

A IGREJA LUTERANA: TORNAR A CRISTO NO RENASCER PESSOAL DA FÈ EM MEIO AO TRAUMA DA EMANCIPAÇÃO HUMANA, COM ESPIRITO DE TOLERANCIA

INTRODUÇÃO

O PANORAMA LUTERANO HOJE



Com mais de 70 milhões de fiéis, a família luterana representa nos anos 80 e 90 a primeira denominação protestante e a terceira no mundo cristão. Vários estudos continuam a explorar a especificidade e a originalidade luterana ¹. o intuito de unidade luterana vem sendo desenvolvido

¹ Cfr E. Kinder, *Literatur*, in AA. VV., *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, Tübingen 1965, S. 1939; W. Elert, *Die Lehre des L. im Abriss* (Mn² 1926); H. Sasse, *Was heißt lutherisch?* (Mn 1934); Schlink; H. Asmussen, *Warum noch luth. Kirche?* (St 1949) F. Brunstäd, *Theologie der luth. Bekenntnisschriften* (Gü 1951) W. Stahlin, *Was ist lutherisch? Zum Selbstverständnis der "luth." Kirche im ökumen. Gespräch* (Kassel 1952); Elert ML; E. Schott, *Die zeitliche u. die ewige Gerechtigkeit. Eine kontroverstheol. Unters. z. Konkordienbuch* (B 1955); BSLK; E. Kinder, *Die luth. Kirche: Und ihr Netz zerriß. Die Großkirchen in Selbstdarstellungen*, hrsg. v. H. LamFarter (St 1957) 213—280. — Zum einzelnen: E. Sommerath, *Der Sinn des Abendmahls . . .* (L 1930), H. Gollwitzer, *Coena Domini* (Mn 1937)- W. Elert, *Zwischen Gnade u. Ungnade* (Mn 1948) 132—169; W. Künneth, *Die Autorität des Bekenntnisses* (Neuendettelsau 1950); P. Brunner, *Die ev.-luth. Lehre von der Taufe* (B 1951)- E. Ellwein, *Die göttliche Wirklichkeit des Sakraments* (Neuendettelsau 1951); R. Hermann, *Zu Luthers Lehre von Sünde u. Rechtfertigung* (T 1952) E. Kinder, *Beichte u. Absolution nach den luth. Bekenntnisschriften*: ThLZ 77 (1952) 543—550; E. Roth, *Sakrament nach Luther* (B 1952); ders., *Die Privatbeichte u. die Schlüsselgewalt in der Theologie der Reformatoren* (Gü1952), P. Brunner, *Grundlegung des S Abendmahlsgesprächs* (Kassel 1954), H. Graß, *Die Abendmahlslehre bei Luther u. Calvin* (Gü² 21954), E. Kinder, *Der Gebrauch des Begriffs "ökumenisch" im älteren L. Zu gleich ein Beitrag zur Frage der Rezeption der altkirchl. Symbole durch die luth. Reformation*, KuD 1 (1955) 180 bis 207 (Lit.); J. Koopmans, *Das altkirchl. Dogma in der Reformation* (Mn 1955), R. Prenler, *Die Realpräsenz als Mitte des christl. Gottesdienstes: Gedenkschr für W Elert* (B 1955) 307—319); ders., *Das Augsburger Bekenntnis u. die röm.-kath. Meßopferlehre*: KuD 1 (1955) 42—58; K. E. Skydsgaard, *Schrift u. Tradition*: KuD 1 (1955) 161—179 (Lit.); E. Sommerlath, *Gesetz u. Evangelium* (B 1955); G. Gloege, *Bekenntnis* (dogmatisch): RGG' 994—1000 (Lit.) E. Kinder, *Schrift u. Tradition*:

na coordenação da Federação Luterana Mundial. Em 1998, a Federação agrupava 57,6 milhões de luteranos dos 61 milhões presentes no mundo (com 124 Igrejas filiadas). ².A especificidade luterana é manifestada na medida em que não há poder e não movimenta segundo a representatividade da legítima autoridade constituída (pastores e teólogos), inclui também leigos e não-teólogos³. A Federação tem suas assembleias a cada 6/7 anos, a última foi feita em Hong Kong (1997), com a eleição do novo presidente, Bishop Christian Krause di Brunswick, Alemanha e, a reeleição do secretário geral do Zimbábue, Rev. Dr. Ishmael Noko. ⁴. São várias avaliações percentuais por continentes e populações de parte luterana. ⁵. São várias avaliações percentuais por continentes e populações de parte luterana. Presente em 80 nações (em 1998, a Federação apresenta um número considerável: 69 países). A atual configuração luterana é resultado de 3 grandes momentos da história reformada: a) sucesso da Reforma, b) imigração mais recente, c) iniciativa missionária.⁶. As estatísticas sobre o número de luteranos são objetos de importantes discussões.

Die Katholizität der Kirche, hrsg. v. W. Stählin - H. Asmussen (St 1957) 9—79 (Lit.) ders., *Die ev. Lehre von der Rechtfertigung. Quellen, ausgewählt u. eingeleitet* (Lüneburg 1957) (Lit.), ders., *Der ev. Glaube u. die Kirche. Grundzüge des ev.-luth. Kirchenverständnisses* (B 1958) (vollständige Bibliogr. zur luth. Ekklesiologie); W. Dantine, *Die Cerechtmachung des Gottlosen* (Mn 1959); E. Kinder, *Die Erbsünde* (St 1959) A. Köberle, *Rechtfertigung u. Heiligung in den luth. Bekenntnisschriften: Begegnung der Christen* (Festsehr. O. Karrer), hrsg. v. M. Poesle - O. Cullmann (St- F 1959) 235 bis 249, H. Sasse, *This is My Body* (Minneapolis 1959); R. Hermann, *Luthers These "Gerecht u. Sünder zugleich"* (Gü 1930* Neudr. 19fiO); P. Brunner, *Der Luth. Weltbund als ekklesiolog. Problem*: Luth. Rundschau 10 (St 1960 bSs 19fiI) 279 □300; H. A. Oberman, *Martin Lutero. Un uomo tra Dio e il Diavolo*, trad. it., Laterza, Roma-Bari 1987; idem, *The Reformation. Roots and Ramifications*, W. B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids (Michigan) 1994; E. Th. Bachmann - M. Brenne Bachmann, *Lutheran Churches in the World. A Handbook*, Augsburg Fortress Press, Minneapolis 1989; P. Ricca - G. Tourn, *Le novantacinque tesi di Lutero*, Claudiana, Torino 1998. Sulla dichiarazione cattolico-luterana del 1999 cfr. F. Ferrario - P. Ricca, *Il consenso cattolico-luterano sulla dottrina della giustificazione. Documenti ufficiali e commenti*, Claudiana, Torino 1999.

² LUTHERAN WORLD FEDERATION, *The Lutheran World Federation*, in «Internet» 1999, <http://www.lutheranworld.org/more/>: «The Lutheran World Federation(LWF) is a communion of Lutheran churches in all parts of the world. In 1947 in Lund, Sweden, 49 churches from six continents formed the LWF as a "free association of churches", gathered together on the basis of Holy Scriptures and in recognition of the Creeds and the Lutheran Confessions. In 1998, the LWF comprises 124 member churches - 122 full members and two associate members - in 69 countries representing 57.6 million of the world's 61 million Lutherans».

³ L. Volken, *The Lutheran World Federation Assembly in Helsinki*, in «Unity», 1963 n° 3, p. 191: «The Assembly itself is a body representing the churches which belong to the LWF. To know more about it than this quantitative aspect, we must ask: What kind of a representative body is it. ? It does not, like a Catholic Council, convene only occasionally. These Assemblies are held regularly every five (from now on every six) years. Nor are its participants only the most responsible pastors and theologians; lay-men and non-theologians are also included. Furthermore, these Assemblies do not make decisions which are binding for all the member churches. The Constitution of the LWF says in reference to an Assembly: « It shall have no power to legislate for the Churches belonging to it. » (Art. 3, no. 1). For the same reason it is not like a Chapter of a religious order. There is not assembled an « Ecclesia Docens » to which an « Ecclesia audiens » will strictly listen and obey. Again, the Assembly is not a massive demonstration of living faith like the German Catholics profess in their «Katholikentag»».

⁴ LUTHERAN WORLD FEDERATION, *The Lutheran World Federation*, in «Internet» 1999, <http://www.lutheranworld.org/more/>: «In the 50 years of its existence, the LWF has grown from a free association to a communion, an expression of the unity, equality and mutuality of Lutheran churches worldwide. The LWF is not a church, and cannot legislate for its member churches. Rather, it is the churches' agent, acting on behalf of its members in areas of common interest such as ecumenical relations, theology, humanitarian assistance, human rights, communication and the various aspects of mission and development. For this purpose it has a 90-member secretariat in Geneva, Switzerland, and the same number of international staff working with local people in LWF development programs in over 20 countries. The history of the LWF is punctuated by its Assemblies, which are milestones for and manifestations of the whole Federation. The Assemblies, held every six or seven years, have the highest authority over the policy and activities of the LWF. Each Assembly elects a President and 48-member Council to lead the organization through its annual meetings. The Ninth Assembly was held in July 1997 in Hong Kong, China. Bishop Christian Krause from Brunswick, Germany, was elected President, and the Zimbabwean Rev. Dr. Ishmael Noko was re-elected as the General Secretary of the LWF. The mandate from the Hong Kong Assembly challenges the Federation to implement the commitments made around the Assembly theme: In Christ - Called to Witness».

⁵ A. Appel, *Unité et diversité du luthéranisme*, in «Unité des chrétiens», 1980 n° 38, pp. 5-6: «LES LUTHERIENS DANS LE MONDE (en millions) Europe de l'Ouest 23,6 / Europe du Nord 21,0 / Europe de l'Est 8,3 / Amérique du Nord 8,9 / Afrique 3,0 / Asie 2,9 / Amérique latine 1,1 / Australasie 0,7».

«PRINCIPALES EGLISES LUTHERIENNES PAR PAYS (en millions - et pourcentage par rapport à la population totale). Allemagne de l'Ouest 22,4 (37,2 %) / Etats-Unis 8,6 (3,9 %) / Suède 7,5 (91,4 %) / Allemagne de l'Est 6,5 (38,9 %) / Danemark 4,7 (92,5 %) / Finlande 4,6 (97,8 %) / Norvège 3,9 (95,9 %) / Indonésie 1,8 (1,3 %) / Inde 0,9 (0,2 %) / Brésil 0,9 (0,8 %) / Tanzanie 0,9 (5,7 %) / Union Soviétique 0,6 (0,2%) / Papouasie-Nouv.Guinée 0,6 (23,5 %) / Afrique du Sud 0,6 (2,3 %) / Ethiopie 0,4 (1,5 %) / Hongrie 0,4 (4,0 %) / Namibie 0,4 (46,5 %) / Madagascar 0,4 (5,1 %) / Tchecoslovaquie 0,4 (2,7 %) / Autriche 0,4 (5,2 %) / France 0,3 (0,5 %)».

⁶ M. Chambron, *Le monde luthérien et la Fédération luthérienne mondiale*, in «Unité des chrétiens», 1980 n° 38, p. 4: «Les luthériens sont aujourd'hui présents dans près de 80 pays. Dans certains, ils représentent pratiquement l'ensemble de la population; dans d'autres, une minorité substantielle; ailleurs, un infime pourcentage. Dans son extrême diversité, la répartition géographique du luthéranisme mondial est en fait la conséquence de trois phénomènes qui se manifestèrent successivement: l'implantation territoriale de la Réforme au 16ème siècle, les mouvements migratoires du siècle dernier, et l'expansion missionnaire contemporaine. Les grandes Eglises historiques sont essentiellement celles d'Allemagne de l'Ouest et de l'Est (bien que le nombre des luthériens proprement dit y ait été réduit, dans certaines régions, par la formation ultérieure d'Eglises «unies» regroupant

Teoricamente os luteranos os 63 milhões. Em pratica esta cifra compreende muitos membros declarados da Igreja luterana européia, mas que não praticantes. As Igrejas reunidas na Federação Luterana Mundial representam 59 milhões de fieis (contados do mesmo modo), e a presença maior è na Suécia com 7 milhões e 700 mil fieis.

A formação das Igrejas unidas torna esse panorama mais complexo.

A formação de Igrejas nacionais se deve a tendência das autoridades civis, que, depois de acolher a Reforma de Lutero, favoreceram o surgimento das Igrejas Luteranas (no inicio sem o consenso do próprio Lutero).⁷ A maior vulnerabilidade da configuração luterana se percebe na Alemanha, com tentativas de asservimento da parte do regime nazista.⁸ No século XX o momento mais dramático para o luteranismo alemão foi durante o nazismo, quando o regime de Hitler favoreceu a fundação da igreja Evangélica Alemã, do *Reichsbischof* Ludwig Müller (1883-1946), de claras intenções racistas arianas. Como reação foi fundada a Igreja de Confissão do Pastor Martin Niemöller (1892-1984), aprisionado em 1937. Depois da Segunda Guerra Mundial, os luteranos da Alemanha se uniram no EKD = Igreja Evangélica da Alemanha, que acolhe também os reformados e na VELKD = Igreja Universal Evangélica Luterana da Alemanha que procede ao interno da EKD com uma posição doutrinal somente luterana.⁹

Na Europa, o luteranismo se expande nos países do Mar Báltico (Letônia e Estônia) e naqueles da Europa centro-oriental (Hungria, Eslováquia, Eslovênia, Polônia), mas se articula, sobretudo nos países escandinavos. Na Dinamarca, foi oficialmente adotado por Frederico I de Schleswig-Holstein (1523-1533) como religião de Estado.

Seu sucessor Cristiano III (1533- 1559) expulsou o clero católico e o luteranismo foi introduzido também Islândia. Seguiu um período de declínio até o seu renascimento feito por Nicolai Frederik Severin Grundtvig (1783-1872)¹⁰. Da conquista da Noruega pelos daneses em 1537, o luteranismo era a religião exclusiva do Estado até a lei de tolerância em 1845.¹¹ Na Suécia foi a atividade missionária do irmão Petri (ou Peterson) que provocou a introdução da Reforma, aprovada pela regra de Västerås de 1527. Todavia, a Historia do luteranismo na Suécia teve um

aussi des reformés) et celles des pays scandinaves et de Finlande, qui sont constituées en Eglises nationales, regroupant plus de 90 % de la population».

⁷ W. H. Van de Pol, *World Protestantism*, New York 1964, p. 97: «The Lutheran national churches owe their existence to the attitude of the princes. In this respect they do not differ from the Anglican Church of England. Whenever a prince joined Luther and the Reformation, commanding that the gospel be preached and that the reforms be introduced, a Lutheran church actually arose. Luther personally protested sharply against this name. Originally, in Germany as elsewhere, people spoke of reformed or evagelic churches. The name Lutheran church began to be used only toward the end of the sixteenth century as a result of the theological controversies about the differences between Lutheran and Calvinist teachings».

⁸ S. Spinsanti, *Ecumenismo*, Roma 1982, pp. 242-243: «Per le Chiese luterane tedesche, sottomesse al potere laico fin dall'inizio, divenute elemento strutturale della Germania moderna dopo l'azione unificatrice della Prussia di Bismarck, l'ora tragica doveva suonare con l'avvento del regime nazista. I nazional-socialisti vollero fissare lo statuto del protestantesimo nel quadro dello Stato nuovo, fondendo tutte le confessioni in una «Chiesa evangelica tedesca» con la parola d'ordine: «Uno Stato, un popolo, una Chiesa». Era la strumentalizzazione più awilente che la Chiesa potesse subire. Se ne riscattò con la resistenza morale, che portò alla creazione della «Chiesa confessante» (sinodo di Barmen, 1934), ispirata teologicamente da K. Barth e guidata da Niemöller. Pagò la sua libertà anche con dei martiri, come D. Bonhoeffer».

⁹ Il sito ufficiale dell'EKD è <http://www.ekd.de/ekd/rat.html>.

¹⁰ Il sito ufficiale è <http://www.folkekirken.dk/>

¹¹ Il sito ufficiale è <http://www.kirken.no>

pouco de tribulações, obstaculada pelo rei com simpatia calvinista como Eric XIV (1560-1568) ou católica como Sigismondo (1592-1604), mas já o sucessor deste último, Carlos IX (1604-1611) a Reforma se consolidou para depois encontrar no famoso rei Gustavo Adolfo (1611-1632) seu protetor durante a Guerra dos 30 Anos (1618-1648).

Do ponto de vista organizacional e litúrgico a Igreja da Suécia manteve uma estrutura católica (nisso se assemelha com a Igreja Anglicana), se bem que a partir de 1593 tenha aderido a Confissão de Augusta, mas particularmente nos últimos anos a Suécia esta se tornando um dos países mais descristianizado.¹² Até 1809 a Finlândia fazia parte do reino da Suécia e assim foi automática a sua adesão a Reforma.¹³ Na Itália em 1948 se constitui um sínodo provisório formando em 1949 a Igreja Evangélica Luterana da Itália (CELI). As 3 comunidades do Golfo de Nápoles formadas por italianos, que estavam separadas, aderiram a CELI em 1957. Em 1991 se constituiu a comunidade siciliana. Hoje a CELI conta com aproximadamente 8mil fiéis, boa parte de língua alemã, mesmo que algumas comunidades são bilíngües. Com DPR 18 de maio de 1961 a CELI obteve o reconhecimento como entidade de culto. A particularidade desse reconhecimento è que não há como se sucedeu em outros casos, uma entidade de confissão, mas considera a confissão em si, que assim vem a ser dotada de personalidade jurídica de direito privado.

O estatuto original que data de 1958 e foi aprovado no seu contexto com referimento a uma particularidade civil, foi em seguida objeto de modificações aprovadas com o D.P.R. de 7/03/1975, n.192.

Nos Estados Unidos, o luteranismo teve o maior sucesso. A Reforma luterana foi levada avante pólos colonos holandeses e suecos na primeira metade do século XVII, sobretudo na tolerante Pensilvânia.

Todavia o não preparo dos pastores luteranos locais não permitiu o salto de qualidade até a chagada na América de uma missão de piedade, em 1742 tendo como capo Henry Melchior Muhlenberg (1711-1787), que reorganizou a Igreja Luterana na América. As sucessivas e grandes imigrações de alemães (5 milhões) e Escandinavos (2 milhões) no século XIX ampliaram fortemente a presença luterana sobre o território. Em 1847 foi fundada a German Evangelic Lutheran Synod of Missouri (depois somente Lutheran Church – Missouri Synod) que se manteve sempre tradicional e conservadora. Hoje conta com aproximadamente 2.5000.000 fiéis¹⁴. Após varias divisões e contrastes, a linha principal dos luteranos americanos é organizada na ELCA

¹² Il sito ufficiale è <http://www.svenskakyrkan.se/>

¹³ Il sito ufficiale è <http://www.evl.fi/english>

¹⁴ Il suo sito è <http://www.lcms.org>

(Igreja Evangélica Luterana na América), que è a maior organização luterana e recolhe aproximadamente 5.200.000 fiéis¹⁵.

Dopo divisioni e contrasti vari, la linea principale dei luterani americani si è organizzata nell'ELCA (*Evangelic Lutheran Church in America* = Chiesa Evangelica Luterana in America), che è la più grossa organizzazione luterana e raccoglie circa 5.200.000 fedeli¹⁶.

A Ásia vê nascer a comunidade luterana mais numerosa em Sumatra, a *Huria Kristen Batak Protestant Church*, configurada como Igreja independente em 1930¹⁷. Sob a guia de Ephorus (bispo) Jubil Raglan Hutauruk com sede em Tarutung. Se utiliza o indonesiano, a Igreja é organizada em 26 distritos em todo o território, extendendo-se em direção aos USA. Em 2003 o numero de filiados são de 3.000.000. Faz parte da Federação Luterana Mundial desde 1952 e, depois do Conselho Ecumênico da Igrejas e nos conselhos asiáticos: a “Christian Conference of Asia” (CCA), la “United Evangelical Mission – Communion of Churches in Three Continents” (UEM) e la “Communion of Churches in Indonesia” (CCI). L’Università Nommensen - aberta em 1954 – è a maior universidade luterana no mundo, situada em Permatang Siantar e Medan no norte de Sumatra.

Na África, os luteranos chegaram na Libéria em 1860, sem experiência africana, trabalhavam junto aos nativos de etnia Loma e colocavam por escrito sua própria língua¹⁸.

Uma presença importante embora com perseguições e dificuldades foi na Etiópia.

OS PRESSUPOSTOS DA RECONCILIAÇÃO



A LUTA COM A CONDUÇÃO ROMANA DA IGREJA

A pergunta principal da parte de qualquer um que considere o evento Lutero e luterano é sem duvida o fato que somente Lutero foi excomungado, diferente de outros protagonistas

¹⁵ Il suo sito è <http://www.lcms.org>

¹⁶ Il suo sito è <http://elca.org>

¹⁷ Cfr www.HKBPchurch.org.id.

¹⁸ R. J. Payne, *The Meaning of Founder's Day*, (Address given at the Founder's Day Celebrations, 29 April – 1 May 1983), Monrovia (pro manuscripto) 1983.

envolvidos na trama¹⁹. Qual foi o erro?.. de não excomungar “os outros” ou de ter limitado tudo somente a Lutero? A explicação não è fácil. O erro pode ter sido apenas jurídico ou formal ou ainda ser visto nesse nível²⁰. A questão da excomunhão não è, portanto, uma tática de exaltação da condução compreensiva na qual se **ingrovigliò** a problemática luterica. Diversos expoentes são utilizados para “desintoxicar” o apoio católico oficial sobre esse ponto (também se a maior e mais recente argumentação apresenta a eventualidade de uma abolição da excomunhão como expressão de uma indiferença a superar com o “poder religioso”).²¹ Boa parte dessa decisão parece inspirar-se ao temos de ver estender-se um “anti-papismo”²².

Outro problema è aquele “de fundo”. Se a Confissão de Augusta fosse o texto constituído na prospectiva luterana, esse podia ser reconhecido como tal, das autoridades e das outras Igrejas, particularmente daquelas que decidiram por obstacular²³.

¹⁹ W. Michaelis, *Le controversie riguardo all'abolizione della scomunica*, in «Concilium», 1976 n° 8, p. 171: «Nessun luterano riesce a capire il controsenso che soltanto Martin Lutero Ca differenza degli altri riformatori del sec. XVII sia stato colpito con la più pesante e discriminante pena ecclesiastica, per quanto la sua dottrina Cquando egli venne scomunicato, anzi anche in seguito C fosse molto più vicina alla fede cattolica delle dottrine degli altri riformatori d'allora (per es. Calvino, Zwingli). Secondo Häring, la scomunica contro Lutero non doveva essere lanciata. Questa punizione può e deve essere abolita a causa della sua illegittimità, senza neppure chiedersi se forse un piccolo residuo di proposizioni di Lutero vada ancora disapprovato dal punto di vista cattolico. Una scomunica oggettivamente illegittima non è e non può essere Cda parte cattolicaC legittimata in maniera postuma per il fatto che Lutero dopo questa scomunica ha sostenuto posizioni dottrinali che più tardi al concilio di Trento sono cadute sotto l'anatema (nulla poena sine lege!). Come non si dà l'assoluzione per una colpa futura, così non è possibile una punizione per un atto futuro».

²⁰ W. Michaelis, *Le controversie riguardo all'abolizione della scomunica*, in «Concilium», 1976 n° 8, p.167: «Un danno compiuto attraverso un atto giuridico esige una riparazione attraverso un atto giuridico dello stesso valore. Questo principio è stato strettamente rispettato nell'abolizione della scomunica del 1054. Se ciò non fosse (o non fosse più) possibile, colui che ha arrecato il danno o i suoi successori legittimi hanno l'obbligo di riparare in altro modo. Vercruysse¹ ritiene urgente e necessaria nel caso di Lutero una «parola ufficiale, formale e liberatrice». E nota con dispiacere che essa manca nel discorso del card. Willebrands a Evian-les-Bains. Non si capisce come un esponente del Vaticano a riguardo del nostro problema abbia potuto dichiarare che non si può pretendere dalla chiesa cattolica una specie di confessione postuma di un errore commesso.² Si tratta invece, come ha giustamente indicato von Campenhausen nella dichiarazione già ricordata, di questo: un errore giudiziario, se può effettivamente essere verificato, viene cancellato 'ufficialmente', quindi adeguatamente, in quanto si ritira l'accusa della scomunica maggiore contro Lutero, di essere eretico in assoluto nel senso giuridico del termine e non soltanto di avere fatto singole affermazioni tinte di eresia.³».

(¹ *Spectator*, cf. supra. / ² *Manchener Abendzeitung* del 16.2.1970, P. I, e *VELKD-Informationen* 2/1970, P. 9. / ³ *Echternach in Rhein. Merkur* nr. 9/1970, P. 21.)

²¹ Cfr J. Ratzinger, *Church, Ecumenism & Politics*, New York 1988, p. 105; W. Michaelis, *Le controversie riguardo all'abolizione della scomunica*, in «Concilium», 1976 n° 8, p.160: «L'autore con la sua 'Proposta' non si rivolse soltanto a 70 padri conciliari, a periti conciliari e al santo Padre, ma anche ai vescovi luterani della Repubblica Federale Tedesca, della Scandinavia, dell'Austria e del Brasile,¹ come pure ai presidenti della Lega evangelica, delle chiese evangeliche in Germania (EED) e dell'alleanza luterana mondiale (LWB), per promuovere anzitutto un colloquio della LWB con il Segretario per l'unione. L'esigenza che l'abolizione della scomunica a Lutero avvenisse solo in accordo con i luterani era già stata avanzata nel documento sopra menzionato,² inoltrato da mons. Wittler. Nella primavera del 1967 il pastore luterano Walter Riess e il laico cattolico Edward Meiners avanzarono a Paolo VI la preghiera di annullare la scomunica contro Lutero.³ La stessa istanza venne avanzata, nel 1967, simultaneamente dal cattolico professore di teologia ecumenica Paulus Wacker (Paderborn) e dall'evangelico professore di storia della chiesa Peter Meinhold (Kiel),⁴ e ancora dal cattolico professore di teologia morale Bernhard Häring⁵ e dal luterano presidente delle chiese prof. Theo Schaller.⁵ Più tardi il prof. Meinhold cambiò parere.⁶».

(¹ *epd/Dok.* / ² *epd/Dok.* ppq 23 S. 15 / ³ *epd/ZA* del 18 12 1967 / ⁴ *KNA KKW* 23/1967, p. 2 / ⁵ *epd/ZA* 208/IS57, p. 5 / ⁶ *Speyer C epd* ZA 216/1967, p. 1. / ⁷ *KNA-KKW* 48/49/1967, p. 7 e *KNA-KKW* 43/1968, pp. 5 ss.)

²² D. Olivier, *Perché Lutero non è stato capito? / 2. Risposta cattolica*, in «Concilium», 1976 n° 8, p. 34: «Le tesi sulle indulgenze non erano antipapali. Implicavano tutt'al più una concezione poco conformista del papato. Nel secolo XVI, la Sorbona e i consiglieri di Carlo V andranno molto più lontano che non le 95 tesi, nell'opposizione al papato: eppure non incorreranno nei fulmini di Roma. Oltre al sospetto di eresia di cui fu vittima, Lutero ebbe la malasorte di apparire come una minaccia per lo statuto del papato nella chiesa. Il seguito dei fatti doveva confermare che egli costituiva effettivamente un pericolo grave per il primato, di cui Roma non riusciva più a imporre, senza lottare, il rispetto da parte di tutti. Il processo aperto contro di lui nella primavera del 1518, traduceva una reazione di insicurezza: si riteneva preferibile farlo tacere piuttosto che rischiare un vortice antipapale. In un contesto così passionale, il dibattito dottrinale che Lutero pretendeva, non poteva non apparire puramente accademico».

²³ D. Olivier, *Confessione di Augusta: il Vangelo e la Chiesa*, in «Conversazioni», 1980 n° 11, p. 3: «La Confessione di Augusta definisce la fede cristiana dei luterani, un po' come il concilio di Trento definisce la fede cattolica. Gli altri protestanti riconoscono l'importanza di questo documento della fede. La chiesa di Roma l'ha sempre ignorato, perché vi vedeva il documento eretico del protestantesimo. Alla celebrazione del quarto centenario della dieta di Augusta, nel 1930, la situazione non era cambiata: il cattolicesimo rimase indifferente alle celebrazioni di questo giubileo. Ma ecco che, dopo un altro mezzo secolo, tutti parlano del nuovo giubileo della Confessione di Augusta. Centinaia di studi sono stati pubblicati in questi anni, in vista dell'anniversario. Da parte cattolica, uomini come il card. Ratzinger, arcivescovo di Monaco, e il prof. Schütte del Segretariato romano per l'unità, hanno lanciato l'idea che forse Roma potrebbe riconoscere la Confessione di Augusta come un'espressione della fede comune».

LE PROSPETTIVE APERTE DAI DIALOGHI INTERECCLESIALI

Nem todos estão convencidos que a multiplicação de diálogos formais e institucionais é a melhor via ²⁴. Entre vários temas escolhidos como fio condutor dos diálogos, se destaca aquele sobre a “justificação” que tem sua grande relevância e serve como plataforma de **riprospezione** das perspectivas eclesiais sobre a fé da parte dos dois interlocutores ²⁵. Também da parte daqueles que se demonstraram às vezes reservados diante do empenho ecumênico, dentro da família luterana (o sínodo luterano no Missouri), o interesse se apresenta e o exame serio do texto ajudou no aprofundamento progressivo do dialogo ²⁶. A piedade havia colocado adiante a chave individual da

²⁴ K. Rahner, *Où en est l'œcuménisme aujourd'hui? Réponses d'un orthodoxe, d'un catholique-romain et d'un protestant*, in «Bip/Snop», 1981 n° 426, p. 5: «L'éminent théologien catholique Karl Rahner, répondant à une question sur l'utilité d'une nouvelle commission de dialogue entre catholiques et luthériens qui devrait prochainement être créée, dit notamment: "On ne voit pas très bien comment il serait possible d'arriver par cette méthode à de sérieux résultats. Au fond de notre conscience chrétienne nous nous sentons - comme il est naturel - responsables pour le progrès du mouvement œcuménique et nous créons une nouvelle commission bien qu'il y ait déjà suffisamment de telles commissions. Mais le vrai problème pour moi se trouve ailleurs: les Eglises peuvent-elles - sans que l'une des parties en dialogue sacrifie ses convictions fondamentales - faire des progrès sur le terrain œcuménique? Je crois que cela est possible"».

²⁵ THE LUTHERAN CHURCH MISSOURI SYNOD, *The Joint Lutheran/Roman Catholic Declaration on Justification. A Response Prepared by the Department of Systematic Theology Concordia Theological Seminary, Fort Wayne*, (Indiana The Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod), in «Internet» 1999, <http://www.lcms.org/president/catholic.html>, screen page 1: «Historical Introduction. The Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification was prepared between 1995 and 1997 by Roman Catholic and Lutheran theologians under the auspices of the Vatican and the Lutheran World Federation (LWF). In 1995, the first version was sent to the participating churches. The Institute for Ecumenical Research in Strasbourg, France, prepared a Lutheran response, while the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity under Cardinal Cassidy acted for the Vatican. A revised text was ready by the summer of 1996 and further changes were suggested by the LWF Council in September. A final version was authorized for distribution by the LWF Executive Committee in February 1997.¹ This text was adopted with near unanimity (958-25) by the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (ELCA) at its August 1997 assembly in Philadelphia.² The Joint Declaration is not a new, independent effort, but concludes and summarizes various national and international Lutheran/Roman Catholic dialogues. The 1980 papal visit to Germany on the occasion of the 450th anniversary of the Augsburg Confession provided the original stimulus. This led to the formation of the Ecumenical Working Group of Evangelical and Catholic Theologians in Germany, who by 1986, produced *The Condemnations of the Reformation Era: Do They Still Divide?*³ This evoked a negative response by the Evangelical [Protestant] theological faculty of Georgia Augusta University, Göttingen, Germany: *Outmoded Condemnations? Antitheses between the Council of Trent and the Reformation on Justification, the Sacrament, and the Ministry-Then and Now*.⁴ A formal lifting of mutual condemnations on justification was planned for 1997 to coincide with the 450th anniversary of the Council of Trent's Decree on Justification and the fiftieth anniversary of the Lutheran World Federation in 1997. The issue proved too intractable for this time-table.⁵ Unlike the ELCA-Reformed Agreement, the Joint Declaration does not call for full communion, although the doctrine of justification is no longer considered an obstacle to bringing it about: "the mutual 'anathemas' (condemnations) drawn up in the sixteenth century on the teaching of justification no longer apply to these churches." The Declaration has a core resemblance to Lutheran accords with the Reformed. As in the Agreement and Marburg Revisited, past differences are seen as "complementary." Like *A Common Calling*, which speaks of the "diverse witnesses to the one Gospel that we confess in common," the Joint Declaration holds that with this current agreement on the "basic truths of the doctrine of justification," the characteristic "concerns" of each communion with their "remaining differences" are now mutually acceptable. Without disowning its past, each church holds that "the understanding of justification set forth in this Declaration shows that a consensus in basic truths of the doctrine of justification exists between Lutherans and Catholics." Positions of each are tolerable within the doctrinal dimensions of the other. "Therefore the Lutheran and the Catholic explications of justification are in their differences open to one another and do not destroy the consensus regarding basic truths" (Declaration 5.40). Many prominent Lutheran theologians of course approve of the Joint Declaration. Harding Meyer invokes the LWF's ecumenical slogan of "Reconciled Diversity," and Carl Braaten calls it "a step in the right direction."⁶ Others are more reserved, as will be shown».

(1. Following the directive of the LWF Executive Committee, General Secretary Ishmael Noko asked the 124 member churches to answer the following question regarding the approval of the Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification (JD) by May 1, 1998: "Does your church accept the conclusions reached in 40 and 41 of the JD and thus join affirming that, because of the agreement of the fundamental meaning and truth of our justification in Christ to which the JD testifies, the condemnations regarding justification in the Lutheran Confessions do not apply to the teaching on justification of the Roman Catholic Church presented in the JD?" Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification: A Commentary by the Institute of Ecumenical Research (Hong Kong: Clear-Cut, 1997) was distributed in May 1997. This document is hereafter referred to as A Commentary. / 2. The General Synod of the Church of Norway accepted the Declaration on November 14 and urged its pastors to acquaint their people with the decision. In Finland, the church delayed final approval until May 1998. / 3. Edited by Karl Lehmann and Wolfhart Pannenberg, translated by Margaret Kohl (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990). / 4. Translated and first published by Oliver K. Olson with Franz Posset in *Lutheran Quarterly* 5 (Spring, Autumn, and Winter 1991), and later in book form (Ft. Wayne, Indiana: Luther Academy, 1992). / 5. Wilbert Rusch remarks that the attempt to articulate sufficient agreement on justification to warrant declaring "inapplicable" the 16th century condemnations was undertaken "at an original suggestion from the ELCA" ("The Ecumenical Task of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America: Some Personal Observations," *Lutheran Forum* 30 [September 1996]: 22). Rusch does not provide details. / 6. Harding Meyer, "Nicht mehr unüberwindlich," *Lutherische Monatshefte* 36 (September 1997): 27; Carl Braaten, "Confessional Integrity in Ecumenical Dialogue," *Lutheran Forum* 30 (September 1996): 25.)

²⁶ THE LUTHERAN CHURCH MISSOURI SYNOD, *The Joint Lutheran/Roman Catholic Declaration on Justification. A Response Prepared by the Department of Systematic Theology Concordia Theological Seminary, Fort Wayne*, (Indiana The Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod), in «Internet» 1999, <http://www.lcms.org/president/catholic.html>, screen page 3-4: «The Structure of the Joint Declaration. The Declaration consists of forty-four paragraphs subdivided into five sections. Under "A Preamble" are found paragraphs 1-7. The first major section, "1. Biblical Message of Justification," is subdivided into paragraphs 8-12. The entire second major section, "2. The Doctrine of Justification as Ecumenical Problem," is contained in paragraph 13. There follows section "3. The Common Understanding of Justification" in paragraphs 14-18. This "common understanding" is then unfolded in the longest section "4. Explicating the Common Understanding of Justification" with paragraphs 19-39. Section 4,

justificação, os teólogos do século XVIII não a consideravam mais aquele elemento inspirador essencial da tradição luterana comum.²⁷ A dinâmica da justificação se amplia consideravelmente e vem manifestada em senso não limitante confessional na reflexão teológica dos grandes inspiradores da teologia do século XX²⁸. A dúvida luterana continua, considerando a posição

paragraphs 19-39, is further divided into seven aspects of the doctrine over which the churches were divided. Each of the seven parts is constructed so that Lutherans and Roman Catholics set forth their common agreement and then each sets out its own particular emphases. The final section, "5. The Significance and Scope of the Consensus Reached," encompasses paragraphs 40-44 and resolves the quandry section, "2. The Doctrine of Justification as Ecumenical Problem." On the basis of this consensus, the mutual condemnations are lifted (paragraph 41). Paragraph 44 concludes with gratitude for "this decisive step forward" and a prayer to be led "further toward that visible unity which is Christ's will." References to supporting documents are included in an "Appendix." Some Illuminating Textual History. From a Lutheran perspective, the Declaration is not entirely without merit. Paragraph 31 expresses Lutheran-Roman Catholic consensus on the Law and the Gospel: 'We confess together that persons are justified by faith in the Gospel 'apart from works prescribed by the Law' (Romans 3:28). Christ has fulfilled the Law and by his death and resurrection has overcome it as a way to salvation . . . ' This comes closest to an explicit profession of sola fide, which is found in the Declaration only in paragraph 26, prepared by the Lutherans.¹ Paragraph 32 is also unmistakably Lutheran. This is contradicted by the next paragraph (33), which is unmistakably Roman Catholic: the statement that "Christ is not a lawgiver in the manner of Moses" allows the traditional Roman evasion that the ceremonial but not the moral law is excluded from justification. The scholastic view that the Gospel is the "New Law" is left in place. To this the Lutheran response has always been Romans 7:7: "I should not have known what it is to covet if the law had not said, 'You shall not covet.'" St. Paul meant to exclude precisely the moral law from justification. In the view of six ELCA theologians (from Luther Seminary, St. Paul), the good Lutheran statements above were likely "a last-minute insertion by some of the German Lutheran representatives who were worried about the tilt of the whole document toward individual internal transformation through grace rather than newly righted relationships through God's Word of Law and Gospel."² They point out that since the necessary theological presuppositions are nowhere developed in the document, the good paragraphs 31-32 "connect with nothing."³.

(1. Note must be taken also of two documents: *Evangelicals & Catholics Together: The Christian Mission in the Third Millennium* (First Things 43 [May 1994]: 15-22), and *The Gift of Salvation* (First Things 78 [January 1998]: 20-23), in which Lutherans had no hand. The Gift of Salvation is a document agreed to on October 6-7, 1997, by a group of Evangelicals and Roman Catholics, including Harold O.J. Brown, James Packer, Avery Dulles, and Richard Neuhaus. It expressly affirms "agreement with what the Reformation traditions have meant by justification by faith alone [sola fide]." This document is not the object of our critique, but it has fine points. For example, "In justification God, on the basis of Christ's righteousness alone, declares us to be no longer rebellious enemies, but forgiven friends, and by virtue of His declaration it is so." It also speaks of "justification [as] central to the scriptural account of justification." Both documents laid down a common agreement on certain issues, but were also forthright in setting down disagreements. Among these are "the meaning of baptismal regeneration, the Eucharist, and sacramental grace; the historic uses of the language of justification as it relates to imputed and transformative righteousness; the normative status of justification in relation to all Christian doctrine; the assertion that while justification is by faith alone, the faith that receives salvation is never alone; diverse understandings of merit, reward, purgatory, and indulgences; Marian devotion and the assistance of the saints in the life of salvation; and the possibility of salvation for those who have not been evangelized." This could also be taken into our critique of a Declaration. The earlier document, *Evangelicals & Catholics Together* also affirmed a basic agreement in faith. Such concerns are also applicable to the Declaration. / 2. "A Call for Discussion" was the product of six professors and not the entire faculty of Luther Seminary, St. Paul. The faculty, however, passed a resolution May 22, 1997, which said the Declaration touched on the central Lutheran doctrine and questioned the legality of the proposed action. A vote on the Declaration "would run the risk of signaling that the ELCA is not serious about its own confessional heritage or its relationship to the Roman Catholic Church." / 3. The Strasbourg Institute A Commentary notes that, "No Catholic condemnations relate to the law-gospel distinction as such" (41).)

²⁷ LUTHERAN - ROMAN CATHOLIC DIALOGUE IN THE UNITED STATES, *Justification by Faith*, in «Origins», 1983 n° 17, p. 287 n° 71: «Whereas Pietism emphasized the individual experience of justification in rebirth and sanctification, Enlightenment theologians of the 18th century, such as Semler, no longer viewed justification as an essential Christian doctrine. Reflecting a rationalistic anthropology which minimized sin and stressed the prowess of the natural creature and the ability of individuals to control their destiny, these theologians taught that righteous conduct, in accord with natural morality and the teaching of Jesus, brings salvation. It seemed sufficient to acknowledge God as the father of humankind, to follow Jesus as the teacher of universal moral values and to experience the Holy Spirit as the power which prompts human beings to lead a better moral life¹».

(¹ See, for example, the Lutheran theologian Johann Salomo Semler (1725-91), in Mueller, *Rechtfertigungslehre*, 85, cf. 83-88 (bibliography) (cited above, note 128).)

²⁸ R. Curtis, *Hans Küng on Karl Barth. A noted Catholic theologian believes that Barth has abandoned the Reformation position*, (most recently modified Monday, 23-Sep-96. It was published by «Jubilee: A Magazine of the Church and Her People», July 1965, pp. 39 et seq., in «Internet» 1997, <http://village.ios.com/~rkcl/kung.shtml>: «Küng's Justification provides a summation of Barth's doctrine on justification, although scarcely a "hoary" one, about which Barth writes to Küng: "I here gladly, gratefully and publicly testify not only that you have adequately covered all significant aspects of justification treated in the ten volumes of my Church Dogmatics published so far, and that you have fully and accurately reproduced my views as I myself understand them; but also that you have brought all this beautifully into focus through your brief yet precise presentation of details and your frequent references to the larger historical context. Furthermore, your readers may rest assured--until such time as they themselves might get to my books--that you have me say what I actually do say and that I mean it in the way you have me say it." Both Karl Barth and Hans Küng see that justification is not the central dogma of Christianity. They see that the central dogma is the mystery of Christ, in which is revealed the mystery of the Trinity and the mystery of total creation, which was created good, fell, was redeemed and is to be consummated. For Barth, the fall does not mean that the sinner is no longer a human being, that in his sin he has lost his essence, his nature, his capacities, his power of choice. Nor is justification, in Barth's view, a cloak; it is a true transformation. The justified man is a work of the divine new creation. But in that very fact, the justified man knows that he had fallen prey to nothingness and knows that he would fall time and time again without the work of God. Whatever he has he does not have on his own, since he is a sinner. He only has it as a gift of God's grace. All he is, as a justified man, he receives. But in the Roman doctrine of man's cooperation in the work of justification, Barth sees that: "The heart and guiding principle of the Romanist doctrine of grace is the negation of the unity of grace as always God's grace to man, as His sovereign act which is everywhere new and strange and free. It is the negation of the unity of grace as His grace in Jesus Christ. It is the division of grace by which it is first of all His, but then--and this is where the emphasis falls--effected and empowered by His grace, it is also our grace." And against such a view of grace, Barth feels compelled to set his face. He is forced to oppose such a view because: "The negative statement of Paul and the Reformers is that no human works, not even those which are demanded by the Law, which can seriously be expected of man and regarded as good, either are or include his justification. As works to advance his justification they are not expected of him and they are not good." It is Christ alone in whom man is justified and revealed as justified. But Barth does not do away with man; he does not make God's Incarnation a hollow shell. Barth respects graced man as well as the sovereign graciousness of God: "For it is the meaning and reach of the atonement made in Jesus Christ, the power of the divine act of sovereignty in grace, that God willed not to keep to Himself His own true being, but to make it as such our human being, and in that way to turn us back to Himself, to create the new man."».

romana, se de verdade se quer reconhecer a justificação como critério fundamental para ajuda evangélico sobre fé gratuita²⁹. Somente a fé justifica não as obras e nem os vários ritos, esses não obtêm a salvação, mas ao contrario exprimem sua intenção³⁰. As obras serão o aspecto da religião na fé: religião como idolatria que deve passar sob o juízo de Deus e ser superada na ineludible “justificação somente da fé”³¹. As contribuições vêm ofertas de varias Igrejas luteranas para melhorar o texto do acordo, em particular aquele da Igreja luterana da Finlândia³². A justificação não vem percebida como aquela que transforma, mas segundo a visão do “simul justus et peccator” se faz referimento à “justificação forense”, ou seja, aplicação da justificação da parte de Deus ao pecador que continua sempre pecador³³. Pede-se uma explicação sobre a ambigüidade verbal do

²⁹ THE LUTHERAN CHURCH MISSOURI SYNOD, *The Joint Lutheran/Roman Catholic Declaration on Justification. A Response Prepared by the Department of Systematic Theology Concordia Theological Seminary, Fort Wayne*, (Indiana The Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod), in «Internet» 1999, <http://www.lcms.org/president/catholic.html>, screen page 3-4: «Justification as Criterion? Even more telling is the history behind the amendment of paragraph 18, regarding justification as "criterion." We rely here on Eberhard Jüngel's critique, "Um Gottes willen-Klarheit!" [For God's sake-clarity!]. After intense discussions, the German LWF contingent proposed that the article of justification be recognized "as criterion" which "constantly serves to orientate all the teaching and practice of our churches to Christ." This change was officially accepted into the June 1996 version of the Joint Declaration, but then was vetoed by the Roman Sacred Congregation for Doctrine of the Faith. As Jüngel puts it: "Cardinal Ratzinger corrected Cardinal Cassidy to the effect that the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity may concede only that '... the doctrine of justification is an indispensable criterion.'" By the addition of the indefinite article "an," justification was demoted from its position of unique, overarching criterion to one among others. Roman Catholics added that they "see themselves as bound by several criteria." This intervention by Ratzinger's Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith may signal that the Vatican is actually planning to grant its long-delayed official approval to the final text, though some Lutherans remain unconvinced».

(1. Eberhard Jüngel, "Um Gottes willen-Klarheit! Kritische Bemerkungen zur Verharmlosung der kriteriologischen Funktion des Rechtfertigungsartikels-aus Anlass einer ökumenischen 'Gemeinsamen Erklärung zur Rechtfertigungslehre,'" *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 94 (1997): 394-406.)

³⁰ EVANGELISCH-LUTHERISCH / RÖMISCH-KATHOLISCHEN STUDIENKOMMISSION, *Bericht „Das Evangelium und die Kirche“*, in «Lutherische Rundschau» (Sonderdruck), 1972 n° 3, p. 2 n° 29: «Für lutherisches Verständnis unterstehen aufgrund des Bekenntnisses der Rechtfertigung alle kirchlichen Traditionen und Institutionen dem Kriterium, daß sie rechte Verkündigung des Evangeliums ermöglichen und die Bedingungslosigkeit des Heilsempfangs nicht verdunkeln. Von daher ergibt sich, daß kirchliche Ordnungen und Riten nicht als Heilsbedingungen auferlegt werden dürfen, sondern nur als freie Entfaltung des Glaubensgehorsams gelten können¹».

(¹ *Confessio Augustana*, VII.)

³¹ G. Thils, *Propos et problèmes de la théologie des religions non chrétiennes*, Tournai 1966, pp. 47-48: «Ainsi donc, «toute religion est une forme d'idolâtrie ou de justification par les œuvres, c'est-à-dire d'incrédulité. Ici, Barth se trouve d'accord avec Calvin et Luther. Conçu comme une religion, le christianisme est aussi incrédulité, car l'idolâtrie, la justification par les œuvres, l'orgueil du développement spirituel, sont des plantes qui croissent aussi sur sol chrétien! L'«abolition de la religion» que comporte la révélation démasque l'incrédulité dans le christianisme mieux encore que dans toute autre religion. A proprement parler, la *vera religio* n'existe pas davantage que l'homme bon. Si l'on peut admettre que le christianisme est la vraie religion et doit être considéré comme tel, on ne peut en revanche l'affirmer que dans un acte de foi. Sous sa forme concrète, il ne mérite pas cette qualification. Nous ne pouvons parler de la vérité de la religion chrétienne que dans le cadre de la doctrine de la justification de l'impie. Pour juger du degré de vérité ou d'erreur d'une religion, il n'existe qu'un critère: c'est le nom de Jésus-Christ. Ce n'est qu'en raison d'un acte divin de grâce et d'élection qu'une relation s'est établie entre le nom de Jésus-Christ et la religion chrétienne» (p. 77)».

³² THE LUTHERAN CHURCH MISSOURI SYNOD, *The Joint Lutheran/Roman Catholic Declaration on Justification. A Response Prepared by the Department of Systematic Theology Concordia Theological Seminary, Fort Wayne*, (Indiana The Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod), in «Internet» 1999, <http://www.lcms.org/president/catholic.html>, screen page 5: «Finnish Additions. Finnish theologians may have been even more influential than the Germans. This is evident from a comparison of the 1995 version of the Joint Declaration, the January 30, 1996, submission by the Council for International Relations of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland, and the final version of the Declaration. Despite some muddles, which can be discussed below, the theologically forceful language of the Finnish response found its way into the final text, including the addition of a whole new paragraph (8) on the rich Old Testament background of section "2. Biblical Message of Justification." Another improvement was the inclusion of explicit Trinitarian-Christological language at various points, especially in a completely re-worked paragraph 15, which previously lacked substance».

³³ THE LUTHERAN CHURCH MISSOURI SYNOD, *The Joint Lutheran/Roman Catholic Declaration on Justification. A Response Prepared by the Department of Systematic Theology Concordia Theological Seminary, Fort Wayne*, (Indiana The Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod), in «Internet» 1999, <http://www.lcms.org/president/catholic.html>, screen pages 7-8: «Failures of the Declaration: A Confessional Lutheran Perspective. 1. Justification: Forensic or Transformational? The foremost defect of the document is that it does not come clean on the most glaring conflict between Augsburg and Trent. For Lutherans, justification is essentially forensic, that is, God declares the sinner righteous on account of and in Christ. Roman Catholics define justification as an internal transformation of the believer, a "process," which Lutherans place in the area of sanctification, about which too there are different understandings. Roman Catholics have understood grace as if it were almost a substance, *gratia infusa*, which is poured into the soul initially by Baptism. Lutherans, with Paul, see justifying grace as the favor Dei, God's gracious attitude whereby He accepts sinners. The title of paragraph 4.2, "Justification as Forgiveness of Sins and Making Righteous," to be sure, could be understood in a Lutheran way. The famous paragraph 72 of Apology IV makes it clear that faith "being made righteous" in justification means only receiving "the forgiveness of sins."¹ Clearly this is not what is meant in the Joint Declaration. However, the Formula of Concord expressly rejects the view that justifying righteousness "consists of two pieces or parts, namely, the gracious forgiveness of sins and, as a second element, renewal or sanctification" (SD, III, 48). We are not alone in our concerns. So also the six ELCA theologians: The fundamental problem with JDDJ is that it seems to subsume the Lutheran understanding of justification under a Roman Catholic understanding of justification as a process whereby the soul is progressively transformed through "grace." . . . The document presents an understanding of justification in terms of the soul's progressive internal transformation by infused grace, and never refers in a vital or critical way to the Lutheran insistence on justification by faith alone (*sola fide*) in God's Word of promise, no doubt because such insistence would undermine the entire structure of the doctrine of justification proposed by JDDJ (emphases in original). This objection does come a bit late! For

texto concordado ³⁴. Da sua parte, a Federação luterana mundial promove um renovado aprofundamento no contexto atual e em ressonância ao diálogo bilateral com a Igreja católica de comunhão romana, sobre a justificação com documentos e mensagens a várias igrejas Luteranas afiliadas, como aquele de 1998³⁵ Se retorna assim a um novo sinal da centralidade da questão cristológica ³⁶.

years the ELCA compromised itself in various ecumenical dialogues. Lutheran acceptance of the Roman Catholic position on justification should come as no surprise. H. George Anderson, now Presiding Bishop of the ELCA, co-chaired the U.S. Lutheran-Roman Catholic dialogue on Justification by Faith, which concluded: "156 (5). . . . By justification we are both declared and made righteous . . . 158 . . . [God's saving work] can be expressed in the imagery of God as judge who pronounces sinners innocent and righteous, . . . and also in a transformist view, which emphasizes the change wrought in sinners by infused grace."² On this point the Lutherans completely surrendered, but Rome was not required to reform her traditional definition, which was officially restated in the 1994 Catechism of the Catholic Church: "Justification includes the remission of sins, sanctification, and the renewal of the inner man" (498). The characteristic Roman Catholic fusion of "forensic" and "transformist" views of justification has been wrongly attributed to Luther by such prominent scholars as Alister McGrath and Tuomo Mannermaa, as will be shown below.³».

(1. See also the explanation in FC, SD, III, 19 and 20. / 2. "U.S. Lutheran-Roman Catholic Dialogue, Justification By Faith," Origins: NC Documentary Service, 13 (October 6, 1983): 298. / 3. Alister E. McGrath, *Iustitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification, from 1500 to the Present Day* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986, 1993), 10-32, 44-53, 125-130.)

³⁴ THE LUTHERAN CHURCH MISSOURI SYNOD, *The Joint Lutheran/Roman Catholic Declaration on Justification. A Response Prepared by the Department of Systematic Theology Concordia Theological Seminary, Fort Wayne*, (Indiana The Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod), in «Internet» 1999, <http://www.lcms.org/president/catholic.html>, screen pages 9-10: «3. Justification: The Article by Which the Church Stands or Falls, or One Truth Among Others? Much more is at stake in this discussion for Lutherans than for Roman Catholics, who see justification as one topic among others and give it another definition.¹ For Lutherans justification is the integrative center of all faith and theology.² Without justification, Lutherans lose the distinctive characteristic of their theology and the reason for their existence. It is the core of all Christian truth and gives form and shape to all other biblical articles. All articles are at stake in justification, and justification is at stake in all articles. It is the very engine that drives not only the Augustana (XX,8) but the entire Concordia (Apology IV, 2; XII, 3, 10; Smalcald Articles II/I; Large Catechism, Creed, 33, 54, 55; Formula of Concord, S.D., III, 6; V, 1). The six ELCA theologians are quite right in saying: "Lutherans have always insisted that justification by faith alone is the chief article and the criterion, the 'plumb line' by which all doctrine and practice is to be judged."³ Paragraph 18 of the Joint Declaration tries to accommodate the Lutheran position by saying that the article of justification "is more than just one part of Christian doctrine" and that it "stands in an essential relation to all truths of faith." However, as we have seen, the attempt to have the article of justification defined as overall "criterion" was blocked by the Vatican and the "criterion" reduced to one among others. Some who may find the protracted discussion on justification too abstract, easily recognize differences in beliefs and practices that the Declaration leaves untouched. These "neuralgic points" are concealed under broad dogmatic terminology in paragraph 43 of the Declaration. The U.S. dialogue, however, was more forthright: "Some of the consequences of the differing outlooks seem irreconcilable, especially in reference to particular applications of justification by faith as a criterion of all church proclamation and practice" (paragraph 121). To wit: "Catholics and Lutherans, for example, traditionally differ on purgatory, the papacy and the cult of saints" (153). The solution of "this impasse" (121) is, of course, for the Lutherans to surrender the Reformation position: "Lutherans, however, do not exclude the possibility that such teachings can be understood and used in ways consistent with justification by faith; if such teachings are preached and practiced in accord with this doctrine, they need not, from this Lutheran perspective, divide the churches even though Lutherans do not accept them" (153)!¹ The Augsburg Confession (XXII- XXVIII) and the Smalcald Articles (Part II) applied the criterion of justification to practice in the same way they applied it to doctrine. Lutherans of Reformation times held that practices which contravened justification did in fact divide the church. Practice mattered as applied doctrine. The Evangelical-Roman Catholic Gift of Salvation paper spells out "diverse understandings of merit, reward, purgatory, and indulgences, Marian devotion and the assistance of the saints in the life of salvation, and the possibility of salvation for those who have not been evangelized." For Lutherans it is nonsense to speak of consensus on justification if these issues remain unsettled. Differences in practices point to fundamental doctrinal discrepancies».

(1. See "Grace and Justification" in the Catechism of the Catholic Church ([Mahwah, New Jersey: Paulist Press, 1994], 481-490), which weaves together justification, grace, merit, and Christian holiness in a way consistent with the Council of Trent. / 2. "In this controversy the chief article [locus] of Christian doctrine is at stake, which, when it is properly understood, illumines and magnifies the honor of Christ and brings to pious consciences the abundant consolation which they need" (Apology IV,2). / 3. "A Call for Discussion," citing a Memo of March 5, 1997, to The ELCA Synod Bishops of Regions 1 and 3. / 4. The Jesuit theologian Avery Dulles is quite precise in recognizing these differences. See "On Lifting the Condemnations," *Dialog* 35 (Summer 1996): 220.)

³⁵ LUTHERAN WORLD FEDERATION, *The Implications of Justification in the World's Contexts. The Day of the Reformation. October 31, 1998, Lutherstadt Wittenberg*, in «Internet» 1999, <http://www.lutheranworld.org/wittenberg/document/theses.html>, screen pages 1-2: «Introduction . More than sixty theologians from all over the world met from 27C31 October 1998 in Wittenberg, Germany, to discuss "justification in the world's contexts". The host, the Lutheran World Federation, had urged its member churches to nominate younger teachers of theology and the LWF Department for Theology and Studies was responsible for the program. The consultation should not be regarded as being a continuation of the discussion on the "Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification" between the Lutheran World Federation and the Roman Catholic Church but rather as an attempt to interpret the doctrine anew. The reason for the meeting was the question regarding the relevance of the doctrine since the truth of the gospel of justification concerns life and can therefore be communicated only if it is related to today's world. The "Implications of Justification in the World's Contexts" is the outcome of a process. An international working group consisting of six, independent persons had been appointed whose task it was to interpret the presentations and discussions with the aim of formulating a paper that reflected the group's observations. The document was presented in plenary on the last day of the consultation. It was received with praise and criticism, and members of the group incorporated the constructive criticism into the final paper. The revised text was once again submitted to the working group to ensure that the various critical remarks had been taken into account. The text before you is a working paper that which we are sending to the Federation's member churches for further reflection on the significance of "justification today". The consultation would welcome it if the working paper were brought to the attention of the broader public as the meeting was not only an intercultural but also an interdisciplinary event. It is foreseen that the contributions including this working paper be published. It is only in the context of the papers delivered at the consultation that the complexity of the concerns raised in this working paper become fully comprehensible».

³⁶ THE LUTHERAN CHURCH MISSOURI SYNOD, *The Joint Lutheran/Roman Catholic Declaration on Justification. A Response Prepared by the Department of Systematic Theology Concordia Theological Seminary, Fort Wayne*, (Indiana The Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod), in «Internet» 1999, <http://www.lcms.org/president/catholic.html>, screen pages 9-10: «5. Justification: Christological Core and Center Defining justification is a

O RECONHECIMENTO DA PARTE DA SEDE ROMANA

A assinatura da declaração comum de Augsburg não entra no mérito da doutrina sobre a justificação³⁷. Seus efeitos podem ser considerados como duplos. Em 1º lugar, a compreensão fundamental da doutrina da justificação aproxima luteranos e católicos, para além das condenações doutrinárias do século XVI: o ensinamento não recai sobre a condenação do

delicate task. Even some Reformation-era Lutherans slipped into a Roman-like (scholastic) understanding of it.¹ Justification is also the most central of all articles of faith, because it gives form and shape to all the other articles as they apply to the believer. Without relating a particular article to justification, that doctrine is not properly understood. So when justification is misunderstood, the entire body of doctrine is off balance. Justification describes the believer's relationship to God as he is accepted for Christ's sake. So it is not only a matter of how a particular article is biblically demonstrable (*sola scriptura* [AC XX, 11 {Eph 2:8-9}], but also how it relates to justification as the core article by which the church stands or falls. Justification is a distinct article but it belongs to and is never separate from christology (*solus Christus*). Christology and justification are two sides of one doctrine-what God accomplishes in Christ (atonement), he applies to believers (justification).² Rome sees justification as what God accomplishes in the believer (transformist view). The Lutheran christological view stands diametrically opposed to the Roman anthropological one. Lutherans quarreled not with Rome's christology qua christology (that is, the Second Article of the Nicene Creed), but with Rome's doctrine of justification, which rendered this christology ineffective for the believer. So it was not simply that such things as Masses for the dead or purgatory lacked biblical support, which of course they did, but more importantly, these were rejected because they detracted from Christ's work and deprived Him of His glory.³ Rome's view of grace as an infused substance, *gratia infusa*, stands at the base of its theology of justification as a process. Lutherans hold that justification is first of all a universal, world-embracing act and judgment of God in Christ, which is received by faith alone: "The first and chief article is this, that Jesus Christ, our God and Lord, 'was put to death for our trespasses and raised again for our justification' (Rom. 4:25)" (Smalcald Articles, II/1). "Indeed, the entire Gospel that we preach depends on the proper understanding of this article. Upon it all our salvation and blessedness are based, and it is so rich and broad that we can never learn it fully" (Large Catechism, Creed, Second Article, 33). The Formula of Concord (SD, III, 25) lists four "essential and necessary elements" of justification: 1. the grace of God; 2. the merit of Christ; 3. the Gospel; and 4. faith.⁴ The first three constitute what has been called "general" or "universal" justification, which then becomes "personal" or "individual" justification when appropriated by faith (what the Apology calls *fides specialis* [personal faith]). (The terms "objective" and "subjective," though sometimes used by Lutherans in this context, fit the Calvinist view more closely, which rejects universal grace and regards the "subjective" aspect of justification as the "experience" of it in one's soul or conscience.) Personal justification takes place by faith. God's justification of the world in Christ (universal justification) is prior to anyone's faith and constitutes its object and substance. All this is, at best, peripheral to the Declaration. Justification exemplifies the Lutheran understanding of all doctrine: grace means that God acts prior to faith. A parallel is the example of the Lutheran understanding of the Lord's Supper where Christ's bodily presence in the Bread and Wine is prior to our reception of it and is not dependent on our faith. God justifies the world while it is still ungodly.⁵ Justification is a reality in Christ, and is therefore prior to anyone's reception of it by faith. It possesses an objective reality in God alone. Abraham believed in the God who justified the ungodly, Romans 4:3-5. God was justifying the ungodly before Abraham believed. The Declaration cites 1 Cor. 1:30, "Christ is our righteousness," but does not unfold its christological content. The Declaration speaks of justification in terms of what it does, its effects (the transformist view), and does not touch upon it as a divine accomplishment in Christ, as other commentators also note. Where Roman Catholics see justification as something happening in man (anthropological view), Lutherans see justification as accomplished in Christ (christological view). Atonement and objective justification are coterminous, but the latter is dependent and a result of the former. Justification is not an arbitrary decision of God that is accomplished by sovereign decree, but flows from God's regard for the work of Christ.⁶ God justifies and He understands His act of justifying (justification) as His own saving accomplishment in Christ. So also Outmoded Condemnations? of the GBttingen faculty: "Corresponding to God's being God, justification occurs through Christ alone (*solo Christo*), by grace alone (*sola gratia*), and in faith alone (*sola fide*)."⁷ This justification in Christ is as universally expansive as is the divine condemnation of the world in Adam. In both the universal condemnation and justification, he is acting according to justice or righteousness. God's justification of the world in Christ must exceed His universal condemnation of the world in Adam. Without this belief, Christ's work becomes inferior to Adam's, a horrific doctrine by all standards (Rom. 5:15). God's universal acceptance of all of mankind in Christ is essential to the Lutheran doctrine that justification takes place in the blood of Christ who on this account can be called our justification. Rom. 5:9: "Since, therefore, we are now justified by His blood, much more shall we be saved by Him from the wrath of God." Universal justification does not imply the universalism of an apokatastasis, which makes personal participation in justification inconsequential. We quote from Hans Kung, "All men are justified in Jesus Christ and only the faithful are justified in Jesus Christ."⁸ By contrast, justification for Rome is basically a grace-driven process in man. And it is this view that dominates the Joint Declaration. It is true that the strong Finnish representations succeeded in reshaping a previously bland, "anthropologically" orientated paragraph into an express confession of Trinitarian-Christological substance: "15. . . The foundation and presupposition of justification is the incarnation, death, and resurrection of Christ. Justification thus means that Christ Himself is our righteousness, in which we share through the Holy Spirit in accord with the will of the Father. . . ." Had this been the document's real starting point, rather than a decorative afterthought, the result might have been different. "Justification thus means that Christ Himself is our righteousness" is in need of development, but, as mentioned, this does not happen. Given the "transformist" commitments of the document, even noble Trinitarian-Christological language can do little more than remind us of the painful contrast between the confessional "ought" and the ecumenical "is."

(1. FC, III and IV, "Justification" and "Good Works." One may also see Franz Pieper, *Christliche Dogmatik*, 3 volumes (Saint Louis: Concordia, 1917-1924), 2:633-635. FC, Ep III/8 explicitly condemns "that renewal [renovationem] and love belong to our righteousness before God." / 2. One may see the Smalcald Articles. / 3. Apology XXIV, 90. The Mass cannot be a sacrifice for sin because it would be on par with Christ's death. / 4. One may compare Apology IV, 53. / 5. Pieper, *Dogmatik*, 2:631. / 6. Theories of a limited atonement operate with precisely this kind of deficiency in seeing atonement and justification as arbitrary acts of a sovereign God, that is, Calvin and the Reformed. / 7. Outmoded Condemnations, 17 (emphasis added). / 8. Justification (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1981) 223. Kung continues (224): Also, "In the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, God's gracious saving judgment on sinful mankind is promulgated. . . . Here God pronounces the gracious and life-giving judgment which causes the one just man to be sin and in exchange makes all sinners free in Him.")

³⁷ LUTHERAN WORLD FEDERATION - ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH, *Official Common Statement regarding the Joint Declaration on Justification*, in «Origins», 1999 n° 29/6, p. 85: «In faith we together hold the conviction that justification is the work of the triune God. The Father sent his Son into the world to save sinners. The foundation and presupposition of justification is the incarnation, death and resurrection of Christ. Justification thus means that Christ himself is our righteousness, in which we share through the Holy Spirit in accord with the will of the Father. Together we confess: By grace alone, in faith in Christ's saving work and not because of any merit on our part, we are accepted by God and receive the Holy Spirit, who renews our hearts while equipping and calling us to good works».

Concilio de Trento e as reprovações das confissões luteranas não vão aplicadas ao ensinamento da Igreja Católica Romana apresentado nesta declaração³⁸. Em 1985, depois da visita do papa na Alemanha, se examina mais uma vez as varias condenações do passad (cfr il volume *Lehrverurteilungen — kirchentrennend*)³⁹. È a primeira vez que um documento comum é assinado pelas principais autoridades da Igreja católica e das Igrejas Luteranas. A declaração comum de 1999 não foi o resultado de um evento singular. Melhor dizendo foi o culmine de muitos diálogos entre as duas partes durante muitos anos⁴⁰. Muitos equívocos foram retificados no processo desses diálogos e da redação conjunta deste particular documento⁴¹. Um dos aspectos mais interessantes da situação atual é que os luteranos mesmo devem explicar “que coisa é?” as suas congregações em uma sociedade que vive neste tempo, ou seja, fora dos tempos da Reforma, quando essa era um ponto crucial de polemica.⁴² De outra parte, ocorre esclarecer que este acordo não significa uma reintegração luterana, concluindo seu retorno na Igreja católica de comunhão romana⁴³. Se trata invés de indicar possivelmente de um modo novo as diversas posições da Igreja católica e dos luteranos⁴⁴. A duvida em certos ambientes universitários continua explicita em relação a autenticidade “luterica” especifica que a tradição luterana representa⁴⁵. Se pergunta se a chave

³⁸ Cfr LUTHERAN -ROMAN CATHOLIC DIALOGUE, *Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification*, in «Origins», 199, n° 28/8, pp. 120-127. Alla luce di questo consenso, le differenze di lingua, di elaborazione teologica ed enfasi nella comprensione della giustificazione descritta nei paragrafi 18 a 39 sono accettabili. Perciò le diverse interpretazioni cattolica e luterana sono aperte l'uno all'altra nelle loro stesse differenze e non smentiscono il consenso riguardo alle verità di base (*Ibid.*, n° 40-41).

³⁹ W. Kasper, *The Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification. Cause for Hope*, in «Centro pro Unione», 2000 n° 57, p. 4: «When the official ecumenical dialogue was established after the Council, it could fall back on the results of theological investigation. Even the very first dialogue document, the so-called “Malta Report” (1971) showed that there was a far-reaching consensus on the doctrine of justification. The question was taken up again in the USA dialogue “Justification by Faith” (1985), again with the same results. Finally the question was treated when, after the Pope’s first visit to Germany, all of the doctrinal condemnations from the 16th century were examined. This German dialogue was published in the book, *“Lehrverurteilungen — kirchentrennend?”* [The Condemnations of the Reformation Era. Do they still divide?] in 1986. The result was, once again, that today there are no differences on this question dividing the Churches».

⁴⁰ U. Kühn, *The Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification: Opportunities - Problems - Hopes*, in «Gregorianum», 1999 n° 80/4, p. 610; E. Cassidy, *The Meaning of the Joint Declaration on Justification*, in «Origins» 1999, n° 29/18, p. 286.

⁴¹ WORLD LUTHERAN FEDERATION - ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH, *Official Common Statement regarding the Joint Declaration on Justification*, in «Origins», 1999 n° 29/6, p. 91.

⁴² Cfr S. Oppegaard, *Significance of the Joint Declaration: What is Justification?*, in «Lutheran World Information», 1999 n° 11, pp. 12-14.

⁴³ M. Johnson, *The Joint Declaration and Lutheran - Roman Catholic Unity: Some Unresolved Questions*, in «Lutheran Forum», 1999 n° 33/1, p. 23.

⁴⁴ A. Dulles, *Two Languages of Salvation: the Lutheran-Catholic Joint Declaration*, in «First Things», 199 n° 98, p. 29: «What seems to be surfacing is a willingness to acknowledge that we have here two systems that have to be taken holistically. Both take their departures from the Scriptures, the creeds, and early tradition. But they filter the data through different thought-forms, or languages. The Catholic thought-form, as expressed at Trent, is Scholastic, and heavily indebted to Greek metaphysics. The Lutheran thought-form is more existential, personalistic, or, as some prefer to say, relational. The Scholastics adopt a contemplative point of view, seeking explanation. Luther and his followers, adopting a confessional posture, seek to address God and give an account of themselves before God. In that framework all the terms take on a different hue».

⁴⁵ THE LUTHERAN CHURCH MISSOURI SYNOD, *The Joint Lutheran/Roman Catholic Declaration on Justification. A Response Prepared by the Department of Systematic Theology Concordia Theological Seminary, Fort Wayne*, (Indiana The Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod), in «Internet» 1999, <http://www.lcms.org/president/catholic.html>, screen pages 11-12: «6. Justification: Beyond “Law and Gospel” and Faith. Our response has taken advantage of critiques including the one offered by six Luther Seminary (ELCA) professors. They rightly point to the incompatibility between the Declaration’s understanding of justification as an inner process of transformation and the Lutheran view of justification through faith alone (*sola fide*). But their stress on faith as “relational,” especially without a clear affirmation of the incarnation and atonement, is itself misleading. Their polemic against “some contemporary Finnish Luther scholars” who “align justification with theosis through the idea that faith ‘receives’ Christ, and so divine life itself is ‘imparted’ to the person in justification” is valid, if it targets the mingling of justification and sanctification in that approach. On the other hand, we could hardly disagree that God through Christ dwells in believers, especially through the Sacrament. Faith to be sure is “relational” but not as though in justification this faith were more than pure receptivity, the empty hand filled by the Person and Work of the God-Man. It is a common Protestant error that faith justifies somehow also because of its own inherent value. Seeing faith as a substantive cause of the believer’s justification is hardly different from the characteristic Roman fusion of justification with sanctification. Without Christ, faith is nothing. Listen to Luther in his Galatians Commentary. But where they speak of love, we speak of faith. And while they say that faith is the mere outline, but love is its living colors and completion, we say in opposition that faith takes hold of Christ and that He is the form that adorns and informs faith as color does the wall. Therefore Christian faith is not an idle quality or an empty husk in the heart... But if it is true faith, it is a sure trust and firm acceptance in the heart. It takes hold of Christ in such a way that Christ is the object of faith, or rather not the object but, so to speak, the One who is present in the faith itself [in ipsa fide Christus adest]... Therefore, faith justifies because it takes hold of and possesses this treasure, the present Christ... Therefore, the Christ who is grasped by faith and who lives in the heart is the true Christian righteousness, on account of which God counts us righteous and grants us eternal life!».

cristocêntrica fundamental da Reforma venha respeitada na intenção desta declaração comum (o contexto reformado de fundo, ou seja, a razão de ser cristológica da reforma)⁴⁶. As críticas advertem implicitamente ou explicitamente a incerteza de uma distinção entre aquilo que foi feito e a intenção que tinha em senso positivo, relativizando de fato as “brigas” do passado (enquanto apontam o dedo sobre o relativismo do presente)⁴⁷. Se teme que um jogo de sutilezas e um reducionismo histórico formal ajude pouco a reconciliação real⁴⁸.

¹ Luther's Works, 26:129-130. The response of the six ELCA theologians about "faith as trust in God's eschatological Word of promise" is too bare. Where is the full-blooded Lutheran stress on the life, death, and resurrection of the God-Man as alone-saving object of faith? The missing dimension here is that very vicarious (substitutionary) satisfaction of God's justice in Christ, which is criticized in various ways in *The Law-Gospel Debate: An Interpretation of Its Historical Development* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1968) by Gerhard Forde, one of the six St. Paul theologians. Rather than reject outright the Finns' plea for solid Trinitarian-Christological foundations, they ought to have acknowledged the intent, even while correcting the faulty implementation. Faith is "relational," but without express reference to God's concrete, historical act of righteousness in the Cross and Resurrection of His Son, the language is open to Barthian or Bultmannian interpretations. Eeva Martikainen's significant study of Luther's understanding of doctrine notes the proclivity of modern Luther scholarship for putting pale philosophical fancies, for example, "relational ontology," in the place of Luther's strong incarnational-doctrinal realism (*Doctrina: Studien zu Luthers Begriff der Lehre. Schriften der Luther-Agricola-Gesellschaft*, 26 0357-3087 [Helsinki: Luther-Agricola Gesellschaft, 1992], 15).

⁴⁶ THE LUTHERAN CHURCH MISSOURI SYNOD, *The Joint Lutheran/Roman Catholic Declaration on Justification. A Response Prepared by the Department of Systematic Theology Concordia Theological Seminary, Fort Wayne*, (Indiana The Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod), in «Internet» 1999, <http://www.lcms.org/president/catholic.html>: «6. Justification: Beyond "Law and Gospel" and Faith. Whereas the six ELCA theologians do not relate faith and justification to the atonement, Küng and several other Roman Catholic theologians recognize justification as an effect of Christ's universal atonement. For instance Meinertz, "The objective fact of justification is accomplished in the redemptive death of Christ, in connection, of course, with the resurrection. And so Rom. 5.9 can insist that we are justified in His blood, and by way of complement, in Rom. 4.25, that Christ was raised up for our justification." ¹ Küng himself puts it like this: AOn the one hand, the justification accomplished on the cross must not be separated from the process which reaches down to the individual man; this would in one way or another lead to apokatastasis. On the other hand, personal justification must not be separated from the general act of justification on the cross; this would in one way or another lead to predestinationism. Rather both must be seen as the two sides of a single truth: All men are justified in Jesus Christ and only the faithful are justified in Jesus Christ@ . ² Küng previously offered: "In reading texts which speak of justification in connection with the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, it is striking to note that all of them referred emphatically to faith as well (for example, Rom. 4.5, 20-25)." ³ The Joint Declaration fails not simply in this or that detail of justification, but in terms of the "big picture." «.

¹ Küng, *Justification*, 226. / ² Küng, *Justification*, 223. / ³ Küng, *Justification*, 223.)

⁴⁷ THE LUTHERAN CHURCH MISSOURI SYNOD, *The Joint Lutheran/Roman Catholic Declaration on Justification. A Response Prepared by the Department of Systematic Theology Concordia Theological Seminary, Fort Wayne*, (Indiana The Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod), in «Internet» 1999, <http://www.lcms.org/president/catholic.html>: «7. Flawed Ecumenical Methodology. Tuomo Mannermaa traces the Leuenberg Concord to a fallacious distinction between a common "ground" or basis and differing modes of "expression." This approach is similar but not identical to G. Ebeling's scheme of distinguishing fides justificans from fides dogmatica. ¹ Mannermaa sees a similar faulty pattern at work in the Ecumenical Working Group's 1986 *The Condemnations of the Reformation Era-Do They Still Divide?*, which is "not the only text in which the distinction of ground and expression, center and periphery, concern and formulation [Anliegen und Ausgestaltung] serves as hermeneutical key to the solution of the ecumenical problem." ² The Joint Declaration follows a similar pattern in distinguishing between the basic "concerns" or "intentions" and the actual doctrinal positions and formulations of Trent and the Book of Concord. First, terms like grace, faith, and justification are identified, but precise meanings give way to equivocations. Then the Declaration takes these ambiguities as proof of a "consensus on basic truths concerning the doctrine of justification," of which the differing theologies of the two churches are merely complementary and not contradictory expressions. ³ Setting aside the past condemnations on such grounds amounts simply to wishing them away. Understandably the Declaration cannot say that the past condemnations were simply wrong. Paragraph 42 puts it like this: "Nothing is thereby taken away from the seriousness of the condemnations related to the doctrine of justification. Some were not simply pointless. They remain for us 'salutary warnings' to which we must attend in our teaching and practice." If "some" of the condemnations were "not simply pointless," were many or most of them "simply pointless" then? An earlier version of the Declaration had put it like this: "Nothing is thereby taken away from the seriousness of the condemnations related to the doctrine of justification. They did not simply or altogether miss the point. Where the basic consensus is not adhered to they still apply today. In this respect the mutual doctrinal condemnations remain 'important as salutary warnings.'" The Church of Finland's response asked pointedly: "What does the formulation 'where the basic consensus is not adhered to' mean in concrete terms?" The final form of this point evidently follows the maxim: the less said the better. Having referred to unresolved issues such as purgatory, indulgences, merit, satisfaction, sacrifice of the mass, invocation of saints, and monastic vows, Avery Dulles asks what it would mean to say that such matters are no longer church-divisive: "Does it imply that Lutherans may today teach and hold the doctrine of Trent and that Catholics are free to teach and hold the positions of the Book of Concord on the disputed points? If such freedom does not exist, the issues appear to stand in the way of full communion." ⁴ He adds this eloquent plea: In the present atmosphere Christians find it all too easy to declare that the doctrinal disagreements of the past have lost their church-divisive character. Pervasive though the present climate of agnosticism and relativism may be, Lutherans and Catholics must resist it. One of the most precious things we have in common may be our conviction that pure doctrine is crucially important and that eclesial unity should not be purchased at the expense of truth. I sincerely hope that we can continue to learn from one another, appropriate one another's insights, and correct one another's oversights ⁵».

¹ Tuomo Mannermaa, *Von Preussen nach Leuenberg. Arbeiten zur Geschichte und Theologie des Luthertums. Neue Folge* (Hamburg: Lutherisches Verlagshaus, 1981), 1:48, 56-63. / ² Tuomo Mannermaa, "Einig in Sachen Rechtfertigung? Eine lutherische und eine katholische Stellungnahme zu Jorg Baur," *Theologische Rundschau* 55 (1990): 327. / ³ The Strasbourg A Commentary (48) concedes as much: "The Catholic and Lutheran doctrines of justification do speak partially different languages, sometimes using different concepts, sometimes drawing different distinctions. Nevertheless, that which is common and fundamental is expressed in the JD in a common language." Somehow the second sentence contradicts the first. / ⁴ Dulles, "On Lifting," 220. / ⁵ Dulles, "On Lifting," 220.)

⁴⁸ THE LUTHERAN CHURCH MISSOURI SYNOD, *The Joint Lutheran/Roman Catholic Declaration on Justification. A Response Prepared by the Department of Systematic Theology Concordia Theological Seminary, Fort Wayne*, (Indiana The Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod), in «Internet» 1999, <http://www.lcms.org/president/catholic.html>: «7. Flawed Ecumenical Methodology. Though some have pointed out that the "mutual condemnations" in the Council of Trent and the Book of Concord are different, these differences must not be exaggerated. Gottfried Martens in his *Die Rechtfertigung des Sünders-Rettungshandeln Gottes oder historisches Interpretament* criticizes the various justification dialogues precisely for

NOVOS HORIZONTES DE APERTURA

De um contexto mais estreitamente alemão, do qual surge o intuito luterano, o desenvolvimento das situações portaram a multiplicação das relações com outras Igrejas: aquelas ortodoxas e com as Igrejas fundadas mais recentemente⁴⁹. Também a tardia iniciativa missionária portou superamentos significativos seja da “ocidentalidade”(com a presença na Etiopia) seja da mesma articulação doutrinal (com a contextualização da *Confissão de Augusta*)⁵⁰.

reducing everything to historically variable expressions and interpretations. In fact the booklet *Ecumenism: The Vision of the ELCA. A Guide for Synods and Congregations*, captures the prevailing approach perfectly: "As Lutherans seek to enter into fellowship without insisting on doctrinal or ecclesiastical uniformity, they place an ecumenical emphasis on common formulation and expression of theological consensus on the Gospel."¹ When Dulles observes that "Trent made no mention whatever of Luther or Lutherans," he is technically correct.² The fact is, however, as Jedin puts it, "The Tridentine decree on justification is the Church's authoritative answer to the teaching of Luther and the Augsburg Confession on grace and justification. The reformed doctrines of Zwingli and Calvin were only lightly touched upon in the course of the debate"³ It is also true that the Lutherans specifically refused to include "entire churches" in their condemnations of error (Preface to the Book of Concord). When the ELCA theologians opine, however, "nor are Roman Catholics excluded by Lutherans from Lutheran fellowship, including Holy Communion, even to this day," they are indulging in an unhistorical, woolly ecumenism. The Formula of Concord, for example, understands the Smalcald Articles as having properly explained the Augsburg Confession, and given ample grounds "for having no communion with the papists, and for neither expecting nor planning to come to an understanding with the pope about these matters."⁴ Despite the official Roman misrepresentations of justification, C. F. W. Walther cited Luther that the church has been preserved under the papacy because Roman Catholics have what Luther calls "Christ's ordinances and gifts": Baptism, the reading of Gospel in the vernacular, absolution in private and public confession, the Sacrament of the Altar though it was administered at Easter and under one kind, the call or ordination to the pastoral office, and lastly prayer, the Psalms, the Creed, the Ten Commandments, and many fine hymns.⁵ We can only be encouraged that in our country, Roman Catholics are offered and many receive the Lord's Supper every Sunday and in many dioceses under both kinds».

¹ *Ecumenism-The Vision of the ELCA: A Guide for Synods and Congregations* (Chicago: Evangelical Lutheran Church in America), 22-23. A good antidote would be Martikainen, *Doctrina*. / ² Dulles, "On Lifting," 307. One could easily illustrate this in great detail, as is demonstrated in *Outmoded Condemnations?* / ³ Jedin, *Trent*, 2:307. / ⁴ FC, SD, Rule and Norm, 7. / ⁵ *The True Visible Church*, translated by J. T. Mueller (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1961), 24-25.

⁴⁹ P. Tillich, *Theology of Culture*, London 1962, p. 170: «The ecumenical point of view is further emphasized by the surprising fact that a Protestant institute such as Union Theological Seminary is intimately connected with a Greek Orthodox institute, St. Vladimir's Theological Seminary. At the same time, the opposite wing of Christian thought and life, Unitarianism, is in America a living reality and has still directly and even more indirectly a definite influence on the theological situation as a whole. The ecumenical point of view is also stressed by the fact that representatives of the so-called younger churches, those in Asia and Africa, are regular guests in the great American institutions of theological learning and ecclesiastical activity. They bring points of view into both American and Continental theology that were unknown to us within the limited horizon of German Protestantism».

⁵⁰ A. Appel, *Unité et diversité du luthéranisme*, in «Unité des chrétiens», 1980 n° 38, p. 6: «Le luthéranisme ne s'est engagé dans l'aventure missionnaire que vers la fin du 18ème siècle, en Inde par exemple, et au 19ème siècle en Afrique. Lorsque l'Eglise Mekane Yesu d'Ethiopie, qui est recrutée au sein de la Fédération Luthérienne Mondiale, elle veut bien souscrire à la Confession d'Augsbourg, mais rappelle que celle-ci est le fruit d'un débat théologique, au 16ème siècle qu'elle n'a pas connu et qui s'adresse à son partenaire catholique, alors que l'Indonésie, elle, se compose de 75 % de Musulmans. Remarque salutaire, puisqu'elle oblige le luthéranisme à se situer au-delà de son contexte culturel et historique européen. Elle mènera à une confession batak qui se veut conforme à la tradition évangélique et luthérienne. Lorsque l'Eglise Mekane Yesu d'Ethiopie, qui est probablement l'Eglise luthérienne qui a progressé le plus rapidement (elle a passé au cours des deux dernières décennies de 20.000 à 500.000 membres), veut affirmer sa solidarité face à des Eglises multitudinistes qui semblent perdre leur substance, elle leur pose la question de l'évangélisation et de l'aide au développement ainsi que de leurs méthodes paternalistes et colonialistes qui n'ont rien à voir dans une communauté chrétienne».