

Evangelical Episcopate, Yes — Sacramental Requirement, No

by Joseph A. Burgess

Take on the historical episcopate? It's the ecumenical thing to do — so the argument goes. We must become part of the "great" church, and all that remains is to work out strategy, steps, and stages. What could be more obvious? Further, it is argued, in an age of change where change has become the final authority, we have a leadership crisis and that will be solved by adopting the historic episcopate. What we need is "real" bishops who will stand up for the truth with "real" authority, and that means bishops in historic succession.¹

What Is "Real" Authority For Lutherans?

That is to say, what is binding, compelling, final authority? Among the welter of claims to authority Lutherans have a very clear position:

It becomes necessary to make a careful distinction between faith as trust in the divine promises and those aspects of the faith of the Church which are responses to the divine promise through confession, action, teaching, and doctrinal formulations. These responses are necessary: the gospel (the promise of God) does indeed have a specifiable 'knowledge' content. But the authority of this content, Lutherans believe, is established by its power to convict of sin and convince of grace through the work of the Holy Spirit and is not enhanced by saying that the teaching office or doctrinal formulations are themselves infallible.²

We do not hold to some sort of "platonic" gospel, in the abstract, no matter how carefully delineated and defined, to which we give our intellectual assent and then have done with it. The gospel is "the power of God for salvation" (Rom 1:16). Even the great doctrine of the Trinity, no matter how carefully defined by ecumenical councils and how exquisitely spun out by later speculation about the Trinity, is not the "final authority" in abstracto. As Schlink has pointed out:

In the Roman church the dreadful fact had become evident that, in spite of the preservation of the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity, God was not known any more, since the gospel had been lost ... The triune God, therefore, is known only in the distinction of law and Gospel, that is, by faith in the Gospel.³

Joseph A. Burgess is pastor of Faith and Zion Lutheran Churches in Regent, North Dakota.

The same kind of thinking applies to the canon of Scripture, and most particularly to the appeal to inerrancy; Scripture "may err, but not the gospel of God's unconditional mercy in Jesus Christ to which the biblical writings are the primary witness."⁴ And the same applies to ecclesiological structures. We are irrevocably committed to the view that the authenticity of the gospel is the only guarantee for the legitimacy of structure in the church — rather than the converse, that the legitimacy of the structures of the church guarantees the authenticity of the gospel.⁵

The gospel, to be sure, "does indeed have a specifiable 'knowledge' content."⁶ As a consequence of the incarnation, the word of God is found in statements, assertions, and propositions. The question is how these are used. Do they become fleshly forms of legitimation? Fleshly forms of legitimation bind us to the tyranny of the law even while the law destroys all confidence in the flesh. Faith is called forth by the gospel, which stands over against the law and fleshly forms of legitimation. Thus proper use in proclamation is what is meant by "purely" and "rightly" (CA 7), not what is infallible or true in some other sense. For this reason

the language of infallibility continues to seem dangerously misleading to most of us even when applied to the Bible, and to all of us when used in reference to popes, councils, or doctrinal formulations. It can too easily be abused to detract from the primacy of God's justifying act in Jesus Christ.⁷

Fleshly legitimation is terribly tempting. Would that somewhere this side of the grave were given to us the kind of security our flesh desires! But the only guarantee of the transmission of the gospel is the Holy Spirit, who works faith when and where he pleases. "For there is no special gift (*charism*) of infallibility in the magisterium."⁸ Even the dominical sacraments are not guarantees, but effective signs, founded on words of promise. Whatever else may be said about *iure divino*, *iure providentia*, and irreversible developments, they do not provide any kind of guarantee of the transmission of the gospel that would eliminate the *ubi et quando*. Typical for Lutherans in this process of discernment is what happened in the heresy trials of Richard Baumann and Paul Schulz, where German regional churches refused to make decisions about dogma. Baumann demanded a decision on his view of papal primacy and infallibility; Schulz wanted the church to rule on certain propositions affirming atheism. Instead, Baumann was suspended until he should change his viewpoint and Schulz was dismissed for not proclaiming the gospel. Proximate authorities sought to remain proximate.⁹

More →

The Critical Point: Eschatology

All of the above is based on the eschatological proviso, the eschatological divide. Jesus Christ has been raised from the dead, “the first fruits of those who have fallen asleep” (I Cor 15:20), but all in Christ “shall be” made alive (I Cor 15:22). Lutherans describe existence before the parousia as a time of brokenness, lived *sub contrario, sola fide*, and *simul iustus et peccator*; our proclamation is *solus Christus sola cruce* (I Cor 2:2), which is foolishness and an offense. Is it any wonder that two contemporary Roman Catholic theologians, H. Döring and G. Greshake, easily find the basis for contrasting Lutheran/Roman Catholic ecclesiologies in contrasting eschatologies?¹⁰

What then of continuity after the ascension? The church is indefectible (Matt 16:18), yet medieval theologians were wont to point out that this might mean no more than Mary alone under the cross. As happens in the development of any group, charisma was routinized. The critical point, as Congar helpfully puts it, is: Where is the Holy Spirit located?¹¹ The gospel is to be transmitted (Rom 10:14-15), but is there a guarantee that goes beyond the *ubi et quando* of the Holy Spirit? All “are constantly re-examined and reinterpreted in the light of God’s Word.”¹² Creeds, council, canon, and all modalities of church structure, including therefore also the historic episcopate, are subject to the same criterion of God’s Word, which includes the eschatological proviso.

To illustrate the complexities involved: Christians of the Eastern Orthodox tradition, who go back in church history as far as any, do not accept the development of papal primacy and infallibility. The Eastern Orthodox do, however, hold patriarchates to be a binding development, including the later development of patriarchates. A system of *chorepiscopi*, bishops subject to the city bishop and limited to ordaining minor orders, developed in Syria, the inner parts of Asia Minor, and Cappadocia; they were disbanded by the Synod of Laodicea but appeared again under the Franks. Thus for several centuries a four-fold order of ministry existed in the church. In the high Middle Ages the college of cardinals was held by many to be *iure divino*.¹³

Are all developments equal, but some more equal than others? Hardly. All are subject to the same criterion, God’s Word. On the question of the historic episcopate our Confessional literature is very specific: ecclesiastical ranks “were created by human authority” (Ap 14:1; cf. 7:33-34). We are quite content to use traditional polity, up to and including the papacy, provided that such polity is “renewed under the gospel and committed to Christian freedom.”¹⁴ The gospel is, of course, *sola fide* and *sola cruce*; the eschatological proviso is part of the gospel. Christian freedom, of course, includes the adiaphoristic principle, that is: 1) that whatever does not stand in the way of proclaiming the gospel and celebrating the sacraments purely and rightly is a matter of Christian freedom, an *adiaphoron*; 2) that something good in itself, such as ecclesiastical ranks “created by human authority,” cannot be made a requirement for salvation and the lack thereof cannot be allowed to cast doubt on being fully in Christ’s body; and 3) that an *adiaphoron* is only an *adiaphoron* when it is an *adiaphoron* for both sides involved.

As far as the location of the Holy Spirit in church structures is concerned, therefore — using traditional conceptuality — Lutherans “insist that the *signum* of succession can exist where

the *res* of apostolicity is absent (or, at any rate, so seriously distorted and obscured that the presence of the *signum* is misleading rather than helpful).¹⁵ Transmission of the gospel on this side of the parousia continues to be *sub contrario sola fide*. When Apology 13 takes up the possibility of calling ordination a sacrament (along with confirmation, extreme unction, matrimony, government, prayer, giving alms, and afflictions), the conclusion is straightforward: we have no objection “if ordination is interpreted in relation to the ministry of the Word” and then cites Romans 1:16. The Word of promise authenticates. Prayer, as Apology 13 indicates, is a parallel case, and how prayer is *sub contrario* is graphically described in Romans 8:26: “We do not know how to pray as we ought, but the Spirit himself intercedes for us with sighs too deep for words.”

Other traditions, as we all know, understand that the eschatological proviso has already been lifted, at least provisionally, often on the basis of such biblical passages as Ephesians 2:6, where it states that Christians are already raised and already “sit with him in the heavenly places.” As realized eschatology develops, it tends to locate the Holy Spirit at one extreme or the other — either as Father, Son, and Holy Experience or as Father, Son, and Holy Church.

The Historical Question

Roman Catholic theologians quickly realized Luther’s concerns had wide-sweeping ecclesiological implications. Among other things, the idea of the public office of preaching the gospel, though not fully fleshed out by 1530 — as Maurer indicates, was one of those implications. The radical reshaping of episcopacy in the Lutheran compromise proposed in Article 28 of the Augsburg Confession was rejected by the Roman Catholic side. Strictly speaking, therefore, the Lutherans were not bound to the proposed compromise; but the Augsburg Confession, including the understanding of bishops in Article 28, has become our basic Confession.¹⁶ According to Article 28, bishops, who are the same as pastors and presbyters, do what they do “simply by the Word” (CA 28:22).

Although the ecclesiology of the day was not fully developed and thus the term “emergency situation” only applies in a limited sense, Lutherans very quickly began creating their own particular episcopal structures. “They could overcome the emergency only because they perceived the theological possibility of doing it. The emergency situation does prove the rule, but it also reveals what is ultimately essential and necessary.”¹⁷ The term “emergency situation” should, to be sure, always be used *cum grano salis*: To the victor belongs the definition of “emergency situation.”

Romanticism

Why the great attraction of the historic episcopate? It’s human nature. The grass is always greener. In 1292, as a consequence of hopes fanned by ideas of Joachim of Fiore that a *papa angelicus* would restore the church, a Benedictine hermit named Peter of Morrone was elected pope (Celestine V). He lasted less than six months; the pipedream had turned into a nightmare.

Similarly, in the cold light of day the historic episcopate ends up being far less attractive. Without working out a structure based on the actual primacy of the gospel and allowing for Christian freedom in practice, the vision of restoring the church through the historic episcopate (*episcopus angelicus*) remains an eschatological chimera and should be identified as such.

The Romanticism Of Teaching Authority

What we need is real teaching authority, "real" bishops, it is claimed. Gil Meilaender writes of complaining to Julian Hartt about how unsatisfactory the Lutheran approach to teaching authority is. "I allowed that it might well be one of the worst ways to deal with serious theological questions. Methodist that he was, (Hartt) responded by assuring me that bishops were capable of at least as much harm."¹⁸ One may retort, of course, that Methodist bishops are not "real" because they lack the historic episcopate, but they are arguably the most powerful bishops in Christendom, and if what one wants is "strong" bishops, such are available. Not all Methodists are happy with "strong" bishops — and many Roman Catholics feel the same way.

A recent study (1982) by the Southeastern Pennsylvania Synod of the former LCA, done with the help of the Alban Institute, on the functions of the bishop points up the dilemma: both pastors and congregations want their bishop to speak with authority when he agrees with them, but not when he disagrees. There's the rub. Lutherans advocating "real" episcopal teaching authority have to deal with the actual history of it all. During the first generation of the Reformation no bishops stood on the side of the freedom of the gospel, with the exception of Georg von Polentz, Bishop of Samland, and Erhard von Queiss, Bishop of Pomerania, both from eastern Prussia, far from the power of the pope and the emperor. In the 1930s during Hitler's rule no Lutheran bishops stood up with the Confessing Church, with the possible exception of Bishop Theophil Wurm; on the Roman Catholic side things were no better, with Bishop Clemens August von Galen parallel to Wurm. Only three out of eighty-three Roman Catholic bishops in Argentina opposed the terrorism of their recent military dictatorship.

Nor do things improve closer to home. Was Bishop Pike of the Episcopal Church in this country using the charisma of episcopal teaching authority when he denied the doctrine of the Trinity? Is the theological liberalism of Bishops "Honest to God" Robinson and Jenkins of the Church of England an expression of episcopal teaching authority? At this point in time at least two Episcopal bishops in the United States have knowingly ordained active homosexuals to the priesthood and at the last triennial convention of the Episcopal Church in this country ten to twelve bishops indicated that they would ordain active homosexuals to the priesthood. On the other hand, five standing bishops of the Episcopal Church in the United States refuse to ordain women to the priesthood. Which of these is truly episcopal teaching authority?

Parallel for Lutherans is how the historic episcopate is functioning in the Church of Sweden. Two years ago a recently retired bishop of Stockholm reported that his colleagues in the Church of Sweden had "agreed to disagree" on whether to impose "the celibate life" on homosexuals in the public ministry.¹⁹ More than half a million of the communing and voting

members of the Church of Sweden have never been baptized. Episcopal teaching authority seems to have operated differently than might have been expected. Could there be any relationship between this and the fact that of the countries included in a recent survey only Sweden was found to have a majority claiming to be "atheist?"²⁰

Yet does not "real" episcopal teaching authority at least take place at the collegial level? It "is not apparent in Anglican experience," one Anglican expert points out:

*Here is a lamentable weakness — an apparent inability among bishops to agree upon what fundamentals should be agreed upon. How can the bishops be the guardians of a tradition which is itself unclear to them: if they are to be guardians of the faith, who is to be their guardian? ... There is in no real sense a college of bishops in England.*²¹

Episcopal teaching authority has become a similar dilemma for many American Roman Catholic theologians, faced as they are with troublesome statements by their episcopal conference on war, economics, and the status of women. One proposal is to move as far as possible in the direction of "fallible teaching authority,"²² which, though not precisely an oxymoron, indicates a desire for teaching authority that is not quite so "real." When all is said and done, teaching authority only has authority because it is self-authenticating. When Bishop Berggrav, Primate of Norway, defied the Nazis by proclaiming the Word of promise, he lacked historic orders.

The Romanticism Of Unity

Has the historic episcopate led to unity? Will it produce unity? First of all, what happens on this score in the Roman Catholic Church must be separated out as a question for itself. As Cardinal Suenens has said:

*We have heard arguments based on 'what the bishops taught for decades.' Well, the bishops did defend the classic position. But it was one imposed on them by authority. The bishops didn't study the pros and cons. They received directives, they bowed to them, and they tried to explain them to their congregations.*²³

Thus in the Roman Catholic Church "Episcopal unity is revealed as enforced, not genuine."²⁴

In the course of church history bishops have been as great a source of disunity as of unity. Major tensions and disagreements among early bishops cannot be overlooked; it was not all sweetness and light.

*In fact there were considerable periods and large areas in which the 'Catholics' were in a minority ... It appears that at one moment in the 4th century there were no fewer than six bishops in Antioch, each claiming to be the sole representative of the authoritative and valid succession from the days of the apostles.*²⁵

On balance bishops go with the flow, that is, serve the establishment, as can be seen in the fact that in a crisis, which is when teaching authority is really needed, they have tended to line up with the establishment: for example, at the time of the Arian heresy, on the side of the Arians and the Arian emperor (recall the classic study by Cardinal Newman on consulting the faithful in matters of doctrine);²⁶ at the time of the Reformation, on

More →

the side of the pope and the emperor. No, the historic episcopate has been a fallible mark of church unity. The jurisdictional struggles within Orthodoxy are well-known. Anglicanism seems to be at a crisis point in England, Australia, and the United States, though they do often muddle through. As far as the future is concerned, Reumann has suggested:

*Have the executive directors of global missions or university professors who travel widely become de facto the voices of universality? Given time and budget, various persons could fill this necessary function in the church.*²⁷

Here one must also question those who assert that unity is the same as truth. For example: "In fact unity is of the essence of the truth of the Gospel."²⁸ What seems to be meant is, to paraphrase Keats: Unity is truth, truth unity; that is all you know on earth and all you need to know. Unity is crucial for the mission of the Gospel, without a doubt, but unity by and for itself may promote error, and disunity may be necessary for the pure and recte of the mission of the Gospel (cf. Gal 1:6-8; 2:5, 11-14).²⁹

The Only Way Into the Ecumenical Future?

It has been said that Lutherans have to adopt the historic episcopate because the other side will never change. But Rahner argues that we cannot say with certainty that the three-fold office is *iure divino* because this division does not go back to the historical Jesus; thus it is not certain that the Protestant churches would have to adopt this division if they wished to be united with the Roman Catholic Church.³⁰ Schillebeeckx says much the same thing.³¹

In earlier centuries even the Anglican Church was more flexible in these matters. Under James I bishops were consecrated for Scotland without being previously ordained to the diaconate and priesthood, and under Charles II, when the episcopate was restored in Scotland, "no attempt was made to impose the condition of episcopal ordination upon the existing clergy in general," and six further bishops were consecrated without being previously ordained to the diaconate and priesthood.³² In the Eighteenth Century some Lutheran missionaries in India, working under the aegis of the S.P.C.K. (the Anglican foreign missionary arm), upon occasion, using the Lutheran Ordinal, ordained Indians as "country priests," and "there is no evidence that any of these 'country priests' in South India was re-ordained according to the Anglican rite."³³ Later, after the victory of the Tractarians, such flexibility was no longer possible; Anglicans had become more Roman than Rome. Such incidents as those just recounted are now classified as "exceptions" or "emergency situations." To the victor belongs the definition of "emergency situation!"

At this point the fledgling ecumenist needs to be alert to the distinction between recognition and reconciliation. Mutual recognition of ministries is not the real difficulty; in a certain sense it could be said to exist already between Lutherans and Episcopalians and even between Lutherans and Roman Catholics. We recognize that the other church even now in itself has a valid sacramental life and a valid ministry to go with that life. The difficulty is the reconciliation of ministries, as interminable negotiations within the Consultation on Church Union demon-

strate. Reconciliation would mean that ministries had actually become interchangeable between separate churches. With all due respect to those claiming that the pipeline theory is out of date because now all that is required is that one becomes part of the "order" of bishops, an unbroken chain of laying on of hands for each is still being required.

When all is said and done, how much would we actually gain? We are already in pulpit and altar fellowship with Sweden and Finland through the LWF. If we were, for example, to take on the historic episcopate in the Anglican fashion, we would reach some level of reconciliation of ministries with part of the Anglican communion — probably not all, and we would be able to change from observer to participant status in the Consultation on Church Union. But neither Rome nor Constantinople recognize Anglican Orders, and in light of Anglican ordination of women, it is unlikely that Rome or Constantinople will recognize Anglican Orders. To take on the historic episcopate in Roman Catholic fashion, we would have to accept papal primacy and infallibility, probably as uniates. To take on the historic episcopate in Orthodox fashion, we would have to become Orthodox.³⁴ To take on the historic episcopate in Swedish fashion does not change the issue; Swedish Orders are not accepted by Rome or Constantinople either.

Difficult Practical Matters

Practical matters seem intractable. Who is going to make the first move? The weaker party? That seems like coercion. When sister churches are to form a larger unity, what role is the older or more gifted sister to have in the mix? Over the long term how can the sisters all survive as persons, especially when trouble develops, and still keep their unity? More specifically to the question of the historic episcopate — the Swedish model does not fill the requirements set by other episcopally-ordered churches because a Lutheran pastor without historic orders is not re-ordained when he or she becomes a pastor in the Lutheran Church of Sweden, but this is not the case in other episcopally ordered churches. Unfortunately proposals made concerning the historic episcopate in Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry seem to have become history; the very diplomatic but unmistakably critical responses in Churches Respond to BEM I-VI pretty well cancel each other out.³⁵ Probably at this moment in history the most important move for those who want Lutherans to adopt the historic episcopate would be to make sure that any Lutheran churches ordaining women as bishops reverse the process, for women as bishops is a real barrier to reconciliation with the vast majority of those holding to the historic episcopate.³⁶

Yes, an episcopate "renewed under the gospel and committed to Christian freedom"³⁷ would foster the mission of the church, which is to proclaim the Word of promise purely and rightly. To carry out such a mission is to be truly apostolic.³⁸ **LF**

— Endnotes —

1. The pragmatic argument, that is, that the historic episcopate will be a greater help than other ecclesiastical means in solving the authority, leadership, and truth crises of today, is frequent among those pushing the historic episcopate; those Lutherans calling themselves Evangelical Catholics fall into the same pattern, e.g. Leonard Klein, *Forum Letter* 21 (1992) 4; James R. Crumley, Jr., *Lutheran Forum* 24 (1990) 36; Robert L. Wilken, *dialog* 31 (1992) 152. When it is pointed out that the pragmatic argument does not work because the historic episcopate has not in fact been a greater help, then comes the anguished reply, *abusus non tollit usum*. But if the case such people are trying to make is not the pragmatic one, but that the *usus* is valid

in itself alone, then they need to stick to dealing with what is for them the even more difficult problem, that of trying to demonstrate that the historic episcopate is *jure divino*, an irreversible development in God's plan.

2. **Teaching Authority And Infallibility In The Church** (Lutherans and Catholics in Dialogue 6; ed. P. C. Empie, T. A. Murphy, and J. A. Burgess; Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1980) Lutheran Reflections, #10, 63; both George Lindbeck and Gerhard Forde are among the signatories to this statement. Hereinafter abbreviated as L/RC 6.
3. Edmund Schlink, **Theology Of The Lutheran Confessions** (tr. P. F. Koehnke and H. J. A. Bouman; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1961) 66. Emphasis in the text.
4. L/RC 6, #7, 62.
5. George Lindbeck, "The Lutheran Doctrine of the Ministry: Catholic and Reformed," *Theological Studies* 30 (1969) 611.
6. L/RC 6, #10, 63.
7. L/RC 6, #16, 65.
8. L/RC 6, #20, 67.
9. **The One Mediator, The Saints, And Mary** (Lutherans and Catholics in Dialogue 8; ed. H. G. Anderson, J. F. Stafford, and J. A. Burgess; Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1992) Lutheran Reflections, note 6, 363.
10. H. Döring, *Kirchen — Unterwegs zur Einheit* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1969) 45-65; G. Greshake, "Eschatologie II, katholische Sicht," *Ökumene Lexikon* (ed. H. Krüger, W. Löser, and W. Müller-Römhald; Frankfurt: Lembeck; Knecht, 1983) 339-42.
11. Y. Congar, **Tradition And Traditions** (New York: MacMillan, 1966) 338-47; cf. *idem*, **I Believe In The Holy Spirit** (3 vols.; New York: Seabury, 1983) *passim*.
12. L/RC 6, #20, 67.
13. J. Michael Miller, **The Divine Right Of The Papacy In Recent Ecumenical Theology** (Analecta Gregoriana, Vol. 218, Ser. Fac. Theol., Sec. B. n. 70; Rome: Universitá Gregoriana Editrice, 1980) 21.
14. **Papal Primacy And The Universal Church** (Lutherans and Catholics in Dialogue 5; ed. P. C. Empie and T. A. Murphy; Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1974) Lutheran Perspectives, #32, 23.
15. George Lindbeck, "Question No. 2," **Eucharist And Ministry** (Lutherans and Catholics in Dialogue 4; ed. P. C. Empie and T. A. Murphy; Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1979) 59.
16. Wilhelm Maurer, **Historical Commentary On The Augsburg Confession** (tr. H. G. Anderson; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986) 188-204.
17. "The Condemnations of the Reformation Era," *Lutheran Quarterly* 5 (1991) 511-12.
18. *First Things*, no. 14 (June/July 1991) 39.
19. *The Lutheran*, February 14, 1990, 23.
20. *Lutheran World Information*, November 21, 1991, Number 8.
21. Peter Moore, "The Anglican Episcopate: Its Strengths and Limitations," in **Bishops: But What Kind?** (ed. P. Moore; London: SPCK, 1982) 132-33. Emphasis in the text.
22. James L. Heft, "Episcopal Teaching Authority on Matters of War and Economics," in **Theology And Authority** (ed. R. Penaskovic; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1987) 102.
23. Cited in Richard A. McCormick, "Dissent in Moral Theology and Its Implications: Some Notes on the Literature," in **Moral Theology No. 6. Dissent In The Church** (ed. C. E. Curran and R. A. McCormick; New York/Mahwah, NJ: Paulist, 1988) 533.
24. McCormick, 533.
25. Ruth Rouse and Stephen Charles Neill, eds., **A History Of The Ecumenical Movement 1517-1948** (2nd ed.; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1967) 12; this point is made in a section written by Neill, a bishop having the historic episcopate in the Anglican mode.
26. J. H. Newman, "On Consulting the Faithful in Matters of Doctrine," *The Rambler* 1 (July 1859).
27. John Reumann, "Eucharist and Ministry," in **Lutherans In Ecumenical Dialogue: A Reappraisal** (ed. J. A. Burgess; Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1990) 206.
28. *The Tablet* (London), December 26, 1991.
29. Cf. "More than Church Unity, Study Document for the Fifth Assembly," *Lutheran World* 17 (1970) 43-58, esp. 44, 47.
30. Karl Rahner, "Open Questions in Dogma Considered by the Institutional Church as Definitely Answered," *Journal Of Ecumenical Studies* 15 (1978) 215.
31. Edward Schillebeeckx, "The Catholic Understanding of Office in the Church," *Theological Studies* 30 (1969) 570.
32. Rouse and Neill, 143 (note 25 above).
33. Rouse and Neill, 161 (note 25 above).
34. To suppose that the Orthodox are going to change on the ordination of women, flies into the teeth of the evidence. As the Orthodox have moved into other cultures, they have not changed in anything essential. Note what has happened in over a century of living in North America.
35. Edited by Max Thurian in Geneva by the WCC from 1986-88. Compare also the summary of the Lutheran responses, also very diplomatic but unmistakably critical, in Michael Seils, **Lutheran Convergence?** (LWF Report 25; Geneva: LWF, 1988).
36. Cf. *Lutheran World Information*, September 3, 1992.
37. Note 14 above.
38. See further: Joseph A. Burgess, "What is a Bishop?" *Lutheran Quarterly* 1 (1987) 307-29; *idem*, "An Evangelical Episcopate?" in **Called And Ordained** (ed. T. Nichol and M. Kolden; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990) 137-50. It is perhaps worth mentioning that even though Ministry #38 of **Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry** states that episcopacy is to be a "sign, but not a guarantee," the Roman Catholic response to BEM states that the historic episcopate is not only a sign but a guarantee; see "Roman Catholic Church," **Churches Respond to BEM** (Faith and Order Paper 144; ed. M. Thurian; Geneva: WCC, 1988) 5:26, 33. Then the eschatological proviso involved in faith in the promise has been eliminated.

Thanks to the Recent Benefactors of the ALPB!

Rev. Oswald Elbert, Sinking Spring, PA
 Ms. Kathryn Koob, APO, AE
 Hill Avenue Grace Lutheran Church, Pasadena, CA
 Pr L M Andersen Camarillo, CA
 Rev Dr Donald E Schedler Columbia, MO
 John E Pedersen, Ottawa, ONT, CANADA
 Rev Steinar Bruun, Port Alberni, BC, CANADA
 St Luke's Lutheran Church, Farmingdale, NY
 Manfred Schurer, Huntingdon Valley, PA
 Immanuel Lutheran Church, Delhi, NY
 Charles E Sukup, Dougherty, IA
 Mr Fred Kempin, Havertown, PA
 Mr Alfred Christiansen, Saginaw, MI
 Rev Howard W Palm, Pleasant Hill, TN
 Lee A Maxwell, St Louis, MO
 Pr William J & Marie Meyer, Garden City, NY
 Dorothy P Schott, New Port Richey, FL
 Rev Herbert C Meyer, Cromwell, CT
 Mr & Mrs Ken Kaufmann, Lewisburg, PA
 Mr F G Timmel, Baltimore, MD
 Mrs Dorothy L Hockman, Cvil Winchester, OH
 Rev Willard R Garred, Des Moines, IA
 Paul R Brott, Honolulu, HI
 Rev Edward H Birner, Greenbelt, MD
 Mrs Dwight L Gladfelter, Tumbauersville, PA
 Mrs Marion Zelenko, Albany, NY
 Thomas I Nelson, Birmingham, AL
 Rev Tim Rossow, Dearborn, MI
 Rev Gerald Schaar, Riverview, FL
 Mr George R F Tamke, Lewisburg, PA
 Rev John G Fuchs, Edwardsville, IL
 Dr & Mrs Robert B Gronlund, W Palm Beach, FL
 Ruthfred Lutheran Church, Bethel Park, PA
 Clifford S Reppe, Sun City, AZ
 Prof Carl A Volz, St Paul, MN
 Rev Albert W Galen, Oviedo, FL
 Mrs Wenonah S Deffner, Madison, WI
 Rev Elwood L Stark, New Canaan, CT
 Bethlehem Lutheran Church, Los Alamos, NM
 Rev Royce J Scherf, Aptos, CA
 Rev Dennis L Hanson, Sandpoint, ID
 Rev Lloyd H Linder, Pittsburgh, PA
 Emil A Dieter, Englewood, FL
 Walter C Rubke, Yuba City, CA
 Rev Rick R Senner, Rembrandt, LA
 Mrs Georgia L Watters, Citrus Heights, CA
 Rev Nathaniel Day, Brooklyn, NY
 Robert M DeLisser, MD, Pensacola, FL
 Rev Theodore B Gulhaugen, Neeviah, WI
 Mrs Frances H Erickson, Pasadena, CA
 L Hoyt Peterson, Edison, NJ
 Rev W E Sund, Toledo, OH
 Rev Earle T Beck, Waterford, MI
 Rev Ronald W Albers, Evansville, IN
 Rev Richard R Omland, Billings, MT
 Rev Rudolph Shintay, Chicago, IL
 Rev Robert H Fischer, Western Springs, IL
 Miss Mae E Nelson, Faribault, MN
 Dr Richard Roddis, Bellevue, WA
 The Rev Arnold Steinbeck, Monterey, CA
 Charles A Gray, Syracuse, NY
 Rev Floyd E Johnson, Maple Ridge, BC, CANADA
 Ms Evelyn J Junge, New York, NY
 Rev Robert P Hansen, Fremont, NE
 Ruth L Huysman, Medford, NJ
 Ms Ruth E Halvorson, Portland, OR
 Dr & Mrs Robert H Boyd, St Paul, MN
 Rev Robert E Ward, Banks, OR
 Rev Fred Schumacher, White Plains, NY

Please watch for the annual ALPB
Christmas Appeal in the mail soon!