

LOGIA

A JOURNAL OF LUTHERAN THEOLOGY

HOLY TRINITY/JULY 1994

VOLUME III, NUMBER 3

CONTENTS

AUG 31 1994

ARTICLES

- Worship: The Activity of the Trinity*
By Jim Bushur3
- Let Us Pray: A Historical Examination of the Collect of the Day*
By David P. Saar.....13
- What Is Ministry?*
By Bruce Bitter23
- A Call for Manuscripts.....37
- Cybernetics in the Church: The Spiritual Gift of Church Government and Administration*
By Hans-Lutz Poetsch38
- Lutherans and Rome on Justification: "Fundamental Consensus"?*
By Burnell F. Eckardt Jr.43
- "Inklings" by Jim Wilson52



REVIEWS53

- Review Essay: *No Other Gospel! Christianity among the World's Religions.* By Carl Braaten
- Holy Things: A Liturgical Theology.* By Gordon W. Lathrop
- Is There a Synoptic Problem?* By Eta Linnemann
- Beyond Charity: Reformation Initiatives for the Poor.* By Carter Lindberg
- Dietrich Bonhoeffer—His Significance for North Americans.* By Larry Rasmussen
- The Future of Christology: Essays in Honor of Leander E. Keck.* Edited by Abraham J. Malherbe and Wayne A. Meeks
- The Apostles' Creed: A Faith to Live By.* By C. E. B. Cranfield
- Ministry in the New Testament.* By David L. Bartlett
- Heresy and Criticism: The Search for Authenticity in Early Christian Literature.* By Robert M. Grant

BRIEFLY NOTED

LOGIA FORUM.....71

- In the Name of the Father • The Freedom of Pigs • When the Gospel Isn't Working
Augustinians Anonymous • Herman's Gnosticism • The Priestly Rule of Discipline • Luther on Vocation
Taps Bugled for Church Management • Mothers as Fathers on Mothering Sunday 1994
Death as a Mother • As Go the Schools, So Goes the Synod • It's All Russian to Me
St. Michael and All Angels • What Does It All Mean?
Casting a Vision • On Silencing the Lord's Song

Let Us Pray

A Historical Examination of the Collect of the Day

DAVID P. SAAR

A RECENT LWML RALLY OPENED WITH EVERYONE'S HEADS bowed, eyes closed, and hands folded as the local pastor opened with prayer. To open a meeting with prayer or to say grace before the potluck supper is a task invariably assigned to the pastor. This is the time to listen and observe the pastor, because the degree to which he is able to pray off the top of his head is popularly thought to have a one-to-one correspondence with his relationship to God. Oftentimes, it seems, clergy cast all caution to the wind and in an almost compulsive, daredevil enthusiasm, rise to the occasion by attempting to demonstrate their high degree of Christian spirituality with the use of the most difficult and complex of all prayers, the public *ex tempore* prayer. This type of off-the-cuff praying is, for most people, clerical or lay, the most difficult because it relies heavily on personal gifts that may not be equally given or fully developed. Furthermore, there is a tendency for *ex corde* prayer to be wordy and repetitive or for the pastor to sermonize. It is also tempting to slip into favorite topics or set phrases that usually grate ("O Jesus, we just thank you"). Many of us have been taught that every Christian should be able to speak to God in a comfortable and relaxed way, even in public. Pastors are expected to be the model *par excellence* for praying like this. The problem is that many of us, pastors and lay people alike, are unable to pull it off. Embarrassed, we stumble and mumble and drift into a wandering, meaningless chatter. A solution to this predicament can be found by exploring undoubtedly one of the most distinctive, imaginative, and attractive aspects of the liturgy, the collect. With prose like Hemingway's, lean and mean, these muscular prayers possess a unique framework that, when fleshed out, reveals a pattern of prayer worthy of imitation in the life of the church.

TOWARDS DEFINING THE TERM COLLECT

Scholarly speculation has come to posit two propositions about the etymology of the word "collect." The term refers either to the collecting of the congregation for worship or to the gathering of the people's petitions. Most scholars conclude that the term's origins are simply ambiguous. Pastor Friedrich Lochner, brother-in-law of C. F. W. Walther, who in 1876 was called to teach liturgics at Concordia Seminary, Springfield, arrives at this conclusion. He cites Luther's etymological explanation of the word as being related

to the collection of the offering, and also refers to two other sources, Caspar Calvör (1650-1725), a theologian involved in liturgics, and the Cologne *Kirchenordnung* of 1544.

Whence the name for these prayers comes—whether from their being a prayer of the assembly and a summary of its petitions, or from the fact that brief prayers of this kind were used at the oblations of the ancient Church, i.e., at the gathering of the sacrificial gifts—will probably remain undecided. That Luther locates their source in those oblations is apparent from his remarks in the writing *Against the Heavenly Prophets*: "When the Hebrew language was still common among them, the apostles and the first Christians called the bread and wine which they had gathered for observance of the sacrament 'mass,' in Hebrew in accordance with Jewish custom. A part of it was consecrated for use in connection with the sacrament, the other was distributed among the servants of the congregation and the poor. For a long time afterwards this practice was also referred to as 'collections,' as the *Historia tripartita* testifies. Though the practice was discontinued the word 'collect' still remains in the papist mass" (AE 40,121). Using a play on words that cannot be rendered in translation, Calvör gives his opinion in his *Ritual* thus: "The collects are without a doubt short prayers of the priests, who say them not for themselves but with the entire assembly (*collecta*) and Church. The assembly either recites them aloud with the priest (*collectus collegit*) or reads them silently as he speaks them, thereby praying with the priest for the common good and need. (I.C. Cap XIII)." Similarly, the Cologne Reformation of 1544, according to which it is "a common prayer of the whole Church, for which reason it is also called a collect, a collected prayer from the heart and life of all present or a prayer of the gathered congregation."¹

An alternative explanation takes its cues from a parallel thesis of liturgical analysis. Aidan Kavanagh, O.S.B., professor of liturgics at the Yale University Divinity School, proposes that liturgical synecdoche is responsible for the origin of the term "Mass" (*missa*), being derived from the dismissal rite.² In this case, the synecdoche, that is, the part used for the whole, is the

DAVID P. SAAR is pastor of St. John Lutheran Church, Mount Forest, Ontario.

extension of the term for the dismissal rite (located at the end of the Service of the Word for the uninitiated and at the end of the Service of Holy Communion for all the faithful) to cover the whole service of word and sacrament. Liturgical synecdoche such as this is not unusual, but goes back to the genesis of Christian tradition. For example, the Greek verb εὐχαριστεῖν, "to give thanks" (Lk 22:19, 1 Cor 11:24), quickly becomes a noun referring to the whole service.

The term "collect" is a liturgical synecdoche in reverse.

In the same way, *mutatis mutandis*, the term "collect" is a liturgical synecdoche in reverse. Here a term referring to the whole, namely, the gathered congregation, the *collecta*, comes to be a term signifying a part, namely, a particular prayer of those assembled, the Collect of the Day. Further support can be found in the Vulgate's translation of Hebrews 10:25, where the term *collectionem* is used for the gathering of the people of God for worship:

*non deserentes collectionem nostram sicut est consuetudinis quibusdam sed consolantes et tanto magis quanto videritis adpropinquantem diem.*³

not neglecting to meet together, as is the habit of some, but encouraging one another, and all the more as you see the Day drawing near (Hebrews 10:25 RSV).

The inconclusiveness of the etymological data does not allow us to make any judgments about the original meaning of the term "collect" nor to define it any further than as a prayer used at the conclusion of a gathering of the people of God that collects and summarizes their prayers.

THE ORIGINS OF THE COLLECT

The early history of the collect may be located in its use in the syntax of prayer to which it belonged as a member of the common intercessions concluding Christian worship services. This intercessory framework, often referred to as the Bidding Prayer, consisted of an invitation to pray, silence, and the collect. Functioning as it does in this structure, it is easy to see why some find rationale for the collect's root meaning as a collection of the people's prayers into public verbal expression. Anglican scholar Kenneth D. Mackenzie describes the collect's function as a summary of these solemn prayers of the people:

In its original form the Collect seems to have been the closing act of a stereotyped devotional form. First the presiding minister, whether bishop or priest, would suggest a subject for prayer, or at least call on people to pray. This was followed by a time of silent individual prayer. . . . Finally, the officiant recited the "Collect," putting into public and corporate form the petitions of the people.⁴

A further development of the Prayer of the Faithful may be identified in the litany (from the Greek λιτανεία, a petitionary prayer). This new and shorter form of intercessory prayer originated in the Eastern tradition, whence Pope Gelasius I (492–496) introduced it in the West, placing it after the Introit. According to Robert Taft, a Jesuit who teaches oriental liturgy and languages at the Pontifical Institute in Rome, the litany is a natural evolution of, and in many respects not unlike, the Bidding Prayer.

Different as it [the litany] may at first seem, it is just an expansion of the primitive unit (*Oremus*-collect). . . . For a litany does no more than fill in with a series of expressed diaconal petitions what in the older system was a period of silent prayer. . . . The literary form remains the same: the deacon addresses the people ("For. . . let us pray to the Lord"), but in their response, if expressed, the faithful address themselves to God (*Kyrie eleison*), as does the celebrant in the concluding oration.⁵

Current Lutheran hymnals provide a number of examples of addressing God using these ancient forms of prayer that include the collect. The Kyrie litany of the divine service, concluding in the Collect of the Day, is the most popular model.⁶

The authorship of the earliest written collects is generally attributed to Pope Leo I (440–461).

The *oratio prima* of the Roman rite was apparently introduced by Leo I (440–461) or his immediate predecessor. It was not a feature of the liturgy in the time of Celestine I (422–432) but some extant collects date from that of Leo.⁷

Cursus, a Latin literary writing technique that arranges the accents of words and phrases in a rhythmic order not unlike the Shakespearean iambic pentameter, is employed in the collects and is one reason for making a link between them and Leo. According to Josef Jungmann, the Jesuit liturgical scholar, since the *cursus* is characteristic of the rhetorical writing style of Leo the Great, many of the oldest collects may be credited to his pen.

In the sermons of Leo the Great as well as in his letters, the law of the *cursus* was so strictly followed that the absence of the *cursus* could be used as a criterion of literary criticism. In the more ancient orations, the rules of the *cursus* have been regularly observed. And this is another reason why many of these orations are probably attributable to Leo the Great.⁸

A striking example of this is given by comparing the collect appointed for the Second Sunday after Christmas in *Lutheran Worship* with the Tome of Leo. The collect is found in the earliest liturgical manuscript known as the Veronensis, a *libellus* or booklet, formerly known as the Leonine Sacramentary, where it is assigned to 24 December.

Deus, qui humanae substantiae dignitatem mirabiliter condidisti, et mirabilius reformasti: da nobis ejus divini-

tatis esse consortes, qui humanitatis nostrae fieri dignatus est particeps, Jesus Christus Filius tuus Dominus noster: Qui tecum vivit et regnat in unitate Spiritus Sancti Deus: per omnia saecula saeculorum.

O God, our Maker and Redeemer, who wonderfully created us and in the incarnation of your Son yet more wondrously restored our human nature, grant that we may ever be alive in him who made himself to be like us; through Jesus Christ, our Lord, who lives and reigns with you and the Holy Spirit, one God, now and for ever.⁹

It is not now nor ever has been our intention to abolish the liturgical service of God completely.

The Tome of Leo was a letter sent by Leo the Great to the patriarch of Constantinople. It expounds the christological doctrine of the Latin Church against Eutyches (a heresiarch who confounded the two natures in Christ) and was given formal recognition at the Council of Chalcedon in 451. The verbal and conceptual similarities of his letter and the collect are remarkable.

This birth in time in no way detracted from, in no way added to, that divine and everlasting birth; but expended itself wholly in the work of restoring man, who had been deceived. . . . But we are not to understand that "generation," peerlessly wonderful, and wonderfully peerless, in such a sense as that the newness of the mode of production did away with the proper character of the kind. . . . Therefore in the entire and perfect nature of very Man was born very God, whole in what was his, whole in what was ours. (By "ours" we mean what the Creator formed in us at the beginning, and what he assumed in order to restore) . . . the fact that the nativity of our Lord Jesus Christ is wonderful, in that he was born of a virgin's womb, does not imply that his nature is unlike ours. For the selfsame who is very God is also very Man.¹⁰

While there are, no doubt, many anonymous authors of the collects, apparently the substantive core originates with Pope Leo the Great.

Soon after the time of Leo the Great, the earliest liturgical manuscripts and books were formulated, chronicling the history of the use of the collect in the divine service. In these ancient liturgical writings a lively tradition is documented that records the maturation of the collect. At the end of the fifth century there appeared on the scene nascent liturgical manuscripts known as *libelli*, which were leaflets containing the order of service along with the propers. A significant series of these rudimentary manuscripts was incorrectly labeled as the Leonine

Sacramentary in 1735 by F. Branchini, its first editor, who surmised that it was the work of Leo the Great. Now known as the *Veronensis*, it is usually dated between 558 and 590. *LBW* retains five collects from this collection,¹¹ *LW* also preserves five,¹² and *TLH* has six.¹³

A further stage in the production of liturgical manuscripts can be identified in the sacramentary, a book that contains all the texts the pastor needs for the celebration of the divine service. Two sacramentaries are relevant to the history of the collect, namely, the Gelasian and the Gregorian. The Gelasian Sacramentary is technically known as the codex *Reginensis* 316 and is found in the Vatican library. Like the *Veronensis*, it is misleadingly named, for Pope Gelasius had no real connection with its composition or compilation. This sacramentary is commonly dated 628–715. Eighteen collects from the Gelasian Sacramentary are kept in *LBW*,¹⁴ twenty-three in *LW*,¹⁵ and twenty-four in *TLH*.¹⁶ The second sacramentary is the Gregorian, which has an extensive family tree. The available manuscripts indicate that this sacramentary emerged in the late seventh century and was introduced north of the Alps only a century later. Unlike the Gelasian, the Gregorian Sacramentary reflects the papal liturgy of this period. Fourteen collects in *LBW* are from the Gregorian Sacramentary,¹⁷ as are nineteen in *LW*¹⁸ and thirty in *TLH*.¹⁹ The origin of the collect goes back to the conclusion of the church's intercessory prayers, whence it is refined and stylized by fifth century clerical wordsmiths to blossom in the sacramentaries, where it quickly becomes a standard, fixed portion of the propers for the divine service.

THE COLLECT ACCORDING TO LUTHERAN USE

Luther's criterion in his reform of the Mass was that the liturgy in no way contradict God's word and promises. This was particularly true with respect to the first and chief article of the faith, justification. For this reason Luther cut out the series of offertory prayers in the Roman liturgy of his day because they smacked of sacrifice and obscured the gospel and the words of Institution. The canon of the Mass, essentially a string of collect-type prayers, was omitted for the same reason. Yet Luther was not interested in doing away with the liturgy altogether. In his first attempt at liturgical revision, he clearly states his intentions in this matter:

It is not now nor ever has been our intention to abolish the liturgical service of God completely, but rather to purify the one that is now in use from the wretched accretions which corrupt it and to point out an evangelical use.²⁰

Melanchthon also fiercely defends the Lutherans against the charges that they had done away with the historic worship of the church.

To begin with, we must repeat the prefatory statement that we do not abolish the Mass but religiously keep and defend it. In our churches Mass is celebrated every Sunday and on other festivals, when the sacrament is offered to those who wish for it after they have been

examined and absolved. We keep traditional liturgical forms, such as the order of the lessons, prayers, vestments, etc. . . . We mention this only in passing in order to point out that our churches keep the Latin lessons and prayers (Ap xxiv).

Arguing that good works are pleasing to God because of faith in Christ, Melancthon cites the concluding phrase of the collect, "through Jesus Christ, our Lord," thus proving the dictum of Prosper of Aquitaine, the fifth century theologian who fought against Pelagianism, *legem credendi lex supplicandi statuat* (the law of prayer establishes the law of believing):

Thus other good works please God because of faith, as the prayers of the church ask that everything be accepted because of Christ and request everything because of Christ. It is well known that every prayer closes with this phrase: "through Christ our Lord" (Ap iv, Tappert, p. 166).

Thus the litmus test for the retention of the collect was that it not hinder the good news of faith in Jesus Christ, but be evangelical in tone and so serve in the proclamation of the gospel.

With the advent of the church-destroying movements of Pietism and Rationalism, the collect was shoved aside or transformed into an anthropocentric thing.

The principle of an essentially christological evaluation of the liturgy that Luther enunciated was put into practice in the sixteenth-century *Kirchenordnungen*, which regulated ecclesiastical life, including worship, in the various territories of the German nation. Most of these church orders retained the Latin collects as Luther had recommended. In addition, they normally included collects in the vernacular and supplemented the historic series of collects with new compositions, most notably those composed by Veit Dietrich, a pastor from Nuremberg, and Johann Mathesius, a Luther biographer. These collects were coordinated with the pericopes and thus were often called "text collects." Friedrich Lochner comments on the incorporation of the collect into the new Lutheran rite:

The Reformation found a wealth of ancient collects, and among them not a few which were still pure. It took a number over from these, rendered them into German, and used them alongside those in Latin. But besides these, from the Lutheran Church itself came a number of collects. The best are from Veit Dietrich (1541) and Johann Mathesius (1568). The collects of Veit Dietrich are based on the Gospel lesson, and are thus called text collects.²¹

Well into the eighteenth century, both the Latin and the German collects were in use, still giving evidence of a well-ordered worship life within the Lutheran Church. If the collect was read in Latin, the church members were trained to consult their hymn-books or prayer books in order to follow along in German.

With the advent of the eighteenth century church-destroying movements of Pietism and Rationalism, the collect was shoved aside or, along with the rest of the liturgy, transformed into an anthropocentric thing. By the late nineteenth century, though, a breath of fresh air awoke the church to the forgotten treasures of the collect. Pastor Johann Konrad Wilhelm Löhe (1808–1872) epitomizes this perspective on the liturgy and the collect, in particular as he is quoted by the American Lutheran liturgical scholar Luther Reed, who says Löhe spoke of the collects as "the breath of a soul, sprinkled with the blood of Jesus, brought to the eternal Father in the Name of his Son."²² In North America, the Common Service of 1888 served to ensure that the graceful simplicity of the collect and the evangelical message it conveys would be a secure and permanent part of the worship of the Lutheran church to this day.

THE FORM OF THE COLLECT

The form a prayer takes ought to convey the substance of what God desires and commands of us in prayer. Luther writes in the *Large Catechism*: "We should look upon the form and the substance of our prayers as something God has demanded and we are doing in obedience to Him."²³ The unique literary structure of the collect has two shapes, the simple and the complete. The simple collect consists of three parts, namely, (1) an address or invocation, (2) a petition, and (3) a conclusion. For example: "Lord [address], we beseech Thee, give ear to our prayers and lighten the darkness of our hearts by Thy gracious visitation [petition]; who livest and reignest with the Father and the Holy Ghost, ever one God, world without end [conclusion]."²⁴ The complete collect has five parts: (1) the address to God; (2) the antecedent reason, which is often in the form of a relative clause and refers to some attribute or act of God that is the basis for the petition; (3) the petition itself; (4) the desired result from the petition; and (5) the conclusion. An example of this is the collect for Ash Wednesday in *LW*, "Almighty and everlasting God [address], because you hate nothing you have made and forgive the sins of all who are penitent [antecedent reason], create in us new and contrite hearts [petition] that we, worthily repenting our sins and acknowledging our wretchedness, may obtain from you, the God of all mercy, perfect remission and forgiveness [desired result]; through Jesus Christ, your Son, our Lord, who lives and reigns with you and the Holy Spirit, one God, now and forever [conclusion]."²⁵

The first ingredient in the recipe that makes up the collect is the address to God the Father. The justification for addressing prayer to God the Father is the dominical command and example.²⁶ The apostles follow Christ's example in their own prayers.²⁷ This practice was reiterated and reinforced by a local synod at Hippo in North Africa (A.D. 393), which expressly stated that the church's public prayer must always be directed to the Father.

Let no one in prayers name the Father instead of the Son, or the Son instead of the Father. And when he is standing at the altar, prayer should always be directed to the Father. And whoever writes other kinds of prayers for himself let him not use them unless he has previously cleared them with the learned brothers.²⁸

There are therefore few collects that are not addressed to the Father: *LBW* has seven collects,²⁹ *LW* has six collects,³⁰ and *TLH* has five collects that deviate from the rule,³¹ all of which are addressed to the Son.

Prayer addressed to God the Father is significant because such prayer is indicative of the petitioner's relationship with the addressee.

Prayer addressed to God the Father is significant because such prayer is indicative of the petitioner's relationship with the addressee, a relationship characterized by love and trust. As Luther points out in the *Small Catechism*, only a child could so boldly approach his father. In his exposition of the Lord's Prayer of 1519, Luther expands these thoughts further:

The best way to begin or introduce the prayer is to know how to address, honor, and treat the person to whom we submit our petition, and how to conduct ourselves in his presence, so that he will be gracious toward us and willing to listen to us. . . . He who prays thus stands with an upright heart in the correct relationship to God; such a man is able to pray and to move God to mercy.³²

Prayer addressed to God the Father is grounded in holy baptism. In this holy washing of water by the word we receive the name of the Father (Mt 28:19) and are made his children (Gal 3:26-27; 4:6-7). Thus, as heirs of the hope of eternal life and as children of the heavenly Father, we can boldly pray, "Our Father."

In the second place, we turn to the relative clause, sometimes called the antecedent reason, upon which the petition is founded and which supplies the basis of the address. As such, this clause usually refers to a divine trait or characteristic or to the marvelous working of God in salvation history. The dominical and apostolic example utilize the relative clause in prayer (Mk 14:36; Acts 4:24-28; 2 Cor 1:4; Eph 1:3). Occasionally, this element of the collect is omitted, in which case the petition either precedes the address or follows it, or else there is an extended address followed by the petition. This occurs thirty-one times in *LW*³³ and thirty-eight times in *TLH*.³⁴ *LBW* chose a bolder approach in translation by eliminating relative clauses altogether or drastically rephrasing them.

Despite the complex phraseology, the antecedent reason is theologically consequential. This clause expresses the reason we can approach God the Father in prayer. It builds this reason not on what we have done but on what God has done. On this basis, it possesses a certain sacramental quality. This makes a collect, in the words of the Anglican Edward M. Goulburn,

a word of man to God, based and built upon a word of God to man . . . [for] every prayer, which is to reach heaven, must be built on some part of God's revelation of Himself. Man could never have spoken a word to God, except in the first instance God had spoken a word to him.³⁵

This insight contains profound christological and incarnational truths, for had not God the Father revealed himself in the person of his Son, we would have nothing to say to him. Since God has spoken a word in the Word, we are able to speak back to him. This we do by saying back to him what he has said to us. The German theologian Dietrich Bonhoeffer (1906-1945) writes of this in his little book on the Psalms:

And so we must learn to pray. The child learns to speak because his father speaks to him. He learns the speech of his father. So we learn to speak to God because God has spoken to us and speaks to us. By means of the speech of the Father in heaven his children learn to speak with him. Repeating God's own words after him, we begin to pray to him. We ought to speak to God and he wants to hear us, not in the false and confused speech of our heart, but in the clear and pure speech which God has spoken to us in Jesus Christ.³⁶

Thus in the relative clause we repeat his word back to God our Father and proclaim how the Word has revealed himself and worked in our salvation history.

The third ingredient of the collect is the petition, which has a marked beauty all its own, born of faith. The petition is the thing for which we ask, and is what our heavenly Father desires to hear from us. Our Lord Jesus himself instructs us to ask (Mt 7:7; Jn 15:16, 16:24). The supreme example we have of such petitioning is our Lord himself (Mk 14:36; Lk 23:34; Jn 17). Due to the very nature of the collect, its employment of terse thoughts, and its usage in public worship, the collect's petitions are characteristically general and broad, yet they are able to express a wide range of requests in such a way as to be specific, warm, and personal, and at the same time to function as prayer should in worship by expressing this in general, solemn, and public language.

Since God commands us to petition him and desires our asking, nothing is dogmatically or practically insignificant. In the petition God opens us up to his mercy, showering upon his children his gracious love. This he does in Christ. All of our asking is offered in Christ. Our ontological identity in Christ acquired in holy baptism permits us to stand boldly before the throne of grace to beg for all that we need. The law of prayer becomes relevant to the petition, as Aidan Kavanagh notes:

It [*lex supplicandi*] is a law of supplicatory prayer—not prayer or worship in general, but of prayer which petitions God for the whole range of human needs in specific, a law of eucharistical petition. This is the nub of the reason why the *lex supplicandi* founds and constitutes the *lex credendi* and is therefore primary for Christian theology. The way Christians believe is, somehow, constituted and supported by how Christians petition God for their human needs in worship. The reason why this is so seems to be rooted in what happens to one in baptism. If by faith and baptism a Christian is associated intimately with the risen Christ, then the Christian has been graced so as to stand with him, the great High Priest who has entered into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God on our behalf (Hebrews 9:24), petitioning his Father for the world.³⁷

Petitioning in Christ exalts to the Father's heart what can, without faith, be petty and self-indulgent; and from his heart our hearts become full of joy.

Fourth, among the components that make up a collect is included the element known as the purpose. This ingredient voices the reason for which we ask, indicating the benefit sought from the petition. A petition born of faith in Christ produces results; benefits sought are received (Mt 7:7; Jn 16:24; Mk 11:23–24). This fourth part of the collect may not always be expressed. In the collects contained in *LBW*, the result clause is absent forty times,³⁸ in *LW* thirty-five times in all,³⁹ and in *TLH* thirty-two times.⁴⁰

Petitioning in Christ exalts what can, without faith, be petty and self-indulgent.

The purpose clause expresses our desire for God and not just for something from him. Is prayer really a relationship in which instead of wanting *him* we want something *from* him? Surely this is not what this fourth ingredient of the collect intends. It serves to propel us ever deeper into a relationship with God, ever further into a life hid with Christ in God (Col 3:3), that, in the words of the purpose clause of the collect for the Last Sunday in the Church Year, "we with all the redeemed may enter into your eternal kingdom."⁴¹

In fifth and final place, a collect concludes by pleading Christ's name in an ascription of glory to the Godhead. The grounds for this culmination are christological (Jn 14:13–14; 15:16; 16:23–24, 26). Consequently, the apostolic practice was to offer prayers in Christ Jesus (Acts 4:30; Rom 1:8; 7:25; 16:27; 2 Cor 1:20; Eph 3:21; 5:20; Col 3:17; Jude 25). Another warrant for directing our prayers through Jesus Christ is his priestly office. As our eternal High Priest, Jesus lives to intercede and mediate for us before the Father's throne (Rom 8:34; 1 Tim 2:5; Heb 7:25, 13:15). The

highlights of Christian doctrine are expounded in the collect's termination. First, an abundant and magnificent distillation of christological truth may be seen. It becomes clear that Jesus is true God and true man. He is our Redeemer, Mediator, King, and our ascended, ever-living High Priest. The communication of attributes and Christ's eternal relationship with the Father and the Spirit are all summed up in this conclusion. Second, we are aware of our relationship to him. He is our Lord. This is so because we have been baptized into his name and into his death and resurrection. He has bought us with his blood, rescued us from the devil, and lifted us up to reign with him. Third, there is contained in the collect's conclusion a commentary on the Holy Spirit. He is equal with the Father and the Son and as such is to be worshiped and glorified. Moreover, he lives in and forges the unity between the persons of the Holy Trinity. Finally, the confession of the mystery of the Holy Trinity is made in the concluding phrases of the collect. Here we praise and confess the one true God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, who is from the ages of the ages, now and forever. Clearly, the axiom that we pray what we believe and believe what we pray can be seen to be at work in the collect, for given this formal literary structure, the collect becomes an ideal environment in which to express briefly yet profoundly the most elementary and the deepest theological statements of the holy Christian church.

IMPLICATIONS FOR USING THE COLLECT

The practice of using the collect as a pattern for formulating prayer has a number of implications. First, the form of the collect offers a guideline on how to pray. That the church has always followed a broad format for structuring her prayers has been recently pointed out by Douglas Fusselman. The outline that the early church fathers followed in their prayer was that of the prayer our Lord himself has taught us to pray.

The Lord's Prayer also served as the outline, the deep structure, for all Christian prayer. Whether individually or corporately, early Christians did not understand or practice prayer apart from the Lord's Prayer outline.⁴²

Therefore, when Luther states in the *Small Catechism* that our Father in heaven has commanded us so to pray, he means that a Christian is to pray using the outline of the Lord's Prayer.

He [Luther] was convinced that it was important for Christians to understand the various petitions of the Our Father because this was the only formula for all Christian prayer . . . believers were commanded to pray, and pray only, within the bounds of the Lord's Prayer outline because it was normative for all prayer.⁴³

Therefore, in learning how to pray, we have before us our Lord's instruction in the Our Father and the church's Spirit-filled guidance in the collect. The Lord's Prayer tells us what to pray for and the collect helps us to organize our thoughts. When a pastor or lay person is called upon to open a meeting with prayer or say grace before the potluck supper, there is no need to feel at a loss or wonder how to compose his thoughts, for the collect framework is a

ready outline to be filled in. Rambling thoughts can be controlled and ordered by the structure that the collect provides. "Prayer-ers" can relax, knowing they do not have to be spectacular or entertaining, and can instead focus on the matter at hand. The collect becomes for us, then, an able teacher in the school of prayer.

Second, since the collect has its roots in the general intercessory prayers of the divine service, as was shown above, it can also instruct pastors in writing these prayers of the people. Such intercessory prayer was urged by St. Paul (1 Tim 2:1-2). In the medieval period, the general prayer of the early church evolved into what is referred to as the Prone, a preaching service and catechesis in the vernacular consisting of the Creed, Our Father, Hail Mary, confession of sins, and other prayers. In keeping with the popular prayers of the Prone, the Lutheran church orders gradu-

The collect serves as a model for prayer by being the greatest example of brevity in public prayer.

ally developed a general church prayer that consisted of comprehensive intercessory petitions. While older hymnals provided a model to follow or use, today's worship books only sketch an outline of what is to be prayed in the general prayers. Unfortunately, this can meet with unpreparedness on the part of the pastor and result in a feeble, impromptu attempt at prayer. Walter Huffman, professor at Trinity Lutheran Seminary, Columbus, Ohio, writes of this problem:

As invigorating as extempore prayer may be in some communities, it is more embarrassing than edifying in others. Our model in this matter, the free flowing "pastoral prayer," is often characterized by hackneyed expressions, shallow theology, and idiosyncratic ramblings that put the congregation at the mercy of the leader's moods. It is often an insult to the assembly and an evasion of responsibility to simply "leave it to the Spirit" in such moments of public prayer.⁴⁴

The solution to this could simply be preparation, the pastor writing out the prayer beforehand. The rubrics dictate that thought and preparation must go into this as much as any other part of the divine service.⁴⁵ St. Augustine is reported to have written, "God does not ask us to tell him about our needs in order to learn about them, but in order that we may be made capable of receiving his gifts."⁴⁶ The collect can assist in making this possible. The collect's thoughts are a careful balance of the general and the particular, its form provides a direction and goal for prayer, and its shape supports the message it communicates. In composing the General Prayer, these aspects of the collect can rescue the pastor from floundering in uncharted waters, giving a style and syntax of prayer to pilot him. Both *LBW* and *LW* provide a number of patterns to follow in writing the Prayer of the Church.⁴⁷ Using the collect as a

guideline in the composition of these prayers can free the pastor and the congregation from the pitfalls of their own thoughtlessness and open them to the thoughts and gifts of God.

Third, the collect serves as a model for prayer by being the greatest example of brevity in public prayer. All too often an *ex corde* prayer is repetitious and verbose. The collect demonstrates that public prayer does not need to be wordy in order to communicate appropriate thoughts and expressions. Scripture attests to the importance of brevity when approaching God in prayer (Eccl 5:2; Mt 6:6-7). The collect's ability to be brief proves to be a highly advantageous model for congregational prayer too, as Walter Huffman points out:

In the spirit of public prayer we use words with great economy. A rambling, undisciplined prayer or a long monolog is an offense to the people gathered to pray. The congregation cannot give interior assent to prayers that are too long or complex for immediate understanding. Simple, direct expression spoken deliberately allows people to grasp and own the words of the leader. In the end such brevity is a recognition of the democracy of public prayer, of the necessary reciprocity between leader and people. . . . The prayer of the faithful should be guided by a sense of classic restraint. Petitions that are preachy or overly didactic fail in the assembly because they are felt to be manipulative. Cute or ingenious expressions call attention to the cleverness of the prayer leader and disable the ability of a group to pray. If we must pause to consider an interesting twist in the language, we have already lost something of the force of our intention to pray. Restraint would ask for language that has one primary function: to aid common prayer.⁴⁸

Before we begin to indulge the temptation to blabber in our prayers, we would do well to heed Luther's cautionary remark:

to think to worship God with many words and a great noise is to count Him either deaf or ignorant, and to suppose we must waken or instruct Him. Such an opinion of God tends to His shame and dishonor rather than to His worship.⁴⁹

The wisdom the collect reveals to us is that the brevity of our prayer affords us time to listen to and for God in his word. The collect's characteristic restraint and economic use of words demonstrates itself as a worthy assistant in the Christian's prayer life.

Fourth, the collect can form a vital element in Christian spirituality. Christian spirituality is a Spirit-led life, a life lived in the Spirit given in holy baptism, a life renewed by the Spirit as each day sin is rooted out and the life of Christ is planted in us. The spirituality of a personal prayer life has its foundation in the public prayer life of the church. Pastor Harold Senkbeil explains:

That is, personal prayer is defined and molded by the public prayers of the church. . . . Liturgical, personal prayer is built on the Real Presence—the understanding that God is really there, that He really feeds us in His

church, and that He really desires to hear our prayers . . . personal prayers are no different than the public prayers of the church. They are all a response to the grace and mercy of God in His Son Jesus Christ.⁵⁰

The collects give voice to our own thoughts and prayers. By expressing thoughts that are general and not specific, the collects invite the "pray-er" to adapt them to his own situation, filling their broad phrases with his timely and particular needs. This flexibility makes these public prayers very private prayers. Richard Foster describes this benefit of the church's prayers:

liturgical prayer helps us articulate the yearnings of the heart that cry for expression. Sometimes it is hard for us to find the words to say what we feel. At other times we do not feel up to praying, and the words of the liturgy "prime the pump," as we say.⁵¹

Since the collect consists of a graceful, lean, and concise prose, it is memorable and easily remembered. This proves to be an advantage in the dry times of a Christian's life or in times of trial or crisis when words fail and thoughts are not forthcoming. At times

like that it proves helpful not to have to think. Another way the collect can help us in our spirituality is by reminding us that we are not alone in prayer. We do not pray in isolation but are joined by the communion of saints. The collects, used by Christians for over fifteen hundred years, unite us with God and his saints everywhere who call on his name. That this is true helps us avoid the temptation of making our prayers into our own private religion, and also saves us from the latest fads. By praying the collects we are confronted with sound doctrine, with God's Word, and with time-tested emotions. Praying the collects can thus prove to be an integral part of a Christian's Spirit-led life of prayer.

Finally, in order to become more familiar with these jewels of prayer, there are a number of sources that might be considered for use. The hymnal and its resources provide an extensive listing of collects for various occasions.⁵² In addition, two excellent volumes deserving space on the pastor's book shelf are Carl Carozzi's *Prayers for Pastor and People* and Frank Colquhoun's *Parish Prayers*.⁵³ Both of these books include prayers of the church year along with prayers for personal and public occasions. The last resource to be mentioned is *Prayers for Worship*, a slender volume of collects intended to supplement the Collect of the Day in the manner of the old Lutheran "text collects."⁵⁴

NOTES

1. Friedrich Lochner, *Der Hauptgottesdienst der Evangelisch-Lutherischen Kirche* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1895), p. 139; tr. John R. Stephenson.
2. Aidan Kavanagh, *Confirmation: Origins and Reform* (New York: Pueblo Publishing Company, 1988), p. 32.
3. *Biblia Sacra Vulgata* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1969), pp. 1852-1853.
4. Kenneth D. Mackenzie, "Collects, Epistles, and Gospels," in *Liturgy and Worship*, ed. W. K. Lowther Clarke (London: SPCK, 1932), p. 374.
5. Robert Taft, "The Structural Analysis of Liturgical Units: An Essay in Methodology," in *Beyond East and West: Problems in Liturgical Understanding* (Washington, D.C.: The Pastoral Press, 1984), p. 156.
6. *Lutheran Book of Worship* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House and Philadelphia: Board of Publication, Lutheran Church in America, 1978), pp. 52-53, 57-58, 78-79, 99, 100, 148-151, 168-173, 200, 209-210. Henceforth to be identified as *LBW*. *Lutheran Book of Worship: Ministers Desk Edition* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House and Philadelphia: Board of Publication, Lutheran Church in America, 1978), pp. 139-142. *Occasional Services: A Companion to Lutheran Book of Worship* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House and Philadelphia: Board of Publication, Lutheran Church in America, 1982), pp. 91-93, 103-104, 194-195, 212-213. *Lutheran Worship* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1982), pp. 159-160, 179-180, 257-260, 276-278, 279-287. Henceforth to be identified as *LW*. *Lutheran Worship Agenda* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1984), pp. 86-87, 375-377. *The Lutheran Hymnal* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1941), pp. 110-112, 116-117, #661. Henceforth to be identified as *TLH*.
7. Peter G. Cobb, "The Liturgy of the Word in the Early

Church," in *The Study of Liturgy*, ed. Cheslyn Jones, Geoffrey Wainwright, and Edward Yarnold (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978), p. 183.

8. Josef A. Jungmann, *The Early Liturgy: To the Time of Gregory the Great*, trans. Francis A. Brunner (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1959), p. 297.

9. *LW*, p. 19.

10. Leo the Great, "The Tome of Leo," in *Christology of the Later Fathers*, eds. Edward Rochie Hardy and Cyril C. Richardson, trans. William Bright (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1954), pp. 361, 363-364.

11. Christmas 1, Easter 4, Pentecost 9, Pentecost 12, Pentecost 23.

12. Christmas 2, Pentecost 4, Pentecost 7, Pentecost 9, Pentecost 12.

13. Easter 3, Trinity 4, Trinity 8, Trinity 11, Trinity 12, Trinity 13.

14. Advent 2, Advent 3, Advent 4, Christmas A, Christmas B, Lent 2, Palm Sunday, Easter Evening, Easter 3, Easter 5, Easter 6, Easter 7, Pentecost 3, Pentecost 6, Pentecost 10, Pentecost 17, Pentecost 19, Pentecost 22.

15. Advent 2, Advent 4, Christmas Eve, Christmas Dawn, Christmas Day, Epiphany 1, Lent 2, Palm Sunday, Easter Eve, Easter 5, Pentecost 2, Pentecost 3, Pentecost 5, Pentecost 6, Pentecost 8, Pentecost 11, Pentecost 15, Pentecost 16, Pentecost 17, Pentecost 18, Pentecost 19, Pentecost 20, Pentecost 24.

16. Advent 2, Advent 3, Advent 4, Christmas Eve, Christmas Day, Palm Sunday, Easter Eve, Easter 2, Easter 4, Easter 5, Easter 6, Trinity 1, Trinity 2, Trinity 5, Trinity 6, Trinity 7, Trinity 9, Trinity 10, Trinity 14, Trinity 15, Trinity 17, Trinity 18, Trinity 19, Trinity 20.

17. Advent 1, Christmas 2, Epiphany, Epiphany 4, Epiphany 6, Epiphany 7, Epiphany 8, Lent 4, Good Friday, Easter Day A, Easter Day B, Easter 2, Ascension, Pentecost 25.

18. Advent 1, Christmas 1, Epiphany 2, Epiphany 4, Epiphany 5, Epiphany 7, Epiphany 8, Lent 3, Lent 5, Tuesday in Holy Week, Good Friday, Easter Day, Easter 2, Ascension, Pentecost, Pentecost 2, Pentecost 23, Third Last Sunday.
19. Advent 1, Christmas 1, Epiphany, Epiphany 1, Epiphany 2, Epiphany 3, Epiphany 4, Epiphany 5, Septuagesima, Sexagesima, Quinquagesima, Lent 1, Lent 2, Lent 3, Lent 4, Lent 5, Monday in Holy Week, Tuesday in Holy Week, Wednesday in Holy Week, Good Friday, Easter, Easter 1, Ascension, Pentecost, Trinity 16, Trinity 21, Trinity 22, Trinity 23, Trinity 24, Trinity 25.
20. "An Order of Mass and Communion for the Church at Wittenberg," 1523, AE 53:20.
21. Lochner p. 140, tr. David P. Scaer.
22. Luther D. Reed, *The Lutheran Liturgy* (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1947, reprint St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1985), p. 280.
23. F. Samuel Janzow, *Luther's Large Catechism: A Contemporary Translation with Study Questions* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1978), p. 80.
24. Collect for Advent 3, in *TLH*, p. 55.
25. *LW*, p. 32.
26. Mt 6:9; Lk 11:2; Jn 15:16, 16:23; Mt 11:25-26; 26:39, 42, 53; 27:46; Mk 14:36; Lk 10:21; 22:42; 23:34, 46; Jn 11:41-42; 12:27-28; 17:1, 5, 11, 21, 24, 25.
27. Acts 4:24, Rm 8:15, 2 Cor 1:3, Gal 4:6, Eph 1:3, Col 1:3, 1 Pt 1:3.
28. Josef A. Jungmann, *The Place of Christ in Liturgical Prayer*, trans. A. Peeler (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1989), p. 169; trans. John A. Stoudt.
29. Advent 1, Advent 3, Advent 4, Tuesday in Holy Week, Maundy Thursday, Good Friday, Pentecost 20.
30. Advent 1, Advent 2, Maundy Thursday, Easter 7, Pentecost 11, Pentecost 18.
31. Advent 1, Advent 3, Advent 4, Maundy Thursday, Ascension.
32. AE 42:22-23.
33. Advent 1, Advent 2, Advent 4, Christmas Day, Christmas 1, Epiphany 2, Epiphany 6, Epiphany 7, Epiphany 8, Lent 1, Tuesday in Holy Week, Good Friday, Easter 2, Ascension, Easter 7, Pentecost 4, Pentecost 7, Pentecost 8, Pentecost 9, Pentecost 10, Pentecost 11, Pentecost 15, Pentecost 16, Pentecost 18, Pentecost 19, Pentecost 21, Pentecost 22, Pentecost 23, Pentecost 24, Pentecost 25, Third Last Sunday.
34. Advent 1, Advent 2, Advent 3, Advent 4, Christmas Day, Christmas 1, Epiphany 1, Epiphany 3, Epiphany 5, Septuagesima, Quinquagesima, Lent 1, Lent 3, Lent 4, Lent 5, Monday in Holy Week, Tuesday in Holy Week, Wednesday in Holy Week, Good Friday, Easter, Easter 1, Easter 6, Ascension, Trinity 4, Trinity 8, Trinity 9, Trinity 13, Trinity 14, Trinity 15, Trinity 16, Trinity 17, Trinity 19, Trinity 20, Trinity 21, Trinity 23, Trinity 24, Trinity 25, Trinity 26.
35. Edward Meyrick Goulburn, *The Collects of the Day: An Exposition Critical and Devotional of the Collects Appointed at the Communion*, vol. 1 (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1880), pp. 13, 17.
36. Dietrich Bonhoeffer, *Psalms: The Prayer Book of the Bible*, trans. James H. Burtness (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1970), p. 11.
37. Aidan Kavanagh, *On Liturgical Theology* (New York: Pueblo Publishing Company, 1984), pp. 134-135.
38. Advent 1, Advent 2, Christmas, Christmas 1, Christmas 2, Epiphany, Epiphany 1, Epiphany 2, Epiphany 3, Epiphany 5, Epiphany 6, Epiphany 7, Epiphany 8, Transfiguration, Lent 5, Palm Sunday, Tuesday in Holy Week, Wednesday in Holy Week, Maundy Thursday, Good Friday, Easter 2, Easter 3, Easter 6, Ascension, Trinity, Pentecost 4, Pentecost 5, Pentecost 7, Pentecost 8, Pentecost 12, Pentecost 13, Pentecost 14, Pentecost 15, Pentecost 16, Pentecost 18, Pentecost 19, Pentecost 20, Pentecost 21, Pentecost 27, Christ the King.
39. Advent 3, Advent 4, Christmas Eve, Christmas Dawn, Christmas Day, Christmas 2, Epiphany, Epiphany 1, Epiphany 2, Epiphany 3, Epiphany 4, Epiphany 6, Epiphany 8, Transfiguration, Lent 2, Palm Sunday, Monday in Holy Week, Good Friday, Easter, Easter 2, Easter 3, Easter 6, Ascension, Easter 7, Pentecost, Trinity, Pentecost 2, Pentecost 3, Pentecost 5, Pentecost 11, Pentecost 12, Pentecost 13, Pentecost 15, Pentecost 17, Pentecost 18.
40. Advent 3, Christmas Day, Epiphany, Epiphany 1, Epiphany 2, Epiphany 3, Epiphany 4, Epiphany 6, Sexagesima, Quinquagesima, Lent 1, Lent 3, Palm Sunday, Good Friday, Easter 1, Easter 2, Ascension, Easter 6, Pentecost, Trinity, Trinity 2, Trinity 6, Trinity 7, Trinity 9, Trinity 11, Trinity 14, Trinity 15, Trinity 16, Trinity 17, Trinity 18, Trinity 20, Trinity 22.
41. *LW*, p. 94.
42. Douglas D. Fusselman, "Pray Like This': The Significance of the Lord's Prayer in Luther's Catechisms," *Concordia Journal* 18 (April 1992), p. 142.
43. Fusselman, p. 150.
44. Walter C. Huffman, *The Prayer of the Faithful: Understanding and Creatively Using the Prayer of the Church* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1986), p. 35.
45. *Ministers Desk Edition*, p. 28. *Altar Book*, p. 28.
46. Kenneth Stevenson, *Accept This Offering: The Eucharist as Sacrifice Today* (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1989), p. 35.
47. See note 6 above. Another resource would be any of the three Augsburg Fortress bulletin insert series "Celebrate," "Lessons and Prayers," and "Jubilate," all of which provide prayers of the church according to the hymnal pattern.
48. Huffman, p. 42.
49. "The Magnificat," 1521, AE 21:325-326.
50. Harold L. Senkbeil, "Liturgy as Mission: A Response to the Challenge Facing Lutheranism from Evangelicals in America Today," *The Bride of Christ*, vol. 15, no. 3 (Pentecost, 1991), p. 13.
51. Richard J. Foster, *Prayer: Finding the Heart's True Home* (San Francisco: Harper-Collins, 1992), p. 107.
52. *TLH*, pp. 102-109, 118-119. *LW*, pp. 124-133. *LW Agenda*, pp. 366-375. *LBW*, pp. 42-51. Occasional Services, pp. 48-75, 290-295. *Service Book and Hymnal* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House and Philadelphia: Board of Publication, Lutheran Church in America, 1958), pp. 218-236.
53. Carl G. Carozzi, ed., *Prayers for Pastor and People* (New York: The Church Hymnal Corporation, 1984). Frank Colquhoun, ed., *Parish Prayers* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1967).
54. Gregory J. Wismar, ed., *Prayers for Worship: Alternate Collects* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1993).

LOGIA BOOKS

NEW *Dying to Live: The Power of Forgiveness.* By Harold L. Senkbeil. CPH, 1994. Approx. 180 pages. Hot off the press! (see the excerpt in this issue's LOGIA Forum, page 81). Only \$9.99 from LOGIA Books plus \$2.00 shipping and handling. Order 5 or more copies @ \$8.99 plus \$2.00 shipping and handling for each. Receive one *FREE* copy of *Dying to Live: A Study Guide* by John T. Pless with each order.

NEW *Dying to Live: A Study Guide.* By John T. Pless. Parish tested, this 28-page study guide from LOGIA Books is excellent for adult Bible study groups of all kinds. Incisive questions and additional insights further amplify Senkbeil's marvelous manuscript. This Study Guide's unique format also allows plenty of space for marginal notes to make it a truly personal "working document." 1-9 copies @ \$1.00 each. 10-24 copies @ \$.85 each. 25+ copies @ \$.70 each. Shipping *FREE*.

Eschatology. By John Stephenson. Vol. XIII of Confessional Lutheran Dogmatics. Robert Preus, Editor. Approx. 176 pages. \$10.95 plus \$2.00 shipping and handling.

The Church and Her Fellowship, Ministry, and Governance. By Kurt E. Marquart. Vol. IX of Confessional Lutheran Dogmatics. Robert Preus, Editor. 264 pages. \$14.95, plus \$2.00 shipping and handling.

Christology. By David P. Scaer. Vol. VI of Confessional Lutheran Dogmatics. Robert Preus, Editor. 113 pages. \$9.95, plus \$2.00 shipping and handling.

Outmoded Condemnations? Antitheses between the Council of Trent and the Reformation on Justification, the Sacrament, and the Ministry—Then and Now. Faculty of Theology, Georgia Augusta University, Göttingen. Translated by Oliver K. Olson, with Franz Posset. 118 pages. \$5.00, plus \$1.00 shipping and handling.

Communion Fellowship: A Resource for Understanding, Implementing, and Retaining the Practice of Closed Communion in the Lutheran Parish. By Paul T. McCain. 33 pages. \$5.00, plus \$1.00 shipping and handling.

Please photocopy, clip, and mail.

Name: _____

Mailing Address: _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____

MAKE CHECKS PAYABLE TO:
"LOGIA"

MAIL ORDERS TO:
LOGIA BOOKS
PO Box 5757
Naperville, IL 60567

TITLE	QUANTITY	PRICE	SHIP/HAND	TOTAL
TOTAL ENCLOSED				

Overseas orders, please include \$3.00 extra shipping per book.
Please allow 4-6 weeks for delivery. All funds U.S.