

Concordia Theological Monthly



AUGUST

• 1951

Rome and the Lutheran Liturgy

By IRVIN ARKIN

AUTHOR'S NOTE.—The fundamental reason why this topic was chosen by the author is a rather deep-rooted curiosity of many Lutheran liturgiologists concerning Rome's views and reactions to Lutheran liturgics in general and the Lutheran Liturgical Movement in particular. This curiosity is whetted and agitated by the liturgical movement which is taking place presently in the Roman Church under the influence of the German Benedictines and the Austrian Augustinians. Such names as Ellard, Reinhold, and Hellriegel immediately bring to mind the vast task these men are undertaking in America to restore meaning to the liturgy for the Roman laity.

Also, the Lutheran liturgiologist cannot forget that in Rome today lie many of the same basic traditions which comprise his own liturgical thesaurus and background. Although he must differ radically in doctrine from the Roman Church, he, nevertheless, is ever aware of the vast storehouse of liturgical tradition which is present in the Roman See.

But a reason more immediate is an article which appeared in a recent Roman Catholic periodical in which its author tried to convey to his readers the impression that Lutheran liturgics are slowly bringing the Lutheran Church back to Rome.¹ The desire was created, therefore, to know the general consensus of Roman Catholic thought on this matter.

To our knowledge Rome has never issued a decretal or encyclical dealing with the Lutheran liturgy. Letters were therefore sent to various Roman Catholic seminaries, universities, abbeys, priories, monasteries, convents, and parishes, asking for honest reactions concerning this matter. The answers which were received were then culled, and the most clear and concise were set aside, excerpted, and organized. No authoritative statements are herewith quoted. None of the letters came with the *Nil Obstat* of a diocesan reviewer or the *Imprimatur* of a bishop. However, the material gathered from these letters can, for all practical purposes, be presented as a consensus of contemporary Roman Catholic thought. It is with this thought borne in mind that the material is herewith reviewed.

In looking at the Lutheran Liturgical Revival as it manifests itself in this age of a Lutheran renaissance, the Roman Catholic Church studies it as one would, in a sense, examine a scientific specimen, applying to it the various rules and propositions within the realm of certain knowledge. In the very title itself, "Lutheran Liturgical Revival," there lies the cause for a bit of eyebrow lifting on the part of the Roman Church. For the point is maintained that an investigation ought to ensue on our part as to why there is need for this liturgical revival, or, "liturgical movement."²

The purpose of such an investigation is obvious. For if one would place on the same plane adiaphora and inviolate dogma, the apparent discarding of certain adiaphoral practices would make the observer suspicious of the security and authority of the teachings of such a church body. To us such an investigation would prove less meaningful than it would to the Roman communion, for it is not our practice to place the arbitrary on the same level with the absolute, to equate ritual and dogma. Yet in view of the fact that such is their position regarding ritual and ceremony and in view of their teachings, it is understandable to the Lutheran liturgiologist why such a contention on their part is both natural and to be expected.

I

To comprehend to the fullest the Roman reaction to Lutheran liturgics, it is necessary first to investigate and attempt to understand the Roman viewpoint regarding this field of theology.

The center of Roman Catholic worship is bound up tightly in the framework of liturgies, for the heart of their devotional acts is the Eucharist, the Lord's Supper, as presented by means of certain definite and distinct outward visible ceremonies. But to the Roman Catholic these ceremonies must not take on the characteristic of individuality or be assembled in accordance with the whim and will of the celebrant. For even as the truths they express are objectively true, so, too, the ceremonies which express these truths must be assembled objectively and practiced uniformly.

The ceremonies of the liturgy of Rome are marked by sacredness and universality.³ The sacredness of liturgical services is necessary

because the service is an act of the worshiper to his God, who is the all-holy objective of our devotion and adoration. The ceremonies require the mark of universality, says Rome, because God Himself is universal, is all embracing, and is the Author of the service of worship. This is His service; this is the service of His desire and command. Therefore the service must take on His mark of universality. And even as God never changes, but is always the same, so too must the liturgical practices of the Church be as stable as possible. "We may go further and say the Liturgy is the service of God. It is that service of worship which God desires and can demand as Lord, Creator, and Judge of mankind. The Lord, and not the servant, determines *how* this service must be rendered, *what* must be done, and *when* and *where* it is to be done." ⁴

In a sense, therefore, liturgies are the objective ceremonies wherein are represented and symbolized the objective truths of God. Liturgies are the visible aids whereby the dogmas of the Church, though clear in themselves, are made more discernible to the faithful.⁵ Also these ceremonies satisfy the desire of man to shower the Almighty with his love and adoration. It is the natural instinct of man to bestow gifts upon those whom he loves. So it is also in the manifestation of man's love and devotion to God.

The objective independence and validity of ceremony relies completely and totally, says Rome, on the objective reality and validity of the Sacraments therein expressed. To the Roman Church, in viewing and commenting on any Lutheran liturgical act, be it progressive or regressive, the underlying thought after which will be patterned their critique is the assumption that for ceremonies to be valid the Sacraments which they assist must be valid; otherwise you have merely an empty shell. And since Rome denies the validity of our Sacraments, it is not surprising to find their reaction to a Lutheran liturgy as being rather condescending in expression, but intolerant in opinion.

II

The relationship existing between man and liturgics was mentioned. The opinion was presented that liturgics, comprising ceremony and rite over the firm layer of truth, draws man by his

senses to worship his Creator. This opinion is maintained by the Roman Church as a judgment based on an empirical investigation into the nature of man. Even in his daily living man takes recourse to rite and ceremony.⁶ In view of this fact it is but natural that the Church, which must be all things to all men, must take into consideration the drives and dynamics operative and inherent in man. The Roman Church thus finds it difficult to understand the why and wherefore of the general Protestant attitude in this respect.⁷ By this ability of man, his sensuously perceptive nature, he is instinctively drawn to beauty. And this trait in man, this appreciation of beauty, present in man by the very nature of man, enables him, Rome insists, to worship in beauty and truth. Moreover, this love of beauty has both purpose and end. For the purpose of the love of beauty is to lead man to the end, the Beauty which is God.⁸ This aesthetical aid, which the liturgy is, needs a heart of stable truth, truth which has its roots in dogma.

III

Rome examines liturgy and dogma as correlatives in the light of her own dogmatic assertions. Dogma is that which is believed to be true. Dogma requires authority. Authority to the Roman Catholic requires Peter. Therefore, the fundamental trouble with Lutheran liturgics, according to Rome, is its source—"an act of wilful rebellion against authority."⁹ Luther's rebellion negated Rome's certainty of sure knowledge and valid dogma. This presents an insurmountable difficulty, since liturgy, in the "true" sense of the word, demands and necessitates a faith in the Real Presence, for "if there is no belief in the Real Presence of our Lord Jesus in the Holy Eucharist . . . then the rites and ceremonies of the liturgy have lost their meaning and purpose of existence."¹⁰

The assertion that liturgy as such demands faith in the Real Presence can, however, be misunderstood and therefore must be presented more definitely. For Rome it means the popish doctrine of transubstantiation. Liturgy is the thread that binds us to history, and history demands historical universal faith, and this, says Rome, in turn demands belief in transubstantiation.¹¹ To this

one is forced to say "*non sequitur*." It is obvious that, in the viewpoint of the Roman See, ceremony and ritual are of little or no effect without the fundamental doctrine of transubstantiation.¹² Any other theory or doctrine of the Real Presence is null and void, for the truth of the Sacraments is hinged to the concept, Rome says, of *gratia infusa* and not to the evangelistic concept of *fidem confirmans*.

Liturgy and dogma are joined together by the bar of truth, and one cannot rightly assert having the one without having also the other. One may have liturgy *in specie sed non in veritate*. Purity of liturgy demands and cannot rightly exist without purity of dogma. And purity of dogma, purity of teaching, requires an absolute authority by which the dogma may be retained in its pristine purity; the liturgy in turn may be retained in like manner.¹³

Therefore the Church of Rome has appropriated as its own personal, private, nontrespassable property the centuries of liturgical traditions which constitute the so-called Western Rite. On the other hand, the Lutheran liturgiologist, in the course of his research, finds himself studying in effect the same traditions. That this is so is neither startling nor surprising, since both churches use basically the Western Rite. However, the Roman Church, in viewing such research, in believing the Western Rite to be hers alone, and in viewing liturgy and dogma as inseparable, is amazed at the one-sidedness of the Lutheran liturgiologist. For here is a man steeped in Western tradition, who, nevertheless, rejects many Roman doctrines. This interest on the part of the Lutheran Church in these Western traditions, which Lutherans believe to be their heritage as well as the heritage of the Roman Church, must needs bring a question to the front on the part of the Romans: Why accept our *traditions* and not our dogma?¹⁴ That such questions are asked is due to the fact that Lutheranism is regarded as a piece of truth that cut itself off from the source of truth, but which nevertheless is striving blindly for truth. In the so-viewed one-sided liturgical movement extant in Protestantism, especially in Lutheranism, which seemingly strives after the rites of Rome without the doctrinal requisites of Rome, Rome can only hope that this rather illogical progression will one day be replaced by one which is to Rome more logical and pleasing.

IV

Two points yet remain. The first of these is the consideration of Martin Luther and the Sacraments. Again it must be stressed that the Roman Catholic looks upon liturgy and dogma as a union which man must not put asunder. Therefore the Lutheran liturgy must be and is examined by Rome in the light of the proximity of its adherence to the Lutheran Rite and in the light of its adherence to Roman dogma. In view of the fact that the Lutheran liturgy is wedded to Lutheran dogma, it becomes necessary to investigate Rome's view of Luther and the Sacraments. Luther, she claims, took his followers out of the Church when he himself left the Church. And what is this "Church"? It is the organization founded upon the rock of Peter. Since the sub-Apostolic period of history the Church has been envisioned and figured by various and sundry forms. One of these is the figure of a ship. Like all ships, the Church, too, must, in the course of history, pass through storms and gales of dispute and conflagration. But, Rome maintains, the fundamental fault with Luther was that he deserted the ship, leaped from it never to return.¹⁵

In his *Babylonian Captivity*, Luther rejected the Roman sacramental system. But primarily he denied, in the Roman view, the heart of Rome's worship, the canon of the Mass and the doctrine of transubstantiation. Luther, they insist, did not believe in the Real Presence,¹⁶ and since this is the core of all liturgical action, the question begins to take form as to the "why" of the entire liturgical movement existing today in the Lutheran Church. Though every Lutheran will challenge the contention that Luther did not believe in the Real Presence, nevertheless, from the Roman point of view, this is a statement of truth and can be agreed upon, provided one is willing to equate Real Presence and transubstantiation.

The accusation is therefore made that Luther abolished the Mass, dispensed with the Sacraments, lacked faith in the Real Presence, and, for all practical purposes, dispensed with a sacramental liturgy. These views regarding Luther and the Sacraments are the underlying thought patterns forming the foundation for the reaction of Rome to the Lutheran liturgy. If these accusations are

true, then one is faced with a dilemma. If one remains within the Lutheran system, one cannot have a "sacramental liturgy"; and if one would have this "sacramental liturgy," then one cannot remain within the Lutheran Church. Whether the two are mutually exclusive we need not discuss. However, for point of observation it must be noted that for the Roman this is a true dilemma: two mutually exclusive propositions, for which there can be no synthesis, are set forth. However, there is a hypothetical facet upon which Rome makes comment. Though there cannot be a valid synthesis in dealing with two propositions of this dilemma, one can, nevertheless, conceive of an apparent synthesis, namely, the adding of the ritual of "right" to the dogma of "wrong." In doing this one may appear to have found a synthesis, but one must examine what actually has been done. The accidents of worship may have been added, but not the reality thereof. The service, it is claimed, may look more interesting, more eye pleasing, but that is all. The service is still "shadow instead of substance."¹⁷

Rome's theologians insist that the relation between Luther and the Sacraments, and therefore between the Lutheran Church and the Sacraments, is such as to negate even the possibility of a Lutheran liturgical *revival* in the true sense of the word. To have a proper and valid revival necessitates the restoration of the seven Roman sacraments as well as the acceptance of the total doctrine of the "total Church," the Roman system of dogmatics. If the Lutheran liturgical system develops itself around the two Sacraments of its own rite, then, in the eyes of Rome, it is incomplete and invalid and therefore no system at all. Furthermore, by no means can the Lutherans aspire to reality without sacerdotal succession. In view of the intimate union between liturgy and dogma, and in view of Luther's own position in regard to the Sacraments, it is really impossible for the reflecting Roman to conceive of a liturgical restoration in the Lutheran Church. Liturgy is the dress of a reality. To restore liturgy implies the *a priori* possession of that dogmatic reality. But since the reality itself is missing from the Lutheran Church, it cannot *restore* liturgy, it can merely *appropriate* it.¹⁸ Thus, though the dress be present, the core remains absent.

V

The final facet to be investigated in order to comprehend realistically the Roman Catholic reaction to the Lutheran liturgy is the concept of the term "sacrament." To the Roman mind there is a firm line of faith which unites the concept of Church with the concept of "sacrament." They regard the *communio sanctorum* as a *communio sacramentorum*. To separate the one from the other is to present an untenable and impossible situation, for the sacraments are indispensable for the very existence of the Church and for the effecting of man's salvation. The Church and the sacraments cannot be separated. Where the Church is, there are the sacraments. To place this into a concrete situation: true sacraments demand the reality of the true Church and vice versa. Since, Rome says, the Lutheran Church is not the true Church, its Sacraments are not true. That its Sacraments are not true (and therefore its Church not true) is evident from the fact that, in spite of all ceremony, Lutheranism lacks a valid priesthood. In a previous chapter it was pointed out that Rome views the worth of any ceremony and rite in accordance with the reality which the rite and ceremony seeks to dress and adorn. If the ceremonies are employed to adorn unreal or invalid sacraments, then these same ceremonies are of no real value, but are merely vain show and pageantry. This, Rome asserts, must be borne in mind as you view the Lutheran liturgy, for, owing to the broken line in the Lutheran priesthood from Apostolic times, it is improper to speak of Lutheranism as having valid Sacraments.

Until fairly recently Rome has merely presented this bicategorical statement. There are churches with valid orders (Rome, Orthodox, Uniat), and there are churches without valid orders (Protestantism). However, of late there have been various instances in Protestantism, especially in Anglicanism, where Protestants have been ordained by Orthodox bishops. Naturally such an action presents to Rome an acute problem. She recognizes the validity of Orthodox orders. She believes that Orthodox bishops are properly consecrated and therefore can properly and validly impart Apostolic orders. In accordance with her own teaching she must, therefore, accept as valid and effective, the orders of such Protestants as are ordained by Orthodox bishops. As stated, such

a situation presented a problem to the Church of Rome until an answer was found. "Although we must say that in such a case his ordination would be valid and therefore his consecration of the Sacred Species in Mass also valid and effective, yet, as St. Augustine says, he is a thief and doing something to which he has no right and therefore endangering his soul to eternal punishment."¹⁹

But what of the Lutheran Church, which, in Rome's view, has no valid orders and yet believes in the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist? Rome suggests a unique dogmatic — the "Eucharist of Desire," a charitable take-off on the doctrine of the Baptism of Desire.

VI

In view of these underlying concepts which make up the general thought pattern of the Roman Catholic Church, it is not surprising when the Lutheran liturgiologist meets with adverse criticism in regard to the general field of liturgics. The Lutheran Church is regarded as a branch which cut itself off from the true Vine. In keeping with this simile, therefore, Lutheran liturgics are regarded as an attempt, and an "inadequate" attempt at that, to attach to the divorced branch of heresy the leaves and appearance of orthodoxy.²⁰ Liturgy and dogma are inseparable. They are a unity dedicated to God which serve to proclaim to the world the truth of God. If a church lacks doctrinal security, the very foundation and strength of all rite and ceremony, how can such a church have a liturgy in the proper sense of the word? The doctrinal variances which exist in Lutheranism prove to Rome the lack of catholicity in its dogma. A lack of catholicity in dogma means a lack of catholicity in liturgy. Since it has been pointed out that the validity of the one depends on the reality of the other, and that one of the essential marks of any liturgy is its catholicity, or universality, therefore, in view of all this, Lutheranism can merely strive for a liturgy, but can never articulate its desire in a true liturgy.²¹

One of the fundamental faults of the Lutheran Liturgical Revival or of any non-Catholic liturgical revival, Rome insists, is its approach. The very fact that many Lutherans and sectarians are becoming engaged in liturgical research is indicative of a genuine conscientious spirit of searching for that which is right and proper.

However, to the Roman mind, this zeal is manifesting itself in an improper approach. Instead of becoming involved in ceremonial or peripheral research, it would be more profitable to such liturgically curious people if they would rather begin by re-studying honestly their dogmas and those of the Roman Church. "Personally your efforts seem vain and worthless to me. If you are honestly looking for the truth, you are going about it in the wrong way. It would be better to get the facts — pray for the grace of faith."²² In doing this with sincerity of intent the inevitable result will be the effecting of a dogmatic substance around which a liturgical sheath can validly be constructed. Naturally such a dogmatic foundation would be the return to the "fold of Peter" of all those who broke away, a return to the authority of the Pope.

Unless this approach, therefore, of striving to restore the reality of dogma and then to restore ritual and ceremony is taken, all is rather purposeless. Dogma, Rome declares, must first be restored. To insist that Lutheranism has the Mass is to insist on what is confessionally impossible. To have the Mass is to have transubstantiation. Yet this very fundamental requirement is virtually impossible, not because of divine teaching or prescription, but because a mere man, Martin Luther, on the basis of fallible human reason, discarded this basic dogma. Because it is built on the sand of uncertainty, therefore, the Lutheran Liturgical Revival is doomed to failure. Any success which it might have would be purely accidental and incidental.²³ Its success cannot be real because reality itself is discarded. It may increase the devotion of its adherents to its own false doctrines, but such cannot be called true success.

VII

It neither surprises nor startles the Lutheran liturgiologist that Rome presents some adverse criticism as she views the Lutheran Liturgical Revival. In view of the various *a priori* considerations which form the foundation for Roman thought, it would be more startling and surprising if there were a complete absence of opposition. However, *in omnibus veritas*. To say that Rome can find no merit at all in the Lutheran liturgy would be to do an injustice to Rome. In spite of her traditional legalistic dogmatism one must not, in all honesty, ascribe to her only an attitude of sheer neg-

ativism. In her reflections on the Lutheran liturgy and the liturgical revival, she at times fosters a relatively positive opinion. Such an opinion, however, never takes on the character of absolute positivism. That this is so is rather obvious and cannot, naturally, be conceived of as otherwise. Rome's positivism must be interpreted as relative to, or in the light of, her *a priori* judgments.

In presenting her positive reactions to the Lutheran Liturgical Revival, Rome has asserted her applause and commendation for the movement especially in view of the times in which the Church presently finds itself. For the first time in centuries the Church has been faced with the threat of dire and severe persecutions. The world is in a chaotic state and lives under the threat of war and destruction. Especially in these times, therefore, there is need for a strengthening of faith and of spirit through the Christian truths. This strengthening can most effectively be accomplished via the liturgy.²⁴ In view of this, one finds a definite positive reaction on the part of Rome.

But along with the secular evils which try the faith of the Church, there are also the evils which creep into the Church and try to rob it of its very heart and soul. Rome expresses its delight in the Lutheran liturgy as a bulwark against the two evils of pietism and excessive individualism,²⁵ both of which had their harmful effects on the Church in the eighteenth century. A liturgical Church, because of the very nature and essence of liturgy, presents itself as a defender against these twin forces. But, what is more and of greater concern to both Rome and Wittenberg, it presents a rather strong force to combat the inroads of Calvinism with its iconoclastic intent. Rome admits the liturgy of Luther as being of a positive liturgical nature and content, but frowns on the result of the Reformed influence on liturgical thinking in the world. That the Lutheran Church, nominally a Protestant Church, should strive for liturgical worship presents to Rome a heart-warming sight.

The final category of Rome's positive reactions to the Lutheran liturgy can be classed under the general heading of "relative or narrow positivism." It is positive in the sense that it encourages further progress in the liturgical field. It is positive in that it rejoices in the work which has been done by the Lutheran liturgiologists. However, its positivism is relative in the sense that it

is stated in the light of the formerly stated *a priori* judgments. In brief, they are stated in the light of the requirements, in Rome's view, for a valid liturgy, a valid sacrament, a valid authority. She maintains that she applauds any liturgical research on the part of the Lutherans. She does not begrudge the Lutherans the joy of studying the liturgy. After all, she believes, it is her liturgy that they are studying, for she claims to be its rightful owner. Furthermore, blinded by her own conceit, she firmly believes that such a study will result in the inevitable return, not only to the traditional liturgy of Rome, but also to the traditional theology of Rome.

VIII

When the Roman Catholic extends a pro or a con opinion regarding the Lutheran Liturgical Revival, one finds that the ultimate reaction of the Roman Catholic is the hope and desire for union, for an end to the schism between East and West, and for the healing of the wounds caused by the "heretic" Luther. That this should be the final and ultimate desire of Rome is completely in accord with the various judgments which she presents as the foundation for the judging and examining of any non-Catholic liturgy. However, in expressing this desire, she presents them in a threefold manner. The first is the simple expression of the desire of union "that all may be one."²⁶

She recognizes the need for unity. And, furthermore, she realizes the basic cause for disunity as being vain, foolish pride. However, rather than seeing the error of her own ways and the false contents of her own dogmatic system, she, in looking at the Lutheran liturgy, proclaims that if pride could be overcome (and she means Lutheran pride), then unity could be accomplished.²⁷ She further looks upon the Liturgical Revival as a step, a progressive movement in the right direction, and that direction is "home to Rome." However, until this return to Rome has been accomplished, Rome will continue to maintain that there will always be something lacking in Lutheranism, and that the Lutheran clergy will continue to deprive their people of their rightful inheritance of the true doctrine of Christ and the "grace-infusing" sacraments.²⁸

What is Rome's view of the Lutheran liturgy and the modern Liturgical Revival? To understand fully her reactions and reflec-

tions, we have stated the various *a priori* judgments which must be taken into consideration, for they make up the foundation of her thinking. Basically her view is this: The Lutheran liturgy can do no more than increase the devotion of its people to its own peculiar set of doctrines. It cannot accomplish, in the true sense of the word, a sacramental way of life nor a liturgical way of living. The Lutheran Liturgical Revival is faced, according to Rome, with two equally distasteful eventualities. Either it will result in sheer formalism (since pure content, she maintains, is impossible), or else it will result in a return to "Mother Rome."²⁹ This is the final hope of Rome.

Rome looks and beholds. She examines in detail and then concludes. She sees the Lutheran liturgiologist handling things which she views as her own personal private property. Ritual, ceremony, vestments, terminology, all fall under the discerning eye of the Liturgical Revival and under the critical eye of Rome. She has presented a series of *a priori* judgments on which must be based all liturgical thinking and action. The Lutheran liturgiologist agrees with many of these judgments as such and disagrees with some of their extensions. Liturgy, Rome declares, is merely the outward sign of an inner reality. In this declaration the Lutheran can completely concur. For the Church of the Augsburg Confession, in its approach to liturgics, has always stressed their value as a teaching aid, an approach which presupposes the presence of a pure doctrinal core.

But here Rome poses a crucial question. She sees the Lutheran Liturgical Revival, but fails to comprehend it. It is illogical, she maintains, to continue in the path we are now following. If liturgics have a purpose and also a need, and if that need is doctrinal truth and purity, then what will keep Lutheranism from returning to Rome, the source and dispenser of all truth and wisdom? On this the Lutheran liturgiologist must take a firm stand and voice his objection.

Rome wants the Lutheran liturgiologist to return to her. Yet the Lutheran must make a like request. He must ask and pray that Rome return to the true teaching of Christ and cast off her anthropocentric heresy of justification by faith *and* works, of salvation by the personal merit of man *via gratia infusa*. Liturgy, it is

true, needs doctrinal truth for survival; however, that doctrinal purity can never exist in the Roman See as long as she holds to her false teachings.

Liturgy expresses truth, and that truth rests in Christ Jesus, who gave Himself for us that He might redeem us from our sins. Justification by faith alone, without the deeds of the Law, is, and ever must remain, the core of every liturgical action. It is this doctrine which determines a rite's validity and true reality. On this the Lutheran Church must stand. On this the Lutheran liturgiologist must base all his liturgical thinking. For on this, and only on this, can one build truth. Rome in her *a priori* judgments on liturgics has voiced the opinion that any ritual, unless it is based on truth, is null, void, vain, and worthless. In this very precept she has condemned herself and her entire liturgical framework.

Rome views the Lutheran liturgy and must of necessity condemn it, for she has a false conception of the core of liturgics. To her the core is the vast web and mesh of work-righteousness which makes up her theological system. If Rome condemns the Lutheran liturgy because it is based on justification by faith alone, then the Lutheran liturgiologist must welcome this condemnation, for then he is being condemned for believing what is right and true and not false and a mockery of the holy name of God.

St. Louis, Mo. — Bronx, N. Y.

NOTES

1. "Lutheran High Church Described," the *St. Louis Register*, August 18, 1950.
2. Letter No. 42. For obvious reasons it was deemed advisable not to publish the correspondents' names. All letters are in the author's files and are numbered. In the following references the letters are designated merely by numerals. (ED. COM.)
3. Letter No. 5.
4. Letter No. 13.
5. Letter No. 16.
6. Letter No. 23.
7. Letter No. 6.
8. Letter No. 8.
9. Reinhold, The Rev. H. A., "Extramural Liturgical Movements," *Orate Fratres*, XX (October 6, 1946), 503.
10. Letter No. 21.
11. Letter No. 18.
12. Letter No. 22.
13. Letter No. 2.
14. Letter No. 34.
15. Letter No. 4.
16. Letter No. 1.
17. Letter No. 9.
18. Letter No. 22.
19. Letter No. 29.
20. Letter No. 55.
21. Letter No. 7.
22. Letter No. 30.
23. Letter No. 24.
24. Letter No. 27.
25. Letter to author from E. P., Oct. 19, 1950.
26. "Liturgical Briefs," *Orate Fratres*, XX (October 6, 1946) 524.
27. Letter No. 49.
28. Letter No. 51.
29. Letter No. 25.