

The Formula of Concord—Article VIII Of The Person of Christ

Gene E. Jahnke

[Chicago Pastoral Conference of the Southeastern Wisconsin District WELS,
New Life Evangelical Lutheran Church, Lake Zurich, IL, January 9, 2001]

Introduction

Suppose you gave a quiz to your congregation after services one Sunday:

Mark these questions true or false:

T F God died on the cross.

T F Mary is the mother of God.

T F God was forsaken by God on the cross.

What answers would you expect? While we could wish everyone would mark true for each, it would not surprise us to find much confusion. For the person of Christ is both a mystery and a miracle. Isaiah 9:6 could be translated in part, “His name shall be called Miracle.” “Indeed, the miracles Jesus *did* pale into insignificance when we compare them with the miracle that Jesus *is* (emphasis mine).”¹

The confusion concerning the person of Christ does not lie in a lack of clarity of Scripture, or in a dearth of Scripture passages dealing with the subject. Rather it lies in not subjecting our human reason to the authority of God’s Word, and not wanting to believe what that Word says. Luther said that if we would follow reason, we would all become Mohammedans. Another time he said that the statement that God became man is philosophically indefensible.

“Who do people say the Son of Man is?” (Mt 16:13) Jesus posed this question to His disciples. They reported several answers, all of which put Jesus in the human class with the rest of mankind. Peter confessed the disciples’ own answer, however, when he proclaimed, “You are the Christ, the Son of the living God!” (Mt 16:16)

There have always been those who deny the divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ. They are naturally outside of the pale of Christendom, “Unfortunately there have been many within the external church who have been unable to accept the full consequences of confessing that Jesus Christ from eternity shared the divine essence to the full, and that through the incarnation the Son of God took on the human nature from the Virgin Mary into the unity of His person.”²

Article VIII of the Formula of Concord is the Lutheran Church’s most complete confessional statement on the person of Christ. May our study of it deepen our personal faith in our God-Man ‘Savior, help us more clearly communicate Him to others, and help us recognize the many falsehoods spawned by the Deceiver regarding our Christ.

Historical Background

Most of us have grown up sitting at the feet of sound Lutheran pastors and teachers who taught us to know Jesus as the Scriptures present Him. “There can be a disadvantage to this also, however. As inheritors of these doctrines and not formulators of the doctrines, we may forget the struggle the formulation required. We may not study the Scripture behind the doctrines as thoroughly as we should. Consequently, we may hold to the

¹ Becker, Dr. S., *God Manifest in Flesh: The Mystery of the Personal Union*, unpublished paper.

² Teigen, B., *I Believe: A Study of the Formula of Concord*, Mankato, MN: Lutheran Synod Book Co., 1977, p. 14.

doctrines in an orthodox, Lutheran fashion, but we may or do not understand what we are upholding in as deep a way as we should.”³

Doctrinal disputes proliferate even today. But disputes that result in persecutions, imprisonment, banishment and death are beyond our ken. Such was the world of post-Reformation Germany. The Crypto-Calvinistic Controversy that precipitated the writing of Articles VII and VIII was such a fight.

Luther and his followers had emphatically rejected the false teachings of Zwingli. Zwingli insisted that communicants receive only bread and wine, arguing: “Jesus has ascended into heaven. He is sitting at the right hand of God the Father. How then can His body be here on earth? How can it be present in the Lord’s Supper in many different places at one and the same time?”

“Zwingli reasoned on the basis of the logical principle ‘Every true body is in a place’. It can be in only one place at a time. If Christ’s body is a true human body, it can have only a circumscribed physical, local, tangible and visible presence. In other words, Zwingli denied the omnipresence of Christ’s human nature.”⁴

True Lutherans had set forth the biblical doctrine of the real presence in many writings, including the Augsburg Confession in 1530. But Philip Melanchthon soon exhibited doubts in his private correspondence, vacillating between Luther’s views and something closer to Zwingli’s. Melanchthon hoped to unite the Lutherans with those who held a different view of the Lord’s Supper. So in 1540 he authored the Variata to the Augsburg Confession, altering Article X. He changed the words. “The body and blood of Christ are truly present, and are distributed to those who eat in the Supper of the Lord,” to read, “... with the bread and wine the body and blood of Christ are truly exhibited to those who eat in the Lord’s Supper,” and omitted the words, “And they reject those who teach otherwise.” In effect Melanchthon became the proponent of unionism. “Had he had his way, and had not the tendency which he inaugurated been checked, the Lutheran Church would have lost its character and been transformed into a Reformed or, at least, a unionistic body.”⁵

John Calvin often expressed admiration for Luther, but vehemently opposed Luther’s doctrine of the Lord’s Supper and of the majesty of Christ’s human nature. For a time he was considered a Lutheran, and signed the Augsburg Confession in 1539. But he explained that he understood it in the sense in which Melanchthon interpreted it. “Calvin held that after His ascension Christ, according to His human nature, was locally enclosed in heaven, far away from the earth. Hence he denied also the real presence of Christ’s body and blood in the Holy Supper. In fact, Calvin’s doctrine was nothing but a polished form of Zwingli’s crude teaching, couched in phrases approaching the Lutheran terminology as closely as possible. Even where he paraded as Luther, Calvin was but Zwingli disguised (and poorly at that) in a seemingly orthodox garb and promenading with several imitation Lutheran feathers in his hat.”⁶

The Reformed came to an agreement acceptable to both the Calvinists and Zwinglians. The document dogmatizing this agreement was the Consensus Tigurinus of 1549, authored by Calvin. “Here not only the view of Zwingli was expressed that bread and wine in the celebration of the Eucharist remind us of Christ’s death and benefits, but also the deeper views of Calvin that they are signs and tokens of God for the believer. Christ in this ceremony communicates Himself to us as the true spiritual bread. Calvin even used the phrase that we partake of the body and blood of Christ; but this phrase expresses for him, not the real presence of the body and blood, but the fact that we are made participants of the benefits of Christ. In other words: A spiritual influence is exercised by the glorified Christ which is mediated through the Spirit of Christ and the faith of man. The body of Christ remains in heaven, is locally confined to heaven to the day of judgment. The believer through faith rises to heaven and comes into communion with the glorified Saviour.”⁷

In the Consensus Tigurinus itself we read: “In as far as Christ is a man, He is to be sought nowhere else than in heaven and in no other manner than with the mind and the understanding of faith. Therefore it is a

³ Haar, T., Article VIII -Formula of Concord, 1987, unpublished paper.

⁴ Gawrisch, W., *On Christology, Brenz and the Question of Ubiquity in No Other Gospel*, Milwaukee, WI, Northwestern Publishing House, 1980, p. 229.

⁵ Bente, F., *Concordia Triglotta*, St. Louis, MO Concordia 1921, p. 181.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 174.

⁷ Fritschel, G., *The Formula of Concord—Its Origin and Contents*, Philadelphia, PA, Lutheran Publication Society, 1916, pp. 177-178.

perverse and impious superstition to include Him under elements of this world.” Again: “We repudiate those [who urge the literal interpretation of the words of institution] as preposterous interpreters.” “For beyond controversy, they are to be taken figuratively, ... as when by metonymy the name of the symbolized thing is transferred to the sign.” Again: “Nor do we regard it as less absurd to place Christ under, and to unite Him with, the bread than to change the bread into His body.” Again: “When we say that Christ is to be sought in heaven this mode of speech expresses a distance of place, ... because the body of Christ, ... being finite and contained in heaven, as in a place, must of necessity be removed from us by as great a distance as the heaven is removed from the earth. Such was the teaching cunningly advocated by Calvin and his adherents, the Crypto-Calvinists in Germany included, but boldly and firmly opposed by the loyal Lutherans, and finally disposed of by Articles VII and VIII of the Formula of Concord.”⁸

Calvin’s views, often couched in seemingly orthodox terminology, found acceptance in some Lutheran circles. Even Wittenberg, the home of the Reformation, became infected with Crypto-Calvinism. “In fact, Luther had expressed concern, shortly before departure on the last trip of his life to Eisleben, that members of the Wittenberg faculty had been infected with Calvinist leaven on the Lord’s Supper. So he announced that there would be an across-the-board examination of the staff upon his return. As God willed, he died suddenly at Eisleben.”⁹ Though Melancthon kept silent, other Lutheran voices, such as Joachim Westphal and John Brenz, sounded a warning. But Calvin and his followers viciously attacked them.

One of the charges leveled against the Lutherans was that Lutherans were “ubiquitists”. The Reformed applied the term “ubiquity” to the Lutheran doctrine of the omnipresence of Christ’s human nature. “They have consistently misrepresented Lutheran teaching as if it involves a physical and corporeal extension of Christ’s body throughout heaven and earth.”¹⁰

Luther had pointed out in his Confession Concerning Christ’s Supper that according to Scripture the body of Christ employs at least three modes of presence. The first is the visible or local mode of presence, used, for example, when He lay in the manger. The second is an invisible, illocal, yet definitive presence, used, for example, when He suddenly appeared to His disciples as they were crossing the Sea of Galilee by night. The third is Christ’s illocal, replete, divine omnipresence.

Christ’s omnipresence can also be spoken of in two ways. His omnipresence generalis is that according to which He fills heaven and earth. “He who descended is the very one who ascended higher than all the heavens, in order to fill the whole universe.” (Ep 4:10) His *voli*-presence is a special presence that Christ effects whenever and wherever He chooses. “Where two or three come together in my name, there am I with them.” (Mt 18:20) This special presence Christ also promises in His Holy Supper, in, with, and under the bread and wine. “In virtue of the personal union Christ is present everywhere also according to His human nature; while the peculiarly gracious manner of His presence in the Gospel, in the Church, and in the Lord’s Supper depends upon His will and is based upon His definite promises.”¹¹

Zwinglians accused Luther of stretching and expanding the humanity and thereby enclosing the divinity. “Such words,” Luther replied, “obviously apply to the corporeal, circumscribed mode of being, as a peasant stuffs himself into his jacket and trousers, when the jacket and trousers are expanded so that they will go around his body and legs. Get out of here, you stupid fanatic, with your worthless ideas! If you can not think in higher and other terms than this, then sit behind the stove and stew pears and apples, and leave such subjects alone.”¹² Brenz protested the way the Reformed used the term “ubiquity”, saying, “They have invented the new and monstrous term ‘ubiquity’ in order to impress and persuade the illiterate and, uninformed the more easily that we have devised the new and monstrous dogma that Christ’s body, like rubber, is spread and stretched into all places geometrically.”¹³

⁸ Bente, op. cit., *Triglotta*, p. 175.

⁹ Mug, E., *Getting into The Formula of Concord*, St. Louis, MO, Concordia, 1977, p. 51.

¹⁰ Gawrisch, op. cit., p. 243.

¹¹ Bente, op. cit., *Triglotta*, p. 184.

¹² Gawrisch, op. cit., p. 243.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 244.

More and more Lutheran territories were coming under the control of Crypto-Calvinists. True Lutheran orthodoxy seemed in danger of being snuffed out. By 1573 the Calvinization of Saxony seemed to be an accomplished fact. Elector August had been duped into believing that the Philippists (followers of Melancthon) were the true Lutherans, that Melancthon knew the real mind of Luther. Elector August viewed the Crypto-Calvinists as loyal, loving, and evangelical, and the dissenters (true Lutherans) as troublemakers. He was persuaded to banish more than a hundred Lutheran theologians, pastors, and teachers who would not endorse the Crypto-Calvinistic teachings.

But God was not about to let the truth be silenced! In 1574 the Crypto-Calvinists anonymously published a document entitled *Exegesis Perspicua* (Clear Exegesis). This document much more boldly supported the Calvinist position, denigrating some of Luther's statements and writings, and urging union of Lutheran and Reformed churches. Shortly thereafter a letter of one of the Crypto-Calvinistic schemers was misdirected' into the hands of a loyal Lutheran. The letter urged giving a Calvinistic prayer book to Anna, the wife of Elector August, adding slyly, "If first we have Mother Anna on our side, there will be no difficulty in winning His Lordship (August) too."¹⁴ The letter made its way into the hands of Elector August. His eyes were finally opened. He understood in a flash the massive intrigue and dishonesty that had been going on in his realm for at least a dozen years. The conspirators were unmasked. The leaders of the conspiracy were jailed.

"Thus ended the Crypto-Calvinistic drama in Electoral Saxony. Henceforth such men as Andreae, Chemnitz, and Selnecker were the trusted advisers of August, who now became the enthusiastic, devoted, and self-sacrificing leader of the larger movement for settling all of the controversies distracting the Lutheran Church, which finally resulted in the adoption of the Formula of Concord."¹⁵ God promises to work all things for our good. He used these controversies to lead His Church to more clearly confess His truth!

Summary of Article VIII

The controversy revolved around two points. "Is the union of the two natures of Christ a union in name only? Do the qualities of each nature communicate anything to the other?"¹⁶ The Zwinglians said that no truly human body of Christ could be in heaven and in the Lord's Supper at the same time. The Crypto-Calvinists declared "that nothing should be ascribed to the human nature in the person of Christ which is above or contrary to its natural, essential property" (Solid Declaration VIII, 4).

The Formula of Concord then sets forth the true biblical doctrine concerning the person of Christ. It states six theses which "we believe, teach and confess."

1. The eternal Son of God became incarnate (SD VIII, 6)
2. In the incarnation there was a union of human and, divine natures without mingling or separation (SD VIII, 7)
3. Each nature retains its nature and essence (SD VIII, 8)
4. Each nature has its appropriate properties (SD VIII, 9-10)
5. The two natures of Christ now exist inseparably in the one person of Christ (SD VIII, 11)
6. In this personal union the human nature of Christ has been exalted to the right hand of majesty (SD VIII, 12)

When was Christ's human nature exalted to this majesty? "He did not first receive it when He arose from the dead and ascended into heaven, but when He was conceived in His mother's womb and became man, and the divine and human natures were personally united with one another" (SD VIII, 13).

¹⁴ Mug, op. cit., p. 55.

¹⁵ Bente, op. cit., *Triglotta*, p. 191-192.

¹⁶ Allbeck, W., *Studies in the Lutheran Confessions*, Philadelphia, PA, Fortress Press, 1968, p. 287.

The ancient church had already dealt with the topic of the hypostatic (personal) union. It had rejected the Nestorian view, that “the two natures, the divine and the human, were united with one another, as two boards are glued together, so that they *realiter*, that is, in deed and truth, have no communion whatever with one another” (SD VIII, 14). Zwingli was repeating the old heresy of separating the two natures. The Fathers instead “explain the personal union and communion by the illustration ... of the soul and body, and of glowing iron. For the body and soul, as also fire and iron, have communion with each other, not ... by a phrase or mode of speaking, or in mere words, that is, so that it is to be a mere form of speech and mere words, but *vere* and *realiter* ... that is, in deed and truth” (SD VIII, 18-19). Thus it is correct to say not only that *Christ’s human nature* suffered and died, but that the *Son of God* suffered and died.

The Formula next presents the result of this personal union, the doctrine of the communication of attributes, or perhaps more accurately, communication of idioms. “‘Idiom’ is a term that refers to the attributes, activities or experiences that are peculiar either to the human or the divine nature in Christ.”¹⁷ This was treated at length in Chemnitz’s *De Duabus Naturis in Christo*, from which Article VIII is largely drawn. Article VIII does not use the technical language but gets the message across.

The first category we call the idiomatic genus, namely, that the properties of each nature are ascribed to the entire person, to the God-man. “That which is, indeed, an attribute of only one nature is ascribed not to that nature alone, as separate, but to the entire person” (SD VIII, 36).

The Sacramentarians (followers of Zwingli and Calvin, as well as Crypto-Calvinists) subtly undermined this truth. They ascribed attributes to the entire person of Christ, but meant by it only one nature. Zwingli invented the term *alloeosis* for this clever device. The Formula quotes Luther’s strong warning against such subterfuge. “Zwingli calls that an ALLOEOSIS when something is said of the divinity of Christ which really belongs to the humanity, or vice versa. As Luke 24, 26: “Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into His glory?” Here Zwingli juggles, asserting that the word Christ is understood of the human nature. Beware, beware, I say, of the ALLOEOSIS! For it is a devil’s mask, for at last it manufactures such a Christ after whom I certainly would not be a Christian; namely, that henceforth Christ should be no more and do no more with His sufferings and life than any other mere saint. For if I believe that only the human nature has suffered for me, then Christ is to me a poor Savior, then He Himself indeed needs a Savior. In a word, it is unspeakable what the devil seeks by the ALLOEOSIS” (SD VIII, 39-40).

The horrible implications of *alloeosis* were well understood by the authors of the Formula, for they further quote Luther: “We Christians must know that if God is not also in the balance, and gives the weight, we sink to the bottom with our scale. By this I mean: If it were not to be said, God has died for us, but only a man, we would be lost. But if “God’s death” and “God died” lie in the scale of the balance, then He sinks down, and we rise up as a light, empty scale. But indeed He can also rise again or leap out of the scale; yet He could not sit in the scale unless He became a man like us, so that it could be said: “God died,” “God’s passion,” “God’s blood,” “God’s death.” For in His nature God cannot die; but now that God and man are united in one person, it is correctly called God’s death, when the man dies who is one thing or one person with God” (SD VIII, 44).

The next category we call the *apotelesmatic genus*, namely, that “whatever the Savior did and still does to accomplish (His) blessed purpose may not be ascribed to either of His natures exclusively, but must be ascribed to both natures conjointly.”¹⁸ “Therefore Christ is our Mediator, Redeemer, King, High Priest, Head; Shepherd, etc., not according to one nature only, whether it be the divine: or the human, but according to both natures” (SD VIII, 47).

The last category we call the majestic genus, namely, that when the Son of God assumed the human nature, He imparted to it divine majesty, glory, and attributes. The Sacramentarians contended that Christ’s human: nature, even in the personal union with divinity, “has nothing, else and nothing more than only its, natural, essential properties ... and that, on this account, nothing should or could be ascribed to the human nature

¹⁷ Gawrisch, W., “The Practical Application of the Doctrine of the Two Natures in Christ”, *WLQ*, Vol. 82, Spring 1985, Number 2, pp. 103-104.

¹⁸ Koehler, E., *A Summary of Christian Doctrine*, St. Louis, MO, Concordia, 1939, p. 92.

in Christ which is beyond, or contrary to, its natural properties” (SD-VIII, 50). Thus how could Christ’s body and blood, for instance, be present wherever the Lord’s Supper is celebrated?

The authors of the Formula reference an abundance of Scripture passages plainly showing that divine majesty, attributes and works were imparted also to Christ’s human nature. Here is a sampling:

Jn 5:27 “He has given him authority to judge because he is the Son of Man.”

Mt 28:18 “All authority in heaven and earth has been given to me.”

Jn 3:35 “The Father loves the Son and has placed everything into his hands.”

Jn 13:3 “Jesus knew that the Father had put all things under his power.”

Whatever Scripture tells us that Jesus received while He was living on earth, He must have received according to the human nature, for the divine nature possessed it from all eternity! (SD VIII, 57) Even more directly the Scriptures attribute divine efficacy to Christ’s human nature in passages such as I Jn 1:7 “The blood of Jesus, his Son, purifies us from all sin” (SD VIII, 59). No passage better sums up the person of Christ than Col. 2:9 “In Christ all the fullness of the Deity lives in bodily form.”

The Crypto-Calvinists were fond of saying that their doctrine was that which had been taught by early church fathers. Indeed, Melancthon’s early wavering seemed to stem in part from an undue respect for the authority of the church fathers, instead of putting Scripture above all. But their view of church history was not unbiased. So Article VIII makes frequent reference to the teaching of the ancient orthodox church, showing that sound Lutheran Christology was different neither from Scripture nor from the doctrine of orthodox teachers through the ages.

The Formula makes a special point of explaining that Christ is also omnipresent in His human nature. “Also according to His assumed human nature and with the same, He can be, and also is, present where He will, and especially that in His Church and congregation on earth He is present as Mediator, Head, King, and High Priest” (SD VIII, 78).

The Formula concludes with a list of seven errors:

1. Christ’s human nature is mingled with the divine.
2. Christ’s human nature is an infinite essence.
3. Christ’s human nature has become equal with the divine.
4. Christ’s ubiquity is by a local mode.
5. Only Christ’s human nature suffered.
6. Christ is present with believers only in His divine nature.
7. Christ’s human nature has no real communion with his divine nature, but only in name.

Article VIII concludes by explaining that a wrong use of reason has led to the problems. Its closing words are timeless: “We admonish all Christians, since in the Holy Scriptures Christ is called a mystery upon which all heretics dash their heads, not to indulge in a presumptuous manner in subtle inquiries, concerning such mysteries, with their reason, ‘but with the venerated apostles simply to believe, to close the eyes of their reason, and bring into captivity their understanding to the obedience of Christ, 2 Cor. 10, 5, and to take comfort, and hence to rejoice without ceasing in the fact that our flesh and blood is placed so high at the right hand of the majesty. and almighty power of God. Thus we shall assuredly find constant consolation in every adversity, and remain well guarded from pernicious error” (SD VIII, 96).

The Epitome presents the Formula’s propositions in twelve affirmative theses. In twenty negative theses it expands on the errors listed in the Solid Declaration. It enumerates the Christological errors of ancient heresies as well as those of the Sacramentarians.

Final Thoughts

The Crypto-Calvinistic Controversy and Article VIII that it spawned sound forth both a note of warning and one of comfort. What is our touchstone for testing ideas, finding truth? Melancthon might have leaned toward, “What is scholarly?” Calvin might have leaned toward, “What is reasonable?” Luther would boldly profess, “What is Scriptural?” We all know that Scripture is the true source of absolute truth. But do we truly look there’ first for answers, ideas, growth?

How comfortable are we with questions for which we have no answer? Do we remember, as the book of Job reminds us that any attempt to explore the mysteries of God with human reason and speculation is an attempt to catch crocodiles with a fishhook (Job 41:1)?

What price are we willing to pay for true doctrinal unity? How easy it is to overlook seemingly small aberrancies so as to keep things pleasant and calm. How easy it is to avoid putting in the effort and work required to recognize false spirits masquerading as, angels of light.

We are surrounded by cults with blatant Christological errors (Mormons, Jehovah’s Witnesses, Unity, Baha’i, et al.). How well have we trained the saints to bear witness to the Person of Christ in this segment of this dark world?

But God is gracious to us! He has already pardoned our failures. He has promised that the gates of hell will not prevail against His Church, and He has proven it in history. He assures us that His Word will never pass away, and He deigns to use clay vessels such as us in preserving that Word.

What comfort we have in knowing that the infinite fullness of God is encompassed in the person of Jesus of Nazareth. It’s mind-boggling, “something like saying that all the water in the seven seas is contained in a pitcher held in one’s hand.”¹⁹ We need not wonder what God is like, for “God the One and Only, who is at the Father’s side, has made him known.” (Jn 1:18) We need not look for God in nature, or space, or in the mind of a brilliant philosopher. He is already with us in both His human and divine natures. He is specially with us in His Church and in His Supper. For He has a body, a body that shares in all the qualities of God. We need not wonder if God can understand what it’s like to be human, to walk in our shoes, to be one of us. He still is one of us—yet far above us at the same time. So only our unique Christ can take us from where we’re at, and lift us to the highest realms to be with Him. “Our citizenship is in heaven. And we eagerly await a Savior from there, the Lord. Jesus Christ, who by the power that enables him to bring everything under his control, will transform our lowly bodies so that they will be like his glorious body.” (Phil. 3:20-21) Even so, come, Lord Jesus!

¹⁹ Tjernagle, Dr. N. S., from a series of articles on the *Formula of Concord*, circa 1977.

Bibliography

Allbeck, W., *Studies in the Lutheran Confessions*, Philadelphia, PA, Fortress Press, 1968.

Becker, Dr. S., *God Manifest in Flesh: The Mystery of the Personal Union*, unpublished paper.

Concordia Triglotta, St. Louis, MO, Concordia, 1921.

Fritschel, G., *The Formula of Concord—Its Origin and Contents*, Philadelphia, PA, Lutheran Publication Society, 1916.

Gawrisch, W., *On Christology, Brenz and the Question of Ubiquity in No Other Gospel*, Milwaukee, WI, Northwestern Publishing House, 1980.

Gawrisch, W., “The Practical Application of the Doctrine of the Two Natures in Christ”, *WLQ*, Vol. 82, Spring 1985, Number 2.

Haar, T., *Article VIII—Formula of Concord*, 1987, unpublished paper.

Koehler, E., *A Summary of Christian Doctrine*, St. Louis, MO, Concordia, 1939. Klug, E., *Getting into The Formula of Concord*, St. Louis, MO, Concordia, 1977.

Teigen, B., *I Believe: A Study of the Formula of Concord*, Mankato, MN: Lutheran Synod Book Co., 1977.

Tjernagel, Dr. N. S., from a series of articles on the *Formula of Concord*, circa 1977.