

Commemoration of the Reformation in Germany and Lund

by THEODOR DIETER

Anniversaries play an important role in the lives of communities, peoples, states, towns, and also churches. Communities take these anniversary occasions to retell the story of where they came from. In so doing they reassure themselves about who they are. Origins reveal the basic marks or characteristics by which communities can be most clearly identified. Narratives of origin help communities understand who they are in the present and what they might become in the future. Since looking back into the past helps a community understand itself in the present, an opposite movement can also be discerned: how the past of a community is perceived and presented is also determined by the way this community understands itself in the present. The narrative of the coming into being of a community not only describes what actually happened but also creates a specific picture of the past. Historic events are connected with a certain meaning and become symbols for certain ideas, attitudes, and structures. Thus, collective remembrance tends to create myths in telling history.

For this very reason, it was a terrible shock for many Protestants when doubts arose as to whether Luther had actually posted the 95 Theses on the door of the Castle Church in Wittenberg. The story of the little Wittenberg friar who had the courage to challenge the Roman Church and who, through a few hammer blows, made the old church with its wrong teaching collapse—what an appealing story this was! And now would this highly symbolic story have to be given up? The logic of historical-critical research and the logic of collective commemoration often go in different, even opposite, directions. In any event, collective narratives often reveal more about the contemporary self-understanding of a community than they do about its history.

It is evident that this has also been the case with the anniversaries of the Reformation. The 31st of October 1517 has become the symbol of the Reformation of the sixteenth century. For Protestants, indulgences represented the distortion of the medieval church, out of which Luther led the true Christians, and the servitude under the ecclesial hierarchy, from which Luther liberated them. The 31st of October 1517 was the symbol for the way out of darkness into light, from error into truth, from bondage into freedom. This was celebrated at Reformation anniversaries in general and especially at centennial years of remembrance. On the opposite side, the anniversaries and especially centennials of the Reformation were special occasions for Roman Catholics to accuse Protestants of renouncing the true church, destroying its unity, and clinging to heretical doctrines. The way into freedom for one party was the way to renouncing the true church for the other.

This points to another function of commemoration days and anniversaries. They are not only opportunities for communities to tell collectively where they come from in order to understand better who they are; they also tell their history in order to justify who and how they are. In these narratives, often the legitimacy of their very existence is at stake, for this legitimacy has sometimes been contested. For centuries, Protestant Christians painted the Roman Church in the darkest colors as distorted and false, in order to justify both Luther's criticism of the Roman church and also the existence of the Lutheran church. Protestants insisted that the Roman Catholic church in their own time was basically the same as the Roman church in Luther's time, so that Luther's criticism would remain fully valid and applicable. Similarly, Catholics contested the notion that Protestant churches were churches at all, that they had true sacraments and a true ministry, that one could find salvation and truth in them. Quite the contrary, Protestants were seen as being on the road to hell. Thus, over centuries, the centennials of the Reformation were occasions for the fiercest struggles between Protestants and Catholics, as if history kept on repeating itself and the split of the church had to be enacted again, even if under different circumstances and with different contours.

In 2017, the fifth centenary of the Reformation is taking place. It is different from the four previous centenaries in several key respects. One of the foremost differences will be the fact that this one will, for the first time, take place in an ecumenical age. This creates the expectation that Protestants, differently from former times, will commemorate not only among themselves but also together with the Catholics with whom they have been in dialogue for half a century. But how can this even be possible, judging by the previous centenaries so dominated by confessional conflicts? This question will be discussed by analyzing the document of the Lutheran/Roman Catholic Commission on Unity, *From Conflict to Communion*.¹

In the last hundred years, the churches in most countries of the Western world have become a smaller part of their respective societies, with respect to both the number of their members and also their influence on societies and people's lives. Many societies have become multi-religious through migration. In the last decades, the Pentecostal, charismatic, and Evangelical movements have led to the emergence of many new churches or Christian communities that are in competition with the "historic" churches. This is a very different context compared with that of earlier centenaries, and it influences the commemoration considerably. Further, in many of these countries, the events that are called "the Reformation" played an important role in their respective histories. Thus not only churches but also secular societies are challenged to commemorate the Reformation as part of their general history. There are several actors in the commemoration besides the churches. In Germany, for example, the state, even though religiously neutral, expressed high interest in supporting the commemoration of the Reformation as part of German history and has spent a lot of money restoring Reformation sites, and supporting national and international conferences and exhibitions on the Reformation and related topics.

Many people will, of course, ask about the role of the churches in the past and then turn to look at the churches in the present. This creates a higher level of publicity for all the churches, but especially the Protestant ones. Shrinking in numbers and influence, they wish to demonstrate to the wider public how important the Reformation

was for shaping the modern world that people live in today and the freedoms they enjoy, and that the message of the Reformation still offers answers to the existential questions of contemporaries.

Altogether, in the commemoration by the Protestant churches there is a complex combination of aims and interests that are sometimes in conflict with each other. Challenged to convince people that the churches are still meaningful and relevant for people today, the churches cannot be expected to undergo a critical self-examination after 500 years—for example, whether they might need another reformation. It is much more likely that the documents prepared for the commemoration will tend to be advertisements for the churches. Even if one may disagree with such tendencies, the reasons for them are not hard to understand. This can be illustrated by analysis of the document of the Evangelical Church in Germany, namely, *Rechtfertigung und Freiheit* (“Justification and Freedom”).

Justification and Freedom

The Council of the Evangelical Church in Germany (EKD) convened an *ad hoc* commission of professors and high church officials to reflect on how to commemorate 500 years of the Reformation. It produced a document called *Justification and Freedom. Celebrating 500 Years of the Reformation in 2017*.² As the subtitle indicates, it is understood as a “foundational text,” that “addresses theologically concerned women and men, presbyters, members of church councils, pastors and theologians, but also a broader public curious about the significance of the 2017 Reformation jubilee.”³ The text has mainly two aims: (a) to explain “to what extent the religious insights of the Reformation also provide an answer to the questions asked by men and women today, many of whom, after all, are not concerned in the slightest about their individual relationship to God,” and (b) to “discuss both the contribution of the Reformation to the *history of freedom in Europe* as well as the differences between the Reformation understanding of ‘freedom’ and the ways in which freedom is experienced today.”⁴ The first asks whether the theological insights of the Reformers are still relevant or meaningful to people of today as they inspired, motivated, and determined so many people in the

sixteenth century, or whether Reformation ideas can be seen at best as merely part of the history of mentalities in the past. It is very appropriate that in asking this question the text puts the doctrine of justification in its center.⁵

The second aim looks at historical connections and contexts, arguing that even non-Christians could and should be interested in the commemoration of the Reformation, since it contributed to the present shape of the German political community. As Germany's President, Joachim Gauck, stated in the solemn state ceremony "500 Years of Reformation":

The present shape of our political community cannot be imagined without the Christian churches. And it cannot be imagined without the Reformation. . . . The Reformation matters to all people. To the present day it has had a determining influence on the history and fate of many European countries and on large parts of the non-European world, but most notably on our Germany and our Scandinavian neighbors.⁶

In spite of its ambivalences, "the Reformation discovery of the biblically well-founded freedom of the individual belongs to the long and often bloody European history of freedom. It remained a dynamic impetus finally to create a polity in which political freedom is guaranteed by the state and in which everybody is recognized as a subject of rights."⁷ Thus "Justification and Freedom" is a very appropriate theme, since it allows for addressing both a central aspect of Luther's theology and also important effects of the Reformation in history.

The first task—explaining the relevance of Reformation insights for the present day—is especially difficult since, as the document states, a "categorical difference, both historical and existential, [exists] between people of the sixteenth century and those of the twenty-first."⁸ The document even goes so far as to state that the Reformation movement did not entirely leave behind the "image of God as a stern judge ruling sovereignly like an absolute monarch."⁹ But in his famous preface to his Latin works, Luther explained his struggle with the philosophical concept of justice applied to God (giving everybody his or her due), so that in this understanding, the "righteousness

of God” indicates just the opposite of an absolutist, arbitrarily acting judge. Nevertheless, the challenge remains that “justification” calls for the imagery of a court before which one has to give an account of one’s life. The document offers alternatives that attempt to take up human experiences of love, recognition and appreciation, forgiveness, and freedom.¹⁰ Here the language of the document comes close to the language of sermons in which pastors try to explain the gospel by drawing on common insights and experiences.

However, there needs to be a word of critique about such attempts to make the gospel message understandable for the people of today as endorsed by the document. One can see in popular seminars on personal development, for example, advice given to people to be unconditionally gracious to themselves and others, to recognize and forgive themselves and others (which is, of course, good)—but without any reference to God, as a deliberate omission. Even grace has become secularized, and for many people it no longer requires God as its subject. The document could have usefully taken up the relation and difference between common human experience and the special Christian experience of grace, discussing and elaborating when the conceptuality of justification may be complemented by other conceptualities. Notably, Jesus Christ is not mentioned even once in these reflections; it seems to be easier to talk about the love of God without any reference to Jesus at all.

The second chapter (“The Core Issues of Reformation Theology”) takes this problem up again and addresses it in a much more comprehensive way. The core issue is, of course, justification, and the document states in a traditional, dogmatic way:

The justification doctrine proceeds on the assumption that in one central respect human beings are incapable of justifying themselves and do not need to justify themselves: before God they cannot and need not justify themselves. Nevertheless, they are indeed “justified” by God, not because they in themselves are in the right, but because they are justified by grace. “Justified by grace” means: I am loved in spite of everything about me that is not lovable; I am accepted, in spite of being unacceptable. . . . through justification God does not confirm something that is already the case; he does not recognize human beings because they deserve recognition.¹¹

The doctrine of justification is then explained in some detail with respect to the so-called four *solas* that were developed in the nineteenth century in order to describe this doctrine (by Christ alone, by grace alone, by faith alone, Scripture alone, and a fifth one is added: by the Word alone). The representation of the doctrine is quite carefully done and refers to Luther, Zwingli, Calvin, and the confessional writings of the Lutheran and the Reformed churches. For each *sola*, first the basic idea or the “theological keynote” is expressed. Then it is elaborated by stating what God does or has done and what human beings should do or cannot do. These three steps are followed by “current challenges,” both “from within the church” and “from society.” This is a very effective structure, taking on the first task of the document, with many illuminating and beautiful turns of phrase.

Nevertheless, using the *solas* also creates its own problems. “The word ‘alone’ emphasizes each key element in an exclusive way. The expression ‘by / through (*something*) alone’ thus here always implies ‘not by / through (*something else*). . .’”¹² Thus the *sola*-propositions are only meaningful if what is excluded by the *sola* is also indicated. As far as quotations from the Reformers are used, what are excluded are, clearly, the positions of the Roman church. But since the document wishes to clarify the meaning and significance of the doctrine of justification *today*, the question whether the Roman Catholic church still holds the positions ascribed to it in the time of the Reformation had to be addressed. In other words, ecumenical theology had to be included, like it or not. But ecumenical theology does not actually play a role in this chapter, or at best is there only silently and implicitly. The reader would expect a more explicit answer, since the *sola*-method is introduced as a precise way of defining the meaning of justification.¹³ Under the heading of “current challenges,” only aspects questioning the *solas* are addressed, but not whether and to what extent the *solas* still apply to the Roman Catholic Church. One cannot excuse this absence on the grounds that the document is meant only as an inner-Protestant concern, since the *solas* in their origin address Roman Catholic doctrine and practice. If some other contrast were meant, it needed to be stated outright. In this respect, the chapter is clearly not differentiated enough.

A second problem arises because it is not sufficient to exclude certain elements through the *sola* as being not constitutive. One needs also to define in positive terms the relationship between what is affirmed in the *sola*-propositions and what is excluded. If, for example, normative Scripture is by the *sola scriptura* principle separated from tradition, that does not mean that tradition simply disappears. Rather, a new challenge arises to find also a *positive* description of the relation between the two after *sola scriptura* has been stated.¹⁴ This is needed for a complete presentation of the Reformation understanding, and Roman Catholics especially need an answer to this. It is no surprise that many Catholics felt that this presentation of the doctrine of justification tended to exclude them from commemorating the Reformation, even though this was clearly not intended by the authors.¹⁵

Two further deficiencies with the ecumenical perspective of the document may be mentioned. Under the heading, “The ‘Learning History’ of the Reformation,” the document explains how the Reformation churches have since learned a number of important things, among them how to overcome their confessional differences. In this connection, the Leuenberg Agreement is mentioned as part of the success story of Reformation learning. But when it comes to the ecumenical work of the Lutheran World Federation (LWF), the text becomes monosyllabic. The *Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification* (JDDJ), signed in 1999 by the Vatican and the LWF, is not mentioned by name.¹⁶ It is only said that “it was possible to engage in a common formulation of the doctrine of justification with this church [the Roman Catholic Church].”¹⁷ The text continues: “Divisions persist as well with regard to the Mennonites, the spiritual heirs of the Anabaptists, who were persecuted in word and deed by the churches of the Reformation; in July of 2010, a worship service of repentance was celebrated jointly with this church.”¹⁸ It was the LWF that conducted ecumenical conversations with the Mennonites for five years. A study document was produced in which, for the first time, the history of the relations between Anabaptists and Lutheran temporal authorities and theologians in the sixteenth century was *jointly* described.¹⁹ On the basis of this report, the LWF decided to ask forgiveness from the Mennonites as the spiritual heirs

of the Anabaptists for the wrongs done by Lutherans to their forbears. At the LWF Assembly in Stuttgart in 2010 representatives of the LWF confessed the sins of the Lutherans, while representatives of the Mennonites granted forgiveness. This happened in the presence of representatives of many Christian churches. Reconciliation was then solemnly celebrated in the subsequent service. This was a deeply moving experience for all who were present. But *Justification and Freedom* only stated: “in July of 2010, a worship service of repentance was celebrated jointly with this church.” It is a pity that the EKD does not seem to be ready to perceive and acknowledge properly the ecumenical work that is done without its own direct participation, even though several of its member churches—the Lutheran churches in Germany—were involved in it.

In the introductory chapter, the document speaks in passing of the emergence of confessional churches as a consequence of the Reformation. “The 2017 Reformation jubilee must be celebrated against an intellectual backdrop which acknowledges that the Reformation resulted in the pluralization of Western Christendom.”²⁰ This is true. “It would be one-sided and inadmissible to perceive this event only pessimistically as the occasion of a ‘church schism’ . . .”²¹ But does this take seriously enough that not only the pluralization of Western Christendom took place but also the separation of the churches that emerged from the Reformation? Thus the Protestant churches struggled to overcome the split between themselves in the “Leuenberg Agreement” so that the plurality could become a gift rather than a source of disagreement and conflict.

This has not yet been possible in the same way with Catholics. Thus the following sentence appears as an unreasonable demand for Catholics, who also suffer from the split of the church: “The jubilee should [German: *muss*], therefore, be celebrated together with Roman-Catholic Christendom and with a view to the worldwide impact of the Reformation.”²² It is clear that the document shows an ecumenical intention, but it does not realize that for a joint celebration *both* parties must see something good in what they celebrate. But as long as the pluralization of Christendom is connected primarily with division, Catholics as well as many Lutherans cannot celebrate this plurality. This may reflect a difference from certain

other Protestants, for whom plurality is the highest value and unity is only a secondary consideration. But the preface to the first edition of the text offers another approach to a joint celebration: “We wish, rather, to rejoice in the spiritual fruits of the Reformation and therefore *celebrate* this jubilee in ecumenical breadth.”²³ Unfortunately, *Justification and Freedom* did not elaborate on this approach; only if certain gifts can be identified, namely, that the Catholics also received in what we call “the Reformation,” will a joint celebration become possible. In order to make this happen, one has to distinguish within the broad term “Reformation” those aspects that have been gifts for the church and that *both* parties can recognize as gifts (and thus are reasons for celebration) from those aspects that invite rather lamentation and mourning. This is the way that *From Conflict to Communion* chose and that made the Roman Catholic-Lutheran prayer service in Lund possible.²⁴

Coming back to the task of the EKD document to address the current challenges for the doctrine of justification, the ad hoc commission deserves praise for taking up this difficult problem with which pastors have to struggle all the time. In order to show how great these challenges are, three responses of the text will be discussed. First, the challenge put to “by grace alone”:

We achievement-oriented human beings have a tough time accepting the Reformation notion of being justified alone by faith. Of course we don't mind having our flaws overlooked or ignored, but we want the good things about us to be acknowledged. We don't want God to reject us on account of our weaknesses, but we definitely wish for him to appreciate us for our strengths. The Reformers, however, were convinced that human beings were sinners to such an essential degree that any distinctions along these lines were inappropriate before God.²⁵

This statement precisely defines the challenge. People of today are not desperately yearning for grace; if anything, dependence on grace seems to be humiliating to them. The text rightly says that this is connected with the corresponding challenge of how to understand “sin.” Sin is described as “being bent in on oneself,” but no explanation is given as to how this description of sin leads one to understand *sola gratia*. It is not clear how “by grace *alone*” could be

communicated to modern people who wish to be acknowledged mainly by works and a little bit by grace.

The *solus Christus* is challenged, too, by living in multi-religious societies. For many it seems to be arrogant and intolerant. The last sentences in this section are: “Just as Christians draw their only comfort in life and in death from belonging to Christ, in the same way the followers of other religions draw sustenance from their own specific faith. Both sides of a dialogue should be willing to acknowledge this.”²⁶ This is true as a psychological reality, but now the theological questions begin. Are all people saved through Christ alone, even if they live in other religions and perhaps even through other religions? Or does the *solus Christus* call for the communication through word and sacrament in order to reach people? Christians draw their comfort from belonging to Christ, because this is comfort not only for them but the true comfort for all people.

With respect to “Scripture alone,” the document mainly addresses the challenge of whether *sola scriptura* still holds true if one has to distinguish between “the Bible” and “the Word of God.” This is indeed an important challenge, but one may wonder why the lack of biblical knowledge in wide parts of the Protestant churches is not equally mentioned as a serious problem. That as many Christians as possible are familiar with the Bible is the basis for the *sola scriptura*. It is surprising to read: “Key theological decisions in the Evangelical church are not made by adding up individuals in a purely mathematical manner, but rather by virtue of the so-called great consensus (*magnus consensus*), trusting on the basis of the scriptural principle of the Reformation that God through his Holy Spirit will inspire the church with the correct interpretation of his biblical words—and that he will consequently lead the church to a harmonious unity of its discordant voices and not to a disharmonious polyphony of individuals.”²⁷

One would very much like to know which decisions the Commission has in mind here. Shortly before *Justification and Freedom*, the EKD published a document called “Zwischen Autonomie und Angewiesenheit” (“Between Autonomy and Dependence”)²⁸ about new ways of understanding family and new forms of life. The book provoked many fierce discussions, including about the proper use of

Scripture in this topic. There was a sentence that especially attracted the attention of Catholic readers: “With respect to the diversity of the biblical images and the historic determinedness of living together as family it remains decisive how church and theology interpret the Bible and which orientation they give from here.”²⁹ For Catholic readers this statement explicitly affirmed that one needs the church in order to interpret Scripture properly for today—the traditional Catholic argument against the *sola scriptura*. Furthermore, given that many New Testament scholars claim that Luther did not interpret Paul’s letters properly, one would have expected that the EKD document would have addressed the manifold challenges of *sola scriptura* more comprehensively.

Relatively little space is given to the second aim of the book—to identify the contribution of the Reformation to the emergence of the modern world—namely, that “it contributed to the development of the modern basic rights of freedom of religion and of conscience, it changed the relationship between church and state, it had a share in forming the modern concept of freedom and the modern understanding of democracy, just to mention a few examples.”³⁰ There is a clear awareness of the differences between Luther’s concept of freedom and the modern understanding of freedom: “To be sure, when Luther in his 1520 freedom treatise describes the process of justification by speaking, in a double proposition, of the Christian as a perfectly free lord of all and a perfectly dutiful servant of all, he is putting forth a notion of Christian freedom which by no means is identical with the modern understanding of freedom. And yet Luther’s concept is bound up with the history of freedom in Europe.”³¹ Luther’s appearance before the Diet in Worms and his refusal to recant is seen as a striking example in this connection. The text argues that not “concepts and abstract insights, but rather the embodiment of these concepts and insights in *condensed narratives*” are required, “the expression of the Reformation understanding of freedom through moving, powerfully-told narratives.”³² Nevertheless, the document offers only this one example.

The document ends with an all-embracing gesture. The message of Christian freedom can “be celebrated in 2017 as a Christ-centered feast by evangelical Christians in the entire world . . . together with

their Roman-Catholic and Orthodox brothers and sisters in the faith” on the basis of the common affirmation of the gospel of Jesus Christ, and also “with the modern secular constitutional state and its citizens of different religions and worldviews”—“in sympathetic dialogue and cordial agreement”—being aware “that the Reformation’s message of freedom contributed to the emergence of precisely this constitutional state.”³³

From Conflict to Communion

In what follows, *From Conflict to Communion*, the document of the International Lutheran/Roman Catholic Commission on Unity established by the Lutheran World Federation and the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity, will be analyzed not from the outside as was *Justification and Freedom*, but from the inside.³⁴ The aim of the Commission’s work was to elaborate the basis for a common Catholic/Lutheran commemoration of the Reformation in 2017. The main challenge was the fact that the associations and connotations that Protestant and Catholic Christians connect with the word “Reformation” are quite different, even contrary. For Protestants, “Reformation” is associated with the rediscovery of the gospel, freedom, and the assurance of faith, while Catholics associate it with the split of the church. How could a joint commemoration of Catholics and Protestants be possible in view of such divergent connotations? It seems to have been easier to commemorate ecumenically the 500th birthday of Martin Luther in 1983 than the 500th anniversary of the Reformation in 2017. Commemorating Luther allows for dealing with a fascinating although complex and difficult personality who taught a challenging theology from which everybody can learn at least something. But commemorating the Reformation focuses on the church and its ongoing division, which does not cease to grieve many Christians. In the process of discussing this problem, the Commission produced and discussed several drafts and rejected one after the other.

The problem became even more difficult since the question was not only whether Lutherans and Catholics could *commemorate* jointly, but also whether they could *celebrate* the Reformation jointly.

In 2014, on many occasions, the French and Germans commemorated together the beginning of World War I which occurred one hundred years earlier. While a joint commemoration of the event was possible, of course, it could not be celebrated. Celebration is only possible if something positive happened to people and their communities, but the outbreak of a war is of course nothing positive, nor is the split of the church. Thus some Catholics argued: joy and thankfulness can only be directed to the ecumenical movement, since it is the attempt to overcome the division that the Reformation brought with it. In 2017, it is not the Reformation that is to be celebrated, they said, but the ecumenical movement. The Reformation could only be an object of lamentation. But even though Protestants, at least ecumenically engaged Protestants, deplore the split of the Western church in the sixteenth century and suffer from it, it is clear that they cannot agree with such an emphasis. In this perspective, a joint commemoration would not ever be possible. Since for Protestants the first feelings they associate with the Reformation are gratitude and joy, they wish to express these emotions when commemorating in 2017.

But we have to go one step further. It is true that we can only celebrate the good that has happened to us. But the converse must also be said. If there is *nothing* to be celebrated when we look back into the past of a community, then there is nothing good in it at all. With respect to the Reformation this would mean: if there is nothing to be celebrated regarding the Reformation, then there is simply nothing good in it. But then it would be better if it had not happened at all. This would mean it would be better if there were no Protestant churches. We should not refuse to acknowledge the logic of this conclusion! If nothing good could be celebrated, it would be meaningless to continue in ecumenical conversation; it would not make sense to seek deeper communion in dialogue. The challenge of how to remember the Reformation in 2017 shows that ecumenism itself is at stake. When theologians have been confronted with such contradictions, they have, of old, developed distinctions in order to overcome the contradictions. Concepts like “Reformation” do not denote an entity so precisely defined in itself that their meaning is either true or false. Rather, such words can have quite

different meanings that are more or less useful in order to address and analyze certain aspects of a highly complex phenomenon, in this case the phenomenon to which we point when we use the word “Reformation.”

In order to cope with the problems that it had to address, the Commission distinguished between the following two meanings of “Reformation.” First, the word can denote a series of events that began with Luther’s publication of the 95 Theses in 1517, ran through the accusation and the trial against him in Rome, the Bull of Indiction and the excommunication in 1521, the Diet of Worms with Luther’s refusal to recant, the attempts to overcome the religious divide such as the Diet of Augsburg in 1530 with the Augsburg Confession, the attempt to solve the conflict with military means, the Smalcald War, and after the Emperor’s victory his effort to turn back the Reformation changes, the failure of that effort then leading to the religious Peace of Augsburg in 1555 that divided Germany into Catholic and Lutheran territories, and finally to the Council of Trent (1545–1563) that in its self-understanding rejected the Reformation movement. One can label this as “Reformation I.” Instead of referring to a chain of events, “Reformation” according to another meaning (“Reformation II”) can denote the whole ensemble of theological insights into the Word of God by the reformers and the congregations in which these insights came to bear in the sixteenth century.

According to “Reformation I,” the Reformation does not belong to Protestants alone; the reformers and their followers were not the only subjects of this history. Besides Luther and his colleague Philip Melancthon, players include also bishops like the Archbishop of Mainz and Brandenburg or Cardinal Cajetan, the Electoral Prince of Saxony, Emperor Charles V, the French king Francis I, even the Ottomans and many others. It is important to be conscious of all these actors, for it is within this history that the Western church came to be divided. But if there were so many players in this history, the results cannot all be attributed exclusively to Luther and the other reformers. This impression is often created if the following syllogism is set up. Proposition 1: “Luther is the originator of the Reformation” (meaning “Reformation II”). Proposition 2: “The

Reformation led to the division of the Western church” (meaning “Reformation I”). Conclusion: “Luther is the originator of the division of the Western church.” But this is the classical error of equivocation. It results from using two distinct meanings of the word “Reformation” within the syllogism. Whether a common commemoration of the Reformation will succeed depends on whether it is possible to distinguish between different meanings of the word “Reformation.” More precisely, it will depend on whether there is anything among the theological insights of Martin Luther that can be perceived as something good in the eyes of Catholics, too. That the Commission could answer this question positively is a result of both the Second Vatican Council and the ecumenical studies and dialogues of the last sixty years.

The Second Vatican Council prepared the way to a common commemoration and even celebration when it identified “many elements of sanctification and of truth”³⁵ outside the walls of the Roman Catholic Church. It stated that “some and even very many of the significant elements and endowments which together go to build up and give life to the Church itself can exist outside the visible boundaries of the Catholic Church.”³⁶ It mentions them: “the written word of God; the life of grace; faith, hope and charity, with the other interior gifts of the Holy Spirit, and visible elements too.” The Council also speaks of “many liturgical actions of the Christian religion” that “the brothers separated from us also use.” “These most certainly can truly engender a life of grace in ways that vary according to the condition of each Church or Community. These liturgical actions must be regarded as capable of giving access to the community of salvation.” But the recognition and appreciation relate not only to certain elements but also to the communities in which they are used, for they, as the Council declares, “have been by no means deprived of significance and importance in the mystery of salvation. For the Spirit of Christ has not refrained from using them as means of salvation.”³⁷ If this is so, if there is something good in these ecclesial communities, then there is also something that deserves to be celebrated.

From Conflict to Communion takes up this impulse and puts in its center a presentation of four basic aspects of Luther’s theology,

namely, those that were controversial in the sixteenth century and ever since: justification, the Lord's Supper, ministry, and Scripture and tradition. For ecumenical dialogues involving Lutherans, the Lutheran confessional writings usually have been the point of reference while Luther's theology has functioned as a commentary on them. That the Commission chose Luther's theology, rather than the Confessions, in *From Conflict to Communion* is not only because in 2017 one remembers the beginning of the Reformation in 1517 with Luther's 95 Theses, but also because in Luther the development and unfolding of Reformation theology are most clearly seen. The document places a description of Luther's theology within the horizon of the ecumenical dialogues of the past fifty years, and with their help compares it with Catholic doctrine, and looks for differences and commonalities. Thus also Catholic perspectives are present throughout the document. There was no need to repeat all the arguments of the dialogues; rather, the presentation was based on the results of these studies and dialogues.

The Commission showed much common ground in these areas. Thus *From Conflict to Communion* offers both a sketch of Luther's theology and also a summary of fifty years of Catholic/Lutheran dialogue. It was found that there are many features of Reformation theology that Catholics can also claim a share in. Among the ecumenical dialogues, the *Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification* plays a special role, since it is officially received by the Lutheran World Federation and the Roman Catholic Church. In this part of *From Conflict to Communion*, the word "Reformation" as "Reformation II" is used.

Inasmuch as anything in common with the Catholic doctrine can be identified—something that therefore can be understood as something good by both Lutherans and Catholics—there is also reason for both to celebrate. The Second Vatican Council expressly stated that "Catholics must gladly acknowledge and esteem the truly Christian endowments from our common heritage which are to be found among our separated brothers."³⁸ Therefore, if the Council itself calls for a "glad acknowledgment," what then should prevent Catholics from celebrating jointly all that ecumenical dialogues have shown to be held in common with the Lutherans? It is very clear

how important the ecumenical dialogues are for a joint celebration in 2017, namely, the proof that there actually are endowments from our common heritage on both sides.

Thus, *From Conflict to Communion* can also be understood as the theologically well-founded request to Catholics to rejoice together with Lutherans over the important theological insights of the reformers. The document emphasizes that the common commemoration has its basis in the one baptism that brings both Lutherans and Catholics into the one body of Christ. According to the Apostle Paul, “If one member suffers, all suffer together with it; if one member is honored, all rejoice together with it” (1 Cor. 12:26). When Lutheran Christians remember the Reformation, it affects the Catholic members of the body of Christ as well. The document states, “In remembering with each other the beginning of the Reformation, they are taking their baptism seriously” (no. 221).

What has been said so far relates to Reformation in the meaning of “Reformation II.” But the document also takes seriously Reformation in the sense of “Reformation I,” namely, “Reformation” as denoting a series of events in the sixteenth century that led to the split of the Western church. The third chapter offers a sketch of these events. This sketch describes some important events along the way and makes it clear that the split of Western Christianity was the result of the interactions of many players, but that it was not the intention of the reformers to split the church. Among those players are not only the reformers but also people responsible in the Roman church; thus Reformation *in this sense* is the work of Martin Luther as well as of Roman officials and many political players. Reformation as a series of events that led to the division of the church does deserve regret, mourning, and even the confession of guilt. This is not the first time that churches have publicly confessed their sins. The document points to the confession of sins by Pope John Paul II in the millennium year 2000 and to the confession of sins against the Anabaptists that the Lutheran World Federation undertook at its Assembly in Stuttgart in 2010. It is quite clear that a confession of sins in 2017 cannot be a one-sided confession, as if the Lutheran side alone were responsible for the split of the church and thus exclusively had to confess its responsibility. Both parties were

guilty, so that a confession of guilt must include both sides. But it is not easy to identify what exactly has to be confessed as sin, and one can easily imagine that a struggle could break out about the content of such a confession.

The document reflects to a certain extent on this topic. It argues that the theologians of both sides are not guilty on account of having held to their divergent convictions. If they had given them up and recanted without having been convinced that they were wrong, then they would have acted against their consciences and thus become guilty. A Lutheran theologian who is convinced that Luther's doctrine of justification is true cannot accuse Luther of having committed a sin by sticking to his convictions at Worms in 1521 and refusing to recant his teaching. Rather the document sees the guilt of both the reformers and their opponents to be *in the way* they struggled to gain acceptance for their opinions in the public: by interpreting their opponents' statements quite often according to the worst construction and deliberately misunderstanding them, so that they often violated the Eighth Commandment's prohibition against bearing false witness against one's neighbor—by caricaturing them and exposing them to ridicule and even demonizing them; by putting the imposition of their respective convictions far above the preservation of the unity of the church; by reciprocally instrumentalizing temporal and spiritual matters. The document aims at a mutual confession of guilt, hoping that if it were carefully prepared and spoken with serious intention it would significantly improve the relations between the churches, and would give testimony to the society that the churches themselves are able and prepared to do in relation to each other what they so often request from others: to be ready and prepared for reconciliation. For the document, *From Conflict to Communion*, both aspects of "Reformation," common joy and common grief, belong together when it comes to the joint remembrance in 2017.

The commemoration of the Reformation as proposed in this document recognizes this insight. "What happened in the past cannot be changed, but what is remembered of the past and how it is remembered can, with the passage of time, indeed change. Remembrance makes the past present. While the past itself is unalterable,

the presence of the past in the present is alterable. In view of 2017, the point is not to tell a different history, but to tell that history differently” (§ 16). Commemorating the Reformation with both joy and lament, with thanksgiving and confession of guilt, presupposes and expresses a way from conflict to communion that Lutherans and Roman Catholics have travelled over the past fifty years. But they have not yet reached the goal of this journey. Thus any commemoration also should include looking forward and committing to continue on the way.

The document closes with five imperatives that have been extremely well received since the publication of the book. The first imperative states: “Catholics and Lutherans should always begin from the perspective of unity and not from the point of view of division in order to strengthen what is held in common even though the differences are more easily seen and experienced” (§ 239). This could be called the “option for unity,” and it means that Lutherans and Catholics should not perceive the other church primarily as the *other* church but rather as a part of the one body of Christ. That means we should take seriously the catholicity of the church as it is confessed in the Creed—of course, not “Roman Catholicity” but a more comprehensive catholicity. Then the relations of one church to another are no longer *external relations* but *relations within the one body of Christ*. To believe in the catholicity of the church in such a way that it is expressed in the life of the churches requires a continuous conversion of heart and mind. A conversion of the heart allows Christians to rejoice when they are able to identify elements that bring the churches closer to each other, and causes them to be sad when they recognize the things that keep or drive them apart from one another. A conversion of the mind puts the burden of proof on what separates rather than on what unites. The task is then to discover and emphasize what they have in common instead of using all their intellectual skills to demonstrate that in spite of many common convictions they are nevertheless separated and should remain so. These are two basic options that are prior to the use of any arguments about differences and their significance, and as such they influence the use of arguments. The option for unity is fully in line with the third article of the Creed.

If Christians of different churches follow the option for unity while their churches are still separated from each other, they will not and should not remain the same when they encounter each other, as the second imperative requires. Ecumenism not only compares doctrines that continue to be always the same but also intends that Christians should be prepared to learn from each other, to integrate elements of the teaching and practices of other churches if the dialogues prove them to be convincing. The second imperative thus reads: "Lutherans and Catholics must let themselves continuously be transformed by the encounter with the other and by the mutual witness of faith" (§ 240). The third imperative speaks of the goal of ecumenism that has often been understood as "visible unity." This concept is not an easy one. Is unity at all visible? Is the unity of a state visible when one looks at the king or a president? These figures may symbolize the unity of the state, but does that mean that unity itself is visible in them? It is more accurate to say that people who are supposed to form a unity have certain elements in common, and one can see these elements. For Lutherans, these are the so-called *notae ecclesiae*, the marks of the church, such as preaching the gospel, sacraments, ministry, and so on. The third imperative encourages and challenges Christians to become better aware of the elements that they share, to increase their number and to deepen their participation in them in order to make unity visible. The imperative says: "Catholics and Lutherans should again commit themselves to seek visible unity, to elaborate together what this means in concrete steps, and to strive repeatedly toward this goal" (§ 241). Quite often, the concept of visible unity is related only to the common celebration of the Lord's Supper/Eucharist, but the third imperative asks Christians to look for a multiplicity of elements they may share even if they cannot celebrate that sacrament together. The fourth imperative points out the fact that people in the Reformation were so deeply moved by the gospel that it changed their world. Today the gospel does not very often have such an effect. Thus remembering the Reformation also includes the appeal to Lutherans and Catholics to become inspired by the gospel as before. The fourth imperative reads: "Lutherans and Catholics should jointly rediscover the power of the gospel of Jesus Christ for our time" (§ 242). Finally,

church and ecumenism do not exist for their own sake, but for all people. Thus the fifth imperative states: “Catholics and Lutherans should witness together to the mercy of God in proclamation and service to the world” (§ 243).

Common Prayer Service in Lund, October 31, 2016

It does not happen very often that the result of an ecumenical dialogue is transformed into an ecumenical service, but this happened with *From Conflict to Communion*. On 31 October 2016, a Joint Catholic–Lutheran Commemoration of the Reformation was held through common prayer in the Lutheran Cathedral in Lund, Sweden, jointly led by the President of the Lutheran World Federation, Bishop Munib Younan, together with the LWF General Secretary, the Rev. Martin Junge, and Pope Francis, together with Kurt Cardinal Koch.³⁹ Just think of it: in 1521 Pope Leo X excommunicated Martin Luther as a notorious heretic; 495 years later, Leo’s successor travelled to Lund—the city in which the LWF was founded in 1947—in order to commemorate solemnly the Reformation together with Lutherans. Entering the cathedral, Pope Francis was accompanied left and right by Bishop Younan and the Rev. Junge—at the same level. The three men were dressed in a similar fashion, with albs and red stoles. That the Pope wore red was immediately a significant sign. Red is the liturgical color for October 31 in the Lutheran churches, but certainly not in the Roman Catholic Church. So Pope Francis came into the Lund cathedral wearing the liturgical color of Lutheran churches for Reformation Day. From the other side, it cannot be taken for granted that the LWF would conduct its central service at the beginning of the Reformation year as a Lutheran/Roman Catholic common prayer, which representatives of the other Christian churches were invited to participate in. But this common prayer shows how seriously the claim is taken that the reformers did not intend to split the church, but to reform it.

The three basic elements of *From Conflict to Communion* (the two-fold looking back and the looking forward) constituted the basic structure of the common prayer. In an opening prayer, Pope Francis said: “Jesus Christ, Lord of the Church, send your Holy Spirit! Illumine

our hearts and heal our memories. O Holy Spirit: help us to rejoice in the gifts that have come to the Church through the Reformation, prepare us to repent for the dividing walls that we, and our forebears, have built, and equip us for common witness and service in the world.”⁴⁰ This prayer indicates the structure of the whole prayer service. One of the most remarkable features of the common prayer was the fact that it began with thanksgiving for what the church universal has received through the Reformation. There was a Lutheran statement explaining these gifts, and a Roman Catholic one taking this up, while Bishop Younan brought the gratitude for them before God—in the presence of the Pope—with these words: “Thanks be to you, O God, for the many guiding theological and spiritual insights that we have all received through the Reformation. Thanks be to you for the good transformations and reforms that were set in motion by the Reformation or by struggling with its challenges. Thanks be to you for the proclamation of the gospel that occurred during the Reformation and that since then has strengthened countless people to live lives of faith in Jesus Christ.”⁴¹

The second part of the common prayer was dedicated to repentance. A Lutheran and a Roman Catholic statement indicated some of the wrongdoings in the past leading to religious wars with the deaths of hundreds of thousands of people. The prayer contained three steps: lament (“that even good actions of reform and renewal had often unintended negative consequences”), acknowledging the guilt of the forbears (“We bring to you the burdens of the guilt of the past when our forebears did not follow your will that all be one in the truth of the gospel”—these words were spoken by Pope Francis), and confessing one’s own sin (“We confess our own ways of thinking and acting that perpetuate the divisions of the past”).⁴² Pope Francis and Bishop Younan called on Christ for forgiveness and reconciliation and on the Holy Spirit for ever-new beginnings. Trusting in having received forgiveness, Pope Francis and Bishop Younan, Cardinal Koch, and the Rev. Martin Junge shared the sign of peace, as did the many representatives of the churches gathered in the cathedral. The first two parts of the common prayer looked back in joy and lament, in thanksgiving and confession of guilt, corresponding to the two meanings of the word “Reformation” previously mentioned.

The third part of the common prayer looked into the future. “Common Witness and Commitment” included two sermons by Pope Francis and the Rev. Junge on John 15:1–5, the Creed, the Five Ecumenical Imperatives, and the signing of a joint statement by Pope Francis and Bishop Younan. Among other things, Pope Francis said:

With gratitude we acknowledge that the Reformation helped give greater centrality to sacred Scripture in the church’s life . . . Let us ask the Lord that his word may keep us united, for it is a source of nourishment and life; without its inspiration, we can do nothing. The spiritual experience of Martin Luther challenges us to remember that apart from God we can do nothing. “How can I get a propitious God?” This is the question that haunted Luther. In effect, the question of a just relationship with God is the decisive question for our lives. As we know, Luther encountered that propitious God in the good news of Jesus, incarnate, dead and risen. With the concept “by grace alone” he reminds us that God always takes the initiative, prior to any human response, even as he seeks to awaken that response. The doctrine of justification thus expresses the essence of human existence before God.⁴³

Following the Creed, the five imperatives were read, and in a touching ceremony five children one after the other lit small candles around the baptismal candle that stood beside the baptismal font in the midst of the cathedral. The children walked slowly through the aisle to the choir, being mindful of not extinguishing the flame, walked up the steps to the big candles behind the altar, and lit them. This took quite some time. Observing the way the children walked so carefully made everybody aware of the challenge and the power of the imperatives that Lutherans and Catholics were making as their own commitments. The Joint Statement that Pope Francis and Bishop Younan signed repeated in its first part mainly what had already happened in the service, while the rest included several commitments. Most remarkable were the following sentences:

Many members of our communities yearn to receive the Eucharist at one table as the concrete expression of full unity. We experience the pain of those who share their whole lives, but cannot share God’s redeeming presence at the eucharistic table. We acknowledge our joint pastoral responsibility to respond to the spiritual thirst and hunger of our people to be one in Christ. We long for

this wound in the body of Christ to be healed. This is the goal of our ecumenical endeavors, which we wish to advance also by renewing our commitment to theological dialogue.⁴⁴

The common prayer concluded with an intercessory prayer in many languages for the needs of the world and with the blessing by Pope Francis and Bishop Younan.

Overall, this service had to give witness to history of the way “from conflict to communion” that Lutherans and Roman Catholics have pursued together for more than fifty years and how this shapes their present perception of and attitude to the Reformation. Therefore, many statements had to be made, many words had to be used in order to achieve what this very special service required. Nevertheless, the liturgy was very lively, appealing, and powerfully performed by the musicians and singers. The variety of colors of skin and the traditional costumes was an impressive element in the service. Prof. Dirk Lange (St. Paul/USA) chose traditional church hymns, songs from many countries, and well-known Taizé-songs in a very creative way so that the common prayer had a powerful flow, sometimes slower, sometimes quicker, always focusing the attention on the topic at hand. The beautiful Romanesque cathedral of Lund was a most appropriate place for this commemoration. Its semi-darkness created a special feeling of being part of a long history, for in the Church of Sweden there was no break from the medieval church when it became Lutheran, but a smooth transition. Thus, the common prayer in Lund was a wonderful celebration of fifty years of Lutheran/Roman Catholic dialogue, a demonstration that Lutherans and Catholics are actually on the way from conflict to communion. It realized a new perspective on the Reformation, and has become a strong encouragement to continue on the journey to visible unity.

NOTES

1. *From Conflict to Communion. Lutheran-Catholic Common Commemoration of the Reformation in 2017*. Report of the Lutheran-Roman Catholic Commission on Unity, (Leipzig: Evangelisches Verlaganstalt, 2013). (Paragraph numbers refer to this text.)

2. *Rechtfertigung und Freiheit. 500 Jahre Reformation 2017. Ein Grundlagentext des Rates der Evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland (EKD)*, (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2014), 4th ed. 2015. English translation *Justification and Freedom. Celebrating 500 Years of the Reformation in 2017. A Foundational Text from the Council of the Evangelical Church in Germany* on the website of the EKD: https://www.ekd.de/english/download/justification_and_freedom.pdf (visited November 12, 2016; page numbers refer to this text).

3. *Justification and Freedom*, p. 8.

4. *Justification and Freedom*, p. 10.

5. Thomas Kaufmann and Heinz Schilling have criticized the document for narrowing the Reformation to the doctrine of justification and therefore to Luther, thus offering a “dogmatic historiography,” creating a “dogmatic construct” of the Reformation that “historically represents all that one thinks to be important,” claiming that “all in the Reformation is basically about religion,” separating church history and the history of theology from general history (Thomas Kaufmann and Heinz Schilling, “Die EKD hat ein ideologisches Luther-Bild,” *Die Welt*, May 24, 2014 [<https://www.welt.de/debatte/kommentare/article128354577/Die-EKD-hat-ein-ideologisches-Luther-Bild.html>] visited November 12, 2016). But a commission, established by a church, has the right and the task to raise the question whether theological insights that played a role in history *and* have marked the shape of a specific church are still relevant for people 500 years later. This in no way claims that the Reformation was *all* about religion. Nowhere does the document say or imply this. Nevertheless, one may be astonished how carelessly very different meanings of the word “Reformation” appear side by side in *Justification and Freedom*. Reformation is called “an event of global significance” (p.9) and as such *limited in time and space*, while Reformation is also said *not* to be “an event long since completed and closed, but a *process of renewal that continues* to this very day” (p.22; italics added); the text speaks about “Reformation” as a *concept* that was developed after the sixteenth century (p.9), but also makes the Reformation even a *subject* that persecuted the Anabaptist movement (p.25—Note the difference: English: persecuted “by the churches of the Reformation”; German: verfolgt “von der Reformation” [German edition, p.39; see fn.2]). Even though the word “Reformation” denotes a highly complex phenomenon and thus can have very different meanings, the text says without closer definition: “In its essence, the Reformation was a *religious* event, for the men and women who championed the Reformation expected God *himself* to awaken true faith and thus renew the relationship between God and believer” (p.9). Such an essentialism makes the text vulnerable to criticism.

6. Speech of President Joachim Gauck at the “Festakt ‘500 Jahre Reformation’” on October 31, 2016, in Berlin, p.18. [http://www.bundespraesident.de/SharedDocs/Downloads/DE/Reden/2016/10/161031-Festakt-Reformation.pdf?jsessionid=A95DEE72F80F6C70FB4E48CD01895BF8.2_cid379?__blob=publicationFile; visited November 12, 2016] (my translation).

7. Speech of President Joachim Gauck, p.4 (my translation).

8. *Justification and Freedom*, p. 59 (whatever “categorical difference between people” might mean).

9. *Justification and Freedom*, p. 17.

10. *Justification and Freedom*, pp. 19–22.

11. *Justification and Freedom*, p. 28s.

12. *Justification and Freedom*, p. 30.

13. With respect to the “solo verbo,” it is not explained what is excluded by the “solo” (see pp. 43–6).

14. Although the document has to present the Reformation understanding of justification, one may wonder why there is no attempt to justify this tradition exegetically according to the *sola scriptura*. The few biblical quotations only serve as *dicta probantia*.

15. Prof. Dr. Wolfgang Thönissen, Director of the Catholic Johann-Adam-Möhler-Institut in Paderborn, wrote with respect to *Justification and Freedom*: “This text is a thorough cancellation of the ecumenical conversations led with the Catholic church in the last decades.” (<http://www.katholisch.de/aktuelles/aktuelle-artikel/antikatholische-grundsatzte>; visited November 12, 2016) This statement goes far beyond what the text says or intends, but Thönissen points to a blind spot in the document. As we will see later, there are also other ecumenical stumbling blocks in the text.

16. As a reaction to criticism of the first edition, the preface to the fourth edition of the text mentions JDDJ explicitly (see p.5).

17. *Justification and Freedom*, p. 25. This is not even correct since the JDDJ not only offers common formulations for what Catholics and Lutherans share together, it also acknowledges that there are differences that are acceptable and do not deny the consensus. This is reflected in the concept of the so-called differentiating consensus that explicitly includes the recognition of differences.

18. *Justification and Freedom*, p. 25.

19. “Healing Memories—Reconciling in Christ. Report of the Lutheran-Mennonite International Study Commission,” Geneva 2010 (<https://www.lutheranworld.org/content/healing-memories-reconciling-christ-report-lutheran-mennonite-international-study-commission>; visited November 12, 2016).

20. *Justification and Freedom*, p. 15.

21. *Justification and Freedom*, p. 15.

22. *Justification and Freedom*, p. 15.

23. *Justification and Freedom*, p. 7.

24. See the concluding section below.

25. *Justification and Freedom*, p. 41.

26. *Justification and Freedom*, p. 36.

27. *Justification and Freedom*, p. 24. Without discussing the challenge of *claritas externa* of Scripture, this comes close to a Spiritualist statement.

28. *Zwischen Autonomie und Angewiesenheit. Familie als verlässliche Gemeinschaft stärken. Eine Orientierungshilfe des Rates der Evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2013).

29. *Zwischen Autonomie und Angewiesenheit*, p.58 (my translation).

30. *Justification and Freedom*, p.8.

31. *Justification and Freedom*, p.59.

32. *Justification and Freedom*, p.60.

33. *Justification and Freedom*, p.66.—In the meantime, the (Catholic) Deutsche Bischofskonferenz and the Evangelische Kirche in Deutschland published an ecumenical document “Erinnerung heilen—Jesus Christus bezeugen.” Ein gemeinsames Wort zum Jahr 2017 (Gemeinsame Texte 24), Bonn/Hannover 2016 (https://www.ekd.de/download/erinnerung_heilen_gt24.pdf; visited November 12, 2016). It also contains a helpful proposal for ecumenical services of repentance and reconciliation.

34. The author of this article was one of the drafters of the document.

35. *Lumen gentium* 8.
36. *Unitatis redintegratio* 3.
37. *Unitatis redintegratio* 3.
38. *Unitatis redintegratio* 4.
39. See the service on Youtube: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=plkK6zNHP_o
40. The booklet distributed at the common prayer in Lund does not contain information about authors or editors or places. Its title is: *From Conflict to Communion: Together in Hope. Joint Catholic-Lutheran Commemoration of the Reformation. 31 October 2016* (referred to as “Commemoration”). The liturgy for Lund was developed by Theodor Dieter (Strasbourg/France), Dirk Lange (St. Paul/USA), and Wolfgang Thönissen (Paderborn/Germany) in close cooperation with the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity and the Communion Office of the LWF. See: https://www.lutheranworld.org/sites/default/files/dtpw-lrc-liturgy-2016_en.pdf (referred to as “Common Prayer”). There are slight differences between the text of the Common Prayer and the Commemoration.
 41. Commemoration, 10 / Common Prayer, 13.
 42. Commemoration, 12 / Common Prayer, 14f.
 43. Address of His Holiness Pope Francis, “Homily at Ecumenical Prayer Service Commemorating the Reformation” (*Origins* 46 [2016], 373).
 44. Pope Francis / Bishop Younan, Joint Statement on the occasion of the Joint Catholic-Lutheran Commemoration of the Reformation (*Origins* 46 [2016], 373).