

The Lutheran-Episcopal Concordat and Porvoo

by MEG H. MADSON

OFFICIALS OF THE Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and its official publications are insisting that the ELCA adopt the sacramental historic episcopate for the sake of unity and mission. Proponents of the Lutheran-Episcopal Concordat (*Called to Common Mission*) claim that the ELCA should not be afraid to adopt the Episcopal episcopate because, as Martin Marty told the ELCA Church Council in April 1998, “Lutherans elsewhere are enjoying the episcopate.”¹

Yet this does not seem to be the case in Tanzania. The historic episcopate is tearing Tanzanian Lutherans apart. In 1980 the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Tanzania had six synods (German) and five dioceses (Swedish). By 1988 German synods had dropped from six to three, and Swedish dioceses had grown from five to thirteen.² Why? Because of tribalism. The pressure to extend the historic episcopate has fragmented the church into smaller dioceses since each tribe wants its own bishop, not wanting a “chief” from another tribe. As a result, the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Tanzania is for all practical purposes a loose federation of competing dioceses, among which there is almost no cooperation.³

In Germany Lutherans have endorsed the Meissen Agreement with Anglicans, but Meissen does not include an agreement for a “reconciled, common ministry” (§17B) because differences over the historic episcopate could not be overcome.⁴ The text is forthright about the problem: The Lutheran/Reformed churches say “this particular form of *episcopé* should not become a necessary condition for ‘full, visible unity,’ ” whereas for the Anglicans “full, visible unity . . . includes the historic episcopate and the full interchangeability of ministers” (§16).

Where have Lutherans and Anglicans reconciled their ministries? Concordat proponents commonly point to the Porvoo Common Statement, adopted in 1997 in Northern Europe between six

Lutheran churches and four Anglican churches.⁵ Michael Root states:

[The Concordat and Porvoo] are two paths . . . plotted with the same compass; the two proposals are worked out in their differing situations in terms of the same underlying theological understanding of gospel, ministry, and episcopacy. The Concordat and Porvoo represent not merely compatible, but thoroughly complementary realizations of a common ecumenical vision.⁶

But Root's claim is countered by Canon Robert Wright, chief Episcopal author of the Concordat:

Porvoo, which claims to establish 'communion' between churches that are geographically far apart from each other, is indeed easier because it does not achieve or even name full communion but only something that seems rather less: a closer relationship, a deepening of fellowship, not unlike what was already achieved in the United States by the Lutheran-Episcopal agreement of 1982, but with the addition of a 'normal' (but presumably not invariable) participation in each other's episcopal consecrations.⁷

Is Porvoo like the Concordat, as Root says, or more like the 1982 Lutheran/Episcopal Agreement for interim-eucharistic sharing, as Wright says? The following will compare and contrast Porvoo and the Concordat.⁸

How Porvoo and the Concordat Differ

A Simple Declaration vs. An Extended Process. On September 1, 1997, the churches who accepted Porvoo declared themselves in "communion," not "full communion."⁹ As Wright says, Porvoo "represents less of a doctrinal agreement than does the Concordat, and is formulated more on a basis of the rights of ancient historic state churches to do whatever they agree to do, and it does not claim to reach 'full communion.'"¹⁰ While the churches under Porvoo agree to coordinate implementation of their agreement, there is no joint commission to provide official interpretations of Porvoo and to make ecumenical, doctrinal, pastoral, and liturgical decisions that the churches must accept in order to move forward. Under Porvoo there is no temporary suspension of the 1662 Or-

dinals, and thus no reimposition of the Ordinals on a unified Anglican/Lutheran ministry.

In contrast, the Concordat establishes an extended process. (*Called to Common Mission* will be cited by paragraphs, in the revised version transmitted by the ELCA Church Council in November 1998.) The ELCA declares full communion at the beginning, but The Episcopal Church, USA (ECUSA) does not declare full communion until the end of the process. Between the inauguration and realization of full communion, a Joint Commission (50% Episcopalian, 50% Lutheran) officially interprets the agreement (§24) and makes the actual decisions on “ecumenical, doctrinal, pastoral, and liturgical matters” (§23) that must be implemented in order for the churches to move forward. Finally, at some future date “in the context of a common life and mission there is a shared ministry of bishops in the historic episcopate” (§14), the ELCA adopts the theological principles of the ordinals of the Book of Common Prayer and full communion is achieved (§16).

Is Porvoo a simple declaration rather than an extended process because Scandinavian Lutherans already have the historic episcopate? First, there is no such thing as “the” historic episcopate. Episcopalians, Roman Catholics, Orthodox each have “an” historic episcopate, but Roman Catholics do not recognize Anglican orders and the Orthodox do not recognize Roman Catholic or Anglican orders.

Second, some, but not all, of the Lutherans in Porvoo have episcopal structures, but none regard their structures as sacramental, as necessary for true unity or valid Eucharists, as do Episcopalians. LWF member churches are in full communion with each other on the basis of the Augsburg Confession and the Small Catechism. All agree that variety in church order and ordination is no barrier to recognizing each others’ ministries as valid and effective, and that only the Word is essential for a valid sacrament.¹¹ The Church of Sweden, for example, welcomes any ELCA pastor to serve without reordination.¹²

In 1922, when the Church of England recognized the Church of Sweden, the Swedish Bishops’ Assembly wrote to the Anglicans:

No particular organization of the Church and of its ministry is instituted *iure divino*. Our Church cannot recognize any essential difference, *de jure divino*, of aim and authority between the two or three Orders into which the ministry of grace may have been divided, *iure humano*, for the benefit and welfare of the Church.¹³

And in 1936 the Archbishop of Finland used this Swedish statement as his own in writing to the Archbishop of Canterbury about the historic episcopate.¹⁴

Under Porvoo the Anglicans accept the Danes on the basis of presbyteral succession, without episcopal succession.¹⁵ In an essay accompanying the Porvoo text, Anglican Bishop Christopher Hill states that the ordination rites of the Churches of Denmark, Norway, and Iceland show they had the right “sacramental intention [to] ordain priests to a distinct episcopal ministry.”¹⁶ Porvoo does not present a theory of personal succession, but one of “sacramental intention.”

Episcopal Ordination—Open Invitation or Required. Under Porvoo Anglican bishops are “invited” but not required to participate in the consecration of Lutheran bishops. The text says Anglican bishops will “normally” (§58.b.vi, but, as Wright says, presumably not invariably),¹⁷ participate in the consecration of a new Lutheran bishop.

In contrast, under the Concordat both churches “promise to include regularly” (§12) one or more bishops to participate in the ordination of a new bishop. The ELCA “pledges” to include “at least three bishops already sharing in the sign of episcopal succession” (§19) at the ordination of each new Lutheran bishop.

What is at stake for Lutherans in this requirement? The gospel and the freedom of the gospel. Behind the insistence on Episcopal ordination lies the relation between the historic episcopate and the real presence of Christ in the Sacrament.¹⁸ Episcopalians agree with Roman Catholics that the sacramental power to make the body and blood of Christ present in the Eucharist comes through Holy Orders. For Episcopalians, like Roman Catholics, only episcopally ordained priests can confect the Eucharist.

Only bishops in historic succession can ordain. “There is in some sense an ontological dimension to becoming and being a

bishop,”¹⁹ writes Anglican William Gregg. He notes a recent shift in the liturgy for the ordination of a bishop. Until 1979 the official prayer of consecration leaned in a more Lutheran direction: “Receive the Holy Ghost for the Office and Work of a Bishop in the Church of God, now committed unto Thee by the Imposition of our hands.” The focus was on the office the bishop fills. In the current Book of Common Prayer, however, the focus has shifted to a more Roman Catholic theology of ordination as an ontological change. At the moment of consecration the presider prays: “Father, make X a bishop in your Church. Pour out upon him the power of your princely Spirit.” The church, and more specifically the bishop, here becomes a mediator (instrument) of salvation. For Anglicans, as for Roman Catholics, Christ’s mediation is extended ecclesialogically through the church, sacramental ordination, and episcopacy. Bishops are essentially mediators of sacramental grace.

In contrast, Lutherans think about mediation in more christological terms. In the eighth Lutheran-Roman Catholic Dialogue, the Lutheran team addressing this issue of mediation stated: “Christ gives himself in word and sacrament, thus continuing to be present to those who receive him in faith through the power of the Holy Spirit. Christ himself is the mediation. He takes our sin and gives us his righteousness.”²⁰ Christ is the sole mediator; he uses *means*, the Word and sacraments.

Because for Lutherans mediation is totally christological, a total exchange of sin for righteousness, church structures are not instrumental. Nothing can be made a requirement alongside the Word of God. The gospel means freedom from any particular church structure. Lutherans are thus quite content to use traditional polity, including episcopal structures and even the papacy, provided that no one particular structure or kind of oversight is required. The Augsburg Confession (28) and Apology (14:1) sketch out a different kind of “episcopé,” a “Word alone” episcopé. Bishops do what they do “by God’s Word alone” (CA 28:21, German). Lutheran bishops and pastors equally share the one office of ministry because all power and authority are in the Word alone. For this reason, Apology 13:11 says that ordination can be called a sacrament (along

with confirmation, government, prayer, giving alms, and afflictions), provided it is through the Word.

Lay Deacons or Ordained Deacons. Under Porvoo lay deacons are acceptable. The Swedes are the only Lutherans, under Porvoo, who ordain deacons. Hill writes, “Anglicans may well be a little less emphatic about the threefold ministry when they consider the spasmodic provision for deacons as a distinct order in the episcopally ordered Church of Scotland during parts of the seventeenth century.”²¹ Hill also notes that for Anglicans the order of deacons is a probationary step to the priesthood, whereas for Lutherans deacons, lay or ordained, are service ministries and include nurses, teachers, social workers, and so forth. Under Porvoo the churches agree to study the diaconate, but again there is no Joint Commission, no time line, no future imposition of the 1662 Ordinals on a unified Episcopal/Lutheran episcopate.

In contrast, the Concordat sends mixed signals about deacons. On the one hand, the text states plainly, “The ordination of deacons or diaconal ministers by the ELCA is not required by this Concordat” (§9). On the other hand, the text does not say that ordained deacons are not required for full communion. In fact, the ELCA “pledges” to study jointly with Episcopalians “the diaconate, including its place within the threefold ministerial office and its relationship with all other ministries” (§9). What is the purpose of further study unless change is anticipated? As Wright states, “Lutherans may not have an ordained diaconate in the near future, but by the Concordat both churches would share it and accept it in principle.”²² If the diaconate is accepted at the beginning in principle, then it is only a matter of time before it is adopted in practice. At final full communion, when the temporary suspension of the 1662 Ordinals comes to an end, the ELCA must adopt the three ordinals of the BCP (§16).

Some ELCA bishops have said that the deletion in the final draft of the phrase “the threefold ministry of bishop, presbyters, and deacons in historic succession” indicates that ordained deacons are not required. But other phrases have been added, such as “the one ordained ministry will be shared between the two churches in a common pattern” (§8), “fully interchangeable bishops,” (§14), a

“shared ministry of bishops in historic succession” (§14), which are all synonyms for “the threefold ministry.” The historic episcopate is, after all, not merely the episcopal laying on of hands from one generation to the next. To the contrary, it is the historic succession of episcopal ordinations to the threefold ministry.²³ For Anglicans “ministry” means “a single sacramental and pastoral ministry of Word and Sacrament which is extended through the bishops to the offices of priest and deacon.”²⁴ Again: “Ordained ministry [is] embodied in the office of bishop through which it is extended to priests and deacons.”²⁵ Priests and deacons are merely extensions of the one office of the bishop. As things stand, there is no question, however nuanced the language of the Concordat, that according to Anglican understanding there can be no final full communion, no common ministry, without the threefold ministry.

In summary, comparing the texts of Porvoo and the Concordat demonstrates the accuracy of Robert Wright’s interpretation over against what Michael Root has claimed. Porvoo is a simple declaration of communion; no Joint Commission is given the power to make official interpretations of Porvoo; tactile ordination by an Anglican bishop is not required; the Anglican Ordinals are not imposed at a future time on a unified Anglican/Lutheran ministry; ordained deacons are not required. In contrast, the Concordat describes a lengthy process in which Episcopalians only declare full communion at the end (§16); a Joint Commission is given sole power to interpret the text (§24) and make ecumenical, doctrinal, pastoral and liturgical decisions that must be implemented for the churches to move forward (§24); when the temporary suspension of the Anglican Ordinals comes to an end, the principles of these Ordinals are reimposed on the unified Lutheran/Episcopal ministry (§16); as a consequence, ordained deacons will be required at final full communion as part of what it means for bishops to be “fully interchangeable” (§14).

A Common Theology of “Sign” in Porvoo and the Concordat

Despite the striking differences between Porvoo and the Concordat, both documents have as their centerpiece the Anglican

version of an historic episcopate. Both make the seemingly modest claim that the historic episcopate is a sign of unity:

Concordat: They promise to include regularly one or more bishops of the other church to participate in the laying-on-of-hands at the ordinations/installations of their own bishops as a sign, though not a guarantee, of the unity and apostolic continuity of the whole church. (§12)

Porvoo: [W]e acknowledge that the episcopal office is valued and maintained in all our churches as a visible sign expressing and serving the church's unity and continuity in apostolic life, mission and ministry. (§58.a.vi)

These claims that the episcopate is a sign echo the well-known claim of the World Council of Churches' 1982 document, *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry (BEM)* that the historic episcopate is a "sign, though not a guarantee, of the continuity and unity of the Church."²⁶

What is less well-known are the official criticisms of this claim.²⁷ For example, the Roman Catholic response noted that in an earlier draft of *BEM* the text at this point read "effective sign," and by deleting the modifier "effective" the meaning of the word *sign* was obscured. "Episcopal succession can rightly be called a *guarantee* of the continuity and unity of the church," Roman Catholics claimed.²⁸ The Episcopal church did not respond directly to the claim that the historic episcopate is a "sign" of unity, but it noted that only episcopally ordained priests can preside at the Eucharist.²⁹ The Church of England said: "[B]oth episcopal and non-episcopal churches are lacking unless their faithfulness to the apostolic tradition in life and teaching is linked to a common sign of that faithfulness in a single ministerial succession."³⁰

The problem is: What is a sign? The word has many meanings. For Tillich a "symbol has a power inherent within it that distinguishes it from the mere sign which is impotent in itself."³¹ Rahner maintains that a sign is related, in its essence, to what is symbolized and thus can render it present.³² In contrast, Freud said that symbols and signs are very possibly mistaken indications of reality.³³ For Jung signs and symbols are produced by the collective unconscious.³⁴

For Pierce anything can become a sign for anybody under the right conditions, and can by the same token lose its signifying function when those conditions are absent.³⁵ Which understandings of “sign” are present in Porvoo and the Concordat?

Neither document develops a theological rationale; both merely make assertions. The Concordat stretches an agreement about the practical need for *episcopé* into a consensus on bishops as those who safeguard the unity and continuity of the church: “Both churches value and maintain a ministry of *episcopé* as one of the ways in which the apostolic succession of the church is visibly expressed and personally symbolized in fidelity to the gospel through the ages” (§12).

But do Lutherans teach, as Episcopalians do, that bishops are effective signs of unity and continuity? Arland Hultgren cites Schlink in support of the episcopate: “The succession of episcopal laying-on-of-hands is therefore a sign for the unity and catholicity of the church. We should therefore welcome it as a sign and if it is absent, it is right for us to work for its introduction.”³⁶ Schlink, however, goes on to say,

But this *signum* must never be dissociated from the *res* which it signifies, in other words from the traditional teaching of the Apostles themselves. The sign of apostolic succession can neither replace the necessity of submitting oneself ever anew to the historic teaching of the Apostles, nor devalue the pastoral ministry which exists without the apostolic succession.³⁷

Thus for Schlink the Word determines the office, not the office the Word. He uses the word “sign” as a pointer, a label. This is very different from using “sign” as something that is “effective,” that renders present what it symbolizes, as Anglicans and Roman Catholics claim.

Porvoo equivocates about the episcopate as a sign. On the one hand, the consecration of a bishop is said to be an “effective” sign in four ways (§48): 1) It bears witness to the Church’s trust in God’s faithfulness; 2) it expresses the Church’s intention to be faithful to God’s initiative; 3) the participation of a group of bishops in the laying on of hands signifies their and their churches’ acceptance of

the new bishop and so of the catholicity of the churches; and 4) it transmits the ministerial office “in accordance with God’s will and institution.” As a result, the church is a sign of the kingdom, ordination is a sign of God’s faithfulness, and consecration to the historic episcopate is a sign of apostolic continuity (§50). The sign of the historic episcopate cannot be dropped without losing the thing which it signifies. For the sign *effects* what it signifies.

On the other hand, “The use of the sign of historic episcopal succession” as such guarantees neither “the fidelity of a church to every aspect of the apostolic faith, life and mission” nor “the personal faithfulness of the bishop” (§51). Nevertheless, Porvoo concludes that churches which lack episcopal succession should embrace the sign of the historic episcopate because “the retention of the sign is a permanent challenge to fidelity and unity,” (§51) and it is “a means of making more visible the unity and continuity of the church at all times and in all places” (§53). Thus in Porvoo “sign” is far more than an fallible pointer. As Hill confidently asserts: “Agreement on the Church as sign, that is, that the Church is sacramental, is central to the Porvoo Common Statement.”³⁸ German Lutheran Ingolf Dalferth maintains that Porvoo even heightens the claim that the historic episcopate is a sacramental necessity:

[The theology of sign] does not in the slightest represent a retraction of the traditional assertion of the indispensable necessity of the historic episcopate for the Church, but on the contrary represents a heightening of this claim, arguing that ordination and ministry or consecration and episcopal office are to be understood and to that extent are indispensable *as signs* for the visible unity of the Church. The Anglo-Catholic thesis that the historic episcopate is indispensable for the *esse* of the church is thus replaced by the new Anglican thesis that it is indispensable for the true *visible unity* of the church.³⁹

To be sure, the Concordat and Porvoo are strikingly different. Under the Concordat full communion will be achieved in about twenty years. Under Porvoo it may take a hundred years. It is a commonplace among Anglicans that they are *the* broad church, able to accommodate and develop as long they maintain the one

thing needful—the historic episcopate. Thus neither Porvoo nor the Concordat should be seen as innovative ecumenical approaches. They are parallel examples of the broad Anglican *modus operandi*. As Archbishop William Temple said in 1936:

I could only agree to union or to any approach to full intercommunion on the basis of the agreement that all future ordinations are episcopal. *But, if that is agreed, I would go far in recognizing the de facto efficacy of existing ministries.*⁴⁰

NOTES

1. Martin Marty's address to the ELCA Church Council, April 18, 1998, available on the internet, ELCA News.

2. See Peter Fue, "Apostolic Succession: The Crisis of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Tanzania." Master's Thesis, Wartburg Seminary, 1989, 109–26, Appendix I (c).

3. Information received by correspondence from Dr. James C. Bangsund, Makumira University College, Tanzania (June 1998).

4. Paragraph numbers here refer to The Meissen Common Statement in *The Meissen Agreement: Texts* (Council for Christian Unity Occasional Paper No. 2, London: Church House, 1993).

5. *Together in Mission and Ministry. The Porvoo Common Statement with Essays on Church and Ministry in Northern Europe* (London: Church House, 1993). The Anglican churches who signed Porvoo are: Church of England, Church of Ireland, Scottish Episcopal Church, Church in Wales. The Lutheran churches are: Evangelical-Lutheran Church of Finland, Evangelical Lutheran Church of Iceland, Church of Norway, Church of Sweden, Estonian Evangelical-Lutheran Church, Evangelical-Lutheran Church of Lithuania. The Church of Denmark and the Evangelical-Lutheran Church of Latvia did not accept Porvoo.

6. Michael Root, "The Concordat and the Northern European Porvoo Common Statement: Different Paths to the Same Goal," *A Commentary on "Concordat of Agreement,"* eds. James E. Griffiss and Daniel F. Martensen (Minneapolis: Augsburg; Cincinnati: Forward Movement, 1994), 139.

7. J. Robert Wright, "In Support of the Concordat: A Response to Its Opponents," *Sewanee Theological Review* 40 (1997): 171. (Hereafter, Wright, "In Support of the Concordat.")

8. For an analysis of Porvoo from a Missouri Synod perspective, see Tom G. A. Hardt, "The Borgā (Porvoo) 'Common Statement,'" *Logia*, 8:3 (1998): 45–52.

9. At Lambeth 1958 Anglicans established the official terminology: "Full communion" was defined as 'unrestricted *communio in sacris* including mutual recognition and acceptance of ministries, . . . and where varying degrees of relation other than 'full communion' are established . . . the appropriate term is 'intercommunion'" (Resolutions #14, see also #15). The fact that Anglicans chose to use term "communion" to identify the goal of Porvoo indicates it is a kind of relation other than "full communion" and thus not comparable to the Concordat.

10. J. Robert Wright, “The Episcopal Church and the Historic Episcopate: An Episcopalian Viewpoint” Address for Continuing Education Event at Luther Seminary, St. Paul, Minnesota, July 15, 1998.

11. “Interestingly, while some persons think of Porvoo as less ‘binding’ in practices among Lutherans and Anglicans, the text specifies that only those priests/pastors (as well as bishops and deacons) who are ‘episcopally ordained’ can serve in one another’s churches—a requirement that the *Concordat* does not make”; see Arland Hultgren, “Lutheranism and the Historic Episcopate: Are They Compatible?” *dialog* 37 (1998): 137, n.35. However, if this were an accurate interpretation of Porvoo, these Lutherans would, in effect, be withdrawing from the LWF, which they have not done; see also n.12, below.

12. Gustaf Wingren develops the theological rationale for this openness found in the Swedish Church. He contrasts Lutheran *non-sacramental* episcopal structures with Anglo-Catholic *sacramental* structures, finding them “incompatible”:

“That it is a matter of ‘either-or’, and that there can be no wobbling about between both, is especially evident when both theses are formulated negatively. Luther, for his part, could see the Church of Christ even in the Rome of the Pope, because the *Wōrd* was there. Where the Gospel is heard and where the sacraments are administered according to Christ’s institution, there Christ comes through the mist of false theology which is hung over the Word, baptism, and the Lord’s Supper: the faith of the heart can lay hold on the promises of the Word. There is, of course, need to eliminate false usages from such a body and to make the message of the Scriptures clear to all by straightforward preaching. But a Lutheran theologian can never regard another Church in such a way as to believe that it lacks something that it must be for us Lutherans to provide. It is the Word that has primacy over the Church and those Church members in the other body do, indeed, hear the Word; they only need understand something that is already theirs. This freedom in our relation with others is a gift of the Word. No one is so free and so bound as he who is rooted in the Word. The situation changes entirely when Church or ministry is set above the Word. Then the source of life of the Church is no longer something that comes to the Church and creates the church but is *in* itself, once and for all deposited *in* the Church by Christ. If then any body has, on the way between Christ and the present day, lost succession, it cannot derive the true and genuine life of the Church from the Word, nor from baptism, nor from the Lord’s Supper; what is lost is lost until the right ministry is brought from some other undamaged Church.

We do not intend, at this point, to enter on a discussion with European churches that think along these lines. . . . What we intend to emphasize is something different: that this conception of the ministry is incompatible with the central message of the Lutheran Reformation, incompatible with our confessions, and devoid of support in the Bible” in Gustaf Wingren, *The Living Word* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1949), 101–102; emphasis in text.

13. Cited in Ivar Asheim and Victor R. Gold, eds., *Episcopacy in the Lutheran Church?* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1970), 134.

14. *Ibid.*

15. In 1537 John Bugenhagen, who did not have episcopal consecration himself, consecrated seven Danish superintendents or bishops.

16. Christopher Hill, “Introduction,” *Together in Mission and Ministry*, 51. (Hereafter, Hill, “Introduction.”)

17. Wright, "In 'Support of the Concordat,'" 171.
18. Lutheran/Episcopal Dialogue II identified as an area for further examination, "the relation of the Eucharist to the historic episcopate." *Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogue Report and Recommendations* (Cincinnati: Forward Movement, 1981), 29.
19. William Gregg, "By Solemn Prayer and the Laying-on of Episcopal Hands': Ordination and Implementing Full Communion," *Sewanee Theological Review* 40:2 (Easter 1997), 219. (Hereafter, Gregg, "By Solemn Prayer.")
20. *The One Mediator, the Saints, and Mary*, Lutherans and Catholics in Dialogue VIII, eds. H. G. Anderson, J. F. Stafford, and J. A. Burgess (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1992), 39.
21. Hill, "Introduction," 49.
22. Wright, "In Support of the Concordat," 172.
23. William Reed Huntingdon, *The Church Idea. An Essay Toward Unity* (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1870).
24. Gregg, "By Solemn Prayer," 225.
25. *Ibid.*, 226.
26. *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry* (Faith and Order Paper No. 111; Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1982) 29, M 38.
27. See Meg H. Madson, "BEM: What Does Sign Signify?" *Lutheran Forum* 25:2 (1991):20-21.
28. *Churches Respond to BEM*, ed. Max Thurian, Vol. VI, (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1988) 33; emphasis in text.
29. *Churches Respond to BEM*, II (1986):60.
30. *Churches Respond to BEM*, III (1987):56.
31. Paul Tillich, "The Religious Symbol," *Daedalus* 87 (1958): 3.
32. Karl Rahner, "The Theology of the Symbol," *Theological Investigations* (London: DLT, 1966) 4:239, 242; cf. "The Church and the Sacraments" *Inquiries*, tr. W. J. O'Hara (New York: Herder and Herder, 1964), 200-201.
33. Sigmund Freud, "The Psychology of Errors," *A General Introduction to Psychoanalysis*, tr. Joan Riviere (New York: Liveright Publishing Corporation, 1935), 25-37.
34. C. J. Jung, *Man and His Symbols* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1964).
35. On the significance of C. S. Pierce for the study of sign and symbolism, see C. K. Ogden and I. A. Richards, *The Meaning of Meaning* (New York: Brace, 1923).
36. Arland Hultgren, "Lutheranism and the Historic Episcopate: Are They Compatible?" *dialog* 37 (1998): 141.
37. Edmund Schlink, *The Coming Christ and The Coming Church* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1968) 232; cf. George Lindbeck, "Episcopacy is therefore the normal polity of the church. Yet it is a subordinate, instrumental and fallible sign of apostolicity which may be misused by being made superordinate and constitutive." *Eucharist and Ministry*. Lutherans and Catholics in Dialogue IV; eds. P. C. Empie and T. A. Murphy (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1979), 58.
38. Hill, "Introduction," 46.
39. Ingolf Dalferth, "Ministry and the Office of Bishop According to Meissen and Porvoo: Protestant Remarks about Several Unclarified Questions," *Visible Unity and the Ministry of Oversight*. The Second Theological Conference held under the Meissen Agreement between the Church of England and the Evangelical Church in Germany (London: Church House, 1996), 34; emphasis in text.
40. Cited by Mark A. McIntosh, in *A Commentary on Concordat*, 93; emphasis in text.



Martin Luther, Full of Figures Inside

Michael Mathias Precht, 1983