



THE SPRINGFIELDER

January 1975
Volume 39, Number 1

The Twenty-Seventh Institute of Liturgical Studies

(Valparaiso University, February 4-6, 1975)

CARL BORNEMANN

The author is pastor of St. Philip's Lutheran Church, Detroit, and has served as visiting professor of liturgics at Concordia Seminary, St. Louis.

I. THE REV. DR. EUGENE BRAND (LCA) of the Inter-Lutheran Commission on Worship (ILCW) was the "keynote" speaker, presenting "Families and the Family" and stressing the baptized individual's relationship to the "family" (home and congregation) and to the "family meal" (Eucharist) over against an individualistic emphasis. Baptismal rites should rest "not upon the theology of the Sacrament but upon the theology of the Church," according to Brand. Use of historical criticism dominated his presentation. The "great commission" (Matt. 28:19) "can hardly be the actual words of Jesus" (because of Peter's lack of understanding in Acts and because of references to "Baptism in the name of Jesus"). He strongly criticized our Agenda's introduction to Baptism, with its references to original sin and its use of Scripture: "we should know better," "it would not stand up under New Testament scholarship." He contended that one could not base Baptism "on the actual words of Jesus." Later, in the small group discussions, Brand was asked about the Large Catechism (IV 57), which states that we baptize infants "solely" on account of the command of God (Matt. 28:19). Brand responded that, as we treat the Scriptures with critical analysis, so we should treat the confessions also. "Luther was a child of his day." Brand stressed the community and the community meal. He was not opposed to infant Baptism *if* the community took full responsibility (family and congregation), and *if*, ideally, the infant were not barred from the Eucharist. He recognized that the latter condition may not be normative for the present and that we may "have to be content with progress toward the goal which escapes us in this generation." Ultimately, however, if we can get around infant Baptism, we should be able to "use the same mental gymnastics to support" infant communion. There is no theological reason for withholding the Eucharist "from any baptized individual." He would "come down hard on anyone who says that infant communion is wrong." In the small group discussions he asserted that baptized infants receive God's grace, but that if a child dies without Baptism, he is no worse off than a child who dies with Baptism.

II. The team of the Rev. Alfred Buls and Teacher Richard Sandler (Bethel Lutheran Church, University City, Missouri) offered a free-wheeling presentation on training families to prepare small children for First Communion. The methods were inductive

("what do you see in this picture?" etc.). There was no discussion of Luther's "core": Ten Commandments, Apostles' Creed, Lord's Prayer (although this content may in practice be present).

III. The Rev. Professor Mark Bangert (of the Joint Project for Theological Education) presented a kind of progress report on ILCW thinking concerning the "Daily Office" of worship in family and congregation. He was critical of "monastic elements" in the present Matins and Vespers services inherited through Luther, although he was not specific. He had some good words for the "Andachten" (Portals of Prayer) as having a workable "core." The outline presently under consideration would involve a Morning Prayer (stressing resurrection) and Evensong (stressing epiphany and light in darkness). The final rite offered to the Church may have three options: an elaborate rite for the congregation, a "simpler" rite for the parish, and a core form for the family. Evening Worship would be:

A	B	C
Lucinarium (Lighting of everyone's candle from one candle in all three options while a hymn was sung)		
(three versicles)	(three versicles)	(one versicle)
Psalm 141	Psalm 141	
Proper Psalm	Proper Psalm	Proper Psalm
Canticle-Hymn-Collect	Hymn	Hymn
Readings (including non-Scripture)	Reduced Reading	Reduced Reading
Gospel Canticle (e.g., the Magnificat)	Gospel Canticle	Gospel Canticle
Litany	Litany	
Free Prayer	Free Prayer	Free intercession
Collect for peace	Collect for peace	Collect for peace
Our Father-Benediction	Our Father-Benediction	Our Father-Benediction

Morning Prayer is similar, varying between choice "A" with three Psalms, three readings, Canticle, Prayer of the day, free intercessions, collect for grace, Our Father, and a "resurrection office," and choice "C" with one Psalm, one lesson, etc. In the small group discussions the similarity between these proposals and Fr. Storey's "Morning Prayer and Evensong" for the Roman Catholic Church (and used for worship by the Institute) was pointed out to Bangert. Bangert admitted the "ecumenical cooperation" involved.

IV. A Roman Catholic guest lecturer, Fr. N. Mitchell, gave a progress report on his denomination's work on material for the catechumenate. He showed great concern for the "quality, not quantity" stress of the early Church described by Hippolytus, personal guidance (opposed to communication of information), continued conversion process and Christian growth, and discipline in prayer and life of both learner and teacher.

V. A Methodist guest lectured on the need to feed the hungry. In his presentation he emphasized that the Eucharist was a "political event" that brings salvation to the world—making the world "as much like the kingdom of God as possible"—that Jesus feeding the hungry crowd was a "Eucharist event" (as is our feeding hungry people), that setting up new technologies, new order in the world, telling people to eat lower grades of meat, etc., was the work of the Church. He had to leave immediately, so there was no time for questions.

VI. The Rev. Hans Boehringer (of the ILCW) emphasized the "community" with much eloquence. He criticized our present baptismal practice on four points:

- (1) Pastors who apologize for the extra time Baptism adds to the service;
- (2) the movable, trivial fonts;
- (3) apologies for using too much water;
- (4) the rite, which seems to be for infants and "retarded adults."

He praised the practice in the days of Hippolytus when Baptism was important, central, and involved discipline and the community. He contended that the ILCW baptismal rite (and other rites) should involve "ecumenical consensus wherever possible" and that the proposed rite is "more Lutheran than what we have now." He considered the Eucharist a logical result of Baptism, but he did not stress the point. When asked why the Apostles' Creed was spoken by the assembly in the proposed ILCW rite and not by the catechumen (or by those speaking for him), Pastor Boehringer replied that "not all Lutherans on the commission were of like minds of the appropriateness of putting the words of the Creed (or of the renunciation) into the mouths of infants." (Brand at that moment told the questioner that that question alone "delayed us for six months.") Boehringer mentioned that at another conference he had been asked, "Before you guys wrote this (ILCW Baptismal rite), why didn't you speak to the theologians?" He answered, "Which ones?" Then he added, "We fancy ourselves to be theologians." Pastor Boehringer granted that the proposed rites of the ILCW are the results of certain "trade offs" among the members of the Commission.

VII. Pastor C. R. Evenson (also of the ILCW) gave a progress report on "Affirming the Baptismal Covenant," a flexible rite to be repeated with the individual at various stages of Christian growth within the community, as a replacement for a rite of "Confirmation" (as a once in a lifetime event). He stressed that such Baptismal reaffirmation could include occasions of marriage, reinstatement, transfers, board installations, and new occupations, as well as coming to the congregation from outside Lutheranism. He listed a tentative order, not unlike elements in the present form of Confirmation, but he mentioned a "write your own vows" option which ILCW representatives favor.

SOME OBSERVATIONS

Pastor Evenson made two observations I should suggest be taken quite seriously:

1. It is easier to act one's way into a new way of thinking than to think one's way into a new way of acting.
2. Behavior is governed more by "side-glancing" than by directions from a leader.

Proposed new rites are not necessarily adiaphora. They can enhance true doctrine, or they can be "painless" vehicles of false doctrine (or of underplaying true doctrine). The Church will want to consider whether proposed rites highlight clear scriptural and confessional principles and note when those truths are obscured. We must note these cases in point in the proposed ILCW Baptismal rite:

1. The omission of the "Exhortation" (with its biblical references to the necessity for Baptism, the gifts of Baptism, Jesus' command to baptize, original sin) in the light of the historical-critical depreciation of those texts by Brand and others.
2. The omission of the sign of the cross (on forehead and breast) with its statement of objective justification prior to the act of Baptism.
3. The possible over-emphasis on the community (and I sensed an over-emphasis at this Institute) by burying the catechumen's renunciation of evil and confession of the Apostles' Creed in a general congregational recitation (which is little different from any other Sunday).
4. The generalizing of the question to sponsors (and parents), omitting references to teaching children the *content* of the faith (the Ten Commandments, Creed, Lord's Prayer, teaching of Scripture). At the Institute there was a general depreciation of doctrinal content in the preparation of the catechumenate and an emphasis on caring, sharing, being a friend, etc.

The Institute is to be commended for its basic openness, frankness on the part of the presenters, and the time allowed for questions and discussion.