

Concordia Theological Monthly

Continuing

LEHRE UND WEHRE
MAGAZIN FUER EV.-LUTH. HOMILETIK
THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY-THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY

Vol. XIII

September, 1942

No. 9

CONTENTS

	Page
Leading Thoughts on Eschatology in the Epistles to the Thessalonians. L. Fuerbringer	641
False Principia Cognoscendi in Theology. W. H. T. Dau	654
Luther: A Blessing to the English. William Dallmann	662
Henry Melchior Muehlenberg. W. G. Polack	673
What Makes for Effective Preaching? J. H. C. Fritz	684
Outlines on the Wuerttemberg Epistle Selections	692
Miscellanea	699
Theological Observer. — Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches	709
Book Review. — Literatur	716

Ein Prediger muss nicht allein weiden, also dass er die Schafe unterweise, wie sie rechte Christen sollen sein, sondern auch daneben den Woelfen wehren, dass sie die Schafe nicht angreifen und mit falscher Lehre verfuehren und Irrtum einfuehren.

Luther

Es ist kein Ding, das die Leute mehr bei der Kirche behaelt denn die gute Predigt. — *Apologie, Art. 24*

If the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle? — *1 Cor. 14:8*

Published for the
Ev. Luth. Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States
CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, St. Louis, Mo.



Miscellanea

Extra-Lutheran Witnesses for the Papacy as the Antichrist

It is sometimes stated by men who apparently are not well acquainted with the literature on the Antichrist that the identification of the Papacy with the Antichrist is a doctrine peculiar to the Lutheran Confessions and in particular to the Synodical Conference and its associates. Over against this supposition we could easily fill reams of paper with quotations from authors who were definitely not "Missourian" in their doctrinal and confessional stand. But from the great mass of literature we select only two excerpts which definitely show that students of Holy Scripture and the history and usages of the Church have been compelled to see in the Papacy the "Antichrist," "the man of sin" spoken of in various passages of Holy Writ, notably in Daniel, 2 Thessalonians, 1 John 2, and the Book of Revelation.

Our first witness is a treatise called *The Lantern of Light*, written about the year 1400. It contains three chapters of special interest in this connection, namely, "What Is Antichrist in General?" "What Is Antichrist in Special with His Three Parties?" and "What Is Antichrist in Special with Five Conditions?" Chapter IV of this treatise reads literally:

"Of the great chief Antichrist that in a special manner bringeth forth false laws against Jesus Christ and pretendeth himself to be most holy, the Lord God thus teacheth by the prophet Isaiah 9. (ver. 15.) A man of great age and worshipful, holden of the world, he is head and chief Antichrist. A prophet or a preacher teaching leasing, he is the tail of this Antichrist. Of this tail speaketh St. Peter more plainly and saith, These are spiritual merchants that shall chaffer with the people in feigned words, and with their sugar-likorous speech they beguile the hearts of the innocents.¹⁾ For Jude saith, They shall worship the persons of men because of winning. This tail of Antichrist shall not preach freely."

Various passages are then quoted, Rev. 13:16, 17; 14:9—11; Zech. 11:15, 17; Rom. 8:9; Rev. 16:10, 11, with an application of them to the Romish prelates of that day. Then follows: "Lincoln²⁾ saith, 'I quake, I dread, I am in horror, I am afraid, but I dare not be still, lest peradventure that sentence fall on me which the prophet saith, Isaiah 6, Wo to me, for I have stilled. The well, the beginning, and the cause of all ruin and mischief IS THE COURT OF ROME.' Now, by the one authority of God, and one accordance of his holy saints, follows an open conclusion firmly grounded in true belief, that in the court of Rome

1) Simple people.

2) Grosthead. He resisted the Pope's profligate demand that he should allow an Italian boy to hold a benefice in his diocese. For this he was cited to Rome; the near view he had of the papal court fully convinced him it was Antichrist.

is the head of Antichrist, and in prelates is the body of Antichrist, but in those clouted sects, as monks, canons, and friars, is the venomous tail of Antichrist.

“How this Antichrist shall be destroyed, God himself teacheth by the prophet Daniel and saith, This Antichrist shall be destroyed without hands, that is, without power of man. For Paul saith, 2 Thess. 2, Christ shall slay Antichrist with the spirit of his mouth, that is, with the holy word of his law. And the Lord shall destroy him with the shining of his coming, that is, with turning of men’s hearts by his grace, to his law, a little before the doom.”

Our second witness is John Jewell, prominent English divine, Bishop of Salisbury, who in the middle of the sixteenth century published his *Exposition upon the Two Epistles of the Apostle St. Paul to the Thessalonians*. We quote from his discussion of 2 Thess. 2:3 f.: “The most cruel of any (oppressions) that ever were, are, or shall be, is the cruelty of ANTICHRIST. By him the church of God shall suffer great tribulations, such as were not from the beginning of the world; and then shall his fury increase and his tyranny be the greater, when his kingdom shall decay, and the days of his desolation shall be at hand. Primasius saith, ‘Then shall Babylon come to the ground, when she shall last of all take power to persecute the saints of God.’ For then will God arise, and will judge His own cause; He will deliver the afflicted, and will slay Antichrist with the breath of His mouth.

“Let us look into the church of Rome, and behold the usage and behavior thereof. Where shall we find that heavenly comeliness which St. Paul requires? Where is the comfortable reading of the Scriptures? Where are the people taught their salvation in Christ Jesus? Where is the brotherly meeting of all the congregation at the communion of the Lord’s supper? May we say of Rome, that it holds fast the form and fashion of that church which Christ and his apostles left unto us, and which the holy ancient fathers continued? Nay, rather, we may say of them with Chrysostom, ‘They may have the chests and coffers wherein the treasures were sometimes kept, but the treasures they have not.’ We may say, It is not now a house of prayer, but a den of thieves: we may say, It shall no more be called Bethel, the house of God, but Bethaven, the house of vanity, or of lying.

“Jupiter and Bacchus, and the idols of the heathen, were not so dishonored of their worshipers, as the almighty and everlasting and only true God is dishonored in that synagogue. I speak of Rome as it is now, and as it hath been these many years. For in the time of our elder fathers, it had great testimony of true holiness. Ignatius called it ‘most chaste.’ Tertullian said, it was a happy church, because the apostles of Christ suffered martyrdom in it, and left their whole doctrine unto it.³⁾ And in like sort did others give unto Rome, as it was in those times, reverend and worthy commendation. But now saith he, O Rome, how much art thou changed from the old Rome! Thou which

3) Ignatius was martyred at Rome, A. D. 107. Tertullian lived at the commencement of the third century.

has been the chief in all the world, art now the chief in all naughtiness. They have forsaken the manner of life, and the love of the Gospel, which they of old time had in Rome, and therefore cannot be inheritors of their commendation.

“Thus the apostle speaketh of Antichrist: he is the man of sin, and the son of perdition. It will be somewhat hard to treat of this matter and to open the words of this Scripture. Whatsoever I shall speak, it will be ill taken of many, and many will doubt of the truth of my speech; such affection they bear to him whom the apostle deciphereth to be Antichrist. Albeit whatsoever I utter in opening the apostle’s words shall be such, as the Holy Scriptures and learned writings of the holy fathers have left unto us, and the church of God hath proved, and at this day doth prove to be true.

“But what shall he do whereby he may be known? Paul saith, *Which is an adversary.* This shall be the mark whereby you may know him; he shall set himself against God, and against Christ, for he is an enemy of the cross of Christ. Why then, say you, are not the Jews, and Mahomet, and the Turk, either all, or the most wicked of them, so called, seeing they utterly refuse all Christian religion? Because none of these sit in the temple of God, which is the place where Antichrist shall advance himself; and because Antichrist shall not in open show set himself against Christ, as doth Mahomet, and the Turk, but subtly and craftily, like an evil and ungracious servant. He will not openly speak his blasphemies, or spit at the gospel of God, or defy the name of Christ; but he will call himself ‘the servant of God’; perhaps, ‘the vicar of Christ’; and perhaps, ‘the servant of God’s servants’; or perhaps, ‘the head, or the chief member of the church.’⁴⁾ He shall say he is led with the zeal of God’s house, and shall do nothing less; for he shall seek himself; he shall say, he seeks the glory of God, when all that he doth is for the enriching and ambitious enlarging of his own worldly pomp and vanity.

“In matters of princes, if any man take upon him the name of an ambassador, or deputy to a prince, having no commission thereto, and in this boldness presume to levy and raise a power, and force the subjects to follow him, although he work all this under the name, and by the color of the prince’s authority, as is the manner of rebels to do, yet he is a traitor, and his doings are not well thought of because he deals in the prince’s matters without warrant from the prince.

“Even so Antichrist; he shall come in the name of Christ, Yet will he do all things against Christ, and under pretence and color of serving Christ; he shall devour the sheep and people of Christ; he shall deface whatsoever Christ hath taught; he shall quench that fire which Christ hath kindled; those plants which Christ hath planted he shall root up; he shall undermine that house which Christ hath built; he shall be contrary to Christ; his faith contrary to the faith of Christ, and his life contrary to the life of Christ. Is any man desirous to see Antichrist? His coming shall be notable; it shall astonish the world. By this mark you may know him; he shall be contrary to Christ. To show you at large this

4) Titles assumed by the Popes.

contrariety, by comparison of things contrary in Christ and Antichrist, would ask long time. It shall be sufficient that we consider only some few wherein they are manifestly contrary, that by them judgment may be made of the residue.

“St. Paul saith, Heb. 10: With one offering hath he consecrated forever them that are sanctified. And again: We are sanctified by the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once made. What is he then that saith, I make priests to offer a daily sacrifice for the sins of the people, by whom the offering up of the body of Christ is made every day? He is contrary to Christ; he is Antichrist.

“St. Paul saith, Eph. 1: God hath appointed Christ over all things, to be the Head of the church. What is he then, which saith, I am the head of the church? which saith, All the churches of God are knit in me; you must understand as I understand; you must hear with mine ears, and see with mine eyes; I will govern and direct you? He is contrary to Christ; this is Antichrist.

“Christ ordained that the communion should be ministered under both kinds, Matt. 26: — What is he, then, that delivers it to the people but under one kind? He is contrary to Christ: he breaks the first institution of the Lord’s supper; he is Antichrist.

“Christ saith, John 18: My kingdom is not of this world.— What is he then, which saith, I am lord of lords, and king of kings: I have right to both swords; my power and authority reacheth over all the kingdoms of the world? He is contrary to Christ; he is Antichrist. Christ washed his disciples’ feet, John 13.— What is he then, that gives his feet to be kissed of kings and emperors? He is contrary to Christ; he is Antichrist. Christ paid tribute to Caesar, Matt. 17.— What is he then, that exempts himself and his clergy from the temporal sword and authority? He is contrary to Christ; he is Antichrist.

“Christ allowed marriage, and reproveth fornication.— What is he, then, that allows fornication and forbids marriage? He is contrary to Christ; he is Antichrist. Christ saith, John 5: Search the Scriptures.— What is he then which saith, Give not that which is holy to dogs, neither cast pearls before swine; ye may not search the Scriptures? He is contrary to Christ; he is Antichrist. These are the certain and undoubted marks of Antichrist.

“Here methinks I see the secret motions of your heart. You look that I should name THE BISHOP OF ROME, that it is he who hath suffered himself to be called by the name of God. I will not tell you in mine own words. Unless the bishop himself so speak, I will not tell you. Mark then, and witness of my indifferency,⁵⁾ whilst I speak hereof; that I follow not affection, but deal uprightly. Therefore I say again, unless the bishop himself suffer himself to be called by the name of God, I will not say of him so.

“Then let us see what he has written of himself, and what he has suffered others to write. Pope Nicholas saith, (Dist. 96): It is well known, that the pope was called God by the godly prince Constantine.

5) Impartiality.

And therefore pope Pius, in his bull, saith, No man dare obey her, (queen Elizabeth,) or her will, or commandments, or laws, upon pain of our curse.⁶⁾

“The pope was well content to suffer Christopher Marcellus, one of his parasites in the council of Lateran,⁷⁾ to say unto him, ‘Thou art another God in earth.’ The pope is content so to have a division of tenures made between him and God, as the poet Virgil some time flatteringly wrote: ‘The emperor divides his rule, and holds half with Jupiter.’ In the Extravagants it is set down, ‘Our Lord God the pope.’⁸⁾ Mark these words: Our Lord God the pope. In them the pope is called Lord, and is called God. Oh! merciful Lord God, who from the heavens beholdest this vanity, how great is thy mercy in suffering this?

“I devise not this; his own books, his own doctors, his own decrees and decretals, speak it, and set it down. ‘To believe that our Lord God the pope might not decree, as he decreed, it were a matter of heresy;’⁹⁾ it is so written there, he has heard it, he has seen it, he knows it is so, yet he suffers it to go abroad, and thereby suffers himself to be called God.¹⁰⁾ He has burnt many saints of God and holy men, for no other cause, but for the profession of the Gospel. He has in many places burnt the Holy Bible, and such books as teach nothing but godliness. Where did he ever burn—what speak I of burning? where may it appear that ever he controlled any for so writing, or called in such speeches?

“But you say, The pope at this day is not called God; he rather abases himself, and writes himself by a title of humility, and is called, The servant of servants. Be it so, that he is so called, and so written. Yet he is king of kings, and lord of lords. This servant saith, I do make holy the unholy; I do justify the wicked; I do forgive sins; I open and no man shutteth.—This servant can say, Whosoever obeyeth not me, he shall be rooted out.—This servant may dispense with any commandment of the Old and New Testament.—‘This servant has Christ’s lieutenantship, not only over things in heaven, over things in earth, and over things in hell, but also over the angels, both good and bad.’ No man may judge this servant; for they say, ‘The pope is exempted

6) “We do command and interdict all and every the noblemen, subjects, people, and others as aforesaid, that they presume not to obey her or her monitions, mandates, and laws. And those who shall act otherwise, we bind with the same sentence of anathema.” Pope Pius V. bull of condemnation of Elizabeth, queen of England, 5.

7) Concil. Later., sess. 4.

8) Etrav. Johan xxii. The extravagants were decretals of the Popes, added by them to the canon law, so called because they were not arranged in the body of the law.

9) *Ibid.*

10) Pope Pius arrogated this power to himself in his bull against Queen Elizabeth. Paul IV., who was pope a few years earlier, expressed himself still more strongly, saying, “The Roman pontiff who governs in earth as the vicar, and in place of (vices geret) God and our Lord Jesus Christ, and obtains fulness of power over nations and kingdoms, and is judge of all, and not to be judged by any one in the world.” See, Bullarii Rom. 1638. Bulla 19, Paul iv.

from all law of man.' And again: 'Neither all the clergy, nor all the whole world, may either judge or depose the pope.' Such a power this servant of servants claims to himself. What greater power may be given to God? what angel, what archangel, ever had the like power?

"And this power even at this day pope Pius challenges as proper to his seat; that he has the authority which is due to Christ over his church; that no man may judge him, nor say he doth err, nor ask why he doth so. He is invested in the privilege of his church, and loses no one jot of his dignity. It is yet good at this day, which hath been set down, 'It is sin, as great as sacrilege or church-robbing, to reason of any of the pope's doings.' These are their own words, God knows, before whom we stand this day, they are their own words, and not mine. Thus does he *sit in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God.*¹¹⁾

"And therefore may we say, as Eusebius said, 'This is an evident token that they hate God, because they will have themselves called by the name of God'; or as Gregory, who, speaking of Antichrist, said, 'Whereas he is a cursed man, and not a spirit; he feigns himself by lying to be a God.'"

Four Concordances

The re-publication of Walker's *Comprehensive Concordance to the Holy Scriptures* by the MacMillan Company, 1941, calls for a re-valuation of the four concordances available for use with the Authorized Version. This all the more, in view of the remarkably low price — \$2.00 — at which Walker's concordance is being offered. It is a well-bound book of 957 pages. Without pretending to be exhaustive, we offer a comparison between Walker's book, Cruden's, Young's, and Strong's.

Walker's *Comprehensive Concordance to the Holy Scriptures* was the work of the Rev. James Bradford Richmond Walker, born in Taunton, Mass., April 15, 1821. He was graduated from Brown University in 1841 and from Andover Theological Seminary in 1846. As a pastor he served churches in Maine, Massachusetts, and Connecticut. He died on January 24, 1885. The introduction to the new MacMillan reprint cautions the user not to expect an all-inclusive work, containing every a, an, in, the, this, that, not, so, he, her, etc. It is offered as "a simple concordance, strictly alphabetical in arrangement, even to proper names, with passages and references under each alphabetical head in correct Biblical order." Proper names are always accented to assist in pronunciation. The page is clearly legible, and the book itself is compact and pleasing in size and appearance.

Of Cruden, first published in 1737, the most recent edition is that published by the John C. Winston Company in 1930. As to size, Cruden's has 783 pages of informative material. The print is the same size as Walker's although of a different type face. Walker's is simply an alphabetical digest of the Authorized Version. Cruden's indicates material changes made by the Revised Version and the American Revised Version.

11) Bellarmine states that the whole sum of Christianity is concerned in the doctrine of the Pope's supremacy.

Turning at random the pages in both concordances, let us stop at the term "man" and compare their method of presentation. Cruden's: "God said, Let us make m. [italicized] in our image (Gen. 1:26, 27; 9:6)." Walker's: "Gen. 1:26. God said, Let us make m. [heavy print] in our image, 27 — 9:6." Cruden's gives an explanation of the term "man" in the words 1) a human being, 1 Cor. 10:13; 2) the human race, mankind, Job 5:7; 3) the adult male, as distinguished from a woman or a child, Acts 4:22. Walker's, on the other hand, gives no such unfoldings of the concept. The topic "man" in Cruden is treated under the general head "man," then "a man," then "a certain man," "any man," "man-child," "every man," "man of God," "mighty man," "no man," "of man," "one man," "Son of Man," "that man," "this man," "man of war," "wicked man," "wise man," "man joined with woman," "young man." In Walker the arrangement of texts is controlled by the following heads: "man," "a man," "a certain man," "any man," "man-child," "every man," "man of God," "*like man*," "mighty man," "no man," "of man," "*old man*," "one man," "*poor man*," "*rich man*," "*righteous man*," "Son of Man," "that man," "this man," "man of war," "wicked man," "wise man," "man with woman," "young man." I have italicized the sections which Walker has added to Cruden's under "man."

Robert Young's *Analytical Concordance to the Bible* was first published in Edinburgh in 1879. It was reprinted by Funk and Wagnalls in New York in 1917. Young's is a much larger book than either Cruden or Walker. For the additional weight and size, Young's has approximately eight words per line against five and a half in Walker's and in the 1930 edition of Cruden. In endeavoring to locate a text, the additional words quoted in Young offer a material advantage.

Like the two previously mentioned, Young's is a complete concordance. Walker's occasionally has a word not listed in Young's, as "pool" and "rye" (listed as "rie"). But Young lists "skull," which is missing in Walker's. I am unable to account for these variations.

The chief distinction of Young, however, is that each term has its texts listed, not according to such rather arbitrary divisions as we noted for "man" in Walker's and Cruden's, but according to the Hebrew and Greek originals. Turning to "mountain," Walker groups all his texts under these headings: "mountain," "high mountain," "in mountain," "mountains," "in the mountains," "of the mountains," "to the mountains" — thus compelling one who is searching, *e. g.*, for the location of "sacrifice upon tops of the mountains" to look under two or three heads. Young has all Old Testament texts containing the English words "mount" and "mountain" under the five Hebrew terms so translated, and all the New Testament under the single Greek term *oros*, giving six subdivisions for the term "mountain" in this concordance. Young also gives a transliteration and accurate translation of each Hebrew or Greek stem. The various tenses of a verb are listed under the stem, as *moved* under *move*. In Walker's these are listed separately. For Biblical study Young offers a Hebrew index-lexicon to the Old Testament and a Greek index-lexicon to the New. Every Hebrew and Greek word is here listed in transliteration, and the various English terms by which it has been

rendered are listed below. This makes possible a thorough study of any term or concept either of the Old or New Testaments.

James Strong's *Concordance* was published by the Methodist Book Concern in 1890. Strong offers no subdivisions whatever under the various terms. There is one tabulation, beginning with Genesis and ending with Revelation, for the word "man." However, all these references are co-ordinated with a "comparative concordance" and a Hebrew and Greek dictionary at the end of the volume. Numbers are appended to each line of quotation, indicating that the leading word in the passage quoted is there the translation (in the Authorized Version) of the Hebrew or Greek word correspondingly numbered in the Dictionaries in the later portion of the work. For instance, for Matt. 9:30, under "man" we find the line:

Saying, see that no m. know it 3367

This is followed by a line from verse 32:

they brought to him a dumb m. 444.

The figure 3367 leads us to the Greek word *medeis* (no one), while 444 is the word *anthropos* (man). With every reference in this very complete work — it contains also terms which we have failed to discover in Walker's and Young's — thus traceable to its Hebrew or Greek origin, we have an arrangement superior to Young who, as noted, forms groups of references in the body of the work under the various Hebrew or Greek originals. Only for a student who habitually studies his Bible with reference to the original tongues will the arrangement in Young's prove superior.

We also note that Strong supplies in his *Comparative Concordance* (a section of 261 pages) a complete digest, by books, chapters, and verses, of the Authorized and Revised versions, including the American variations.

In conclusion we note that Cruden is frequently sold in inferior editions printed from old, sometimes badly damaged plates (not the case, however, with the Winston Edition), while the MacMillan reprint of Walker is apparently newly set up and the type, while very small, easily legible. Cruden is usually sold for \$2.00, the price of Walker's is \$2.00, Strong's \$5.00, and Young's \$7.50.

THEODORE GRAEBNER

Shall We Have a Lutheran Nuptial Mass?

The Lutheran Church of America, in some of its areas, seems to have entered upon an era of repristination, not so much in the doctrinal field, where, generally speaking, such a course would not be amiss, as in the field of liturgics. Now, there can be no doubt that many liturgical customs come under the heading of adiaphora, so that their observance is a matter of Christian liberty and within the jurisdiction of the individual congregation. On the other hand, those who would use the true Lutheran liturgiologist's approach might do well to study, not superficially, but intensively, *all* the liturgical writings of Luther, in order to

understand fully the principles which this careful student of Scripture emphasized in making his own suggestions in the field of liturgics. Many of these principles have been referred to in the more than two-score articles in this field of theological learning which have appeared in the pages of this periodical in the twelve years of its existence. A few fundamental considerations, for example, were broached in an article which appeared last year (Vol. XII, 589 ff.), and others will be found in practically every volume of the series, if one will but take the trouble to consult the table of contents and the shorter items appearing in the section "Miscellanea."

In this particular connection we have in mind chiefly two articles. One was printed in Volume II, 818 ff., and is headed "Die Sakramente in ihrer Beziehung zur Gemeindeorganisation." The other is found in Volume XI, 598 ff., and discusses "The Means of Grace from the Administrative Angle." In either case emphasis is laid, on the basis of the Word of God, on the fact that the Lord's Supper, or the Eucharist, in agreement with its institution, the doctrinal directions connected with its celebration, and its history, is definitely a function of the Christian congregation. The celebration of the Eucharist by conventicles, *ecclesiolae in ecclesia*, as in the case of the Pietists, the Stundists, and other enthusiasts, has always been definitely condemned by the teachers of our Church. Group communions which are not included in the regular congregational setup, making congregational supervision difficult or impossible, are not in agreement with the obvious intention of Him who established the Sacrament of His body and blood also in token of the inner communion of the true believers and for the furtherance of this fellowship. In the early Church this consideration was so strongly emphasized that, at every Communion in the regular meeting-place of the congregation, officers of the church, usually subdeacons, brought the sacred elements to the sick and shut-ins, so that all communicant members might always be included in the common celebration of the Lord's Supper by the congregation. A part of these considerations underlie also the practice of the "reserved Sacrament," and we rightly recognize the element of emergency in communing the sick in their own homes.

The Roman Catholic sect has for centuries observed a special form of private or votive mass, one which is now most intimately interwoven with its ceremonies and usages. This is the so-called "nuptial mass," a special celebration of the (mutilated) Eucharist as the Roman Church observes it in connection with holy marriage. In a recent leaflet missal this ceremony is called "The Mass on the Day of Marriage." Its essential feature is this that the newly married couple, in the rite of the Catholic sacrament, receives the Eucharist alone.

Now, the Roman sect makes much of this specific form of celebration. The Catholic Encyclopedia declares that this celebration goes back to the days of Tertullian, although, as Bingham shows in his *Christian Antiquities* (Vol. 7:334 f.), the assertion is not beyond a certain doubt. And there is by no means a full agreement in the best liturgical writings as to the introduction of the nuptial mass as early as the third century. It seems clear that all teachers of the Church who carefully studied the

doctrinal background of the Sacrament understood that a Communion service connected with the ceremony of giving in marriage was not in harmony with the obvious congregational function and setup presupposed by its establishment. As we know, Luther definitely did not include a nuptial mass in his *Traubuechlein* of 1534, and if one studies his writing *Von der Winkelmesse* of 1533 (St. Louis Ed., 19, 1220 ff.), the reason will be obvious. The English writers in the field of liturgics were, on the whole, ready to continue the custom which had become established. Procter, for example, in his *History of the Book of Common Prayer* (p. 444) has the remark: "The Reformed Service, like that from which it has been derived, ended with an administration of the Holy Communion, the rubric being expressed in positive terms, 'The new married persons, the same day of their marriage, must receive the Holy Communion.' This was altered in 1661, in compliance with the objection of the Presbyterians, or more probably from a conviction that many persons would be married according to the rites of the Church who were far from being in communion with it." (Cp. Gwynne, *Primitive Worship and the Prayer Book*, 338 f.; Lee, *Directorium Anglicanum*, 206 f.). It is significant, as Gwynne points out, that the "American Church (the Protestant Episcopal Church in America) has omitted the remaining portions of the service in the English Book," while the English, Scottish, and Irish Books lead on to the Holy Communion. In other words, where the Protestant viewpoint was emphasized more strongly, the opposition against associating the ceremony of holy marriage with a sacramental character was more pronounced.

The correct answer to the question proposed in the caption of this brief discussion, in keeping with fundamental doctrinal considerations and proper liturgical expression of the tenets and traditions of Lutheranism must of necessity be negative. As stated above, the Lord's Supper presupposes a congregational setup, since it is a congregational function and involves a representative congregational participation. A Lutheran nuptial mass, furthermore, is not an emergency, since both bride and groom may and should partake of the Sacrament in their own congregation before their marriage, where they may be properly examined by their own pastor, as the Lutheran Confessions prescribe, and then as soon after the marriage ceremony in the congregation of which they both are members, where the same supervision and control of the admission to the Sacrament may be exercised. Nor may we overlook the fact that an introduction of a Lutheran nuptial mass will certainly be connected with a false sacramentalism, an attitude which is bound to lead to a misunderstanding concerning holy marriage. For this, according to the words of Luther, is in itself a "weltlich, irdisch Ding," and is sanctified only by the Word of God and prayer, as we have it in our beautiful marriage ceremony.

P. E. KRETZMANN

