

Vol. 43
#2

CONCORDIA
THEOLOGICAL
QUARTERLY

CTQ

Volume 43, Number 2

CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

FORT WYNE, INDIANA

APRIL 1979

Wellhausenism Evaluated After A
Century Of Influence..... Raymond F. Surburg 78

Sing a New Song.....Armand J. Boehme 96

God's Here and
Is Not Silent..... Philip M. Bickel 120

Theological Observer 121

Homiletical Studies..... 124

Book Reviews 157

Books Received..... 177



CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Sing A New Song:

The Doctrine of Justification and the
Lutheran Book of Worship Sacramental Liturgies
 Armand J. Boehme

Martin Luther discovered a new song for the church to sing — the song of justification by grace through faith in Jesus Christ. This was really the old song of God's church that had been drowned out by work righteousness. Luther rediscovered the song of justification, and it is the article of faith by which the church stands or falls (*articulis stantis et cadentis ecclesiae*).¹ All of Christian doctrine stands or falls with this article.² This clear doctrine is the only hope for lost and sinful mankind.

However, in the past several decades, a number of Lutheran theologians have felt that the Lutheran Church has moved away from this song of justification by grace to the cacophany of work righteousness. The means by which this shift has been accomplished in Lutheran circles, is the Liturgical movement³ and its products — The *Service Book and Hymnal* with its Eucharistic Prayer;⁴ The Lutheran Hymnal's *Worship Supplement* and its Eucharistic Prayers;⁵ and the *Lutheran Book of Worship* with its Eucharistic Prayers and its whole theology of worship.⁶

The Eucharistic Prayer is not just any prayer used in a Communion service. It is a prayer which encloses or includes the Words of Institution. The Words of Institution are thus changed from Gospel proclamation to the people into a prayer offered to God. This transforms the nature of the Sacrament into something we offer to God, rather than God coming to us in grace. Eucharistic Prayers are traditionally found in the Roman Catholic Mass Canon. This fact caused Werner Elert to write in 1953, "I'm gravely concerned about the future of the American Lutherans . . . They are going back to the canon of the mass."⁷ He and other Lutheran theologians in the 1950's were concerned about the doctrinal changes evident with the inclusion of Eucharistic Prayers in Lutheran worship services. William Nagel wrote of the damage to the doctrine of justification:

It is well known that efforts are being made to restore the so-called "high prayer" to the Lutheran "mass" . . . yet any-

body whom the *sola fide* of the Reformation has made mistrustful of any and every form of pious activism in the appropriation of salvation will look very critically upon this embedding of the *verba testamenti* in which the Lord himself bestows the Supper's gift of grace upon us, in a profusion of human prayer-action.⁸

The article of justification must be the critical principle of all liturgical work, for this alone will help to give God's action first place in the liturgy, and will safeguard the Word and Sacraments as means of grace.⁹ Ragnar Bring noted this emphasis in 1950:

The Sacrament, then, is a gift of God. If the Gospel is to be expressed through the Sacraments, we must wholeheartedly adopt the conception of God as giver. If there is the slightest thought that Communion is an offering to God, a sacred act in God's direction, then the Gospel is rendered null and void at once.¹⁰

Though there was a struggle over the adoption of the Eucharistic Prayer in the *Service Book and Hymnal*,¹¹ the real theological struggle concerning Eucharistic Prayers did not begin in American Lutheranism until the work of the Inter-Lutheran Commission of Worship (ILCW), which produced the *Lutheran Book of Worship* (LBW). Arguments began in earnest in 1970 after Contemporary Worship II, the provisional celebration of the Eucharist was issued by the ILCW.¹² From 1970 to 1975 only ALC and LCA theologians seemed concerned about the dangers to grace and justification brought about by the liturgical innovations of the ILCW.¹³ In 1973, three LCA/ALC seminary faculties formally objected to the doctrinal changes present in the ILCW Communion liturgy.¹⁴ Since 1975, LCMS theologians have also begun to write about the ILCW/LBW liturgies.¹⁵

This paper concentrates on the baptism and communion liturgies of the LBW.¹⁶ What is the basic problem with these liturgies? They confuse Sacrament and sacrifice.¹⁷ The Confessions clearly separate the two.

A Sacrament is a ceremony or work in which God presents to us that which the promise annexed to the ceremony offers . . . A sacrifice, on the contrary, is a ceremony or work we render God in order to afford Him honor.¹⁸

The Sacraments are not the work of man, but the work of God Himself.¹⁹ We are to respond with thanks and praise (sacrifice) to God for what He has given us in the Sacrament. The Apology clearly shows that this occurs properly *after* the reception of the grace in the Sacrament:

After conscience encouraged by faith has perceived from what terrors it has been freed, then indeed it fervently gives

thanks for the benefit and passion of Christ, and uses the ceremony itself to the praise of God, in order by this obedience to show its gratitude; and testifies that it holds in high esteem the gifts of God.²⁰

The comfort of conscience through the forgiveness of sins belongs to the nature (*ad sacramenti rationem pertinet*) of the Sacrament. The thanksgiving belongs to the sacrifice.²¹ The Confessions clearly deny that our sacrifice belongs to the *nature* of a Sacrament.²²

Luther himself excluded *all* thought or word of sacrifice from his final work on the liturgy, the German Mass.²³ Why? Luther speaks eloquently to this point in Article II of the Smalcald Articles. Luther writes of the abomination of the Mass Canon and its sacrifice:

The Mass should by right be relinquished, if for no other purpose than to prevent abuses, even though in itself it had something advantageous and good. How much more ought we to relinquish it, so as to prevent forever these horrible abuses, since it is altogether unnecessary, useless, and dangerous, and we can obtain everything by a more necessary, profitable, and certain way without the Mass.

. . . But since the Mass is nothing else, and can be nothing else (as the Canon and all books declare) than a work of men . . . by which one attempts to reconcile himself and others to God . . . for this very reason it must and should be condemned and rejected. For this directly conflicts with the chief article . . . [i.e., justification].²⁴

If we are bound to the Lutheran Confessions, then we are confessionally bound to avoid mixing our sacrifices with the Sacrament in order to safeguard the doctrine of justification by grace through faith in Christ. Some might say that this was necessary only in Luther's time. However, today it is still necessary to separate clearly our sacrifice from God's Sacraments. This was shown by some disturbing statistics from *A Study of Generations*, an analysis of Lutherans and their beliefs:

. . . the LCA has more members, about three out of five, who agree with rather obvious statements of a belief in salvation by works. The smallest proportion, about two out of five, is found in the LCMS . . . Pastors of the LCMS are the lowest scoring group on Salvation by Works . . . significantly more clergymen of the LCA believe in salvation by works . . .²⁵

Salvation by grace alone through faith alone should be believed by one hundred percent of all Lutherans! Since this central doctrine of justification is not believed or understood by all, should

new worship forms confuse and even contradict the Gospel by turning God's gift in the Sacraments into *our* work and sacrifice?

Many of the criticisms levelled against LBW Sacramental liturgies center on just this point: that the liturgies exalt man's action, work, and sacrifice — and in so doing, they “endanger the doctrine of justification.”²⁶ This danger centers in the LBW's Eucharistic Prayers, which occur in both the baptism and communion liturgies. The “Flood Prayer” in the Baptism liturgy “parallels the eucharistic prayer in the Holy Communion . . .”²⁷

The inclusion of Eucharistic Prayers in the LBW has turned the character of the Lutheran Sacramental worship service upside down. The Words of Institution in the Communion service are no longer proclamation of God's grace to the people, but a prayer man offers to God.²⁸ The Eucharistic Prayer reintroduces into Lutheran worship the very sacrifice of the Canon of the Mass so vehemently rejected by Luther, because it attacked the doctrine of justification.²⁹

In the Eucharistic Prayer, we call to God's remembrance (*anamnesis*, “recalling, memorial”)³⁰ all that Christ has done for our salvation. For the LBW, our prayer calling for God's remembrance becomes one of the constitutive factors of the Sacrament.³¹ The character of the Sacrament is thus turned from God's gift to us, to our act of remembrance directed towards God.³² This was the emphasis of Karlstadt and the Sacramentarians.³³ The ILCW remembrance seems based on the faulty exegetical study of *anamnesis* in the Words of Institution by Joachim Jeremias.³⁴ For the ILCW/LBW or *anamnesis* must call to God's remembrance what Christ has done, before God will forgive.³⁵ Forgiveness depends on our cultic act of worship.³⁶ Here we are again placed squarely back into the *quid pro quo* theology of the medieval mass.³⁷

Tied with the *anamnesis* is our memorializing thanksgiving.³⁸ For the ILCW/LBW our act of thanksgiving is the most important part of the Sacrament: “as something we are to do, the Lord's Supper is an act of thanksgiving . . .”³⁹ Another ILCW author puts it this way: “the Lutherans discarded what was most primitive in the Eucharistic tradition, namely, the act of thanksgiving, and retained what was secondary [i.e., the Words of Institution].”⁴⁰ In defining the Sacrament as our act of thanksgiving, the LBW/ILCW as joined hands with Zwingli who said, “The Eucharist is never the bread or the body of Christ but the act of giving thanks.”⁴¹ He titled his Eucharistic liturgy “A Memorial or Thanksgiving of Christ.”⁴² The LBW, then, has changed the character of the Lord's Supper, as Krodell observes:

. . . the Lord's Supper as our memorializing thanksgiving

is not the Lord's Supper but the Christians' supper. . . . Thus the Lord's Supper is debased to being an identification tag of Christians. A long time ago Luther had strongly rejected this distortion of the Lord's Supper as Zwinglian heresy, since for Zwingli, too, the Lord's Supper is a memorializing thanksgiving.⁴³

Since man's act of thanksgiving and *anamnesis* are "consecrative" for the Eucharist of the LBW,⁴⁴ the Words of Institution undergo a change as well. For the LBW/ILCW the Words of Institution have been changed to a "Narrative of Institution."⁴⁵ Instead of the words of Christ, the ILCW authors give us their story about the words — "it is our telling the story now."⁴⁶ The authors have replaced the words of Christ with their own! The Narrative of Institution has no other purpose for the LBW/ILCW than to serve as "a recital of the particular event which justifies our present act of praise."⁴⁷ The unimportance of the Narrative of Institution is reflected in these words by one of the LBW authors who helped write the eucharistic prayer section of the liturgy:

We suppose, for example, that the one thing which must always be done in celebration of the Lord's Supper is that the narrative of institution be recited. But that is clearly the one thing in all heaven and earth that cannot possibly belong to the necessary structure of the Lord's Supper . . .⁴⁸

Luther and the Confessions hold that the Word consecrates the Sacrament, and without it, there can be no Sacrament. But for the LBW/ILCW the Word no longer consecrates the Sacrament.⁴⁹ For this reason an *epiclesis* (prayer invoking the Holy Spirit) is added to both of the sacramental liturgies.⁵⁰ This addition raises some theological problems.

In the LBW Baptism liturgy, the *epiclesis* follows the actual Baptism and gives the impression that the Holy Spirit has not come to the person through the Word in Baptism, but arrives only after the *epiclesis* is prayed.⁵¹ The *epiclesis* has also led to a great deal of emphasis on the water rather than the Word in Baptism.⁵²

The introduction of the *epiclesis* in the Communion liturgy reflects a theory of consecration that is not in accord with the Lutheran Confessions.⁵³ The invocation of the Holy Spirit has traditionally been used by the Reformed to deny or avoid the Real Presence.⁵⁴ With an *epiclesis*, the character of Communion changes from the Lord's Supper into a meal of the Spirit.⁵⁵

There is also much use of the word "covenant" in the LBW liturgies.⁵⁶ Since "covenant" is also the name of a certain form of Reformed theology (Federalist-Covenant Theology),⁵⁷ the use of this word (along with the *anamnesis* and *epiclesis* as described

earlier) seems to indicate a shift toward Reformed theology by the LBW.⁵⁸

The Lutheran Confessions show exactly what is to be central in the Lord's Supper. The Lord gives us His gifts — forgiveness of sins, His true Body and Blood, the assurance of eternal life. These benefits are placed in the Sacraments solely by the power of the Word — the very words of Christ. For it is the Word which consecrates the Sacraments.⁵⁹

The great emphasis on man's action in the LBW's sacramental liturgies has, in conjunction with other ingredients, led to a confusion of law and Gospel. This confusion is also a result of the faulty method of biblical exegesis used by the ILCW/LBW. One ILCW author writes, ". . . the Confession's exegetical procedure is exactly like that of the ILCW . . ." (This assertion is, of course, false, since we have earlier seen that the ILCW is committed to a historical-critical method which was unknown to the Confessors — see footnote 46.) This combination of man's action and historical-critical method has led ILCW authors to see "the word which constitutes the sacrament as *both* law and gospel, not as gospel only . . ."⁶⁰

The above statement is contrary to both Scripture and the Confessions. The Confessions clearly distinguish between the Gospel and the Law: ". . . the Gospel is properly the promise of the forgiveness of sins and of justification through Christ, . . . the Law is a doctrine which reproves sins and condemns."⁶¹ The Confessions describe the Sacraments, and the Word which consecrates the Sacraments, only in terms of the Gospel (promise, grace, forgiveness, remission, etc.):

The Sacraments are signs of God's will toward us, and not merely signs of men among each other; and they are right in defining that Sacraments in the New Testament are signs of grace. And because in a sacrament there are two things, a sign and the Word, the Word, in the New Testament, is the promise of grace added. The promise of the New Testament is the promise of the remission of sins . . . Therefore the Word offers the remission of sins. And a ceremony is, as it were, a picture or a *seal* . . . of the Word, making known the promise . . . so a ceremony is useless unless such faith is added as it truly confident that the remission of sins is here offered.⁶²

The Confessions clearly show that the Sacramental Word and the Sacraments are Gospel — "Means of Grace" — and not law. Scripture also teaches the same thing. Baptism takes place "for the remission of sins," or "to wash away thy sins" (Acts 2:38; 22:16). "Baptism doth also now save us" (1 Peter 3:21). Holy

Communion was instituted by Christ “for the remission of sins” (Matt. 26:28) Scripture and the Confessions clearly show that the sacraments are Gospel, not law or a mixture of law and Gospel.⁶³

The LBW liturgies also allow for infant communion.⁶⁴ The Lutheran Church opposes infant communion, because of the words of St. Paul: “But let a man examine himself . . .” (1 Cor. 11:28).⁶⁵ Because an infant lacks the ability to examine himself properly previous to reception of the Lord’s Supper, it is obvious that communion should take place only after proper catechetical instruction concerning the Lord’s Supper has been completed.

The LBW Sacramental liturgies contain some of the very worship practices rejected in the Confessions (FCSD X was a refutation of Roman Catholic worship practices forced on the Lutherans).⁶⁶ In fact, the work of the ILCW/LBW is based on a theological principle contrary to the Confessions (AC VII states that common rites and ceremonies are *not* necessary for true unity in the church).⁶⁷

Both Roman Catholic and Reformed influence, then, is evident in the LBW liturgies. Such a hodgepodge of theologies will surely cause confusion among the people in the pew, and a loss of the beautiful doctrinal heritage of the Lutheran Church. Lutheran’s glorious “new song” of justification by grace through faith in Jesus Christ must remain central to Lutherans — in both belief and worship. If we desire to sing that “new song” with a new melody or a new form, that is all well and good. But we must be careful lest the new melody or form change the substance of the song itself. For we want to continue to sing that song of justification loud and strong. It identifies and sustains us as biblical Christians and Confessional Lutherans who want to proclaim clearly the Gospel which alone forgives our sins!

FOOTNOTES

1. The first and chief article is this,

That Jesus Christ, our God and Lord, died for our sins, and was raised again for our justification, Rom. 4:25 Of this article nothing can be yielded or surrendered, even though heaven and earth, and whatever will not abide, should sink to ruin And upon this article all things depend which we teach and practice in opposition to the Pope, the devil, and the world. [Smalcald Articles, Part II, 1-5.]

See also, Augsburg Confession IV. Apology IV. Formula of Concord, Epitome III, Formula of Concord, Solid Declaration III. Bengt Hägglund, *History of Theology*, trans. G.J. Lund (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1968), pp. 225-232. E.H. Klotsche and J. T. Mueller, *The History of Christian Doctrine* (Burlington, Iowa: The Lutheran Literary Board, 1945), pp. 176-178. P. Althaus, *The Theology of Martin Luther*, trans. R.C. Schultz (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966), pp. 224-250.

2. This does not mean that the specific *locus* “De iustificatione” considered by itself, is all that the Lutherans consider indispensable. Rather they regard

the entire *corpus doctrinae* as bound up inextricably with justification. All doctrines have their place in this doctrine. All doctrines stand or fall with the doctrine of justification. [H.J.A. Bouman, "The Doctrine of Justification in the Lutheran Confessions," *Concordia Theological Monthly*, XXVI, 11 (November, 1955), p. 804]

See also, F.E. Mayer, *Religious Bodies in America*, 3rd Ed. (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1958), pp. 144ff. F. Pieper, "Dr. C.F.W. Walther as Theologian," trans. J.T. Mueller, *Concordia Theological Monthly*, XXVI, 12, (December, 1955), pp. 913-920. "Theology of Fellowship," (CTCR Document, n.d.), p. 18. F. Pieper, *Christian Dogmatics*, II, committee trans. (St. Louis; Concordia Publishing House, 1954), pp. 503-557. H. Schmid, *The Doctrinal Theology of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*, trans. H. Jacobs and C.A. Hay (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1961), pp. 424-441. Wm. Arndt, "The Doctrine of Justification," in Theo. Laetsch, ed., *The Abiding Word*, II (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1947), pp. 235-257.

3. Gregory Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy* (Westminster: Dacre Press, 1945). Yngve Brilioth, *Eucharistic Faith and Practice: Evangelical and Catholic* (London: SPCK, 1930). Charles Davis, *Liturgy and Doctrine: The Doctrinal Basis of the Liturgical Movement* (N.Y.: Sheed and Ward, 1960); this book is a must for understanding the theological framework of the ILCW. Chapters 4-7 read like a handbook to the theology of the ILCW. E. Koenker, *The Liturgical Renaissance in the Roman Catholic Church* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1966); this book is a good primer for understanding the theology of Odo Casel, whose *mysterientheologie* appears in ILCW liturgies, pp. 104-124. Odo Casel, *The Mystery of Christian Worship and Other Writings* (Westminster; Md.: Newman Press, 1962). H. Leitzmann, *Mass and Lord's Supper: A Study in the History of the Liturgy*, trans. Dorothea Reeve (Leiden: Brill, 1954). Peter Brunner, *Worship In the Name of Jesus*, trans. M.H. Bertram (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1968).
4. The Appeal for the inclusion of the Eucharistic Prayer in the *Service Book and Hymnal* was made on the grounds of "deepened scholarship." *Service Book and Hymnal* (Minneapolis: APH; Philadelphia: Bd. of Publication: LCA, 1958), p. vii.
5. The *Worship-Supplement* was designed to fill the gap until the new pan-Lutheran Hymnal (*The Lutheran Book of Worship*) could be produced. The "new items" brought forth for LCMS use were "the singing of the Offertory as the offerings [including bread and wine] are brought forth . . . and the Prayer of Thanksgiving" (p.9). The 3 "Prayers of Thanksgiving" (pp. 45-47) are Eucharistic prayers. *Worship Supplement* (St. Louis: CPH, 1969). The LCMS Committee established to revise *The Lutheran Hymnal* had already decided before 1966 to approve "the principle of the Eucharistic Prayer . . . in any subsequent Order of the Holy Communion a Eucharistic Prayer will be included." H.F. Lindemann, "Progress Reports, Synodical Conference: Committee on Liturgical Texts," in E.S. Brown, Jr., ed. *Liturgical Reconnaissance: Papers Presented at the Inter-Lutheran Consultation on Worship* (Philadelphia: FP, 1968), p. 125.
6. Theodore Tappert is reported to have said that were the ILCW theology of worship adopted by the Lutheran Church, "one would have to fight the Reformation all over again." O.K. Olson, "Liturgy as 'Action,'" *Dialog*, 14, 2 (Spring, 1975), p. 113. E.S. Brown, *Reconnaissance*, op. cit. This book is must reading for understanding the theological and liturgical ground that gave rise to the Inter-Lutheran Commission on Worship and the *Lutheran Book of Worship*. The papers in this book were presented at the meeting

- that formed the ILCW. Reasons given for the new hymnal include the promotion of Lutheran unity (pp. 113-114, 118, 131-133), the desire for a common "Christian hymnal for all the major denominations" (pp. 114, 126, 128), and the need for the revision of worship forms brought on by "advances in historical-liturgical studies" (pp. 114, 32). On this last point, see D.M. Granskou, "Historical Critical Exegesis and the Renewal of the Liturgy," *The Lutheran Quarterly*, XIX, 1 (February, 1967), pp. 74-86, esp. 74 and 80. See also C. Davis, *Liturgy and Doctrine*, *op. cit.*
7. L. Green, "Between Luther the 'Now' Generation: Some Thoughts About 'Contemporary Worship' as Advanced by the Inter-Lutheran Commission on Worship," *The Springfielder*, XXXIX, 3 (December 1975), p. 81.
 8. Wm. Nagel, "Justification and the Discipline of Liturgics," trans. Wm. Doberstein, *The Lutheran Quarterly*, Vol. VIII, (1956), pp. 48-49.
 9. *Ibid.*, p. 45.
 10. Ragner Bring, "On the Lutheran Concept of the Sacrament," *World Lutheranism of Today: A Tribute to Anders Nygren* (Rock Island, Ill.: Augustana Book Concern, 1950), p. 87.
 11. *Minutes of the Sixteenth Biennial Convention — ULC* (Philadelphia: The Muhlenberg Press, 1948), p. 444. See also, *Minutes of the Central Pennsylvania Synod* for May 25, 1949.
 12. *Contemporary Worship 2: The Holy Communion* (Minneapolis: APH; Phila.: FP; St. Louis: CPH, 1970).
 13. 1970 — O.K. Olson, "Luther's 'Catholic' Minimum," *Response*, XI, 1-2 (1970), pp. 17-31. "The ILCW order requires the use of a eucharistic prayer (the mass canon), something specifically rejected by the Reformers. . . ," p. 19.
 1971 — "The New Holy Communion," *Lutheran Forum* (April, 1971), pp. 64ff. Three reactions to *Contemporary Worship 2* occur.
 1972 — O.K. Olson, "The Mix Makes a Muddle," *The Lutheran Standard*, 12 (June 20, 1972), pp. 11-12. ". . . mixing God's gift to us with our sacrifices to him results in nothing but a muddle."
 1974 — O.K. Olson, "Contemporary Trends in Liturgy Viewed from the Perspective of Classical Lutheran Theology," *The Lutheran Quarterly*, XXVI, 2 (May, 1974), pp. 110-157. "In its adoption of novel theological insights the ILCW has failed to safeguard the biblical doctrine of Grace Alone," p. 110.
 1975 — O.K. Olson, "Liturgy as 'Action,'" *op. cit.*, pp. 108-113. "That an explicit rejection of the theology of the Lutheran Confessions occurs in a discussion of 'reactualization' may serve to make us wary of the theology of 'action'; and suspect that in the end 'action' implies something a good deal more sinister than the recent talk about an 'evangelical doctrine of sacrifice' leads one to expect. In fact, 'action' is a synonym for 'Works'," p. 111.
 Paul Rorem, "Luther's Objections to a Eucharistic Prayer," *The Cresset* (March, 1975), pp. 12ff. L. Green, *op. cit.*, pp. 81-87. For a listing of many other articles on this subject — pro and con — see O.K. Olson and A.J. Boehme, "An Annotated Bibliography on Some Materials Pertaining to the Present Controversy on the Use of a 'Eucharistic Prayer'" (In Concordia Seminary Library, Ft. Wayne, Ind.).
 14. The three seminaries were Luther Theological Seminary, St. Paul, Minn. (ALC), whose faculty wrote the formal objections; Southern Theological Seminary (LCA), Columbia, S.C.; and Lutheran Theological Seminary (Mt. Airy — LCA), Philadelphia, Pa.
 An excerpt reads: ". . . there are departures from traditional Lutheran worship practices . . . such items as the epiclesis, the 'four-action' shape (with obligatory fraction, offertory procession, and prayer context of the

Words of Institution) and the seeming lack of balance between the sacrificial/sacramental elements of the service to the detriment of the latter." O.K. Olson, "Luther's . . .," *op. cit.*, pp. 112-113.

15. That LCMS theologians did not write about the ILCW liturgies before 1975 seems to stem from the internal problems of the LCMS, and the lack of availability of some ILCW material in LCMS circles. The following list includes the works of LCMS theologians (indicated by *) and non-LCMS theologians.

1975 — Gotthilf Doehler, "The Descent into Hell," *The Springfielder*, XXXIX, 1 (June, 1975), pp. 2-19. This is a refutation of the faculty translation of the Apostles Creed by ICET ("he went to the dead") contained in the *Worship Supplement* and optional in *Lutheran Book of Worship*. *Carl Bornmann, "The Twenty-Seventh Institute of Liturgical Studies," *Ibid.*, pp. 40-43, reports that Eugene Brand (project director for ILCW) said that the Great Commission "can hardly be the actual words of Jesus." He also stated that we must treat the Scriptures critically, and should commune infants.

1976 — *R. Klann, "Inter-Lutheran Commission on Worship," *Concordia Journal*, II, 2 (March, 1976), pp. 41-42. *R. Klann, "Christ's Descent into Hell," *Ibid.*, pp. 43-47. *Arnold F. Krugler, "The Words of Institution: Proclamation or Prayer?" *Ibid.*, pp. 53-60. "For Roman Catholicism the Eucharistic Prayer has always concentrated in it the essential elements of the so-called Sacrifice of the Mass, which Luther saw as devastatingly legalistic and work-righteous." (p. 56). *M.H. Scharlemann, "Some Remarks Regarding the Celebration of the Lord's Supper," *Concordia Journal*, II, 3 (May, 1976), pp. 91-93. *J. Nickel, "Whither the New Hymnal?" *Ibid.*, pp. 110-113. *H. Wangerin, "Thoughts on the New 'Worship Book,'" *Ibid.*, pp. 113-116. *David P. Scaer, "The Great Thanksgiving of the ILCW," *The Springfielder*, XL, 1 (June, 1976), pp. 36-41. R.G. Hughes, "C.W. 7. A Critique . . . To Be Continued," *The Mt. Airy Parish Practice Notebook*, No. 10 (June, 1976), pp. 1-5, criticizes the ILCW Baptism liturgy for liturgically blunting God's gracious approach in Baptism. Clarence L. Lee, "The Great Thanksgiving: A Critical Review," *Ibid.*, pp. 5-7, notes that the ILCW Thanksgiving Prayers make the supper more ours than Christ's. Gottfried Krodel, "The Great Thanksgiving of the Inter-Lutheran Commission on Worship: It is the Christians' Supper and Not the Lord's Supper." *The Cresset: Occasional Paper #1* (Valparaiso University Press, 1976).

1977 — *D. Judisch, "The Deepening Liturgical Crisis," *Concordia Theological Quarterly*, XLI, 1 (January, 1977), pp. 50-52. *D. Judisch, "Delaney's Defense of the ILCW," *Concordia Theological Quarterly*, XLI, 3 (July, 1977), pp. 46-50. *W.E. Schmidt, "Lutheran Book of Worship — A Perspective," *Concordia Journal*, III, 3 (May, 1977), pp. 99-106. *P.F. Foelber, "Lutheran Book of Worship," *Ibid.*, pp. 107-109 — a defense of ILCW. "Editorial: Whatever Became of Common Sense?" *The Bride of Christ*, I, 2 (May, 1977). "Issues at Dallas: The Proposed New Hymnal," *The Lutheran Witness* (May 22, 1977), pp. 6-9.

1978 — "Report and Recommendations of the Special Hymnal Review Committee" (n.p.: n.n., n.d.). Special report by an LCMS committee on the *Lutheran Book of Worship* material. *C.J. Evanson, "Theological Observer," *Concordia Theological Quarterly*, 42, 3 (July, 1978), pp. 305-306 — critique of above LCMS report. *M.W. Bangert, "The LCMS Should Accept The Lutheran Book of Worship." *Christian News*, II, 39 (September 25, 1978), pp. 12-13 — defense of LBW. *T.F. Nickel, "A Brief Evaluation of the Reformation Affirmations," Part II, *Doctrinal Concerns*, I, 8 (September-October, 1978), pp. 1-4. This is a summary of LCA/ALC

Objections to LBW (see also the reprint in *Christian News*, 11, 47, (Nov. 20, 1978), pp 1, 16.) *K. Marquart, "Liturgical Commonplaces," *Concordia Theological Quarterly*, 42, 4 (October, 1978), pp. 330-346. *C.J. Evanson, "Worship and Sacrifice," *Ibid.*, pp. 347-377.

1979 — Glenn N. Schram, "A shift deplored: One man's 'nay' to LBW," *Christian News*, 12, 1 (Jan. 1, 1979), p. 13. *H.D. Hummel, "The 'Great Thanksgiving' in the 'Lutheran Book of Worship,'" *Christian News*, 12, 4 (Jan. 22, 1979), pp. 7-8 — defense of Eucharistic Prayer by a professor at the St. Louis Seminary of the LCMS.

16. The Communion liturgies are found on pp. 57-120 and the Baptism liturgy on pp. 121-125 of the *Lutheran Book of Worship: Pew Edition* (Minneapolis: APH; Phila.: Bd. of Pub., LCA, 1978). Most important to read are the rubrics to the sacramental services in *Lutheran Book of Worship: Ministers Desk Edition* (Minneapolis: APH; Phila.: Bd. of Pub., LCA, 1978), pp. 25-32. The rubrics show that the thanksgivings of the Baptism service are equivalent to the Eucharistic prayers of the communion services. An intensive study of these rubrics should be made. This edition also has 4 Eucharistic Prayers, three of which are not contained in *LBW: Pew Edition* (pp. 221-227, *LBW: Ministers Desk Edition*).

17. "My sacrifice is shared in that what we offer together will be returned to us as heavenly food for our sustenance and joy. In this cultic motion from sacrifice to sacrament the mystery of God's action among men is demonstrated: what we surrender [offer/sacrifice] to him he gives to us and through us to others." Eugene Brand, "Luther's Liturgical Surgery: Twentieth Century Diagnosis of the Patient," in *Interpreting Luther's Legacy: Essays in Honor of Edward C. Fendt*, (Minneapolis: APH, 1969), p. 188.

The ILCW bases this self-sacrifice on Rom. 12:1 (*LBW: MDE*, p. 28, #25; *CWII*, p. 100). Our self-sacrifice to God includes the bread and wine to be used for the Sacrament (*The Great Thanksgiving: ILCW* — N.Y.: The Inter-Lutheran Commission on Worship, 1975 — p. 6); see also the rubrics for the *LBW* which make it evident that this offering and self-sacrifice is not really optional (*LBW: MDE*, pp. 26, 28; #24, 25). E.L. Brand, project director for ILCW, shows that this offertory and self-sacrifice is not optional for the authors of ILCW when he writes that if you leave it out "you will have no grounds to call what has been done the Lord's Supper," E. Brand, "Ceremonial Forms and Contemporary Life," *Response*, VIII, 2, (St. Michael, 1966), p. 95. See also R.M. Hals, "The Concept of Sacrifice as a Background for the Eucharist," *The Lutheran Quarterly*, 26, 2 (May, 1974), pp. 174-188.

This Roman Catholic idea of combining Sacrament and sacrifice is a feature of the modern Liturgical movement of which the *Lutheran Book of Worship* is a part. C. Davis, *op. cit.*, pp. 85-111.

Luther provides an excellent contrast to the faulty thinking of the ILCW: For unless we firmly hold that the mass is the promise or testament of Christ, as the words clearly say, we shall lose the whole gospel and all its comfort. Let us permit nothing to prevail against these words . . . for they contain nothing about a work or a sacrifice . . . Therefore, just as distributing a testament or accepting a promise differs diametrically from offering a sacrifice, so it is a contradiction in terms to call the mass a sacrifice, for the former is something that we receive and the latter is something that we give. The same thing cannot be received and offered at the same time, nor can it be both given and accepted by the same person . . . What shall we say then of the canon of the mass [i.e., eucharistic prayers] . . . it would be safer to reject them all than admit that the mass is a work or a sacrifice, lest we deny the word of Christ and destroy faith together

with the mass. [*Luther's Works*, 36, 51-52.]

18. Apology XXIV, 18; see also 68-77. See also Apology XIII, 3.
19. Large Catechism IV, 10; V, 6.
20. Apology XXIV, 74-75.
21. "And the Fathers, indeed, speak of a two-fold effect, of the comfort of consciences and of thanksgiving, or praise. The former of these effects pertains to the nature [the right use] of the Sacrament; the latter pertains to the sacrifice." Apology XXIV, 75.
22. A reading of the confessional writings clearly shows that the Confessions do not refer to the sacrament as a sacrifice:

The Augsburg Confession refers to the sacraments as "Signs and testimonies of the will of God toward us" (XII, 1-2; see also IX, X, XXIV).

The Apology calls Sacraments "rites which have the command of God, and to which the promise of grace has been added . . ." (XIII, 3; see also IX, X, XXIV).

See also Smalcald Articles Part II, Article II; Part III, Articles V, VI.

The Large Catechism refers to the sacraments as "Treasure and gift" (*Schatz und Geschenk; Thesaurus et donum*) (V, 29; see also 36). The sacraments are "not our work, but God's" and faith in the sacrament "excludes and repels all works which we can do . . ." (IV, 35 & 34).

The Formula refers to the Sacrament of Communion in Article VII: "We likewise reject and condemn all other papistic abuses of this Sacrament, as the abomination of the sacrifice of the mass for the living and the dead" (FCTD VII, 109).

This brief study clearly shows that the Confessions clearly distinguish between Sacrament (what God does for and to us) and sacrifice (what we do in response to God's gracious gift in the Sacrament). Sacrament cannot be a sacrifice — and this is a confessional principle!

For a clear refutation of the ILCW's faulty translation and exegesis of Rom. 12:1, see O.K. Olson, "Contemporary . . ." *op. cit.*, pp. 134-137; A. Krugler, *op. cit.*, pp. 57-58; Apology XXIV, 26. For a clear refutation of the mixing of Sacrament and sacrifice, see O.K. Olson, "Mix . . ." *op. cit.*, pp. 11-12.

23. For texts of the German mass, see *Luther's Works* 53, or B. Thompson, *Liturgies of the Western Church* (New York: The World Publishing Co.: A Meridian Book — New American Library, 1961), pp. 95-137.

"The third captivity of this sacrament is by far the most wicked abuse of all . . . that the mass is a good work and a sacrifice" (LW 36, 35).

"Therefore these two things — mass and prayer, sacrament and work, testament and sacrifice — must to be confused; for the one [Mass, sacrament, testament] comes from God to us . . . the other [prayer, work, sacrifice] proceeds from our faith to God . . ." (LW 36, 56; also 288-289).

"Let us, therefore, repudiate everything that smacks of sacrifice, together with the entire canon and retain only that which is pure and holy" (LW 53, 26).

Luther scholars agree that Luther saw "that the most dangerous heresy of all in the doctrine of the Lord's Supper was that which regarded it as 'a sacrifice and a good work.'" J. Pelikan, "The Theology of the Means of Grace," in H. Kadai, ed., *Accents in Luther's Theology* (St. Louis: CPH, 1967), p. 135. Luther "was careful not to make a direct connection between the temple sacrifice and the eucharist, if only for the reason that he had to destroy the concept of the sacrifice of the mass . . ." H. Bornkhamm, *Luther and the Old Testament*, trans. Eric and Ruth Gritsch (Phila.: Fortress Press, 1969), p. 186. Luther "urged the retention of the elements that did not suggest sacrifice. The Lord's Supper was a gift to the congregation — not a good

deed of the worshipper." Conrad Bergendoff, *The Church of the Lutheran Reformation* (St. Louis: CPH, 1967), p. 51. "Luther regained for the church a sacrament in place of the sacrifice of the Mass, making Communion, in the vernacular, conform to its Biblical origin." *Ibid.*, p. 285. "In the first stage, Luther is fighting to preserve the genuine meaning of the sacrament as a gift of God in opposition to the doctrine of the sacrifice of the Mass." P. Althaus, *op. cit.*, p. 375.; see also p. 392. "The canon of the mass disappeared because this was the portion in which the reference to sacrifice occurred." R. Bainton, *Here I Stand* (Nashville/N.Y.: Abingdon Press, 1950), p. 339. ". . . Luther eliminated all prayers which spoke of sacrifice . . . both the small and large Canon, and many other prayers of the mass." Carl Wisloff, *The Gift of Communion: Luther's Controversy with Rome on Eucharistic Sacrifice*, trans. J.M. Shaw (Minneapolis: APH, 1964), p. 167; see also pp. 56-72, 140-155, 166-182.

"What makes the offertory procession intolerable for evangelical Christians at bottom is that by identifying the gifts that worshippers bring with the elements of Communion, a doctrinal link is made between the believer's self-sacrifice and Christ's sacrifice on Calvary, thus implying that we participate in our own redemption. There is nothing clearer in all of Lutheran theology on the liturgy than that our self-sacrifice be kept clearly separate from Christ's." O.K. Olson, "Contemporary . . ." *op. cit.*, p. 137.

". . . The ILCW proposes to make the entire reception of the body and blood of Christ dependent upon the action of the congregation in *first* offering the gifts *needed* for the Lord's Supper . . . Is this nothing else than a return to the Roman Catholic 'Sacrifice of the Mass' that so stirred the ire of the Lutheran Reformers?" A. Krugler, *op. cit.*, p. 58.

"It is inadvisable, if not improper, to mix our gifts with God's Gifts . . . Surely the mixing of our gifts with God's Gifts detracts from the centrality of the bread and wine in the eucharist. Our present practice may have the effect of minimizing God's Gifts, to some extent even of negating them. And we must ask whether our present offertory practice does not mislead us into considering ourselves as the givers rather than as receivers of the divine Gifts. Our practice seems virtually to shout out that we are engaging in a barter or in a gift-exchange process." Arlo D. Duba, "Gifts in Worship: God's and Ours," *Liturgy* (Dec., 1976), p. 299.

24. Smalcald Articles, Part II, Article II, 6-7.

25. M.P. Strommen, M.L. Brekke, R.C. Underwager, A.L. Johnson, *A Study of Generations* (Minneapolis: APH, 1972), p. 272. See also pp. 276, and 369-Scale 15.

26. L. Green, *op. cit.*, p. 82. ". . . many of us who have used the rite feel that the approach of the gracious God (the central action of Baptism) has been liturgically blunted." R.G. Hughes, *op. cit.*, p. 2. "The ILCW order is a basic challenge to Lutheran doctrine. It is based on theological principles which tend to blunt the doctrine of grace." O.K. Olson, "Luther's . . ." *op. cit.*, p. 17. "In its adoption of novel theological insights the ILCW has failed to safeguard the biblical doctrine of grace." O.K. Olson, "Contemporary . . ." *op. cit.*, p. 110. "To imbed Christ's Words of Promise into the Eucharistic Prayer is to destroy their character as Gospel to the congregation." A. Krugler, *op. cit.*, p. 56. "Luther would reject TGT [The Great Thanksgiving] as papal heresy . . ." G. Krodel, *op. cit.*, p. 29. See also T.F. Nickel, *loc. cit.*; G. Schram, *loc. cit.*; O.K. Olson, "Liturgy . . ." *loc. cit.*

27. *Lutheran Book of Worship: Ministers Desk Edition*, p. 31, #9; the text of the prayer is on pp. 309-310. *LBW: Pew Edition*, p. 122. For a thorough criticism of the use of this prayer see R.G. Hughes, *loc. cit.* The LBW text has so changed Luther's original "flood prayer" as to make it unacceptable.

28. “. . . one should not pray the Words of Institution but rather proclaim them to the people. Put simply, a prayer, especially of praise and thanksgiving, is our offering to God. The Gospel is God’s proclamation to us. The Words of Institution are Gospel. Therefore they are to be proclaimed to the people and not prayed to God.” Paul Rorem, *op. cit.*, p. 16.
- “To imbed Christ’s Words of Promise into the Eucharistic Prayer is to destroy their character as Gospel to the congregation. . . . the proposal to imbed the Words of Institution in a prayer spoken by the pastor-priest at the altar is a return to the Semi-Pelagian or synergistic dogma of self-sacrifice that Luther so properly condemned. It is to change the event of Holy Communion from one in which the congregation is the recipient of God’s undeserved grace to one in which the congregation makes an exchange with God. We offer Him our prayers, our money, and our bread and wine. In return He supposedly gives us the body and blood of Christ. Holy Communion becomes our feast to which we by prayer invite the Holy Spirit.” A. Krugler, *op. cit.*, pp. 56-57.
- “The ILCW order requires the use of a eucharistic prayer (the mass canon), something specifically rejected by the Reformers . . . because . . . to mix man’s prayers with God’s proclamation creates confusion and reverses the sacrament’s God-to-man direction of movement . . . Luther was flatly opposed to any kind of eucharistic prayer, since the implication for the liturgy of his emphasis on grace was that the mass is essentially something God does for man, not vice versa. . . . He was against all eucharistic prayers, because *they reverse the direction of movement from God to man*. The mass becomes something man does.” O.K. Olson, “Luther’s . . .” *op. cit.*, pp. 19, 24-25.
- “In adopting the Commission’s proposals — which of necessity means adopting the basic exegetical-theological rationale developed by the Commission — we must be aware that we are not simply enriching or enlivening the liturgical-tradition of the Lutheran churches; we are changing that tradition — changing it in a massive, substantive way that strikes at the very meaning and purpose of the sacrament in the Lutheran tradition.” C.L. Lee, *op. cit.*, p. 6. See also Wm. Nagel, *op. cit.*, pp. 48ff.
29. Theologians anxious to return the eucharistic prayers to the Lutheran worship service fault Luther for removing them from the service. See F.C. Senn, “Luther’s Revision of the Eucharistic Canon in the *Formula Missae* of 1523,” *Concordia Theological Monthly*, XLIV, 2 (March, 1973), pp. 108ff. E.L. Brand, “Luther’s Liturgical . . .” *op. cit.*, pp. 108ff. H. Hummel, *op. cit.*, p. 7.
30. O.K. Olson, “Contemporary . . .” *op. cit.*, p. 137.
31. “. . . St. Paul’s Greek text makes *remembrance* the *goal* of our act of thanksgiving . . . Narrative remembrance leads into specific prayer, *the Remembrance, or Anamnesis, Therefore, O God, with this bread and cup* . . ., etc. Here we directly call our Lord’s life, death and resurrection to memory, before God and the fellowship.” *TGT*, *op. cit.*, p. 3.
32. “Thus the Lord’s Supper is interpreted as a remembrance of Christ’s sacrifice enacted with the elements, a ceremony to which we add, not for ourselves but for God, our mental activity of recalling that sacrifice and of calling upon God to remember this sacrifice and — obviously — act accordingly. At this point the Lord’s Supper has been transformed into a cult, not different from any pagan cult, by which man tries to manipulate God According to the authors our obedience to Christ’s command ‘Do this’ involves that we do something so that God remembers something. Poor God, that he needs us to remind him! Is his memory span so short? . . . Christ’s sacrifice is repeated by means of remembrance . . .” G. Krodel, *op.*

cit., p. 13. A careful study of pp. 13-24 of Krodel's paper will reveal the fundamental gap between Luther and the *Lutheran Book of Worship*.

"The casual reintroduction of the *anamnesis* and *epiclesis*, which are required in the new tire . . . implicitly deny the centrality of the Word . . ." O.K. Olson, "Luther's . . ." *op. cit.* p. 27.

"The prayer of *anamnesis* has been the locus for the sacrifice of the mass and for the doctrine of transubstantiation in the Western church. In the terminology of Lutheran theology the *anamnesis* prayer belongs to the realm of *theologia gloriae*." O.K. Olson, "Contemporary . . ." *op. cit.*, pp. 137, 139. See also O.K. Olson, "Liturgy . . ." *loc. cit.*

The Confessions and Luther speak about a proper remembrance:

"For to remember Christ is not the idle celebration of a show, or one instituted for the sake of example, as the memory of Hercules or Ulysses is celebrated in tragedies, but it is to remember the benefits of Christ and receive them by faith, so as to be quickened by them." Apology XXIV, 72.

"By the words, 'This do in remembrance of me,' Christ meant what Paul meant by his words, 'Proclaim the death of the Lord,' etc. I Cor. 11:26. Christ wants us to make Him known when we receive the sacrament and proclaim the gospel, so as to confirm faith. He does not want us to sit and indulge in such fancies and make out of such a remembrance a good work, as Dr. Karlstadt dreams." *Luther's Works*, 40, 208.

"Thus both 'remembrance' and 'proclamation' mean nothing else than the preaching of him [Christ] publicly, as is done in all sermons." *Luther's Works* 36, 349.

"For Christ completely separates the two matters, sacrament and remembrance, when he says, 'Do this in remembrance of me.' The sacrament is one matter, the remembrance is another matter." *Luther's Works* 38, 122.

It is noted that neither Luther nor the Confessions state that remembrance is to be directed to God; it is to be proclaimed to the people.

33. "The first fault which he [Luther] found with the enthusiasts and the Swiss was that they failed to recognize that the Lord's Supper is God's gift . . . Their conception of the sacrament as primarily a meal of remembrance not only despised the clear words of Christ, but was also a merciless act toward man in his actual situation. . . . The understanding of the Lord's Supper as a meal of remembrance is ultimately nothing else than a doctrine of work righteousness which does not lead man out of his trouble. Instead, it actually leads him deeper into his trouble because it requires that he climb out by genuine remembrance and love, which he must create by his own powers." P. Althaus, *op. cit.*, p. 392.

For Zwingli "the purpose of the sacrament, therefore, is to lift our faith by remembrance of the breaking of Christ's body for us on the cross, to heaven, where he sits bodily at the right hand of God . . ." *Luther's Works* 37, xviii. See also G. Rupp, *Patterns of Reformation* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969), pp. 146-147. G.W. Bromiley, trans., ed. *Zwingli and Bullinger* (Phila.: The Westminster Press, 1953; The Library of Christian Classics, XXIV), pp. 234-235. *Luther's Works* 40, pp. 182-186; 207-214.

34. "'In remembrance of me' can then scarcely mean 'that you may remember me,' but most probably 'that God may remember me.'" J. Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, trans. N. Perrin (Phila.: Fortress Press, 1977), pp. 254-255; see also pp. 237-253.
35. Here the *Lutheran Book of Worship* reflects the work of Peter Brunner:
- "The fact that the church celebrates the remembrance of Christ by prayer, proclamation, and act thus becomes an event which elicits the remembrance of the Lord Himself. . . . the New Testament covenant memorial ascends to God's throne and evokes His active, end-effecting

remembering. . . . In its earthly administration it releases a heavenly event, a kingdom-of-God movement in the heavens, yes, even in the heart of God." P. Brunner, *op. cit.*, p. 192.

36. "The sacraments can be understood only in the attitude of the recipient because they, in as far as they are administered by man, involve reception; they are acts for receiving the promises. What is received in them is the content. . . . But now already it must be stated that their fulfillment can by no means be considered as resulting from man's cultic acts. That marks the difference between sacramental action and sorcery. The sorcerer purposes to effect, to generate, or even to compel something. Whenever associated with a deity, sorcery attempts to pressure the deity. To conceive of the Christ-ordained sacraments in that light would be blasphemy." W. Elert, *The Lord's Supper Today*, trans M. Bertram and R.F. Norden (St. Louis: CPH, 1973) p. 10.
37. ". . . TGT turns the Lord's Supper into our work . . . Christ's sacrifice is repeated by means of remembrance . . . at this point Zwingli's concept of the Lord's Supper is merged with the Roman concept of the Mass as a sacrifice . . . Zwingli . . . defines it as a subjectively-oriented remembrance of Christ's sacrifice. For him the Lord's Supper is a remembrance act of Christ's suffering and death, to be repeated by us." G. Krodel, *op. cit.*, pp. 13-14.

"This reintroduction of the crude *quid pro quo* theology of the medieval mass by an inter-Lutheran commission is so unexpected and hard to believe that we are still included to look charitably for articulations of a different character within the document to relive us of the necessity of having to face a totally unacceptable interpretation of the sacrament . . . however . . . the charitable search for mitigating language and theology appears fruitless." C.L. Lee, *op. cit.*, pp. 6-7.

TGT admits that "as we bring God's saving acts to remembrance" our act is to "be included in his one saving act in the Lord Jesus." TGT, *op. cit.*, p. 1. Our remembrance saves or justifies us in the sight of God, according to ILCW. This also is a feature of the modern liturgical movement which states that in the Eucharist "Christ's redemptive work is sacramentally renewed, so that we can take part in it." C. Davis, *op. cit.*, p. 69; also pp. 53, 82.

Luther resoundingly rejected any such notion: "But it is still more mischievous and malicious, that he gives such remembrance the power to justify, as faith does. The proof he [Karlstadt] gives is, he says, that it is written, 'That they have done this in remembrance of me.' What think you? It is written, 'They have done it in remembrance of me.' Therefore such remembrance justifies. There you comprehend how well Dr. Karlstadt understands the Lord's Supper, his remembrance, and justification, namely, that the devil shows only ridicule and scorn in these matters." *Luther's Works* 40, 207.

38. TGT, *op. cit.*, pp. 1-3.
39. *Ibid.*, p. 2.
40. F. Senn, *op. cit.*, p. 653.
41. U. Zwingli, *Opera*, ed. Schuler and Schulthess (Zurich: Schulthess, 1832), 3, 542; quoted in P. Althaus, *op. cit.*, p. 393. For Zwingli's liturgy see B. Thompson, *op. cit.*, pp. 141-156. "The Eucharist is a rite of thanksgiving, an uplifting of the heart, a confession of faith." J. Rillet, *Zwingli: Third Man of the Reformation*, trans. H. Knight, (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1964), p. 228.
42. B. Thompson, *op. cit.*, p. 151.
43. G. Krodel, *op. cit.*, pp. 11-12. "We know, however, that it is the Lord's Supper, in name and in reality, not the supper of the Christians. For the Lord not only instituted it, but also prepares and gives it himself, and is him-

self, cook, butler, food, and drink as we have demonstrated our belief above." *Luther's Works* 37, 142. See also F.R. Webber, *Studies in the Liturgy* (Erie, Pa.; Ashby Printing Company, 1938); see especially chapter 13, "Was There a Great Trinitarian Hymn of Thanksgiving?"

44. "Inasmuch as the authors define thanksgiving in terms of a memorializing thanksgiving, the presence of Christ depends, then, on our memorializing thanksgiving . . . For TGT Christ and his Word are not constitutive for the Lord's Supper, but our memorializing thanksgiving is." G. Krodel, *op. cit.*, pp. 10, 28.
45. *TGT, op. cit.*, p. 3. Krodel notes what the LBW/ILCW has done here: "Instead of biblical texts we hear a 'liturgical narrative' which the authors have 'composed.' The *authors'* particular event which justifies our present act of praise' . . . It is not the Word of God but the authors' composition . . ." G. Krodel, *op. cit.*, p. 9.

The Confessions note what happens to the Lord's Supper when we no longer use God's Word but the words of man: ". . . not the word or work of any man produces the true presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Supper . . . but all this should be ascribed alone to the power of Almighty God and the word . . . of our Lord Jesus Christ . . . in all places where the Supper is celebrated according to the institution of Christ, and His Words are used, the body and blood of Christ are truly present, distributed, and received, because of the power and efficacy of the words which Christ spoke at the first Supper. . . . no man makes the bread and wine set before us the body and blood of Christ, but Christ Himself . . ." FCSD VII, 74-76. ". . . if you take away the Word . . . you have nothing but mere bread and wine . . ." *Large Catechism* V, 14. See also *Luther's Works* 36, 277.

If we use not the Words of Christ but our own words, the bread and wine are not consecrated; they remain bread and wine. There is then no Real Presence of the body and blood of Christ in, with, and under the bread and wine. The LBW Narrative of Institution removes the Real Presence from the Lord's Supper, because it substitutes the words of men for the Words of Christ!

"For the authors of the *FC* the *verba* are to be recited as *verba consecrationis* because they efficaciously set up the institution. If the *verba* are not recited as *verba consecrationis* but only as a story [narrative], as Jenson and the ILCW suggest (II), then only bread and wine is distributed . . ." G. Krodel, "Consecration in the Lord's Supper: An Examination of the Proposal of the ILCW in Light of *FC.SD* VII. 83/84 and Johann Gerhard's *Loci Theologici XVIII/XXI*" (unpublished paper read to the ILCW Symposium, Ft. Wayne, Ind., April, 1977; rev. ed.), p. 31.

"Luther would reject TGT as the heresies of Karlstadt, Zwingli, and Calvin because it negates the real presence of Christ . . . and instead maintains a presence of Christ *via* a memorializing thanksgiving . . . For TGT Christ and his Word are not constitutive for the Lord's Supper . . . Since there is no real presence, there is no distribution of forgiveness of sins, and no comfort of souls." G. Krodel, "The Great . . ." *op. cit.*, p. 28.

Carl Wisloff draws a parallel between the emphasis on sacrifice and the doctrine of the Real Presence: "The doctrine of the real presence does not lead to the idea of the Eucharistic sacrifice but is rather the most absolute hindrance against any mention of sacrifice in connection with the sacrament." C. Wisloff, *op. cit.*, p. 155. The greater emphasis on sacrifice in the liturgy would then indicate a lessening of the importance of the Real Presence.

46. "The liturgical narrative is *not* the reading of a Scripture excerpt or of a conflation of excerpts; it is our telling the story now." *TGT, op. cit.*, p. 3. What

can be the cause of this replacement of the words of Christ with the words of men? An answer is provided by a professor at Lutheran School of Theology in Chicago. He writes:

"If there is to be a liturgical renewal in our times, then a truly prophetic statement on the relation between the Bible and liturgy is in order. In such a statement one would have to come to grips with the historical-critical method of exegesis and its relation to liturgical renewal, for the Bible which is to be related to the liturgy is the Bible as we know it in the twentieth century . . . if the proposed new common hymnal . . . is to have a role in liturgical renewal, then it cannot ignore or brush aside what has gone on in critical biblical research during the last century.

"As Bultmann has shown, the primary historical datum in the New Testament is the faith of the primitive Christian community. This radically revises older understandings of the founding of sacraments like Baptism and the Lord's Supper by Jesus, and the Lutheran criteria for a sacrament stressing the command of Jesus needs redefinition. Liturgies written in a pre-critical age made far different assumptions about the primary historical data, which was then supposed to be a direct report of the life and thought of Jesus and the apostles, by the apostles. The Christians who wrote these liturgies were men of good faith who used the Bible as they understood it. However, if we are to be as biblical as they, we must use the Bible and the biblical words according to our understanding, not theirs.

"The liturgy which we have does present the Bible, but it is presented in the only way that a pre-critical age of exegesis could present it." David M. Granskou, *op. cit.*, pp. 74, 80, 85.

Another theologian reinforces the above opinion when he writes: "This is not to say, though, that the bread and wine sayings necessarily go back to Jesus." Eduard Schweizer, *The Lord's Supper According to the New Testament*, trans. J.M. Davis (Phila.: FP-Facet Books: Biblical Series #18, 1967), p. 16, footnote #41.

The LBW/ILCW also followed many of the ideas found in J. Jeremias' book, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus* (*loc. cit.*). This book first appeared in the mid 1930's and was the cause for Michael Reu's essay, "Can We Still Hold to the Lutheran Doctrine of the Lord's Supper?" *Two Treatises on the Means of Grace* (Minneapolis: APH, 1952), pp. 40-118. Reu notes that if Jeremias' conclusions are accepted, the Lutheran Biblical doctrine of the Lord's Supper is lost.

Doubt (as to whether we have the actual words of Christ) created by historical-criticism is one contributing cause behind this change in the attitude towards the words of institution. For, in the words of M. Reu, ". . . Baptism and the Lord's Supper . . . can be such firm realities only if they are divinely instituted, and if the Spirit testifies to me, that Scripture, which relates their institution, is reliable ground, created by God Himself, that it is the Word of God itself." "What Is Scripture and How Can We Become Certain of Its Divine Origin?" *Kirchliche Zeitschrift* (Aug., 1939), quoted in M.H. Scharlemann, "Reu and the Doctrine of the Holy Scriptures," *Concordia Journal*, V, 1 (Jan., 1979), p. 19. See also C. Bornmann, *op. cit.*, pp. 40-43.

47. *TGT, op. cit.*, p. 3. A problem is also noted with the text of the Narrative of Institution:

"Further, the authors are wrong when they state that their version is faithful to Scripture's witness as a whole. . . in their version the authors are not only not faithful to the text and witness of Scripture, but they distort it. . . On these texts the authors perform major surgery. . . It must be pointed out that here the authors substitute their version of the text for Scripture. . . Further, there is a fundamental difference between the text of this verse that

the authors present to us and the text that we find in Scripture. . . . The authors' statement is based on their version of the text, and this raises the question: Is the Lutheran church ready to adopt as basis for its liturgy the ILCW version of Scripture?" G. Krodel, "The Great . . ." *op. cit.*, pp. 8-10.

48. R.W. Jenson, "Toward Reform of the Lutheran Liturgical Tradition," *Bulletin of the Lutheran Theological Seminary Gettysburg*, 56, 1 (Feb., 1976), pp. 44ff.
49. See footnotes 44-47, and previous quote.
50. *LBW*, *op. cit.*, pp. 70, 90, 111, 122, 124. *LBW: MDE*, *op. cit.*, pp. 221-225, 257-262, 293, 298, 309-311. *TGT*, *op. cit.*, p. 4.
51. *LBW*, *op. cit.*, pp. 123-124; *LBW: MDE*, *op. cit.*, p. 311.
52. "Water" is mentioned 7 times in the *LBW* liturgy; this is as opposed to 2 times in the current LC-MS liturgy (*The Pastor's Companion*, St. Louis: CPH, n.d., pp. 1-7). ". . . the answer to the catechism question, 'How can water produce such great effects,' is re-statement of the resistance of the Western church to the practice of *epiclesis*. Luther, in re-stating the position of Augustine that it is the word of God which is the means of grace, not the water, can be said to speak for the Western church. Restoration of the Baptismal *epiclesis* . . . will produce an order at odds with Lutheran doctrine on baptism." O.K. Olson, "Contemporary . . ." *op. cit.*, p. 140. ". . . the eucharistic *epiclesis* as at baptism . . . runs into contradiction with the apostolic Gospel." L. Goppelt, *Apostolic and Post-Apostolic Times* (New York: Harpers, 1970), p. 220.
53. "An example of a substantial influence is the position of the Invocation of the Holy Ghost after the Words of Institution in the Eucharistic Prayer of the new *Service Book and Hymnal* prepared by the Inter-synodical Commission on the Liturgy, a position that reflects the theory of consecration through the *Epiclesis*, in contrast to the Western doctrine, shared by the Lutheran Confessions, of consecration through the Words of Institution." Arthur Carl Piepkorn, "The Protestant Worship Revival and the Lutheran Liturgical Movement," in M.H. Shepherd, Jr., ed., *The Liturgical Renewal of the Church* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1960), pp. 90-91.
The Confessions make this point very clearly: "It is the Word (I say) which makes and distinguishes this Sacrament, so that it is not mere bread and wine, but is, and is called, the body and blood of Christ . . . The Word must make a Sacrament of the element, else it remains a mere element . . . It is true, indeed, that if you take away the Word . . . you have nothing but mere bread and wine." *Large Catechism* V, 10-14. ". . . where the Supper is celebrated according to the institution of Christ, and His words are used, the body and blood of Christ are truly present, distributed, and received, because of the power and efficacy of the words which Christ spake at the first Supper." *FCTD* VII, 75.
54. The views of Calvin are found in the Scotch Confession of Faith, Art. XXI: "In the Supper, rightly used, Christ Jesus is so joined with us that He becomes the very Nourishment and Food for our souls This union is wrought by the operation of the Holy Ghost, who by true faith carries us above all earthly things . . . and makes us to feed upon the body and blood of Christ Jesus, which was once broken and shed for us but is now in heaven . . ." F. E. Mayer, *Religious Bodies of America* (St. Louis: CPH, 1958), pp. 215-216, footnote 68. See also J. Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, trans. H. Beveridge (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1966), II, pp. 563-565, 570-571, 582-583, 592; *Calvin's Commentaries: The Gospels*, (Grand Rapids: Associated Publishers and Authors Inc., n.d.), VII, p. 506.

For Zwingli's doctrine see, Ulrich Zwingli, *Fidei Ratio* (1530), in H.E.

Jacobs, *Book of Concord* (Phila.: General Council Publication Board, 1919), II, pp. 168ff.; G. W. Bromiley, *op. cit.*, pp. 179, 183-184.

55. "A related point is that the invocation of the Holy Spirit is included in this eucharistic prayer. It is important that this sacrament be associated with the proper person of the Trinity. It is Jesus, God the Son, who gave us His body and blood. Certainly any suggestions should be avoided that the Eucharist is the Holy Spirit's supper." D. Scaer, *op. cit.*, p. 36.
- "People who consider it necessary to call upon the Holy Spirit for something to happen in the Lord's Supper shift the center of the Lord's Supper from the Second Article of the Creed to the Third, as Calvin did. For the Lutheran tradition the Lord's Supper is first of all a Christological event . . . the *Epiclesis* in the Lord's Supper is an element alien to Luther and the Lutheran tradition, and therefore to be rejected." G. Krodel, "The Great . . ." *op. cit.*, p. 15. See also, *FCSD* VII, 2-8, 55-56, 88, 104; *FCE* VII, 3-5, 29, 36; *Apology* X, 54.
56. Not only do the *LBW* authors translate "*diatheke*" as "covenant" rather than "testament," but they also use the word in two eucharistic prayers and in two prayers in the baptismal liturgy. (*LBW: MDE*, *op. cit.*, pp. 258, 262, 308-309.) See the discussion in O.K. Olson, "Contemporary . . ." *op. cit.*, pp. 152-153; also K. Hagen, "From Testament to Covenant," *Sixteenth Century Journal*, III, 1 (April, 1972), pp. 8ff.
57. The *LBW* liturgies not only use the word "covenant" but also mention "covenant" events (*LBW*, pp. 257-264). For a listing of the 8 Covenants, see *The New Scofield Reference Bible* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1967), pp. 1317-1318. Covenant Theology is discussed in *Present Truth*, V, 7-8 (Nov.-Dec., 1976), pp. 9-57; 5-20. See also *Lutheran Cyclopedia* (St. Louis: CPH, 1975), pp. 294, 636. See A. Boehme, "A Review of the ILCW Liturgical Texts" (unpublished paper sent to ILCW committee), p. 3.
58. L. Green, "The Statement on Communion Practices: A Critical Appraisal," *Concordia Review* (July, 1976), pp. 5-17. This article was reprinted in the *Concordia Theological Quarterly*, XLI, 2 (April, 1977), pp. 58-69. This careful study of the 1976 "Report of the ALC-LCA Committee to Study Communion Practices" reveals that there has been a move toward a Reformed position on the Lord's Supper, because of the emphasis on the "covenant." This emphasis is evident also in the "Statement on the Communion Practices" (adopted by the Fourth General Convention of the ALC, October 19, 1968). This document states that the Lord's Supper "celebrates the covenant between Christ and his Church, so that participation is a reaffirmation of this covenant." (p. 2). For a detailed study of the gradual shift of some Lutherans to a Reformed doctrine of the Lord's Supper, see M.W. Lutz, "God the Holy Spirit Acts Through the Lord's Supper," in E.P. Kauffeld, ed., *God the Holy Spirit Acts* (Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 1972), pp. 115-202. See also O.K. Olson and A.J. Boehme, *op. cit.*, pp. 1-7.
59. The Sacraments have "the promise of grace" (*Apology* XIII, 3, 4, 6), and are "the signs of the promises" (XIII, 20). By faith we are to "Receive the promised things there offered in the Sacrament . . . the free remission of sins." (XIII, 19-20). ". . . where the Supper is celebrated according to the institution of Christ, *and his words are used*, the body and blood of Christ are truly present, distributed, and received, because of the power and efficacy of the words which Christ spoke at the first Supper." *FCSD* VII, 75.

"And all these are established by the words by which Christ has instituted it, and which every one who desires to be a Christian and go to the Sacrament should know . . . The Words, however, are these: Our Lord Jesus Christ, the same night . . ."

"The chief point is the Word and ordinance or command of God . . . It is

the Word which makes and distinguishes this Sacrament . . . For although the work is accomplished and the forgiveness of sins acquired on the cross, yet it cannot come to us in any other way than through the Word." *LCV*, 1-4, 8-14, 31; also *Luther's Works* XXXVI, 277.

60. R. Jenson, "Reply to Gerhard Foerde," *Response*, XV, 2-3 (1975), pp. 53ff. See also R. Jenson, "Toward . . ." *op. cit.*, pp. 43ff.; for here Jenson makes the reception of the Gospel gift of the Sacrament dependent upon our fulfillment of the command (law) part of the Narrative of Institution. Krodel replies: "Jenson's argumentation is based on a tearing of the *verbum* into parts, namely, a law-action part — which then in *TGT* is structures, in good Anglo-Roman fashion as a prayer of many parts and actions — and a gospel-promise part in which the fulfillment is contingent on the obedient fulfillment of the law-action part To assume this, as Jenson does, is a denial of the 'Lutheran' understanding of the means of grace . . ." G. Krodel, "Consecration . . ." *op. cit.*, p. 8. See also G. Krodel, "The Great . . ." *op. cit.*, pp. 27-28.

"In overlooking the distinction between Law and Gospel we endanger the doctrine of justification, the *articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiae*. Nothing worse could be said about a liturgical form offered to the Lutherans of America." L. Green, "Between . . ." *op. cit.*, p. 82.

61. *FCSD* V, 27.

62. Apology XXIV, 69-70; also 17-18, 49. "For when we are baptized, when we eat the Lord's body . . . God truly forgives us for Christ's sake." Ap. XIII, 4-5. The Sacraments are "properly signs of the New Testament, and testimonies of grace and the remission of sins." *Ibid.*, 14; also 18-22.

"We further believe that in this Christian Church we have forgiveness of sin, which is wrought through the holy Sacraments and Absolution, moreover, through all manner of consolatory promises of the entire Gospel. Therefore, whatever is to be preached concerning the Sacraments belongs here . . . Everything, therefore, in the Christian Church is ordered to the end that we shall daily obtain there nothing but the forgiveness of sins through the Word and signs [Sacraments] to comfort and encourage our conscience as long as we live here." *LC* II, 54-55.

"Thus we have briefly the first point which relates to the essence of this Sacrament. Now examine further the efficacy and benefits on account of which really the Sacrament was instituted; which is also its most necessary part, that we may know what we should seek and obtain there. Now this is plain and clear from the words just mentioned: *This is My body and blood, given and shed FOR YOU, for the remission of sins*. Briefly that is as much as to say: For this reason we go to the Sacrament because there we receive such a treasure by and in which we obtain forgiveness of sins. Why so? Because the words stand here and give us this; for on this account He bids me eat and drink, that it may be my own and may benefit me, as a sure pledge and token, yea, the very same treasure that is appointed for me against my sins, death, and every calamity." *LCV*, 20-22; also 28-38, 66-70. See also *SA* Part III, Art IV; *ACIX*, 2; XIII, 1-3; XXIV, 28-37; *FCSD* VII, 53; *LC* IV, 23-29, 41.

The Confessions clearly show that Sacraments are "rites which have the command of God [*mandatum Dei*], and to which the promise of grace has been added . . . For rites instituted by men will not in this way be sacraments properly so called. For it does not belong to human authority to promise grace. Therefore signs instituted without God's command are not sure signs of grace . . ." Ap. XIII, 3-4. Sacraments are rites commanded by God, i.e., that have firm support in Scripture as God-given instruments of grace.

So Luther also teaches ". . . that the chief point is the Word and ordinance

or command [*mandatum*] of God. For it [the Lord's Supper] has not been invented nor introduced by man, but without any one's counsel and deliberation it has been instituted by Christ." LC V, 4-5. See also LC IV, 6.

Jenson and the LBW misunderstand the command of God (*mandatum Dei*) and change it into Law (*lex semper accusat*). Thus for Jenson and the LBW, the Gospel character of the Sacrament is lost.

63. The following statements taken from a document adopted by the ULCA in 1960 sum up the nature of a sacrament, and also note the dangers of re-introducing any notion of sacrifice into the sacrament:

"The essential nature of the sacrament is gift (*beneficium*). The direction of God's action in it is altogether from God to man; it imparts forgiveness of sin, life and salvation. This gift can in no sense be designated as an offering from man to God, nor should it be designated as a eucharist or thanksgiving The term *sacrifice* . . . should not be used to designate the gift of the sacrament. The gift is all God's . . . An additional reason for caution with respect to the use of the term sacrifice in this context is that it provides an opening for the re-invasion of the church by notions that are alien to the gospel. Men desire a God who is malleable to their sacrifices. The Christian gospel proclaims a sacrificing God who ends all propitiatory sacrifices. But when response is designated sacrifice, the covert pelagianism which solaces the offense of the gospel is invited back into the very heart of the gospel. This invitation has the power and the peril it does because it may be liturgically invested with the most seductive piety." "The Sacrament of the Altar and Its Implications," in E. Brown, Jr., *op. cit.*, pp. 38-39.

64. "Does the heavy emphasis on a Eucharistic culmination of the form action shape of Baptism suggest an incompleteness for infants that heralds an ILCW push for infant Communion?" R. Hughes, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

The Rubrics of *LBW* answer Professor Hughes' question, when they state: "The gift of Communion is the birthright of the baptized." (*LBW: MDE, op. cit.*, p. 31.) "Customs vary on the age and circumstances for admission to the Lord's Supper. Older children and adults should commune for the first time during the service in which they are baptized. Infants may be brought to the altar and receive a blessing." (*Ibid.*, p. 30). The *LBW* has moved very close to infant communion, for it is only a small step from bringing the just-baptized infant to the altar for a blessing (implying an active use of his eucharistic birthright) to actual communion. The 1976 joint LCA-ALC Communion Statement (see footnote 56) admitted all "those who are baptized" to partake of the Lord's Supper. This clause was, however, changed at the most recent LCA and ALC conventions to prohibit infant communion. One ILCW author, Robert Jenson, who authored eucharistic prayers for the *LBW*, is one of those who was communing infants. "LCA Seminary Bars Professor from Celebrating Eucharist: The Issue is 'Infant Communion,'" *Missouri In Perspective*, VI, 6 (January 15, 1979), p. 3 Here the *LBW* reflects the influence of the ecumenical liturgical movement:

"Baptism exists as a first step towards the Eucharist. It unites us to Christ and the Church, but by relating us to the Eucharist. The Eucharist is, as it were, already active in us through baptism. Union with Christ and the Church remains the proper effect of the Eucharist which alone gives it in full Just as the Christian initiation of the individual person receives its completion in the celebration and reception of the Eucharist, so also the Church receives its full existence in a given place by the event of the eucharistic assembly." C. Davis, *op. cit.*, pp. 70-72.

Here we have the liturgical movement's rationale for infant communion. The sacrament of Baptism and our fellowship with Christ and the Church

are inadequate without the Eucharist. Here we find the theological reasons which cause some Lutheran theologians to say that barring infants from communion "excommunicates" them from the Church. *Missouri In Perspective, op. cit.*

65. The recent changes which allow some children to partake of communion before confirmation is also a result of the faulty theological orientation described in footnote 62.
66. Charles V forced Roman worship practices upon the Lutherans, causing the theological controversy which lies behind FC X. FC X rejected those rituals. "It is astonishing, then, to become aware of the persistent sameness of the rituals Emperor Charles V insisted be forced on the Protestants. The very same liturgical orders are being pressed on us in the name of ecumenism. The mass canon, emphatically rejected by Luther, now renamed the 'eucharistic prayer' and reinterpreted by *Mysterientheologie*, is the prime cause of a new 'liturgical consensus.' And the argument is brought home in an emphatic fashion that if we do not accept that liturgical *concordia*, we will be sectarian." O.K. Olson, "Politics, Liturgics, and *Integritas Sacramenti*," in L.W. Spitz and W. Lohff, eds., *Discord, Dialog, and Concord* (Phila.: Fortress Press, 1977), p. 79. For a study of the events behind FC X see F. Bente, *Historical Introductions to the Symbolical Books of the Evangelical Lutheran Church* (St. Louis: CPH, 1921), pp. 93-112.
67. Surveys concerning the ILCW work revealed some fascinating statistics: (1) only 20% of the congregations of the 3 synods were using eucharistic prayers, and this after many years of those prayers being offered in the *Service Book and Hymnal* and the *Worship Supplement*; (2) of the ALC congregations testing LBW liturgies over half raised theological questions or criticisms about the materials, and 51% of the ALC people found the service either unacceptable, dull, lifeless, or difficult. One-third of LCA test congregations raised theological questions or criticisms, and 57% of its members found the new liturgies either unacceptable, dull, lifeless, or difficult. W. Schmidt, *op. cit.*, p. 103; Karl L. Barth, "The President's Corner," *South Wisconsin District News* (February, 1979), p. 2.

If the people really do not, for the most part, see the new worship forms as better than the old, then why did the ILCW keep on working to get the book out? Those who originally formed the ILCW have said why:

"Seen from the viewpoint of the churches this has great practical value for inter-Lutheran dialog, paralleling other activities in the field of church unity" (p. 132).

"The new book must represent, not two-thirds of the Lutheran churches in our country and in Canada, but three-thirds of the churches. Muhlenberg's ideal of 'one church, one book,' must be more than an ideal, more than a dream; it must . . . become a reality, a dream fulfilled" (p. 113).

"It would . . . be the most significant step possible in the direction of Lutheran unity in America" (p. 114).

But the *Lutheran Book of Worship* serves not just to promote Lutheran unity: "Its value for an ecumenical core of Christian hymns has potential also in an approach to Roman Catholics, Anglicans, etc . . ." (p. 132). All these quotations derive from E.S. Brown, *op. cit.* It is also a step "toward a Christian hymnal for all major denominations" (p. 114). See also A. Boehme, "Response" (paper read at the April 1978 South Wisconsin District Pastoral Conference, available from the District Office), footnote 29.

This unity in worship forms is one goal of the modern ecumenical movement. ". . . the unity with which ecumenism is concerned is . . . unity in all realms which belong to the mission of the Church: teaching, worship, sacra-

ment, mission, service to the world." W.A. Visser T' Hooft, "Ecumenism," in M. Halverson and A.A. Cohen, *A Handbook of Christian Theology* (New York: New World Publishing Company; A Meridian Book, New American Library, 1974), p. 92.

Another author notes some of the reasons for the changes in church liturgies:

"A major influence has been the change of perspective with respect to the Bible produced by modern historical criticism and research . . . Another potent factor has been the contemporary ecumenical movement looking towards the reunion of the churches. It has become increasingly apparent that the several 'ways of worship' in the churches are divisive forces, whether theologically or psychologically, keeping Christians separated from full inter-communion." M.H. Shepherd, Jr., "Liturgy," *Ibid.*, p. 212. See also Harold O.J. Brown, *The Protest of a Troubled Protestant* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1970), pp. 29-44, 248-256.

This desire to establish unity on the basis of common worship services is clearly contrary to AC VII and FC X. These Confessional statements show that true unity in the church does not consist of common human rites and ceremonies, and yet this is the goal of those in the Inter-Lutheran Commission on Worship which produced the *Lutheran Book of Worship*.