

LUTHER'S OTHER MAJOR LITURGICAL REFORMS : 2 THE ORDINATION OF MINISTERS OF THE WORD

The precise date of the composition of Luther's ordination rite seems to be uncertain. The revised translation of P. Z. Strodach given by Ulrich S. Leupold is from the handwritten Wittenberg *Agenda* of 1539, but texts with some not insignificant variant readings are to be found in a Hamburg codex of about 1535, and a Freyberg codex of 1538.¹ However, the first evangelical ordination in Wittenberg was as early as 1525. It may be conjectured, therefore, that between 1525 and 1539 Luther had his own ordination rite, the precise form of which varied from ordination to ordination. The apparent delay in providing something like a definitive text of the rite may have been for various reasons. In the early years of the Reformation most protestant ministers were former Catholic priests, and thus the question of ordination did not immediately arise. Again, Luther's toleration in matters liturgical meant that he was always unwilling to impose his own forms upon others. However, as the Lutheran communities consolidated themselves, and as ordinands came forward who had never received ordination in the Catholic Church, so it became necessary to provide an ordination rite.² However, the need for Luther to draw up his own ordination rite in preference to using the existing medieval rites is pinpointed by Leupold's observation in his introduction to the rite:

The rite of ordination Luther composed was an entirely new creation. It had no more than the name in common with the sacrament of ordination in the Roman church.³

A comparison of Luther's rite with the medieval rites verifies the accuracy of this observation. One factor for this radical departure from the Western Church's traditional liturgical forms may have been the Reformer's lack of attachment to and familiarity with the medieval rites. He would have been acquainted with them, from his own ordination and his presence at other ordinations. But the rites were contained in the *Pontifical*, the bishop's book, and as an Augustinian Friar, Luther himself would never have had occasion to use them. Furthermore, unlike the Mass, they were not part of his regular liturgical life; the Reformer would have felt no personal attachment to them. However, the overriding factor for the lack of resemblance between the rites was Luther's theology of

ministry; it is here that the absolute necessity for a new rite is to be found.

The medieval Western ordination rites

The ordination rites found in the medieval *Pontificals* and which were in use in Europe at the time of the Reformation were the result of a fusion of earlier Roman and Gallican ordination rites; the resulting composite rites had in their turn been overlaid with various ceremonies accompanied by prayers and blessings.⁴ They also differed in their precise details, for since the *Pontifical* was the bishop's book, a bishop could make changes to suit local fads and fashions.

The oldest extant ordination rites are those contained in the *Apostolic Tradition*.⁵ In this early liturgical document the three clerical orders of bishop, presbyter and deacon are firmly established, though it also knows other legitimate ministries and functions within the community — reader, subdeacon, teacher, virgin, widow, and those having gifts of healing.

The bishop was chosen and appointed by the people. After all had prayed in silence for the descent of the Holy Spirit, one of the bishops present laid hands on the bishop-elect, and recited a prayer for ordination. The prayer itself makes it clear that it is God who ordains. The procedure for the ordination of the presbyters and deacons was similar, and according to the *Canons of Hippolytus*, apart from the name Episcopate, the same prayer was used for bishops and presbyters.⁶ In the case of the ordination of a presbyter the bishop and other presbyters laid hands on the candidate, whereas for a deacon only the bishop performed the laying on of hands. The ordinations took place within the Eucharist. For the other ministries, with the exception of the reader who was presented with a book, appointment was by naming only.

The classical ordination rites of the Latin Roman liturgy have some links with those of the *Apostolic Tradition*, but the prayers are different. The oldest known source is the *Leonine Sacramentary*, which has prayers for ordaining bishops, deacons and presbyters in that order, and a lengthy prayer for the setting apart of religious virgins. These prayers may be supplemented by material from the later *Gregorian Sacramentaries*, and the manner of performing the rites by the *Ordines Romani*.⁷

When a candidate had been elected to the episcopate, he came to Rome where he was examined and approved. Ordination took place at the Sunday Mass after the Epistle. The Pope called the congregation to prayer for the candidate, and during silent prayer a litany was sung. After this the Pope recited a collect,

and then the ordination prayer with the laying on of hands. The rite ended with the kiss of peace.

The ordination of presbyters and deacons took place at one of the Ember weeks. On the Wednesday or Friday the candidates were presented to the faithful for their approval. The ordination itself took place on the Saturday during the vigil. The candidates for the diaconate were presented to the Pope by the Archdeacon after the Epistle. After a bidding to prayer, a litany was sung, concluding with a collect. The ordination prayer with the laying on of hands followed, ending with the kiss of peace. The ordination of presbyters which followed was very similar. However, because of the numbers of ordinands, the hand-laying came to be separated from the prayer at the ordination of presbyters. The bishop and presbyters laid their hands in silence on each ordinand's head. The bishop then recited a collective prayer, during which hands were held out over the heads of the ordinands.

Five minor orders were also known in the Roman rite, though no provision was made for any ceremony for the appointment of exorcist, reader or doorkeeper. For the acolyte and subdeacon there was the ceremony of handing to the candidate the instrument representative of his function (the *porrectio instrumentorum*), a linen bag for the hosts and an empty chalice respectively.

In the Gallican rite, where Ember seasons were unknown,⁸ the rites for ordaining bishop, priest and deacon began with a presentation of the candidate to the people by the bishop, to which the people replied *Dignus est*. The rites themselves consisted of a bidding and an ordination prayer with the imposition of hands. In the rite for ordaining priests there was also an anointing of the hands, and for ordaining a bishop, two bishops held the book of the Gospels over the head of the candidate during the imposition. In the rite for the minor orders there was a *porrectio instrumentorum* with a solemn charge, bidding and blessing.

Already in the eighth century *Gelasian Sacramentaries* there is to be found a mingling of the Roman and Gallican material. H. B. Porter explains:

The general pattern is first to have one or more biddings or exhortations (Roman, Gallican, or both), one or more collects, and then the Roman consecratory prayer. In the case of presbyters and deacons this is followed at once by a Gallican bidding and Gallican consecratory prayer. Thus, in effect, a man receives the ordination rite of both traditions one after the other. In the case of bishops, the substance of

a different consecratory prayer is interpolated into the Roman prayer.⁹

The *porrectiones instrumentorum* of the minor orders of the Gallican rite displaced the simpler ceremonies of the Roman rite, and *porrectiones instrumentorum* were also introduced into the rites of bishop, presbyter and deacon. In the rite for ordaining priests — the main medieval order — additions were also made to emphasise the power to offer the sacrifice of the mass, and to give absolution, the former by giving the vesting a theological significance (the harmless chasuble becoming the symbol of sacrificial priesthood) and by the delivery of a chalice and paten, the latter by an accompanying formula at the imposition of the hands.¹⁰ The custom of singing the *Veni creator spiritus* was also a late medieval innovation.

With little idea of the history of the medieval composite rites, theologians tended to emphasise what were later accretions — the Gallican anointing of the hands, the *porrectiones instrumentorum*, and in the ordination of priests, the formula of authority to forgive sins. The rite was regarded as a sacrament which conferred a *character indelebilis*.

Luther on Ministry

In his *Address to the Nobility*, 1520, Luther wrote:

It has been devised that the Pope, bishops, priests, and monks are called the *spiritual estate*, princes, lords, artificers, and peasants are the *temporal estate*. This is an artful lie and hypocritical device, but let no one be made afraid by it, and that for this reason: that all Christians are truly of the spiritual estate, and there is no difference among them, save of office alone. As St Paul says (I Cor. xii), we are all one body, though each member does its own work, to serve the others. This is because we have one baptism, one Gospel, one faith, and are all Christians alike; for baptism, Gospel, and faith, these alone make spiritual and Christian people.

As for the unction by a pope or a bishop, tonsure, ordination, consecration, and clothes differing from those of laymen — all this may make a hypocrite or an anointed puppet, but never a Christian or a spiritual man. Thus we are all consecrated as priests by baptism, as St Peter says: "Ye are a royal priesthood, a holy nation" (I Peter ii. 9); and in the book of Revelations: "and hast made us unto our God (by thy blood) kings and priests" (Rev. v. 10).¹¹

The two main points of this passage, that priesthood and ministry belong to all Christians, and any difference is of

function only, form the heart of Luther's understanding of ministry. Gösta Hök has explained:

According to Luther and his successors the ministry is *jure divino* one: it is a ministry of the Word with the same power and authority for each one who holds it. It is possible, however, to make a distinction *jure humano* between different orders within that ministry so that not all exercise the same power and authority.¹²

For Luther ministry is essentially concerned with proclamation of the Word; the Word has been given for man's salvation, and everything is subordinate to it. Thus in *Concerning the Ministry*, 1523, he wrote:

Ordination indeed was first instituted on the authority of Scripture, and according to the example and decrees of the Apostle, in order to provide the people with ministers of the Word. The public ministry of the Word, I hold, by which the mysteries of God are made known, ought to be established by holy ordination as the highest and greatest of the functions of the church, on which the whole power of the church depends, since the church is nothing without the Word and everything in it exists by virtue of the Word alone.

Luther argued that the ministry of the Word is common to all Christians. All can baptise, all can bind or loose chains. "There is no other Word of God than that which is given all Christians to proclaim". However, in *Concerning Christian Liberty* Luther remarked:

For though it is true that we are all equally priests, yet we cannot, nor, if we could, ought we all to, minister and teach publicly. Thus St Paul says, "Let a man so account of us as of the ministers of Christ and stewards of the mysteries of God" (I Cor. iv. 1).¹³

In a later work, *On the Councils and the Church*, 1539, Luther argued that the ordained ministry is there for the sake of good order. If all exercised their priesthood when the congregation came together, chaos would result. It would be like the chatter of housewives on their way to market, all wanting to talk rather than to listen, and the resulting noise would be like a chorus of frogs. The Church would become a Tower of Babel. Similarly, if all insisted on doing the baptism, the poor infant would be drowned. It is because all are priests that not all may exercise the priestly functions in public. In his *Lectures on Titus*, 1527, commenting on Titus 1: 5, Luther argued that Christians all have a priesthood, but they do not all have the priestly function:

Therefore it should be noted that it was Paul's ordinance

that he should select "elders" (in the plural) in each city, and they are called bishops and elders.

In the *Babylonian Captivity*, 1520, the Reformer explained that the specialised ministry, or priests, were chosen from among Christians to minister on their behalf and in their name; however, that specialised ministry was primarily for the preaching of the Word; performing baptisms, celebrating the eucharist, and give absolution, were simply expression of the Word.

It becomes apparent that for Luther the specialised ministry is dependent upon the priesthood of all Christians. Following the pattern of Titus 1: 7, I Timothy 3: 10 and Acts 6, ministers were to be elected and called by the congregation, and derive their authority from them.¹⁴ However, in his consideration of Luther's writings on ministry, B. A. Gerrish noted that sometimes — particularly in his *Address to the Nobility* — Luther speaks of the ministry as a distinct divine institution, for the purpose of ruling a congregation with preaching and the sacraments, and therefore deriving its call and authority from God, not the congregation. According to Gerrish, there is here a tension, and one which cannot fully be eliminated.¹⁵

The main form of the ordained ministry in the medieval Church was the threefold ministry of bishop, priest and deacon. To the bishop belonged the power of ordination and excommunication; to the priest, the power of offering the Mass and confecting the body and blood of Christ, and absolution; the deacon's main task had been reduced to the reading of the Gospel. For Luther, the main task of any ministry was preaching the Word, and it was from this standpoint that he viewed the threefold ministry. In the *Babylonian Captivity* he wrote:

Furthermore, the priesthood is properly nothing but the ministry of the Word — the Word, I say; not the law, but the gospel. And the diaconate is the ministry, not of reading the Gospel or the Epistle, as is the present practice, but of distributing the church's aid to the poor, so that the priests may be relieved of the burden of temporal matters and may give themselves more freely to prayer and the Word. For this was the purpose of the diaconate, as we read in Acts 5 (6: 1-6). Whosoever, therefore, does not know or preach the gospel is not only no priest or bishop, but he is a kind of pest to the church, who under the false title of priest or bishop, or dressed in sheep's clothing, actually does violence to the gospel and plays the wolf (Matt. 7: 15) in the church.

Writing against Jerome of Emser in 1521, Luther appealed to

Acts 20: 17-18, 28, to show that the words bishop and elder are interchangeable.

"Bishop" too stems from the Greek language. For he whom they call *episcopus* is called *speculator* in Latin and "a guardian or watchman on the tower" (warttman odder wechter auff der Wart) in German. This is exactly what one calls someone who lives in a tower to watch and to look out over the town so that fire or foe do not harm it. Therefore, every minister or spiritual regent should be a bishop, that is, an overseer or watchman, so that in his town and among his people the gospel and faith in Christ are built up and win out over foe, devil, and heresy. Thus St Luke, in Acts 20 (: 17-18, 28) says, "Paul called to him the priests of the church," that is, the elders of the Christians in Ephesus, "and said to them, 'See to yourselves and to all the flock of Christ, over which the Holy Spirit has set you as bishops, to feed the church of God, which he has acquired with his own blood'." Here it is clear that the elders are called bishops, that is, overseers of God's church — of the Christians who are God's people.

He also appealed to Titus 1: 5, 7, and to St Jerome for this interpretation. Elsewhere the Reformer seems to have regarded a bishop as the chief presbyter in a given area, having special oversight. According to his *Lectures on I Timothy*, 1528, "bishop" means "watchman", "visitor", one who visits to see people; and in the *Lectures on Titus* Luther stated that every city ought to have many bishops, that is, inspectors or visitors. In his *Instructions for the Visitors of Parish Pastors in Electoral Saxony*, 1528, this role is called the office of superintendent; this pastor shall be superintendent of all other priests who have their parish or benefice in the region. But apparently this office did not constitute a separate Order requiring a special ordination rite.

On the question of the diaconate Luther was not particularly clear. In his *Lectures on I Timothy*, commenting upon 3: 8, he explained:

Deacons were men who also preached occasionally. We read in Acts 6: 1-6 that they chose seven men in the church to be in charge of providing for the poor and the widows. Those deacons also at times preached, as did Stephen, and they were admitted to other duties of the church, although their principal responsibility was to care for the poor and the widows. That custom has long ceased to exist. In the papist church the man who reads the Gospel is a subdeacon (sic).

The distribution of goods and the care of the poor have been relegated to the hospices.

A similar definition of the task of deacons was given in the *Babylonian Captivity*. Yet in spite of his definition, Luther did not restore the diaconate as a separate ministry, and did not provide a liturgical rite for their appointment. Only one liturgical rite was prepared — for the ordination of a minister of the Word.

Luther's objections to the medieval ordination rites

Nothing comparable to Luther's analysis of the Canon of the Mass exists with regard to the medieval ordination rites. Nevertheless, the Reformer's objections to and criticisms of the rites may be pieced together from his theological approach to ministry, and from the casual references in his writings. These latter references are mainly concerned with the ordination of priests.

The medieval liturgical emphasis on ordination as a means of receiving special grace, of conferring an indelible character, and the power to offer the sacrifice of the Mass and to give absolution, were at complete variance with Luther's understanding of ministry. In the *Babylonian Captivity* the Reformer repudiated the belief that ordination was a sacrament, that it conferred grace, and a *character indelebilis*:

Of this sacrament the Church of Christ knows nothing; it is an invention of the church of the pope. Not only is there nowhere any promise of grace attached to it, but there is not a single word said about it in the whole New Testament. Now it is ridiculous to put forth as a sacrament of God something that cannot be proved to have been instituted by God. I do not hold that this rite, which has been observed for so many centuries, should be condemned; but in sacred things I am opposed to the inventions of human fictions. And it is not right to give out as divinely instituted what was not divinely instituted, lest we become a laughingstock to our opponents.

And again,

Let this then stand fast: The church can give no promises of grace; that is the work of God alone. Therefore she cannot institute a sacrament.

The belief that Orders convey grace was in the view of Luther a grave error which had resulted in the destruction of Christian brotherhood, and turned shepherds into wolves, servants into tyrants, and ecclesiastics into something more than men of the world. For the Wittenberg Reformer ordination was a church rite by which men are called to minister in the church; it was a

public confirmation of their calling. It was introduced by the Fathers, and is comparable with such things as the consecration of vessels, buildings, vestments, water and the like; ordination was no more a sacrament than any of these ceremonies.

Since for Luther this churchly rite was concerned with setting apart men for the ministry of the Word, anything which detracted from this, or which gave the impression that something else was being conferred, was an unwanted element. It is no surprise therefore that Luther speaks scathingly of some of the secondary elements of the medieval rites. Writing against Jerome Emser he pointed out that if tonsure, consecrations, anointings, and vestments make priests and bishops, then Christ and the apostles would never have been either. There is an element of ridicule in *Concerning the Ministry*:

In place of ministers of the Word they only ordain priestly functionaries who offer up masses and hear confessions. For this is what the bishop means by giving the chalice into the hands of the candidate and giving him the power of consecrating, and sacrificing for the living and the dead. This indeed is a power that angels never could glory in, nor could the virgin mother of God possess it, but they have it though they be more impure than seducers and thieves. And thus in a most holy mysterious manner the bishop breathes in their ears and makes them father confessors, saying, "Receive the Holy Spirit". Such is this most glorious power of consecration and absolution.

Again,

The chalice of course he accepts and thinks that all his ordination means is that he is permitted to consecrate and sacrifice Christ in the mass, and to hear confessions.

All of these things, Luther asserted, were human inventions; it is as if some actor laughed and gesticulated in an empty theatre. From these passing comments it becomes fairly clear that in Luther's rite there would be no ceremony of vesting, no *porrectio instrumentorum*, no anointing, and no reference to the exclusive power of absolution.

It might well be asked as to why the Reformer did not simply remove from the medieval rites those parts of which he disapproved? We may conjecture that the reason why the ancient ordination prayers were jettisoned along with the ceremonies was on account of their themes. The old Roman ordination prayer for the presbyter mentioned the Old Testament priesthood — the Levites, Eleazar and Ithamar, the sons of Aaron — as types of the Christian ministry. This was precisely the priesthood which Luther believed had been abolished by the priesthood of Christ.

Christ's priesthood was after the order of Melchisedek, not the Levitical priesthood of the Old Testament.¹⁶ The ancient prayer was for Luther theologically "unsound". Again, whereas the Gallican blessing for the priest referred to the instructions to Timothy and Titus, and emphasised belief, teaching and practice, it also asked for the candidate that "With the consent of thy people may he transform, by an untainted benediction, the body and blood of thy Son". While the text may originally have referred to Ephesians 4: 17 it had been changed to refer to the Eucharist, and was interpreted in terms of transubstantiation. As far as Luther was concerned, such a concept was anathema. Thus he simply dispensed with the medieval rites.

Luther's Ordination rite 1539

In *Concerning the Ministry* Luther urged the Bohemians to stop sending their priests to Rome for ordination, but to elect, and effect their own ordination. Referring to Catholic objections that this was a novelty, Luther replied:

I answer, it is the most ancient custom, following the example of the Apostles and their disciples, but abolished and destroyed by the contrary examples and pestilential teachings of the papists.

With an eye on the New Testament "commissioning" of ministries, Luther proceeded to outline an evangelical rite for ordination. First the congregation of Christians must believe in the Word, and beseech God with prayers. Then they will come together freely.

Proceed in the name of the Lord to elect one or more whom you desire, and who appear to be worthy and able. Then let those who are leaders among you lay hands upon them, and certify and commend them to the people and the church or community. In this way let them become your bishops, ministers, or pastors. Amen.

Similarly, in *That a Christian Assembly or Congregation has the right and Power to Judge all Teaching and to Call, Appoint, and Dismiss Teachers, Established and Proven by Scripture* of the same year, Luther taught that although if a Christian was in a place where there were no other Christians, he needed no further call to preach and teach the gospel to the heathen, the normal procedure in a Christian congregation was election by the people. Furthermore, since Luther saw no difference between the biblical bishop and presbyter, the laying on of hands was no longer reserved for the bishop; thus in *Lectures on Titus*:

Ordination was not performed as our bishops do it, but the elders gathered and performed it by the laying on of hands.

This teaching formed the basis of his approach to an ordination rite.

The text of the 1539 ordination rite may be summarized as follows:

1. The candidates are examined either on the same or the preceding day.
2. The congregation are admonished to pray for the candidates.
3. The ordinator and the presbyters kneel. The choir sings *Veni sancte spiritus*.
4. Versicle and response, and the collect for Pentecost, *Deus qui hodierna die corda fidelium*, in German.
5. Lection. I Timothy 3: 1-7.
6. Lection. Acts 20: 28-31.
7. Admonition to the candidates.
8. Imposition of hands by the presbytery. The ordinator recites the Lord's Prayer.
9. Optional prayer.
10. I Peter 5: 2-4.
11. Blessing with the sign of the cross and these words or similar: "The Lord Bless you that you may bring forth much fruit".
12. Optional hymn: "Now let us pray to the Holy Ghost".
13. The presbyter chants "Our Father, etc."

It was assumed that the candidates had been elected, or "approved" by the congregation, and by the secular authorities, both of which were considered signs of God's call. This was made explicit in an alternative admonition (7) in the Freyberg codex.¹⁸ The actual ordination seems to have been intended to take place in the context of the Eucharist, for the chanting of "Our Father" would appear to mark the beginning of the consecration. While the whole congregation has a part in the ordination, there was a presiding presbyter or ordinator. Luther replaced the *Veni creator spiritus* with what would appear to be the Pentecost sequence *Veni sancte spiritus et emitte coelitus*, followed by the collect for Pentecost with versicle and response. A central place was given to the reading of the Word, the lections themselves describing the type of man expected for the ministry, and his task. The reading from Acts echoed the theme of *Veni sancte spiritus* and the collect for Pentecost, namely the action of the Holy Spirit in calling a minister of the Word. In place of any commissioning to offer the sacrifice of the mass or to forgive sins, the admonition was concerned to stress the duty of the minister — to feed God's people with the pure Word of God, and to guard against wolves and sects which burst in among the poor sheep. In place of the old ordination prayers,

Luther used the Lord's Prayer. The optional prayer which followed gave some rationale for this strange choice of ordination prayer. Luther regarded the optional prayer as an explanation of the three parts of the Lord's Prayer. According to the Reformer, the petition "Hallowed be thy name" asked that God would send labourers into the harvest (Matt. 9: 37-38). The Holy Spirit allowed the proclamation of the gospel in order that God's will might be done on earth as in heaven. Delivery from evil included the request for delivery from the false teaching of Rome, from Moslems and other sects; that is, that the shepherd might faithfully guard his sheep. After the prayer with the laying on of hands another reading emphasised the character of the minister, his way of life rather than the conferring of an indelible character. The rite concluded with a short blessing of the candidates and an optional hymn.

When Luther's rite is compared with the old medieval ordination rites there is no doubt that it is a completely new rite, and in this sense is a departure from received tradition. It is extremely difficult to sympathise with Luther's curious use of the Lord's Prayer as an ordination prayer. Yet what appears to modern liturgical science as cavalier treatment, was, for Luther, the necessary use of "the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God". His liturgical rite, as far as his theology was correct,¹⁹ was a theological necessity. As Hök explains:

His purpose was to reintroduce the main theme of the New Testament, and so for this reason he teaches a single ministry of the church, that is, a ministry of the Word which is a service and a commission, not an authority or office, and which has as its task, not the offering of sacrifice, but the continuation of the apostolic proclamation of the Gospel and the diaconate.²⁰

NOTES

1. Luther's Works (American edition), edited by J. Pelikan and H. T. Lehmann, Vol. 53, pp. 122-126. Unless otherwise stated all references are to this edition of Luther's works.
2. In 1535 Elector John Frederick set out a definite order for the examination, calling, and ordination of candidates. *Ibid.*, p. 123.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 122.
4. See W. K. Firminger, "The Ordinal", in *Liturgy and Worship*, ed. W. K. Lowther Clarke and C. Harris, 1932, pp. 626 ff.
5. G. Dix, *The Treatise on the Apostolic Tradition*, 1937; G. J. Cuming, *Hippolytus: A Text for Students*, 1976.
6. W. K. Firminger, *op. cit.*, p. 631.
7. For the text of the prayers, H. B. Porter, *The Ordination Prayers of the Ancient Western Churches*, 1967.
8. See G. G. Willis, *Essays in Early Roman Liturgy*, 1964, pp. 49 ff.

9. Porter, op. cit., p. 79.
10. W. K. Firminger, op. cit., pp. 652-654.
11. *Luther's Primary Works*, ed. H. Wace and C. A. Buchheim, 1896.
12. G. Hök, "Luther's Doctrine of the Ministry", in *Scottish Journal of Theology* 7 (1954), pp. 16-40, p. 17.
13. *Luther's Primary Works*.
14. B. A. Gerrish, "Priesthood and Ministry in the Theology of Luther", in *Church History* 34 (1965), pp. 404-422; pp. 414-415; Hök, art. cit., pp. 18-19.
15. Ibid., p. 416.
16. e.g. *The Freedom of A Christian*, 1520; *Lectures on Hebrews*.
17. Porter, op. cit., pp. 36-37.
18. Luther's Works, Vol. 53, p. 125, n. 5: "First, you hear here (Acts 20: 28-31) that the Holy Ghost called and ordained you bishops in his flock or church. Therefore, you must believe for certain that you were called by God, because the church sent you here and secular authority has called and desired you. For what the church and secular authorities do in these matters, God does through them, so that you may not be considered intruders."
19. Gerrish points out that Luther's priesthood of all believers is not un-Biblical, but it is not exegesis either.
20. Hök, art. cit., p. 40.

BRYAN D. SPINKS, Witham, Essex.