men."[52] Where Augustine would only be able to say "valid," the Augsburg Confession uses the word "effective." Here baptism possesses inseparably both word and Spirit. We might here refer also to Apology 9 (on baptism), where we are told that the baptism of infants is "necessary and efficacious for salvation."[53] Indeed, the distinctive anti-Donatist interest of Augustana 8 is that there be no denigration of Christ's institution and command. Hence, any suggestion that the quality of the minister's faith or life contributes in any way to the efficacy of baptism is explicitly rejected. The integrity of baptism is wholly apart from faith, for, as Luther wrote in his Large Catechism, "everything depends upon the Word and commandment of God. . . . When the Word accompanies

the water, baptism is valid [*recht*], even though faith be lacking. For my faith does not constitute Baptism but receives it. Baptism does not become invalid [*unrecht*] even if it is wrongly received or used, for it is bound not to our faith but to the Word."[54]

Finally, the unity of word and Spirit is indicated by the very definition of the church which recurs in Articles 7 and 8 of the Augustana and of the Apology. With some frequency Augustine quotes Paul's words in 1 Corinthians 13:2 ("if I have all faith . . . but have not love, I am nothing") to the effect that, while outside the church there may be faith, yet it is the bond of love with the catholic church which truly demarcates the church. Baptism may therefore be given outside the church, but it is not profitable until the Holy Spirit is given within the church. However, in the confessions the church is explicitly the community of *both* faith and the Holy Spirit. As Augustana 8 puts it, "the Christian church, properly speaking, is nothing else than the assembly of all believers *and* saints."[55] In the Apology one reads corresponding definitions: the church is "the association of faith and of the Holy Spirit in men's hearts"; the church is "the congregation of saints who have among themselves the association of the same Gospel or doctrine and the same Holy Spirit, who renews, sanctifies, and directs their hearts"; the church properly called is "the congregation of saints who truly believe the Gospel of Christ and have the Holy Spirit."[56] Indeed, faith is the distinctive gift of the Holy Spirit, as we learn from Augustana 5, for "to obtain such [justifying] faith God instituted the office of the ministry, that is, provided the Gospel and the sacraments. Through these, as through means, he gives the Holy Spirit, who works faith, when and where he pleases."[57] Not surprisingly, therefore, and otherwise than in Augustine, Luther writes that "outside the Christian church (that is, where the Gospel is not) there is no forgiveness, and hence no holiness."[58] One cannot divide and separate word and the Spirit; the Spirit is bound to the word. In sum, because the confessors could not and did not think of the sacrament as other than possessing inseparably both word and Spirit, the Augustana can assert that the sacraments are "signs and testimonies of God's will toward us."[59] Augustine could never have said that.

Because of the emphasis in the confessions upon the efficacy of

the word and the importance of faith, there is an emphasis on pure and correct teaching and faithfulness to the institution of Christ. Here also the confessions seem closer to Cyprian than to Augustine. Faith is not unrelated to correct and pure preaching and teaching and the right use of the sacraments. We are all familiar with the assertion of the Augustana that "it is sufficient for the true unity of the church" (that is, sufficient for the reception of saving faith through the Holy Spirit) that "the Gospel be preached in conformity with a pure understanding of it and that the sacraments be administered in accordance with the divine Word."[60] It is a point often repeated by Luther and the confessions. For example, in his treatise *On Councils and the Church* (1539), Luther maintains that one recognizes "God's people in the holy sacrament of baptism, wherever it rightly, according to Christ's institution, is *taught*, believed, and used."[61] According to the confessions, unlike Augustine, the direct action of God in the sacraments is the direct action of the word and the Holy Spirit bound to the word. Thus, the confessions provide a basis for deciding whether sacraments administered here or there are or can be regarded as true sacraments. In his *Confession concerning Christ's Supper* of 1528, Luther asserts, apparently against the Anabaptists, that the sacraments do not stand "on man's belief or unbelief but on the Word and ordinance of God--unless they first change God's Word and ordinance and misinterpret them, as the enemies of the sacrament do at the present time. They, indeed, have only mere bread and wine, for they do not also have the words and instituted ordinance of God but have perverted and changed it according to their own imagination."[62]

There is, then, a boundary for the mishandling and profanation of the sacraments. Regin Prenter seems essentially correct when he argues that the permission given in Augustana 8 to receive the sacraments from unbelieving pastors presupposes that the institution and command of Christ are expressed in such a way that the faithful can hold on to it, can recognize it as that of the Lord, and therefore need have no worry about the character of the pastor.[63] The proclamation of the gospel is not unrelated to the right administration and use of the sacraments. But the Word of God has been made flesh and has dwelt among us. The story of His life, the

accounts of His sacramental institutions, and the record of His words of institution and command are indispensable for the teaching, preaching, and the right use of the sacraments which are the marks of the church and apart from which we would have no reason to believe that the church is present.

ENDNOTES

1. Apology 7-8.3: "That is why we added the eighth article, to avoid the impression that we separate evil men and hypocrites from the outward fellowship of the church or deny efficacy to the sacraments which evil men or hypocrites administer." *The Book of Concord: The Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church.* Trans. and Ed. Theodore G. Tappert in collaboration with Jaroslav Pelikan, Robert H. Fischer, and Arthur C. Piepkorn (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1959), p. 168.

2. *Adversus Haereses*, 3.24.1. *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the Writings of the Fathers down to A.D. 325*, ed. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson (New York: The Christian Literature Company, 1885-1887) [henceforth abbreviated ANF], 1, p. 458.

3. *De Oratione* 2 (ANF 3.682); cf. Romans 8:15-16.

4. *De Baptismo* 6 (ANF 3.672).

5. *De Pudicitia* 21; (ANF 4.99).

6. An example is the creedal formula in *Epistula Apostolorum 5*: "in the Father, the ruler of the entire world, and in Jesus Christ, our Savior, and in the Holy Spirit, the Paraclete, and in the holy church and in the forgiveness of sins." The *Epistula* dates from c. 140 A.D.

7. Cyprian, *Epistle* 75.9 (ANF 5.392). This letter, although a part of the collection of Cyprian's letters, is in fact a letter to Cyprian from Firmilian, Bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, who was a strong supporter of Cyprian's position in the East.

8. Cyprian, *Epistle* 74.5 (ANF 5.387); also 74.1; 73.4.

9. Cyprian, *Epistle* 73.4 (ANF 5.380).

10. Cyprian, *Epistle* 69.7 (ANF 5.399).

11. For the thought of Cyprian on church and sacrament see Erich Altendorf, *Einheit und Heiligkeit der Kirche: Untersuchungen zur Entwicklung des altchristlichen Kirchenbegriffs im Abendland von Tertullian bis zu den antidonatistischen Schriften Augustins* (Berlin-Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter, 1932), pp. 44-116; Geoffrey Grimshaw Willis, *Saint Augustine and the Donatist Controversy* (London: SPCK, 1950), pp. 96-105; Walter Simonis, *Ecclesia Visibilis et Invisibilis: Untersuchungen zur Ekklesiologie und Sakramentenlehre in der afrikanischen Tradition von Cyprian bis Augustinus* (Frankfurt: Josef Knecht, 1970), pp. 1-23; Ulrich Wickert, *Sacramentum Unitatis: Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis der Kirche bei Cyprian* (Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1971); Robert F. Evans, *One and Holy: The Church in Latin Patristic Thought* (London: SPCK, 1972), pp. 36-64; Michael M. Sage, *Cyprian* (Philadelphia: Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, 1975), pp. 295-335.

12. Cyprian, *Epistle* 70.3 (ANF 5.376): "neque enim potest pars illic inanis esse et pars praevalere. si baptizare potuit, potuit et spiritum sanctum dare."

13. Cyprian, *Epistle* 75.9 (ANF 5.392): "qui baptizat habet spiritum sanctum et baptisma quoque ipsum non sit sine spiritu constitutum."

14. For parallels between the unity of God and the unity of the church, see Cyprian, *Epistle* 74.4; 75.3; *De Unitate Ecclesiae* 23.21.

15. Cyprian, *Epistle* 33.1: "ecclesia super episcopos constituatur et omnis actus ecclesiae per eosdem praepositos gubernetur"; cf. ANF 5.305.

16. See Cyprian, *Epistle* 66.4; 75.16. For discussion of this point see Evans, *One and Holy*, p. 50.

17. Cyprian, *Epistle* 73.7 (ANF 5.381), also 75.16.

18. Cyprian, *Epistle* 69.7 (ANF 5.399).

19. Cyprian, *Epistle* 69.8 (ANF 5.399).

20. Cyprian, *Epistle* 69.7; 70.1,2.

21. Cyprian, *Epistle* 66.8: "et illi sunt ecclesia plebs sacerdoti adunata et pastori suo grex adhaerens. unde scire debes episcopum in ecclesia esse et ecclesiam in episcopo et si qui cum episcopo non sit in ecclesia non esse"; cf. ANF 5.374-375.

22. Cyprian, *Epistle* 73.5: "quomodo ergo potest videri qui apud illos baptizatur consecutus esse peccatorum remissam et divinae indulgentiae gratiam per suam fidem qui ipsius fidei non habuerit veritatem?"; cf. ANF 5.380-381.

23. Cyprian, *Epistle* 73.12 (ANF 5.382).

24. Cyprian, *Epistle* 73.12 (ANF 5.382).

25. For Donatist views on church and sacrament see Altendorf, *Einheit und Heiligkeit*, pp. 117-153; Simonis, *Ecclesia Visibilis et Invisibilis*, pp. 23-43; Evans, *One and Holy*, pp. 65-91.

26. For fuller discussion of Augustine's views on church and sacrament see Altendorf, *Einheit und Heiligkeit*, pp. 158-171; Willis, *Saint Augustine*, pp. 113-126, 144-168; Stanislaus J. Grabowski, *The Church: An Introduction to the Theology of St. Augustine* (London: B. Herder Book Company, 1957); Simonis, *Ecclesia Visibilis et Invisibilis*, pp. 75-124; Evans, *One and Holy*, pp. 79-128.

27. Evans, *One and Holy*, p. 65.

28. See Augustine, *De Vera Religione* 4.6. For an identification of the Roman Empire as a sign of God's fulfilled promise see *Contra Faustum Manichaean* 13.13: "signum et indicium manifestum." For discussion of this point see Simonis, *Ecclesia Visibilis et Invisibilis*, pp. 76-77.

29. Evans, *One and Holy*, p. 84.

30. Simonis, *Ecclesia Visibilis et Invisibilis*, pp. 84-85.

31. Augustine, *Contra Litteras Petiliani*, 2.81.178. *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, First Series, ed. Philip Schaff (Buffalo: The Christian Literature Company, 1887-1890) [henceforth abbreviated NPNF], 4, p. 571.

32. On this theme see especially Grabowski, *The Church*, pp. 230-464. Also Simonis, *Ecclesia Visibilis et Invisibilis*, pp. 79-83.

33. Augustine, *De Baptismo* 3.16.21 (NPNF, 4.442). Augustine consistently understands *hē agapē tou theou* of Romans 5:5 to mean love which is directed toward God, having God as its object, not the love which God directs toward us.

34. Augustine, *De Baptismo* 1.5.7 (NPNF, 4.415); also *De Baptismo* 4.2.2.

35. Augustine, *De Baptismo* 1.12.18 (NPNF, 4.419). See also *De Baptismo* 3.16.21; 5.8.9; 6.5.7.

36. Augustine, *In Joannis Evangelium Tractatus* 5.1.6. (NPNF, 7.33).

37. Augustine, *Epistle* 61.1; see also *De Baptismo* 4.1.1; 4.17.24; 6.1.1. This usage does not mean that baptisms administered outside the church are utterly worthless, Grabowski explains: "Augustine admits the validity of baptism administered outside the church. Baptism so administered produces, in the soul of the recipient, an effect which Augustine calls a 'form' (*forma, forma pietatis*). However, since it is produced outside the church, it is irregular and illicit, and consequently it does not convey the life of grace, it does not bring a rebirth of the soul, it does not effect a participation in the Holy Ghost. . . . However, on account of the sacramental 'form' impressed on the baptized one, when such a person returns from heresy or schism to the fold of the church, and becomes a member of the mystical body of Christ, he returns to the source of grace, to the fount of charity, and to a participation of the Holy Ghost (*The Church*, pp. 236-237).

38. Augustine, *De Baptismo* 1.10.14: "Nor is it those only that do not belong to it who are openly guilty of the manifest sacrilege of schism, but also those who, being outwardly joined to its [the church's] unity, are yet separated by a life of sin" (NPNF, 4.418); also *De Baptismo* 3.16.21; 3.18.23; 4.3.5.

39. Augustine, *De Baptismo* 4.3.5: "For, according to His foreknowledge, who knows whom He has foreordained before the foundation of the world to be made like to the image of His Son, many who are even openly outside, and are called heretics, are better than many good catholics. For we see what they are today; what they shall be tomorrow we know not. And with God, with whom the future is already present, they already are what they shall hereafter be. But we, according to what each man is at present, inquire whether they are to be today reckoned

among the members of the church which is called the one dove, and the Bride of Christ without a spot or wrinkle" (NPNF, 4.448).

40. Augustine, *De Baptismo* 3.10.15: "Nor is the water 'profane and adulterous' over which the name of God is invoked, even though it be invoked by profane and adulterous persons" (NPNF, 4.439).

41. Augustine, *Contra Litteras Petiliani*, 3.49.59 (NPNF, 4.621). See also *De Baptismo* 3.16.21: "invisibly and imperceptibly" the Holy Spirit is given. In this passage Augustine distinguishes "the sacrament," which even heretics can possess; "the operation of the Spirit" (such as prophecy), which even the wicked can possess; and "the operation of the Spirit," which "only the good can have" (NPNF, 4.443).

42. Augustine, *Epistle* 93.11.48 (NPNF, 1.399); also *De Baptismo* 6.5.7: "It makes no difference to the holiness of baptism how much worse the man may be that has it, or how much worse he that confers it" (NPNF, 4.481).

43. Athanasius, *Contra Arianos* 2.42. *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, Second Series, ed. Philip Schaff and Henry Wace (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, n.d.), 4, p. 371.

44. In *Contra Arianos* 2.43 Athanasius mentions other heresies which "use the words only, but not in a right sense . . . nor with sound faith [*mē phronousai de orthōs . . . mēde tēn pistin hugiainousan*], and in consequence the water which they administer is unprofitable, as deficient in piety, so that he who is sprinkled by them is rather polluted by irreligion than redeemed." He mentions the Manichees, Phrygians (Montanists), Samosatenes, the Gentiles (as atheists), and again the Arians. This viewpoint of Athanasius had earlier been asserted by the Council of Arles (314 A.D.) and was reaffirmed in Canon 19 of the Council of Nicaea (325 A.D.) against the followers of Paul of Samosata.

45. Augustine, *De Baptismo* 7.53.101 (NPNF, 4.512-513).

46. Augustine, *De Baptismo* 7.53.102 (NPNF, 4.513).

47. Augustine, *De Baptismo* 7.53.102 (NPNF, 4.513).

48. Augustine, *De Baptismo* 7.53.102 (NPNF, 4.513).

49. Tappert, p. 30. CA 3.4: "ut sedeat ad dexteram patris et perpetuo regnet ac dominetur omnibus creaturis, sanctificet credentes in ipsum, misso in corda eorum spiritu sancto, qui regat, consoletur et vivificet eos ac defendat adversus diabolum et vim peccati."

50. *WA* 7.721.12: "tota vita et substantia Ecclesiae est in verbo dei."

51. *WA* 43.597.2: "ibi esse ecclesiam Dei, ubi verbum Dei sonat. . . . Sermo Dei enim est, qui constituit ecclesiam"; cf. *LW* 5.244.

52. Tappert, p. 172. Apology 7-8.22: "Illa vero est proprie ecclesia, quae habet spiritum sanctum." Tappert, p. 33. CA 8.3: "Et sacramenta et verbum propter ordinationem et mandatum Christi sunt efficacia, etiamsi per malos exhibeantur."

53. Tappert, p. 178. Apology 9.1: "necessarius et efficax ad salutem."

54. Tappert, p. 443. LC IV.53.

55. Tappert, p. 33, italics added. CA 8.1: "ecclesia proprie sit congregatio sanctorum et vere credentium."

56. Tappert, p. 169. Apology 7-8.5: "societas fidei et spiritus sancti in cordibus." Tappert, p. 169. Apology 7-8.8: "congregationem sanctorum, qui habent inter se societatem eiusdem evangelii seu doctrinae et efusdem spiritus sancti, qui corda eorum renovat, sanctificat et gubernat." Tappert, p. 173. Apology 7-8.28: "congregationem sanctorum, qui vere credunt evangelio Christi et habent spiritum sanctum."

57. Tappert, p. 31. CA 5.1-2.

58. Tappert, p. 418. LC II.56: "extra hanc christianitatem, ubi huic evangelio locus non est, neque ulla est peccatorum remissio, quemadmodum nec ulla sanctificatio adesse potest."

59. Tappert, p. 35. CA 13.1: "signa et testimonia voluntatis Dei erga nos."

60. Tappert, p. 32. CA 7.2.

61. *WA* 50.630: "kennt man Gottes Volck oder das Christlich heilig Volck an dem heiligen Sacrament der Tauffe, wo es recht, nach Christus ordnung geleret, gegleubt und gebraucht wird"; *LW* 41.151.

62. *LW* 37.367 (*WA* 26.367). In his *Americanisch-lutherische Pastoraltheologie* C. F. W. Walther also emphasizes the connection between true (*giltig*) baptism and right doctrine and faith and expresses opinions like those of Athanasius concerning the Arians (see notes 43, 44). It is not simply the right baptismal formula which makes a true baptism; the church which baptizes must possess the right meaning which the baptismal formula intends: "Allein nicht der Schall der in der heiligen Schrift enthaltenen Worte ist das Wort Gottes, sondern der damit ausgedruekte Sinn." Walther quotes Paul Tarnov (d. 1633), who quotes Basil of Caesarea concerning the organic bond between the baptismal formula, right faith about the formula, and churchly acts: "Wir muessen zwar so getauft werden, wie wir empfangen haben; aber auch so glauben, wie wir getauft werden; aber auch so preisen, wie wir geglaubt haben, nehmlich den Vater und den Sohn und den Heiligen Geist" (pp. 120-125; also the quotes from Brenz, pp. 111-112). Beyond the Arians and the Socinians, Walther adds the Swedenborgians, the Unitarians, the Campbellites, and free associations as groups whose baptisms cannot be accepted.

63. Regin Prenter, *Das Bekenntnis von Augsburg: Eine Auslegung* (Erlangen: Martin-Luther Verlag, 1980), p. 119.

Theological Observer

"THE DEADLY TRIO OF LITURGICAL HERESIES"

The title used above is taken from an advertisement of Open Church Ministries in *Christianity Today* (March 11, 1991). Here are the three sins unto death: 1. In worship the congregation has become an audience and the pastor a performer. 2. No lay preaching means that a "church probably doesn't allow laymen to *mature* into ministers." 3. No sharing means that the poor preacher "beats his brains out in the pulpit week after week to make a difference in people's lives" without any response from them. James Rutz, the author of the article-advertisement, provides this analysis of the problem:

> You find that the root problem, in a nutshell, is the "priesthood of believers," the central goal of the Reformation, still exists only on paper. In a very important sense, our churches remain closed to laymen.

It is with hesitancy that I mention that a booklet, *1700 Years Is Long Enough: A Guide to Creating an Open Church*, is available for $3.00. Lutherans will feel uncomfortable with this interpretation of the priesthood of believers. Some ideas are familiar under other disguises and can be easily critiqued. Especially problematic is the false opinion that the ministry is viewed as a higher level of sanctification within the reach of every Christian. The corollary is that it is not a special office established by Christ and derived from the apostles, the chief heresy for Open Church Ministries. If the ministry is a matter of spiritual maturity, then the apostles should have been disqualified. In closing, the article-advertisement says that, if the Open Church Ministries program is adopted, "you will never be the same, and your church won't either--praise God!" Certainly it will not be Lutheran.

David P. Scaer

FIGHTING FOR SOULS: MORMONS VERSUS ANGLICANS

A controversy has broken out over a Mormon attempt to obtain registrations of baptisms of the Church of England for the Mormon genealogical rolls in Salt Lake City. Such, at least, is the stated purpose. The real intention, an Anglican authority fears, is the Mormon rebaptism of the souls of the dead. Americans, who keep separate birth and baptismal rolls, are not faced with this problem. Many of our dear Lutheran ancestors have already been spirited away into the Mormon heaven (by vicarious baptism) by means of raids on county-seat and city-hall records. The response of the diocesan archivist of Chichester, the lord protector of the rolls, would be humorous if it were not intended to be serious. "The concern is that the baptism of the dead is an interference

with the souls of dead Anglicans (which the Mormons want to acquire) that is not in keeping with the traditions of the Anglican Church." This statement is capable of an exegesis of various sorts. On the surface the Anglican archivist has appointed himself as a St. Michael at the heavenly gates to prevent the Mormons from sneaking into the Christian heaven to carry off the souls of deceased Anglicans. We American Christians have no guardians, since our birth records can be obtained by anyone. Or perhaps the reference to "souls of dead Anglicans" has another meaning. Similar is the debate over 1 Peter 4:6. Just who are the "dead" to whom "the gospel was preached"? We leave this question to wiser men and to the archivist who has planted his feet at the door of heaven to fight off the marauding Mormons and to defend the inviolate Anglican traditions. "Onward Christian Soldiers" might be an appropriate hymn for the occasion. "The Battle Hymn of the Republic" might offend English sensitivities.

David P. Scaer

TWEAKING BISHOPS' NOSES: A SLIGHT RETRACTION

In commenting on Richard John Neuhaus's trek to Rome (*CTQ* 55 [January 1991], pp. 44-48), I said that "it seems unlikely that he will tweak the noses of Rome's bishops as he did those in the more tolerant ELCA." But tweaking is exactly what the ex-Missourian is doing. He has tilted the miter of Archbishop Weakland of Milwaukee, who has suggested a more open dialogue with women considering an abortion. Weakland states: "Our ability to defend the life of the unborn will only be deepened when we expand that kind of respectful dialogue" (*First Things*, 12 [April 1991], p. 68). The prelate claims that he upholds churchly opposition to abortion, but at the same time he has been "harshly judgmental toward those in the prolife movement." LCMS pastors in Wisconsin already knew the archbishop's position. We thank Neuhaus for telling the rest of us. Here is an issue where the LCMS and the Roman Church have stood together.

In a signed editorial, "More on the Gulf" (pp. 62-63), Neuhaus criticizes another prelate for writing in a letter made public by Senator Edward Kennedy that President Bush's "call for unity is specious" and "a demand that we abandon our own judgment, conviction, and, at least in some cases, moral principles for the sake of going along." Wryly Neuhaus adds, "So now you know what this President is really up to." The bishop's name is known to Neuhaus, but out of charity he is not revealing

it. Neuhaus will be admitted into the priesthood of the Archdiocese of New York. If the Roman Church had a collegial system like the LCMS Council of Presidents, the doors of that heaven might forever have been blocked to him. Neuhaus-watchers who want to read his statements first-hand may subscribe to *First Things*, P.O. Box 3000, Department FT, Denville, New Jersey 07834-9847, at $24 per annum. Special promotions may bring the cost down a little. The layout resembles the original issues of *Christianity Today* and its writing style the *National Review*, although without the latter's delectable humor.

David P. Scaer

FEMINISM: THE END OF THE FORWARD ADVANCE?

An Associated Press release (March 29, 1991) reported: "Bishops of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America say that the only doctrinally acceptable way for a person to be baptized is 'in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.'" Many LCMS pastors can breathe a sigh of relief that they will not have to face the touchy issue of determining whether baptisms administered in the name of the "Creator, Redeemer, and Sanctifier" are acceptable. The ELCA bishops had come under heavy fire for not exerting their role as their church's teachers. This statement is their second encyclical to gain public attention. The first was their opposition to homosexual ordination. Retreat from Moscow was the turning point for both Napoleon's and Hitler's armies. The episcopal pronouncement, unanimously adopted, leaves radical feminists with little hope of doing away with the classical and biblical trinitarian formula in ELCA. Encouraging was the statement by the bishops that "we must also be responsible in maintaining the integrity of our orthodox Christian tradition." It has been a long time since we heard that kind of phrase. Twenty years ago it should have been raised in the matter of women's ordination. Nevertheless, the besieging armies have been stopped in their forward advance for now.

Part of the AP report that "Christians 'dare not confuse our proclamation about God and our invocation of God'" shows that a retreat from radical feministic expressions is not total withdrawal. The bishops concede that "in speaking about God, creative use of both masculine and feminine metaphors, analogies, similes, and symbols are highly appropriate and recommended by both Scripture and tradition . . . ." Granting that there is a distinction between invoking God and proclaiming Him, this hardly means that feministic language unacceptable in invoking Him

becomes acceptable in preaching about Him. The language of prayer and invocation cannot undergo a metamorphosis in preaching. The Father of the trinitarian invocation cannot become a mother in our sermons. The God we confess is the God we preach.

Perhaps the bishops want to avoid appearing too harsh in a church body in which the proportion of female seminarians is approaching a majority. In this context the bishops' requirement of "Father-Son-Holy Spirit" terminology is courageous. Yet there must be a limit to the creative use of language in preaching about God. Similes provide a greater latitude than metaphors. God is *like* the woman sweeping the house for the lost coin. Some pastors who are overly sensitive to using feminine analogies have suggested that the woman is the church. Sometimes the Scriptures do use an analogy that would otherwise seem objectionable to call our attention to God's action. The coming of the Lord's day as a thief in the night can hardly suggest a lack of divine seriousness in the Seventh Commandment. God can be *like* a hen gathering chicks. Switching some analogies to metaphors may be slightly disrespectful. God can be like a mother in His care of Israel, but to change the analogy to a metaphor is to introduce an ancient pagan abomination. Such a metaphor as the bridegroom-bride imagery to describe the relationship of God to His believing community is laid in cement in both the Old and New Testaments--for example, the Prophets, the Synoptics, Paul, and the Apocalypse. Our language about God (theology) must first be drawn from and then be guided by the Scriptures. The bottom line to our confessional subscription is that the Scriptures are the source and norm of doctrine, especially our speaking about God. The unbridled creative use of metaphor would give us an entirely different religion. The libertine use of creative metaphor gave the ancient world its fertility cults. Having stopped the advance by maintaining the "Father-Son-Holy Spirit" invocation, the ELCA bishops can take up the more fundamental issue of why we *must* use this language in speaking about God.

David P. Scaer

ANOTHER GLOOMY ADVENT

Any doubt of the Lutheran seriousness about original sin is removed when the number and length of the liturgical penitential seasons are considered. Alongside the forty-day period of Lent one must place the two and a half weeks of pre-Lent beginning with Quinquagesima and the whole season of Advent. If one adds to these the ten-day period between

Ascension and Pentecost and the final three weeks in the Trinity season, nearly one quarter of the church year is penitential. Some have perhaps tipped the boat too far in the other direction by stressing each Sunday as a celebration. Yet an unnecessarily heavy emphasis on penitence might negate the place of the gospel in Christianity. Not only may gloom and doom betray the gospel, but the church might find it difficult to attract outsiders and to keep its own members. A preacher with a penitential mind-set may be tempted to preach sermons heavily oriented to the law. He has another opportunity to castigate his people for their sins. The genius of Christianity is not simply that people are confronted with the grotesqueness of their sin, but that they find sweet comfort in Christ. Our liturgical seasons should reflect this genius.

The earliest apostolic and post-apostolic church did not know of such long penitential seasons. Lent was the first and lasted only several days before Easter. Marked by nearly complete fasting, it was both shorter and more severe than our longer forty-day period, characterized by half-hearted resolutions to give up the inconsequential luxuries of life. Often these are hardly more than second attempts to carry out failed New Year's resolutions. It seems that the older custom of a shorter and more intense penitential season has much to offer. But apart from the questions of how long we make Lent and how we observe it, do we really need a pre-penitential season before Lent and a penitential season before Christmas?

This question is prompted by the Reverend Clark Morphew, an ELCA clergyman in the Minneapolis area and a nationally syndicated columnist. In an article entitled "A Few Carols Lift Spirits at Advent," he begins with this telling sentence: "Sunday we begin Advent, one of the dreariest seasons of the church's liturgical calendar--and the time that preachers set aside to drive people wild with greed and desire." Morphew is not so radical as to suggest that Advent be abolished, nor is he in any way a crypto-Arminian who denies sin's control over human life. His is only a humane suggestion that perhaps each Sunday during Advent the pastor might let the people sing one Christmas carol in church.

As he points out, the whole scheme is off-balance. The people reach Christmas only after four gloomy Advent Sundays, following perhaps three Sundays stressing divine judgment (at the end of the ecclesiastical year), and are then left with very little Christmas. It is no wonder that Christmas *has* to be celebrated outside of the church. Dante's *Inferno* or a Roman requiem mass for the poor souls in purgatory could not be more depressing. The pastor's proclamation on Christmas Day that the world's

celebration is ending and that the church's is only beginning is simply untrue. Christmas begins on December 24 and ends on December 25. There quickly follow the holidays of St. Stephen the Martyr, St. John the Apostle, and the Holy Innocents, and somehow that momentary Christmas joy is swallowed up. Epiphany might be called the Christmas of the Gentiles, but we all know it really is not. Christmas was two weeks before. Unless Christmas were celebrated in the shopping malls and with television specials, it would almost be missed in the churches. Hymn for hymn the weight is on Advent and not Christmas. Some of the greatest Christmas music is neither sung nor heard in the church. Advent loses its role as preparation and becomes a thing in itself.

Clark Morphew is not suggesting that we scrub Advent. Certainly one would not destroy the anticipation of Advent by letting the poor people sing just one Christmas hymn each Sunday. The characters of Advent and Lent are *not* identical. Lent leads downward to Good Friday, but Advent leads upward to Christmas. Easter joy is built on the surprise that the crucified one has risen from the dead. Christmas is the joy over what we all know is going to happen. An analogy using pregnancy and birth might be the best one. The liturgical categorization of hymns is hardly the law of the Medes and the Persians. The editors of *Lutheran Worship* have transferred St. Ambrose's and Luther's "Savior of the Nations, Come" from the Christmas section to the Advent section. Following Clark Morphew's suggestion, a few more liturgical transgressions would not only be in order but welcomed by the people. Advent may not be Christmas, but it is the prelude to and, indeed, the beginning of Christmas. Our preaching may take on a different character with an occasional Christmas carol.

David P. Scaer

CLOSED COMMUNION: SAYING IT BETTER

Some time back I wrote a brief piece on how the expression "closed communion" and not "close communion" expresses the ancient and traditional church policy of admitting only those to the Lord's Supper who belong to the fellowship of the church. In an article in a recent issue of the *Concordia Journal*, Norman Nagel of Concordia Seminary in Saint Louis provides the necessary biblical and historical data to support this assertion and states his preference for "closed communion" to say what the church really intends to say about this practice. His article, "Closed Communion: In the Way of the Gospel; In the Way of the Law" (17

[January 1991], pp. 20-29), attempts with much success to determine the origin of the phrase, "close communion," which is clearly of recent invention. For me the phrase was a puzzle and I could trace it back no further than Fritz's *Pastoral Theology* (1931). It is not known to Pieper. With the wide use and influence of Fritz, it attained virtually doctrinal status, especially among those who wanted to maintain some sort of communion practice. Nagel convincingly shows that the phrase "close communion" came from the Baptists and probably migrated into Lutheran theology in the early part of this century. This fascinating story is contained in a footnote (pp. 27-28, note 8) which may have escaped less persistent readers. The phrase, which has no biblical origin, has taken on a life of its own and has given rise to theological disputations. A random selection of Sunday church bulletins suggests that my contribution of some years back was completely ignored. Nagel's superior argumentation should be elevated from a scholarly footnote to popular dissemination. "Close communion" is the unofficial "official" substitute for "closed communion" in LCMS circles, even though its origin among the Baptists might be sufficient reason to ignore it.

Only in English is it possible to make the transition from "closed" to "close" to give the impression--and I might add the false impression--that with both words we are saying the same thing. For example, in German "closed" would be *geschlossen* and "close" *nah* or *eng*. Both words do have the same Latin ancestry in *claudere*, "to shut," but have descended into the English language by different paths. The word "close" has a chumminess about it which conjures up the picture of the communicants holding hands during the reception of the sacrament while singing "Let Us Break Bread Together on Our Knees," a Protestant hymn which has been strangely showing up in Roman Catholic "missalettes." (The use of the word "missalette" for the throw-away services in the Roman Catholic Church shows that not even it is immune to Protestant trends.) In any event, the contemporary church is more comfortable with "close communion," and the matter should rest there. "Close" and "closed" are at least linguistic second cousins, but conceptually each is saying something different than the other. "Closed" implies that someone is kept out; at the time of the eucharistic celebration the doors were closed. "Close" implies that "we are all in this together." Since no other major Protestant denomination is even concerned about such matters, this terminology is strictly the business of the LCMS.

The Holy Supper is first of all a participation in Christ and secondarily a sharing with others who are receiving. Fellowship among Christians is

dependent on and an extension of the participation in the eucharist. We are part of one another not directly but through Christ's body and blood. If one switches the order, the biblical model is replaced with Schleiermacher's, as is shown in Werner Elert's *Eucharist and Church Fellowship*. (Nagel deserves our thanks again for the English translation of this volume.)

The real problem is not whether the practice is called "closed communion" or "close communion," but whether our church will be able to implement any restrictions at all on those who wish to commune. Equally important is how the practice of restrictive communion will be maintained without offending the proclamation of the gospel. On the surface there is the theological problem of a seeming contradiction between the invitation of the gospel urging *all* to come to Jesus and the rule that only *some* (and not others) may receive the eucharist. Any relaxation of our communion practices probably comes from an effort to overcome this tension. The one stranded in the pew is fully aware that he has been "closed" out--excluded--in spite of the fact he has been informed by the bulletin or communion card that "close communion" is practiced. He knows that he is not "close" enough to be included. A restrictive communion practice can make inviting the unchurched--whether they are nominal Christians, Christians of other denominations, or non-Christians--awkward, to say the least. These invitations are important because, within the context of the hymns, the liturgy, the Scripture readings, and the sermon, conversion takes place. Here the unbeliever is confronted with the law and the gospel, just as the believer is. The outsider is invited to participate in hearing the word, but is excluded from the sacrament for which he is properly deemed unprepared. He cannot be put in a position where he will take the holy things lightly, and thus he must wait.

The early church did not have to face this problem since only the baptized in communion with the celebrating church remained for the eucharist. This second half of the service was called the *missa fidelium*, because only those who had confessed the faith were there. Constantine's "christianization" of the Roman Empire made infidelity politically inexpedient and almost extinct. Soon all citizens of the empire were *ipso facto* members of the church. The matter was resolved and stayed resolved up through the eighteenth century when princes and governments still largely determined the religious persuasion of their subjects. To be Spanish was to be Roman Catholic, Scottish to be Presbyterian, and Swedish to be Lutheran. One physician treating my sainted pastor-father informed him that he would not have been Catholic but Lutheran, if he

had been born a few kilometers in another direction. Political boundaries were synonymous with religious ones, and thus in Europe whole towns and states were of one religion. With the exception of the colonial period, America has not known this kind of monolithic religious situation. Thus, visitors to our congregations may not belong to our denomination. In certain cases members of the church may account for a small portion of the assembly--for example, at some weddings, memorial services, baptisms, and confirmations. To avoid the embarrassment of excluding most of those present the pastor has no difficulty in overcoming the temptation to celebrate Holy Communion. Since the early church knew of no other Sunday services than those at which the communion was celebrated, no one can seriously suggest that we have fewer such services in order to maintain our restrictive policy. That course of action would be "closed communion" with a vengeance and "close communion" of no kind!

It seems totally unlikely that any church with a restrictive communion practice will revive the ancient custom of dismissing the non-members after the sermon in order to restrict the communion to the baptized. Churches of the Roman and Eastern Orthodox communions certainly do not do so. A church with a "closed communion" policy will have to be sensitive to those who remain in the pew. Through special prayers in the bulletins and the singing of hymns, some spiritual participation can be provided for those who do not receive Holy Communion. Luther prepared the hymn, "O Lord, We Praise You," to help communicants understand the Lord's Supper. This hymn, with others and various prayers, can also serve those who are not communing.

In some Lutheran congregations many of the members themselves leave at the time of the communion. We are, however, overcoming the unfortunate custom of having, not the *infideles*, but the *fideles* leave before the communion, simply because the length of the service interferes with their schedules. In any case, usage of restricted communion can be awkward simply because some can receive and others not. Calling the practice "close communion" and not "closed communion" attempts to remove the awkwardness of having those who are allowed to commune and those who are not at the same service. In reality it might even worsen matters, since it suggests that some do not belong to the "club." Exclusion from the Supper says less about not belonging to the group and more about not being ready to receive what the early church called "the holy things."

"Open communion," in some sense of the term, is common practice in the mainline Protestant denominatons and in not a few Roman Catholic parishes (despite the official policy of Rome). In actual practice attendance at the Holy Communion is not problematic for some denominations since it is so infrequently celebrated. Many Protestant churches are without altars and so have no special provisions for a ritual of this kind. Some churches with a eucharistic piety--for example, the Episcopal Church--resolve the issue of who may attend by simply inviting all baptized Christians. But even these churches do not have a completely "open communion," since the suggestion is made in the bulletin that only those who have been baptized may receive. As open as this invitation is, it might offend those who find baptism unnecessary. It is hard to believe that any church has a completely "open communion" policy to allow, let alone encourage, non-believers to commune. But anything is possible.

Lutheran congregations may be tempted to let down some barriers to communion simply in order to be like other churches. Our practice of restricting admission to the altar was the uniform usage of the church in its first seventeen centuries and is in line with the official positions of the Roman and Eastern churches. The professors of St. Vladimir's Seminary, a Russian Orthodox institution, were both surprised and delighted to learn that the LCMS adhered, as they do, to the ancient custom of closed communion. Simply put, "closed communion" is neither sectarian, as if it were a private custom, nor schismatic, as if it were bringing unnecessary divisions to the church. We should neither feel awkward nor be embarrassed. The historical and ecumenical arguments overwhelmingly favor placing restrictions on who may approach the altar to receive Christ's body and blood, as Nagel has shown. The Holy Communion is, after all, more than an opportunity to get spiritually acquainted with the person sitting next to us in the pew.

Our own churches handle a restrictive communion practice in a variety of ways. Communion registration cards are in a very real sense restriction cards. They are more than a means of obtaining names and addresses to keep track of who was really there. In nearly all cases they require belief in the real presence, membership in the denomination, or more specifically membership in the celebrating congregation. Others tactfully require that those receiving for the first time see the pastor before the service begins. This approach removes some embarrassment, since both visiting Lutherans and non-Lutherans must see the pastor before communion. But this requirement presents problems in logistics. Arriving at the church at 10:25 for a service beginning at 10:30 does not really allow any time for

the would-be communicant, even if he is Lutheran, to find the sacristy and announce his desire to commune. Demonstrating membership in a Lutheran congregation resolves the problem easily. Just how the pastor can explain our communion policy in a minute or two at the most to the non-Lutheran is another matter. The tactfully stated requirement of speaking to the pastor before the service can never really be carried out when it is read for the first time only minutes before the beginning of the service. It is simply a polite way for the church to say that the communion is closed to visitors. If the visitor reads the notice and takes it seriously, the pastor in the overwhelming majority of cases does not have to explain the practice.

In most churches the matter of who may come to the communion is handled by a notice in the bulletin. One of the more thorough announcements, touching all bases, reads as follows:

> Our congregation observes the historic church practice of "close communion." "Communicant" membership testifies of a "closeness" in faith, in doctrine, and in "mutual conversation and consolation of brethren." God's Word admonishes each individual communicant to "examine himself" before participating in the Lord's Supper, for "worthy participation" means repentance and faith. At the same time God warns us to "judge ourselves" in this matter; therefore we practice close communion. Those desiring to receive the Holy Eucharist with us for the first time are asked to speak with one of the pastors before approaching the altar.

This announcement is so thorough that even the veteran members of the congregation may not comprehend it all. The phrase, "mutual conversation and consolation of the brethren," may be without immediate meaning to some. Non-members, especially those with severely limited church backgrounds, may understand only that the pastors should be consulted, a requirement which, as mentioned, cannot really be carried out before the service. The reference to the word of God admonishing self-examination is sufficiently foreboding to settle any marginal cases. It is questionable whether "close communion," defined as a closeness in faith and doctrine and as the mutual consolation of the brethren, accurately describes the ancient church practice of "closed communion." If agreement in faith and doctrine is intended, then that word and not "closeness" should be used. How or when is "close" close enough? Do we have here an unnecessary play on words?

In the ancient churches and those of the Reformation bishops and pastors declared communion fellowship on the basis of an agreed doctrine. Then it was simply a matter of one church being in communion with another and of an individual belonging to that church. It was not a matter for individuals to decide for themselves. Each church had its confessions, and communion was not a matter of interrogation by the pastor or soul-searching by the communicant. The LCMS previously followed this practice of the early church and Reformation. Then there is the description of "repentance and faith" as necessary to a "worthy reception." The presence of contrition and faith in sinners is essential, to be sure, but in a Reformed context these terms are understood quantitatively. People may absent themselves from the communion because they find themselves insufficiently worthy. This feeling of lack of personal worth and so dependence on God in Christ is really the only attitude in which they should approach the altar.

Are we caught between surrendering our restrictive communion policy and printing a policy that cannot really be appreciated by those for whom it is intended? The real problem is that we are caught between the universal call to salvation and the limited invitation to participate in the eucharistic mystery, which is offered only to those who have first confessed the faith and been baptized. In placing a restriction on the Holy Communion, two things must be kept in mind. (1.) This restriction is imposed by Christ through the Apostle Paul. (2.) More importantly, God intends that all people should receive Christ's body and blood. The unbelief preventing one from receiving is of one's own doing and not God's. The practice of "close communion" or "closed communion" can never suggest a reward for moral or spiritual achievement. The words "given and shed for you for the remission of sins" suggest that sinners, not saints, are coming to the altar. In the sacrament our lack of holiness is exchanged for the Lord's abundant holiness.

Since we will never go back to the practice of dismissing those who are not in full membership with the church before the eucharistic celebration, perhaps it might be better to eliminate the longer theological discourses from our church bulletins and simply say something like the following:

> We welcome to this celebration of the Lord's Supper those Christians who are not fully united with us. It is a sad consequence of the division in Christianity that we cannot extend to them a general invitation to receive communion. Lutherans believe that the Lord's Supper is a celebration of the congrega-

> tion signifying a oneness in faith, life, practice, and worship. Reception of the Holy Communion at this time by Christians not fully united with us would imply a oneness which does not yet exist and for which we must all pray. We invite you to join us in praying for the unity of the church in the confession of the true doctrine.

Prayers could be provided in the bulletin or elsewhere for both those who are and those who are not receiving the Holy Communion so that those who do not receive the communion are not entirely "closed" out of the worship. The Holy Communion expresses our unity with each other by being made one in Christ by baptism, but at the same time it uncovers the deep rifts in Christendom. The tragedy of a divided Christendom becomes evident in the celebration of the Holy Communion, but at the same time it can be a time of commitment to remove barriers to full fellowship by working for a complete and full confession of the doctrine of our Lord Jesus. What we cannot attain here on earth will be given to us by His grace in the banquet of heaven, where all the saints will participate at one table--one altar--with one host who is both victor and victim.

An open communion policy would proclaim a false unity, but our doctrinal integrity also requires that we show concern for those who may not at this time be admitted to our altars. The LCMS has been able to do this in the past without compromising her doctrinal integrity or surrendering her sensitivity and solemn duty to proclaim Christ to those who are not members of her fellowship.

David P. Scaer

PATRIOTIC SERVICES

During this past summer I had occasion to attend a service at a congregation where I had worshipped a number of times in the past. It happened to be Sunday, July 1, but I had not anticipated the service that awaited me. The first hint came when we entered the nave and found flags tied to the candlestick holders at each pew. The pastor, in some opening comments, described the service as "kicking off" the week of celebration.

The service itself began with the pledge of allegiance, followed by the singing of "The Star Spangled Banner." During the course of the service we also sang "God of Our Fathers," "America the Beautiful," and "The

Battle Hymn of the Republic." I confess that of these four I found myself able to sing only the second and fourth. While the offering was gathered, a soloist sang "God Bless America," exhorting all of us to join in (with drums accompanying) on the second time round. The lessons read were not those appointed for the Fourth Sunday after Pentecost but were from Romans 13 and Matthew 22 ("Render unto Caesar").

I thought I had been around a good bit, but I left rather taken aback. I have since learned, however, that such services are not altogether uncommon in LCMS congregations. If so, there is theological reason for concern. We have, of course, ample cause to be thankful for the many good things about our country, although we ought to love it, not chiefly because of those blessings, but simply because it is the land given us. Indeed, in a variety of writings over the years I have defended the American tradition of liberal individualism and thought myself rather devoted to it. But I could not worship in the service I described above. What is wrong theologically with such a service?

It is, first of all, unseemly for *us* in particular to engage in such mixing of Christ and culture. Knowing that many of our fellow Lutherans did not acquit themselves altogether admirably during the Nazi rise to power, we should be alert to danger here. (Unfortunately, however, there are still among us some who would rather deny Nazi atrocities than admit the mistakes of some of our fellow Lutherans.) For us in particular, therefore, Romans 13 ought to be a passage to be handled with great care. For us a church decorated with flags of our country--at a time when emotions have run high over proper treatment of the flag--ought to be an impossibility. For us, above all, the thought of incorporating the pledge of allegiance into a service of worship ought to be taboo. But, sadly, it is not. And just as sadly our congregations may respond enthusiastically. I have, as I noted above, worshipped on a number of occasions at the congregation whose patriotic service I described. I have always felt that its singing was not very robust. But its members sang well this past July 1. Indeed, they positively blared out the patriotic songs. It is absolutely inconceivable that they would have sung "For All the Saints" with as much gusto. These are *our* tendencies. Perhaps they are tendencies of most Christians--about that I am uncertain. But we, above all, should have no pledge of allegiance in our services. It would be better to become Mennonites.

The issues go deeper than our peculiar heritage, however. Consider some of the words we were invited to sing in that service:

O beautiful for patriot dream
That sees beyond the years.
Thine alabaster cities gleam
Undimmed by human tears.

Had St. Augustine heard these words, he would have assumed that they must refer to the *civitas dei*, that city of God of which glorious things are spoken. They could not possibly refer to any earthly community in human history, and to make such an identification would be to create an idol (in Augustine's language, to "love inordinately" a good thing). And, of course, the language *is* biblical; the description of the heavenly Jerusalem "undimmed by human tears" is here applied to America. Another stanza of the same song begins this way:

O beautiful for pilgrim feet
Whose stern, impassioned stress
A thoroughfare for freedom beat
Across the wilderness.

That "errand into the wilderness" (as historian Perry Miller called it) was undertaken by Puritan feet, and the use of such biblical imagery (as the trek into the wilderness) to describe the building of an earthly city is quintessentially Puritan--its roots in Calvin's theology. The attempt to build "a city set on a hill" that John Winthrop set before his fellow Puritans is something quite different from the Lutheran sense that the political order can never be Christianized and remains, at best, an organized use of force for the sake of justice.

Or, again, we were invited to sing these words from "The Star Spangled Banner":

Then conquer we must,
When our cause it is just.

I suppose they might seem at first an admirable bit of modesty--anticipating victory only when our cause is just (though few will be the occasions when we think it is not). In fact, however, these words inculcate political falsehood and encourage political messianism. Where are we guaranteed that we must conquer simply because our cause is just? Where are we guaranteed that the righteous need never suffer in human history? If, however, we tell ourselves often enough that we must conquer because our cause is just, we may teach ourselves to do whatever is necessary--even the evil that is necessary--to win when we think our cause a righteous one. In the technical language of ethics, this is a failure to

distinguish *jus ad bellum* (the justice of going to war) from *jus in bello* (what is just in war). In more ordinary language, it is an attitude that may enable us to firebomb cities or use atomic weapons on civilian targets.

I do not suppose, of course, that every worshipper singing these songs has all the thoughts in mind or makes all the theological mistakes I have described here. However, unless we suppose that worship shapes no attitudes, unless we suppose that the *lex orandi* is never the *lex credendi*, we should want our clergy to be more theologically alert. If we must have something called a patriotic service, we should sing G. K. Chesterton's great hymn, "O God of Earth and Altar" (*LBW*, 428; omitted, unfortunately, from *LW*):

> O God of earth and altar,
> Bow down and hear our cry;
> Our earthly rulers falter,
> Our people drift and die;
> The walls of gold entomb us;
> The swords of scorn divide.
> Take not Thy thunder from us,
> But take away our pride.

I fear, however, that the singing might not be done with as much gusto.

Gilbert Meilaender
Oberlin, Ohio (1990)

Book Reviews

THE FREEDOM OF A CHRISTIAN: LUTHER'S SIGNIFICANCE FOR CONTEMPORARY THEOLOGY. By Eberhard Jüngel. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1988. 109 pages.

The heart of this little book of three chapters is its last chapter, an extended discussion of the continuing significance of Luther's *Freedom of a Christian*. It is preceded by two shorter chapters in which Jüngel considers what it might mean to think of the contemporary significance of a thinker like Luther and how Luther's thought might be suited to speak to our time. Jüngel writes: "If contemporary theology has any central theme at all, it is Christian freedom." Hence, his attention to Luther's famous treatise from the year 1520. Jüngel's interpretation of this treatise focuses on Luther's distinction between the inner and outer man. It is exactly this distinction--with its seeming implication that external (social and political) freedom is of little importance--that has made modern thinkers turn away from Luther or see in him a view that needs to be rejected. Jüngel argues, however, that for Luther the inner man, when addressed by God in Christ, "can allow himself to be called out of himself." Christian freedom cannot simply be identified with movements for freedom in the world, but the freedom of the inner man is expressed through the medium of the deeds of the outer man.

We may wonder whether this move will solve the problem Jüngel addresses. The "objectionable" dualism of Luther's view may recur when we ask whether the pure inward love of the free Christian may not be expressed in the "alien" form of external deeds that seem less than loving. To ask that question is to wonder whether Jüngel's project of finding unity between inner and outer man may not miss some of the significance of faith in earthly life. This little book will repay careful study--but no other kind of study! Jüngel, professor of systematic theology at Tübingen, writes a difficult and convoluted prose. One will probably need to turn elsewhere for a *clear* and readable introduction to Luther's understanding of Christian freedom.

Gilbert Meilaender
Oberlin, Ohio

BASIC PRINCIPLES OF BIBLICAL COUNSELING. By Larry Crabb. Grand Rapids, Michigan: The Zondervan Corporation, 1975.

I have tried to keep familiar with American pastoral counseling literature during the past two decades. Some graduate course work in counseling, plus a graduate program, has helped me. Somehow, however, I missed reading Larry Crabb's *Basic Principles of Biblical Counseling*.

The book, which first appeared in 1975, has apparently been reprinted. Nowhere did I find any mention that this reprint features any revision. I had heard about Crabb's book. I am pleased to have had the chance to read and review it. The book is not lengthy, but it is also not read quickly. The principles set forth are not difficult to comprehend, but Crabb offers much material on which to ponder.

Crabb's basic contention is that the problems presented by parishioners in counseling are the result of faulty thinking. Counselees seek a sense of self-worth, but seek to base self-esteem on the wrong principles. Crabb contends that, if the counselor teaches the counselee correct biblical principles concerning his self-worth as God's child, many counseling problems will be solved. The therapy which Crabb advocates is an educative type of therapy. The counselor does listen, but his primary role is as teacher of right thinking. Crabb seems to be the Albert Ellis of pastoral counseling, since Ellis propounds the same general thoughts in presenting a secular counseling modality.

While Crabb rejects the Jay Adams school of pastoral counseling (and I certainly agree with him on that point), the counseling theory which he advances is still, it seems to me, too directive. Teaching has a role in Christian counseling. The problem is that counselees tend to reject teaching which is imposed by a counselor. It is better that the counselee should slowly discover such teachings through the process of a more Rogerian counseling technique, heavy on listening skills and gentle with confrontation and teaching. In my experience, counselees flee more directive counseling and tend not to benefit, even if what the counselor teaches is correct.

Crabb writes clearly and has a good sense of humor. He seems to use the law too heavily, although he does not avoid the gospel. The book does provide food for thought for both counseling pastors and theological students (as a potential adjunct text). I recommend the book, but it should be read with the cautions which I have noted.

Gary C. Genzen
Lorain, Ohio

FREED TO SERVE. By Michael Green. Dallas: Word Publishing Company, 1983.

At first glance the reader might assume that this book's title refers to the Christian's freedom from the chains of sin, freedom to serve the Christ

who redeemed him. The "freed" of this title, however, refers not to release from sin; rather, it is actually a demand to be free of what Michael Green takes to be stifling oversight by Anglican clergy, and the book as a whole is a call for ecclesiastical overhaul within that communion. Although Green writes from within the Anglican church, and although both his diagnoses and prescriptions are directed to that body, a desire for the general application of this ecclesial medicine to all churches seems to underlie Green's words to his own church.

While Green's criticisms of overbearing, controlling, or neglectful clergy certainly are well-founded, his attempts to reorder clergy-laity relationships are often muddled. The book contains many contradictions for, while Green on the one hand attempts to retain fidelity to the scriptural distinctions between clergy and laity, on the other hand he often advises congregations to set those distinctions aside. At one place pastors-priests are said to have no distinctive ecclesial functions associated with their office, yet at another place they are said to be distinguished from others precisely by certain special duties. Ordination is at one place described as a charge to take up pastoral duties, but at another it is described as an after-the-fact affirmation of one's success in functioning in pastoral ways. Along the way Green also dismisses Anglican teaching on apostolic succession and calls for the ordination of females as pastors.

After working through the several chapters of complaints and suggestions, the reader is left wondering where Green's repair work is actually leading. His new ecclesiology is not well-defined. On a positive note, where a clearly defined pastoral leadership exists, that leadership is given excellent advice in Green's final two chapters on training and lay training. A well-stated appeal also is made for the whole-life care of congregational members and the development of diaconal networks to accomplish this end. In many churches searching debate on the relationship of pastors and laity is underway. Because it fails finally to articulate a clear definition of that relationship, *Freed to Serve* likely will not contribute to the resolution of that debate.

Andrew Dimit
Duluth, Minnesota

THE NEW WESTMINSTER DICTIONARY OF LITURGY AND WORSHIP. Edited by J. G. Davies. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1986.

This volume is already four years old and perhaps too old to review at this point, but as a dictionary it involves different criteria than most books. It is not a book that one reads; it is a book that one consults. Over the past few years I have consulted this resource book on liturgy so frequently that I feel as if I have read every article. Not every liturgical question is answered here, but it is remarkable how comprehensive this book is for our purposes.

The New Westminster Dictionary of Liturgy and Worship is a revision of the edition of 1972. As the book cover advertises, "With over fifty percent of the original articles updated, it now has 160 more pages and more than 70 additional articles that document the important areas that have changed since the first edition of *The Westminster Dictionary of Worship.*" One would not think that enough has taken place since 1972 to require an update, but the results of the liturgical movement have created a need for numerous new articles on recent trends and developments. For example, the influence of the house-church on the liturgy is documented both historically and liturgically. Since it became a religious force in this century in various denominations, the house church phenomenon has resulted in the development of more informal and intimate liturgies.

The articles are clearly written. There is some good bibliographical guidance to further reading, although some articles receive no bibliographical information. This book would be a valuable addition to any pastor's library and I highly recommend it.

Arthur Just, Jr.

PASTORAL ADMINISTRATION: INTEGRATING MINISTRY AND MANAGEMENT IN THE CHURCH. By David S. Luecke and Samuel Southard. Waco, Texas: Word Books, 1986.

In his foreword to *Pastoral Administration* Martin Marty says, "Management--it seems everyone wants to be in on it except ministers." That insight is backed up by surveys quoted by the authors which show that administration or management is the most time-consuming work of pastors and the least satisfying to them. The book is an attempt by

Luecke and Southard to put some enjoyment in the task of administration and illustrate the importance of administration in the life of parish pastors. The methodology is to take an event or problem from everyday parish life with comments and insights from Luecke and Southard.

The approach of the authors is quite different. Southard stands beside the people as a counselor. He has his arm around the shoulders of parishioners as he walks with them. Luecke stands ahead of the people. He is an architectural builder holding out a vision of a better way. For Luecke, the structure can provide support while, for Southard, the support needs the structure.

If a pastor purchases the book as a "how to do it manual," he will be disappointed. There are no organizational charts, lists of things to do, sample forms, or check sheets. Rather this is a kind of "self-help" book dealing with the problems that parish pastors have with administration. It shares more characteristics with the psychological self-help book than with the step-by-step fix-it book. Therein lies both the strength and the weakness of the book. The book tries to make one think about administration in a new way. However, it will not help a pastor if he is simply looking for practical ways of doing things.

There is much about the book that is helpful, but perhaps it tries to do too much in making everything "administration" or "management." The preaching of the word of God and the administration of the sacraments are certainly in a sense "administration." They do need to be "managed." But in the context of modern American culture, there seems to be a diminution of the high and holy calling to the public ministry of the word of God and the sacraments when we collapse everything into "administration."

Roger D. Pittelko
Detroit, Michigan

spring-summer BOOKS

HINDUS AND CHRISTIANS

A Century of Protestant Ecumenical Thought
CURRENTS OF ENCOUNTER SERIES

S. Wesley Ariarajah

Tracing the history of Christian attitudes toward Hinduism, the author stresses the need for a theological reappraisal in order to understand Christian-Hindu relations.

0504-3 Paper, $21.95

GOD WITH US

A Theological Introduction to the Old Testament

Christoph Barth

"This book will be a valuable pedagogical resource for study in church and in seminary. The presentation is clear, lean, and straightforward. Barth gives Israel's faith a powerful hearing, with directness and without undue complications."

— *WALTER BRUEGGEMANN*

3680-1 Cloth, $29.95

FAITH & ORDER SERIES
FAITH TO CREED

Ecumenical Perspectives on the Affirmation of the Apostolic Faith in the Fourth Century

S. Mark Heim, editor

Contributors include John Meyendorff, William G. Rausch, E. Glenn Hinson, A. James Reimer, and Max L. Stackhouse.

0551-5 Paper, $13.95

WOMEN AND CHURCH

The Challenge of Ecumenical Solidarity in an Age of Alienation

Melanie A. May, editor

"This collection of essays addresses a very important problem from a feminist theological perspective. I recommend it to anyone interested in ecumenical dialogue."

— *ELISABETH SCHÜSSLER FIORENZA*

0552-3 Paper, $10.95

OLD TESTAMENT THEOLOGY

Basic Issues in the Current Debate
Revised and Expanded • Fourth Edition

Gerhard Hasel

0537-X Paper, $14.95

NEW SERIES

LOUVAIN THEOLOGICAL AND PASTORAL MONOGRAPHS

Inspired by Louvain's long tradition of theological excellence within the Roman Catholic tradition, the volumes in this series express some of today's finest reflection on current theology and pastoral practice.

DIALOGUE WITH THE OTHER

The Inter-Religious Dialogue

David Tracy

This book reflects David Tracy's ongoing interest in the other and The Other. His discussion enters into dialogue with figures as diverse as Meister Eckhart and William James, and traditions as different as Buddhism, Christianity, and Judaism.

0562-0 Paper, $12.95

THESE THINGS HAVE BEEN WRITTEN

Studies in the Fourth Gospel

Raymond F. Collins

In this book Collins calls to mind the fashion in which the Fourth Gospel was written, elucidates the many facets of the evangelist's notion of faith, and finally focuses on the Word and the new commandment of love.

0561-2 Paper, $19.95

HOW TO PLAY THEOLOGICAL PING-PONG

Essays on Faith and Reason

Basil Mitchell

Basil Mitchell develops some important themes that have concerned him as a philosopher with a keen interest in theology, reflecting on the various aspects of the relationship between faith and reason.

0544-2 Paper, $14.95

HOW MY MIND HAS CHANGED

James E. Wall and David Heim, editors

Fifteen shapers of religious thought reflect on how they have reoriented their thought in light of social and political events, scholarly research, or personal experience.

0533-7 Paper, $8.95