

Martin J. Heineken reviewing *Called and Ordained*
The Lutheran Quarterly
Volume V Number 4 Winter 1991

the judging function of the law and the full pathos of the "given and shed for the remission of sins" and the "As oft as you eat this bread and drink this cup you proclaim (show) the Lord's death until he comes" is largely excised, so the doctrine by which the church is believed to stand or fall is trivialized into what comes close to Voltaire's scoffing remark, "God will forgive, that's his business." What is needed, as Reinhold Niebuhr pointed out long ago in his *Human Nature and Destiny* is a doctrine of atonement with some teeth in it. In all the talks at the St. Olaf Conference there was—if my reading is correct—little reflection of this.

3. Since then much thought has been given to the consideration of these structures and they have been expanded to include others such as those included under the general rubric of culture: science, art, education, and other free forms of community. All these are in the realm of God's creation, under the law with its rewards and punishments and thus contribute to human well-being, but they are not in the realm of redemption. In all of these structures human beings may achieve varying degrees of 'civil righteousness,' which have merit *coram hominibus* (before men) and are well-pleasing to God, but they have no merit *coram deo in loco justificationis* (before God in the place of justification).

4. This summary is based upon Carl Braaten's, *The Apostolic Imperative* (pp. 138–63) It is cited as a "characteristic statement of this position including most of the elements mentioned." If the summary cited represents Braaten's own personal conviction one wonders where, after several permutations, Braaten is going to go next.

5. While Grindal mentions the fact that the vote taken at the LCA convention was simply to change the "man" that defined the ministry of the church to "person" and that it passed by voice vote after only one half hour of debate, and, while she also states that the commission that presented the report said that nothing in its view of "the official, representative ministry" would prevent a woman from holding the office, she does not elucidate the rationale that led to that conclusion. Since I served on the commission, a further elucidation may be helpful. From the first time the commission met there was agreement that the matter should not be decided by citing isolated scriptural proof passages, nor by considering physical, and psychological qualifications or the sociological standing of women in any given culture, but solely on the basis of the church's understanding of ordination in the full context of its biblical, theological, confessional orientation. If then the ministry is a "ministry of the Word of God" and all the power and efficacy inhere in that Word, then the sex, no more than the skin color, the race, the moral perfection, or the length of the nose, etc., of the one proclaiming the Word can make any difference, no matter whether the proclaimer is just one of the priesthood of all believers or one from among that priesthood who has been called and ordained to the official, representative ministry of the church. It is not a matter of the distinctive contributions that women qua women can make to the basic theological understanding of the ministry, any more than of the peculiar contribution that men qua men might make. It is true that the qualities which a person possesses, no matter whether male or female, will make a difference in the practical performance of ministry, but this is not the reason for ordaining them . . . The only thing that is prerequisite to the holding of the office of the public ministry of the church is the call and ordination by the church for the church. It is this which the women who celebrated the 20th anniversary apparently forgot. Instead of having the church as a whole celebrate and rejoice because the empirical church at long last realized more fully the nature of the church and its ministry, it seems to have turned into a self-congratulatory celebration of what women qua women have accomplished and appeared to be more a celebration of feminist liberation and achievement than a humble acknowledgment of what the grace of God accomplished. This kind of celebration was no more warranted than if men qua men met separately to glory in their achievements as men through the mil-

lennia, in utter forgetfulness of all the perversities they committed, precisely as macho males. Women qua women may and have, since they were ordained, contributed substantially to the actual performance of ministry, but they cannot qua women presume to alter the church's confession of the christian-catholic faith on the assumption that this confession (e.g., the ecumenical creeds) is the product of a false male claim to superiority and is, therefore, to be radically revised. This would mean the creation of a new church other than that of "Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, today, and forever."

6. Every human formulation of doctrine is subject to the so-called "protestant principle" which Paul Tillich defined as the principle that any human doctrine which claims absolute ultimacy for its formulation must be protested, which then includes its own protest. (See "The Protestant Era, Univ. of Chicago Press, 1948, passim)