



IN THE CONTEXT OF
Unity

A HISTORY OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF
LUTHERAN BOOK OF WORSHIP

Ralph W. Quere

IN THE CONTEXT OF UNITY

A History of the Development of the
Lutheran Book of Worship

by Ralph W. Quere

Lutheran University Press
Minneapolis, Minnesota

In the Context of Unity

A History of the Development of *Lutheran Book of Worship*

by Ralph W. Quere

Copyright © 2003 Lutheran University Press. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without prior permission of the publisher.

Library of Congress Cataloging-In-Publication Data

Quere, Ralph W.

In the Context of Unity : a history of the development of Lutheran book of worship / Ralph W. Quere

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references.

ISBN 1-932688-00-5 (alk. paper)

1. Lutheran book of worship. 2. Lutheran Church—United States—Liturgy—History. 3. Liturgical movement—Lutheran Church—History. 4. Lutheran Church—United States—History. 5. United States—Church history. I. Title.

BX8067.A3 Q4 2003

264'.041—dc21

2002037000

Lutheran University Press, PO Box 390759, Minneapolis, MN 55439
Manufactured in the United States of America

DEDICATION

To all the saints,
living and dead,
who labored to develop and improve
Lutheran Book of Worship

To all those who have studied
Lutheran Book of Worship
to better understand its significance

To all those involved in *Renewing Worship*,
developing twenty-first century worship resources
that will redound to the glory of God
in the celebration of the sacraments
and the proclamation of the gospel of Jesus Christ.

CONTENTS

Preface	6
Acknowledgments	8
Prologue	10
Introduction	12

Part I: Contemporary Worship Booklets

Chapter One: <i>Sancta</i>	21
Singing a New Song	21
Writing New Rites	28
Chapter Two: <i>Apostolica</i>	38
The Beginnings of the Theological Critique	38
The Continuing Critique	46
Popular Reaction	57
Chapter Three: <i>Una</i>	61
Climax of the Theological Debate	61
Evolution of the "Holy Communion for Trial Use"	71
Practice & Principles of Reform	98
Completing Contemporary Liturgies	

Part II: A Lutheran Book of Worship

Chapter Four: <i>Catholica</i>	111
Reviewing by the Churches	111
<i>Vox Populi</i> : Reactions from Field-Tests	156
The Theologians' Debate as Debacle	180
Finalizing the Revisions	198

Chapter Five: <i>Ecclesia</i>	211
Missouri in Convention & Committee	211
Publishing <i>Lutheran Book of Worship</i>	223
Conclusion	
Communion Practices	230
Early Evaluations of LBW	239
Epilogue	
Consensus and Confession	244
Augustana contra Americana	245
Beyond Augustana	248
One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church	249
Endnotes	252
Appendices	
Abbreviations	269
ILCW, Committees, Subcommittees, Review Groups, etc.	271
Index	
Name Index	275
Subject Index	227

PREFACE

The work required to produce a service book and hymnal is necessarily multifaceted both because of the nature of its contents and because worship is the focal point for the various aspects of the life of the church. Pastors, liturgists, theologians, students of congregational life and cultures, musicians of varying skills, poets, and hymn writers are needed for the process, and their work must be coordinated to make a coherent whole. To produce the *Lutheran Book of Worship* (LBW) the participating churches established the Inter-Lutheran Commission on Worship (ILCW), and it established working committees and numerous subcommittees and task forces consisting of the types of persons just enumerated. It is difficult to imagine a more participatory process. To produce a historical description and analysis of that process requires a mastery of endless detail while keeping the larger picture in view. This the author has achieved and, in an exemplary manner, making this book a mother lode of information about the making of LBW.

The *Service Book and Hymnal*, one of LBW's predecessors, marked the apex of the movement begun with the Common Service to restore to Lutherans in North America the fullness of their Reformation heritage. The SBH also set an ecumenical course that is rooted in the Lutheran Reformation but opens into the wider heritage of the church catholic. The author's approach is prompted by that ecumenical path intentionally continued by the ILCW as he describes its full participation in such agencies as the Consultation on Common Texts, the Consultation on Ecumenical Hymnody and the International Consultation on English Texts. Placed side by side, the Episcopal, Presbyterian, Methodist, Roman Catholic, and Lutheran books of the 60s and 70s are more remarkable for their commonality than for their differences. Thus a new climate for ecumenical understanding and progress has emerged on the American scene, and Lutherans have emerged as full partners in it.

The author is fully aware that the context of unity, however, also includes *Lutheran* unity, and that LBW foundered on that stage. Previous books, including the SBH, had marked Lutheran mergers, both preparing their way and then exemplifying ever greater Lutheran unity. The use of

the Common Service by all the participants in the LBW process, it was hoped, had prepared the way for one book for all Lutherans. That hope was burnished when the invitation to form the ILCW could come from the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, but the author details how a course change in that body turned the hope into a threat. Leaders of LCMS fully recognized the LBW potential to further Lutheran unity and saw it as a threat to their sense of particularity. That led the way to rejecting it. Nevertheless, since LCMS persons were fully involved in its preparation, LBW still stands as a melding of Lutheran traditions in the context of greater unity.

Moving into the larger catholic context precipitated theological debates that tended to center on the Eucharist and particularly on the eucharistic prayer. The author has dealt with these controversies even-handedly, while making his own judgments clear. The question becomes whether the *lex credendi* understood from a Lutheran perspective can accommodate eucharistic prayers stemming from the *lex orandi* of the great tradition. The Lutheran Church in America and The American Lutheran Church answered yes; Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod answered no, though even in the affirmative churches some theologians remain unconvinced. The author has enriched the evocation of these theological debates by paralleling them with a case study on communion practices among American Lutherans. This gives the book a strong accent on the Holy Communion, positioning it within the larger context of church life.

In the quarter century since its publication, however, the baptismal focus of the LBW has emerged as perhaps its greatest contribution. In rescuing the baptismal liturgy from the ranks of occasional services and in its emphasis on the congregation's participation in the rite, LBW has facilitated a rediscovery among Lutherans of their own strongly baptismal theology. Seeing the Christian life as flowing from the both great sacraments promotes greater ecumenical sensitivity and vision, for there is no hint of denominational barriers in either rite. Celebrating them always implies the context of unity and always evokes the great church. This largely *ex post facto* baptismal emphasis is understandably absent from an historical account of the ILCW's work.

As the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, together with sister churches in North America, again takes up the task of renewing its liturgical books, one can hope that they will continue to follow the ecumenical course charted by SBH and continued by the ILCW. This book contains the reasons why.

Eugene L Brand
LBW Project Director

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In the year after the publication of the *Lutheran Book of Worship* in 1978, the conviction grew in me that the history of its development needed to be recorded. I had a fair number of files as secretary of the Liturgical Text Committee and chair of its Ordinal subcommittee and was able to supplement these from the files at ALC headquarters and Augsburg Publishing House in Minneapolis. August Sueflow at the Concordia Historical Institute in St. Louis was most helpful in granting me access to the ILCW files of the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod. Elizabeth Wittman was also most helpful in accessing the ILCW files transferred from the Lutheran Council in New York City to the new ELCA Archives in 1988. More recently Susan Ebertz and Karen Lull of Wartburg Seminary Library and Eric Stancliff of Concordia Seminary Library (St. Louis) helped identify and locate a number of obscure references.

Hearty thanks to the following student research assistants—most of them are now serving as pastors—for their diligence, care, and skill as they aided in the research for this book: Steven Berke, Roy Hammerling, Mark Luepke, Donald Dovre, Scott Beebe, Ethan Feistner, James Duehring, James Davis, and Douglas Whiting. Much of the typing was done by then student Darby Lawrence and Scott McCluskey, aided by faculty secretaries, Marcia Ellison, Barbara Larsen, Nancy Bauer, Barbara Talmage, Joan Sacrison, Ruth Legacie, Patricia McCord, Gracia Lambert, Pam Strobel, Marsha Batt, and Rhonda Kiehl (who also typed the charts). In this new century, Mary McDermott assisted by typing various pieces and student research assistant Dirk Stadlander helped with checking text and notes, as well as the tedious task of proofreading page proofs, assisted by Christopher Gaule, D.J. Rasner, Jeremy Walloch, Daniel Gerrietts, and Daniel R. Taylor.

Helpful suggestions after reading the penultimate draft were made by my late, beloved colleague, Ralph F. Smith. Aid in statistical analysis of the various field test to discern what was “significant” was graciously given by the late Fr. John Naumann of Loras College. Interesting contacts and conversations with then Notre Dame graduate students the late Paul Nelson, Michael Aune, Jeffrey Truscott, and Johanna Räsänen of Helsinki. Encour-

agement to me and potential publishers came from Prof. James F. White of Notre Dame, Philip Pfatteicher whose manual and commentaries undergirded LBW with monumental scholarship, Anita Stauffer, and Eugene Brand of ILCW and later Lutheran World Federation. A further word of thanks to Gene: not only did he write a number of letters to editors regarding publication, but he re-read the manuscript just before publication and he, like publisher Leonard Flachmann, caught a number of errors out of their personal experience working as project director and Augsburg representative respectively. I also appreciate the careful editing work at Kirk House Publishers of Karen Walhof, who had assisted at Augsburg in the publishing of the LBW. As a professor at what is now Trinity Seminary in Columbus, Gene was my teacher of liturgics, a mentor and model, also in ecumenics, during and after his work with ILCW. My gratitude was increased by his willingness to write the preface to this book.

Easter 2003

Ralph W. Quere

Wartburg Theological Seminary

PROLOGUE

My purpose in writing this history of the preparation of the *Lutheran Book of Worship* (LBW) is manifold.

The major reason is that the process and its product are important enough to be recorded for posterity. The processes of generating, approving and revising materials, the commitment to field-testing, and the decisions, right or wrong, made in design and analysis of responses are crucial for future endeavors. Lack of a clear mandate and structure from the churches, along with changes in directions due to popular and political pressures, wreaked havoc with the process, causing delays and frustrations. Radical changes within the Lutheran Church–Missouri Synod (LCMS) altered the process and its outcome.

A secondary purpose for writing is that the Inter-Lutheran Commission on Worship (ILCW) functioned at a critical time in the life of Lutheran churches in America. Its controversies and results constitute a case study of a turning point in Lutheran history. The waxing and waning of Lutheran unity in relation to the development of LBW reversed a trend of almost a century with respect to LCMS. The Common Service of 1888 had been drawing all Lutherans in America, including LCMS, closer together. With LCMS pulling out of LBW, the unifying trend shifted to the formation of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

Thirdly, the ILCW's preparation of LBW raised the age-old question of *lex orandi, lex credendi*: the relationship of the rule of prayer to the rule of faith in its ecumenical, theological, and liturgical dimensions—balancing commitments to the Lutheran confessions and the worship traditions of the Church catholic. I have chosen to use the “notes” of the Church from the Nicene Creed as symbolic headings for the different stages and foci in ILCW history moving toward (and for LCMS, finally, away from) LBW. Hence the early quest for relevance is discussed under the Church's *holiness*. The attempt to protect or correct ILCW's orthodoxy comes under the rubric of the Church's *apostolicity*. Continuity (both with the Western Roman Catholic and Lutheran traditions), diversity/freedom, unity/uniformity, and permanence are set forth under the Church's *oneness*. The question of

authority within the Church is asked implicitly and/or explicitly throughout the process of writing, composing, criticizing, reviewing, field-testing, and approving (or disapproving) LBW. The voice of the people, the role of the “experts” pro or con, and the churches’ decision-making are all dimensions of the Church’s *catholicity*. Controversy—especially concerning the eucharistic prayer (now called the Great Thanksgiving)—disagreements and disappointments, new fears and old feuds, internal tensions and external strains drew battle lines within churches but increasingly between LCMS and the other three Lutheran bodies. Signs of this may be discerned early on, but the rupture becomes increasingly evident in early 1976 in LCMS journals and in the tensions between the LCMS Commission on Worship and the reviewers appointed by the Synod. The inevitability of schism within the ILCW churches and the LCMS rejection of LBW seem obvious looking back, but much hard work was done to prevent—as well as to produce—this schism within the worship life of the Lutheran churches.

In the conclusion I attempt to analyze the ILCW’s role during the 1970s by sketching another case study: the shifting policy of communion practices among Lutherans in America from closed to open communion, then moving to inter-communion with the Episcopal church and those in the Reformed tradition. This communion practice case-study relates to more than the theological issue of *lex orandi, lex credendi*. How much agreement in doctrine is required for inter-communion? Are common worship materials a hazard if doctrine is not uniform and pulpit-and-altar fellowship is in limbo?

The epilogue attempts to analyze how the Lutheran confessions functioned as a norm for liturgical reform in ILCW’s work, also where and why LBW went beyond the confessional guidelines (although on their trajectory). How the unity, sanctity, catholicity, and apostolicity of the Church is expressed in LBW is the concern of the final section.

INTRODUCTION

ROOTS OF THE FUTURE • FRUITS OF THE PAST

In North America, the 19th century saw the beginnings of a liturgical movement in which some Lutherans participated and by which all Lutherans have been affected. The 19th century was also the period of immigration of the “Old Lutheran” confessionalists (escaping the enforced mergers with Reformed in the several Union churches in Germany), as well as Scandinavians with various attitudes toward their state churches and toward pietism. The eastern Lutheranism they encountered was shaped significantly by the movement known as American Lutheranism of which Samuel Simon Schmucker of Gettysburg was the center. Schmucker’s eclectic confessionalism (with its revisions of the Augsburg Confession’s sacramental theology) and his ecumenical evangelism (with its use of some “measures” and methods of revivalism) were accompanied by a low church (if not Puritan) approach to liturgy. Even his own General Synod moved away from his more radical proposals in 1855. The schism caused by the Civil War and then by the founding of the Philadelphia Seminary and General Council in 1867 left eastern Lutheranism broken. Nonetheless, the General Council produced its *Church Book* in 1868, which became the parent of the definitive Common Service of 1888. This liturgy not only became a causative factor of the eventual reunion of eastern Lutherans, but also by the early 20th century it had been adopted by virtually *all* Lutherans in North America as the text (and in many cases the music) of their Sunday worship.

Meanwhile, those Lutheran immigrants who had settled in the midwest had, for the most part, rejected American Lutheranism, preferring the language, piety, and theology they had brought with them from the “old country.” But—in spite of their confessionalism—pietism and rationalism had radically altered the liturgies with which they were familiar. The movement between the General Council and the Iowa Synod, the movement between the General Council and Ohio Synods (the latter originally affili-

ated with the General Synod and later influenced by the Missouri Synod), and the cooperative relations between the state-church Norwegians and the Missourians—these and many other factors set the stage for the ready adoption of the Common Service of 1888.

This is all the more amazing because the service appeared when Lutherans—especially in the midwest—were embroiled in the greatest (and worst) theological controversy in the history of Lutheranism in America—the predestination controversy. It began between the Missouri and Iowa Synods and soon splintered fellowship within and among churches throughout the midwest. In some ways, the rejection of LBW by LCMS may be seen as rooted in the still unresolved suspicions deepened by the predestination controversy. But perhaps it is precisely *because of* this controversy (rather than *in spite of* it) that the Common Service manifested Lutheran unity when its ecclesiastical disunity was at a high point. Lutherans have usually been more united theologically than they have been willing to admit: From the right there has been the demand for dialogue and documentation of consensus; from the left there has been the disavowal of any problem. The “no problem” approach has been as unrealistic as the “total theological uniformity” approach to unity in doctrine leading to pulpit-and-altar fellowship. In fact, for virtually a hundred years liturgy has been a meeting ground for Lutherans who could agree formally on little else.

Wilhelm Loehe’s 1844 *Agende* influenced not only the German-Americans in the Missouri and Iowa Synods,¹ but also the eastern synods that produced the Common Service.² The normative rule to decide all questions that arose during the preparation of this liturgy was “the common consent of the pure Lutheran liturgies of the sixteenth century.”³ Loehe’s influence on Scandinavian-Americans was more indirect: The new 1887-1889 Danish Norwegian liturgy, based on an 1879 Bavarian liturgy (which Loehe’s *Agenda* helped shape), was translated and adapted in the 1912-1913 *Lutheran Hymnary of the Norwegians*⁴ and the Danes’ 1927 *Hymnal for Church and Home*.

The Danish and Norwegian immigrant churches also adopted the 1888 Common Service.⁵ The 1913 *Lutheran Hymnary of the Norwegian Lutheran Church* received the Common Service via the Missourians’ English Synod *Evangelical Lutheran Hymnal* (1912).⁶ The Danes literally pasted the Common Service into their 1927 hymnal. It became an integral part of the third edition in 1953.⁷ The 1925 hymnal of the Swedish Augustana Church included the Common Service, along with a translation of the Swedish liturgy.⁸ By 1930 the Augustana hymnal had been authorized for use by Finnish Americans. In the same year the newly formed American Lutheran Church issued the *American Lutheran Hymnal* which included not only the

text but also the music of 1917 *Common Service Book* of the United Lutheran Church in America (ULCA).⁹

Thus by 1930 most Lutherans in America had the text of the Common Service in their hymnals. The entire Synodical Conference (which included the Missouri, Wisconsin and “Little Norwegian” Synods) cooperated on *The Lutheran Hymnal* of 1941 (TLH) which continued to utilize the Common Service. Those churches in the Haugean tradition, like the Lutheran Free Church which utilized the *Concordia Hymnal*, constituted the only major Lutheran group that stood apart from the Common Service.¹⁰ Its merger into the ALC in 1963 brought it, at least theoretically, into the orbit of the 1958 *Service Book and Hymnal* (SBH).

SBH represents a new stage in Lutheran liturgical history in America. The book was the work of the Joint Commission on the Hymnal, organized in 1945.¹¹ Shaped in many ways by Luther Reed, the *Service Book and Hymnal* of 1958 represents an “ecumenizing” if not an “Anglicizing” of Lutheran worship. The Common Service, like most 16th century Lutheran liturgies, is closer to the Roman rite than the *Book of Common Prayer* (at least in structure). The theological difference between Lutherans and Roman Catholics focused in the canon of the mass and hence the absence or modification of eucharistic prayers in Lutheran liturgies. SBH included a eucharistic prayer patterned in part after the most Lutheran of the Anglican prayer books, the 1549 *Book of Common Prayer* (BCP).¹²

Paradigms for eucharistic prayers do, however, exist in the Lutheran tradition. The almost continuous use of eucharistic prayers in the Swedish church, the Pfalz-Neuberg rite of 1543, the Bavarian liturgy of 1879,¹³ the Kassel liturgy of 1896, the Ohio Synod liturgy of 1912 (patterned after the 1879 Bavarian liturgy), the 1936 book of worship of the Lutheran churches in India,¹⁴ and the 1955 *Berlin Agenda*,¹⁵ all provide precedents for eucharistic prayers for Lutherans.

Pioneering work done by the Swedish Lutherans, Yngve Brilioth¹⁶ and Gustav Aulen,¹⁷ forced Lutherans to look anew at eucharistic prayer. Bishop Olof Herrlin’s 1960 work—supporting Brilioth’s and Aulen’s rethinking of eucharistic sacrifice—added more insight into Swedish liturgical thought.¹⁸ Paul Zeller Strodach (1876-1947) and Luther D. Reed (1873-1972) both served on the 1917 *Common Service Book* commission which helped cement the United Lutheran Church merger of 1918. Their advocacy of eucharistic prayers eventuated in their introduction in the *Book of Worship of the Federated Lutheran Churches of India* and in the 1958 *Service Book and Hymnal*.¹⁹ The Indian prayer (proposed by Paul Z. Strodach and patterned after the Eastern Orthodox liturgies of St. James,

St. John Chrysostom, and St. Basil, the Gallican rite and the 1549 *Book of Common Prayer*) is clearly the model with which the SBH committee began.²⁰ But in the addition and positioning of the *epiclesis*, SBH follows not only the Anglican but also the Eastern Orthodox pattern. So also changing the *Kyrie* back to a litany follows the consistent Eastern pattern and the Western pattern till around 600 AD. In all these changes, Eastern Orthodox influences can be posited as strongly as Anglican. And these two changes in SBH are the only significant differences from the Common Service and thus from the 16th century liturgies.

These ecumenical and liturgical movements were clearly affecting Lutherans in America. Heirs of the 19th century liturgical movement, like the Roman Catholic Odo Casel (1886-1948)²¹ of Maria Laach Abbey and the Anglican Benedictine Dom Gregory Dix (1901-1952)²² of the Nashdom community, were to have significant influence on Lutheran worship. The German Lutheran Peter Brunner, through his students Eugene Brand and Robert Jenson, as well as with the publication in English of his *Worship in the Name of Jesus* (1968) reflected ecumenical as well as Lutheran influences.²³ The appearance in English of important historical works by Jungmann²⁴ and Bouyer²⁵ brought the Western tradition into sharper focus. Most significant were the liturgical reforms of Vatican II (1961-65), answering one of the Reformers' basic demands, the liturgy in the vernacular. Alexander Schmemmann's clear and compelling presentation of Eastern Orthodox worship²⁶ helped convince some Lutherans that the patristic christology they share²⁷ made Eastern liturgies a useful resource for Lutheran worship.

Not only were the worldwide ecumenical and liturgical movements significant for the development of LBW, but some uniquely American controversies also influenced the process. One such controversy began among the early Norwegian immigrants. In some fascinating ways, much discussion—though no great controversies—surrounded confession and absolution in SBH and LBW paralleling the controversy among the Norwegian Lutherans that began a century before.²⁸ On one end was the Haugean Eielsen Synod whose Old Constitution (1846 and 1850) specified the following *conditional* absolution: "Accordingly, then, from God's Word is declared to all penitent, repentant, and believing souls the forgiveness of sins in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen."²⁹ The Old Constitution also disallowed laying on of hands since that suggests that absolution was a "powerful *impartation* of the forgiveness of sins." In addition to the Eielsen Synod, those synods that formed the United Norwegian Lutheran Church in 1890 opposed this formulation. The United Church insisted absolution was an *offer* of forgiveness, since it

can be *imparted* only to those who believe. In the merger negotiations of the United Church with the Norwegian Synod and the Haugean Synod (minus the remnant still known as the Eielsen Synod who held onto the Old Constitution), the absolution controversy had to be resolved.³⁰ The 1906 theses avoid the term “impartation” (and also the language of “the justification of the world” which some in the Norwegian Synod had defended). Rather the declaration of absolution is “God’s own absolving act through the ministry of the Word.”³¹ But the “instrument by which the sinner receives, appropriates, and thus becomes a partaker of the gift and treasure of forgiveness which is offered, declared, and bestowed by God in absolution, is faith.”³² The substance of “impartation” seems to be implied in terms like “partaker” and “bestowed.” But again this is qualified as follows: “Absolution itself is always a real and valid absolution of God even though it does not profit without faith.”³³ Thus they allow the dictum that “only the penitent should be absolved” without requiring a conditional absolution, as Eielsen did.³⁴ Interestingly enough, the absolution formula in the liturgy of the 1911 *Lutheran Hymnary* of the three merging churches is borrowed from the 1888 Common Service.

In the United Church 1915 *Altar Book*, the compromise formula is struck in the rite of Public Confession and Absolution. The formula with laying on of hands is: “By the authority of God and my holy office I declare unto thee [singular] the gracious forgiveness of all thy sins; in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.”³⁵ The absolution that had been in use in the Norwegian Synod before the *Altar Book* of 1915 was: “I, by virtue of the power and authority bestowed upon me by God to remit sins on earth, do hereby announce unto you [plural] the gracious forgiveness of all your sins in the name....”³⁶

The absolution controversy among the Norwegian-Americans parallels the in-house discussions of other Lutheran churches up to and including LBW and *Lutheran Worship* (LW). The LCMS worship book was published in 1982. The issue never took on the inter-Lutheran proportions of the predestination controversy, but it has important implications for pastoral and liturgical theology: How, when, and where is forgiveness proclaimed? As the predestination and absolution controversies were winding down, the so-called inspiration controversy over the doctrine of the Word was heating up.

Not unlike the First Vatican Council (1870-1871) in its affirmation of papal infallibility, but perhaps more like the fundamentalist-modernist controversy that began about the same time was the so-called inspiration controversy among the Lutherans. Here the issues were the infallibility and inerrancy of Scripture. The ULCA Constitution of 1918 had declared the

Scriptures “the inspired Word of God and the only infallible rule and standard of faith and practice.”³⁷ But that was not enough for the more conservative “old Lutheran” synods. The Buffalo, Iowa, Missouri, Ohio and Wisconsin Synods drafted the Intersynodical (Chicago) Theses (1925-1928) to finalize the agreement on predestination and to clarify the doctrine of Scripture as *verbally* inspired and without errors or contradictions.³⁸ Similarly, the 1925 Minneapolis Theses of the now forming American Lutheran Conference of largely midwestern German and Scandinavian Lutherans (but without LCMS) affirmed the Bible as “the inerrant Word of God and . . . the only infallible authority in . . . faith and life.” These same issues nearly torpedoed the old ALC merger in the late 1920s. Though its constitution only affirms the “inspired Word” and “infallible authority” of Scripture, an appendix interprets that to include the inerrancy of the original texts and an “inerrant authority, source, guide, and norm.”³⁹ The 1932 LCMS Brief Statement continued in the vein of the Intersynodical Theses, affirming that “verbal inspiration of the Scriptures is not a so-called ‘theological deduction.’” Moreover, inerrancy extends to “historical, geographical, and other secular matters.”⁴⁰ ALC responded with its Sandusky Declaration of 1938 asserting that the Holy Spirit had supplied both content and fitting word, and that the Scriptures were without error or contradiction.⁴¹ The high-point of ALC–LCMS relations came in the Common Confession of 1949 which, significantly, had no article on Scripture, presumably since that had been resolved in the 1920s and 1930s.

Meanwhile, ULCA and ALC continued dialogue on another front. As ULCA began to utilize historical-critical methods in its seminaries, the language of Scripture as a record of revelation was adopted in the 1938 Baltimore Declaration alongside the affirmation that the Scriptures are the Word of God. However, “in its most real sense, the Word of God is the Gospel.”⁴² The Pittsburg Agreement between ALC and ULCA affirms the Bible as “itself the Word of God” as well as the “history of revelation” and human response. It affirms the inspiration of “content and fitting word” and an “errorless, unbreakable whole of which Christ is the center.” It is “the permanent divine relation . . . the only source, rule, and norm of faith and life.”⁴³ Meant to alleviate ALC’s concerns about a shift in ULCA theology, when the latter seemed to place the Baltimore Declaration over the Pittsburg Agreement, ALC became more jaundiced toward ULC’s real attitudes.

LCMS had the same concerns regarding ALC because of its flirtations with ULC in the 1930s. No sooner were these resolved in the 1949 Common Confession than they were raised again regarding the American Lutheran Conference which had begun to explore merger. The growing alienation of LCMS was addressed in Part II of the Common Confession in

1952 on matters of practice (rather than simply doctrine as in Part I of 1949).⁴⁴ Because ULCA was clearly being excluded from these merger negotiations, the Augustana Lutheran Church withdrew in 1952, and the remaining conference churches moved on to merger. Its 1952 United Testimony affirmed the Bible as an “infallible source of revelation” and “only inerrant source and norm for doctrine and life.”⁴⁵

The high-points of inter-Lutheran cooperation and unity came in the 1960s with mergers forming the American Lutheran Church (ALC) in 1960 and the Lutheran Church in America (LCA) in 1962. In 1966 the Lutheran Council in the USA (LCUSA) was formed, which included LCMS. The 1964 constitution of the Lutheran Council in the USA acknowledged the Holy Scriptures to be “the only source and infallible norm” of doctrine and practice. The now controverted language of Word of God was absent.⁴⁶ In ALC–LCMS negotiation, a new approach was taken in the 1960s. Instead of yet one more confession (or constitution), a joint committee prepared an essay on “the Lutheran Confessions and *sola scriptura*.” It affirmed Scripture as (1) an address to sinners, (2) the Church’s sole authority, (3) the Word of God (God speaking) for proclamation (with infallibility understood as effectiveness and reliability) and (4) interpreted via law and gospel for justification and service.⁴⁷ On this basis, fellowship was declared by ALC and LCMS in 1968 and 1969 respectively, with the ALC also declaring fellowship with LCA at the same time.

In the midst of merger negotiations that were to form the American Lutheran Church and the Lutheran Church in America, in 1958, the *Service Book and Hymnal* was published, having been initiated in 1945. SBH mirrors the tensions over the doctrine of the Word in some interesting ways: Its liturgies and hymns reflect almost exclusively the language of the King James Version. The lessons were published in both the King James Version and Revised Standard Version.⁴⁸ Here the tension was clearly over the use of modern English. Doctrinal concerns emerged more clearly in the constitutions. The constitution of ALC, drafted in 1958 reiterated the language of the 1925 Minneapolis Theses concerning the “inerrant Word” as “only infallible authority.”⁴⁹ The LCA constitution of 1962 strikes out in a new direction, affirming only the Gospel as revelation and only Christ as the Word—not the Bible. They are the inspired “record” of redemption and norm for faith and life. Yet, “God still speaks through the Scriptures.”^{50a} In a very real sense the controversy between the “happy Danes” (AELC) and the “holy Danes” (UELC) was mirrored and continued in the mergers: AELC with its assertion that the Bible contains the Word of God merged into LCA; UELC insisted that the Bible *is* the Word of God and joined ALC. Both constitutions embodied the respective positions.

In 1953, the LCMS in convention decided to revise TLH. Subsequent conventions reaffirmed this need. Because of the criticisms of the 1958 *Service Book and Hymnal* [SBH]—especially by musicians on the joint ALC/LCA Commission on Liturgy and the Hymnal—chair Henry Horn issued an invitation to a 1963^{50b} meeting with its counterpart in the Synodical Conference (in which the LCMS constituted the largest denomination). The musicians on the ALC/LCA commission “yearned for new music” and the consensus of the meeting was that “perhaps we could do the thing together with more profit.”^{50c} A subsequent meeting between Horn and Walter Buszin of the LCMS led to a resolution submitted to the next LCMS convention. There was a significant agreement in ALC and LCA with George Seltzer’s view:

I do not know whether or not it is possible for American Lutherans to arrive at a common hymnal.... It would not only be the most significant step possible in the direction of Lutheran unity in America, but also a heavensent opportunity to initiate at once a thorough-going revision of liturgical forms, hymn-texts, and music in our present SBH—a revision urgently demanded by recent advances in historical-liturgical studies, advancing and changing musical tastes, and not least, an insistent urge among both clergy and lay people for more relevant and more contemporary materials for use in worship.^{50d}

In 1965, the Detroit convention abrogated the revision plans and issued a call for an all-Lutheran hymnal. The Commission on Worship of the LCMS and the Synod of Evangelical Lutheran Churches issued the *Worship Supplement* (WS) as an “addition to existing hymnals [to] serve the present needs of the church and be a helpful contribution to the service books of the future” (WS, p. 10). It was also set forth as “a modern experiment in applying timeless truths to timely needs” (WS, p.9).

On February 10-11, 1966, representatives from six American Lutheran church bodies met in Chicago at the invitation of LCMS President Oliver Harms for an Inter-Lutheran Consultation on Worship.⁵¹ In explaining the resolution of the 1965 Detroit Convention of the LCMS to the initial meeting of the Inter-Lutheran Consultation on Worship in February 1966, President Harms expressed the “strong hopes that in this endeavor all might walk together in complete submission to Holy Scripture and in full harmony with the Lutheran confessions.”⁵² At the same session, Walter Buszin expressed concern about doctrinal indifferences creeping into the Lutheran churches via liturgical practices of Roman Catholic or Reformed churches.⁵³ Yet the press release emanating from the consultation indicated that there was a consensus to express both “ecumenical and Lutheran traditions of

worship.”⁵⁴ This moves in a direction different from Buszin’s warnings and indicates that the consultation saw no necessary contradiction between ecumenical borrowings and confessional integrity.

A year later, the Inter-Lutheran Commission on Worship (ILCW) began functioning with representatives from the American Lutheran Church (ALC), the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Canada (ELCC), the Lutheran Church in America (LCA), the Lutheran Church–Missouri Synod (LCMS) and the [Slovak] Synod of Evangelical Lutheran Churches, which eventually became part of LCMS. Herbert Lindemann was elected as the chair. In its statement of purpose, adopted February 6-7, 1967, the ILCW noted the Lutheran churches’ involvement in the “rapidly accelerating ecumenical movement,” as well as the “numerous new and exciting insights in liturgy, Christian history, and theology.” Besides preparing a “new, common liturgy and hymnal,” the ILCW was “to re-evaluate and to continue the church’s rich tradition of worship and music.”⁵⁵ But as a “first step” ILCW was to “prepare common worship materials that are provisional and experimental in character and intended as supplements to existing worship forms in the participating churches.”⁵⁶ Thus was conceived the series of paperbacks known as Contemporary Worship (CW).

The ILCW was organized into four standing committees: Hymn Text Committee (HTC), Hymn Music Committee (HMC), Liturgical Music Committee (LMC), and Liturgical Text Committee (LTC)—the latter with numerous subcommittees. The committees met together as necessary as the Joint Hymn Committee (JHC) and the Joint Liturgy Committee (JLC). Both music committees were able, with ILCW approval, to go outside their membership to commission necessary music.⁵⁷

PART I: CONTEMPORARY WORSHIP BOOKLETS

CHAPTER ONE

SANCTA

THE QUEST FOR RELEVANCE IN CONTEMPORARY WORSHIP WITHIN THE HOLY CHURCH (1967-1972)

Singing a New Song (1967-1970)

During its first year the Hymn Text Committee (HTC) grouped the paramount selection criteria for hymn texts as literary, theological, and functional.⁵⁸ They agreed further that the “direction of hymns (both words and tune) must be God-ward.”⁵⁹ In October 1967 HTC recommended publishing “a number of texts for provisional use,” the next year if possible. Contemporary Worship 1 (CW-1), 1969, Contemporary Worship 4 (CW-4), 1972, eventuated from this decision which the ILCW subsequently approved. Simultaneously both HTC and HMC were working on a “core hymnal” of about 200 hymns.⁶⁰ ILCW noted that “the publishers seemingly do not favor issuing a core hymnal at this time,” but encouraged the committees to continue the larger hymnal collection, as well as the preparation and publication of modern hymns.⁶¹

Interesting input came from Erik Routley, commissioned in 1967 to evaluate SBH and in 1968 to evaluate TLH. Concerning SBH, Routley wrote:

In general I think the hymnal presents a very confused notion of what Lutherans in American and other English speaking countries believe, in theology and in aesthetics. I think it showed leanings toward the pretentious (which often means the 19th century) and away from the direct (which does not necessarily mean the 20th century). With searching theological criticism on the part of an editorial board, it could be the basis of a distinguished new collection.⁶²

ILCW intended to provide such criticism for such a collection.

In his 1967 critique he also remarked concerning TLH that it has “much greater respect for the German Lutheran tradition” and is “much less syncretistic than SBH,” yet “it places so much emphasis on pietism.” He concludes: “Some of the pietist material in both books reminds me of the ancestor-worship of Madagascar, with all its reactionary horrors.” Routley calls for “a balanced sense of history which admits, but regulates progress.”⁶³

Routley’s wit is seen in his critique of the hymn, “On Jordan’s banks” (SBH 4). Routley quips: “The usual reading is: ‘On Jordan’s bank,’ the assumption being that the Baptist could stand on only one bank at once.” The hymn appears in LBW, uncorrected, but is rectified in Missouri Synod’s revision of LBW entitled *Lutheran Worship* (LW).

In his 1968 report on TLH, Routley was lavish in his praise of the music of the Lutheran hymns of 1524-1750 as “the largest body of fine music in the whole literature of hymns.” He spoke of the “sheer weight of excellence” of the chorales in TLH.⁶⁴ But whereas SBH attempted to conflate many cultures without great success, in Routley’s view, “TLH by comparison hardly attempted this task.”⁶⁵ Rather TLH attempted, successfully (given those limitations), to translate 16th and 17th century German Lutheran culture for English-speaking use.⁶⁶ But Routley was not so charitable regarding texts as tunes! His earlier critique of “pietism” was clarified. “Pietism almost entirely drives our corporate praise and social concern in this book.”⁶⁷ Some of this he blamed on Catherine Winkworth’s translations, but the criticism was also substantive. He pointed to heavy emphasis on personal guilt and death and the disparagement of earth. His conclusion was mixed: “I am therefore faced with a book of manifest excellence which seems to me so outdated in its theological approach to worship as to be either a curiosity at best or a menace at worst.”⁶⁸

In his biting criticisms of both TLH and SBH, Routley described the radical differences in the content and intent of the books and thus asked this question regarding the new hymnal: “Is what is now contemplated a hymn-book which translates for English-speaking use the German-Lutheran culture of the 16th and 17th centuries, or is it to be a hymnal embodying the *best* in *all* the main streams of hymnody?” [emphasis mine]. Popular, grassroots reaction to ILCW’s selection of hymns came from laity in all the churches, notably over 15 thousand letters in the ALC. Out of 25 hymns ILCW originally placed at the bottom of its list, nine eventually made it into LW and four into LBW.⁶⁹ Ecclesiastical reaction to “all the mainstreams of hymnody” came from all the churches, but especially from LCMS, which stumbled over this ecumenical issue. As Routley predicted, many hymns of the old German Lutheran culture were not included in LBW. Ecumenism (read “unionism”) loomed large in the eyes of many Missourians!

The HTC in January 1969 decided to continue assembling a small “core hymnal” in spite of the discouragement by the publishers as to prospects of publication⁷⁰ and made suggestions regarding individuals and groups who might serve as evaluators of the initial list.⁷¹ In the course of their discussion George Utech had asked whether the hymnic form is now dead. It was suggested that the television commercial serves as the modern substitute for hymns.⁷² If the quantity and popularity of hymns—new and old—that the JHC considered is any indication, the hymnic form is alive and well!

Hymnody—Popular & Churchly: CW-1 & CW-4 (1969 & 1972)

The debate at the JHC meeting on May 6, 1968, over the folk song, “Sons of God”—with the HTC generally in favor and the HMC generally opposed—illustrated one of the issues. Gilbert Doan of the HTC pleaded the cause of the youth. Young people were saying: “All we ask is openness. All we ask is to try something different. All we ask is that older people not close off all our options in advance, by appealing to standards whose validity we cannot concede.”⁷³ Then, consciously appealing to the wisdom of Gamaliel (Acts 5:38f), Doan used the argument that “if it is of God,” this new music will endure. But then he suggested, rather wistfully: “In these days, even if it *is* of God, maybe it won’t and shouldn’t endure.”⁷⁴ Even after agreement on publication of such folk songs, debate continued in the October 5, 1968, meeting of the JHC over publishing both regular *and* guitar settings of “All you people, clap your hands.” Among the four hymns that had to be referred to ILCW for decision from the April 29, 1969 meeting of the JHC, the only one approved for CW-1 was “God made all mankind brothers,” an adaptation of Tom Glazier’s song, “Because all men are brothers.” Glazier’s version utilized the tune, *Herzlich tut mich verlangen*, adapted from a love song by Hassler in the 16th century for “O sacred head now wounded.” The CW-1 version used a tune from *Southern Harmony*. None of these folk songs made it into LBW or LW. Of the 21 hymns in CW-1, 13 were included in LBW and four in LW. “Earth and all stars,” “God of grace and God of glory,” “In Adam we have all been one” and “Our Father, by whose name” were included in both books.

The debate mirrors the peculiar “ageism” of the youth culture of the 1960s; “Sons of God” reflected the still unconscious sexism of our language, and its direction—as that of the other folk song, “We are one in the Spirit”—violated the HTC’s rule that hymns should be directed “God-ward.” All of these factors surely contributed to the fact that these folk songs did not endure in LBW. Perhaps the Barry Manilow hit was correct that “mu-

sic” writes the songs of a generation (“I am music and I write the songs”). If so, perhaps such songs reflect little more than the *Zeitgeist*, the “spirit of the times,” and not the inspiration of the Spirit of God.

With CW-1 readied for publication, HTC turned its attention to a “Gospel Hymn Project” out of which grew a surprising set of recommendations to ILCW concerning priorities—recommendations which never came to fruition. After noting objectionable features of some “gospel” hymns (unrealistic, simplistic, egocentric, frivolous, perfectionist, paternalistic) as well as positive factors (integrity of faith, simplicity, rhythm, responsibility), the HTC suggested the following priorities for publication in the Contemporary Worship series: (1) gospel songs (e.g., “Standing on the promises”), (2) pop-folk (e.g. CW-1, 2, 7, & 16), (3) informal worship materials (e.g. “Michael, row the boat ashore”), (4) church year hymns, (5) spirituals (e.g. “We shall overcome,” “I wonder as I wander” and “The Virgin Mary had a baby boy”).⁷⁵ Instead, the only other hymn collection, CW-4, contained hymns for Baptism and Communion. This and the other priorities set by the HMC—the “core hymnal” and synthesizing the TLH and SBH collections—clearly won the day. Even though ILCW actually approved “a fascicle of sacred folk songs” (10 yes; 8 no; 3 abstentions), it was never published.⁷⁶

At the February 1971 meeting, the ILCW Executive Committee instructed the hymn committees to proceed with the collection of Communion, Baptism, and confirmation hymns, as well as “a collection of hymns . . . designed to replace provisionally the SBH and TLH.”⁷⁷ ILCW decided no confirmation hymns were to be included in CW-4 but requested the hymn committees to continue to seek suitable hymns for a confirmation service.⁷⁸ At that same November 4-5 meeting the hymns for CW-4 were approved. Five of the suggested hymns were dropped. (Of the 30 hymns published in CW-4, 25 were included in LBW, whereas only six in LW.) Last minute additions fared better. From the hymns, “Praise and thanksgiving” (CW-4, 2), “We praise you, Lord” (CW-4, 7) and “This is a joyous, happy day” (CW-4, 6), the first two made it into LBW and LW.⁷⁹

Questionnaires were approved at the June 1972 Executive Committee meeting for the evaluation of the hymns in CW-1, as well as for the liturgy in CW-2. They were to be sent to two congregations in each judicatory in the U.S. (Canadian distribution was unresolved.) Thus began the intense process of evaluation.⁸⁰

Liturgy—Novel & Radical: CW-2 (1970)

At ILCW’s second meeting in February 1967, one of the ALC representatives, Eugene Brand, was elected chair of LTC. In his presentation of

the task of LTC, he stated his conviction that liturgical “actions cannot be reduced to words.” He further speculated that the day of one uniform rite may be past—given the “rapid cultural change.”⁸¹

Texts of contemporary eucharists were submitted by five members of LTC (John Arthur, Eugene Brand, Philip Pfatteicher, Clifford Swanson and Hans Boehringer submitting Empereur’s “Experimental Liturgy”). The most striking thing about all these was the absence of confession and absolution. The rite submitted by Swanson had a confession after the offertory but *prayed* the ancient absolution contained in SBH:

We pray for pardon, the remission of all our sin [*sic*—a Lutheran attempt to focus on our sinful condition, rather than our bad deeds], time for the amendment of life and the grace and comfort of your Holy Spirit among us.⁸²

The rite submitted by Brand had a “preparation” focused on cross and Baptism, and ending with a modernized version of the prayer from the Episcopal *Book of Common Prayer* used in SBH: “Almighty God, unto whom all hearts are open, etc.”⁸³ Again, there was no absolution. Swanson quoted the “Birmingham experimenters” as follows:

Since the eucharist unites with Christ and brings us into his presence, our sin is cast out. Consequently any revised rite should draw attention to this feature, and in order to do so should omit any form of absolution prior to communion.⁸⁴

Arthur had simply argued that an opening order of confession and absolution makes the service too “penitential.”⁸⁵ The outline (and rite) he prepared for the April 16 LTC meeting was then revised by a committee of Swanson and Boehringer, which suggested reinserting an “act of penitence” at two possible points—before the *Kyrie* or after the offertory.⁸⁶ The new outline, without an absolution, was adopted by the committee at its meeting on June 17 as the basis for a rite that contained the following: an entrance hymn followed by the acclamation, “Blessed be God, Father, Son and Spirit,” and a six-fold *Kyrie eleison* with congregational responses. The collect, hymn of praise, lessons, sermon, creed, and hymn followed. Next followed the “sign of fellowship”—versicles on unity and the exchanging of the peace. Offertory procession and prayer preceded a new eucharist prayer, and new versicles surrounded the distribution.⁸⁷ A subcommittee was appointed to draft, by December, a new rite based upon the agreed outline.

Meanwhile ILCW continued to work with the International Consultation of English Texts [ICET] on new translations of the *Gloria in Excelsis*, the two creeds, the *Sanctus*, the *Agnus Dei*, and the Lord’s Prayer. The

1968 version of the Lord's Prayer included: ". . . holy be your name. . . . Forgive us our sins" [substituted for "trespasses" and the Reformed "debts"], and "Save us *in* time of trial." The Apostles' Creed included the controversial, "He went to the realm of the dead," and the term so threatening to some Lutherans—though used by virtually all other Protestants—"catholic church," rather than "Christian church."⁸⁸ The opening lines of the *Gloria* read: "Glory to God in heaven: peace and grace to his people on earth."⁸⁹ Krister Stendahl, an ILCW member, had proposed: "Glory to God in heaven and peace to his people on earth." Stendahl rendered the verbatim translation as follows: "Glory to God in the highest and on earth peace to men of his (gracious) will and plan," hence "*his* people."⁹⁰

At this November 1968 meeting discussion was held about a common three-year lectionary with the Roman Catholics, Episcopalians, and the Consultation on Christian Union and/or with the Lutheran World Federation (LWF), where there was resistance, especially in German circles, to abandoning the one-year lectionary.⁹¹

The LTC subcommittee's rite, based on the Document 16 outline, was presented at the January 1969 meeting. In lieu of an absolution, the "reconciliation" was spoken: "The peace of the Lord be with you!" "His peace be with you!"⁹² The rubric added: "All may give the word and sign of peace to those nearest to them."⁹³

Another surprising feature was the inclusion of an offertory petition in the midst of the Great Thanksgiving, after the proper preface:

Therefore we rejoice and offer with thanksgiving what you have first given to us: our lives and hope and treasures, the signs of your goodness and symbols of our love.⁹⁴

Even in its position *before* the Great Thanksgiving in CW-2, it drew significant criticism from some theologians. One wonders what its location here would have sparked!

The *verba* began with "On the night before he gave himself to the cross" and concluded with "Do this and remember me." The *epiclesis* reads: "Send your Spirit, Father, upon us and upon these gifts, to give us faith and joy. Fill this place with his presence. . . ."⁹⁵ Thus began the intense debate on how literal and which literal translation should be given to the *verba*, when the Spirit should be invoked, and whether the Spirit is invoked on elements and/or people. The breaking of the bread followed the Lord's Prayer with the words: "Broken and divided, in him we are united. Jesus Christ, our peace and our salvation." Then, with the elevation of the cup, was spoken: "Drink from the cup of blessing, share his death and victory. He is coming soon!" The congregation responded: "Amen! Come, Lord

Jesus!” Informal, anonymous use of the rite by LTC members in controlled settings was authorized.⁹⁶ The rite was forwarded to LMC for musical settings.

In a discussion that occurred April 18, 1969, in a conference at Lutheran School of Theology in Chicago including the ILCW, its four working committees (LTC, LMC, HTC, HMC), the church presidents, worship committees, and publishing house editors, the opinion was expressed that “such new materials would be instrumental in causing as many people to leave the church as would be caused to come into the church.” The rite proposed by LTC was then celebrated by those attending the conference. Oral and written reactions noted concerns about the wording, location, and style of the prayer of confession and act of reconciliation, the “oblationary aspect” of General Thanksgiving, changes and direction (Godward!) of the *verba*, and a general feeling that the emphasis was on human rather than divine action. Committee members reported generally positive responses, especially from student congregations, with the most significant question being raised about the location of the act of penitence and the lack of an absolution. In a joint liturgy session, LMC raised questions about the individual texts in the proposed rite as well as the “common texts” produced by the Consultation on Common Texts.⁹⁷ In its July 1969 meeting, LMC recommended to ILCW that four or five musical settings (including a folk-setting) be published in what was to become CW-2.⁹⁸

At the July LTC meeting, detailed reactions to the proposed ICET texts were given, including a preference in the Lord’s Prayer for “Save us in time of trial. . . .” and in the Nicene Creed, “Son of the Father from all eternity . . .” rather than “eternally begotten.”⁹⁹ Detailed discussions of the text of the proposed Holy Communion were held with LMC.¹⁰⁰ After considering a number of alternate “entrance rites,”¹⁰¹ the joint committees voted to drop the litany from the proposed rite of January 1969. Instead, dialogical material “seeking the presence of God” was to be substituted. Regarding the lessons, it was decided to eliminate the announcement of the end of the reading, substituting “cue words” such as “The gospel of the Lord.”¹⁰² A subcommittee on the act of penitence submitted a sample confession and added an absolution of sorts which became the paradigm for the CW-2 declaration:

As you have confessed, so are you forgiven, because Christ has died for you and risen again. Therefore now be reconciled to one another as you have been made one with him.¹⁰³

Edgar Brown’s suggestion to call the whole section the Reconciliation was enthusiastically received in committee. Thus the new name of the Roman Catholic Sacrament of Penance and the theme of the United Presbyterian

Confession of 1967 gained its place among Lutherans as a substitute for SBH's Confession of Sins or the 1969 proposed rite's Act of Penitence. In CW-2 it is called the Act of Reconciliation (CW-2, 9). Indeed in the revised Preface, adopted at this meeting, worship is defined as "the celebration of the reconciliation of God's people with one another, as well as with God."¹⁰⁴ Furthermore the liturgy "ends with a dismissal to go . . . into the world as bearers of good news and live as living signs of reconciliation and peace."¹⁰⁵

In September 1969, an LTC subcommittee consisting of John Arthur, Hans Boehringer, and Eugene Brand reworked the proposed rite and submitted it to the December 1969 meeting of LTC for further modification and approval. The so-called New Testament benediction, "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ. . ." became the greeting, following the entrance hymn and replacing the invocation and the suggested Prayer for the Presence of God. The litany/*Kyrie* remained excluded. Minor changes were made in the wording of the Great Thanksgiving and the Fraction [the breaking of the bread]. The Aaronic Benediction (Numbers 6:24-26) was replaced by "Almighty God, the Father. . ."¹⁰⁶ At its February 1970 meeting, the executive committee of ILCW adopted the text of the Holy Communion rite and accepted the music for publication pending LMC's approval by mail vote. CW-2 was expected to appear in summer 1970.¹⁰⁷ By October it was published.

Writing New Rites (1970-1972)

Reorganizing for Action (1969-1971)

At its July 1969 meeting, the Executive Committee appointed a special committee to revise the Rules of Organization and Procedure. In a preface to the proposed revision, the "slowness of ILCW" (having produced only "one small volume of 56 pages containing 21 hymns after nearly four years of work") was attributed to "too much organizational machinery" and inappropriate use of staff. Utilizing staff's talents, especially to "coordinate the work of ILCW," was recommended so that "more work can be done in less time and at less cost" since the "churches are becoming impatient."¹⁰⁸

The "impatience of the churches" was further expressed by the 1971 Milwaukee Convention of the LCMS, designating 1975 as the target date for the new book of hymns and liturgies. In a response drafted by Brand and Gilbert Doan, such a target date was called both "imprudent" and "impractical." Given the emerging consensus after the "storm of reaction against outdated materials for worship," ILCW responded to LCMS that the necessarily slower process of production by "fully representative delegations

from the churches,” rather than by “expert staff”—was desirable and needed to take into account responses from churches. Few such responses were forthcoming from LCMS congregations. Not too subtly it was pointed out that Concordia had sold less than 4,000 copies of CW-1 to congregations, while Fortress had sold about 8,000 and Augsburg 110,000. Moreover, less than 10,000 copies of CW-2 had been sold by Concordia, whereas Fortress sold about 70,000 and Augsburg 110,000 (58% of purchases were ALC congregations, 31% LCA, and the balance ELCC, LCMS, or inventory!). LCMS was encouraged to facilitate distribution and responses to the Contemporary Worship materials to insure the “theological soundness and confessional integrity” LCMS sought.¹⁰⁹

At the same time the Executive Committee reported to the churches its reorganization proposal: (1) reducing the number of representatives constituting the commission, (2) having churches’ commissions on worship meet in joint session for approval of ILCW materials, and (3) employing a full-time director.¹¹⁰ At the previous ILCW meeting, discussion concerning the restructuring had focused on the relations of staff, church worship commissions, and the proposed director.¹¹¹

At the November 1970 ILCW meeting, the following was proposed by Mandus Egge and Theo DeLaney, the ALC and LCMS worship executives (Edgar Brown having recently left the LCA office):

Resolved, that following the publication of Contemporary Worship 1 and 2, the period of experimentation regarding new worship forms, both liturgical and hymnological, be considered at an end and that future work be considered “permanent” work, looking towards the publication of an all-Lutheran book of worship. . . .¹¹²

At this point, the subsequently controversial limit of 200 hymns was proposed. The resolution was supported in principle by JHC at its September 20 meeting.¹¹³ ILCW tabled this and instructed the Executive Committee to develop a master plan of publications.

At its February 1971 meeting, it was proposed “that the ILCW objective be to publish two basic books: one a hymnal and the other a service book.”¹¹⁴ At the November 1971 meeting, the publishers expressed themselves in favor of two books for 1975.

The Marriage Service for the Sexual Revolution: CW-3 (1970)

The rubrics of the first draft of the Marriage Service began with the shocking suggestion that marriage and the Holy Communion be “celebrated

in conjunction with one another”—shades of a nuptial mass! The wedding of Cana and the second coming of “Christ the bridegroom” were cited to support the suggestion. The banns were reinterpreted as a request for prayer. “Sentimental or ‘cute’ customs” were discouraged and suitable music encouraged.¹¹⁵

The Prayer of the Day alluded to Christ hallowing the Cana wedding and prayed that the bride and groom “may at length celebrate with Christ the Bridegroom the marriage feast which has no end.”¹¹⁶ The dialogue, in lieu of the *Gloria in Excelsis*, began:

Minister: Happy are those who are invited to the marriage feast of the Lamb.

People: The Spirit and the Bride say, “Come.” Let everyone who listens answer, “Come.”¹¹⁷

The soteriological and eschatological dimensions of Christian faith and life were brought into the marriage rite. An explanatory comment on the suggested epistle, Ephesians 5:20-33, said: “Marriage is the Church in miniature.”

The first draft suggested the following vows:

I _____ take you _____ to be my wife/husband from this day forward, to join with you and share together whatever the future may hold, the good and the bad, sickness and health, and, forsaking all others, promise to keep faithfully to you until death parts us.¹¹⁸

Then the minister says:

Since _____ and _____ have made their wedding promises before God and in the presence of this congregation, I pronounce them man and wife, in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. Amen.¹¹⁹

A rubric suggested that the parents may lay hands on the heads of their children during the blessing.¹²⁰

The rubrics continued:

If for sufficient reason, the Holy Communion is not celebrated, the service concluded here with the Lord’s Prayer and the blessings. . . .¹²¹

Thus after the prayers, the Liturgy of the Eucharistic Meal completed the marriage rite. The following was suggested as a benediction:

God almighty send you his light and truth to keep you all the days of your life. The hand of God protect you; his holy angels

accompany you. God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit cause his grace to be mighty upon you.¹²²

The second draft contained minor editorial changes and no structural changes. The chair of the subcommittee, Philip Pfatteicher, presented his own revision of the second draft to the LTC's June 1970 meeting. The committee consensus was that "normally the marriage rite ought to be in the context of the eucharistic rite."¹²³ Thus the rite proposed followed the pattern used ultimately in CW-2 and had alternate Prayer for the Day, a Dialogue (substituting for the Hymn of Praise), followed by the Liturgy of the Word and the Marriage Rite after the Hymn of the Day. The Dialogue used the refrain: "Happy are those who are invited to the marriage feast of the Lamb."¹²⁴ Although in the first two drafts the explanation of how sin burdens marriage followed the Gospel, by the third draft the reference to sin introduced the marriage rite as such.¹²⁵ Instead of beginning with the vow,¹²⁶ "I take you," the third draft reads: "If it is your intention. . . ." The vows and exchange of rings followed. The possibility of allowing alternate vows was raised by an LTC member.¹²⁷ The rite proceeded with prayers, without the traditional "pronouncing" them "man and wife" and moved into the offertory and the Liturgy of the Eucharistic Meal.

LTC, in its October 1970 meeting, discussed the fourth draft of the marriage rite. LTC questioned the way "meaningless or inappropriate symbols . . . unduly sentimental or 'cute' customs"¹²⁸ are condemned in the Introduction and the unqualified rejection of blessing of the rings in the rubrics,¹²⁹ as well as the assertion that the promise of fidelity "makes the marriage." Nonetheless LTC approved the rite "in substance."¹³⁰

By the sixth draft the negative comments about "banns, inappropriate symbols . . . and sentimental customs" (from "overly expensive gowns" to "flower girls"), and blessing the rings were finally dropped and a more positive statement was made about what a wedding *should* be, (rather than what should *not* happen). The Dialogue that replaced the *Gloria* was altered. This draft suggested as the opening and closing antiphon: "I will sing the story of your love, O Lord, forever; I will proclaim your faithfulness to all generations."¹³¹

The recurring refrain from the Psalms ("O give thanks to the Lord for he is good . . .") was used in the New English Bible translation, "Praise the Lord." A dialogue from Psalm 89:1, Jeremiah 33:11 and Psalm 100:4f.¹³² replaced the earlier dialogue based on Revelation with its refrain, "Happy are those who are invited to the marriage feast of the Lamb." Also the parents' blessing taken from Song of Solomon 1:4 ("Let us rejoice and be glad for you; let us praise your love more than wine and your caresses more than any song"), which survived the first five drafts, are the following in the sixth draft: "May they dwell in God's presence forever; may true

and constant love preserve them.” The passage from Song of Solomon was suggested in the rubrics as an alternative.¹³⁴

LTC did not deal with the marriage rite at its February 1971 meeting and received a refinement of the sixth draft, via the seventh draft. It was recommended for publication in the CW series and for congregational use in pamphlets, setting forth options with or without communion.¹³⁴

The vow ending “until death parts us,” which had survived eight drafts, was changed in the November 1971 meeting to read: “I promise to be faithful to you as he gives us life together.”¹³⁵ The Marriage Service—CW-3 appeared in spring 1971. Edward Hansen reported comments such as: “Isn’t anything left that’s fixed, permanent, stable?”¹³⁶ Brand reported some negative and numerous positive responses. The staff summarized criticisms as focusing on (1) “the unnecessary and ill-advised freedom given to couples to write their own vows” and (2) a legal question when states require the words, “I declare you man and wife.”¹³⁷

Reactions in the media—some 75 news stories in the public press reported by Brand¹³⁸—were varied. On May 12, 1972, the *Duluth Herald* (p.2) reported that the service “appears to carry the approval of most Duluth LCA ministers, who contended it was ‘long needed.’” Applauding the omission of words and actions like the “giving away” of the bride, pastors saw the rite moving away from the subordination of women. One noted: “Women have their way after marriage, anyway.”

On the other end of the continent the temperature was surprisingly cooler. The *Orlando Sentinel* (2-B) observed on May 18, 1972, that the rite “appears headed for a cool reception in many of Orlando’s tradition-bound churches.” However the pastors were reportedly receptive to “the couple’s option of writing their own vows.” They were concerned that the ceremony remain “stable, sensible, and on an even keel.”

The *Yonkers Herald Statesman* on May 18, 1972, reported that one LCMS pastor said: “In my entire 14 years in the ministry, I had only one request from a bride-to-be not use the word ‘obey.’” The pastor saw that one request as due to “the influence of the women’s lib movement.” An LCA pastor noted that “obey” had long since been optional in the LCA rite. (It did not appear in the ULCA’s 1918 rites, much less in the 1958 SBH.) “In my 28 years in the ministry,” he continued, “I never used the prayer of fertility.” The LCMS pastor commented: “We don’t pray that they should breed like cattle, but the Bible says ‘children are the heritage of the Lord.’” Brand had been quoted as saying: “We do not regard marriage as primarily a matter of child-bearing. The reason a couple gets married is to produce a relationship of their own, whether or not they have children” (Gettysburg,

Pennsylvania *Times*, May 16, 1972). James Stack in the Boston *Morning Globe* of May 20, 1972, characterized the rite as a “mod marriage ceremony.” Sterling Bemis of the Long Beach *Press Telegram*, May 21, 1972, with tongue in cheek, suggested that the next stage in marriage ceremonies would climax: “I now pronounce you whatever you say.” The *New York Times*, May 28, 1972, article had the headline: “Lutherans no longer require brides to be given by fathers.”^{138a}

Services of the Word for Preaching: CW-5 (1972)

With the completion of its work on CW-2, LTC took up the proposal of a “preaching service” at its June 1970 meeting. Some opposed any such service, preferring use of the ante-communion portion of the eucharistic rite or the more historic *Matins*. The committee was divided into three groups to continue discussion. Suggestions and outlines were presented, along with a minority report by Boehringer suggesting that the first task should be to “revitalize and restore” *Matins* and *Vespers*. One group suggested that it be essentially a spoken service (which is what emerged in LBW), the other two suggesting canticles (with which CW-5 was filled). The format of the synagogue service and a baptismal remembrance were also highlighted.¹³⁹ The following outline was finally agreed upon:

- Procession (with book) Song
- Blessing
- Canticle of Praise
- Covenant Act—Renunciation and Creed
- Announcement of the Day
- Collect
- First Lesson
- Anthem
- Second Lesson
- Two forms of “Thanks for Hearing” or Psalm
- Third Lesson
- Sermon
- Hymn of the Day
- Offering
- Litany—Intercessions and optional Confession
- Our Father
- Praise (Canticle—Te Deum or other)
- Aaronic Benediction¹⁴⁰

Clifford Swanson and Herbert Lindemann presented four services patterned on this outline to the October 1970 meeting.

It was suggested regarding these services that “We bless you” might be better than the repeated “archaic” phrases, “Blessings on him . . .” or “Blessed are you.” Having a set place for an anthem was rejected in favor of a “floating choir.” It was resolved not to use the term “offertory” but to provide a responsory (termed “Brief Response” in the revision) as one opportunity for “doing something good musically.”¹⁴¹ On the final day, the outline was revised as follows:

Hymn
Versicles (blessing God)
Canticle of Praise
Covenant Act (with Apostles’ Creed)
Announcement of the Day
Prayer of the Day
First Lesson
Psalm (hymn)
Second Lesson
Brief Response
Sermon
Hymn
Offering
Our Father
Canticles of Praise
Versicles
Benediction¹⁴²

It was agreed that the Advent service was “practically completed.” Lindemann was given the assignment of the Christmas/Epiphany service, and Swanson was to prepare the service for Lent. The following resolutions were passed as guidelines: that there be provision “for specific intercessions appropriate for the congregation for a given time and place,” and that the “the subcommittee seriously consider putting some form of confession in the service.”¹⁴³ The latter never did emerge in the Service of the Word.

Regarding the preaching service, in February 1971, LMC discussed whether there was too much “proper” material for different seasons.¹⁴⁴ In the joint session with LTC they discussed the problem of limiting the number of canticles, asking whether this was a musical service or a spoken service with music. LTC insisted that there be two canticles for Advent, Lent, Easter, and general services, arguing that—with repetitions—there would be only six *new* canticles for congregations to learn—for Advent/Christmas/Epiphany: the *Magnificat* and Isaiah 60; for Lent: the Beatitudes and “If we die with the Lord”; for Easter “This is the feast” and *Te Deum*; for the general service *Te Deum* and Jeremiah 31.¹⁴⁵

The preaching service, revised according to the October 1970 outline, was reviewed at the LTC meeting. It was decided to move the Cantic of Praise to a position after the Covenant Act. The latter baptismal remembrance introduced the Apostles' Creed with a seasonal preface. There were objections to the "inaccurate statements and 'folksy' approach" of the prayers in the Christmas/Epiphany rite; however it was agreed that there should be a separate service for Christmas/Epiphany after several reversals, but with the same canticles as Advent.¹⁴⁶

At the June 1971 meeting, a period of silent reflection was inserted after the sung responsory to the second lesson and before the sermon and made permissive before or after the benediction. The CW-2 *Gloria in Excelsis* was substituted for the *Te Deum* in the Christmas/Epiphany service. The term "Prayer of the Day" was substituted for "Prayer for the Day"—a change that prevailed in the revisions of CW-2 also.¹⁴⁷ At the same meeting, what was to become the LBW form of the benediction was adopted:

The Lord bless you and keep you.

The Lord make his face to shine upon you and be gracious to you.

The Lord look upon you with favor and give you peace.¹⁴⁸

The new title, "Service of the Word," was adopted for the preaching service. The services were approved and forwarded to ILCW for final action.¹⁴⁹ Since the music was not yet available at the time of the November 1971 meeting, members were to send comments and votes by mail.¹⁵⁰ As of the February 1972 Executive Committee meeting the music was not yet finished; thus LMC had not yet acted on it.¹⁵¹ Finally, in its report to the Executive Committee, LMC recommended nine canticles and six responses.¹⁵² The responses were all new. Of the nine canticles, "Glory to God" and "This is the feast" had already appeared in CW-2. Traditional texts included the *Magnificat* (music by Gerhard Krapf), the *Benedictus* (by Dale Wood), and the *Te Deum* (settings by Richard Hillert and Egil Hovland). The Lucian Deiss settings of "Zion sing" and "Keep in mind" were used. The John Arthur text "Listen! You nations," was set to music by J. Bert Carlson. The texts of the responses were by John Arthur, the music by Richard Hillert, with alternates by Leland Sateren. Services of the Word was approved by ILCW by mail vote, and CW-5 appeared early in 1973.

There were a number of unique features in the Services of the Word, some of which were retained in the LBW. The seasonal dialogues at the beginning of the services were followed by a Covenant Act with seasonal introductions, the recitation of the baptismal creed. Seasonal introductions were eliminated but the baptismal motif remained: "God has made us his

people through our Baptism into Christ" (LBW, p. 128). Also eliminated in LBW was the term Covenant Act (e.g. CW-5, 13), along with similar references to the "covenant" in Affirmation of the Baptismal Covenant (CW-8).

There were some theological objections to applying "covenant" language explicitly to Baptism, its remembrance, or affirmation. The reasons for dropping the Christmas/Epiphany and Easter seasonal dialogues were more practical, but some beautiful liturgical material was lost nonetheless. The Service of the Word for Christmas/Epiphany began:

Blessed are you, O Christ, Son of God,
you were before time began
and came into the world to save us. . . .
Blessed are you, Son of Mary,
born a child, you shared our humanity (CW-5, 26).

In the Easter service is given the classic Eastern Orthodox greeting which appeared nowhere else in LBW material:

Christ is risen.
He is risen indeed. Alleluia! (CW-5, 52).

The Advent prayers taken from the Great-O-antiphons were followed by the response, "Lord, come soon!" (CW-5, 18f.), now buried in the Prayers for Daily Prayer (LBW:MDE, pp. 92f.). The other seasonal prayers were also lost in the condensation of the Service of the Word in LBW where the General Prayer from the *Lutheran Hymnal* (pp. 23f.) was substituted. The use of the Deacon's Litany, expanded from the *Service Book and Hymnal version* (SBH p. 2), provided for the response in Greek, *Kyrie/Christe eleison*, or English, "Lord, have mercy" (CW-5, 74f.), in General Service I.

Similarly the Beatitudes canticle from the Lenten service (CW-5, pp. 42-45) was lost. Several 1971 proposals attempted the mixing of the two possible translations:

Happy are those on whom God has smiled! . . .
Blessed are the poor and distressed. . . .
Happy are those who hunger and thirst. . . .
Blessed are those who make peace. . . .
Happy are those who have suffered persecution...!¹⁵³

General Service II began the dialogue with the ancient Jewish formula of thanksgiving: "Blessed are you, O Lord our God, King of the universe, for in your wisdom you have formed us" (LBW, p.127). This was repeated at the end of the dialogue, although CW-5 and its predecessors had ended: "...for you have given us everlasting life" (CW-5, 81).¹⁵⁴

Some shifting of canticles took place after the May 1971 proposal: The Beatitudes were substituted in the Advent service for the *Magnificat*; the latter remained in the Christmas/Epiphany Service and the *Gloria in Excelsis* replaced the *Benedictus*; the *Te Deum* remained in Easter and General Service II but was replaced by the shortened *Benedictus* in General Service I.¹⁵⁵

CHAPTER TWO
APOSTOLICA

**THE QUEST FOR ORTHODOXY IN CONTEMPORARY WORSHIP
WITHIN THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH
(1970-1973)**

**The Beginnings of the Theological Critique:
Eucharistic Controversy I (October 1970—August 1973)**

There is a sense in which all of the controversies swirling around the ILCW's work were "eucharistic." In some circles the very use of the term "eucharist" raised eyebrows and tempers—even though that name was never proposed for the revised rite. The story is told that the *only* change made in the penultimate and unacceptable version of the SBH eucharistic prayer was to rename it the Prayer of Thanksgiving. The story—whether apocryphal or not—symbolizes one superficial dimension of the issue. The deeper issue involved the fear that the Sacrament of the Altar was being changed into a eucharistic sacrifice (i.e. the charge against the medieval Roman canon of a daily repetition of Calvary). Again, the new offertories, especially with an offertory procession, was seen as transforming the divine gift into a human work. Further, setting the words of institution (which are pure gospel) into a prayer (which is human endeavor and therefore falls under law) corrupts gospel into law, grace into works, and sacrament into sacrifice. Language of remembrance/memorial raised specters of not only Roman but also Reformed opponents. The introduction of an *epiclesis* praying that the Holy Spirit would be sent upon the elements and/or people rekindled old Lutheran debates about the nature of the consecration by introducing this much older prayer of the Eastern Orthodox. Even those more "high church" Lutherans who favored an *epiclesis* could not agree on whether it belonged before or after the *verba*. The introduction of an *epiclesis* into the baptismal, confirmation, and ordination rites intensified the concern over Orthodox influence/corruption.

Concerns over Lutheran identity, confessional integrity, and ecumenical influences complicated the liturgical task. More parochial concerns of

balancing traditions of various Scandinavian-American and German-American Lutherans in liturgy and hymnody further complicated the issues.

Such are the outlines of the eucharistic controversy of theologians. There were popular reactions expressed in letters and field tests and the ecclesial reactions of seminary professors, pastors, and church review committees. If prayer and praise are faith's response to God's Word, the sacramental and sacrificial dimensions may well be mixed in the service of Holy Communion with its proclamation of the crucified and risen Lord both in preaching and in participation in the Lord's Supper. Even the "non-controversy" over confession and absolution involved much internal debate and discussion within ILCW and numerous reversals and shifts in language. The issue here was not explicitly "eucharistic" but it was clearly "sacramental." How much of the sacramental language of absolution in private confession belonged in the rite of public confession? Doctrines of ministry and ordination as well as sacramentology came into play.

In his master's thesis, "The Great Thanksgiving: The Eucharistic Debate Among American Lutherans," Dennis Paulson detailed the theologians' debates surrounding the ILCW's work as focused on the eucharistic prayer. Paulson makes a strong case for Odo Casel's influence on Peter Brunner, and of Peter Brunner's influence on doctoral students Robert Jenson and Eugene Brand, and thus on the ILCW's work.¹⁵⁶ Jenson was author of the so-called Prayer of Many Parts (Prayer I in CW-01). Brand served first as ALC representative and LTC chair, then as LCA worship executive and ILCW staff person, and finally as ILCW project director. The documenting of influence is difficult under any circumstance and much more so with a committee's work, but the importance of Brunner's students—especially Brand—cannot be doubted. Given the complex process of review and approval, no individual gets credit or blame for the product.

CW-2 Critiques (1970-1971)

Already in October 1970, some reactions to the new rite were received. Some ALC district presidents objected to the eucharistic prayer and especially the *epiclesis* as "not Lutheran." An LCA pastor echoed the latter charge and added a caution against "Calvinism." Oliver Olson prepared a lengthy critique and asked to appear before LTC to discuss the issues. The request was forwarded to ILCW for a policy decision.¹⁵⁷ ILCW resolved in November that "under ordinary circumstances only representatives of recognized groups be granted such appearances."¹⁵⁸

Eugene Brand's introductory article, "A Eucharist for All Lutherans," points to CW-2's structural similarity to the Consultation on Christian Union (COCU) and 1969 Roman rites.¹⁵⁹ Descriptive articles in various denominational publications introduced the COCU rite to parishioners. Boehringer characterized the *Worship Supplement* as "the closing chapter of one stage of liturgical work," Contemporary Worship represented "the first page of something new."¹⁶⁰

During 1971 the criticism of CW-2 began to take shape. LMC heard the criticism that the rite was "word heavy" between the Sermon and the Preface.¹⁶¹ LMC further supported the LTC recommendation that there be a formal evaluation of CW-2.¹⁶² LTC at its November meeting expressed the desire for reactions especially on the Entrance Rite, the ICET texts of the Lord's Prayer and Creed, the Act of Reconciliation, the Passing of the Peace, the Offertory action, and participation by assisting [lay] ministers. Ten congregations from each church body were to be selected to fill out questionnaires.¹⁶³

But the criticisms of ILCW's work had begun even before publication of the new liturgy. In a preview of CW-2, the editor of *Lutheran Forum* raised questions about the focus of the Act of Reconciliation *after* the sermon. This relocation of the reconciliation "appears to dilute the Lutheran understanding of the preached word as the public absolution."¹⁶⁴ The editor also wondered why there was no mention of "the real presence of the true body and blood of Christ" apart from "the words of consecration," an omission also present in SBH but corrected in the Spanish version *Culto Cristiano*.¹⁶⁵

A set of review articles in *Response* evaluated the recently published CW-2 services. Roy Enquist noted both the permission for liturgical diversity that the church seemed to be giving with the publication of such a rite and the polarization occurring between a "high church underground and the non-liturgical establishment."¹⁶⁶

Oliver Olson argued that the four-action shape (offertory, thanksgiving, fraction, reception) set forth by Dom Gregory Dix and adopted by ILCW, reversed the proper direction of the sacrament, which is earthward (i.e. *from God to us*).¹⁶⁷ Interestingly enough, Olson suggests that we should learn from the Presbyterians. ("The provisional order of the Presbyterians is really more Lutheran than the ILCW order.") Thus, "place a firm Amen after the first part of the eucharistic prayer, then direct the words of institution to the congregation, and then . . . we could continue praying."¹⁶⁸

Aelred Tegels made the interesting observation that CW-2 met the liturgical criteria of Vatican II better than the revised Roman rite, but also

that Luther's admonition in the *Deutsche Messe* had the "essential themes and elements of traditional eucharistic prayer."¹⁶⁹ Leigh Jordahl judged CW-2 "quite conservative" and "evangelical" in its concept of sacrifice and its offertory, but criticized the locus of the confession and the *epiclesis*. At its core, he said, it represented the best of the "Protestant principle" and "catholic substance," using Paul Tillich's phrases.¹⁷⁰

Robert Jenson's major criticism also related to the "service of confession and 'reconciliation' and the kiss of peace." He argued that if "we do not need confession at the beginning of our worship, then we certainly do not need it here." Jenson continued, "On the other hand, if we cannot get along without confession, then the beginning is the obvious place." But it was more confusion than compromise that brought about the experiment as Jenson suspected: ". . . that two parties in the commission have compromised by giving us the worst of both positions."¹⁷¹ The long-standing confusion of the Church as to how to handle confession and absolution had especially haunted Lutherans in the last century. Jenson criticized wordings in various texts but supported the offertory and eucharistic prayer with *epiclesis* which Olson and others would continue to criticize.¹⁷²

Lowell Green also saw the influence of Vatican II but found it "unfortunate."¹⁷³ He suggested that the word spoken during the fraction and lifting of the cup were a "take-off" on I Corinthians 10:16f. and reminiscent of "crypto-Calvinist evasions of the Real Presence." Similarly "the breaking of the bread from a loaf has been the hallmark of the Reformed church."¹⁷⁴ Though arguing for the need of a new King James Bible and criticizing many of the translations of CW-2, Green also argued for a free translation of the *verba* (viz. "this is my blood of the New Covenant").¹⁷⁵ Leigh Jordahl journaled his reactions from initial enthusiasm to ambivalence to "keen disappointment," suggesting "too much hasty improvisation."¹⁷⁶ He regarded the eucharistic prayer as an improvement over SBH but criticized the *verba* rendering, "friends" for "disciples" and "do this to remember me."¹⁷⁷

In the same symposium, Pfatteicher defended the new rite—including those items criticized from both perspectives.¹⁷⁸ He concluded that "the format of the rite is a useful departure from the service books of the past." He further noted that no individual on LTC "would have come up with the rite we as a committee have proposed." He acknowledged the "nagging suspicion, unacknowledged and usually unspoken. . . Surely liturgical revision—no matter how skillful or exciting—is not alone going to revitalize the Church in the 20th century."¹⁷⁹

Another answer to its critics came from Hans Boehringer of LTC in an article addressing especially the criticisms raised by Olson. In defense

of the validity of following Dix's "four-action shape," Boehringer argued that "the Church should naturally imitate her Lord." (I should add that this is really the only serious defense against substituting for bread and wine, coffee and donuts or coke and potato chips—much less grape juice.) His main point was that attempting to establish "Luther's Catholic Minimum" is more medieval Roman than "Lutheran"—or even "catholic" in the best sense.¹⁸⁰

Brand also responded to Olson:

It is proper to insist that a liturgical act be theologically defensible, but it is not proper to shape a liturgical act according to a particular theological position. The distinction may be subtle, but it makes the difference between full sacramental life in all its necessary ambiguities and a minimalist approach improperly governed by theological disputation.¹⁸¹

The argument clearly gave *lex orandi* priority over *lex credendi*. Brand reminded the critics that the fraction (CW-2, p. xvii) is a permissive rubric and may thus be omitted. He also asked why, if the Great Thanksgiving is wrong, it would be acceptable with a "may" rubric—a question that remained relevant throughout the review process leading up to LBW.¹⁸² Against what he saw as false opposition between divine and human "action," Brand argues that God works "in, with, and under" human actions done in obedience to God['s promises].¹⁸³ So a eucharistic prayer can be addressed to God as prayer and still be a proclamation of gospel, overheard by the eavesdropping congregation.

Frank Senn's friendly critique focused on "liturgical actions and gestures" more than on "liturgical verbiage" or theology. ("I do not think there are any *major* theological problems with it.") Notably the offertory rite was "bloated." The removal of the confession and relocation of the passing of the peace was suggested.¹⁸⁴

A different critical perspective appeared in the review by Arthur Carl Piepkorn.¹⁸⁵ Supportive of many of the features of CW-2 (e.g. dropping the opening confession), Piepkorn also criticized much (e.g., the location of the confession in the new rite). He suggested that restoring the Creed to its position after the lessons would improve the situation by placing the confession right after the sermon, as in the medieval preaching office and many 16th century Lutheran services.¹⁸⁶ This, Piepkorn argued, would make more sense than expecting a hymn to be a "concrete corporate response to concrete reading and proclamation of God's Word." Such an expectation is "fantasy!"¹⁸⁷ His other major criticism of the confession dealt with the suggested formulations (CW-2, xv) as preoccupied with "real or fancied

sins against others to the total neglect of sins against God.” Moreover he saw the potential use of such bids as a form of religious pressure.¹⁸⁸ The other serious criticism leveled by Piepkorn dealt with the *epiclesis* in the Great Thanksgiving (which, except for certain wordings, he seemed to approve): invoking the Spirit *after* the words of institution *upon* the elements with hands extended over those elements “runs counter to the express Lutheran teaching that the bread and wine become the body and blood of Christ through the recitation of the words of institution over them (Large Catechism, Sacrament of the Altar (BC 447. 9-11); Formula of Concord, Epitome VII, 9: Solid Declaration VII, 63, 73-84).” Even when used experimentally, Piepkorn cautioned, the words “and upon this bread and wine” should be omitted.¹⁸⁹ Overall, Peipkorn criticized “changes for the sake of change,” like the dropping of the *Introit* and *Kyrie*, the substituting of new gospel acclamations (“We praise you Christ. . . .”) and the moving of the Creed.¹⁹⁰

Walter Bouman was positive and optimistic in his reaction.¹⁹¹ He asserted:

The fact that this is an experimental rite for almost 95% of Lutherans in North America is of great significance for eventual unity of American Lutherans. . . . If there is unity in ritual, organizational unity will not be far behind.¹⁹²

Bouman’s dictum, meant as a promise, was heard and feared as a threat by some in Missouri Synod. Insofar as this well-documented dictum of Lutheran history in America (witness the Common Service of 1888, SBH of 1958, etc.) was taken seriously, it may have been the beginning of the end of LCMS participation in the common book. A new/old Missouri Synod was arising!

Bouman was supportive of the new locus of the confession as “an acceptable, perhaps even a good, solution to a vexing problem.”¹⁹³ He challenged some phrases in the Great Thanksgiving but thought the “reference to the sacrifices of Christ was . . . an acceptable solution to a problem that has plagued the Western church—both its form in the Latin rite and by its absence in the Lutheran rite—for centuries.”¹⁹⁴ Like Olson, Bouman noted the “heavy dependence” on Gregory Dix, as well as Evelyn Underhill, and the influence of Anglican rather than contemporary Lutheran sources.¹⁹⁵

CW-2 Theology (1972-1973)

Scholarly criticism went public in Oliver Olson’s *Lutheran Standard* article, “The Mix Makes a Muddle.” Citing Brand’s comments on “Luther’s liturgical surgery” (removing all that smelled of sacrifice), he attacked the

overstatements of Brand and Herbert Lindemann. He portrayed Brand's view as follows: "Anyone who leaves out the 'offertory procession' has 'no grounds to call what has been done the Lord's Supper'." ¹⁹⁶ Similarly he attacked Lindemann's view that "the bread and wine are also presented before the altar in response to the specific command of Christ." ¹⁹⁷ Olson understood the comment in CW-2 in light of Brand's and Lindemann's overstatements: "Our offering is the first action of the supper, corresponding to our Lord's taking of bread and wine" (CW-2, p. 10). All this Olson attacked as an import of "pagan Greek mystery cults" and a denial of the grace of the gospel.

The mix of God's gifts and our sacrifices in the offertory procession and, as he earlier argued, in the eucharistic prayer, made the CW-2 liturgy "not harmless." Moreover he argued that "ILCW chose *not* to submit its work for official ALC approval," thus acting for the churches with an authority "superior to synodical governments." Pretending to have "official sanction," in fact, CW-2 "is merely a committee report." ¹⁹⁸

Mandus Egge proposed that ILCW secretary Theodore Liefeld be asked to respond to the theological question raised by Olson. The Executive Committee adopted a motion:

To ask Pastor Egge to investigate with Bishop Knutson and/or other ALC officials ways in which ILCW might be publicly exonerated of the recent charges that the commission has exceeded its authorization by the churches. ¹⁹⁹

Gordon Lathrop's lecture at the Valparaiso Institute of Liturgical Studies in November 1972 was a reply to Olson. Against Olson he argued that a "good restored eucharistic prayer bears witness to what the sacrament gives." ²⁰⁰ Lathrop found in the *Berakah* (viz. the Jewish meal prayer) the pattern for Christian eucharistic prayer: thus "the *Berakah* is itself the New Testament *shape of the liturgy* . . . [and] the vehicle of religious promise. . . ." ²⁰¹ Lathrop also argued Luther's retaining the *verba* "in prayer form" as well as the preface, the Lord's Prayer, and the *Sanctus* restored "something like a very spare version of the Hippolytan Prayer." ²⁰² And, like Luther Reed, he argued that even Luther's *Deutsche Messe* sets the Sacrament in the context of prayer. ²⁰³ He also pointed to the Apology's assertion that the Greek canon, "properly understood is not offensive in its sacrificial terminology." ²⁰⁴

Meanwhile LTC had already begun the process of congregational evaluation of CW-2. The questionnaire proposed earlier ²⁰⁵ was sent out in mid-1972 to 155 congregations which had used CW-2: 86 were returned by the November deadline (including six of the nine LCMS questionnaires

sent). Disappointed in the response,²⁰⁶ ILCW also awaited critiques from the 14 seminaries, as well as the evaluation by the theological symposium scheduled for October 5-7, 1973, in Chicago. The Executive Committee set up a special subcommittee made of LTC secretary Ralph Quere and Wartburg seminarians Edward Hintz, Steven C. Olson, and Lynn Schlessman, to study the questionnaires and the other criticisms of CW-2.²⁰⁷ The official questionnaires were to be filled out by pastors, organists and/or choir directors, adult choir members, youth, and worship committees (or other adult lay people). The latter three groups were asked to reach consensus votes after discussion. Published articles, some 196 letters, and 22 independent local surveys were also analyzed and categorized with reference to the questionnaire. The work was completed January 31, 1974.²⁰⁸ The “Wartburg Report” was introduced to the newly-formed LTC subcommittee on the revision of CW-2, whose task it was to make recommendations concerning the broad outline of the rite.²⁰⁹ Other subcommittees were formed to revise eucharistic prayers and penitential rites.

Frank Senn’s 1973 liturgical critique gave specific suggestions for revising CW-2, concentrating on the eucharistic prayer. Like Brunner and Piepkorn, he argued for the *epiclesis* before the *verba*—following and favoring the Western form of consecration.²¹⁰ Strangely enough, Senn was critical of the medieval Roman and Lutheran focus on the *verba* as a departure from the primitive pattern where “the whole act of thanksgiving was regarded as consecratory.”²¹¹ Senn saw Luther’s consecration theology as rooted in Ambrose but felt it could be “correlated” with a more biblical (1 Timothy 4:4f.) and patristic understanding.²¹²

Requested seminary evaluations were received early in 1973 from Pacific Lutheran Theological Seminary, Lutheran School of Theology in Chicago, Evangelical Lutheran Theological Seminary in Columbus, Wartburg Seminary, the Lutheran Theological Seminary (Gettysburg), Concordia Seminary (St. Louis) and Northwestern Seminary. From Luther Seminary and Lutheran Theological Seminary (Philadelphia) came the request that an independent commission (such as LCUSA’s Division of Theological Studies) “review in depth the biblical/historical/theological aspects of the change from the historic Lutheran liturgy reflected in CW-2. Norman Nagel of Valparaiso University also expressed concern to LCMS President Jacob Preus about the theological approach of ILCW. The Executive Committee proposed in June 1973 that a theological symposium be held the next October to deal with the issues raised.”²¹³

The criticisms from the seminaries took varied formats and are difficult to summarize. Criticisms focused on the location and content of the confession and absolution, the use of a New Testament benediction for the

greeting, the absence of the introits and *Kyrie*, the locus of the announcements, not allowing the Apostles' Creed as an alternate, the location of the hymn of the day and Nicene Creed *after* the sermon, Dix's four-action shape, the concept of sacrifice, language or aspects of the Great Thanksgiving—but *no* criticism of the eucharistic prayer as such. That was to come especially during Olson's professorship at Luther (1972-1973) and the Philadelphia (1973-1977) seminaries and from various LCMS quarters. The most repeated criticism was the form of the *verba*. Several professors objected to the *epiclesis* and the prayer, "Reveal yourself . . ." (CW-2, p. 19). General or specific questions on each of these issues had, interestingly enough, been included on the *congregational* questionnaire.

Continuing Critique: Analysis & Lectures (1971-1974)

Musicians' Analysis: CW-2 Music (1971-1974)

Reactions to the music of CW-2 varied, but there was agreement among some experts that most congregations would find Daniel Moe's Setting 1 and Gerhard Cartford's Setting 3 more difficult, and that Ronald Nelson's Setting 2 and John Ylvisaker's Setting 4 would prove more popular.²¹⁴ Moe's "simple melodies for unison singing" were accompanied by "the diatonic dissonant style of much 20th century music" (CW-2, xxii). Philip Gehring noted an objective relationship of music to the text²¹⁵ and Paul Neve agreed that the fresh, relevant melodies enhance the text.²¹⁶ Thomas Gieschen judged the melodies "strong and often noble."²¹⁷ Nathan Eickmann suggested Setting 1 for a congregation with "some exposure to contemporary harmonies and . . . a fairly active musical program."²¹⁸

Nelson's Setting 2 "has the most immediate appeal and would seem to be the quickest to learn," according to Gieschen.²¹⁹ Nelson's use of familiar hymn tunes was regarded as a good idea, but sometimes turned out monotonous and predictable, in Gehring's view.²²⁰ Neve found in the *Agnus Dei* "beauty in its simplicity" and in the adaptation of the African folk hymn, "Thank the Lord" (CW-2, p. 50f.), "a sense of thanksgiving and rejoicing" and a stirring call to action. (Neve's judgment is confirmed by the "survival" of text and melody in LBW Setting 2). Eickmann suggested that this setting "could be introduced in practically any congregation with favorable results."²²¹

Cartford's Setting 3 adapted ancient plainsong. Gehring said that the music depends on the words "for its shape and substance and without the words would have little recognizable personality." He applauded its splendid simplicity.²²² Gieschen too saw it as "a fine alternative to our more

opulent settings.”²²³ Eickmann felt it “would leave many congregations struggling, especially in a large building with poor acoustics.”²²⁴

Ylvisaker’s Setting 4 was criticized, interestingly enough, by both of the church music reviewers. Gehring, while claiming to like the folk idiom, found the work “folksy,” lacking in the “objectivity” and “superelevation” demanded if we are to “reach upwards” toward liturgical music.²²⁵ Gieschen found it difficult to imagine its use in “celebration” for its “mood is frequently dark, almost Slavic; and the melodies and chord choices too often are aimless and banal.”²²⁶ Over against such anti-Slavic remarks and musically snobbish sentiments, Neve regarded Setting 4 as having a “strong beat” and a “good musical style,” simple enough to be easily learned.²²⁷ Eickmann regarded it as excellent for congregations with instrumental resources for a folk service.²²⁸

Criticism of the musical settings as such was only a part of the larger question of liturgical changes. In his article in the 1971-72 issue of *Studia Liturgica*, Brand asked: “What, for example, is the music of the 70s—jazz, folk, rock, serial, electronic?” For that reason ILCW produced materials for “provisional use and evaluation.” Brand noted the consensus that was easily reached concerning what needed to be changed. Producing “viable substitutes” was complicated by the prevailing North American “cultural situation.” Pointing to the departures from the 16th century Lutheran pattern—adopted again in the 19th and early 20th century Lutheranism—Brand elaborated on the broader tradition that guided late 20th century liturgical reform. “It is the conviction of the ILCW that to be truly Lutheran is to be truly catholic, to make use of the best that the mainstream liturgical tradition has to offer.”²²⁹ In the next years, some theologians and laity would argue that “truly catholic” was “too catholic”!

The evaluations of the music of CW-2 by professional church musicians was almost as varied as the musicians themselves, and yet there was agreement on certain points. Setting 1 by Daniel Moe was designated German neo-classical style by Arthur Halbardier, who also questioned the description of the accompaniment’s harmonies as “diatonic dissonant,” quipped Halbardier, “Whatever that is.” Noting the setting’s careful planning, logic, and skill, he asserted that the tunes are not exciting, warm or beautiful. “The melodies,” with exceptions such as ‘This is the feast,’ “...come off cold and hardly memorable.” Halbardier charged that the constant and contrived dissonance in the accompaniment is “for no other purpose than being dissonant.” The effect is monotonous and, with the dry melodies, popular appeal is lacking.²³⁰ James Boehringer agreed: “Setting 1 will seldom be used.” Its “irregular rhythm,” “chords that sound wrong,”

"little surprises" "unrememberable melodies," and "no climaxes" made Setting 1 "all brain, no feeling."²³¹

Paul B. Bouman recounted a "disaster" when Setting 1 was used unrehearsed in a large congregation of college students and their parents. On another occasion when rehearsed with brass, organ, and choirs it was "a great success." Besides "stumbling blocks" in the Alleluias, Bouman said that the *Sanctus* lacked grandeur, majesty, and dignity and it was "too complicated." In addition, the notation in the *Agnus Dei* was too fragmentary for unsophisticated congregations.²³²

A very different and wholly positive evaluation was given by Frederick Jackisch: Its modern flavor was not too severe. Its singability was excellent, no problems in the accompaniment, and "no musical obfuscation." Overall "Moe's setting . . . is closer to anything I have yet seen which can lead the modern congregation into the sounds of our times."²³³

Frederick Jackisch was as devastating regarding Setting 2 as he was positive regarding Setting 1. The Ronald Nelson hymnic setting was called a "mish-mash from old chorale tidbits to cliché fanfares . . . to African campfire songs." The *Gloria* (which was changed for LBW) was "poor musically"—"waltz-like," "tedious," "cute," with effects that were "lumpy," "squeezed," and boring "after a couple of hearings." "Let the vineyards" (which remained intact in LBW, pp. 86f.) was "probably the best item" and "Jesus, Lamb of God" (which was changed) the worst—"inane in its kindergarten level of melodic line."²³⁵

Paul Bouman agreed that Setting 2 on the whole was "banal," especially the *Gloria* and "Thank the Lord" (which remained intact in LBW, pp. 92f.). Unlike Jackisch, Bouman felt "Let the vineyards" was "border-line."²³⁶

Arthur Halbardier evaluated this hymnic setting as "easy to learn and remember." He credited "Let the vineyards" with "interest, singability, and character" and found "Thank the Lord" like "a carol, appropriately exuberant and lively." He faulted the "shotgun marriage" of "prose text and metrical tune" in the *Gloria*. The music of "Jesus, Lamb of God" was a "mild disappointment" in its "weak attempt" at the style of Ray Repp. "This is the feast" (which appeared as in LBW, pp. 81f.) "marches along sturdily in the manner of *Sine Nomine*" (LBW 174). Halbardier should have been rewarded with the prophet-of-the-decade award: His evaluations—though he expressed reservations regarding integrity and staying power²³⁷—turned out to be accurate predictions!

James Boehringer's evaluation was actually more positive than Halbardier's, though he was also concentrating on what made it attractive to the "average person," e.g. "the regular rhythm; the chords that are . . .

pleasing in sonority; the predictability of the music; and . . . the simple bass lines [that] contribute to the motion, the melody, and the involvement of the individual.”²³⁸

Boehringer also raised broader questions about the wisdom of changing both text and music at the same time and seemed to favor leaving the texts alone. His example of a “stilted and infelicitous” text: “Evil is eclipsed by the light of the Son” (CW-2, p. 31). Besides the “awful” pun on sun and Son, he notes, “light does not eclipse anything; it is the things getting between us and a source of light that makes an eclipse!”²³⁹ (Boehringer says almost nothing about the other settings.)

Bouman said he liked Setting 3 but expected it would be limited in use to gatherings of clergy or musicians. Jackisch concurred but believed it was “a noble, albeit perhaps doomed attempt to salvage a musical idiom that . . . has been relegated to oblivion” (viz. the chant setting by Gerhard Cartford). He noted: “Congregations did not and do not chant”—it takes experienced, rehearsed singers! Moreover, Jackisch asserted, it was “unmanageable for a big group.”²⁴⁰

Halbardier abounded in his praise of Setting 3: “real integrity,” “ingeniously devised moments of real beauty,” “variation, delineation of structure, movement, direction, and climax in his simple monody.” He also lauded the “natural, free, conversational interchange between worshippers and leader.” He concluded that “there is really no point at which to find fault.”²⁴¹

Not so in Halbardier’s view of John Ylvisaker’s folk-style Setting 4. Although he applauded the “poetic feeling” and “beautiful lyric melody” of the hymn, “Help, O God, the thrown away” (CW-2, p. 78), and “Jesus, Lamb of God,” especially when sung in canon, Halbardier’s overall evaluation was “not simplicity, but rather banality.” “He concluded: “This can never be endorsed for public worship.”²⁴²

Jackisch agreed with that overall evaluation and also found the hymn, “Help, O Lord,” to be “pious, burlap, head-shaking, homespun, clumsy.” The paraphrases in the *Gloria* turned out to be “infelicities . . . groan!” “This is the feast” was “slightly better” and the *Sanctus* OK if one liked the “mystical” and the “Eastern,” but the music transformed the text into “Hosanna in the lowest.” “Jesus, Lamb of God” was “not congregational. It should be sung by a group of blues singers . . . bending and flexing the blues notes and driving on top of a hard rock accompaniment.”²⁴³

Bouman agreed about the *Agnus Dei* but not with the overall negative evaluation of Setting 4. He said it had become “well known” after several uses and “well received.” Whereas the tempo made the jazz *Agnus Dei* inappropriate and “utterly ridiculous,” the “other parts of this liturgical

setting seem to be better all the time.” In a closing comment, Bouman noted that “the wordiness of these liturgies” placed “considerable burden on the reader, as well as on the listener.”²⁴⁴

Brand reported LMC’s decision not to use any of the four CW-2 settings in the revision.²⁴⁵ Four composers were asked to write settings “that a) are tuneful, b) are relatively simple musically, c) have regular rhythms.” These composers were Calvin Hampton, Gerald Near, Carl Schalk, and Robert Powell. Settings similar to Daniel Moe’s Setting 1 in CW-2 were to be done by Jan Bender, Phil Gehring, and Roger Petrich. The second setting of SBH from the Swedish *Massbook* was to be adapted by Gordon Jones and Egil Hovland.

Public Celebration: the Minneapolis Worship Conference(June 1973)

As the theological symposium addressed the theological issues connected with the Contemporary Worship materials, the June 1973 Conference on Worship held in Minneapolis addressed broader concerns of worship renewal.²⁴⁶ The keynote by Joseph Sittler analyzed the contemporary religious scene and suggested a “process of solidification” that had developed since World War I around eschatology (“A sense of the . . . pathos and promise of historical life under . . . the powers of the divine life”),²⁴⁷ epistemology and existentialism (“a reopening of ways of knowing and of discourse”),²⁴⁸ and the experience of “nothingness and darkness” (leading to “honesty, freedom, and courage”). Sittler’s proposal was that faith as *doxa* (praise) makes intelligible and illumines, explores and enriches dogma (“what the faith knows—and *how* she knows”).²⁴⁹ Thus “dogma bears forth *doxa*.” So “worship is a cultic ritual” in “the terms it uses, the recollections it cherishes . . . the images and symbols it employs.” But in another sense “Christian worship is *not* the ritual of a cult.” For “what the church says is not esoteric or unintelligible.” Rather it is “an address, through the community, to the culture.” And unlike the mysteries of the cult which are only for the initiated, its “action is public action!”²⁵⁰ A fascinating agenda for discussion of worship renewal!

Henry Horn’s lecture developed the theme, “Worship: The Gospel in Action.”²⁵¹ He noted the tension between the Lutheran approach to law and gospel as ideas and the modern emphasis on experiencing reality with feelings.²⁵² He pointed to Paul Ricoeur’s assertion that truth is the *person* of Jesus Christ, witnessed in Scripture and encountered in preaching in the context of worship.²⁵³ Thus, as Dietrich Ritschl also contended, it is “*Christus praesens* under the form of proclamation and celebration . . . that enlivens our faith and inspires our hope . . . always confessed by Lutherans but rarely imagined . . . in a celebrative mood.”²⁵⁴ Characterizing modern

consciousness in search for “depth experiences,” “deep human interrelationships” and “new solidarity” with humanity, Horn called for “worship-come-alive” with the gospel of “God’s grace and presence” at the center.

It will happen when leaders of worship, faithful to the testimony and expectant of the presence, are willing to celebrate the signs of the kingdom now at work in the world.²⁵⁵

James White gave a fascinating historical interpretation of worship in America in the 19th and 20th centuries.²⁵⁶ After describing the effects of revivalism upon worship, White described the period after 1920 as a new “era of respectability” in worship. In the period from 1920 to 1945, “worship as an aesthetic experience” was substituted for “worship as a conversion experience.” After 1945, there was the attempt at “recovering our heritage.”²⁵⁷ Theologically neo-orthodoxy and confessionalism dominated. In the late 1960s and early 1970s, everything changed.

In almost every congregation there are folks who want to sing the “old” hymns (i.e. those of revivalism), people who want to sing the “good hymns” (i.e. those which are in good taste [cf. the aesthetic stage]), and persons who want to sing “something that moves” (i.e. those songs which have a “beat”).²⁵⁸

White proposed both “formal” and “material” definitions of worship which are eclectic and pluralistic enough to mix form in a given service, in multiple services on the same Sunday or on different Sundays of the month. He pointed to the different stages in the past two centuries to validate this approach.²⁵⁹

Jaroslav Pelikan suggested that though “Pentecost is peculiarly the festival of tomorrow,” the “form of our celebration . . . is basically determined by yesterday.”²⁶⁰ The “rhythm of past and future” in “the melody of theology” (a phrase from Eastern orthodoxy) has its (Western, Augustinian) counterpart in the principle: “The rule of prayers should lay down rule of faith” (*lex orandi statuat legem credendi*).²⁶¹ Pelikan suggested that in worship, we tie yesterday to tomorrow by “a unity in the truth of the church’s doctrine.” So “unity in teaching is then simultaneously the basis of the church’s life and its goal.” Thus the yesterday of “tradition and memory” are held together with the tomorrow of “response and responsibility.”²⁶² Yet “unity in truth is finally and fundamentally inseparable from the holiness of the people of God.” So there is “a call to sanctify: ‘Repent!’”²⁶³ In his amplification of catholicity under the rubric “a universality of concern,” Pelikan reminded:

Repeatedly in Christian history, portions of the church universal have been tempted to suppose that their particular form of Christian

faith, life, and worship were normative for the church as a whole and, therefore, to conclude that they could in effect excommunicate all their Christian brethren who did not agree with them.²⁶⁴

Pelikan concluded that faithfulness to the yesterday and tomorrow of God's people must mean "all of God's people."²⁶⁵ Loyalty to the apostolic tradition was Pelikan's final point: The "context to Christian worship between yesterday and tomorrow." If Lutherans are to be truly "orthodox," Pelikan argued, our reconstructed liturgy "must be steeped in ancient forms and committed to the confession of the fathers," for that is the "most profound inadequacy in the worship life of American Christians," hindering us from singing together the "melody of theology" in the one holy catholic and apostolic church.²⁶⁶

David Stevick's discussion of "Renewing the Language of Worship" set forth the crisis of worship as in part a "crisis of liturgical language."²⁶⁷ He quoted Amos Wilder: "What we are going through can be seen as a crucible of language, a crucible of images, a testing and transformation of signs and symbols, a revolution of sensibility."²⁶⁸ Stevick suggested that "worn-out terms," "historical discontinuities," and "new worlds" of experience stand in contradiction to the words of worship that are "*givens* which are constitutive of life and liturgy." Their integrity "depends on the faithfulness with which they represent the Word."²⁶⁹

Stevick observed: "Culture builds up its forms around the felt questions of life. . . . Culture evokes in us the questions it is able to answer." But when that stability breaks down, there is "disorientation and anomie"; there is "waste and fragmentation." Then "the alienated individual is on his own." Although "liturgy is not primarily a cultural form," it is expressed "in the cultural forms of time and place." Stevick concluded, with the pretension of most generations: "We are obviously at a massive cultural turning point now—probably the most significant transformation since the Reformation." Observing the "enormous liturgical creativity," the need of self-criticism, and "the judgment of an old era and the breaking in of a new," Stevick wisely counseled: "Liturgy should be oriented to that coming, cosmic celebration." For we are to join in the song "which is going on now, and always will go on—a song to one we know by an ancient and troublesome yet luminous metaphor: the Lamb."²⁷⁰ What better apologetic for what may have proved to be the most significant addition to CW-2—John Arthur's adaptation of the Revelation texts, "This is the feast of victory for our God! Alleluia! Worthy is Christ, the Lamb who was slain!" (LBW pp. 60f.; LW pp. 162f.).

E.A. Sovik's lecture on architecture²⁷¹ was a strange yet striking plea: "We must not build any more churches."²⁷² He calls for "centrum" as a

useful and flexible tool with portable “furniture”—“as portable as the equipment in the Israelite tabernacle,” hospitable and functional for multiple purposes, but with integrity. “No imitation marble . . . no electronic bells,” for “God enters the real and uncoshmetic world.”²⁷³

Wayne Saffen asserted: “Worship is the political act *par excellence*.”²⁷⁴ After an analysis of modern idolatries, Saffen pointed to the inevitable political involvements of church and the political implications of worship. His challenge was: “When public worship is raised to the level of political consciousness as being Christ’s disciples in the world, preaching without fear or favor, and confessing God against all secular totalitarianisms, going to church could get interesting again.”²⁷⁵

Eugene Brand’s lecture on “New Accents in Baptism and the Eucharist” presented, not “new discoveries” but facets of the action which have simply reemerged with new significance.”²⁷⁶ The communal dimension of Baptism, related to ethical and eschatological themes, calls into question indiscriminate baptizing (which implies magic and ignores discipline), as well as the exclusion of young children and infants from communion.²⁷⁷ As “a kind of ordination,” Baptism also called us to proclaim the good news, “sharing in the priestly mission of our Lord himself.”²⁷⁸

The new accents Brand noted in the eucharist were: thanksgiving (“solemn joy . . . tinged with awe”), sacrifice (our obedient response of praise for sharing in the benefits of Christ’s once-for-all sacrifice), real presence reinterpreted (in Roman Catholic and Reformed dialogues), and eschatology (a “foretaste of the feast to come”).²⁷⁹ Brand called for unity in the Word and in sacramentality “for the sake of the world—because of the credibility of the gospel” (citing John 17:20-21).²⁸⁰

Scholarly Examination: Chicago [Waukegan] Theological Symposium (October 1973)

The ultimate result of the March 7, 1973, resolution of the Luther Seminary faculty calling for an “independent theological review” of ILCW’s work was the October 5-7, 1973, Theological Symposium held in Waukegan, Illinois.²⁸¹ LCA’s Philadelphia and Southern seminaries had also supported this resolution. Oliver Olson, who was teaching at Luther Seminary at the time, supported, if not instigated, the resolution which sought a blue ribbon commission to conduct the review. Instead the Division of Theological Studies of LCUSA was asked, in cooperation with ILCW, to “conduct a symposium” to gather “the most accurate, scholarly and convincing biblical/historical/theological studies on various points of view regarding Lutheran liturgy and worship practices.”²⁸²

Olson gave the introductory lecture on “Contemporary Trends in Liturgy.”²⁸³ His stated purpose was to. . .

...show that the inclusion in the *Service Book and Hymnal* and especially *Contemporary Worship 2*, of ceremonies whose implicit meaning is that worship is primarily man’s sacrifice to God and, further, that man cooperates in his own salvation by participating in the sacrifice of Calvary, breaks the continuity of the Lutheran theological tradition.²⁸⁴

His sweeping attack on “the liturgical movement” focused on Roman Catholic Odo Casel, Anglo-Catholic Gregory Dix, and Lutheran Peter Brunner. He found Casel’s “revival of cultic drama” in the ALC’s 1968 Statement on Communion Practices where it used “representation” as “present reactualization.” Dix’s four-action shape (taking, blessing, breaking, sharing bread) appeared both in the LCMS *Worship Supplement* and CW-2.²⁸⁵ Melancthon was faulted for his introduction of “action” into Lutheran theology.²⁸⁶ Olson charged that the offertory procession, the eucharistic prayer—especially the *anamnesis*, the *epiclesis*, the fraction of the bread as well as the “votive” use of communion in the marriage rite (CW-3) are cult-manipulation of God.²⁸⁷ Olson called for the elimination of these and a re-emphasis on the Lord’s Supper as testament and Christ’s real presence.²⁸⁸ Olson’s suggestion of limiting the eucharistic prayer to “non-cultic elements”—presumably eliminating *anamnesis* and *epiclesis*, and focusing on the “sacrifice of thanksgiving,” inserting an Amen before the *verba*—was in effect followed by including the Swedish prayer, “Blessed are you. . .” (LBW p. 70, par. 33).

Lathrop presented 40 theses regarding the eucharistic prayer noting the Jewish roots in the *Hodayoth* (thanksgiving) and *Berakoth* (blessing of God). Lathrop identified three aspects or “moments” in such prayers: (1) the naming of God—acknowledging/confessing the truth regarding God by “calling on one of his names, proclaiming his kingship over all, or recounting a specific deed”; (2) *anamnesis*—awareness that the remembered truth affects us now, that God’s deed is present powerfully and that God’s revelation makes praise possible; and (3) supplication that God will remember what has been remembered in prayer. Lathrop concluded that Paul understood Christ’s command, “do this in my *anamnesis*,” to mean, “do this prayer action so that I am remembered and named as the focus of the act for which God is praised and as the basis of the thanksgiving, as the source of knowledge and as center of the supplication of the community.”²⁸⁹ Dennis Paulson suggested that Lathrop’s greatest contribution was to move the debate beyond Dix’s “four-action shape”—or, I would add, Casel’s mys-

tery theology—and to show the roots of eucharistic prayer in Jewish prayer.²⁹⁰

Like Lathrop, Hals attempted to place the eucharistic debate into its Jewish context. He noted that “remembering” in the Old Testament does not aim at controlling God,²⁹¹ for the initiative remains with the Lord. So also the once-for-all past event is not weakened by being reactualized in the present.²⁹² Regarding expiatory sacrifice, Hals argued that “the law-gospel dichotomy” is not appropriate here because “what is in form a ritual law is in essence a gracious offer and proclamation of a saving event, i.e. gospel.” In a similar way he argued that “the sacrifice–sacrament dichotomy is not appropriate” and suggested Ambrogi’s phrase, “a sacrifice with a sacramental structure.”²⁹³ In all this Hals wants to show that God’s actions in history change mythic and cultic categories and that remembering and sacrifice complicate law/gospel and sacrifice/sacrament distinctions.

Robert Jenson’s presentation dealt with the role of the Holy Spirit, especially in regard to the *epiclesis*.²⁹⁴ Paulson has pointed to the parallels in linguistic and conceptual framework as well as pneumatology and eschatology between Jenson and his mentor, Peter Brunner.²⁹⁵ Jenson set forth the characteristics of the *epiclesis*: (1) invoking the Holy Spirit on the (2) elements and sometimes (3) the people, (4) effecting simply the Spirit’s presence (Hippolytus) or (5) consecration and (6) opening the future [of eternal life]. The *epiclesis* may be (7) placed before or after the *verba* and *anamnesis* or both places—for stylistic, *not* theological, reasons. (Jenson sat loose on the debate because he argued that *we* “cannot at all consecrate” but can only “receive bread and wine as the body and blood of our Lord,”) Finally (8) the *epiclesis* is sometimes the occasion for doxology of the Spirit.²⁹⁶ Jenson saw the CW-2 *epiclesis* as a “weak example” of a “right type.” Better to pray “send your Spirit” than “send the power of your Holy Spirit!” for “the Spirit does not *have* a power, he *is* a power.”²⁹⁷ Jenson also criticized the attempt “to get all ethical and socially relevant” by limiting the Spirit’s spontaneity and the Christian’s freedom (e.g. “. . . that we . . . living according to his example . . . bring peace and healing to all mankind”—CW-2, 17). In the light of the holiness theology of Holy Communion in the United Testimony of 1952, it is interesting to notice Jenson’s “carrying the theme of holiness from the *Sanctus* to the invoked sanctification,”²⁹⁸ (e.g. “make holy . . . also those who eat and drink”).²⁹⁹

Herbert Lindemann’s survey of ILCW’s work cites Eugene Brand’s rationale for the *epiclesis*: “Both in form and content, the *epiclesis* attempts to go beyond the terms of the East–West polarization. Placing the *epiclesis* after the words of institution helps combat the massive consecrationalism characteristic of the Western tradition, but it need not result in adopting the

Eastern view . . . it seems appropriate to invoke the spirit [*sic*] both upon the people and upon the bread and wine. An invocation upon the people only is inadequate to a theology which takes the elements seriously.”³⁰⁰

Walter Bouman’s discussion of the ILCW’s Act of Reconciliation ranged broadly into the history and theology of confession and absolution.³⁰¹ Bouman set forth his own and others’ defense of the reconciliation and its placement in CW-2 as psychologically and theologically appropriate. However, after two years of using the rite, he changed his mind.³⁰² Bouman argued that clustering hymn, creed, reconciliation and intercessions between the sermon and the sacrament clutters, distracts, and divides the rite. Further he said that the confession and the *pax* need separate treatment. In fact even the confession attempts too much: secret, general, and reconciliatory confession, as well as “mutual conversation and consolation,” cannot all be taken care of in one rite.³⁰³

Approaching the papers as the participants heard and discussed them, one finds interesting variety in interpretations and conclusions and in such consensus as was reported in the three groups. Group B (Leigh Jordahl, recorder) reported that, “Some members of the group (not necessarily all) found themselves in almost total agreement with Olson’s theology, his historical critique of sacrifice . . . [and] his fear that in our ecumenical enthusiasm we are capitulating all too easily the best of our tradition.” But Jordahl continued, “The group in general was not persuaded by Olson that the rite as such necessarily contradicts Lutheran theology.”³⁰⁴ Group A (Ben Johnson, recorder) also reported that “after careful consideration, there was a turning away from the most direct challenge” by Olson. “Olson’s fears were not shared” that CW-2, especially the eucharistic prayer, “would likely lead to an understanding that the favor of God can be bought by the offering of appropriate sacrifice.” Johnson also stated that the papers by Hals on sacrifice as thank-offering, Lathrop on the Jewish background of the eucharistic prayer, and Jenson on the Spirit each “presented ways in which the sacrifice–sacrament debate over the Lord’s Supper could be avoided.”³⁰⁵

Similarly Group C (Robert Fischer, recorder), after acknowledging the warnings against an “unchristian anamnetic cult,” agreed that “prayer includes a proclamatory function; *anamnesis* includes it also. Kerygma and doxology should not be regarded as mutually exclusive. We agreed [with Lathrop’s contention] that ancient blessings of God may suggest a useful liturgical form which could bring together both elements without implying an unevangelical clerical consecration.”³⁰⁶ This group raised questions about the necessity of “an explicit, formal consecration”—suggesting that simply setting apart the elements at the offertory might suffice. They especially objected to the gesture of “spreading hands over the ele-

ments,” implying a consecration by clerical power, and to the invocation of the Spirit “on this bread and wine.” They applauded the invocation on the people, arguing:

The Spirit is present apart from our summoning, but we are not to take his presence for granted, either. We invoke the Spirit to help us realize his presence and to open ourselves to him.³⁰⁷

The other general criticism that found support in Group B was “a certain degree of romanticism” in ILCW, as in the “entire contemporary ecumenical liturgical scene.” Dix’s stress on “doing the liturgy” and the “four-action shape”—especially the “fraction”—though not heretical, threatened becoming “a genuine mischief maker” and “empty ritualism for the sake of romantic restorationism.”³⁰⁸

Specific questions were raised about the locus of the prayer of the day, the “theological escalation” of the new gospel acclamation, the wording of the *verba*,³⁰⁹ an integral confession and absolution at the beginning of the service (not a *preparatory* rite) for the “assurance of the forgiveness of sins,” and objection—again unheard and unheeded—to the apostolic benediction as a “greeting,” and asking for the “people’s creed” (the Apostles’ Creed) as an option.³¹⁰ Group A asked for several eucharistic prayers.

An interesting discussion occurred in the final session of Group B. Jordahl summarizes the issue:

How do we affirm or respect our people’s “folk piety” but also lead them to something better? How can the parish pastor get concrete and common sense guidance in a time of liturgical crisis and when Luther Reed’s work is in all events anachronistic? We need something that can do for us what Reed intended to do for his age (in spite, for instance, of his constant tendency to romanticize about things Anglican).³¹¹

Whether LBW and LW and their supporting volumes have done that, the Lord of history will finally judge!

Popular Reaction:

Letters, Questions, & Studies of Congregations (1972-1974)

The first of the field tests was begun in 1972. The ILCW’s Executive Committee decided that two congregations in each synod or district should receive the questionnaire. (Distribution among Canadian churches was not prescribed.)³¹² LTC reviewed the questionnaire at its June meeting. Brand reported that besides the congregations selected, general announcements

would invite volunteers.³¹³ Out of the 155 congregations that agreed to participate, about 70 had submitted questionnaires by the November 1972 deadline; ultimately 86 congregations submitted usable questionnaires. One LCMS die-hard was still beating the bushes in March 1973 trying to retrieve questionnaires;³¹⁴ LCMS ended up with only seven submitted!

An initial report was made to the Joint Liturgical Committee meeting in March 1973. Brand presented an interpretation of the questionnaire results. He reported “strong general approval” of the following: the sequence of various parts of the rite, “This is the feast” alternate, offertory procession with bread and wine, the texts of the Great Thanksgiving and Nicene Creed, and the ease of learning and singing the “musical settings *we have used*” (emphasis his). He reported that musicians and teens strongly approved the joyous character of the settings they had used.³¹⁵ “General approval” of the offertory prayer and Great Thanksgiving’s theology was given by the clergy. Whereas clergy and musicians gave “moderately strong approval” to passing the peace, adults and teens were both divided on this.³¹⁶ Opinion was likewise divided on the form of confession and of absolution, the placement of the Hymn of the Day and of the Great Thanksgiving, and the retention of the traditional Lord’s Prayer.³¹⁷

LTC secretary Ralph Quere was requested to supervise a more detailed study, integrating with the ILCW questionnaire results 22 unofficial questionnaires and 165 letters (only two from LCMS). It was decided to categorize these responses according to the questions of the questionnaire wherever possible. The 27 articles that had appeared thus far were also analyzed. Three seminarians from Wartburg Seminary completed this task in January 1974.³¹⁸ The report was published in March. Results were tabulated in terms of positive (strongly agree, agree, somewhat agree) and negative (somewhat disagree, disagree, strongly disagree).³¹⁹ Statistics from individual churches (ALC, LCA, etc.) were not reported as they had been included in Brand’s “beginning interpretation.” At certain points the reactions in “letters etc.” differed significantly from the ILCW questionnaires.³²⁰ These are percentages of the positive ILCW questionnaires and letters:

- overall “utility” of the service (“it works well”): ILCW 95% positive, letters etc. 61% positive
- overall sequence: ILCW 89%, letters etc. 79% (in the ante-communion, the difference ranged up to 30 percentage points; in the communion there was less than 2 points difference—both over 90% positive)
- the confession in the middle: ILCW 41%, letters etc. 29%
- passing the peace: ILCW 67%, letters etc. 49%
- offertory procession: ILCW 88%, letters etc. 68%

- Great Thanksgiving: theology objectionable: ILCW 14%, letters etc. 41%
- Lord's Prayer revision: ILCW 80%, letters etc. 55%
- preferring "Lamb of God" (CW-2, 36) to "Jesus, Lamb of God" (CW-2, 50): ILCW 34%, letters etc. 58%
- ease of singing: ILCW 88%, letters 75%
- joy of singing: ILCW 88%, letters etc. 69%
- Setting 2 (Nelson) wearing well: ILCW 91%, letters etc. 46%
- Setting 4 (Ylvisaker) vitality: ILCW 80%, letters etc. 53%
- contemporary language: ILCW 91%, letters etc. 63%
- Nicene Creed: ILCW 91%, letters etc. 57%.³²¹

In April 1973, a Worship Research Project for LCA was completed by L. David Miller, dean of the Wittenberg University School of Music. Thirteen congregations from coast to coast were studied, including visits and interviews with leaders and members. Usage of contemporary worship materials was among the aspects studied. "Reactions observed to some degree in every congregation" included requests for the hymn, "How great thou art." Moreover, the "greatest objection to contemporary words in worship is focused in the Lord's Prayer and the creed."³²²

Three congregations reported strong negative reactions to Moe's Setting 1 (CW-2, 24ff.), two with drops in attendance and/or giving. Three reported positive reactions to Ylvisaker's Setting 4 (CW-2, 68ff.) including doubling attendance, but one other congregation had a day-long session listening to ILCW tapes and when it came to "Jesus, Lamb of God," in the fourth setting, "everybody broke up laughing. That killed it." Apparently in that congregation there was no further experimentation with the CW-2 settings. At least six congregations examined the Cartford Setting 3 (CW-2, 52ff.) with four positive and two negative reactions given. The recorded comments on Nelson's Setting 2 ranged from positive to the caricature, "the Lawrence Welk setting." Yet all eight congregations that used it agreed or strongly agreed that it "wears well." Three of the 13 congregations had not used CW-2.³²³

Reactions to the Great Thanksgiving had to do not with its theology, but with its length and wordiness: "DO WE HAVE TO PUT EVERYTHING WE BELIEVE IN THERE???" Some disliked the harmony/dissonance in Setting 1; others missed the *Kyrie* and objected to "do not bring us to the test" in the "Lord's Prayer."³²⁴ Miller asked the question: "What is your reaction to contemporary liturgies?" He got the following responses: favorable 58; lukewarm 4; unfavorable 2. "What is your reaction to the folk music of new liturgies and hymns?" Responses were favorable 43; lukewarm 11; unfavorable 2.³²⁵

Corroboration was found at most points in the comparison of the 43 LCA congregations of the ILCW field-test and these 13 studied by Miller. Miller's group gave 100% positive rating on utility ("It 'works' well"); 92% of the LCA congregations in the ILCW test gave a positive response. The total sequence is "psychologically satisfying": Miller 78%; ILCW 81%. A more formal absolution is needed: Miller 39%; ILCW 46%; (ALC congregations in the ILCW survey were at 44%). Confession should be at the beginning of the service: Miller 32%; ILCW 46% (the same percentage in the ILCW survey preferred a more formal absolution; ALC, ELCC, and LCMS were all at about 35%).³²⁶

Issues related to the eucharistic controversy follow: Support of the offertory procession: Miller 88%, ILCW 88%. The theology of the Great Thanksgiving is objectionable: Miller 14%; ILCW 13%; (ALC was highest with 19%; LCMS had 6% and ELCC 0%). The Eucharistic Prayer is too long to use every Sunday: Miller 56%; ILCW 47%. The revision of the Lord's Prayer is good: Miller 84%; ILCW 76%. The traditional "Lord's Prayer" should be retained: Miller 56% ILCW 46%.³²⁷

General comments on musical settings dealt with ease and joy of singing, Miller, both approximately 95%; ILCW both 80%; (ALC ranged around 83% for both and in LCMS 100% found it easy to learn and 90% easy to sing). The settings "are a joy to sing": Miller 87%; ILCW 94%; (ALC 89%; LCMS 100%, ELCC 73%). Words and melody are combined well: Miller 93%; ILCW 95%; (ALC 94%, LCMS 100%, ELCC 100%).³²⁸

Campus ministries (seven responding) were also surveyed. They diverged significantly from the congregations and from the overall response at a few points. They were lower (8%) than ALC (19%) and LCA (13%) in finding the theology of the Great Thanksgiving objectionable (17% overall in the ILCW survey). Also they objected less (28%) than any but ELCC (20%) to its length for use every Sunday. In relation to the Lord's Prayer, they were most favorable of all the groups (92%) toward the new revision and least concerned to keep the traditional as well (17%). Overall reactions of the churches were 55% and 39% respectively. Surprisingly, the campus congregations were least negative on the liveliness of Settings 1 and 2 (18%) and less positive than all but LCA on the folk song setting (79%). Overall reactions of the churches on Setting 1 and 2's liveliness were 32% "ponderous" and 76% positive on the folk setting's vitality.³²⁹ Perhaps to a "rock" generation "folk" was not vital enough!

CHAPTER THREE

UNA

THE QUEST FOR PERMANENCE IN UNIFORM WORSHIP
WITHIN THE ONE CHURCH
(1973-1976)

Climax of the Theological Debate:
Eucharistic Controversy II (Spring 1974- Fall 1975)

One of the first published responses to the theological symposium came from Frank Senn “to pick up [Olson’s] challenge” to relate contemporary Lutheran liturgiologists’ views to classical Lutheran theology.”³³⁰ Senn attempted to correct Olson’s presentation of Casel’s mystery–theology, especially regarding *anamnesis* as “present reactualization.”³³¹ Senn argued that *anamnesis* as “effective reactualization” and *epiclesis* are not efforts at manipulation of God. He points to texts in Luther where “remembrance” (*das gedechtnis*), is both sermon and ceremony (Lord’s Supper) and to the Small Catechism on the Holy Spirit, whose very work invites invocation.³³²

Senn also pointed to texts in Luther and Melancthon where they affirm *eucharistic* as opposed to propitiatory sacrifice. Senn argued the appropriateness of praying the words of institution not only from Luther’s *Formula Missae* but also from the almost universal Lutheran practice of facing the altar when reciting the *verba*—not proclaiming them in the direction of the people.³³³ In light of this assertion, it may be questioned whether the real issues are law-and-gospel in terms of sacrifice-and-sacrament or praise-and-proclamation. It may be that several different *Lutheran* understandings of “consecration” are colliding: The older orthodox view had the pastor facing the altar *addressing* the bread; the newer liturgical view had the pastor addressing God in *prayer* concerning the bread; the neo-orthodox protest called the words *proclamation* to the people.

A final suggestion by Senn came in response to Olson’s warning against the use of analogy. Senn acknowledged that analogy can and did drift into

allegory. But he pointed to Horace Hummel's work in the Israelite cult as the expression of the "two languages" of typology: one language involves empirical, unrepeatable, historical event; the other language is "sacramental—about the repetition or reenactment of events like the Exodus celebration for Israel."³³⁴

OLSON: Pro et contra

Olson contended that the "action" theology rooted in pagan cult-drama had been imported into Eastern Orthodoxy in the offertory procession, the *anamnesis*, and the *epiclesis*.³³⁵ On the other hand Olson demonstrated that Eugene Brand's concept of *anamnesis* had fascinating parallels with that of Zwinglianism. Similarly the fraction was said to be Reformed, as well as cultic, in its origins. The culprits introducing this into Lutheranism were Peter Brunner and his student Brand.³³⁶ Unlike Melancthon (AC XXIV; BC 252.19) and Luther, the new "action" theology failed to distinguish between eucharistic sacrifice and propitiatory sacrifice, and it emphasized "this do" rather than "for you."³³⁷

Olson also pointed to the discussion surrounding the term "eucharistic sacrifice." Its Melancthonian definition ("the opposite of propitiatory sacrifice") was rejected. Thus the sacrifice "accomplished in eucharistic prayer . . . basically the counterpart of the sacrifice of the cross, the sacramental sacrifice . . . it is the reactualization of the cross and it is remembrance."³³⁸ From this Olson concluded that Vatican II's theology of "action" remained a "sinister" synonym for "works."³³⁹

Paul Rorem, then a student at the Lutheran Theological Seminary in Philadelphia where Olson was teaching, builds on Kenneth Hagen's study of Luther's view of "testament." Its appropriate liturgical form was "*a free-standing proclamation to the worshipper, not a prayer to God.*"³⁴⁰ He criticized Brilioth for overlooking the subtle distinction between "hearing" the words of institution "proclaimed to oneself" and "overhearing" them as a priest prays to God!³⁴¹ Rorem's logic was this:

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 to be prayed to God.³⁴²

Rorem concluded: "To consider a 'eucharistic prayer' as in fact a proclamation to those who may overhear the prayer is to seriously damage the integrity of the prayer" since prayer should not be used for "informing."³⁴³

The most important answer to the position summarized so well by Rorem came from Robert Jenson in the Spring 1975 issue of *Dialog*. He

asserted that Lutheran sacramental doctrine disallows making Word and sacrament “rivals.”³⁴⁴ As “visible word,” the eucharist has Christ’s command, “Do this . . . ,” as “canonical warrant.” The church’s obedient performance is the “ordinance” dimension. God’s promise makes it “sacrament” (i.e. God’s act). “Do this” means “give thanks” (i.e. both “let us bless God” and “Bless you, God”). Such thanksgiving is “neither prayer nor proclamation only, but a third encompassing both”; thanksgiving is the “element” that the sacramental promises concern; and the bread and cup are “embodiments of the thanksgiving.”³⁴⁵ “Indeed, phenomenologically, the eucharist is first our deed, which biblical promises interpret as God’s deed. . . .” The “*embodied* prayer word is phenomenologically sacrificial, but not the propitiatory sacrifice the Reformers opposed” (*italics his*). Jenson noted that in Jewish table-thanksgiving “*praise* is also a remembering.”³⁴⁶ Moreover the *anamnesis* is representational “embodied remembering.” “If there is something unchristian about representation, then there cannot be any . . . Christian sacraments at all.”³⁴⁷ Moreover “the consequence of remembering Jesus is faith.” But when God remembers Jesus’ death and resurrection, the consequence is fulfilling the promise of the coming of the Kingdom. In defense of the current ILCW translation, “Do this for my remembrance,” and Jeremias’s idea of reminding God, Jenson pointed to God remembering his covenant (Exodus 2:24). He also pointed to the prayer where God is asked, “Remember your mercy” (Psalm 25:6).³⁴⁸ It is surprising how little was made of such Psalms in the debate over *anamnesis*!

In a strange argument for one who appreciates ecumenical tradition and the Formula of Concord, Jenson asserted that “recitation of the narrative cannot be considered an essential part of the eucharist. . . . Whatever ‘do this’ may include, it cannot possibly include ‘recite the narrative in which Jesus is quoted as saying ‘do this’.”³⁴⁹ Attacking also a consecratory use of the *verba*, Jenson asserted rather: “It is in that this bread and wine *will be* received as the fulfillment of the ordained meal, that they *are* the body of Christ *promised* to the receiving”³⁵⁰ [emphasis his]. Jenson’s language moved in the direction of the “receptionism” with which 16th century Lutherans struggled. If the *anamnesis* is a confession of faith in the power of God’s promise and anticipates God’s movement to us in the eating and drinking, then it rightly focuses the eucharist on Christ’s presence.³⁵¹ Jenson moved beyond “receptionism” in a more Melancthonian direction when he says “the whole occurrence of the eucharist . . . [is] a presence of the risen Lord as an object, as body in the world.”³⁵² This is similar to Melancthon’s view of Christ’s presence in the total ritual action.³⁵³ Eating and drinking are embodied faith, which eats Christ. “We believe this particular utterance of the gospel with the hands, mouth and gullet.”³⁵⁴

Jenson's significant but controversial attempt to move beyond the either/or of proclamation versus praise in analyzing eucharistic prayer, as well as his participation in the ILCW/LTC subcommittee on eucharistic prayers, which produced *The Great Thanksgiving* (CW-01), led to what Dennis Paulson calls "the debate suspended" in late 1975.

The Forde-Jenson Debate

The climax of the public, scholarly debate—outside LCMS circles—came in the fall of 1975 with the publication in *Response* of articles by Gerhard Forde and Robert Jenson. They were reissued by ILCW shortly thereafter under the title, "A 'Great Thanksgiving' for Lutherans? Theological Conversation in Progress." Dennis Paulson identified a dozen objections raised by Forde in his two articles.³⁵⁵ I shall use neither this nor Forde's three-part structure (exegetical, hermeneutical, and historical, plus addenda). I see Forde's single concern to be the nature of the sacrament as gospel proclamation which he undergirded by arguments from Scripture and Lutheran tradition (not only the Lutheran confessions) against the undercutting of such proclamation by ILCW's eucharistic prayers.

Forde appealed to "the accepted Lutheran liturgical practice of the past," "the Lutheran tradition," "the reformers," the "Lutheran fathers," "the Church of Norway" and "the Church of Germany,"³⁵⁶ Conzelmann, Luther's "Babylonian Captivity," "the Scriptures, the Lutheran confessions, and the tradition." On the other hand, Forde's "Reply" ignored Jenson's treatment of the Formula of Concord, Article VII and Gerhard's *Loci*, while rejecting Jeremias's interpretation of the *verba*,³⁵⁷ as well as the Great Thanksgiving of SBH, claimed by the ILCW to be "accepted 'Lutheran practice'" but "never officially sanctioned."³⁵⁸

A final aspect of the methodology of Forde's appeal to authority, grew out of his fear that the ILCW eucharistic prayers would have "a profound effect on the root piety of the Church": ". . . basic changes should be made only in the light of sound theological principles espoused by the whole Church."³⁵⁹ It seems as if Forde was attempting to protect the church from Prosper of Aquitaine's *lex orandi* by appealing to the untenable *consensus* of Vincent of Lerins: what has been believed by all Christians at all times in all places (*ubique, semper, ab omnibus*).³⁶⁰

Jenson responded to Forde that the "only Lutheranism" that can be *normative* is the *doctrine* of the confessions" but adds that it is wise to "consult the 16th- and 17th-century theologians who created the concept ('Lutheran')." He further contended that, "unless prevented by weighty

reasons,” affirming “ecumenical tradition,” and seeking “ecumenical accommodation” has been “the classic Lutheran position.”³⁶¹

Jenson countered Forde’s remark (“I know of no responsible exegete who interprets as the ILCW does”) by pointing to *Die Abendmahlsworte Jesu* of Jeremias, a “responsible—indeed chief—exegete of these texts.” Jenson suggested to the ALC Review Group that it should consult Jeremias “before issuing any further statements.”³⁶²

Jenson interpreted article VII of the Solid Declaration of the Formula of Concord (BC 584.83f.) as liturgical action commanded by a word that is both law and gospel.³⁶³ An extended discussion of Johann Gerhard’s *Loci* followed and included Gerhard’s interpretation of Augustine’s use of “word” as mandate and promise. Jenson said that for Gerhard sacraments are “commanded human actions.”³⁶⁴

Jenson attempted to use the interpretations of both Jeremias and Conzelmann (“Do *this*” = the whole administration), arguing that the two interpretations “coincide” in mandating thanksgiving and sharing of bread and cup. Jenson was forced to admit the divergence of ILCW’s interpretation from Gerhard, 16th century and medieval theologians. These assumed that to do *eucharistia/eulogia* was an act of *blessing* the bread (i.e. consecration), rather than an act of praise. Their error was “excusable and even inevitable.” Forde’s it seemed was not, because modern exegetical “scholarship knows no dispute on this point.”³⁶⁵

Jenson took up the objection that the *verba* should not be connected to the thanksgiving and addressed to both God and the people as prayer-and-proclamation simultaneously.³⁶⁶ He again quoted Gerhard:

the minister *prays* [*precatur*, Jenson’s emphasis] that Christ, present in the sacramental action by the power of his promise, may distribute his body and blood. . . . to those present; *proclaims* [*testatur*, Jenson’s emphasis] that by the power of Christ’s . . . institution the blessed bread will be the communion of his body and the blessed wine the communion of his blood.³⁶⁷

Jenson found in this the simultaneity of ILCW’s position.

Jenson responded to Forde’s distinction of “directions” by discussing Luther’s objections to the canon and his reforms on the *Formula missae*. Luther saw the canon as our propitiatory sacrifice and this as a “*works righteous prayer*” [italics Jenson’s]. The most serious charge in *Misuse of the Mass*, according to Jenson, was the “suppression of the meal character of the supper” (WA 8:513-517; cf. LW 36:170-174); thus, argued Luther, “the sacrifice was invented so that the ‘holy priest’ at the altar would have something to do and not stand there idle” (WA 8:514; cf. LW 36:172).³⁶⁸

Jenson ended with a critique of the ALC review process in general and Forde in particular for ignoring the study, argument, and scholarly discussion of worship in recent generations. Charging ILCW with being “un-Lutheran” he judged irresponsible.

Forde’s “reply” acknowledged Jeremias’s and Conzelmann’s work but found them “poles apart.” He challenged the “Jewish-matrix” argument with the newness of the *New Testament*. Citing Luther’s “Babylonian Captivity” (LW 36:52, 56), he defended the prayer-testament distinction.³⁶⁹

Forde proposed the compromise of ending the prayers with an Amen and then proclaiming the *verba*. He chided Jenson’s parting shot as a “reprehensible” tactic and reminded him that it is to be “*our* liturgy and not the ILCW’s.”³⁷⁰

Evolution of Holy Communion for Trial Use: Revising CW-2

On the basis of the criticisms published, letters received, and congregational response summarized in the Wartburg report, as well as the input from the October 1973 theological symposium, the subcommittee on revision of CW-2 began its work in May 1974. Charles Ferguson from LTC chaired; staff were Brand, DeLaney, and Egge; Gerhard Cartford, George Hoyer, Paul K, Peterson, Carl Segerhammar, and Frances Ingemann rounded out the subcommittee. Their charge was to deal with the broad outline of the rite, noting that other subcommittees had been appointed for eucharistic prayers and penitential rites. The subcommittee recommended that the Act of Reconciliation be removed from the center of the rite and be made optional, prior to the entrance hymn. The suggestion of reintroducing *introit* and gradual met with little enthusiasm³⁷¹ but psalmody was allowed after the greeting.³⁷² The *Kyrie* litany was however to be restored after the greeting and announcement of the day (cf. CW-2, 5). Use of the Greek, *Kyrie eleison*, was urged by Brand and Hoyer. The consensus was to use English with the Greek in brackets (cf. CW-5, 73f.). Return to the traditional western Gospel acclamations, “Glory to you, O Lord” and “Praise to you, O Christ” was recommended. The subcommittee was ambivalent on the placement of the Hymn of the Day, preferring it *before* but allowing it *after* the sermon. There was no consensus on the location of the *pax*. The Creed was placed *after* the sermon and Hymn of the Day. Rather than requiring the fraction, it was to be optional, “depending on the type of bread to be used.” The question of the use of the *verba* alone was raised.³⁷³

Ferguson was asked “to cast the rite in the form which seemed to be emerging from the discussions.”³⁷⁴ When it dealt with these recommendations, LTC had the outline as well as comments from the worship commit-

tee of St. Peter's Lutheran Church, Manhattan, regarding the revision done by Brand which they had used on five consecutive Sundays.³⁷⁵ Members of St. Peter's noted the difficulty of all beginning the invocation together. The general confession was called a "refreshing change" from CW-2 and *Celebrate*; and two forms of confession were requested. Some preferred an absolution to a prayer. The opening sequence was preferred over the TLH/SBH movement from *introit* to *Kyrie*. An introduction to the *pax* that mentioned reconciliation and/or offering was suggested.³⁷⁶ "Save us from the time of trial" was characterized as "a more graceful phrase" than the earlier ICET translation of the Lord's Prayer, "Do not bring us to the test."³⁷⁷

LTC took up the subcommittee's recommendation regarding the optional opening order of confession and also allowed for a confessional section in the intercessions (e.g. the Episcopal Prayer of Humble Access). It removed the opening psalmody option, approved the *Kyrie* and "Worthy is Christ" options and the western Gospel acclamations, with the following suggested ending: "The Gospel of the Lord." It was decided the Apostles' Creed should not be substituted for the Nicene Creed, except when there was a baptism.³⁷⁸ This sequence, left undecided by the subcommittee, was to be as follows: Creed, intercessions, and peace. The words accompanying the fraction, together with the words and action of elevation (CW-2, 19) were struck. It was decided to retain, "Thank the Lord" (Psalm 105) from CW-2, 21 revising the third line to "everyone."³⁷⁹ Alternate translations/versifications of Psalm 105 had been proposed,³⁸⁰ but were rejected. The dismissal was made permissive.³⁸¹

ILCW approved the *structure* of the revised rite and the *form* "in principle" in its November meeting.³⁸² The churches had begun appointing their review committees, and formal ecclesiastical review would begin early in 1975. Eugene Brand was appointed as full-time project director, resigned his LCA staff position, and began his new position January 1, 1975. Mons Teig assumed the ALC worship position, with the understanding that Egge would remain in a consultative role.

The report of the subcommittee on penitential rites to the April meeting of LTC followed the lead of the subcommittee on revision of CW-2, (viz. to remove the confessional order from the center and place it at the beginning). There, following the suggestion of St. Peter's, Manhattan, two different confessional formats were suggested. Also, like the CW-2 revision subcommittee, they suggested "something like the Prayer of Humble Access" in the middle of the rite. Brand incorporated that into his revision of CW-2.³⁸³ With minor changes, LTC approved usage of the Episcopal Prayer of Humble Access.³⁸⁴ The first of the two confessions follows the Book of Common Prayer (and SBH), "Almighty God, to whom all hearts

are open . . .,” as well as “Most merciful God, we confess that we have sinned against you. . . .”³⁸⁵ This prayer was amended by adding the clause, “forgive what we have been, amend that we are, direct what we shall be”³⁸⁶ and dropping, “We are truly sorry and we humbly repent.” The second confession had two alternate rites (A and B). Rite A was approved in principle and revised that evening “in light of CW-2.”³⁸⁷ The rite picked up the language of Romans 3:23: “We have ‘fallen short’ . . .” and cited Romans 5:8-11. Like the biddings of CW-2, 9, optional specific confession was provided for: “To one another and to you, O Lord, we confess . . .” Original sin was also acknowledged (“our sinfulness” and “we are in the grip of death”), as well as our sins (“we . . . pursue our selfish ends”; “we have sinned”; “we have failed to do the good”)³⁸⁸ with the promise announced and absolution pronounced (“God grant you forgiveness. . .”).³⁸⁹ At the Joint Liturgy Committee meetings in June, that absolution was changed to “God grant us forgiveness of our sins.”³⁹⁰

The LTC subcommittee on eucharistic prayers had its initial meeting in March 1974, with John Arthur serving as chair and Brand as staff, with Robert Jenson, Gordon Lathrop, and Gail Ramshaw Schmidt. They interpreted their task to include offertory prayers, as well as dialog, preface, *Sanctus*, and Great Thanksgiving. In the latter the *epiclesis* should be eschatological, and in the offertory it should be “consecratory”—a point Jenson for which had argued. Three categories of prayers were planned: (1) a description of the contents of “a proper prayer” to help others construct eucharistic prayers; (2) a set of fixed and variable segments constructed on the following outline: Dialog, preface, *Sanctus*, laudation (of the Father), *anamnesis* (of the Son), *epiclesis* (of the Spirit), and doxology; (3) unitary prayers such as in Hippolytus and SBH. Jenson worked on the rationale and on category 2 which became the Prayer of Many Parts, (CW-01, 10-19). Schmidt and Lathrop worked on translations of Hippolytus; Schmidt also did seasonal prayers; Lathrop translated a Dutch Roman Catholic prayer.³⁹¹

At the September 1974 meeting, the words of the CW-2 preface, “It is our duty and delight . . .” were changed to “It is the right and full of hope. . . .” Eighteen New Testament scholars were asked to comment on the *verba*; ten had responded by the meeting time. The subcommittee agreed to continue the version of the *verba* conflated from Matthew, Mark, Luke, and Paul. They proposed “who in the night he surrendered to betrayal and death”—picking up the double sense of “handed over” or “given” utilized in the Eastern Orthodox liturgy to emphasize that Jesus willingly gave his flesh “for the life of the world” (John 6:51). “Blood . . . poured out” (CW-2, 17) was changed back to “shed.” CW-2’s “This cup is God’s new cov-

enant in my blood” was changed to “. . . the new covenant *sealed* by my blood” [emphasis mine]. “Do this to remember me” (CW-2, 17) was changed to “Do this for remembrance.” The rationale was: “*Anamnesis* must be rendered in such a way that the object—who is to remember—is left open. The resolution must be left to catechesis.” Lathrop’s translation of Hippolytus was accepted with a correction (cf. CW-01, 20f.), as was the Rotterdam prayer (cf. CW-01, 33-35). Improvements were suggested for Schmidt’s Easter prayer (cf. CW-01, 26f.) Prayers by Arthur and others were still pending. Lathrop was asked to edit Jenson’s Jewish prayer (cf. CW-01, 28f.).³⁹² LTC in its October meeting discussed the subcommittee’s proposal, restoring “salutary” (but not “meet”) to the preface in lieu of “full of hope.”³⁹³

One of the significant compromises Jenson proposed³⁹⁴ and Brand defended was to change the introduction of the *verba* from “you” to “God,” thus removing the words of institution from the “context of prayer.” One interesting motion that was seconded but lost in LTC was to eliminate this option, unless ILCW deemed it “a practical necessity for the acceptance of the rite.”³⁹⁵ Thus LTC refused simply to take a pragmatic approach to the eucharistic prayer debate, but to acknowledge the *other* Lutheran tradition of the critics of eucharistic prayer. Such a compromise would not, however, satisfy the critics.

The third and final meeting of the subcommittee was held in March 1975. After alterations and editorial changes, the following were recommended to LTC: Lathrop’s Rotterdam and Hippolytus translations, Schmidt’s Easter prayer, the SBH prayer (using revisions of Schmidt and Senn), Jenson’s Jewish prayer, and Prayer of Many Parts, plus A Common Eucharistic Prayer³⁹⁶ as “a matter of principle.”³⁹⁷ The subcommittee felt that the latter needed “much work in the area of English style” and that Jenson’s Jewish prayer still needed “tightening.”³⁹⁸

The subsequent LTC meeting in April 1975 approved the Rotterdam prayer “if copyright permission can be obtained” and the Easter prayer with the *verba* from Jenson’s Prayer of Many Parts—subsequently rescinded, letting the shorter *verba* stand.³⁹⁹ Moreover Arthur and Ferguson were asked to revise the Prayer of Many Parts in light of LTC criticisms.⁴⁰⁰

The approval of these prayers was not completed until the next LTC meeting—a joint session with LMC—in June 1975. The ending of the SBH prayer was altered from “heavenly blessing and grace” (cf. SBH, p. 11) to “heavenly peace and joy.” To “remission/forgiveness of sins” (SBH, p. 11) was added the Small Catechism’s gifts of “life and salvation” (WS, p. 45). *Lex credendi* did not prevail this time, for the catechetical addendum did not

survive into the LBW (LBW:MDE, p. 297). This and other revisions were approved and LTC voted to transmit the rationale and eight prayers to all Lutheran clergy. A final copy was prepared in July 1975, it was printed and mailed in August under the title, "The Great Thanksgiving" (CW-01).

By this time, all the review committees had met and had begun their reporting process to the churches. After studying the new musical settings it had commissioned, LMC chose a setting by Richard Hillert. This, along with the revision of SBH Setting 2 by Donna Zierdt Elkins, was submitted to the review groups of the churches in July. The Hillert setting was field-tested in congregations later that year.⁴⁰¹ In October Brand reported problems with settings of some texts for SBH Setting 2. Regina Fryxel, who had done the SBH setting, now provided a setting of "What shall I render." Cartford's CW-2 setting of "This is the feast" was proposed—but ultimately rejected in LBW.⁴⁰²

The committees had prepared rationales—in time for the November 1974 ILCW meeting—setting forth theology, scope, balance, proposed contents, and use of the text and music of the new "people's book" (the latest in a string of temporary titles). The rationales were prepared primarily to aid churches' review committees in evaluating ILCW's work. LTC's brief rationale focused on the *contents* of the book. Pointing to the church's liturgical renewal, the document emphasized the primacy of Baptism, the centrality of Communion and lay involvement in worship leadership—reflecting their status as God's people. "The people's book must therefore include the order for Baptism... as well as the Affirmation of the Baptismal Covenant which replaces the rite of Confirmation."⁴⁰³ The significance of Baptism for the life of repentance was emphasized.

Moreover, confession and absolution—the formal enactment of repentance—is both a return to Baptism and an approach to Holy Communion, and all three convey "forgiveness, life, and salvation." For that reason, confession and Communion can be used together or independently.⁴⁰⁴

The weekly celebration of Communion is to nourish the Church as the body of Christ with the body and blood of Christ in sacrament. The complete Psalter was to be included with imprecatory portions, which "express real human emotions" bracketed, since they "may not always be usable in worship."⁴⁰⁵ Critics of the LBW's omitting lament psalms should note this decision to include the whole Psalter.

Matins, Vespers and Compline were proposed to "help the worshipper relate . . . to the rhythm of day and night . . . in a larger historical and cosmic context."⁴⁰⁶ The Litany for intercession and one Service of the Word

for preaching were included.⁴⁰⁷ Marriage and Burial were proposed, voted out by ILCW,⁴⁰⁸ and proposed again by both liturgy committees.⁴⁰⁹

Practice and Principles of Reform: Revising Liturgies and Hymns Publication of *The Holy Communion for Trial Use: CW-2 Revised*

At the June meeting of LTC and LMC, decisions were made for the July 1975 liturgical materials to be submitted to the church review committees. This included virtually all the major liturgical sections (except Burial), along with the eight eucharistic prayers (CW-01) and a hymn sampling. Decisions concerning the revision of CW-2 included the following: In Public Confession 2, “God grant you forgiveness” was changed to “God grants us forgiveness” and the sign of the cross was removed. “Sins” in the *Agnus Dei* was changed to “sin.”⁴¹⁰ The term “reading” was dropped from the announcement of the readings so that it read: “The first lesson is from the _____ chapter of _____.” The final formula was: “The Holy Gospel according to St. _____, the _____ chapter.” No consensus could be reached on an ending of the lessons—an impasse that prevailed into LBW.⁴¹¹ An attempt to strengthen the CW-2 post-communion blessing failed, and the rubric was made permissive.⁴¹² Attempts to change the CW-2 dismissal also failed.⁴¹³ The blessing in Vespers was changed from “The Lord almighty bless us and direct our days and our deeds in his peace” (cf. Suffrages in LBW, p. 163) to “The almighty and merciful Lord, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, bless and preserve you” (LBW, p. 153).

LMC continued its work sorting out canticles, including extra settings of those in Holy Communion.⁴¹⁴ Elkin was asked to continue the work of revising SBH setting 2. There was discussion of including folksong settings with apparent consensus that these should be available as supplements.⁴¹⁵

The LMC continued its work of sifting the canticles at its October meeting with extra settings of the Holy Communion canticles proposed. (Hillert’s “Jesus, Lamb of God” was the only such extra canticle to make it [LBW 1].) The committee also approved the idea of pointing the Psalms for singing.⁴¹⁶ An example of the complex interplay between LMC and LTC is seen in LMC’s recommendation regarding the Hillert setting that the Gospel acclamation be changed to “Praise *be* to you, O Christ”⁴¹⁷ (LBW, p. 63) since that presumably sang better. The musicians’ wisdom was not followed on that recommendation.

At the October 1975 LTC meeting it was reported that the Holy Communion for Trial Use had been distributed to congregations for field-test-

ing. At the same meeting, in its first response to review committee recommendations, LTC declined ALC's suggestion of a stronger absolution (emphasizing "for you") in the opening order. The rite was now titled Brief Order for Confession and Forgiveness, following an ALC and LCA recommendation. Also following LCA recommendations, the Episcopal Prayer of Humble Access along with the accompanying absolution from Public Confession 1 ("The almighty and merciful God...") was dropped. The ALC recommendation of a permissive use of the Brief Order at this point was not accepted. However, petitions expressing repentance in the prayers were suggested.⁴¹⁸

The ALC recommendation of prefacing both the Nicene and Apostles' Creeds with "may" was met by LTC's motion that the Nicene Creed be used "on great festivals in festival seasons" and the Apostles' Creed on "green Sundays."⁴¹⁹ Regarding the LCA suggestion of various optional forms of communion blessings, LTC now accepted the strengthened language it had side-stepped at its previous meeting: "The body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ strengthen and keep you in his grace."⁴²⁰ In answer to the ALC Review Group's question about the dropping of trinitarian ending of the Aaronic benediction, LTC responded that there was little precedent for H.M. Muhlenberg's suggestion incorporated in SBH, except for the Mozarabic and Swedish liturgies. LCA's recommendation of restoring the responsive form of confession and absolution to Compline was affirmed.⁴²¹

LTC responded to ELCC: Saying adult baptism was "normative" was not meant to demean infant baptism.⁴²² Regarding inclusion of the Small Catechism, LTC noted problems with the 1960 translation and the contradiction such inclusions created with the book's rationale and referred the issue to ILCW. (The 1974 ALC convention had voted that its ILCW delegates had to vote for inclusion of the Catechism and Augsburg Confession in the new book.) Interest was expressed in including the Athanasian Creed, "but it is very difficult to get a good English text."⁴²³ (Interestingly enough, the ALC Review Group did not support including this creed.⁴²⁴)

Pending LTC matters were dealt with. The inclusion of the words "When we eat..." at the fraction (CW-2, 19) was rejected. Rather this invitation was approved: "The gifts of God for the people of God. Come, for all things now are ready." Affirmation of the Baptismal Covenant was expanded with the subtitle, "Confirmation, Reception, Renewal."⁴²⁵ LTC also encouraged ILCW to consider publishing a book of "pastoral acts" including visitation of the sick, healing services, penitential rites, and "instructional guidelines for the pastor."⁴²⁶

ILCW at its November 1975 meeting now approved the LTC's request to include Marriage and Burial in the people's book. The latter rite was approved in principle. The other liturgies were approved with little comment or change. A motion was made to recommend in the Nicene Creed "became *human*" for "became man" to the Consultation on Common Texts. (The Americans had already dropped "men.") However, for some reason action was deferred on this.⁴²⁷ LMC was informed of "the concern of ILCW for the inclusion" of CW-2 Setting 2 by Nelson. This was carried 15-0⁴²⁸ and set in motion the expansion of LBW to three settings. ILCW followed its Executive Committee recommendation and declined the ALC request to include the Small Catechism in the worship book since it was not normally used in worship and developing a common text was not ILCW's responsibility.⁴²⁹

Hymnody Revised & Expanded

The rationale for the "basic hymnal" was rather extensive, beginning and continuing to struggle with the assertion: "A hymnal is a mystery." Initial and continuing response was seen as based on "familiarity or appeal of the music." Texts, continued the lament, "seem largely overlooked in the initial assessment of a new collection of hymns."⁴³⁰

In the long run, however, it seems that a hymnal has but negligible influence in the shaping of musical taste, while the comment is still made with a frequency appalling to preachers, that the theology of most members is determined far more powerfully by the hymnal than by the sermons or by the lessons of the church school or the catechetical class.⁴³¹

Because HTC "took this phenomenon seriously, mixed and ambiguous blessing though it be," they "scrutinized carefully" every text for its "congruity with Scripture and its fidelity to the Gospel" as "preached and taught in the churches of the Book of Concord."⁴³² HTC also eliminated some familiar hymns for biblical or theological reasons⁴³³ such as triumphalism, privatization, racism, male chauvinism, histrionics or self-glorification. Granting that hymns do teach, "a hymn is not a sermon, a catechism, or a lesson," so the committee "regularly excised hymns which are overpoweringly didactic or hortatory."⁴³⁴

Thus the structure of the hymnal contained (1) hymns for the Church year, (2) hymns for liturgical usages, e.g. entrance, Baptism, Communion and (3) hymns "dynamically determined," concerning our relationship to God (e.g. "adoration," "supplication" etc.)⁴³⁵

As if to demonstrate not only the struggle but their own ambivalence, the rationale argues for "balance" since

Heresy occurs not so much in the assertion of flagrantly heterodox propositions as in the mere over-emphasis [*sic*] of one true assertion and the under-emphasis [*sic*] of its correlatives and contraries.⁴³⁶

The critical case in point—testing their ability to juggle biblical, confessional, and theological commitments—was the “popular demand” to include more “so-called Gospel hymns.”⁴³⁷ The committees “clearly recognize that they had up to the present been unresponsive to . . . the response of the people, both in convention and through small groups and privately.” *Vox populi vox Dei?* The response continues: “it was determined at this meeting of the commission [ILCW itself] to include a sizable number of these selections, with the hope that it will be more satisfying and will receive more acceptance by the people in the churches.”⁴³⁸ Then what happens to the biblical, confessional, and theological criteria for texts?

Or music? Some music was “deemed by the musicians to be ‘non-Lutheran’ in character.” The commission responded that “we ought to reflect the part we have in a so-called ‘American church.’”⁴³⁹ It has also been “noted that hymnals stand or fall on their tunes” and argued that they must be “winsome.” The context is “what the church has said in the past through its tunes, what the church is saying now in its tunes and, insofar as possible, what the church ought to be saying in the future through its tunes.”⁴⁴⁰ Twentieth century Lutheran churches with their “varying constituencies” and pluralism are “not evenly served by the vast treasury of the Reformation, primarily German chorales.”⁴⁴¹

So what were the criteria for hymn tunes? The tune should “intensify and enhance what the text provides.” Sometimes history had “solidly wedded the text and tune” and it would have been “foolhardy to divorce the two.” But there were new texts, “unserviceable” tunes, non-western tunes, etc.! Other criteria included “musical accessibility, ease of singing, proper pitch, rhythmic structure.”⁴⁴² One policy, unstated here, emerged in response to the LCA review committee: “The general policy of the HMC is to avoid Bach harmonizations on 4/4 meter of chorales. The activity of the voices is too busy.”⁴⁴³

The hymn committee’s selection of 400 hymns was submitted on October 7, 1974, and approved in principle on November 13, 1974, by ILCW. The next day the commission voted to enlarge the selection to include more Christmas and Easter hymns, as well as “spiritual songs or Gospel hymns.”⁴⁴⁴

Gilbert Doan provided a helpful summary of the growth of the hymn collection. He noted that the original plan of a “core hymnal” was to include a hymn for each festival and Sunday of the three-year cycle (usually related to the Gospel), as well as hymns for opening and closing, sacraments, praise, offertory, etc. The intention was that each congregation would

choose its own supplement of contemporary, ethnic, seasonal, and children's material. The core hymnal was to be 200 hymns. Doan commented: "That hope proved short-lived. There were simply too many opinions as to what is absolutely essential." By the end of 1974 the limit had been raised to 300, then 400 and finally 450. (LBW ended up with 569 as compared with SBH's 602; LW has 520 as compared with TLH's 668.)

Doan ventured his own analysis of the contents of hymnody. In language reminiscent of Erik Routley's evaluation of TLH, Doan said:

The hymn text committee has had a terrible time with the classic chorales. Many of them are superb creations, musically speaking, and dear to thousands of worshippers—perhaps only because of their musical stature. But some of the texts to which they are wedded are heretical, and many are psychologically perverse as well, even in their original languages, and most, in translation, are altogether appalling. That conundrum has yet to be resolved.⁴⁴⁵

Since TLH had the largest collection of chorales, that judgment can only have stirred Missourians' suspicions. Furthermore, the assertion that the new hymnal would "no longer support only the private, the penitential and the 'churchly,'" but also "the celebrative" and "the socially conscious"⁴⁴⁶ must have also raised old fears in LCMS and elsewhere.

Another concern was: "whether to present a clearly *Lutheran* book . . . or . . . a book usable . . . by Lutheran congregations, which is simply the finest hymnody in English, and equally appealing to those communities . . . who have neither German nor Scandinavian blood in their veins." Then Doan concluded rather prophetically: "The outcome in the book will probably be a compromise; the issue itself is of considerable concern in American Lutheranism."⁴⁴⁷ With the prominence given to "inclusiveness" in the formation of the ELCA, Doan's insight was accurate. Which of these LBW is may be long debated.

The evaluation of the hymns was done differently from the repeated field-testing of the Holy Communion. Two hundred persons selected by the hymn committees were sent a list of the hymns' first lines and tunes, as well as copies of unfamiliar texts and tunes. They were asked to check "selection, balance, tone, and content." Then the list was sent to the review committees. Responses were expected by summer 1975. Doan pondered the twin hazards of springing a hymnal unannounced on millions of worshippers and compiling a hymnal done by popularity poll—with all power given to reviewers and none to the committees of experts.⁴⁴⁸

At its August 1974 meetings the hymn committees prepared a list of about 400 hymns to be submitted to the November ILCW meeting. In spite

of the now doubled size (compared to the “core hymnal”), at the October meeting of the LCA Division of Parish Services consulting committee on worship with HTC, chair Gil Doan stated that the limit of 400 made “the greatest problem what to omit.”⁴⁴⁹ During 1975 the lid was lifted, and the list of 400 hymn texts and tunes that was published in the spring was expanded to 492 in the fall. Hymn use survey reports had come in from about 2500 LCA congregations and 1500 LCMS congregations in August 1975 and in early October from 1600 ALC congregations. Along with these came the first of literally thousands of letters (over 15,000 to the ALC worship office) in response to the official list of hymns.⁴⁵⁰ The surveys had also asked for recommendations of other hymns to be added. At the top of LCA and LCMS lists were “How great thou art” (ALC 809 congregations *using* it; LCA 159 and LCMS 78 *recommending* it) and “Amazing grace” (ALC 815; LCA 145 and LCMS 76). “The old rugged cross” (ALC 430; LCA 80 and LCMS 43 votes) and “Blessed assurance” (ALC 171; LCA 21 and LCMS 25) had significant support. “We are one in the Spirit” got enough votes (ALC 496; LCA 120 and LCMS 33) for ILCW to override the hymn committees and include it,⁴⁵¹ though ultimately it was excluded from LBW.⁴⁵² Other songs from the 1960s—“Sons of God” (ALC 330; LCA 32 and LCMS 27) and “Lord of the dance” (ALC 121; LCA 33 and LCMS 6)—were suggested along with such unlikely folk songs as “Michael, row the boat ashore” and “Blowin’ in the wind,” both of which received a number of votes.

In August a subcommittee collated reports of the four review committees, results of hymns use surveys by all four church bodies, critiques from the (200) consultants, and thousands of letters “triggered by circulation of misleading and inaccurate ‘hymns-out’ lists.”⁴⁵³ The subcommittee prepared a draft proposal for the October Joint Hymn Committee meeting. The JHC increased their recommendations to 492. “Amazing grace” and “How great thou art” were included in spite of the expected high cost of rights to the latter’s popular translation. The three strongly supported by ALC letters were restored. The others mentioned above were bypassed. The “balance” of the proposal included 53% English language originals and 47% translations (SBH had 64% English language originals and TLH had only 46%).

Twenty-five more hymns were added for consideration at the ILCW meeting. A whole new category of national songs—including “My country, tis of thee”—to be clearly distinguished from hymns, was added.⁴⁵⁴ Other hymns added included “All people that on earth do dwell,” “Come, gracious Spirit,” “Come thou precious ransom” (all without dissent), “I lay my sins on Jesus,” “Jesus, the very thought of thee” (10-9), “Onward

christian soldiers” (11-8), “Renew me, O Eternal Light” (without dissent), “With the Lord begin thy task” (without dissent), “O perfect Love,” “Mine eyes have seen the glory” (11-7), “Once to every man and nation” (10-7), and “We are one in the Spirit” (18-2).⁴⁵⁵ The latter two were eventually rejected. In adding hymns without referring back to committee, ILCW was breaking precedent. Whether time pressure or ecclesiastical pressure was the prime motive is hard to tell.

Rejected by ILCW at that November meeting were: “O beautiful, for spacious skies,” “I need thee every hour,” “More love to thee,” “Nearer my God, to thee,” “O for a faith that will not shrink,” “Savior, thy dying love” and “Rise up, O men of God” for its sexism and its theology.⁴⁵⁶ The final proposal on the list dated November 21, 1975, contained 510 hymns. The “balance” of the book was now 327 from SBH and 328 from TLH/WS, but that should not be overemphasized because WS was both larger (93 hymns) and just as “contemporary” as the 51 hymns in the CW series. Such statistics give credence to the complaints of strong Missouri influence, but the high praise by Routley for the music of TLH should not be forgotten. Another slant on supposed Missouri influence was suggested by C.B. Lund’s analysis of the shifts in texts and tunes from the 19th to the 16th century:⁴⁵⁷

	19th Century	16th Century
SBH texts	308	23
SBH tune	307	58
LBW texts	159	41
LBW tunes	134	107

Of this “final” ILCW *proposal*, 55% were English-language originals, 45% translations. Of the translations proposed, 22% of the hymns were from German, 8% from Scandinavian languages, 11% from Latin and 1% from Greek and 1 to 4% each from various other ancient and modern languages. Of these hymns 17% were of America origin. Of these 510 hymns 306 texts were in SBH and only 240 in TLH (185 in both); 73 texts were from WS and 37 from CW-1 and CW-4.⁴⁵⁸

The first such “historical/linguistic/ethnic tally” which I found was done by Stanley Yoder in January 1974 when there were only 341 hymns. The percentages are remarkably similar: English language originals 51% and translations 49% (German 22%; Scandinavian 7%; Latin 12%; Greek 2%; eight ancient and modern languages 3%; and 4% as yet unidentified).

ILCW charged the hymn committee to search for a dozen more ethnic hymns, specifically Finnish, Baltic, Polish, and Native American⁴⁵⁹ but set

a cap of 20 new hymns. With the dozen hymns having two settings and the 21 canticles that appeared in LBW, that accounted for most of the 569 hymns that eventually appeared in LBW. For all practical purposes, the hymn selection was in place by the end of 1975. "Drop-outs" and "stragglers" were treated as they appeared. The work of the committees and 200 consultants was virtually finished so far as selection was concerned. The additions voted by ILCW were not welcomed by one of the hymn committees, which noted that it was "deeply concerned about the compromise of standards made necessary by the demand for certain sub-standard additions."⁴⁶⁰

The "Final Proposal"

John Halborg's review of ILCW's "final proposal" began with some interesting insights on the "polarities" between the liturgy's "shape" and the "charismatic" ("the unpredictable piety and predilections of the people") in hymnody. Beyond the hymns for church year, hymn selection became a matter of "private devotion." He argued nonetheless that there should be "something peculiar to a *Lutheran* hymnal" [emphasis mine]: a stress on justification by faith, Christ's incarnation and real presence, and the Spirit speaking through the Word.⁴⁶¹

Discussing the November 1975 proposal, Halborg expressed the hope that "Built on a rock" and "Thine own, O loving Savior" would not be "bowdlerized of their most important verses" as in SBH. He protested the "glaring fault of omitting '*Victimae paschali*'" (this did appear as LBW 137). Concern was expressed over a number of omissions from German hymnody ("I am surprised that Lutherans can observe Good Friday without singing 'O darkest woe.'"). He was pleased with the inclusion of "Jerusalem, thou city high and fair" (LBW 348) with its "superlative art and imagery."⁴⁶²

The Scandinavian selection appeared largely pietistic. Noting important omissions, he concluded: "Even the *Covenant Hymnal* does a better job expressing the variety to be found in this tradition." Similarly regarding the English and American hymns, Halborg asserted "A case could be made that the brightest and best of English hymnody has been eliminated from this collection." Some he noted: "While shepherds watched their flocks," "The spacious firmament on high," "The Lord's my shepherd" (LBW 451) and the Rosetti and Bunyan hymns. He protested "the Unitarian theology of Lowell" in "Once to every man and nation" (dropped, also because of sexism) and Whittier's "Still dew of quietness" ("Dear Lord and Father of mankind," LBW 506). He continued: "If all of the hymns submitted to contests for hymns on the city, stewardship, animals, temper-

ance, mothers, et al. were excised from our hymnody, we would not be spiritually bereft.”⁴⁶³

He suggested that the writers of “literary hymns” could learn from the “directness and clarity of gospel hymns.” He characterized “And have the bright immensities” (LBW 391) as “bold word and timorous meaning.” From the “pop tradition,” he would have added to “We are one in the Spirit”, “Lord of the dance” and “Morning has broken.” He was unhappy about the inclusion of “Now the silence” (LBW 205) and “For the bread which you have broken” (LBW 200) from the Contemporary Worship volumes. He also mourned the dropping of “This little Babe” from *Worship Supplement*.⁴⁶⁴

Halborg suggests that the popularity of the Victorian versions of Greek hymns stemmed from their stress on Easter and on Christ’s mystical presence in the church. Also their “note of pathos . . . often missing from the Latin text” has kinship with the continental hymn. The dropping of “Christian, Dost Thou See Them” (SBH 68) is a loss.⁴⁶⁵

Repeating the call for broader ethnic representation, Halborg concludes: “All things said, it is a good hymnal. . . . There will be hymns left unsung. There will continue to be collections for local use.”⁴⁶⁶

Commentaries: Brand and Doan

Two articles that appeared in 1975 serve as commentaries on the rationales and indicate the thinking of some of the leadership of ILCW. The first appeared in the Spring 1975 issue of *Dialog* by Eugene Brand, project director of ILCW since January 1975. Brand noted that the article “represents my own views which should be blamed neither on my colleagues nor the ILCW.”⁴⁶⁷ Brand mentioned that, though uninvolved in its founding, he was involved with ILCW from the beginning and therefore trusted “that my viewpoint is not idiosyncratic.”⁴⁶⁸ Brand summarized recent liturgical history, noting the needs and problems of preparing acceptable worship materials: moving beyond 16th century church orders; finding “simple, durable, and attractive” music; shifting from interchangeable and provisional booklets to a permanent book.⁴⁶⁹ Pastoral dimensions included a new emphasis on sacraments in worship, concern for relevance without repeating fads, and language that is vernacular “in the best sense of the word.” Brand pointed to the ecumenical dimension of ILCW’s work through the International Consultation on English Texts (ICET) and the North American Consultation on Ecumenical Hymnody. He suggested that “many eastern Lutherans” resisted ILCW materials because of what the Common Service and later the SBH meant for their Lutheran identity. By contrast, Brand argued that the “old ALC” (the 1930 merger of Buffalo, Ohio, and

Iowa Synods) never had as great affection for the Common Service or SBH and “never took liturgy all that seriously anyway.”⁴⁷⁰

Finally, Brand took up the “church-political” dimension, in which he was having his baptism by fire. He noted that only the commission members were appointed as “official representatives” of churches—not the standing committee or subcommittee members. The committees *produced* and the commission *approved* materials. He also noted that ALC and LCA had disbanded their worship commissions, whereas the ILCW delegates from LCMS constituted their worship commission. (A fact that did not seem to help the fate of LBW in Missouri Synod!) Again, whereas LCA and LCMS had Canadian synods, the ELCC was the Canadian counterpart of the ALC. And then there was the “tricky” relationship with the LCUSA—an inter-Lutheran agency in the U.S.A. He admitted that “coordination with programs of [LCUSA’s] Division of Theological Studies had been difficult. If there was a fault, it did not rest with ILCW; it was built into the situation.”⁴⁷¹

The kinds of questions ILCW had to ask, Brand suggested, were: What is “desirable . . . responsible . . . and politically possible?” Among the fascinating examples of the latter is the eliminating of readings from the Apocrypha in the lectionary and funeral eucharists.⁴⁷² Brand noted:

Liturgy devotees have tended to influence each other, gaining few converts along the way. Their work has been an important factor in the general advancement of Lutheran liturgical life. They have sometimes become impatient with the ILCW for not going far enough or for not having sufficiently high standards. It requires political acumen to spark the renewal of worship in a simple congregation; a *tour de force* is needed for a constituency of church-bodies!⁴⁷³

Brand certainly reflected the difficult mediating role he played as director.

Brand concluded his article with a discussion of the liturgical and theological dimensions of ILCW’s task. Regarding the old *lex orandi lex credendi* argument Brand suggested: “It is useless to argue, as some do, whether liturgy embodies theological concepts or whether they emerge from liturgy.” He continued: “No true liturgy can be átheological; no true theology can be áliturgical.”⁴⁷⁴

Concerning Lutheranism Brand observed:

Lutheran pastors tend to be good teachers and preachers, but they do not tend to be good enablers of prayer. Indeed the Lutheran tendency is to subvert prayer and worship into further teaching.⁴⁷⁵

In defense of ILCW against the accusation of departing from “the Lutheran insistence that God’s action is what is important in worship,” Brand said first, that Lutherans have problems distinguishing theological from liturgical questions. He went on to argue more substantively that “God’s action is always in, with, and under our actions.” But he insisted “obedience must ask what we are to do.” To ignore the liturgical side of the question of obedience leaves one with theological clarity and soundness of textbook language without the “rich ambiguity” and “expressive power” of the language of worship.⁴⁷⁶

Brand admitted there are dangers in the “reenactment” or “dramatic” understanding of liturgy and in “horizontal” celebrations of the eucharist. But he pointed out the other danger of compartmentalizing God’s action in church and our action the rest of the week. Brand said that “a context of vital *diaconia* and vital *martyria*” is needed if ILCW is “truly to succeed in its goal of vital worship.”⁴⁷⁷

Another semi-official article from an important spokesperson for ILCW appeared in summer 1975. Gilbert Doan, who had declined the role of project director before Brand’s appointment, wrote an apologetic for the new service book and hymnal. He began with a response to a 1966 questionnaire asking about desired changes in a new hymnal. One succinct answer was: “We just *got* a new book! Why can’t you leave us alone?”⁴⁷⁸ Doan suggested that this was, in its own way, another 60s-style revolt against “the establishment”: This congregation resisted the attempts of “the authorities” to “invade their life and rearrange it all.” But Doan also noted the other dimension of resistance: Against authorities that try to “keep everything the way it had always been.” He concluded his point: “Church officials, pastors, and intelligent lay persons saw that, without close and informed attention, the liturgical life of American Lutheranism would simply be torn to pieces between retrenchment and revolt.”⁴⁷⁹

Doan continued: “Something huge, important, necessary, and altogether unnerving was happening to worship, and the Lutheran churches decided to cope with it together.” Unlike those who had decried LCMS influence on LBW, Doan argued that Missouri’s inclusion was one of the virtues of ILCW. He also reminded that after the early “strident calls for throwaway materials, a loose-leaf mail order service,” official resolutions came from LCMS and ALC “insisting on a *book—and soon*”⁴⁸⁰ [emphasis his]. Doan noted rejection of two earlier proposals to reorganize ILCW with full-time staff to produce this new book. Finally in spring 1974, Presidents Robert Marshall of LCA, David Preus of ALC, and J.A.O. Preus of LCMS met with the ILCW Executive Committee. It was decided to seek

outside funding for the staff position, which Lutheran Brotherhood insurance company provided.

Doan raised the question of the future of ILCW (and of worship renewal) after the publication of the book. He noted: "It is the thought of some that the commission should be dissolved as soon as the book is published, and whether or not some of the smaller publications [e.g., occasional services] ever see the light of day."⁴⁸¹ Some leaders within the church bodies, apparently unhappy with ILCW's independent existence outside their structures, as well as its "products," were quick to end ILCW's life once LCMS pulled out and LBW was published. A new committee was established by ALC and LCA to complete the occasional services book.

Finally, some much deserved plaudits were given to E. Theo DeLaney, the LCMS staff member ("whose memory for, and attention to, hymnological detail has been invaluable to the hymn committees") and Mandus Egge, the ALC worship executive ("whose dipomacy, sound judgment, and attention to the management of the commissions have been indispensable"). Mons Teig, Egge's successor, and the successive LCA staff—Edgar Brown, Eugene Brand, and Ralph Van Loon—all did invaluable administrative and leadership tasks, as well as "the scutwork [*sic*] which, as soon as the last committee member has departed for the airport, seems suddenly to swell to monstrous proportions."⁴⁸²

Scripture, Saints, and the Church Year: C-W6

Discussion of a common lectionary with Roman Catholics, Episcopalians, the Consultation on Christian Union (COCU), and Lutheran World Federation (LWF) began in 1968. LWF consultations beginning in 1968 indicated that there was resistance to abandoning the one-year lectionary, especially in German circles.⁴⁸³ This was reinforced by a distinction in practice between reading texts and preaching texts.⁴⁸⁴ The subsequent meeting of the Commission on Worship and Spiritual Life held in Taize, May 8, 1969, agreed to consider revising the church year, the number of lessons in the service, and the number of lectionary series. Churches were encouraged to experiment with the Roman Catholic three-year lectionary.⁴⁸⁵ Interest in a two or three-year lectionary had been growing, especially among Episcopalians and in COCU. At an LWF lectionary consultation, Friedrich Kalb reported that "in Germany feeling is strong . . . (against) a three-year lesson pattern," about which German Roman Catholics were also said to be unhappy.⁴⁸⁶

The ILCW lectionary committee began its work January 1970. For organizational and structural reasons, the Executive Committee made the

lectionary committee a subcommittee of LTC.⁴⁸⁷ The first task taken up by the lectionary committee was the revision of the “old line” historic western pericopes. They considered that “a helpful and necessary step toward consideration of the [three-year Roman Catholic] *Ordo*” since its year A was similar to the historic pericopes.⁴⁸⁸ The criteria they used were:

origin and history of the choice, ecumenical usage, relation to the other lessons that Sunday and on continuous Sundays of the church year, readability, balance within the canon of the Bible, length of selection, relation to historic emphases of the Christian faith, etc.⁴⁸⁹

However, they noted that they placed special emphasis on (1) relationship of the lesson to the Gospel; (2) “preachability”; and (3) reflection of “the whole counsel of the Word of God,” setting forth “as fully as possible the truths of the scriptural witness to God’s revelation.”⁴⁹⁰ The committee paid special attention to the German-Scandinavian revision of 1970.⁴⁹¹ The lectionary committee recommended that the one-year lectionary be available for Advent 1971 and a “more formal publication and general use beginning in Advent 1972,” followed by a “re-examination . . . within the period 1973-75, taking into consideration the result of work in the German and Scandinavian committees “on the pericopes.”⁴⁹² These latter recommendations concerning reexamination were virtually ignored and, with the positive reception of the three-year lectionary, seemed unnecessary.

ILCW’s response was reminiscent of its earlier instruction to the lectionary group. After LTC expressed its “regret that the lectionary committee has the revision of the old line pericopes as its primary task,” ILCW asked the lectionary committee “to revise its priorities and begin to work at once on a study of the Roman Catholic *Ordo* leading to the formation of a three-year cycle of pericopes.”⁴⁹³ Although the major effort of the lectionary committee was thereafter devoted to the three-year lectionary, a revision of the historic pericopes was made, just before publication of CW-6 on the basis of changes suggested at the LWF Conference on Pericope Reform, held in Geneva in October 1972 with Stanley Schneider representing ILCW.

Some of the modifications in the calendar already recognized by LTC and in use in other Christian groups were introduced in the revision: thus the “—gesima” Sundays became Sundays after Epiphany.⁴⁹⁴ At its November 4-5, 1971, meeting, ILCW approved the “provisional and tentative” revision⁴⁹⁵ to “fulfill an interim function in the churches” while at the same time requesting the churches to authorize a calendar change-over, a new three-year lectionary would be available before January 1, 1974.⁴⁹⁶

At the LWF Conference on Pericopes held in Geneva, October 5-7, 1972, it was explained concerning the three-year lectionary that since "Lutherans in North America exist both in the context of world Lutheranism and immediate context of English-speaking churches, their needs are different from their continental sister churches." The adoption of a three-year lectionary by the Episcopalians and Presbyterians in 1970 and the subsequent adoption of the latter by the United Church of Christ and *The Armed Forces Hymnal* gave strong encouragement to American Lutherans (CW-6, 14f.). The dilemma of denominational vs. ecumenical interests persists. The report added: "Only Lutherans seem still to retain an official interest in a one year system." The conference agreed on numerous calendar changes and recommended them to the churches. (e.g. the Sundays *after* Epiphany; the Sundays *of* Easter; the Sundays *after Pentecost*, etc.).⁴⁹⁸ Principles of pericope selection were discussed. Agreeing that "Scripture interprets Scripture," ILCW noted that its Old Testament selections tried to avoid "mechanical prophesy-fulfillment" relationships with the New Testament.⁴⁹⁹ However, the "consonance" or "interlocking" of lessons on the same day, so that at least two of the three reinforced one another was its way of letting Scripture interpret Scripture (CW-6, 17).⁵⁰⁰

Several difficult issues confronted the committee as they revised the three-year lectionary of the Roman *Ordo*: (1) the function of Lent: ethics or passion history? (2) the use of the Apocrypha; (3) the use of Old Testament lessons in Eastertide. How and when are we to emphasize creation?⁵⁰¹ LTC and Professors Robert Fischer, A.C. Piepkorn and Theodore Tappert advised the committee that the reading from Old Testament Apocryphal books "is permissible but needs to be done with caution in any lectionary to be used in the Lutheran churches." The lectionary committee decided to supply canonical Old Testament lessons as first choice wherever the Roman *Ordo* used the Apocrypha and reconsider the use of the Apocrypha "at the end of our process."⁵⁰²

Several new possibilities emerged in the three-year system which the committee happily incorporated: the theme for the day or season continued but selections were mostly from Matthew in Year A, Mark in Year B, and Luke in Year C, with John scattered throughout—total usage of John being about equal to Luke (CW-6, 20). A second dimension of this option was the semi-continuous readings of epistles—from three to sixteen weeks in length. [See CW-6 indexes for the pattern]. Obviously in the longer series of readings, such as the Epiphany and Pentecost series, interlocking gospels and epistles would often be impossible. The committee's explanation was interesting:

There is a pair of patterns, each with an integrity of its own: the epistle provides a band of blue week-by-week; the gospel has a red thread connecting its readings. But they do not necessarily mix to form purple; each is on its own.⁵⁰³

One interesting variation on this pattern was the “horizontal” use of 1 Corinthians each year during Epiphany season so that by the end of the three-year cycle virtually all of 1 Corinthians was read.

One striking feature about the first lesson was the use of Acts during the six Sundays of Easter combined with resurrection appearances and upper room discourses from John’s gospel. The largest number of the Old Testament selections come from Isaiah, especially chapters 40–66. Next, follows Jeremiah, Deuteronomy, Genesis, Exodus, Kings, Ezekiel, Numbers, Daniel, and Proverbs. Absent are the Judges, Ezra, Esther, Obadiah, Nahum, and Haggai (CW-6, 22). The only New Testament books not used are 2 John, 3 John, and Jude (CW-6, 215-220). Like the Presbyterians, the Lutherans also set aside the readings from the Apocrypha—a decision “made on pastoral rather than confessional grounds” (CW-6, 23).

The debt to the Roman Catholic *Ordo* was acknowledged. CW-6 agreed completely with the *Ordo* about half the time; in one-sixth of the pericopes, totally different texts are substituted; the rest were mostly adjustments in beginning or stopping point or omissions.⁵⁰⁴ The subcommittee pointed to the scope, comprehensiveness, variety of patterns, and sheer magnitude of scriptural material in its three-year lectionary but concluded that these biblical texts must be “personally studied and inwardly digested, publicly read, and outwardly proclaimed.” The theological rationale concluded:

Their power will be released only when the Spirit of the living God, who caused such witness to be recorded “for us and our instruction,” strikes fresh fire in hearts which heed the Lord’s voice (CW-6, 24).

A draft of the introduction to the calendar began by pointing to the difference from the received Reformation calendars and the similarity to the Roman and Anglican ones and asserting that the “basic pattern of the church year has been clarified.”⁵⁰⁵ Both points were dropped in CW-6—probably as counter-productive.

The principal centers of the church year, the Christmas and Easter cycles, were prepared for in Lent and Advent with purple (“the royal color of the coming king”) or, for Advent, blue (“the color of hope). Jesus’ birth and passion were bridged by the green Epiphany season, which ended with the Transfiguration. Lent—without the –gesimas, “a preparation for a preparation”—prepared for Easter, beginning with the purple or black of Ash

Wednesday and ending with the red or black of Good Friday. The Sundays of Easter culminated in Pentecost, when the risen, ascended Lord sent the Spirit. Thus the green Sundays after Pentecost—"the time of the Church"—were also, in a sense, Sundays *after* Easter. The last Sunday, now called Christ the King, "looks back to the ascension and the transfiguration and it also points forward to the appearing" (CW-6, 9f.).

Even the colors caused some controversy. One respondent, rejecting the arguments from tradition, argued concerning Holy Week: "We're Lutherans in North America, and for us, violet (or 'purple,' which is fine by me) is the proper color for that week, and black is the only color for that day." The theological argument was interesting: "Good Friday was a black day, when the Savior suffered and died for our sins. . . . Gratitude, of course, but over all, repentance—black's the color for that! (That's why "O come and mourn with me awhile" [which did not make it into the LBW] is for me, a far more appropriate hymn for Good Friday than "Sing, my tongue, the glorious battle.") Red is the color of rejoicing . . . nothing but black can express the sorrow of Good Friday."⁵⁰⁶ Strange that Lutherans should set aside the *Christus Victor* motif, so dear to Luther, and Christ's glorification on the cross, so clear in John's gospel! The critique continues by rejecting the conflation of Passion Sunday and Palm Sunday, for the latter is a "day of rejoicing (albeit short-lived)." Besides "I have never heard the Passion read on Palm Sunday. . . . The Passion is read on the Wednesdays of Lent . . . but never (in actual reality) on Palm Sunday."⁵⁰⁷

Such absolute statements might have been evoked by Brand's earlier letter: "You are simply wrong about red and Holy Week. Black is not the color of the cross; it is the color of mourning."⁵⁰⁸

The "lesser festivals" (remembering saints from the church's history) contained, as hinted above, some surprises for most Lutherans. Not the New Testament saints, but the subsequent ones caused some controversy. Martyrs and confessors, priests and deaconesses, teachers and renewers (including "reformers"), evangelists, missionaries, pastors and bishops, hymn writers and musicians, translators and mothers—a selective list—but all are included. They come from every century, every continent, and every major Christian group. Controversial were Albert Schweitzer and Dag Hammarskjöld because of their beliefs, Toyohiko Kagawa and Martin Luther King Jr. because of their theologies, and numerous others because of their omission. LCMS solved the problem by excising all except the first century saints, Lawrence (spelled Laurence in LW, p. 9) from the 3rd century, Luther from the 16th century, and C.F.W. Wather from the 19th century—A strange selection by any standards! In spite of criticism, the controverted "saints" remained. Granting the attempt to be balanced, some

omissions seemed indefensible: Philip Jacob Spener, the Lutheran father of Pietism, and William Carey, the first “modern” missionary; Maximus Confessor and John of Damascus are important, relatively late Eastern Orthodox theologians who deserve to be better known among Lutherans.

The prayers *of* (in CW-2 “for”) the day presented some interesting problems. Archbishop Cranmer’s classic translations of the Latin collects had served English-speaking Christians for over four centuries and Lutherans for about 100 years. Translations, plus new and alternate prayers, were provided for CW-6. “In many cases a totally new approach has been employed in composing the prayers in this book” (CW-6, 6).

The subcommittee on prayers decided already in November 1970 that some prayers had to be totally redone while others could be revised.⁵⁰⁹ Even when revising historic collects, it was agreed that there be no compunction to use one sentence, as in the Latin prayers.

When the three-year lectionary was completed in 1972, the subcommittee on prayers turned its energies to completing the prayers for the three-year lectionary. It was agreed that the prayers were to be completed in time for CW-6 to be used in Advent 1973.⁵¹⁰ A year later the subcommittee was dismissed with thanks, its task complete.⁵¹¹

(See comparisons on the next page)

Endings of the prayers were problematic in several different ways. Those that did not end with “Jesus Christ our Lord” or “forever” gave no “cue words” to the congregation to say “Amen” (which had never been a Lutheran strong point anyway). For example, the prayer addressed to Jesus in Holy Week began “Lord Jesus” and ended “in the hour of trial” (CW-6, 76-78; cf. LBW, p. 19). The Good Friday prayer addressed to Christ solved the problem with the trinitarian ending, “where you live and reign with the Father in the unity of the Holy Spirit, one God forever” (CW-6, 80; cf. LBW, p. 20). Similarly, an Easter collect addressed to Christ ended “Alleluia!” (CW-6, 90). It was simply dropped from LBW. LW does not utilize the new Holy Week collects but faced the same issue in a Easter Eve collect ending “through time and eternity” (LW, p. 46).

The wanderings and ultimate destination of the following collects illustrate numerous things about linguistic and liturgical chaos still increasing in ecumenical circles. Under the “old line” Western pericopes the collect for the 13th Sunday after Pentecost in the Roman Missal, the 14th Sunday after Pentecost (Trinity 13) in TLH and SBH, and the 15th Sunday after Pentecost (Trinity 14) in the BCP was the same:

As an example of the evolution of LBW, note this comparison of the Prayer of the Day for the Second Sunday in Advent:

Stir up our hearts, O Lord, to make ready the way of thine only-begotten Son, so that we may be enabled to serve thee with pure minds; through the same thy Son Jesus Christ our Lord who liveth and reigneth with thee and the Holy Ghost, world without end.

SBH (1958), P. 75 /

TLH (1941), p. 54

Stir up our hearts, O Lord, to prepare the way for your only Son. By his coming give us strength in our conflicts and shed light on our path through the darkness of this world; through your Son, Jesus Christ our Lord, who lives and reigns with you and the Holy Spirit, one God now and forever.

LBW (1978), p. 13

Stir up our hearts, O Lord, to prepare the way for your only Son. By his coming give us strength in our conflicts and throw light on the paths we travel in our broken, fear-filled world. Through your Son, Jesus Christ our Lord.

LTC Draft (6-22-71)

Stir up our hearts, O Lord, to make ready the way of your only-begotten Son that at his second coming we may worship him in purity, who lives and reigns with you and the Holy Spirit, one God, now and forever.

LW (1982), p. 11

Excite our hearts, Lord, to prepare the way for your only Son. By his coming give us strength in our conflicts and throw light on the paths we travel in our broken, fear-filled world; through your Son, Jesus Christ our Lord.

CW-6 (1973), 49

The movement is away from and then back to the traditional language of the Advent collects: "Stir up..." the lengthening and then shortening of the hoped for results ("strength" and "light") via service "with pure minds" (becoming eschatological worship "with purity" in LW); note the disappearance and then reappearance of trinitarian ending. It is interesting that the CW-6 variation is a more literal translation of the Latin Advent collects which begin, "*Excita Domine. . . .*"

Almighty and everlasting God, give us an increase of faith, hope, and charity and, that we may [worthily—Missal] obtain that which thou dost promise, make us to love that which thou dost command; through thy Son. . . .

The same prayer supposedly set the theme of the day for the lessons of three different Sundays! But it got worse before it got better! Proposed to LTC for the 14th Sunday after Pentecost by the subcommittee on prayers were the following:

O Jesus Christ, accept our words of allegiance. Then lead us, O Christ, so that our actions also will give testimony to you, Son of the living God.

Proposed Prayers of Day
(March 1973)

O almighty God, you reach out to every land and call men to your kingdom. As you gather people from near and far, let us also be counted among your servants, through your Son, Jesus Christ our Lord.

CW-6 (1973), 105

God of all creation, you reach out to call people of all nations to your kingdom. As you gather disciples from near and far, count us also among those who boldly confess your Son, Jesus Christ our Lord.

LBW (1978), p. 27

Given the confusing ending of the first proposal and the sexist language of the CW-6 prayer, the changes in LBW were not surprising. For LW the following prayer was composed for Pentecost 14:

O Almighty God, whom to know is everlasting life, grant us without all doubt to know your Son Jesus Christ to be the Way, the Truth and the Life that, following his steps we may steadfastly walk in the way that leads to eternal life; through Jesus Christ . . .

(LW, p. 77).

The old Trinity 13/Pentecost 14 prayer for faith, hope and love replaced in LBW the following prayer proposed in CW-6 for the Twenty-third Sunday after Pentecost:

Merciful God, out of your grace and goodness we seek to be delivered from those things that come between us and you . . . (and) between our neighbor and ourselves; through your Son . . .

(CW-6, 114).

This matched Catholic and Episcopal usage but LCMS changed the LBW's Pentecost 23 prayer to the 4th Sunday after Pentecost (LW, p. 65). Indeed, the LCMS substitution for Pentecost 23 seemed to have an anti-

Roman polemic in its reference to those servants who “put no trust in our own merits . . .” (LW, p. 87). The “worthily obtain” of the original Latin collect implies the condign merit of late medieval scholasticism. Moreover, can we obtain faith by love [that sounds like the “faith formed by love” (*fides formata in caritate*) rejected in the Book of Concord]—even it it’s God’s command that we love? Perhaps CW-6 was right in rejecting this collect! Maybe even the Missouri Synod’s moving it cannot redeem it!

Inconsistency in endings remained only in some of the prayers under Petitions, Intercessions and Thanksgivings in LBW (pp. 42-51), e.g., numbers 165; 186 addressed to Christ; 189—the magnificent collect “for your holy catholic church,” ending “for the sake of Jesus Christ, your Son our Savior”; 192, ending “We pray in his name”; 102, ending like 65 with “our Savior Jesus Christ”; 207, addressed to Christ; 208—the beautiful Anglican “Prayer of Humble Access”; 227, addressed to Christ and 232, ending “our Savior Jesus Christ.” There is, of course, nothing “wrong” with such prayers; many are classic. However, if used in public worship, they should either be printed out or people should be instructed in advance if any “Amens” are to be expected!

Whereas the revision of the historic Western pericopes did not provide new psalm selections, the three-year lectionary had whole psalms or segments (longer than the several verses of traditional introits and graduals) for each Sunday of each of the three years. Moreover, these usually differed from year to year—less so for major festivals. Besides attempting to relate Psalter to the themes and new lessons for the days, the subcommittee designed verses from the psalm itself or elsewhere as “refrains” to be repeated as antiphons (CW-6, 48ff.).

Early work on the Psalms was done in conjunction with the Consultation on the Liturgical Psalm, an ad hoc committee of the ecumenical Consultation on Common Texts. Charles Ferguson represented the LTC at the April 26, 1969, meeting. Ferguson’s concerns were for (1) a commonly approved English Psalter (2) based on good biblical scholarship (with liturgical accommodation secondary), (3) including a Jewish scholar, (4) but without attempting a brand new version of the Psalms. Ferguson reported general agreement on these items and also on the versions of Grail, the American Bible Society’s *The Psalms for Modern Man* (Today’s English Version, copyright 1970), and Richard Simon Hanson’s *Psalms in Modern Speech*. (Hanson was a member of this consultation.)

Meanwhile, the Psalms subcommittee of LTC was busy at work selecting psalms. In January 1973, Charles Trexler Jr. joined the subcommittee of Lindemann and Ralph Doermann. Psalms for each Sunday and fes-

tival in each of the three years were selected and a refrain verse designated. In about three-fourths of the cases, the psalm was virtually the same as the Roman Catholic responsorial psalm.⁵¹² Nearly 90 of the psalms were designated for Festival and Sunday use, leaving 61 unused. When adding all the psalms for minor festivals and commemorations, all but 33 were used. LBW dropped Psalm 14, thus utilizing 116 of the Psalms.

Renewing Baptism: CW-7

The first draft of the baptismal rite was presented to the LTC meeting held in June 1971. Built into the CW-2 eucharistic rite, it offered prayers for the day, which could be used on non-festival days. It suggested a procession to the font with presentation of both infants and adults by sponsors.

After interrogating candidates or parents concerning nurture of the child and sponsors concerning their readiness to help, all (including congregation) were asked: "Do you renounce the devil?" [The alternate proposal was: "Do you renounce evil in all its forms?"]. The second question continued: "And all his works?" Finally, "And all his deceits?" This was instead of the traditional Roman Catholic term "pomps" and the traditional Lutheran term "ways." Response to each was: "I do."⁵¹³

A motion was passed to eliminate all reference to the devil on the grounds that "the concept 'devil' is for most people, today, humorous instead of referring to the reality of evil." Later in the meeting, a new motion was passed to reword the renunciation, "the devil and all the forces of evil."⁵¹⁴ In the June 1972 second draft of the rite, the following options were presented: (A) as in the new Roman rite, a three-part renunciation, of (1) "the devil," (2) "and all his works" (3) "and all his empty promises." (This understood *pompa* as ostentatious displays, alluring people to idolatry.) (B) The TLH/SBH version had the devil, his works, and ways. (C) "The devil and evil in all its forms" was used in the Episcopal Prayer Book Studies 18. (D) The COCU interrogation had no renunciation.⁵¹⁵

Next, followed the three-fold question regarding the Creed: "Do you believe in God the Father . . . the Son of God . . . God the Holy Spirit?" Then followed a controverted blessing of the water, with the petition: "Now make holy this water, we pray you by the power of your Holy Spirit (here he is to touch the water with his hand), that those who are here cleansed from sin may be born again." An LCMS Commission on Worship blessing is included for comparison: "Hallow this water by the Word to be a washing of regeneration and renewal in the Holy Spirit so that thy servants, now to be baptized therein, may receive the forgiveness of sins, life and salvation."⁵¹⁶

For the Baptism triple immersion or pouring water on the head was suggested. Then followed the sign of the cross, clothing with a white garment, and presentation with lighted candle. Next, the baptismal group proceeded to the chancel. With the laying on of hands, this prayer was said:

Almighty God . . . who has given you new birth by the water and the Spirit and who has forgiven you all your sins, strengthen you with his grace and give you everlasting life.⁵¹⁷

Surprisingly, no question was raised about the absence of an *epiclesis*.

“Spirited discussion” at the June 1971 LTC meeting focused on “legalistic” questions, absence of risk and suffering motifs, blessing of water, role of sponsors, as well as the form of the renunciation.⁵¹⁸ Other rites were also submitted by the subcommittee: “An Order for Persons Preparing for Baptism,” “An Order for Persons Seeking Admission to Holy Communion,” and “An Order for the Laying On of Hands” in order to “mark a significant point in their lives . . . and request the prayers of the congregation,” e.g. the completion of catechization.⁵¹⁹ These rites began the process of revising the confirmation rites, the theory of which had been altered by a recent study by Lutherans in North America.⁵²⁰ A whole new approach was envisioned to all the initiatory rites.” Hans Boehringer had introduced the rite with “the question of the extent to which the ILCW can ‘lead’ the Church to a new understanding of initiatory rites.”⁵²¹ This “new understanding” attempted to restore baptism to a central place in the life and liturgy of the church. This involved seeing adult Baptism as the paradigm—not as a baby’s rite occasionally applied to embarrassed adults. So it is Baptism, not confirmation, that determines eligibility for first communion and demands catechization, presupposing “repentance and conversion.”⁵²² In fact, the essential liturgical action of confirmation, the laying on of hands, belonged (in the early church) and belonged (in the proposed rite) to Baptism.⁵²³ The subcommittee further suggested that laying on of hands could be *repeated* not only at confirmation but at “a significant stage in a person’s life as a Christian, e.g. undertaking “a new role in Christian service” or transferring to a new congregation or recovering from spiritual problems and “renewing his or her commitment.”⁵²⁴ (This was the precursor of the ill-fated four-fold use of the “Affirmation of the Baptismal Covenant”—CW-8, 15.)

LTC changed the controverted renunciation at its June 1972 meeting from “the devil and all the forces of evil” to: “Do you renounce all forms of evil, the devil, and all his empty promises?”⁵²⁵ The creedal interrogation was also reduced to the single question: “Do you believe in God?” The Apostles’ Creed by candidates, sponsors, and parents was to be the

response.⁵²⁶Boehringer and Ferguson were appointed to reword the blessing of the water. The current proposal was an adaptation of Luther's so-called Flood Prayer from his 1523 and 1526 Order of Baptism (CW-7, 3). The problematic phrases were:

Now we ask, Father, that you enable this water (+) by the power of your Spirit to cleanse those washed in it of their sins.⁵²⁷

In this rite there was not only such an *epiclesis* upon the water but also upon the baptized with the laying on of hands:

Pour your Holy Spirit upon them. Give them the Spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and power, the spirit of knowledge and reverence. Fill them with the spirit of wonder and awe in your presence.⁵²⁸

Thus not only was there an *epiclesis* of the Spirit on the baptized (absent from the first draft, except for the euphemism "his grace" for the Spirit's presence), there was also the addition and adaptation of the SBH confirmation rite's prayer for the six-fold "gifts of grace," (SBH, p. 246) adding "wonder and awe." More significant, however, was the epicletic form of the prayer in the proposed rite, *beseeking* God to pour out the Holy Spirit, rather than presuming to be *bestowing* the Spirit, e.g. "The Father in heaven, for Jesus' sake renew and increase in thee the gift of the Holy Ghost" (SBH, p. 246). *Epiclesis*—prayer for the Holy Spirit—rather than language of impartation of the Spirit became characteristic of all the LBW rites. Still to be resolved was whether the Spirit was to be invoked upon sacramental elements or participants or both.

In the rite prepared for the October 1972 LTC meeting, the renunciation took what was to be its final form (both in CW-7 and LBW): "Do you renounce all the forces of evil, the devil, and all his empty promises?" However, at this point, LTC decided the whole congregation should respond to this question. A three-fold credal question was again proposed and accepted by LTC. Again the form of the second question was problematic. The subcommittee proposed: "Do you believe in Jesus Christ, his only Son?" But the distance from the antecedent "Father" and the insertion of another "I believe" made the phrase "the Son of God" clearer. Similarly, "God the Son"—a parallel construction to the first and third questions—did not allow for the response "his only Son."⁵²⁹

The blessing of the water (now called "the prayer of invocation") was proposed and approved to read:

Now we ask, Father, that by the power of your Spirit you make this a water of cleansing so that all who enter it are washed of their sins.⁵³⁰

An alternate with a blessing of the water prior to the service was deleted. The proposed text for the presentation of the white garment was:

We give you this white garment for God has invited you to share in the wedding banquet of his Son. Wear it unstained until you come to the judgment seat of our Lord so you may have eternal life.⁵³¹

LTC substituted:

Take this robe, for in baptism you have been clothed in the righteousness of Christ who calls you to his great feast.⁵³²

In both cases the imagery of the parable in Matthew 22:11ff. was interpreted somewhat allegorically. With minor changes (viz. the opening verb “put on”) these words were adopted in CW-7. The proposed words with the baptismal candle were:

We give you this light for you have passed through darkness into light. From this moment you must shine as a light in the world to the glory of God (CW-7, 28).

The two-fold imagery—bespeaking both redemption and witness—was simplified by LTC by the substitution of Matthew 5:16.

Two forms of the rite were provided, the second for use without Holy Communion. Also an outline of a shorter service omitted the presentation of the white garment and candle. (The garment was relegated to the rubrics in LBW.) These three options were recommended to ILCW.⁵³³

This Order for Baptism was considered at the November 1972 ILCW meeting. The following responses were made: The “storing up” of Baptisms might (a) minimize the importance of Baptism, (b) require substantial pre-baptismal instruction (c) trouble the consciences of parishioners, (d) place too much emphasis on immersion and on adult Baptism as “the basic model,” (e) the first form might be for adults and the second for children since the latter is for a non-eucharistic rite, (f) the service would be too long; and (g) rather than de-emphasizing the devil, “more attention should be given to the importance (in the early church) of exorcism as a condition and component of Baptism.”⁵³⁴ The rite was approved in substance, allowing for editorial changes prior to publication.⁵³⁵ At the March 1973 LTC meeting, in lieu of the whole initiatory rites subcommittee, Boehringer, Leigh Jordahl, and Gordon Lathrop were asked to give further consideration to the rite for its final editing. Reactions from the subcommittee, which had not worked on the rite since the initial draft, had been requested by Boehringer.⁵³⁶ At the October 1973 LTC meeting, a final question was raised about the historical precedent for blessing newly bap-

tized children at the communion rail.⁵³⁷ The issue raised for some was: Why exclude infants and young children from communion?

Further criticisms were received from Walter Wietzke, executive director of the ALC Division for Theological Education and Ministry, in December 1973. His concerns were that “the significance of the rite will be clouded” by oil, candles, etc., as in the past “the simple direct meaning of Baptism was overlaid with subtleties”; more emphasis on form than content; weak motivation given for infant Baptism; questionable emphasis on immersion. Regarding the “empty promises of the devil,” Wietzke commented: “What is demonic is not that they are empty—but ‘he’ becomes ‘God’ in fulfilling them . . . plus the fact that our motivation is turned from God to other things.” Wietzke’s conclusion was: “With all of this the church still needs a simple, meaningful order for the rite of Baptism—contemporary in its language, expressive of the best in theology.” Yet, Egge reported, Wietzke did not feel “that the questions raised are sufficient to warrant holding up publication. . . .”⁵³⁸ Publication proceeded, and CW-7 was issued in 1974.

Editorial changes made after the October LTC meeting had made the blessing of water even more clearly an *epiclesis*. The November 1973 text, like the CW-7 text, read:

Pour out your Holy Spirit, gracious Father, to make this a water of cleansing.

Similarly the formula spoken with the white garment was changed from “take” to “put on this robe, etc.”⁵³⁹

Affirmation of Baptism as a Covenant: CW-8

The baptismal rite as published in CW-7 had clear implications for a confirmation rite, as did the new practice of early (usually 5th grade) communion divorced from (usually 8th grade) confirmation, as recommended by the Joint Commission for the Theology and Practice of Confirmation.⁵⁴⁰ Most important was the reintroduction of the laying on of hands with an *epiclesis* into the new baptismal rite:

Pour your Holy Spirit upon them: the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and power, the spirit of knowledge and reverence. Fill them with the spirit of wonder and awe in your presence (CW-7, 28, par. 21).

This rejoining of liturgical texts, praying for the Spirit, and the ritual action of laying on of hands marking that gift, ended the bifurcation that gave rise to confirmation as a separate sacrament in the medieval church and as the *central* sacramental “non-sacrament” among Lutherans since the late Ref-

ormation. (This happened in spite of the fact that the Lutheran reformers and their confessional writings clearly rejected confirmation as a sacrament.) Thus in its many-sided Affirmation of the Baptismal Covenant, group confirmation was *not* one of its suggested uses.

ILCW's Executive Committee appointed Hans Boehringer, along with Richard Evenson, Frank Klos Jr., and Frank Senn, for the LTC subcommittee on confirmation/first communion.⁵⁴¹ They met for the first time March 25-26, 1974. The subcommittee agreed on the appropriateness of a rite affirming baptismal promises (1) for those baptized in infancy, (2) for those lapsed, and (3) for communicants transferring or joining from other churches. They also agreed that there be no rite for first communion. Evenson's proposal of six occasions for such affirmation was integrated with proposed periodic baptismal festivals. The policy decision regarding this as a multi-purpose confirmation rite called it a Rite for the Affirmation of the Baptismal Covenant. Senn was asked to draft the rite and Evenson the introductory essay.

It was in Brand's Provisional Rite of Confirmation—designed as a temporary revision of the SBH rite—that the term “covenant” was first introduced. There it was only indirectly linked to Baptism in the address of the pastor to the confirmands: “We rejoice that you have confessed the faith into which you were baptized. . . . The covenant God made with us is forever. Live in it joyfully.”⁵⁴² Such covenant language does not appear in SBH. The addition survived into CW-8, but LBW used “Affirmation of Baptism” and LW returned to “Confirmation.”

The affirmation rite was designed in two forms—with or without the baptismal rite. More significant were four options: (A) confirmation, (B) new members through transfer or instruction, (C) reinstating the lapsed, and (D) renewing commitment.⁵⁴³ The introductory address closely followed Brand's provisional rite:

Dear friends in Christ: In Holy Baptism our Lord Jesus Christ received you and made you members of his Church. You have shared our life together. From God's Word you have learned his loving purpose for [Brand: humanity] you and for all of his creation. You have been nourished at his holy table.⁵⁴⁴

The renunciation follows CW-7. The charge in the provisional rite becomes a question in Senn's draft and the implicit covenant link becomes explicit: “Do you intend to continue in the covenant God made with you in Holy Baptism...?”

The formula with the laying on of hands maintains the imperative form, even though CW-7 had used an *epiclesis* with the laying on of hands. SBH is altered as follows:

Name [SBH omits], the Father in heaven, for Jesus' sake, strengthen [SBH: renew and increase] in you the gift of the Holy Spirit to deepen [SBH: strengthen] your faith, to direct your life [SBH: growth in grace], to empower you for service [SBH omits], to give you patience in suffering and to bring you to [SBH adds the blessed hope of] everlasting life.⁵⁴⁵

The covenant imagery is repeated, and the final sentence of Brand's charge is retained: "We rejoice that you have affirmed the covenant of your baptism. Live in it joyfully."⁵⁴⁶ LTC had questioned the use of "covenant"⁵⁴⁷ but the subcommittee argued, without documentation, that "to speak of a baptismal covenant has strong biblical support."⁵⁴⁸ Brand argued at the subsequent LTC meeting that "in the context of initiation into the people of the new covenant, covenant language is defensible." At the same meeting, LTC recommended the affirmation rite to ILCW for publication.⁵⁴⁹

A serious critique of the rite came from James Nestingen, at that time an editor at Augsburg. Nestingen challenged the distinction in the introduction and its expression in the rite between "God's initiative" and "our response," arguing that God "creates the response in us." The distinction undercuts Baptism as God's "bare naked gift"—"my . . . squalling and squirming does not rob my Baptism of its meaning." The distinction also makes the church manipulative: "This is what God has done, now this is what you must do."⁵⁵⁰ The subcommittee struggled with those issues as they chose the term "covenant." "God makes the covenant with us in Baptism. But surely we can affirm that and then act upon it."⁵⁵¹ Nestingen seems to question the *expression* of faith (which is the creative work of God alone) *in worship*. When he objects that the rite denies the sacramental significance of confirmation, he is correct; for ILCW was attempting to restore the sacrament of Baptism to its place of priority over that which the Lutheran confessions *reject* as a sacrament, i.e. confirmation.

What was clearly a parallel to confirmation, and as close as ILCW wished to come to it, CW-8 described as "affirmation" by participants in "the intensive instruction of catechetical classes for teenage youth" (CW-8, 9). During the affirmation rite, the presiding minister *prays*:

Heavenly Father, through water and the Spirit you have made these men and women your own. You forgave them all their sins and brought them to newness of life. Continue to strengthen them with the Holy Spirit and daily increase in them your gifts of grace: the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and power, the spirit of knowledge and reverence, and the spirit of wonder and awe in your presence; through Jesus Christ, your Son, our Lord (CW8-24, par. 9).

And then with the laying on of hands, the presiding minister *says* (not prays!):

(*Name*), the Father in heaven, for Jesus' sake, strengthen in you the gift of the Holy Spirit, to deepen your faith, to direct your life, to empower you for service, to give you patience in suffering, and to bring you to everlasting life (CW-8, 24, par. 10).

The retaining of the formula that was grammatically a *bestowal* of the Spirit, while denying theologically and liturgically that confirmation or affirmation could do what Baptism already did (i.e. bestow the Spirit). This inconsistency was not corrected until LBW, and that in spite of its restoration of confirmation.

Completing Contemporary Liturgies

Daily Prayer without Ceasing: CW-9

When the preaching services were first proposed in 1970 (eventuating in the 1972 publication of CW-5: *Services of the Word*), Hans Boehringer presented a minority report opposing such services and favoring the renewal of *Matins* and *Vespers*.⁵⁵² Again, the question was raised on whether and how to adapt the ancient monastic hours of prayer to public and private worship. Already in the Middle Ages, the preaching service called *prone* had been created by adding a sermon to *Matins* or *Vespers*. Various reformers modeled liturgies on these offices. Churchly services of morning prayer were based on portions of the three earliest of the monastic services of *Nocturns* or *Matins*, *Lauds* and *Prime*. Evening prayer was drawn from monastic *Vespers* and *Compline*. The SBH General Suffrages (prayers of intercession) were taken from *Lauds* and *Vespers*, Morning Suffrages were based on *Prime*, and Evening Suffrages on *Compline*.⁵⁵³ What to do with this Lutheran liturgical tradition—rediscovered in the 19th century—was the dilemma facing ILCW in the early 1970s.

In 1973, a subcommittee was appointed for the Daily Office, made up of Mark Bangert, Marianka Fousek, Brian Helge, Philip Pfatteicher, chair, and Edward Roe.⁵⁵⁴ The initial meeting was held the following March.

After discussing the expected usage of the offices, the subcommittee discussed the use of the psalter. It was commented that “Lutheran piety is more tied to hymnody than psalmody” and “exclusive use of the psalter may not be compatible with evangelical piety.”⁵⁵⁵ Reflecting the principles and practice of 16th century Lutheran liturgical reform, these comments mirror Luther’s affirming of non-biblical hymns and liturgical texts so long as they are helpful and not unbiblical. The Reformed practice of

allowing only biblical texts (or what is commanded by Scripture) limited their songs, in many areas, to the psalms or their rhymed paraphrases. Thus an early consensus stated: “We recognize that the variation in use of the office should allow for the Psalm(s) to be sung or read or replaced by a psalm paraphrase.” This made a middle way between Roman and traditional Reformed practice. A further principle, which was later to elicit criticism for LBW’s omission of some imprecatory and lament psalms, was stated as follows: “We are agreed to the selective use of the psalter (rather than complete use in an ordered sequence).”⁵⁵⁶

There was not complete consensus on how and which canticles should be used. Compline was to be included but Suffrages remained a question mark. A service of light (*lucernarium*) for Vespers and a baptismal remembrance for Matins were suggested. The following assignments were made: *Matins*—Bangert, *Vespers*—Helge, *Compline* and *Itinerarium*—Roe, the Litany—Fousek, and an introduction by Pfatteicher.⁵⁵⁷ Assignments were due in June so that they could be evaluated and revised before the fall meeting.

Bangert submitted a “week-long cycle of morning services” with “changeable parts” for each day of the week. He acknowledged his debt to William G. Storey’s *Morning Praise & Evensong*.⁵⁵⁸ The rite began with “Lord, open our lips etc.” without a *Gloria Patri*. Next followed the baptismal remembrance with recitation of the Apostles’ Creed—a significant addition to the TLH and SBH *Matins*, an addition which paralleled the Covenant Act in CW-5 and in the LBW Service of the Word. Following the creed the celebrant was to say:

God, the almighty Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, has given us a new birth by means of water and the Holy Spirit and so has forgiven us all our sins. May he keep us faithful to our Lord forever and ever.⁵⁵⁹

The Psalmody was introduced by the traditional *Venite* (Psalm 95) or alternates and on Sunday was followed with a verse from Psalm 150, followed by Prayer of Azariah (35ff.) i.e. the Apocryphal “Song of the Three Jews [Young Men],” *Benedicite, omnia opera* (cf. LBW 18). Alternates were provided for weekdays. Another psalm might follow. Substituting metrical or choral settings was also suggested.⁵⁶⁰

Bangert suggested that—presumably for private use—readings from *Portals of Prayer*, etc. may be substituted. “Silent reflection” was prescribed after the lesson and “may be concluded with a homily . . . an excerpt from the writings of some churchman and/or a hymn.”⁵⁶¹

The refrain, ““This is the day the Lord has made, let us rejoice and be glad” introduced the *Benedictus*, which could be replaced by the *Te Deum* except during Advent or Lent.⁵⁶²

A litany was proposed for the Intercession with a response: “Make us children of light.” The Lord’s Prayer was introduced by the petition: “Lord, remember us in your kingdom [paraphrasing Luke 23:42] and teach us to pray.” As a benediction, the following words were to be used, “May the Lord Almighty order our days and our deeds in his peace.” An *ordained* celebrant could add: “The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, etc.,” accompanied by laying on of hands. Exchanging the peace and a closing hymn were also to be permissible.⁵⁶³

In his September revision, Bangert kept but revised the baptismal remembrance—making it “permissive.”⁵⁶⁴ There was a disagreement at the October meeting, and Bangert was asked to move the baptismal remembrance to the end of the rite.⁵⁶⁵ In the revision, Bangert provided a single service—leaving aside the question of seasonal or daily variation to the subcommittee.⁵⁶⁶ He changed the response in the Intercessions to “Hear us, Father, and give us life.”⁵⁶⁷ It was decided by the subcommittee that Bangert’s addition of a final petition for “the sisters and brothers who are absent” be added to the bid introducing the Lord’s Prayer.⁵⁶⁸ Use of the New Testament benediction (“The grace,” etc.) was to be removed and relegated to a footnote.⁵⁶⁹

Perhaps the most significant change in the office was the substitution of a Psalm prayer for the *Gloria Patri*, the traditional way of “Christianizing” Psalms. This agreement was reached early by the subcommittee,⁵⁷⁰ and the *Gloria Patri* was restored to the opening versicles at the final meeting and was retained in the *Venite* and *Benedictus*. The baptismal remembrance continued to evoke disagreements even at the final meeting. The conclusion “without unanimity” was to place it at the end of *Matins*—as an alternative to the *Benedicamus*. It was to be done from the font and to contain a resurrection gospel and the *Te Deum*.⁵⁷¹

The dropping of the somewhat illogical versicle asking the Lord to “open thou my lips” (at the end of a talk-filled day!) and the substituting of the *lucernarium* were the most striking changes in *Vespers*. The versicles of the *lucernarium* were woven together from Luke 24:29; Psalm 91:5f.; and 1 Peter 5:8. There followed the ancient canticle *Phos Hilaron*,⁵⁷² also paraphrased in the hymn “O gladsome Light” (LBW 279). The Blessing of God for Light proposed by Helge was from the Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus in a modified translation of the one from *Morning Praise and Evensong*:⁵⁷³

We praise and thank you, O God, through your Son, Jesus Christ, our Lord, through whom you have enlightened us by revealing the light that never fades. Night is falling/has fallen and days allotted span draws to a close. The daylight, which you created for our pleasure, has fully satisfied us, and yet, of your free gift, now the evening lights do not fail us. We praise you and glorify you through your Son Jesus Christ, our Lord.”⁵⁷⁴

A “low-key” act of repentance was proposed next—“the least breast-beating form for this that I know”—based on Psalm 141. Helge noted that he had “suppressed verses 6-7 somewhat against my own better judgment as being objectionable to modern people.” The similarly imprecatory language of verses 9f. had also dropped. Kept were “silence” and non-permissive rubrics for incense. Psalms and Lessons followed. The question of using non-biblical (“classic Christian writings”) or even non-Christian readings was raised by Helge, seeking “extensive further guidance.”⁵⁷⁵ The subcommittee decided upon “readings from non-canonical sources, cf. Apocrypha, the church fathers, churchmen. Such readings would be options in place of the homily or in addition to it.”⁵⁷⁶

The ICET translation of the *Magnificat* followed and then the Intercessions, conflated from the “litany of peace” and “ecumenical litany” of the Divine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom. The response was “Lord, have mercy.”⁵⁷⁷

Helge proposed the following prayer:

O Lord, our God, whose power is without compare, whose glory is incomprehensible, whose mercy is beyond measure, and whose love for mankind is beyond word: be pleased, Master, in the depth of your compassion, to look down on us and make us and those praying with us obtain the riches of your mercy and tender pity. For all glory and honor are your due, Father, Son and Holy Spirit, now and at all times, and forever and ever. Amen.⁵⁷⁸

The Lord’s Prayer and New Testament benediction concluded the rite.

Roe’s version of *Compline* began with the verse: “The Lord almighty grant us a quiet night and a perfect end.”⁵⁷⁹ The prayer-as-incense motif from Psalm 141, which followed, was replaced in the next draft by the opening verse from Psalm 92.⁵⁸⁰

Then followed the evening hymn, “All praise to thee, my God, this night” (LBW 278), to Tallis Canon. Alternatives suggested were “Sun of my soul” (TLH 551/SBH 226/LW 488), “At even when the sun is set” (TLH 557 SBH 232). “The day thou gavest” (SBH 227/LBW 274), and “Abide with me” (TLH 552/SBH 576/LBW 272/LW 490).

Roe set forth two “semi-original options” as prayers of confession. More interesting was the “absolution proposal”:

Be firm, O Christian, in the grace of God. In Baptism you are united with Jesus Christ. Know, therefore, that you are forgiven, and consider yourself dead to sin and alive to God. By his power rest in peace and arise in the morning to serve him.⁵⁸¹

In response to criticism on the first draft, Roe dropped the explicit baptismal reference but argued “I wish to retain the sense of our standing in grace and prefer neither a request (may the Lord grant . . .) nor a condition (upon this your confession).”⁵⁸²

The form of confession and absolution remained pretty much intact through the final meeting in January 1975. It was announced at the Executive Committee in March that a new LTC subcommittee on penitential rites had been formed, consisting of Paul Peterson, Walter Bouman, and John Cochran.⁵⁸³ This was to bring consistency and complementarity to the various services. The April meeting of LTC was struggling with the revision of the opening order of confession for the new book.⁵⁸⁴ At that same meeting it was decided to have a modification of the traditional confession printed in a parallel column to the subcommittee’s proposal.⁵⁸⁵ It read: “I confess to God Almighty . . . and to you, my brothers and sisters, that I have sinned. . . .” It ended—not with an absolution by the leader—but with the words: “The almighty and merciful Lord grant *me* pardon, forgiveness, and remission of all *my* sins. Amen” [Emphasis added].⁵⁸⁶ In response to an LCA Review Committee recommendation, LTC voted to include the full “responsive form” of the traditional confession.⁵⁸⁷

Suggested psalms were listed and brief lessons are printed in place. Romans 8:38f. was added to the original selection. The responsory, “Into your hand I commit my spirit,” followed the lesson, then came the office hymn. The traditional *Compline* verses from Psalm 17 were retained, followed by several collects, the Lord’s Prayer, and the gospel canticle, “Guide us waking, O Lord.”⁵⁸⁸

Fousek’s “tentative conservative revision of the Lutheran litany” omitted the opening *Kyrie*.⁵⁸⁹ In the next draft, she added, “Blessed be the reign of the Father, etc.”⁵⁹⁰ Fousek explained that the changes were made “so as to make it no longer a penitential office reflecting quiet piety. This was accomplished most specifically by replacing the opening manifold *Kyrie* with versicles of praise from the Byzantine liturgy.” The subcommittee discussed the wisdom of dropping the traditional opening and decided tentatively there should be two litanies—one penitential and one in a “mode of confidence.”⁵⁹¹ The third draft, presumably in the latter mode, thus began:

In peace, let us pray to the Lord,
 Father, creator of the world,
R/ Receive our prayer!
 Jesus, redeemer of the world,
R/ Hear us in your mercy!
 Holy Spirit, consoler and counselor,
R/ Come to our aid!
 Gracious Lord God,
R/ You are our refuge in time of trouble.⁵⁹²

Then followed the traditional deprecations, “From all sin . . . Good Lord, deliver us.” The same response—or an alternate for both (“Save us, good Lord”) was proposed for the obsecrations (“By the mystery of your holy incarnation”) in lieu of the traditional response, “Help us, good Lord.” The intercessions retained the response added in the second draft, which rendered “beseech” as “implore.”⁵⁹³ In the draft that appeared after the final subcommittee meeting in January, “We implore you to hear us, good Lord” was substituted for the words, “We implore you, good Lord.” More significantly, the *Kyrie* and the traditional plea for mercy were restored to the opening and closing verses, and the proposed collects were dropped.⁵⁹⁴

In April, Pfatteicher presented a revision of Morning and General Suffrages—the latter designed for use at *Vespers*. Instead of the *Kyrie*, with which TLH and SBH began, the Eastern Orthodox *Trisagion* was used: “Holy God, holy and mighty, holy and immortal, have mercy and hear us.”⁵⁹⁵ It had been decided that *Itinerarium* would be dropped or would supplement another office.⁵⁹⁶

One of the important actions taken at the final subcommittee meeting in January 1975 was the approval of Pfatteicher’s draft of *Prone*—a preaching service which might be added to *Matins* or *Vespers*. The subcommittee agreed that, unlike TLH and SBH, the sermon should come, not in the middle, but at the end of the offices. Following the *Benedicamus* and the Lord’s Prayer would come offering, hymn, optional Apostles’ Creed, and then the following Prayer for Illumination (adapted from the *Presbyterian Worshipbook*):⁵⁹⁷

Prepare our hearts, Lord, to receive your word. Silence in us any voice but your own, that hearing we may believe and believing we may obey your will, revealed to us in Jesus Christ our Lord.
Amen.⁵⁹⁸

After the sermon and before the blessing, various collects for the word were given from the TLH Morning Service, the *Concordia Hymnal*, and the SBH collection (see LBW p. 137).

LTC, at its June meeting, revised and approved the texts of the office subcommittee, reshaping Suffrages into a two-fold office for mornings and "other times." These were included with the other already revised rites of the CW series into Liturgical Materials for the Proposed Hymnal and Service Book and submitted to the review committees of the participating churches in July 1975. LTC acted on review committee recommendations at its October meeting.⁵⁹⁹ ILCW approved the texts of the office as amended by LTC,⁶⁰⁰ and the way was cleared for the publication in 1976 of CW-9: *Daily Prayer of the Church*, one of the two ILCW publications reviewed by the churches before publication in the Contemporary Worship series. This must, in part, account for the fact that so few changes from CW-9 to LBW occurred in the office sections.

Comparing the influential *Morning Praise and Evensong* with the end products in CW-9 and LBW, except for overall structure, the individual pieces of Morning Prayer were quite different. Moreover the Roman rite lacked the Paschal Blessing to remember baptism (CW-9, 25-31). *Evensong* used the *Phos Hilaron* on Wednesdays—not as *the* hymn in the service of light. Even the hymnic alternative (LBW 279) is buried in the rubrics of the Minister's Edition (LBW:MDE p.16, par.2). LBW provides alternate thanksgivings (LBW:MDE p. 95), but does not have the variety that the daily services of *Evensong* provide. Thus CW-9 and LBW fix the *Magnificat* as *the* canticle, whereas *Evensong* has great variety. But structurally the similarity is almost total—except for the Lutheran addition of the *Prone* option. Seasonal variants are available in both traditions; these variants, however, were not included in CW-9. While the Lutheran services lack the daily variations of *Morning Praise and Evensong*, the additions of *Prone*, the Suffrages, the Litany, the service of light, and the paschal blessing allow for significant variety.

CW-9's introduction emphasized the office as a way of maintaining "a regular discipline of prayer . . . cultivating a sense of the constant presence of God and of fostering the uninterrupted relationship of [prayer without ceasing, 1 Thessaionians 5:17]" (CW-9, 5). Moreover its "value for meditation" (and this is seen as the chief function of psalmody in the office) and its "unbroken swell of praise" (rather than preaching) gave focus to the primary purpose of *Daily Prayer of the Church* (CW-9, 5f.).

Larry Bailey and Leonard Klein praised CW-9 as "valuable, even if you wait for the arrival of the new hymnal to begin using the new orders." Morning Prayer's "explicit linking of baptismal themes" with the resurrection was of great catechetical as well as liturgical value. The *lucernarium* (service of light) with "Joyous Light of glory" and the Litany linked *Ves-*

pers with the Eastern Orthodox church and the “parts fit together well”—wholly “impressive.” They also found the re-working of *Compline*, Litany, and Suffrages an improvement.⁶⁰¹

Burial of the Dead as a Requiem: CW-10

Ironically, the subcommittee on sickness and death was one of the earliest formed, having its first meeting in April 1970. The only one of its rites to be published in the CW publications was *Burial of the Dead*, also the last of the CW publications and the only one from this committee to be included in LBW. The latter is not so strange, since the rites for the sick and dying were to be included in *Occasional Services*—a work not finally completed by ILCW. The funeral rite will thus be the focus of this section.

Robert Werberg, David Lindblom, Frederick Gotwald, and John Damm were asked to work on the funeral service.⁶⁰² The initial draft was completed and considered at a meeting on May 31. LTC raised questions about the use of Psalm 23 and the Lord’s Prayer, the “diffuse” prayers and the two “massive” benedictions. The committee declined giving “general approval” to the rite and encouraged the subcommittee to keep working on it—a shadow of things to come.⁶⁰³

A second draft of the rite was presented to the June LTC meeting. Questions were raised about the greeting to the mourners, “Peace be with you,” the appropriateness of “Worthy is Christ,”⁶⁰⁴ the interspersing of psalms and lessons, as well as various pastoral concerns.⁶⁰⁵ One novel proposal of this rite was the possibility of having a member of the family lead in the prayers.⁶⁰⁶

A “Very Rough Draft Funeral Service” (third draft) was submitted with the promise of additional material by the subcommittee chair, Johan Thorson. A “final version” was promised within a few weeks.⁶⁰⁷ The next draft is dated 2-17-72. The Job text (“I know that my Redeemer lives”), questioned at the previous meeting, remained at the beginning of the procession.⁶⁰⁸ A long collection of prayers was submitted⁶⁰⁹ which Thorson was asked to edit; he was also asked to prepare an introductory essay on death, funeral services, and care of the bereaved, noting any striking differences from the rites of TLH and SBH.⁶¹⁰ The supposed “final” (fifth) draft of the rite was presented to the October 1972 LTC meeting. The opening baptismal reference, “By baptism we share Christ’s death and by his rising we have new life,” was approved and repeated before the creed. The Job text was likewise made obligatory. Ferguson’s suggestion of Hebrews 13:21 as the benediction was approved. Brand was asked to rewrite the rubrics, and the service was “approved in principle” and submitted to ILCW.⁶¹¹

ILCW approved the “basic structure” of the funeral rite but raised numerous questions regarding details, moods, pastoral theology, and memorial services. The interesting question was raised about a petition in the litany of the committal: “Why should our Lord be asked to weep for us?” Did Jesus really weep *for Lazarus*?”⁶¹² Even stranger is the contradictory request, “weep for us. Wipe away our tears with the courage that only you can give.” It is interesting that the final petition from the requiem mass which had been introduced in the fourth draft was changed from “Eternal rest grant *him*, O Lord, and let light perpetual shine on *him*” to the more prosaic, “Grant *him* eternal rest, O Lord, and let perpetual light shine upon *him*.”⁶¹³

At the March 1973 joint LTC/LMC meeting, the funeral service was not included among the rites recommended for the service book.⁶¹⁴

A sixth draft, including Thorson’s introduction as edited (and changed structurally at one point) by Brand, dated September 7, 1973, was prepared for the next LTC meeting. Brand reversed the baptismal reference and the Job text, “I know that my Redeemer lives,” and introduced it with the Johannine “I am the resurrection and the life,” which now began the liturgy.⁶¹⁵ The litany petition became “O Christ, you wept *with your friends*” [emphasis added] and “light perpetual” became “your light . . . forever.”⁶¹⁶

With Thorson absent, his objections to some of Brand’s changes were discussed. LTC recommended that, rather than publishing the rite at this time, a conference first be held on funeral customs and pastoral care in dying, death, and grief. Subsequently, the funeral service was to be reconsidered and a new rite and manual of practice produced.⁶¹⁷

Thorson reported at the next meeting that nothing had been done yet on the rubrics, the prayers, or the conference. Brand was asked to convene a planning meeting for such a conference.⁶¹⁸ At the next meeting Brand reported that an international conference on death and dying would be sponsored by *Ars Moriendi* of Philadelphia in November 1975. That was to function as ILCW’s conference. Philip V. Anderson, John R. Hanson, Daniel Martensen, Hans Boehringer, and Johann Thorson were asked to attend.⁶¹⁹

The report of the participants drew out the following “religious implications” which they felt were “applicable to ILCW work on the funeral/burial rites.” Such rites should (1) enable bereaved to accept the reality of death; (2) bring perspective through memory—remembering persons in relationships; (3) permit honest expression of honest emotions; (4) place death in the context of creation, suffering, and resurrection; and (5) build continuity between ministry to the dying and the grieving. Further and more specific principles suggested that the wake was for recognizing grief and

remembering the life, contributions, and relationships of the deceased; the service should focus on atonement and resurrection and on the communion of saints; the committal should emphasize resurrection and hope. Symbols of life such as the paschal candle, cross, baptismal garment, and pall were suggested.⁶²⁰ At the June meeting, LTC nominated Boehringer and Anderson, along with Thetis Crombie and Robert Fulton (who had both attended the conference and expressed their interest) as a subcommittee to revise the funeral rite.⁶²¹ ILCW at its subsequent meeting rescinded its previous action and decided to include both funeral and marriage rites in the service book,⁶²² thus putting the subcommittee under time pressure, especially if a Contemporary Worship version was to be published first.

The subcommittee met in October 1975 and agreed on general principles. For example, the Liturgy of the Word was to focus on the Christian understanding of death. The prayers were to be a statement of trust, “commending the deceased to God’s care.” At the grave the emphasis was to be on promise, hope, and resurrection.⁶²³ The re-drafting of the rite was given over to Boehringer. His chief references were the Roman Catholic rite, the Episcopal *Draft Proposed Book of Common Prayer* (DBCP), SBH, and LCMS *Pastor’s Companion*.⁶²⁴ The re-draft was circulated to the subcommittee in time for changes before the spring LTC meeting.

This seventh draft was significantly different in a number of its texts. The resurrection texts from John and Job and Revelation 14:13 (“Blessed are the dead . . .”) used in the Episcopal rite (DBCP, pp. 491f.) were dropped in favor of 2 Corinthians 7:3f., as in the Roman ritual or the CW-2 greeting, “The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ. . . .”⁶²⁵ Similarly the baptismal remembrance in the sixth draft was replaced by Romans 6:3-5 as in the Roman ritual. Processional Psalm 118 was no longer printed in place but became one of a number of options (Psalms 23, 90, 118, Romans 14:7f., Revelation 14:13, a hymn or anthem) which could be sung. There follows the powerful anthem borrowed from the Episcopal rite:

In the midst of life we are in death;
from whom can we seek help?
From you alone, O Lord,
who by our sins are justly angered.

Holy God, holy and mighty,
Holy and merciful Savior,
deliver us not into the bitterness of eternal death.

Lord, you know the secrets of our hearts;
Shut not your ears to our prayers,
But spare us, O Lord.

Holy God...

O worthy and eternal Judge,
Do not let the pains of death
turn us away from you at our last hour.

Holy God...(DBCP p. 492; cf. LW 53:274-276).

In lieu of a *Kyrie* as in the sixth draft, a collect follows.⁶²⁶ Lessons and sermon preceded creed as in the sixth draft. Next came a litany—similar to the one proposed for the committal in earlier drafts—or a series of prayers. The commendation of the departed “into your hands . . . confident that . . . he (she) will be raised to life. . .”⁶²⁷ stopped short of intercession that seeks to influence the destiny of the dead. Brand’s introduction of the commendation in the previous draft was equally modest in form: “May we with them...be partakers of your everlasting kingdom. . . .”⁶²⁸

As the rite was discussed in the April 1976 meeting the approval of the intercessions⁶²⁹ was interpreted by the chair as “affirming the principle of praying for the dead.”⁶³⁰ The vote on the prayer, which asked “give to our brother (sister) eternal life” [“bring our brother (sister) to] the joys of heaven,” “[give *him*] fellowship with all your saints” and “[grant *him*] a place at the table in your heavenly kingdom”⁶³¹ was three positive, one negative, and three abstentions!

Brand gave his answer to the question in an article on “Prayers for the Dead?” as follows:

We say what we would have said at the moment of death had we been present. Prayer that God will give the deceased eternal life . . . should be understood neither as doubt that God will indeed grant such blessings nor as an attempt to “change the judgment of God upon the deceased.” Rather such prayers express the faith and hope of the community.⁶³²

He noted that the reformers’ polemic was directed against “masses offered for the dead, sometimes years after their death,” thus subverting the nature of the Lord’s Supper. “In this polemic, praying for the dead is viewed positively” (see the Apology of the Augsburg Confession XXIV, 93-96). Luther advises clergy to replace masses for the dead with prayers (LW 36:55). Brand concluded, “There is nothing unevangelical about the sort of prayers in CW-10, and they give a fuller expression to faith and hope upon the death of a loved one than would otherwise be the case.”⁶³³

Whereas Brand’s revision began with a second commendation of our brother/sister “to Almighty God,” Boehringer suggested: “The grave may be consecrated in this fashion. ‘Almighty God...you have sanctified the

graves of all your saints. . . . Give our brother (sister) peaceful rest. . . .”⁶³⁴ The second commendation of the person to God is followed by the committal of “earth to earth, ashes to ashes.” This concludes with the Aaronic benediction upon the *departed*⁶³⁵ rather than “The Lord bless *you*” as the previous drafts. Boehringer insisted on the Hebrews 13 benediction here rather than at the end of the service in the church. The concluding versicles were: “Let us go forth in the name of Christ. . . . Thanks be to God.”⁶³⁶

At a July 1976 meeting of a special LTC subcommittee comprised of Boehringer, Pfatteicher, and chair Paul Peterson, the funeral service was revised for an eighth time.⁶³⁷ This draft became CW-10: *The Burial of the Dead*, scheduled for publication December 1, 1976. The major changes included the following: (1) The greeting, “The grace. . .” was dropped. (2) John 11:25f., used in earlier drafts—as in the Episcopal rite—was reintroduced (CW-10, 18). (3) The text, “In the midst of life,”⁶³⁸ was dropped. (4) Five collects were chosen, all from the *Draft Proposed Book of Common Prayer* (with some revisions)—for members, the unchurched, or a child. (5) The creed after the sermon hymn was made permissive (CW-10, 10). (6) The alternate intercessions proposed in the earlier drafts were sorted out for members and for the unchurched, with appropriate modifications to the latter (CW-10, 6, par. 20-23).

The commendation was changed from “Father, into your hands. . .” to “Into your hands, O merciful Savior. . .” It continued: “Acknowledge, we humbly beseech you, a sheep of your own fold. . . . Receive *him* into the arms of your mercy, into the blessed rest of everlasting peace and into the glorious company of the saints in light” (CW-10, 13). Such prayers were to be omitted for the unchurched (CW-10, 6 par. 27, 28a), emphasizing the point that such prayers are not intended to change the eternal condition of the dead.

Psalm 118—originally prescribed for the procession in the church—was now suggested for the procession to the place of interment, along with the Job 19 and John 11:24f. texts. The prayer for the “consecration of the grave” from the seventh draft was retained, but without the heading (CW-10, 15). After the lesson, the commendation and committal were spoken. In the first form the Aaronic benediction was retained. Even in the second, for the unchurched, were the words: “We commend our *brother* to the Lord. May the Lord receive *him* into his peace and raise *him* up on the last day” (CW-10, 16), altering only the phrase from the seventh draft, “his (her) body.” Here the pious hope of eternal peace was expressed with no unwarranted assurances. Again for the unchurched the final prayer was omitted—and it was also restored to its usual translation: “Rest eternal grant *him*, O Lord; and let light perpetual shine upon *him*.” The final “Thanks be to God”

was thankfully omitted and the service ended with the dismissal, "Let us go in peace" (CW-10, 17).

Bailey and Klein found CW-10 "a significant improvement over the turgid, not infrequently morbid, rites in present use." They suggested strengthening the intercessions by adding prayers for Church and world and, at the graveside, "Thou knowest, Lord, the secrets of our hearts. . . ." They defended the petitions for the deceased from Apology XXIV (BC 267.94-96) because "Lutherans have been taught with astonishing consistency that such prayers are not only useless but wrong." They continue: "Nevermind that such teaching may be harmful to the spirituality of those who would commend their dead to a loving God. Lutherans—so they are told—just don't." Bailey and Klein concluded with pastoral sensitivity: "But of course they do, at least in their hearts, and the new rite will allow them to use their lips as well." They argued—not totally convincingly—that such prayer is the opposite of trying to manipulate or change the mind of God. Prayer for the dead, as for God's Kingdom, is "in faith and in the certain hope that he will give it."⁶³⁹

This service, it was said, was not readily adaptable to a funeral home—a "ghastly reality" today! They also opined: "no pastor has any business presiding at the funeral of a genuinely 'unchurched' [i.e. unbaptized] person."⁶⁴⁰

PART II: A LUTHERAN BOOK OF WORSHIP

CHAPTER FOUR

CATHOLICA

THE QUEST FOR A PURE POPULAR PIETY IN LUTHERAN WORSHIP WITHIN THE CHURCH CATHOLIC (1975-1978)

Reviewing by the Churches

The review process by the churches was spurred by the criticisms and controversy surrounding CW-2 and by resolution of the Luther Seminary faculty calling for theological and ecclesiastical evaluation of ILCW's work. The church presidents asked ILCW to draw up a proposal for such a review. The review requested by the church presidents at a meeting March 6, 1974, created a dilemma. Two deadlines were already in place for submissions to the publisher: January 1, 1976, for hymns and November 1, 1976, for liturgies. The logistical problem was how to achieve the review without changing the two deadlines and abandoning the goal of having the book in congregations by Advent 1978. The worship executives (Brand, DeLaney and Egge together with Leonard Flachman, representing the publishers) met in St. Louis to draft a plan for review. The plan calling for an in-process review rather than a final review step was proposed in a letter dated 7 June 1974, signed by Egge.

The plan was approved. The ILCW committees would submit their work to the reviewers in small sections as it was completed. The review committees reviewed the work in sections. This schedule called for the review committees to complete their work in two phases, the first to be completed in 1975, and the second/final review in 1976, with the deadline for the final response being October 30, 1976. This review process was expected to facilitate the spring 1978 publication goal. The review process began in February 1975, and already in April it was clear that the deadline for getting the manuscript to the publisher had to be extended to January 1,

1977. This was largely because of the reviewers concurring with the demands for more hymns.^{641a} Hymn committee consultants concurred with the expansion of the number of hymns from 400 at the beginning of 1975 to 510 at the end of the year. Lists of “hymns in” and “hymns out” spread like wildfire in mid-1975 and led people wrongly to assume that all the hymns not on the ILCW’s “hymns in” process report had been rejected.^{641b} This helped provoke the 15,090 letters received by ALC. This further slowed the selection and review process, contributing to the 569 hymns in LBW and the extension of the review committee deadline until May 1977 rather than October 30, 1976. This deadline would be after both the LCA and ALC conventions, but before the 1977 LCMS convention. Because of the field-testing of the liturgies in congregations done in early 1977 and the pastors’ survey completed in April 1977, the deadline had to be extended to May 1977. The ALC and LCA review committees completed their work by that May.

The way in which the ecclesiastical review was carried out among the four churches was very different. Basically ALC and ELCC simply used a review committee, with ALC also holding one theological consultation. LCA charged its Division for Parish Services with the review, first designating a Consulting Committee on Worship, then the Management Committee to carry out the review. Additionally, each of the LCA seminaries sponsored consultations early in 1977 to get the advice and consent of the faculties. LCMS had, ultimately, the most complex process. Besides the nine person Special Review Committee, there were appointed doctrinal reviewers (censors who acted on all LCMS publications) who reported anonymously: all three persons prepared individual reports on various ILCW liturgies and hymn proposals. The Commission on Theology and Church Relations then entered the process, and finally the LCMS convention appointed a “blue-ribbon” committee.

ALC: Challenging the Consensus

The ALC Church Council approved the review plan in June, and President David Preus asked for recommendations from various boards and the Council of (District) Presidents. Nine persons were appointed,⁶⁴² two more than planned, because of an action taken by the ALC’s General Convention in October 1974. The conventions also resolved that ILCW should “first report directly to DLMC” (Division of Life and Mission in the Congregation) and that DLMC should forward the ILCW report together with its own recommendations to the Church Council. Such reports, in addition to that of the review committee, were to be submitted in time for a report to the 1976 convention. The convention also stressed that the “content of the

liturgy and hymns” as well as “usability and adaptability” was more important than an “early publication.”⁶⁴³ At its first meeting in February 1975, with Omar Bonderud elected chair, President Preus charged the Review Group (as it was subsequently designated) to review hymns and liturgical materials with respect to the Lutheran confessions, as well as their usefulness and adequacy “in meeting the needs of ALC congregations.”⁶⁴⁴ Clifford Swanson, Eugene Brand, and Mons Teig then briefed the group. Initial reactions to the hymn list included concern for more hymns for children and youth, and more contemporary and ethnic hymns. Concerns about sexist language were raised. The list was characterized as “sombre, heavy, plodding. Not enough joy, celebration.” Support for “centrality” of the Holy Communion should not mean relegating the Service of the Word to “second-class status.” Further “no attempt should be made to develop guilt feeling [*sic*] for not celebrating the eucharistic liturgy each service.” Then followed the recommendation that the Service of the Word immediately precede or follow Holy Communion in the book and “that the same number of musical settings be assigned to both.” Concern was also expressed that if confession were “a separate item,” it might be “eliminated in practice.”⁶⁴⁵

At its June 1975 meeting the Review Group (RG) began its task of reviewing the 394 hymns proposed—a task completed at its August meeting. They approved 220 hymns, recommended deleting 59, changing 94, and adding 36, with no recommendation on 21.⁶⁴⁶ Among the deletions recommended were “That day of wrath” (SBH 298)—“stressed negative, lack of gospel”; “Isaiah mighty seer” (TLH 249; LBW 528: used in the chorale communion, LBW p. 120)—unanimous: “plodding text and tune”; “Lord, who at your first eucharist” (LBW 206)—“questionable allusions”;⁶⁴⁷ “Sing, my tongue, the glorious battle” (SBH 61; LBW 118)—“text unclear”; “Victim divine” (SBH 274; LBW 202)—“poor theology; enough communion hymns”; “We all believe in one true god” (Luther’s metrical version of the Nicene Creed. TLH 251; LBW 374—used in chorale communion)—“too long.”⁶⁴⁸

It was difficult to find a pattern in the RG’s recommendations of those hymns that appeared on the ALC’s tally of hymn usage more than ten times: “God bless our native land” was approved unanimously; “O beautiful for spacious skies” was approved with one abstention; “My country, ‘tis of thee” was rejected with seven negative votes and two abstentions; “Mine eyes have seen the glory” was recommended 7/1/1. “O brother man” and “Rise up, O men of God” were roundly rejected. The group was quite positive toward hymns recommended by its members, recommending 14 out of 18, including “Come, come ye saints” which celebrated the Mormon trek to Salt Lake City.⁶⁴⁹

The August meeting also unanimously recommended the so-called Black national anthem, "Lift every voice and sing" (LBW 562).⁶⁵⁰ Nancy Maeker's report on sexist language was forwarded to HTC without acting on any particular points, but rather urging ILCW "to continue to deal with this matter vigorously" for "even more work can be done by the ILCW in eliminating sexist language from the hymns,"⁶⁵¹ a request rather unhelpful in its vagueness. The second meeting had been more specific in asking for reexamination of "certain male images in reference to God, e.g. 'Father'."⁶⁵²

ALC had so far received 9,000 letters which were said to focus on hymns omitted, including Bach harmonizations.⁶⁵³ Already in April 1975, Brand proposed a later deadline for review committee work—March 15, 1976, because of "the clear signal that the hymn list needs to be expanded if it is to meet the needs of the churches as these are perceived by the reviewers".⁶⁵⁴

At the August 1975 meeting the liturgies were dealt with for the first time. The May 1974 *Lutheran Quarterly* collection of the 1973 theological symposium essays was recommended to the group, along with Olson's article on "Luther's 'Catholic Minimum.'" Brand suggested his and Jenson's articles in *Dialog* 14 (1975), as well as Boehringer's "Liturgical Minimalism"⁶⁵⁵ to balance the Olson article. Gerhard Forde had also prepared a memo for the group, questioning the ICET text, especially the *interpolations* in the Creeds "conceived by the power of the Holy Spirit" which "unnecessarily raise questions about or weaken traditional understandings of the virgin birth." He also reiterated as questions the charges made by Olson, Green, Rorem, and others in the ALC earlier.⁶⁵⁶

The RG recommended that "rubrics which may appear legalistic," especially controversial ones like making the sign of the cross, be omitted. It was also moved that the confession contain not just an "enumeration of sinful acts" but a "confession of our sinful nature." Both the absolutions should have a "direct declaration of forgiveness" with "a strong 'for you' emphasis." The RG urged ILCW to "take another look at the liturgical framework of Scripture readings" (e.g., standing for the Gospel, versicles, and responses, having had a split vote on the motion that the Gospel "should not necessarily be given special prominence" by postures or ceremonies or reading by the ordained).⁶⁵⁷

Deletion of the interpolation "the power of" was approved for the Apostles' Creed but not for the Nicene Creed;⁶⁵⁸ printing the Apostles' Creed in place as an option was recommended.⁶⁵⁹ It was carried unanimously that the offertory rite follow the creed "to relate it more closely to the intercessory prayers and avoid certain mis-associations with the eucha-

ristic prayers.” An offertory procession with bread and wine should be considered “optional.”⁶⁶⁰

Great debate surrounded the Great Thanksgivings—their wordy length, their confusing format, but especially their theology. It was moved that the word “great” be removed since it “places undue emphasis upon this one liturgical moment and likewise on the one who presides at this moment.” Furthermore, if an *epiclesis* is used, “it is not to be spoken upon the gifts, but rather for the people gathered.” Finally, apparently alluding to the earlier suggestion of a briefer prayer ended with an Amen before the *verba*, it was moved that the words of institution “be set out by themselves as a proclamation of God’s grace rather than as a part of eucharistic prayer.” These were all carried with one dissenting vote.⁶⁶¹

The RG also recommended that the marriage and funeral services be included in the worship book. The meeting ended with discussion on how the RG could make known to ALC pastors its disagreements with the eucharistic prayers of CW-01 which had recently been mailed. They also sought dialogue with the ILCW committees.⁶⁶²

All the hymn and liturgy committees met in October and ILCW had its annual November meeting before the next RG meeting to which was appended a theological consultation held February 25-26, 1976. The consultants included Gordon Lathrop and Ralph Quere from ILCW; Larry Denef, Wayne Stumme and Robert Vogel from the ALC offices.⁶⁶³

Richard Rehfelt’s presentation regarding CW-7 and CW-8 began with the remark that Lutherans were trying to keep up with the Catholics and Episcopalians in baptismal practice which left him “speechless.” Continuing to speak nonetheless, he asked whether adult Baptism was not the new norm. He found the problem of sin as the context and reason for Baptism inadequately emphasized. Arguing that the symbolism and imagery of candles, white garments, immersion, and anointing were not biblical, he opined that they were also not culturally meaningful to people today. He suggested that such ritual actions, even if permissive, would seem superfluous. Finally, he asked whether the Spirit is given with the water or the oil.

Rehfelt was more positive toward the affirmation rite but suggested that it would take a long time to blot confirmation out of the “Lutheran folk-consciousness.” He felt these rites were “a decade ahead of the church . . . Give us time!”

Wade Davick’s response raised practical and pastoral concerns about having only eight baptismal festivals per year. He reported appreciating

white garments, candles, and the symbolism of infant immersion but said regarding the latter: "I don't know how to do it!"

The discussion that followed reiterated the concern for the undermining of infant Baptism and the ignoring of original sin, as well as CW-8 allowing the original mistake of introducing confirmation to become "a repeatable offense." Concern was expressed about the reference to "conversion" (CW-8, 9). Quere argued the so-called excessive "frosting" of oil, garment, and candle were attempts to "ritualize" the truth of Luther's Small Catechism that the Word makes the water "a gracious water of life," which parallels the *epiclesis* in Eastern Orthodox baptismal rites.

Charles Maahs described the past, present, and future dimensions of the Lord's Supper. He proceeded to analyze each of the eight prayers in CW-01 positively. Maahs argued for diversity and variety and against uniformity or polarization over "false dichotomies" (e.g., eucharist is either sacrament or sacrifice, God's action or our action, and the *verba* either proclaim or consecrate). The discussion that followed James Haney's response (which dealt broadly with impressions of ALC piety and options for liturgical change) surfaced around the question of how liturgical/theological judgments are made (the *lex orandi lex credendi* question), whether the *verba* proclaim or consecrate or can be prayed, and if so, with an *epiclesis*. Fred Lee suggested following the footnote option in CW-01 (p. 15), shifting to "we bless God" (from the prayer form "we bless you") before the *verba*. Gerhard Forde objected that the whole prayer was too sacrificial—the "straight *verba*" were needed. Hans Schwartz proposed a shorter eucharistic prayer. Quere defended the *epiclesis* from a Lutheran understanding of the means of grace: asking God to do what God has *promised*, thus affirming the Spirit's faithfulness and freedom, citing Augsburg Confession V. The fear was expressed that an offertory procession clouded Communion as God's gift by mixing our gifts and God's gifts.⁶⁶⁴

Denef's summary of issues⁶⁶⁵ gave top priority to "a declaration of sin as a context" for Baptism, revision of the renunciation and the exhortations (CW-7, 25-28), and shortening the rite. Concern was expressed about the "multipurpose character" of the affirmation rite and the undermining of Lutheran emphasis on baptismal grace even in the title—as if *our* affirming is more important than *God confirming!* This was the focus of Michael Rogness's written pastoral/theological reaction which argued that if "publicly reaffirming my baptismal covenant after a 'new insight or experience' (CW-8, 15, 4th situation), then I must not have been solidly bound to my baptismal covenant before."⁶⁶⁶ Denef also noted the concern about the possibility of repeated laying on of the hands on the CW-8 rite.⁶⁶⁷

Denef's summary of the discussion of the Great Thanksgiving noted some views of "evident weaknesses": lengthy, poorly written, incomprehensible imagery, tending to "swallow" the *verba*. Finally, some felt there was "no reason for having several lengthy forms of the entire history of salvation as preparation for the words of institution."⁶⁶⁸ One judgment on the revision of CW-2 was:

In general the new service is lengthy, filled with many (too many) options, lacks the spirit of the previous CW-2 services, and is punctuated with ambiguous and at times esoteric terminology and imagery.⁶⁶⁹

Another conclusion was "Make every effort not to print the services in their permanent form in the hymnal at this time." Denef reported that there was "no consensus" regarding the Great Thanksgiving.⁶⁷⁰

The methodological question was taken very seriously at this consultation ("since practice informs and forms the theology of the church");⁶⁷¹ "By what criteria do we determine what is to be included in our liturgical practices? . . . ecumenical practice? . . . confessional heritage? . . . biblical witness? common usage?"⁶⁷²

The Review Group's recommendations regarding the baptismal rite (CW-7) included: the need for a clear statement of original and actual sin as the context for Baptism; revision of the renunciation, i.e. "all his empty promises" (CW-7, 25, par. 15); that the prayers be omitted (CW-7, 16, par. 17); that the Flood Prayer (CW-7, 17 par. 18) be revised to accord with Luther's prayer which, Forde notes, is *for* the baptized, not *about* the water. (In fact, Luther's prayer is half about the water, and half for the baptized. CW-7 has a *one*-sentence petition for the baptized. LBW adds a second!) The group also recommended changing the *epiclesis* from "Pour your Holy Spirit" to "Pour out upon them the gift of your Holy Spirit: wisdom and understanding." The change was not made but strangely enough, the Ministers Desk Edition of LBW speaks simply of "the prayer for the gifts of the Holy Spirit" (p. 31, par. 13). The ALC/ RG also recommended dropping the final sentence regarding the gifts of "the spirit of wonder and awe" which are a "creative" addition to the six gifts mentioned in Isaiah 11:2. (LTC "complied" by reducing the eight to seven, substituting "the spirit of joy in your presence" [LBW p. 124; cf. p. 201]. The group wanted the marking with the sign of the cross to become a permissive rubric—not just the oil—and the giving of white garment and candle to become "subdued permissive rubrics (perhaps in small print or a footnote)."⁶⁷³

The RG recommendation regarding CW-8 was to change the term throughout from "baptismal covenant" to "baptismal," and to have a single

rite with a special section “for confirmation only.”⁶⁷⁴ A change in the prayer (CW-8, 24) was suggested, substituting “sons and daughters” for “men and women” and dropping the gifts of “wonder and awe.”⁶⁷⁵

Regarding the Great Thanksgiving the RG adopted the following:

The ALC Review Group expresses its deep concern with regard to the ILCW proposal for the service of Holy Communion. While we appreciate the efforts of ILCW to bring us into a more ecumenical celebration of the sacrament, we think that it obscures the Lutheran contribution to the understanding of the sacrament. We are not convinced that it represents a healthy development.⁶⁷⁶

The “concerns” that followed dealt primarily with the offertory and the Great Thanksgiving. Other issues had to do with music, format, etc. Previous concerns were reiterated and an *optional* prayer, followed by the *verba*, was proposed, ending in response, “Christ has died etc.” or “Amen. Come Lord Jesus.” Since the *epiclesis* is “offensive in its suggestion that at this moment (that is, when the Holy Spirit is invoked) something unique happens to the elements,” the “standard service” would omit the *epiclesis*. If used in seasonal prayers, such an *epiclesis* “should refer only to the blessing of the people, rather than the elements.” It is clear from this that while the ALC/RG’s reactions to the eucharistic prayer with its *epiclesis* was as strong as many LCMS reviewers, the focus was different. LCMS concerns focused on insuring that the *verba*, not the *epiclesis*, were seen as consecrating; ALC concerns focus on insuring that neither *epiclesis* nor *verba* were seen as consecrating but that the words of institution are simple, clear proclamation only.⁶⁷⁷

The RG also acted on the hymns added by HTC to the November 1, 1975, hymn list. “Alas, and did my Savior bleed” (LBW 98) was rejected as “clumsy . . . morbid . . . erotic”; “At the cross, her station keeping” (LBW 110) was affirmed 5/3/0; “Beneath the cross” was strongly recommended (LBW 107); “Breathe on me” (LBW 488) was affirmed; “Come follow me, the Savior spake” (TLH 421; LBW 455) was rejected for its “dreary tune” and moralism; “Come, my way, my truth, my life” (LBW 513) was rejected for its “obscure text.” They rejected “Creator Spirit by whose aid” (LBW 164) but approved (LBW 284), “Creator Spirit, heavenly dove” (both, along with LBW 472 and 473, based on *Veni Creator Spiritus*) in part because of overuse; “I come, O Savior to your table” (TLH 315; LBW 213) was rejected as “not singable” and too long (stanzas were reduced from 15 to 4; 6 in LW); “Jesus, your blood and righteousness” (LBW 302) was included; “Joyful, joyful (LBW 551) was included; “Kyrie, God Father” (LBW 168) in spite of its being needed for the chorale communion was

rejected again for its “dreary, impossible music”; “O Love that will not let me go” (LBW 324) was rejected as subjective, with “syrupy words and melody.” [The subjective character of reaction to hymns is evidenced in my love for this hymn which was sung at our second child’s funeral.] “There’s a wideness in God’s mercy” (LBW 290), rejected in June 1975, 0/7/2, was approved now 9/0/0; “Wide open are thy hands” (LBW 489) rejected in June 1975 0/6/3, was approved now 5/4/0; “What wondrous love” (LBW 385) and “When peace like a river” (LBW 346) were recommended.⁶⁷⁸

The RG next acted on the hymns on the January 1, 1976, list added by the ILCW itself. “Jesus, the very thought of thee” (LBW 316) was approved 4/3/2 with the observation that “‘sweetness’ prejudices the whole hymn.” “My country, tis of thee” (LBW 566) was rejected again, this time with the explanation of nationalism, “singing a hymn to your country and not to God.” (“O beautiful for spacious skies” was, however, recommended in June 1975.) “O perfect Love” (LBW 287) was rejected more decisively than in June 1975 (0/5/4) as was “Onward, Christian soldiers” (0/6/3) for being triumphalistic and sexist. The RG reversed itself on “Once to Every Man and Nation,” recommending inclusion 6/3/0 but expressing concern about Messianism and sexism.⁶⁷⁹

Next the RG acted on hymns high on the ALC survey: “I need thee every hour” (68%) was not recommended; “More love to thee, O Christ” (73%) was also rejected; “Softly and tenderly” and “Pass me not, O gentle Savior” were likewise bypassed; “O brother man” was again rejected, as was “Rise up, O men of God.” Not one of these SBH hymns was included in LBW,⁶⁸⁰ “Rise up, O saints of God” (LBW 383) being a *new* hymn, except for the tune and the first three words! Contemporary theological concerns prevailed here.

Of the 127 additions proposed, RG recommended against 33 of them and suggested changes in 31 others; 14 other “popular” hymns were recommended for inclusion.⁶⁸¹

The RG had for its major task at its June 1976 meeting preparing its report to the Church Council for the recommendation to the October General Convention. Bonderud reported that 127 hymns had been added since the August 1975 meeting—many “recovered” by the RG. Those not deleted were retained because of “specific liturgical use” or “because the Missouri Synod had pled for them.”⁶⁸² Maeker’s suggestions on sexist language in hymns were acted on (e.g. “Dear Lord and Father of *mankind*” (LBW 506) should be changed to “Dear Lord and Father of *us all*.” “God of our fathers” (LBW 567) should become “God, our creator.” “In Adam we have all been one” should be deleted (LBW 342). ILCW approved none

of these recommendations nor the inclusion of “O beautiful for spacious skies” or “Long ago and far away” also recommended by the RG.⁶⁸³

Recommendations regarding the liturgies repeated previous requests for a “stronger, more direct absolution,”⁶⁸⁴ retranslating in the *verba* “he surrendered to betrayal and death” and “for my remembrance,” dropping “What shall I render” because of the phrase “I will pay my vows,” moving the offertory after the creed, dropping rubrics regarding “how the bread, wine and gifts are brought forward and placed on the altar.” Most significantly, in a 9/0/0 vote, they stated: “We insist that the use of the *verba* without a prayer of thanksgiving must be an option. Option B [a short eucharistic prayer with an “Amen” before the *verba*] does not allow for this practice, which our surveys reveal is the preponderant ALC practice.” They went on to recommend three options, which should appear *in this order*:

- a) The *verba* alone.
- b) A prayer of thanksgiving and separate *verba*.
- c) A prayer of thanksgiving enclosing the *verba*.

The motion passed 8/1/0 with Forde’s “vote against the use of any eucharistic prayer” noted in the minutes. In order to underline their position, *another* motion was passed, to wit: “It is absolutely imperative that, in any case, one option should provide for the use of the words of institution alone” (passed 9/0/0).⁶⁸⁵

Concerning the baptismal rite, the RG asked for a revision or omission of the “flood prayer” (LBW p. 122, par. 9) but they meant the *epiclesis* (LBW p. 124, par. 13), repeating also their relegation of garment and candle to “subdued permissive rubrics.”⁶⁸⁶

The RG unanimously recommended to the Church Council (and thence to the General Convention) to receive and give general approval to the new book with final approval to be given subsequently by the Church Council.⁶⁸⁷ In the report to the ALC Church Council, dated June 1976, drafted by Bonderud and Teig, several positive “conclusions” were drawn:

5.4 Everything in this book certainly doesn’t represent the preferences of our ALC Review Group, but it probably represents rather well the wide diversity of preferences in the ALC. . . .

5.6 ILCW has demonstrated a responsiveness to concerns expressed by congregations and review groups in the participating church bodies. We know of no other worship book that has been subjected to as extensive testing, review, and consultation with the constituency.⁶⁸⁸

At the October 1976 meeting, plans for the ALC General Convention, approval by ELCC, ambiguous results of the LCA convention (more test-

ing with positive results or resubmission to 1978 convention), and future testing procedures and introduction processes were all discussed.⁶⁸⁹

The review of the revised Hillert setting was “very positive”; Nelson’s revision of his CW-2 setting evoked “an overall feeling of disappointment,” having anticipated it would remain “uniformly ‘hymnic’ and rhythmically strong”; the reaction to Cartford’s revision of SBH Setting 2 was non-committal, warning that it would be misleading to bill it as a “slight variation.”⁶⁹⁰

Concerning Morning and Evening Prayer the question was raised about whether many congregations would use them or “whether a small special interest group wasn’t being served” (e.g., college and seminary students).⁶⁹¹

The RG held its initial review of the funeral rite (CW-10). They questioned having the procession mandatory and printing alternate prayers (CW-10, 8f.) in place, favoring their location in an altar book “to avoid questions which cause offense in the choice of prayers.”⁶⁹² They expressed “considerable uneasiness with the repeated prayer for the dead” but appreciated the “proclamatory note in the prayer” (cf. CW-10, 11, left col.).

Surprisingly enough, Forde presented to the RG the 1976 revision of the liturgy of the Church of Norway which “deals quite well with the option of the Great Thanksgiving . . . presented in a very unconfusing manner.”⁶⁹³ Brief eucharistic prayers followed the *Sanctus* and preceded immediately the Lord’s Prayer (as in the LCMS liturgy in TLH and LW). One of the texts was as follows:

We praise thee, holy God, Lord of heaven and earth, you who have loved the world and given your Son Jesus Christ, that he should save us from sin and death, and win for you a holy people. In faith in him and united with all your children we pray the prayer your Son has given us:

Then follow the Lord’s Prayer and the *verba*. The presider continues:

Therefore, Lord, we celebrate this meal with joy and thanksgiving for your completed sacrifice, in faith in your victorious resurrection and ascension, and in anticipation of your coming again in glory. We pray you, grant that we who come to your table to receive your body and blood to [*sic*: may?] appear before your face with humble and sincere hearts. Unite us with yourself as the branches with the vine, teach us to love each other as you have loved us, and gather us one day with you in your fulfilled kingdom.⁶⁹⁵

A motion was passed 8/0/0 referring to ILCW “the new Norwegian liturgy as a satisfactory way to offer options without confusion in the flow

of the service.” It is fairly clear that this form of eucharistic prayer without the option of the bare *verba*, would not have been “satisfactory” to the RG, much less to Forde! That a Swedish prayer (LBW p. 70. par. 33) was chosen adds to the irony!

The RG, having suggested that ILCW “do something on this order,” preceded to flesh out its apology for the “*verba* alone” option, placed first. One of the arguments cited was ALC practice: 43.5% of the congregations “always use the *verba* alone” and only 15% seldom or never use the *verba* alone, according to surveys of “present practice” in ALC. They conceded: “If there is absolutely no possibility” of placing the *verba* first even in the final test liturgy, “we must insist that the three options be clearly designated by a change in the rubric, etc.” The concern was this if the need for “*verba* alone” was to be fairly evaluated, that option too must be tested.⁶⁹⁶

Hans Schwartz presented the proposal regarding the psalter. The RG adopted a statement objecting to the printing of the whole Psalter. Some of their reasons were:

- 1) Psalms are not so widely used as to necessitate the complete Psalter.
- 2) The “specifically Old Testament character of many of the psalms does not recommend their inclusion in a worship book of the church (e.g., psalms asking revenge etc.).”
- 3) “...the complete Psalter would be inappropriate to the limitations and balance of the book.”
- 4) “...we request that at most only those psalms and parts of psalms be included that are chosen for the lectionary.”⁶⁹⁷

Concerning the daily prayer services, the RG states: “We are not particularly impressed with the quality of the music.” Most of the specific criticisms had to do with difficulty. Broader-based testing at other institutions and/or congregations was called for: “Just one community in the Wartburg area is not good enough.” The response to *Compline* was generally negative: the chant, if used, needed revision but the RG recommended it be spoken. The larger question of its “usability on the congregational level” was raised, as well as “whether the office should be in the book at all.”⁶⁹⁸

In the Brief Order for Confession and Forgiveness, the RG reaffirmed the need for a direct absolution but objected to the language in the second absolution that “seems to make the efficacy of the absolution depend on certification of ordination” (cf. TLH, p. 16).⁶⁹⁹ The objection was to the Missourian language, “I . . . a called and ordained servant of the Word . . . forgive you.” However SBH’s language was not significantly different:

“As a minister of the Church of Christ and by his authority, I declare . . .” (SBH p. 248; cf. p. 252). The RG asked for “rewriting of this absolution.”⁷⁰⁰ Instead, it was used in Individual Confession (LBW, p. 197, par. 6).

The RG also objected to the dialogical confession/absolution by both pastor and congregation. Here the objection is a strange counterpart to the ordination link: “Some feel that it suggests that the authority of the pastor’s absolution depends on his prior confession.”⁷⁰¹ The RG’s alternative was not followed, and this dialogue confession reappears in *Compline* (LBW p. 155).

The RG seemed satisfied by the removal of the “repeatability” of the affirmation rite. They also suggested the title “Affirmation of Baptism.”⁷⁰²

In an October 5 memo to ALC commissioners on ILCW, Brand expressed his frustration with the ALC review process. He noted that the Review Group had just met without inviting LMC Chair Cartford (contrary to Brand’s suggestion) to help interpret the music. He agreed that the materials must “stand on their own” but “that does not imply that materials can be evaluated fairly without knowing anything of the process by which they came to be.” Brand continued, “One cannot understand why certain music has been accepted without knowing why other music has been rejected.” Brand bemoaned that fact that, unlike LCA, the ALC/RG did not have ILCW representation, yet he feared that pushing for such representation would be seen as inappropriate “advocacy for the materials as they are.” He concluded with the opinion that the tone for the RG was set by the Augsburg Publishing House CEO Albert Anderson, Chair Omar Bonderud and President David Preus, and that staffer Mons Teig had little to say about policy.⁷⁰³

The ALC General Convention in October 1976 basically accepted the positive recommendation of the Review Group and the Church Council and gave “general approval” to the “Inter-Lutheran Worship Book,” authorizing the Church Council to “approve for publication” after final field-testing and RG recommendations were received.⁷⁰⁴

Interestingly enough, Brand was invited to attend the penultimate meeting of the RG held in March 1977. After a status report, Norman Wegmeyer reported on the ALC field test. Among the recommendations was the interesting idea designating Christmas Eve the “Vigil of Christmas”—paralleling the newly introduced vigils of Easter and Pentecost.⁷⁰⁵ Having failed approval, LBW retains its rubrics for “Christmas *Day*” only, beginning with a prayer for “this holy *night*” (LBW, p. 14). No alternative to Augsburg’s “Candlelight Service” of carols and readings is provided for Christmas Eve!

Corrections were also offered for the Passion preface, changing “he” to “the evil one” (cf. LBW/MDE, p. 212) and “alike eternal” to “co-eternal” in the Athanasian Creed⁷⁰⁶ (LBW p. 54 line 18). A grammatical correction was suggested for the TLH-style wording in the Corporate Confession which speaks of “iniquities with which I have offended you and justly deserve your punishment now and for eternity.”⁷⁰⁷ The RG, quibbling with the preposition, suggests adding “for which.”⁷⁰⁸ When the correction appeared pasted over the original text of the penultimate revision of liturgical texts (April 1977, p. 48), it read, “. . .for which I justly deserve your punishment” (dropping “now and for eternity”). (LCMS reinserts the idea as “present and eternal punishment” [LW, p. 158].)

The RG continued to press for changing the absolution from the “ordained” *forgiving* to the “minister” *declaring* forgiveness. Even in Individual Confession they noted “the lack of a declaration of forgiveness” and suggested contrary to Luther’s Small Catechism, that the absolution “correspond with our previous recommendation,” i.e. to *declare* forgiveness rather than to *forgive*! The RG also suggests that the now grammatically correct Corporate Confession also be used in the Brief Order at the beginning of Communion, in lieu of the mutual confession/absolution from *Compline*, but retaining the absolution that “declares” rather than “forgives.”⁷⁰⁹

The RG protested the rubrics on the offertory, suggesting that not only an offertory procession but other options be spelled out in the book. (Ultimately all details were relegated to the general rubrics.) The RG remained unsatisfied regarding the clarity of the *verba*-only option and requested that the rubrics and format clearly indicate that option. Ironically, the repeated motion to change the translation “new covenant sealed by my blood” to “in my blood” failed this time (4/5/0) but the old recommendation ultimately prevailed in LBW (cf. LBW p. 69). The other change, from “for my remembrance” to “in remembrance” passed the RG again (7/1/1) but ultimately did not prevail in LBW.⁷¹⁰

The RG recommended one, if not three, new musical settings of “Create in me,” as well as retaining “Jesus, Lamb of God” from CW-2, setting 2.⁷¹¹ At the same time they suggested reducing the number of canticles by eliminating the other renditions of the ordinary, *Gloria*, *Sanctus*, etc.⁷¹²

The Service of the Word, Evening Prayer, *Compline*, and Responsive Prayer were approved with little or no comment. It was recommended that in Evening Prayer and Morning Prayer the sermon follow the lessons. It was also suggested that the paschal blessing be omitted in Morning Prayer and that the music be redone. The anthology of prayers drew “general dis-

appointment” with the translation whereas the Psalm prayers received “high praise.” Three alternative eucharistic prayers were approved: those by Jenson (cf. CW-01, I), Reed (cf. SBH, p. 11), and Hippolytus (CW-01, II). The common eucharistic prayer (CW-01, VII) was rejected 4/3/2. The RG also asked that the *verba* be standardized, Hippolytus being different, and that the *epiclesis* in Hippolytus and SBH be modified to “exclude the gifts,” i.e. that the Spirit be invoked only on the people, not the elements.⁷¹³

In his report to the president, Bonderud emphasized the RG’s continuing concern over the omission of original sin in the confession, the inclusion of the whole psalter, and the numbering of Sundays after Pentecost, rather than Trinity.⁷¹⁴

In his preparatory memo for the final meeting, Teig reported the JLC solution to the omission of original sin in the confession without using the words: that we are “by nature sinful and unclean.” The new proposal was: “We confess that we cannot free ourselves from bondage to sin.”⁷¹⁵ The RG had to proceed without the JLC minutes, but Teig had provided detailed notes.⁷¹⁶ Teig also reported that the JLC declined the RG recommendations regarding “merging” Christmas Eve and the Vigil of Christmas since the latter had different traditional texts. For good or ill, this left the church’s best-attended day of worship without significant guidance as to options for liturgical worship on Christmas Eve (see LBW:MDE p. 123).

The meeting began with a report of the machinations within LCMS in light of the recommendation by the Commission on Theology and Church Relations’ of “no action” on the hymnal. President David Preus’s meeting with ALC’s commissioners to ILCW on the eve of the May 17 ILCW meeting was announced.⁷¹⁷

The RG recommended against the provisional “Episcopal solution” of having lesser festivals take precedence over the “green Sundays.”⁷¹⁸

Old issues returned in a final crusade. The concession regarding adding original sin in the Brief Order was not yet satisfactory and was changed to read: “We confess that we are in bondage to sin and cannot free ourselves.”⁷¹⁹ The absolutions were not yet satisfactory. The RG charged that the first option was merely “a statement of general truth and not an absolution.” They recommended either changing “us” to “you” or the following:

In the mercy of Almighty God, Jesus Christ was given to die for us. In his name, I declare to you the forgiveness of all your sins. To those who believe in him he gives power to *be* (changed from *become*) children of God, and bestows on them his Holy Spirit.⁷²⁰

Interestingly enough, the RG gave up trying to substitute the SBH-style absolution (with the “minister . . . declaring”) for the TLH-style (with

the “ordained . . . forgiving”), but ILCW made the change in its May meeting. The RG remained adamant about the Brief Order appearing with each of the settings—not just once as projected by ILCW.⁷²¹ They also insisted that the non-communion ending be included with each service. The RG also recommended that the dismissal, “Go in peace,” be included as optional in communion and non-communion services.⁷²²

The RG recommended uniform terminations for the lessons—either “Here ends the lesson” or “This is the Word of the Lord.” Regarding the offertory, the RG proposed for the LBW itself the simple rubric “The offering is received while the table is prepared.” They continued to argue for “he descended to the dead”—at least in a footnote. On the *verba*, they listed its preferences in order: First, “Do this in remembrance of me,”; then “Do this for my remembrance.” They remained unsatisfied by any of the four solutions to the issue of the format of *verba* and eucharistic prayers and continued to argue their preference for *verba* alone first.⁷²³

Regarding the baptismal rite, they continued to press for a discussion in the general rubrics, such that “whenever there is a difference between doctrine and liturgical practice, that this difference be clarified.”⁷²⁴ Presumably that means that such liturgical actions as might seem to contradict Lutheran doctrine either be harmonized or explained as mere rituals without doctrinal import. It would seem that the *epiclesis* and anointing were in view. The ancient issue of *lex orandi, lex credendi* reemerges.

The RG expressed its strong desire for the inclusion of the Psalm prayers for devotional use. They suggested that the extra canticles for the ordinary (*Gloria*, etc.) be given lower priority than Psalm prayers and Psalms. A number of suggestions of more inclusive language were made in the anthology of prayers.⁷²⁵

The RG asked for a report of the May ILCW meeting and a draft resolution to be prepared by Bonderud and Teig and voted on by mail ballot. They also assigned to John Setterlund, Jerry Evenrud, Forde, Teig, and Bonderud the task of “monitoring” the altar book.

Bonderud outlined for President Preus the major recommendations and the several non-negotiables emerging from the RG meeting.⁷²⁶ In his status report following the May ILCW meeting, Bonderud reported satisfactory changes in the Brief Order. He reported (incorrectly, as it eventuated) that the LBW rubrics (and not just the general rubrics) would make mention of the offertory option of the elements already on the altar. (The final result in fact followed the RG preference for a simple statement without any options.) He reported on ILCW’s retention of “Do this for the remembrance of me” and of assurances regarding uniform *verba* (which did

not happen with the Hippolytus prayer). The conclusion for non-communion services, like the Brief Order, was to be printed with each setting. Only psalms called for in the lectionary were to be included in LBW, but all psalms with Psalm prayers were to appear in the Ministers Desk Edition. Besides these designated “critical issues,” Bonderud reported the alternate *descensus* footnote, the deletion of “Once to every man and nation,” the optional relocation of the sermon in Morning and Evening Prayer, and the lesser festivals taking precedence over Sunday lections. He concludes that ILCW took seriously ALC concerns. Bonderud then prepared and sent a four-page resolution (reviewing the RG’s charge and the ILCW’s final action) calling on the Church Council to accept and approve the manuscript of LBW. The ballots were sent July 1. That same day he wrote Brand expressing the concern that the three options for *verba* and eucharistic prayer be placed “without prejudice.” He commented that Flachman’s latest typographical solution was “no solution.” He found it “confusing, complicated, and extremely difficult to follow.” He added that the RG “would reject it out of hand.”⁷²⁷ In his report to the RG of their unanimous approval, he promised, regarding the format: “I’ll pursue this to keep Gene honest.”

The resolution, along with a report by Bonderud, was submitted to the August Church Council meeting. President Preus was quoted as saying: “I intend to recommend to the Church Council that the ALC go ahead with the book no matter what decisions others make.”⁷²⁸ The handwriting was already on the wall in St. Louis! In June, the LCA Division for Parish Services had recommended to the Executive Council that it give final approval to LBW at its September meeting.⁷²⁹

ELCC: Affirming the Process

At its initial meeting in March 1975, the Material Review Committee (MRC) of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Canada was briefed by Pastor L.R. Likness of ILCW. Dr. G.O. Evenson was elected chair. After affirming ILCW’s plan not to include marriage or burial rites in the pew edition, they recommended that the range in hymns be no higher than D. The minutes record this concern: “While we felt the Church ought not to be visibly in the forefront for equal rights for male and female, it ought not to be swept up into the fad of feminism.” The point concludes: “We should realize that the language of the Bible is not neuter. We should make people understand that gender is necessary.”⁷³⁰

There were numerous hymns for which the MRC sought “reconsideration:” “All people that on earth do dwell,” “Draw near and take the body,” “Savior when in dust” (all of which were eventually incorporated in LBW). Among the hymns they recommended for inclusion not currently

recommended by ILCW were: “Jesus, the very thought of thee” “What Child is this,” “Silent night,” and “Now the green blade rises.” Their preferences regarding tunes were followed in these instances: the tune *O Jesu Christe, wahres Licht* (TLH 512) for “O Christ, our light” (LBW 380); and the tune *Lobt Gott, Ihr Christen* (SBH 197) for “Oh, happy day” (LBW 351). One wonders whether the animus against Bach led to the continued rejection of the MRC’s suggestion to keep *Freut dich sehr* (SBH 71) for “On my heart imprint your image” (LBW 102). Interestingly enough, the MRC also preferred the rather literal rendering of “Day of wrath” (*Dies Irae*) in TLH 607 (but perhaps not all 19 stanzas) to SBH’s short form (SBH 298—3 stanzas) or the hymnic version finally adopted in LBW 321.⁷³¹

From the ILCW’s list of possible “gospel hymns,” the MRC recommended “Blest be the tie” and “Earth and all stars” with the note that “some members were not too happy” with the failure to include any gospel hymns. MRC wanted to delete “Faith of our fathers,” “Jesus, Savior, pilot me” and “Nearer, my God, to thee” (“theology is bad”)—and were successful in the last instance.⁷³²

In their October 1975 meeting, the MRC took up the liturgies after the observation of one member that, whereas “most liturgical denominations are stressing greater freedom, variety, and simplicity in worship,” the Lutheran liturgy is now being made “more ornate and prescriptive.” As a case in point, regarding the Brief Order, “Why make the sign of the cross prescriptive?” Concerning the offertory procession, a “may” rubric is also recommended. Jenson’s Great Thanksgiving (CW-01, 18, par. 3) was modified by omitting that the Spirit “vivify” the elements; for “Christ is present in the sacrament because of his words not because we pray that the Spirit will vivify the elements.” Nonetheless the *epiclesis* with the Spirit blessing “this bread and cup” was left standing. The MRC further recommended retaining the Nelson Setting 2 from CW-2 because of its vigor and joyfulness which they found “lacking in this new setting” (Hillert’s setting in the fall 1975 Holy Communion For Trial Use).⁷³³

Opinion was divided on the use of white garments and candles in Baptism. “Is not the word and the water sufficient?” the secretary asks rhetorically. The MRC had a problem with the suggestion of baptismal festivals and with the stress on “adult Baptism as normative.”⁷³⁴

The MRC expressed appreciation for the Service of the Word; “Responsorial Prayers” was deemed a better title than “Suffrages.” ILCW’s departures from the ICET text of the *Nunc Dimittis* was questioned.⁷³⁵

The March 1976 meeting dealt almost exclusively with hymns from ILCW’s “final proposal” of November 1975. Most interesting are their

general recommendations. The MRC requested “God save the queen” as the Canadian “national hymn” and regreted “the inclusion of so many of the old, staid German tunes and hymns which seem to come direct from TLC” (TLH?). They complained: “They do not make for a singable hymnal . . . with their irregular meter. . . . It seems very retrogressive.” They also pontificated, presumably against TLH: “No hymn needs more than five verses, certainly not eight to twelve as some have. . . . SBH followed this more or less and nobody complained that more verses were needed.”⁷³⁶

Affirming and elaborating on the translational principle Brand explained, the MRC asserted that “a text or translation by a non-living person ought not to be altered unless it is thought to be important [enough so] as to justify a new translation.” As in the meeting a year earlier when the MRC objected to “didst” and “dost” in one of the hymns, so now it challenged “hath” in another, “doth” and “hath” in a third, and “ye” in a fourth, in spite of the “generation from which [they] originate.”⁷³⁷

It was suggested that the third stanza of “Once to every man and nation” be omitted since there are “no new Calvaries” (not to mention no new Messiahs!). ALC and LCMS had also pointed this out! Only one minor change was suggested on liturgical materials, from “Yea” to “Yes” in Advent propers.”⁷³⁸

At its June 18, 1976, convention the ELCC approved the texts of Holy Communion and authorized the Church Council to give approval to the final texts upon recommendation by MRC. Thus the new worship materials were approved in principle “as an official hymnal and service book” for the ELCC.⁷³⁹

In their April 1977 meeting, the MRC debated but did not recommend changing the *epiclesis* in the Hippolytus prayer that read: “Send your Spirit upon these gifts. . . .” In confirmation the MRC favored rewording the “blessing” into a “prayer” for the Holy Spirit (CW8-24, par. 10; cf. LBW p. 201, par. 16). The MRC characterized one set of prayers⁷⁴⁰ as “easily understood as praying for a change in the status of the departed,” (e.g., “give to our *brother* eternal life,” “bring our *brother* to the joys of heaven,” “give *him* fellowship with all your saints).”⁷⁴¹

Concerning the Brief Order, the MRC suggested adding an opening phrase (from Holy Baptism), hence: “We (who are born children of a fallen humanity) confess. . . .” They also recommended an *alternate* absolution for both Individual and Corporate Confession, substituting, “I therefore declare to you the gracious forgiveness of all your sins.” in addition to the catechism’s “I forgive you” formula. Surprisingly the MRC did not suggest the same alternative for the Brief Order.⁷⁴²

The MRC objected to the universalism it felt was implied in the question asked of those making the affirmation: "Do you intend . . . to see Christ and serve him in all people. . . .?" (CW-8,24, par. 7). MRC recommended ". . . to follow the example and command of Christ to serve all people" (cf. LBW, p. 201, par. 14). Though they succeeded at that point, their suggestion to change "strive for justice" to "pray for justice" failed.⁷⁴³

With these "suggestions for minor revision," the MRC concluded: "We heartily endorse the *Lutheran Book of Worship* for use in the ELCC and recommend its final approval by the Church Council."⁷⁴⁴

At its September meeting the ELCC Church Council approved the LBW as "an official hymnal and service book of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Canada."⁷⁴⁵

LCA: Confirming the Trend

Like the LCMS process, the LCA review had several levels. The Consulting Committee of Worship (CCW) forwarded its recommendations to the Management Committee of the Division of Parish Services (DPS/MC) which concurred, added or dropped recommendations which were then transmitted to ILCW. These recommendations were usually treated together when possible; the differences in these committees are noted where available and significant.

The CCW voted (4-3) at its initial meeting in February 1975 that the familiar tune, Hamburg, be used with "When I survey."⁷⁴⁶ "How great thou art" was recommended "with a revision of the text" as an "excellent vehicle for the inculcation of good theology, in spite of its association with the Billy Graham crusades." "Mine eyes have seen the glory" is recommended for "great music, great theology, eschatological." Similarly, "Once to every man and nation" was proposed since the "text is not out of harmony with Lutheran theology; exalted poetry; an important part of American heritage." Also proposed was "Turn back, O man" for its "good theology" complementing some Gospel readings.⁷⁴⁷

Among the deletions the CCW recommended were "Eternal Spirit of the living Christ" (LBW 441) for trite poetry. They recommended deleting the following Gospel hymns: "Great is thy faithfulness," "He leadeth me," "Softly and tenderly" (SBH 531, LBW 334) and "When peace like a river" (LBW 334). Of all these hymns it was said:

Sentimentality clouds the evangelical thrust. Lutheran emphasis should be on the act of God in Christ, not on subjective response or feeling. The theology reflected in these songs is escapist, inappropriate in a day when the church is rediscovering her outreach into the secular world.⁷⁴⁸

Then they added that the “music is of poor quality for congregation singing.” Yet there was “strong endorsement” of the following “spirituals”: “What wondrous love,” “Were you there,” “Let us break bread together,” and “There is a balm in Gilead” (the only one of these “spirituals” *not* included in LBW). And then came a strange, almost poignant, request: “That where tunes have not yet been selected for texts, the SBH tunes be used,” the rationale being “Many of the hymn tunes selections seem not to be in the LCA tradition.”⁷⁴⁹ Another faint protest against Missouri’s influence!

On liturgical matters, the DPS/MC recommended that the wedding and funeral rites be included in the new service book and that SBH Setting 2 be adapted for inclusion.⁷⁵⁰

With the next round of CCW and DPS/MC meetings came the following recommendations: To achieve more options and less verbosity in the office, it was suggested to use “indented paragraphs in the prayers.” It was also recommended that the *mutual* confession be restored to *Compline* but with the following twist: The congregation “offers a prayer for forgiveness” for the presiding minister whereas the latter “declares absolution.”⁷⁵¹ The materials they were reviewing followed the confession with this absolution-turned-petition: “The almighty and merciful Lord grant me pardon, forgiveness, and remission of all my sins.”⁷⁵²

It was also recommended to delete that same text (however in absolution form, “. . . grant you”) from the middle of the communion—after the prayers and the Prayer of Humble Access and before the peace and the offertory. This was a permissive section, suggested when the opening Brief Order was not used. The DPS/MC argued: “This prayer is not a prayer of confession but a prayer for worthy communion [see LBW, p. 48 (208)]. The absolution is therefore inappropriate.” They continued: “The CCW recommends that no confession of sins be included within the service.” The rationale was given:

Preaching is a proclamation of the Gospel; the Lord’s Supper conveys the gift of forgiveness. The Service of Word and Sacrament should be celebratory in character.⁷⁵³

This presumably was *not* directed at a detachable and permissive Brief Order, but at the insertion of a confession as such into the middle of the Service (e.g. CW-2, 9). This was shown by the later affirmation: “We affirm the location of the confession of sins *before* the *beginning* of the service” [emphasis mine].⁷⁵⁴ They also favored including a rite for private confession in the pew edition.⁷⁵⁵

The LCA reaction to the Great Thanksgiving, at least as mirrored in these two committees, was very different from ALC or LCMS. Having

several eucharistic prayers with congregational responses was affirmed.⁷⁵⁶ The DPS/MC's major concern regarding format was that "at least one eucharistic prayer be printed completely." The reason was to avoid "the impression that something secret or mysterious was going on" and to provide "practical and helpful" guidance by reading it. They asked that the prayer "Reveal yourself . . ." (CW-2, 19) be reinserted after the fraction. Finally, they also argued regarding the *verba* in the prayer that the "Pauline acclamation" be rendered in the *first* person. Since the entire section is "a prayer address to God" this makes "the use of a second person pronoun inappropriate" (*viz.*, "as often as *you* eat. . . ." (CW-01, 16)).⁷⁵⁷ The logic was persuasive: "as often as *we* eat . . ." became the pattern (LBW, p. 70).

The DPS/MC argued for "a complete psalter" with the Psalm prayers printed in the pew edition. They asked that the intercessions in Baptism be "shortened and rewritten to reflect the brevity and grace" of the intercessions in the affirmation rite. They also recommended that marking with the sign of the cross become permissive (CW-7, 28, par. 22; cf. LBW, p. 124, par. 14). They found the renunciation "harsh" ("Profess your faith. . . . Reject sin. . . . Do you renounce. . . ?") and asked for rephrasing to "avoid infelicitous constructions." They asked that "Luther's phrase, 'remember your Baptism' be included" in the liturgy in order to "make the rite more of a congregational event." They recommend reconsideration of the title of the affirmation rite to "Confirmation" and "the Affirmation of Faith."⁷⁵⁸

The DPS/MC made one rather cryptic statement, registering "concern for changing the language of hymns and prayers that are in classic English form" and affirming "the importance of maintaining the integrity of the original composition."⁷⁵⁹ At its next meeting, the DPS/MC also affirmed the position of Brand on hymns written or translated before 1850.⁷⁶⁰ Brand had noted that "many texts . . . will remain unaltered because to do otherwise would compromise their poetic integrity." His examples included "Ah, holy Jesus" and "Love divine." He said this to explain ILCW principles even though "ILCW cannot, of course dictate how you deal with the hymn material."⁷⁶¹

Response from two LCA seminaries came to Ralph Van Loon, the LCA coordinator for worship. Writing for Southern Seminary, Richard Carl Hoefler summarized their faculty seminar on the ILCW communion rite. They were pleased with the restoration of the Brief Order and *Kyrie* and seriously objected to the prospect of not printing in full the Great Thanksgiving. They suggested entitling the Brief Order a "Declaration of Grace" rather than "Public Confession." They also objected to using the "conditional" phrase from 1John 1:9 (RSV), "If we confess our sins . . ." and proposed the following: "Because God is faithful and just we can acknowledge [vice "confess"] our sins, be forgiven, and be cleansed from all

unrighteousness.” The faculty recommended the phrase in the absolution, “being penitent,” be changed to “by his grace and love.” They also suggested changing “time for amendment of life” which sounds too much like a required “act of penitence” (i.e. penance or satisfaction) to “power to live the new life.” The absolution would then read:

The almighty and merciful God grant to you, by his grace and love, pardon and remission of all your sins, power to live the new life, and the comfort of the Holy Spirit. (cf. LBW p. 155).⁷⁶²

The short version of the Great Thanksgiving was suggested for the sake of pastors and laity “who avoid the prayer of thanksgiving not for theological reason[s] but because of its wordiness.” A related comment:

A shortened communion service would do more for increasing the frequency of communion than all the current liturgical and theological defenses of the practice.⁷⁶³

The suggestions were bracketed by a less-than-enthusiastic evaluation overall, noting “there has been no great ground swell from our people crying out for a new service.” In fact they discern “a generation who desire to return to that which is certain and unchanging.” For themselves, “there is serious doubt in the minds of the faculty that the proposed services are that much superior to the old, red book [SBH].”⁷⁶⁴

The reaction at Northwestern Seminary was markedly different: Students and faculty were “favorable . . . even enthusiastic.” As at Southern, there was “a strong, positive reaction” to the restoration of the Brief Order and the *Kyrie* and the shortening of the Great Thanksgiving. Whereas eucharistic prayer VI had strong negative reactions at Southern Seminary, Northwestern regarded it as the best (CW-01, 28f.). The music received “more reserved approval” though it was regarded as far better than any in CW-2.⁷⁶⁵

At its March 1976 meetings, the CCW and DPS/MC recommended that the minister and not the congregation say the invocation since the congregation will find it “difficult to begin the invocation in unison.” They also recommended that the phrase in the *Kyrie*, “the health of our souls,” be changed to “our being made whole.” They made the interesting suggestion of adding to the post-communion collect the “psalmic acclamation,” “O give thanks to the Lord for he is good,” with the congregation responding, “For his mercy endures forever.” Like ALC, the LCA representatives asked that the baptismal rite “more clearly reflect our historical and theological stance on original sin and the baptism of infants.” For opening orders of confession, ILCW should include “a positive declaration of grace, if not absolution.” Regarding “The Holy Communion for Trial Use” pub-

lished in fall 1975, the DPS/MC concluded, as a result of the field-testing, that a different setting or a revision of the Hillert setting be done.⁷⁶⁶

Concerning hymns, the DPS/MC recommended that ILCW reconsider “Rise up, O men of God” in “some form” since it ranked 27th in usage in LCA and was one of the most frequently requested in correspondence about hymn selection. Reconsideration of “Come with us, O blessed Jesus” with its Bach harmonization (SBH 283) and use of the Bach harmonizations of *Wachet auf* (SBH 7) and *Wie schön leuchtet* (SBH 120) were unanimously requested and studiously ignored! They further requested that both unison and harmonized stanzas of “For all the saints” be included to add variety to a long hymn and reflect the intention of composer, Ralph Vaughn Williams. For Luther’s lengthy Christmas hymn, “From heaven above,” the DPS/MC, like ALC, requested “starred stanzas” or at least “a program note on use.” A theological objection was raised to the first stanza of “Let the whole creation cry” (SBH 415), notably the line “God is good and *therefore* King.” (LBW’s rendering, “Praise *him* our almighty King” [emphasis mine] would later raise other questions.) Lower keys were requested for eight tunes.⁷⁶⁷

Another important part of the review process in LCA was the set of colloquiums held at each of the nine LCA seminaries in January 1977. Representatives from DPS and ILCW also met with the faculties. Representatives of the seminaries met March 13, 1977, to formulate a report.

The primary issue that emerged was, not surprisingly, the Great Thanksgiving. In a 46-page background paper prepared for the colloquiums, William Rusch noted: “No material published by the Inter-Lutheran Commission on Worship has aroused more attention and debate than this section of CW-2.” He summarized the debate and indicated that he had found 60 articles or books concerning the Great Thanksgiving—most “directly occasioned by the publication of CW-2.”⁷⁶⁸

The difference in the views of seminary professors was reflected in the collation. One seminary recommended the eucharistic prayer without *epiclesis* and with a congregational acclamation and Amen before the *verba* as an “honest alternative.” They would also allow for the *verba* alone. Many participants objected to other eucharistic prayers in the minister’s edition, implying “some special, secret wording too sacred for a layperson’s eyes.”⁷⁶⁹ Another seminary favored, with one dissent, a eucharistic prayer, feeling that the *verba* alone “is often misunderstood as incantation rather than proclamation.”⁷⁷⁰ One faculty was virtually split down the middle: 15 voted for the two options (eucharistic prayer incorporating the *verba* and with *verba* after the Amen); 16 voted for a *verba* alone option.⁷⁷¹ The joint report

recommended a Great Thanksgiving followed by the *verba* and the *verba* alone, thus reinforcing the ALC/Review Group demand. However, contrary to the ALC/Review Group (but not all their theological consultants who had no separate input), the LCA seminary professors recommended an *epiclesis* “on all gifts in keeping with the tradition of the *Service Book and Hymnal*,” i.e. *not* just on the people!

As rationale for its recommendation of the Great Thanksgiving “as an appropriate form of prayer and proclamation,” the summary report of the seminaries argued: (1) It is not contrary to “the authentic Lutheran understanding of the Gospel, not to what Luther himself teaches.” (2) Placing the *verba* within the account of salvation history has “considerable devotional and didactic value.” (3) Eucharistic prayers are part of the earliest liturgical tradition. (4) Prayers like those at the Last Supper “seem to be part of the dominical mandate.” (5) We ought to “share in this ecumenical trend.”⁷⁷²

The report affirmed the optional nature of the “may” rubric for the Brief Order, wanting to avoid a “morbid tone” without discouraging penitence. There was no consensus however on the form of absolution. Two seminaries recommended the “I declare” formula over “I . . . forgive.”⁷⁷³ One seminary suggested reversing the phrases in the absolution to “By the command . . . as a called . . . servant of the Word, I forgive. . . .” Some professors felt original sin was not clearly acknowledged.⁷⁷⁴ Following their suggestion, the report recommended including a phrase like “We are born children of a fallen humanity,” newly added to the baptismal rite (cf. CW-7, 24, par. 13.).⁷⁷⁵

The report recommended following the ICET text of the creed: “He descended to the dead.” The report exhorts encouraging “the understanding of the deep theological meaning of the peace to prevent it from degenerating into “merely a friendly greeting.”⁷⁷⁶

The report did not even address the central aspect of the offertory issue (viz. a procession to bring the elements).⁷⁷⁷ One seminary favored it; another urged “that there be no suggestion that the elements be brought forward.” Another charged that the offertory was a “‘hodgepodge’ of communion themes”; some even found the specter of Reformed theology here! Yet another criticism feared sanctifying North American materialism.⁷⁷⁸ The report recommended restoring the Fraction but with a “may” rubric and making the *Agnus Dei* a “shall” rubric.⁷⁷⁹

The report affirms the threefold structure of the baptismal rite, “related to dying with Christ, rising with the Spirit, and incorporation into the Church,” but again there is no recommendation on the issues relating to the

epiclesis (which the seminaries did debate) or the signing of the cross, anointing with oil, and the giving of a candle (which the seminary reports do not even mention). All these had been major concerns within the ALC. The only recommendation was to add “by the help of God” to the promise of sponsors/parents.⁷⁸⁰

Reactions to the affirmation rite were scattered, and the report makes no comment on confirmation or related matters. Rusch had noted Pelagian and Calvinist charges, as well as the current “official debate with the LCA” on covenant theology.⁷⁸¹ Some seminaries reflected these concerns. Others challenged current confirmation practice. On the level of texts, the interpolation of the phrase “the spirit of wonder and awe in your presence” (CW-8, 45, par. 6; cf. LBW, p. 201, par. 15) into Isaiah 11:2 was challenged. Also one faculty unanimously voted to “remove ‘the devil and all his empty promises.’”⁷⁸² Quite a trick!

In the service for the Burial of the Dead, the seminaries raised questions about the “good works” perspective in the prayers suggesting bargaining with God. Body/soul dualism was also spotted. One seminary found Holy Communion at funerals “divisive and difficult” and recommended deleting prayers “which seem to affect the relationship of the deceased with God.”⁷⁸³ Picking up on a similar concern, the report recommends deletion of the line: “Give our brother peaceful rest in this grave until the day when you will raise him up in glory” because of “its theological ambiguity and pastoral inappropriateness.”⁷⁸⁴ One faculty had felt it would sound to mourners that “the dead person must wait a thousand years or more in the grave . . . until that presence with God commences.”⁷⁸⁵

The Marriage Service, published as CW-3 in 1972, remained virtually unchanged in the 1976 edition of liturgical texts. A recurring theme among the seminary faculties was the ambiguity of the promise (and reality!) of life-long commitment, “I promise to be faithful to you as he gives us life together” (CW-3, 21).⁷⁸⁶ The report recommended restoring the phrase “until death do us part” or its equivalent.⁷⁸⁷ Seemingly on the other extreme, one seminary recommended that “deviation language” simply should not be used regarding marriage. Another faculty found the questionable suggestion that “marriage continues into the afterworld” (CW-3, 21).⁷⁸⁸ Without consensus, the report notes the concern about the unclarity of the phrase, “Pour down your grace” (CW-3, 24).

The LCA discussion of “covenant” that Rusch alluded to was illumined by several papers prepared by J.L. Barkenquist and Terence Mullins. Several issues relate to the ILCW debate over the translation of the *verba*: Barkenquist argued (and Mullins concurred) from the New Testament us-

age that “covenant” is less appropriate than “testament” (in the sense of “last will”), pointing particularly to Galatians 3:15-18 and Hebrews 8:8-12. In part Barkenquist’s argument hinges on the meaning of testament based on the usage of *testamentum* in Latin.⁷⁸⁹ Barkenquist also protested the phrase, the “covenant of baptism,” admitting that Luther did use the term, “but not often.”⁷⁹⁰ Barkenquist also stated that the New Testament “connects forgiveness with ‘sins’ (in the plural) never with ‘sin’ (in the singular)” and suggested that the *verba* should probably retain the plural.” The important distinction between sinful nature and sinful deeds “dare not be obscured.”⁷⁹¹

Input from the LCA’s Committee on Guidelines for Inclusive Liturgical Language came to the CCW in April 1977. Among the suggestions for liturgical texts were: dropping “fellow,” substituting “humanity” or “ancestors” for “mankind,” adding Sarah, Miriam, or Deborah to Old Testament saints, substituting “ruler” for “king” wherever “there are no contextual or theological problems.” With a sensitivity to the authority of Scripture sometimes absent from the discussion, the “sampling” closed with a principle and a request:

Where biblical language is not involved, it is suggested that another look be taken at gender references to God and at the use of “Father” in addressing and describing God.⁷⁹²

At the April 1977 meeting the Management Committee considered not only the CCW report but also the Report of the Test and Review of Liturgical Materials (which included the congregational test results, review by pastors and lay leaders, and theological review by seminary colloquiums) and the study by the Consulting Committee on Women in the Church and Society. Their recommendations and affirmations were based on these other reports.⁷⁹³

Their recommendations included adopting the “Episcopal solution” regarding the Pentecost lectionary (at variance with the ALC recommendation), restoring “descended to the dead” (like ALC), omitting the Service of the Word (“in the light of test results...” it did not “seem to serve a need”), and omitting the Athanasian Creed (which did not seem “useful in the cultic life of the church”).⁷⁹⁴ Baptism was to be retitled “Holy Baptism,” “lessons” were not to be called “readings,” and marriage vows were to be “as long as we both shall live.”⁷⁹⁵ Changes in sexist language included “sons” to “children,” “fathers” to “forebears,” “Abraham” to “Abraham and Sarah,” “fatherly” to “loving,” and “Father of mercies” to “Source of mercies.”⁷⁹⁶ Such changes in God-talk were reflected in a significant revision of the Common Service’s declaration of grace. The new proposal deleted all the masculine pronouns for God as follows:

In the mercy of Almighty God, Jesus Christ was given to die for us and, for his sake, God forgives us all our sins. Those who believe in Jesus Christ are given the power to become the children of God and have bestowed on them the Holy Spirit (cf. LBW, p. 56).⁷⁹⁷

Besides this “passive voice” approach to avoiding masculine pronouns for God, the DPS/MC also suggested shifting to the second person pronoun. Thus the psalm verse in Responsive Prayer 1 (LBW, p. 162) would read:

L: Bless the Lord, O my soul.

C: And all that is within me bless *your* holy name.

L: *You* redeem my life . . . [italics mine].⁷⁹⁸

Another recommendation having to do with Confession concerned the form proposed for the Brief Order and *Compline* (though it remained only in the latter). The DPS/MC recommended reducing to one the thrice-repeated “fault” theme, understanding “fault” as the “basic, sinful condition that issues in sinful thoughts, words, and deeds.” The final clause was also to be dropped, and the absolution incorporated into the prayer of confession as follows:

Therefore, I pray God almighty to have mercy on me, forgive me all my sins, and bring me to everlasting life.

Episcopal and Roman Catholic reduction of the triple “fault,” as well as the ILCW Ash Wednesday rite, were given as further arguments for the recommendation.⁷⁹⁹

The DPS/MC reiterated the ALC concern that the *verba* alone and eucharistic prayers appear as clear options in the format. They also requested that ILCW “reexamine” the text of the words of institution “in view of the concerns expressed through the review process.” Nothing specific was noted, however.⁸⁰⁰

Regarding music, the DPS/MC recommended the Eastern Orthodox practice of singing the responses in the deacon’s litany in harmony in Evening Prayer (LBW, p. 148). Their suggestion that the format indicate that the word “Lord” was to be sung simultaneously was not followed.⁸⁰¹

Numerous affirmations were made—the word “catholic” in the creeds, including the entire psalter, reciprocal confession at *Compline*, unison invocation before confession, the Great Thanksgiving (quoting the seminary colloquium rationale), optional Brief Order of Confession, the chorale communion (LBW, p. 120), including the *Nunc Dimittis* in *Compline*.⁸⁰² Of these, the entire psalter, unison invocation, and *Nunc Dimittis* eventually failed.

At its June meeting, the DPS/MC approved the final hymn list and recommended that the Executive Council approve the *Lutheran Book of Worship* “as an appropriate body of hymnic and liturgical material for use in the church.” At the same time Van Loon expressed the committee’s deep concern over an issue in the Burial of the Dead. The DPS/MC had recommended that “the italicized and alternating ‘sister, brother’ and ‘him, her’ be changed to a consistent citation of ‘sister/brother’ and ‘him/her.’” Van Loon then noted the confusion: “It was reported to the management committee that the recommendation had been *accepted*, and that in all instances the word ‘brother’ (in italics) is to appear *alone* in the final version” [emphasis mine]. Van Loon asked that the “misinterpretation” of the DPS/MC’s recommendation be corrected, opining that the DPS/MC would not have taken affirmative action on LBW “without the expectation that recommendations R-59 would be fully implemented.”⁸⁰³

Some—albeit a few—letters within LCA continued to protest the ILCW’s direction, in terms not unlike early ALC and current LCMS objections: “Foreign theology” was being borrowed “unquestionably and unquestioning . . . without any critical analysis and reflection,” viz. the “federal theology” of the Heidelberg Catechism and the Oxford Movement “which was heavily influenced by shoddy scholarship and Roman Catholicism.”⁸⁰⁴

Letters from several synods also expressed serious concerns. The chair of the New England Synod Worship Committee questioned going ahead with liturgies with 25% positive, 50% neutral, 25% negative responses from test congregations. He also noted the poor response to the revision of SBH Setting 2 suggesting that “the accompaniment . . . destroys the flow of the chant line.”⁸⁰⁷ The latter point was reiterated in harsher terms from the Upper New York Synod: To suggest that the second setting of SBH was being preserved was “not quite true”—in actuality “a deception.” It would have been better to keep the setting intact from SBH. The *verba* seemed to have been changed “for the sake of novelty.” The Offertory from CW-2, “Thank the Lord,” was a “ditty” popularized “for the sake of a present fad.” Sensing the Missouri pullout on the horizon, the writer asked: “whether the trauma of change is worth it when the original purpose of one book for all Lutherans is gone.”⁸⁰⁸

In spite of such opinions, the synodical presidents meeting July 21, 1977, (after the LCMS conventions’s call for delay), concurred with the DPS recommendation, turning down a motion to refer the matter to the 1978 LCA convention (6 in favor, 25 no).⁸⁰⁹ In its September meeting, the Executive Council approved LBW for publication in 1978 “under the auspices of as many of the participating church bodies as are willing.” They

also “expressed the strong hope that the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod will become full partners in the publication and distribution of the *Lutheran Book of Worship* by positive action at its 1979 convention.” The ALC request to delete the Good Friday reproaches “since they appear to foster anti-Semitism” was recommended by CCW and affirmed by the Executive Council.⁸¹⁰

The two-phase review by the churches was to have been completed by 1976. Because of ongoing controversy over the eucharistic prayer and the language of the confession, as well as the popular demand for more hymns, ALC, ELCC, and LCA finally completed their reviews in May 1977. This was about two months before the LCMS convention.

LCMS: Questioning the Cooperation

LCMS’s complex process involved a nine person Special Evaluating/Review Committee (which apparently never met as a group) who acted as “advisors” to the LCMS Commission of Worship (C/W), who were all ILCW members. President J.A.O. Preus also appointed “doctrinal reviewers” (censors who acted on all LCMS publications) who reported anonymously: all of these persons prepared individual reports on various ILCW liturgies and hymn proposals. The Commission on Theology and Church Relations (CTCR) also was brought in and made its own recommendation to the Synod Convention. Finally the convention appointed a “blue ribbon” committee, the Special Hymnal Review Committee.⁸¹¹

As a “case study” somewhat representative of the position that finally prevailed in LCMS, I am including excerpts from the correspondence of one of the Special Evaluating (or Review) Committee members, Rev. Carl Bornmann. Bornmann was pastor of St. Philip’s Lutheran Church, Detroit, a member of the Lutheran–Episcopal Dialogue, and had served as visiting professor of liturgy at Concordia Seminary, St., Louis. One gets some hint of the approach of Bornmann in his report of the 1975 Valporaiso Institute of Liturgical Studies.⁸¹² He stated that “use of historical criticism dominated [Eugene Brand’s] presentation.” He further reported that Brand asserted that baptismal rites should rest “not upon the theology of the Sacrament but upon the theology of the Church”; for, according to Brand, the Great Commission “can hardly be the actual words of Jesus.” On the one hand Brand sees no theological reason for withholding the eucharist from any baptized individual and would “come down hard on anyone who says that infant communion is wrong.” On the other hand, Brand is quoted as saying in the small group discussion: “If a child dies without Baptism, he is no worse off than a child who dies with Baptism.”⁸¹³

Han Boehringer was quoted by Bornmann asserting that the ILCW baptismal rite should involve “ecumenical consensus wherever possible”;

nevertheless, the proposed rite is “more Lutheran than what we have now.” Boehringer noted that “not all Lutherans on the commission were of like mind on the appropriateness of putting the words of the creed (or of the renunciation) into the mouths of infants.” Bornmann added that Brand mentioned that the question alone “delayed us for six months.” Finally “Boehringer granted that the proposed rites of the ILCW are the results of certain ‘trade offs’ among the members of the Commission.”⁸¹⁴

Finally Bornmann injected himself directly into the report with the concluding exhortation: “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.”⁸¹⁵

Bornmann and the other eight were appointed by LCMS president J.A.O. Preus as “reactors to the materials, with an eye to their suitability for use in the church at this time.”⁸¹⁶ In his initial evaluation, due in mid-March, Bornmann noted “many excellent things in the rationale” (especially regarding the sacraments) and “some fine choices of hymns,” but lamented the “flood of unfamiliarity, amid a drastic loss of texts and tunes which most of our people will not wish to lose.” He argued that insufficient usage of the three year lectionary, the baptismal and affirmation rites, and the revised Holy Communion make it “premature” to incorporate them into a “permanent book.” He also asked which “biblical or theological reasons” were being used to eliminate hymns and with what theological developments “in the last decades” the ILCW was attempting to harmonize. Bornmann asked whether excluding “triumphalism” included universalism. He challenged the rationale’s assertion that “a hymn is not a sermon, a catechism or a lesson. It is rather a response.” For it is also a “joyful confession of God’s truth in all its articles.”⁸¹⁷

Finding only 54 hymn texts from TLH and 180 from SBH, Bornmann questioned the balance, giving rise to his concerns about acceptance within LCMS. The dropping of those hymns highlighting “God’s reliable and inspired Word” was questioned. Ironically, Bornmann’s protest against the dropping of stanzas three and four of TLH 473 (“The Church’s one foundation”) which have “a special meaning and place in Missouri Synod’s faith and life” eventuated in the adding of stanza 4 to LBW while LW 289 left out both and thus mirrored SBH. Bornmann’s protest against the “theological emasculation” of TLH 550 and 305 (“O Splendor of God’s glory bright” and “Soul, adorn thyself”) seemed to be directed primarily against dropping over half of the nine stanzas. He also disliked nature hymns which fail to praise God for his mercy in Christ (e.g., “Now that daylight fills the

skies" LBW 268). He concluded: "It should be excluded or have Christian verses added."⁸¹⁸

One of the reactors, Dr. Harold Schnaible, lecturing to the Pittsburgh Pastoral Conference, raised "serious objection" to the fact that "455 hymns with which we are so familiar will be removed and 200 unfamiliar hymns will be added." The figures were more accurate than the 54 in Bornmann's letter, but the statistics as presented were explosive! Schnaible protested the "deletion" of "hymns which speak of the cleansing effect of the blood of Christ," such as "Jesus, thy blood and righteousness" and "There is a fountain filled with blood."⁸¹⁹ The former was finally included in LBW and LW; only LW included the latter, but in a new translation (LW 506). DeLaney responded from his hospital bed, criticizing Schnaible for jumping to conclusions and for raising his "serious objections" in a public lecture.⁸²⁰ Bornmann, who received a copy of DeLaney's letter to Krueger, wrote expressing surprise that confidentiality was expected. He suggested that people were understandably eager for a progress report. He further suggested that the committee meet with DeLaney "to achieve greater understanding and harmony."⁸²¹ DeLaney responded, promising a copy of Gilbert Doan's explanation of the rationale.⁸²²

One of the other reactors, Samuel Janzow, gave his evaluation pointedly:

It is . . . with deep reluctance that I must here record my opinion that the hymnal as it is now proposed by the Inter-Lutheran Commission of Worship would not be suitable for use at this time in our Synod. I believe that in its present form it would in fact be a potentially disturbing and troublesome influence, adding to the difficulties, which today exist in abundance in the Missouri Synod in already sufficient abundance.⁸²³

The political and pastoral concern seemed to outweigh any theological or liturgical concerns.

The second phase of the review dealt with liturgical materials in the July 1975 ILCW service book, including the revised CW-2 Holy Communion and the eight eucharistic prayers in "The Great Thanksgiving" (CW-01). According to the standing proposal, the marriage and funeral rites (the latter not yet completed) were not included. The deadline was the end of September, but the LCMS "reactors" apparently had not been advised until rather late, so Bornmann's reviews were sent directly to Brand and Paul Peterson (LCMS Commission on Worship chair), as well as to DeLaney, in order to arrive in time for the November ILCW meeting. (LTC had met in October and did not have the responses for their consideration.)

Bornmann approved the confessions⁸²⁴ but said that the absolutions needed to be “emphasized and strengthened.” Absolution was “God’s actual forgiveness” given “in the name of the Trinity,” and “not a wish” (viz. “The Almighty . . . grant to you . . . pardon . . .”).⁸²⁵ Bornmann found the closing collects “weak on the real presence.” He found the opening “exhortation” in the baptismal rite “weak”—lacking in scriptural references.⁸²⁶ “The overemphasis is on ‘corporateness’ and deemphasis on individual repentance and faith is not good. . . . The individual being baptized is buried in the congregations’ renunciation and confession of faith.”⁸²⁷

Doctrinal concern emerged in other ways. Regarding the affirmation, Bornmann said: “Our tradition has been not only to repeat the Baptismal Covenant, but to commit oneself to accepting the content of the faith. Our pastors and congregations would want to keep the reference to accepting Luther’s Small Catechism.”⁸²⁸ Further regarding the Apostles’ Creed, “the phrase ‘He descended to the dead’ is unacceptable and contrary to our [1969 Denver] Synodical resolutions.” Some comments on the Litany fell into the same category: “I object to dropping ‘true knowledge and understanding of thy Word’ and substituting, ‘love of your Word.’”⁸²⁹

Bornmann, interestingly enough, was not opposed to the use of eucharistic prayers. His “assumptions” were that such a prayer “praises God for his mercy,” “teaches and edifies the people who pray it to God,” and that it “contains and emphasizes the words of Jesus which consecrate the bread and wine.” Bornmann criticized the translation “*for my remembrance*” as if “remembrance is the *only* purpose of the sacrament” [italics his]. “For all to drink” sounds “like an ‘open communion’ invitation.” “This cup . . . sealed by my blood” was said to be an inaccurate translation and “can carry Calvinistic interpretation of the blood of Christ being in heaven while *this* cup merely ‘seals the New Covenant’ down here on earth.”⁸³⁰

Bornmann protests that the real presence was “veiled in imprecise language.” Most of the *epicleses* were “variations unacceptable for use in our branch of Lutheranism.” For example, “Page 18-(3), ‘Let him bless and vivify this bread and cup,’ is a crass denial of the central place of the Words of Institution,” i.e. in consecrating the bread and wine. He found the Hippolytan and Dutch canons acceptable.⁸³¹

Regarding the question of the sacrifice of the mass that so exercised some ALC theologians, Bornmann found that “most of the prayers do not have an oblation.” He found a “trace” in Hippolytus, “but that can be correctly understood.”⁸³²

In January 1976, the LCMS Commission of Worship passed a resolution asking for the appointment of “doctrinal reviewers” for the hymnic

corpus to meet the March 15, 1976, deadline of the review committees. They suggested the hymns be split among four or five reviewers. DeLaney's cover letter further suggested a two-week deadline after receipt of the hymns. DeLaney also asked that the reviewers "have some expertise in understanding poetic expression (as well as good knowledge of the Scriptures and the Lutheran confessions) so that they will not misinterpret the texts because of the poetic language employed therein." He also gave 13 suggestions for such reviewers, but the actual reviewers remained presumably a mystery.⁸³³

The "mystery" may be partially revealed by an unusual letter from Bornmann to Robert Sauer (one of the vice-presidents of LCMS and Preus's administrative assistant) containing evaluations of the first two pages of hymns from the January 1, 1976, hymn lists. It looks as if Sauer was probably a "doctrinal reviewer" getting assistance from fellow evaluator, Bornmann, sometime professor of worship at Concordia Seminary, St. Louis.

This was further evidenced by the doctrinal reviewer's "comments on the first batch of hymns" in which, like Bornmann in his letter to Sauer, he called "All who love and serve the city" both "shallow" and "ambiguous." Both questioned "Away in a manger" for "no crying he makes." Both challenged "to win us rebels over" in "A Lamb goes uncomplaining forth." Both stated that Jesus, not death, is "kind and gentle" (regarding "All creatures of our God and King"). Both objected to the translation of the last lines of stanza one of "Comfort, comfort now my people."^{834a} Bornmann characterize "Cold December flies away" as a "very vague nature song which could apply to Christ coming to a sinful world, but could also apply to a Hindu maharishee[*sic!*] as well. Not helpful. It should be excluded as not distinctly Christian." The reviewer commented: "This rather *vague 'nature song'* could perhaps be interpreted symbolically by some to refer to *Christ's coming to a sinful world*, but it *could also* be understood to *apply to any number of other 'advents.'* As it stands, there is nothing *distinctly Christian* about this song"^{834b} [italics mine to indicate parallels]. This is not to suggest "plagiarism," but rather the apparent connection between Bornmann, a member of the President's Special Review/Evaluating Committee and the doctrinal reviewer (Robert Sauer[?]). That Sauer became chair of the Special Hymnal Review Committee in 1977 extended the connection one stage further into the review process.

The procedure for this doctrinal review was as follows: The reviewer periodically forwarded to Concordia Publishing House "batches of text" which he had examined. Since "most of the time the reviewers [*sic*] comments were somewhat at odds with what the Commission understands the hymn to be saying," the Commission on Worship (C/W) "adopted a policy of replying or responding to the various comments of the doctrinal reviewer."

DeLaney continued: “Peterson, Messerli, and I put our heads together. . . . I drafted a response . . . and the Commission recognized that I sometimes have a barbed pen or typewriter, and . . . therefore decided to . . . [send] it to all the members of the Commission who were then to channel . . . comments . . . to Pastor Abram, who is then to recast the document in more solicitous language. . . . Concordia Publishing House . . . will then send comments or responses to the doctrinal reviewer.”⁸³⁵

To the anonymous doctrinal reviewer who objected to the line in “A Lamb goes uncomplaining forth” (viz. “to win us rebels over”), the C/W responded with a discussion of reconciliation and conversion. Though correct, this skirted the translational issue.⁸³⁶ The doctrinal reviewer reiterated his concern about the offending line; DeLaney noted that the C/W wondered “whether the reviewer had taken the Commission’s response of 29 June into consideration” when forming his “unacceptable judgment.” The DeLaney asked diplomatically whether the reviewer was concerned about confusing objective and subjective justification (which he applies to the hymn) or universalism. More to the point was his literal translation of the lines from Paul Gerhardt in question:

Den, den hat Gott zum Sundenfeind
Und Suhner wollen wahlen.

This DeLaney rendered: “For it (my soul), Him has God as sin’s-enemy and expiator been pleased to elect.” He concluded that neither TLH or LBW is “strictly a translation from the German”—as is *no* hymn translation with meter and rhyme!⁸³⁷ Again, the reviewer seemed to presume that “winning favor” was “orthodox” (and the standard by which new translations were to be tested) and “rebels” was not. Neither was Gerhard’s imagery!

In the third batch of hymns, two were marked “completely unacceptable,” charging one with a deistic view of creation and the other with synergism. DeLaney commented: “In both instances I believe that it has been demonstrated on the basis of Scripture that these charges are untenable.”⁸³⁸

The doctrinal reviewer’s comments on the fifth batch of hymn texts included some serious and some silly charges. His concern about “Lord, who the night you were betrayed did pray” was the “implication . . . that the eucharist will create the *una sancta*.” The second and third stanzas end:

- (2) So may we all one bread, one body be [and]...
- (3) Soon may we all one bread, one body be,
- (2) & (3) through this blest sacrament of unity.

But, argued the reviewer, “we are already . . . one body.” If the reference is to “institutional unity,” the problem is that, like Rome, St. Louis regarded

the sacrament as “a celebration of altar fellowship, not a means to altar fellowship.” The C/W responded: “Dare anyone . . . deny the possibility of the eucharist’s being the means whereby God brings about a fuller unity among those already at one?” “Real presence” was the issue in “We who once were dead” (LBW, 207, 6): “In this meal we meet you. Be our bread and wine” seemed “personalistic.” The C/W responded: “Who is host at this banquet except the Lord Jesus himself! . . . *He* invites, *He* presides, *He* fills us with life and forgiveness.”⁸³⁹

The doctrinal reviewer found works-righteousness in “There’s a wideness in God’s mercy” (LBW 290, 2) and universalism in “Your kingdom come!” (LBW 372, 2). The attack on “The first Noel” reached a new level, which the C/W characterized as “quixotic tiltings,” for, the reviewer lamented, this “beloved carol incorporates non-Scriptural and contra-Scriptural traditions: 1) The shepherds saw angels, not a star; 2) the wise men saw a star, but hardly the same star; 3) Scripture does not tell us the number of the wise men.” The C/W tried to respond by arguing from Old Testament prophecy concerning the star, from a Luther hymn about eternal light, and from the difficulty of “arguments from silence” before likening the reviewer’s “cavil” to Don Quixote’s windmills!⁸⁴⁰

In a concluding Remark the C/W asked the doctrinal reviewer pointedly:

What has happened to the Lutheran concept of adiaphora so clearly set forth in the confessions? And what has happened to the spirit of Luther’s explanation to the eighth commandment? Throughout the review process there seems to have been demonstrated a determined effort to “set in concrete” certain preconceived “correct” customs and/or usages as being the only acceptable Lutheran way of doing or saying things. The review has seemed to be predicated upon a determination to find something “wrong” with the formulations of the text rather than an examination to demonstrate the “rightness” of conformity to Scripture and the confessions.⁸⁴¹

In his March 1976 evaluation C/W and ILCW, Bornmann mentioned only “A Lamb goes uncomplaining forth,” “Ah, holy Jesus,” “Deck yourself, my soul,” and “Dearest Jesus.” These are “altered by omission [emasculatation] or substitution,” sometimes affecting the doctrinal content or emphasis, e.g. references to vicarious atonement, satisfaction, real presence or gospel (rather than God’s word)—shades of the “gospel reductionism” charge of the Seminex controversy! The protest has shifted from the earlier complaint “only 54 texts” from TLH, for it is now clear that over 250 of the 500+ hymns proposed come from TLH (about 200 of those are

also in SBH). Bornmann's major concern now was: "The alterations, omissions, and changes are *not* published in the official media for the pastors and congregations." So his final recommendation are "revising the 'time table' . . . beyond 1978, so that careful study, discussion and suggested improvements can be made on the level of pastoral and circuit conferences."⁸⁴²

DeLaney's response to Bornmann attempted little apology, especially for certain hymn alterations. He noted unhappily the suppressing of "*him* and *Father* and *his* which seem to be so much a red flag to the sexist language complainers." Regarding "Soul, adorn yourself," DeLaney complains: "If you only knew how we have had to battle for the bride and bridegroom imagery of Scripture in the face of women's opposition on sexist grounds, you would be happy [about] . . . the second stanza of this hymn."⁸⁴³

DeLaney's reflection on the review process is interesting at this point. He observed, "We did not have the same type of reviews from LCMS as from the other three churches." He further stated that the only reasons for honoring review committee requests for deletion of hymns were: "a) doctrine, b) usage, c) low quality."⁸⁴⁴

The second review of the hymns by the President's Special Review/Evaluating Committee also yielded a document from Janzow. He began by commending the improved balance and quality with the added (now 500+) hymns. But he noted "oddities," growing out of the "apparent desire to offer something for every taste" (e.g. "Were you there," "Let us break bread together," and Battle Hymn of the Republic). Such hymns, "at odds with the general cultural pattern in Lutheran congregations," could be made available to congregations which need them; but including them in the "official hymnbook" would result in "the very concept of the Lutheran hymn [being] debased."⁸⁴⁵

Janzow found universalism in "Christ is alive" (LBW 363, 5:3f.), "Faith of our fathers" (LBW 500, last stanza—dropped), "Look, now he stands" (LBW 152), and "Your kingdom come" (LBW 376, 2). "Synergism" is charged against the hymn "Lord Christ, when first you came to earth" (LBW 421, 3 and 4). "What God our father does is right" (HTC 1660—dropped), and "There's a wideness in God's mercy" (LBW 290, 1—e.g. "kindly judgments") are charged with sentimentality; "Lord, receive this company" (LBW 255) is "misty, meaningless romanticism" (demonstrated by daring to pray for Christian unity!)⁸⁴⁶

Schnaible pointed to inconsistencies in "modernization" of pronouns ('thou,' etc.) both in English hymns and in translations of German hymns. He noted that "awful day" still remained in "All praise to thee, my God, this night" (LBW 278, st. 4) and suggested the *Augustana Hymnal's* solu-

tion: “judgment day.” He also noted, with tongue in cheek perhaps, that if “schism” were replaced by “conflict” (as in the *Augustana Hymnal*) in “The Church’s one foundation,” a “sism, skism” pronunciation controversy could be avoided.⁸⁴⁷

Schnaible questioned why “All my heart this night rejoices” was reduced from 15 stanzas to three and “The God of Abraham praise” was expanded from four to twelve stanzas. He noted that the judgment theme was weakened by omitting stanzas from “A multitude comes” (TLH 415, 2, 4 and 5; cf. LBW 313), “Songs of thankfulness and praise” (TLH 134, 4; cf. LBW 90) and “The day is surely drawing near” (TLH 611, 3, 4 & 5; cf. LBW 321).⁸⁴⁸

The methodology of Schnaible’s section entitled “Change of Meaning by Translation” is interesting. It appears, at most points, that the standard to which he was comparing and by which he was judging the ILCW texts was the TLH text—even where that was itself a translation. Among the numerous examples where ILCW and TLH texts were all that was cited, the treatment of “Come, Oh, come, O Quickening Spirit” was characteristic (e.g. “‘Lead our every thought and action’ [SBH 126, 2] is not equivalent to ‘Grant our hearts in fullest measure Wisdom, counsel purity’ [TLH 226, 2]; nor is ‘All our sinfulness erase’ equivalent to ‘Working error’s overthrow’ [LBW 478, 2]).” There seemed to be no acknowledgment that a translation cannot render the original hymn with precision because of meter and rhyme. The method reached its logical conclusion in regard to Godfrey Thring’s hymn, “O God of mercy, God of might” (which incidentally appears in the *same* translation in LBW 425 and LW 397, but in a different key and accompaniment). At issue for Schnaible was the fourth stanza: TLH 439 said “All are redeemed, both far and wide”; ILCW text read, “For all are kindred, far and wide.” Schnaible comments: “Another meaning change.” Changes there were, but not as implied! Thring’s original text had read: “For all are brethren, far and wide, since thou, O Lord, for all hast died”⁸⁴⁹ (cf. SBH 316). LCMS had changed Thring’s language, presumably to reinforce the theme of universal atonement—already stated in the second line—and to avoid the liberal theme of the universal brotherhood of man. ILCW also made changes—to avoid the sexism of “brethren” (as in SBH). Schnaible found that “We are one in the Spirit” is “man-centered,” its “news” that “God is in our land” is not the “good news,” and its purpose to “guard each man’s dignity and save each man’s pride” not the Church’s mission. Schnaible concluded, “I could not sanction the hymn section as is,” given the “gross liberties taken by some of the translators.”⁸⁵⁰

Another problem related both to dropping stanzas and translations: Grundtvig’s “Built on a rock” had been “desacramentalized” in the SBH

and ILCW translation, Schnaible rightly charged: The “means of grace” stanza (TLH 467, 6) was dropped as are other references to Baptism (TLH 467, 3; cf. SBH 151).⁸⁵¹

Yet another piece was inserted into the review process when the LCMS Board of Directors asked the Commission on Theology and Church Relations to provide “an opinion on . . . utilization of contemporary liturgical forms.” The executive secretary, Samuel Nafzger, wrote Bornmann asking for a response to questions about eucharistic processions and prayers. Each question began: “Is it consistent with sound Lutheran theology . . . ?”

Bornmann’s reply, unlike many LCMS or ALC critics, was:

A “eucharistic prayer” which contains the words of institution most certainly can “proclaim the Gospel to the congregation” even though the prayer is initially “an address to God.” The *Gloria in Excelsis*, the *Te Deum*, and the General Prayer of the Lutheran liturgy address God, but they also confess the Gospel of Christ for the edification of those who hear as they pray. The words of institution are already in the context of an “address to God” on “our [TLH] page 15” liturgy’s Preface, *Sanctus*, Lord’s Prayer, etc.⁸⁵²

Whether such a prayer proclaims the gospel as clearly and unambiguously as the *verba* alone is a pastoral issue, differing from parish to parish, contended Bornmann. “However, a eucharistic prayer, properly constructed, is not explicitly synergistic.” He argued from article VII of the Formula’s Solid Declaration that a right understanding of the power of Christ’s words should preclude misunderstanding the celebrant as mediator.⁸⁵³

Bornmann argued that “the offering of bread and wine in the context of an ‘offering procession’ is no more synergistic than offering money in the context of a collection.” In any event, it “is *not* in any sense a ‘propitiatory sacrifice’ attempting to merit anything from God.” He further contended that the “fraction is not inherently Zwinglian, implying a real absence.” He suggested it during the *verba* to emphasize that “we are trying to follow closely what Christ actually did (although it is not essential to the action).”⁸⁵⁴

Bornmann admitted the problems of the *epiclesis* and defended the solution in Arthur Carl Piepkorn’s so-called “Chisolm Canon” (viz. placing the *epiclesis* before the *verba*). That made it clear that the Word, not the Spirit, blesses and sanctifies the elements.⁸⁵⁵

A “seventh batch” of hymns, received by Concordia Publishing House in May 1976 but somehow never forwarded, was finally received by the Commission on Worship early in January 1977. These were forwarded with

a “proposed response,” presumably from DeLaney. The doctrinal reviewer’s objections to this “romantic and sentimental . . . nature hymn” (LBW 506) could, he said, be corrected only by setting the desired speech of God through “earthquake, wind, and fire” (st. 6) into the “context of God speaking to us through Word and Sacrament.” The responder pointed to a number of Old Testament and New Testament texts that speak of God’s revelation through nature;⁸⁵⁶ but strangely enough neither reviewer nor responder mentioned the Elijah text (1 Kings 19:9-18), which is the source of the hymn’s imagery, though Scripture clearly says “the Lord was *not* in the wind . . . earthquake . . . [or] fire.”

On February 25, 1977, Jaroslav Vajda from Concordia Publishing House forwarded to DeLaney a list (dated January 5th) of hymns which were “still under the ban.” Twenty-seven hymns previously challenged by the reviewer and/or evaluators were now approved. Among them: “A stable lamp” (LBW 74), “I bind unto myself today” (LBW 188; LW 172), “Come, risen Lord” (LBW 209), “All who love and serve your city” (LBW 436), “Alleluia, sing to Jesus” (LBW 158), “Away in a manger” (LBW 67, LW 64), “Immortal, invisible God” (LBW 526; LW 451), “Lo, he comes” (LBW 27; LW 15), “What Child is this” (LBW 40; LW 61), “Let us break bread” (LBW 212), “Lift every voice and sing” (LBW 562), and “Comfort, comfort now” (LBW 29; LW 28). The reviewer’s suggestion for dealing with the “unscriptural traditions” in “The first Noel” was to delete stanza 2 and begin stanza 3 with the words: “And in the east appeared a star Where wise men came from country far” (LBW 56). Nonetheless he approved it and “Holy God, we praise your name”—though questioning the line “All on earth your scepter claim” (LBW 36, 1, cf. LW 171; TLH 250—all the same!). That left 21 hymns “still under the ban,” to use DeLaney’s phrase.⁸⁵⁷

DeLaney and Doan (from HMC) prepared a response on the remaining 21 unacceptable hymns for use by Concordia Publishing House and/or the C/W, *not* for “submission to the reviewer.” Many responses were brief: “Why?” “Why not?” “What?” Several are interesting. Regarding “Amazing grace,” (LBW 448, 2) it was suggested that “grace . . . (quite mercifully, if relentlessly) [can] disclose the depth of the arrogance of sin.” They agreed that “Break now the bread of life” is a “weak” hymn but argued that seeking the Lord “*within* the sacred page” is “even more problematical than *beyond*.” Concerning “Lord of all nations” (LBW 419, 3), the reviewer’s concern was the statement that the “wrong I do will crucify the Lord anew.” DeLaney and Doan responded that “hymns are not doctrinal formulations” but that this forceful poetic figure showed that “sin, as slavery to . . . the evil one is precisely . . . participation in that demonic assault on the kingdom which was focused . . . on Golgatha.”⁸⁵⁸

DeLaney asked whether any of the conflicts on the 21 hymns haved now (in April) been resolved. He asked how to proceed, adding, "It continues to rankle that this input was not available on schedule. It has really put the ILCW in an intolerable position." He exhorted: "It must not happen again with the liturgical materials."⁸⁵⁹

The C/W took up the 21 unacceptable hymns: on seven they agreed with the reviewer, including the deleting of "Once to every man and nation" and (because of the unending complaints) changing "A Lamb goes uncomplaining forth." Out of conviction or compromise, they supported the phrase, "to gain for us his favor" (perhaps also to gain the reviewer's favor). On eleven hymns they supported the ILCW text. Four state "O.K. Revise" (e.g., "Christ is alive," LBW 363, 3). DeLaney and Doan recommended a revision to read: "The Son of God our Savior reigns," and this presumably the C/W supported. (It ultimately failed.)

By mid-May 1977, the list of unapproved hymns was down to 13; three of these had been changed but not sufficiently to satisfy the doctrinal reviewer (e.g., the "perfectionism" in "Breathe on me," LBW 488, 2). The ten or so untouched and still unacceptable hymns were ones on which the LCMS C/W had agreed with ILCW rather than the reviewer. Of these hymns, eight made it onto the Blue Ribbon Committee's "delete" or "revise" lists. Two, "Lord enthroned in heavenly splendor" (LW 281) and "All creatures of our God and King," made it all the way into *Lutheran Worship*—the latter with "most kind and gentle death" intact (LW 436, 6). There were also ten hymns newly added by ILCW which were not yet approved by the doctrinal reviewer.⁸⁶⁰

In the April C/W meeting, after studying the comments of the ten evaluators (from the President's Special Hymnal Review Committee), the C/W passed the following resolutions: To assign the invocation to the pastor and the Amen to the congregation; to question the "romantic nature" of "Let the vineyards" (e.g., "hopes and dreams of all"); to withdraw "sealed" from the *verba*; to print no vows in place in the marriage rite, but to provide options which all emphasize the life-long character of marriage and conclude "in the name of the Father . . ."; to delete certain prayers "for pastoral reasons" in the burial rite "to avoid giving false impression";⁸⁶¹ to recast the petition, "Give our *brother* peaceful rest in his grave."⁸⁶²

The report of the doctrinal reviewer concerning the liturgical material apparently arrived after the C/W meeting in mid-April (since no mention or response was made) but before the ILCW/JLC meeting at the end of April. Among the propers questioned is the prayer for a Day of Penitence (LBW, p. 40 [152]). Referring to his comments on "Lord of all nations"

(LBW 419, 3), the reviewer objected that the “phrase ‘we crucify our Lord anew’ is without scriptural warrant and is not acceptable.”⁸⁶³

Reports from a number of doctrinal reviewers appeared from April 1977 on, presumably as response to DeLaney’s plea that the slowness of the review not delay ILCW further and in preparation for the LCMS convention. Henceforth the doctrinal review presumed to be by Robert Sauer (see pages 142-144) will be referred to as “S.” In the Holy Communion, the doctrinal reviewers raised questions about the Brief Order, especially the inadequate statement of original sin. One reviewer stated that “This is the feast” reflects “a Roman Catholic influence,” as does “one holy catholic and apostolic Church” in the Nicene Creed. S asks: “Why has the troublesome phrase, ‘He went to the dead’ been retained in a footnote? What is the status of the footnote?” The C/W responded, incorrectly as it turned out, that “no footnotes are to appear on the pages of LBW,” noting that those in ILCW who preferred the ICET text had acceded to LCMS’s “confessional stance” (viz. Formula of Concord, art. IX). Protests against the sacrificial (hence Roman Catholic) character of offertory processions and eucharistic prayers were repeated by several reviewers, some asking that the first and others asking that both prayers (including the one with an Amen before the *verba*, LBW, p. 70) be deleted. The objections to “sealed” and “covenant” in the *verba* reappeared. One reviewer added that the phrase, “and gave it all to drink,” could lead to “confusion where closed communion is practiced.”⁸⁶⁴ Indeed!

Not only Catholic but Calvinist influence was seen in such terms as “covenant” (federal theology) and in the distribution formula. S asked why the TLH phrase “for your sins” is omitted, finding it “disturbing that the heavy emphasis of the catechism on the forgiveness of sins is missing here.” Another reviewer, admitting there is “no prescribed formula for distribution” in Scripture, asked “Should not the formula be confessional?” He also pointed to the controversy over the distribution formula of the Prussian Union Church liturgy, which was one of the grievances leading 19th century confessionalists to emigrate. The reviewer characterized its inadequacy as leaving “everything up to the individual interpretation of the communicant.” The reviewer, concerned over the obscurity of the phrase, “healing power of this gift of life” (LBW, p. 74) in the post-communion prayer, noted that *diese heilsame gabe* is “much more direct” (though not as “confessional”), but the reviewer did not offer a translation! Several reviewers also objected to the translation in the Lord’s Prayer, “Save us from the time of trial.”⁸⁶⁵

Regarding the baptismal rite, “born children of a fallen humanity” (LBW, p. 121) was noted as an insufficient and “vague reference to origi-

nal sin.” One reviewer protested the use of “free” or “liberate” as cloaks for liberation theology. Several reviewers objected to the phrase “forces of evil” (“sounds more like the Mafia”), and S asked: “What is the connection between the devil and the forces of evil?” The *epiclesis* after baptizing was challenged: “These petitions imply that the Holy Spirit is not present without being summoned.” S also asked what “sealed by the Holy Spirit” means. Another reviewer seemed to understand that and suggested that “the anointing and sealing of the Spirit happen in Baptism, through the washing of water with the word.” The adding of oil obscured the water and in “our neopentecostal era, we ought to glory in our water-baptism and stress that then and there we received the Spirit.”⁸⁶⁶

In the confirmation rite, the absence of a commitment to the teaching of the catechism and “to the triune God, even unto death” the reviewer found “very striking.” In the marriage rite, the reviewer challenged the idea that husband and wife bind themselves to one another: “It is God who joins husband and wife together in holy wedlock.” The vow regarding a life-long relationship was also noted as “extremely weak.” Objections to prayers in the burial rite were repeated with this explanation: “The deceased . . . is already enjoying eternal life, the joys of heaven, in fellowship with all the saints.” The reviewer also noted “a change from LCMS tradition” in the rubric that states: “Many pastors regard conducting funerals for people having no connection with the Church as part of their ministerial obligation” (cf. LBW:MDE, p. 39). The reviewer cited Fritz’s *Pastoral Theology* (pp. 303f.) to which the C/W responded: Fritz’s book “is not normative for the review process.”⁸⁶⁷

In “General Comments” by one doctrinal reviewer was the following illuminating statement:

Some of the criticisms listed may have seemed trivial at first glance, and some of the phrasings could be understood properly with a strictly Lutheran theological background. However, it has been shown that the ILCW project reflects a mixture of Lutheran, Roman Catholic, and Reformed theologies, with a little Liberation and Hope mixed in for good measure. Therefore, the rich Lutheran liturgical heritage is in danger of being lost, and improper doctrines can be implied (and therefore eventually taught to the people) from this hodgepodge of theologies.⁸⁶⁸

It would be interesting to know whether the reviewer felt he or others have “shown” this “mixture” of theologies.

The following understanding of the reviewer’s task was also communicated to ILCW, possibly by S:

The Synodical *Handbook* list as the doctrinal reviewer's primary responsibility the concern "that items submitted to him be in agreement in their doctrinal content with the Scriptures and the Lutheran "Confessions." It also stipulates that "the reviewer shall be concerned that the items submitted to him do not contain statements in doctrinal clarity." (Bylaw 11.157) Many of the notations herewith reported fall into the latter category and are therefore necessarily somewhat subjective. Although I have occasionally noted departures from LCMS piety and tradition, I have not attempted to make a thorough listing of such items. I have also generally not commented on omissions, some of which could be quite serious. Because of these factors, and because of the importance of this project for the church, I request that these comments be forwarded to the CTCR for its review in connection with its study of the ILCW hymnal. It is my recommendation that these materials not be returned to me for final review until the CTCR has completed its study of the hymnic materials.⁸⁶⁹

This final suggestion evoked a quick, negative response from DeLaney: "The Commission on Worship categorically opposes both the request and the recommendation insofar as the CTCR is concerned." The C/W had already met with CTCR in early March to answer their questions and were wary about the further intrusion of this commission into the review process. "It is true that the CTCR has on its own initiative taken up consideration of the hymnal. But this is its own doing, not the assignment of the Synod. Hence it is our opinion that it is outside the normal doctrinal review process to interject the CTCR into this present project."⁸⁷⁰

Several examples from the final interchange between the doctrinal reviewer and the C/W illustrate the increasing tension and frustration in LCMS just before the convention. The reviewer asked whether the proposed antiphon for the Annunciation ("The Virgin shall be with child and bear a son" cf. LBW:MDE, p. 174) is an adequate paraphrase of Isaiah 7:14. "Since the virginal conception of our Lord is an article of faith . . . Why not, "Behold a virgin shall conceive. . . ." The C/W asked: "Why must the worst possible motives and actions always be suspected of ILCW?"⁸⁷¹ Concerning the prayer commemorating Renewers of Society (LBW, p. 37 [142]), the reviewer asked for an explanation of "freedom" and "justice": "Is it our political freedom or freedom in Christ? Is it political justice or God's justice in Jesus Christ? There seems to be confusion on the doctrine of the two kingdoms." After a lengthy attempt to describe interaction between the two kingdoms, the C/W argued that the prayer does not conflict with Scripture or the confessions but only with "some people's narrow limitations on responsibilities of members of the kingdom of God." Con-

cerning the prayer for a Dedication and Anniversary (LBW, p. 39 [148]), the C/W responded that “the reviewer is being exceedingly ‘picky’ in deliberately refusing to recognize that it is the use of a building”—whether by God or God’s people—which makes it “holy or secular, and it is not necessary to spell it out as the reviewer seems to be demanding in his comment.”⁸⁷²

The Commemoration for Pastors and Bishops had the masculine pronouns italicized.⁸⁷³ The reviewer states: “. . . this implies that the admission of women is an acceptable option . . . contrary to the Scriptures. . . . The italics will have to go.” C/W responds: “The liturgical book is a resource, not a rule. . . . The reviewer charged the ILCW and the Commission with affronting the church [that is, LCMS, by allowing for women pastors to be commemorated]. . . . The Commission categorically denies this. . . . since there are no female pastors of any kind to be found among the commemorations!” That the Commission “protested too much” was seen in the ILCW’s addition of an italicized *her* to *his* (LBW, p. 38 [143]). An interesting, unwitting, turnabout by the reviewer was seen in his remark on the next commemoration: “Since theologians need not be pastors, the italicized his is permissible.” The C/W responded: “The Commission thanks the reviewer for recognizing that not all theologians need be male.”⁸⁷⁴

But the problem with these commemorations was nothing in comparison to the furor over some of the “saints” to be commemorated!

The list cannot be approved as given [LBW, pp. 10-12] . . . Are we to recall with thanks those who have perverted the gospel, those who have taught “another gospel”? . . . Why George Fox, Martin Luther King Jr., Hauge, Michelangelo, Calvin, John XXIII, Gruntvig, Schweitzer, Kirkegaard, to cite only a few of the dubious? . . . Why not Walther, or any other Missourians? (Not ONE makes the list!)⁸⁷⁵

In notes prepared by Carl Bornmann, an explication of the objections to these and other commemorations was given e.g., George Fox “did great damage to the concept of the ‘means of grace’ . . .” Not only John Calvin but John and Charles Wesley [13 of whose hymns appear in LW] were challenged as “renewers of the Church” for their “heresies.” “Were they ‘inspired by your Spirit’ [LBW p. 37, (140)]?” Because of the “gross universalism” of Nathan Soederblom, “I could never utter this prayer in his name or celebrate his day.” Also the “denial of the gospel,” “unitarianism and universalism” of Schweitzer would have prevented him from making known “the immeasurable riches of our Savior” (LBW, p. 37, [139]). Kierkegaard was designated as a “questionable” teacher.⁸⁷⁶ Well, the *only* post-biblical saint, besides the Missourian Walther and, of course, Luther,

who made it into the commemoration of *Lutheran Worship* is St. Laurence (p. 9), a mystifying choice, given the options in the ILCW calendar! It was rumored that Laurence was a favorite (perhaps even a patron) saint of one of the members of the new LCMS C/W.

Vox Populi: Reactions from Field-Test Congregations & Pastors **(September 1975-April 1977)**

Congregational Responses to Holy Communion For Trial Use [1975]

Congregational field-testing was scheduled for the first revision of CW-2, printed in summer or fall of 1975, with a new musical setting by Richard Hillert. The title page read: *The Holy Communion, Inter-Lutheran Commission on Worship, For Trial Use*. (LCA sometimes referred to it as “Revised CW-2.”) Testing was scheduled to begin in September in LCA congregations. ALC congregations began their testing in January 1976—during Epiphany, with “opinionnaires” due March 15. The Comparative Report on Testing was finally completed in May 1976 by ILCW.

A ten-percent random sample was attempted: 305 ALC, 214 LCA, 181 LCMS, and 10 ELCC congregations actually participated and reported. Of these about two-thirds were under 500 members; 5% of LCA congregations were over 1,000; 12% of LCMS and 15% of ALC. Almost half of the ALC congregations were rural, with 40% of ELCC, 23% LCA, and 17% of LCMS. (If “independent town” is also included in “rural,” ALC was 67%, ELCC 60%, LCA 54%, and LCMS 51%.) Well over 90% of pastors participated, and over 80% had organists and other laity involved in the evaluation process. The music was rehearsed by 65% of the congregations and 80% of the choirs. Some explanation of the new liturgy was given in 98% of the congregations and 90% or more had a “pre-service” practice. Use of CW-2 was 42% in ALC, 49% in LCA, 40% in ELCC, and 35% in LCMS; whereas 61% of LCMS congregations tried *Worship Supplement*, only 21% of LCA, 20% of ELCC, and 14% of ALC did. The Missouri origins of the latter rites help explain the minimal use in non-LCMS congregations. Those LCMS congregations more open to liturgical experimentation had already tried the 1969 *Worship Supplement* and some were probably loath to try to introduce any more new liturgies. This, along with the Seminex split, points to the reasons for the lateness of the entry of the Missouri synod into the ILCW process; by this 1976 field-test, they were fully involved. But this proved too late!⁸⁷⁷

Regarding Confession and Forgiveness, approximately 85% of the congregations found the first form (patterned on the SBH opening Confes-

sion, pp. 1f.) “good,” “very good,” or “excellent.” The second form (patterned on CW-2, 9) had only 48% rating it “good” or better. The third form (the *Book of Common Prayer* Prayer of Humble Access with an absolution) was placed after the prayers and before the peace. It could be used when the other forms were omitted. It received 58% favorable reaction. However, less than half of the test congregations responded to this third option; the others presumably did not use it. About 90% of the congregations said they preferred the first form.⁸⁷⁸

On the revised modern language style, over 90% found it acceptable and/or preferable (with LCMS respondents several percentage points lower on most answers and a few points higher on unacceptable, approximately 7%). Except for the Lord’s Prayer which had been tried by approximately 40% of the congregations, less than 25% of the congregations had used the ICET texts of the liturgy before. Previous usage in LCA was about ten percentage points higher than in ALC for both the Creed and the Lord’s Prayer, but the approval rate in ALC was twice as high (Creed: 66% ALC, 37% LCA; Lord’s Prayer: 20% ALC, 9% LCA). Robert Strohl summarized the LCA testing: “Overall reaction to use of the ICET texts was not favorable.” The *Gloria*, *Sanctus*, and *Agnus Dei* “were often more acceptable because they are not as deeply ingrained as the Nicene Creed and Lord’s Prayer.”⁸⁷⁹ ALC approval for the *Gloria* and *Sanctus* was at 90% and for the *Agnus Dei*, 70%. Well over two-thirds felt the Apostles’ Creed should be an alternate to the Nicene Creed with ALC highest at 84%. Nearly 90% of ALC and LCA favored the *Kyrie* litany, with LCMS—not familiar with the new litany in TLH—and ELCC at 80%.⁸⁸⁰

Offertory processions bringing bread and wine were found unacceptable in 20% of the ELCC, 24% of ALC, and 27% of LCMS congregations; LCA registered only 12% negative, but 45 congregations made no response on this question. Eucharistic prayers were found unacceptable in 20% of ELCC, 14% of ALC, 10% of LCMS, and 5% of LCA congregations.⁸⁸¹

The placement of the Hymn of the Day after the sermon and the rest of the sequence got the lowest marks from LCA congregations. Similarly on whether the “flow” of the service is good, logical, and acceptable, LCA was 15 to 20 percentage points lower than ALC or LCMS, whose responses ranged from two-thirds to three-fourths approval. (In ELCC 40% said the flow was good, 60% logical, and 80% acceptable.) A whole range of virtually unchartable reactions to the overall service were included in a single question: Highly acceptable, unacceptable, challenging, dull, exciting, lifeless, easy, difficult, other. Results were:

Unacceptable: 30% of ELCC, 42% of LCMS, 43% of ALC, 48% of LCA.
 Dull: 20% of ELCC, 19% of LCMS, 25% of ALC, 30% of LCA.
 Lifeless: 10% of ELCC, 20% of LCMS, 29% of ALC, 28% of LCA.
 Difficult: 80% of ELCC, 54% of LCMS, 61% of ALC, 63% of LCA.

In contrast were those who evaluated it very positively:

Highly Acceptable: 20% of ELCC, 21% of LCMS, 21% of ALC, 12% of LCA.

I assume that the designers of the questionnaire meant “highly acceptable” and “unacceptable” to be a pair⁸⁸² but between one-third and one-half of the respondents marked neither.⁸⁸³ Only 35% of LCA congregations and 40% of ELCC congregations had theological criticisms, whereas 51% of ALC and 52% of LCMS congregations said there were theological issues encountered in the service.⁸⁸⁴ It would seem that questions of flow and music pushed the LCA’s reaction in the negative direction, whereas theological issues—especially regarding issues of eucharistic sacrifice—accounted for the negative reactions in ALC and LCMS. About half of the congregations found the music “hard” or “very hard” to *learn*; less than one-fourth of LCA congregations found it “easy” or “very easy” to *sing*, with ALC and LCMS a few percentage points higher and ELCC at 40%.⁸⁸⁵

Pastors’ Responses to CW-01: The Great Thanksgiving [1975]

During the winter of 1975-76, a questionnaire entitled “Pastors: Your Response is Needed” was sent out to all Lutheran parish pastors. Questionnaires were to be completed and mailed before March 20, 1976. At this point the first eight volumes of the Contemporary Worship series were published; eight eucharistic prayers had also been published in CW-01: The Great Thanksgiving. “Your critical response to material contained in these publications will assist ILCW tremendously in its final revision and selection processes.”⁸⁸⁶ Concordia Teachers College in River Forest, Illinois did the 144-page computer printout analyzing the questionnaires. What follows are the highlights of this study.⁸⁸⁷

Given all the controversy surrounding eucharistic prayers and the large percentage of pastors who always used the *verba* only (LCMS 48%; ALC and ELCC both 44%, LCA 34%),⁸⁸⁸ it is surprising how positively the prayers in CW-01 were received by all the churches! Of the congregations that had used eucharistic prayers up to this point, the following usage was reported:

SBH:	LCMS 14%,	ALC 78%,	ELCC 76%,	LCA 84%.
WS pp. 45-47:	LCMS 40%,	ALC 9%,	ELCC 7%,	LCA 9%.
WS pp. 60f.:	LCMS 47%,	ALC 8%,	ELCC 7%,	LCA 8%.
WS pp. 65f.:	LCMS 50%,	ALC 5%,	ELCC 2%,	LCA 7%.
CW-2:	LCMS 38%,	ALC 52%,	ELCC 39%,	LCA 52%. ⁸⁸⁹

Since the pastors were asked, “Which Great Thanksgiving(s) have you *usually* used?” [emphasis mine], many did give more than one answer. Thus there was no indication *which* prayers were used *how often*. We only know *that* each prayer was used by a certain percentage of pastors on some occasions(s). A subsequent question asked whether the CW-2 prayer was preferred over those in CW-01. “Yes” responses were as follows: LCMS 13%, ALC 18%, ELCC 16%, LCA 20%. Overall, “no opinion” won hands down at 65%.⁸⁹⁰

The first three prayers, which made it into LBW, were rated OK (my designation combining “acceptable” and “good” evaluations) by 75% or more of the pastors. Even the five prayers not selected were rated OK by 65-75% of the pastors.⁸⁹¹ Only 6% objected to the content of the prayers and another 5% to even using such “great thanksgivings.”⁸⁹² There was never more than a three percentage point difference among the pastors of the different Lutheran bodies, except for the ELCC which had a much *lower* (5-10%) rate of objectors. Also, on the ancient prayer of Hippolytus (CW-01, 20f.) objections in ALC were a bit over 3% and in LCA almost 6%.⁸⁹³ Overall the differences among the churches seem minimal and the objectors fewer than expected.⁸⁹⁴ Usage of the CW-2 rite was at 52% in the ALC and LCA and around 38% in ELCC and LCMS. Moreover in the categories of “study” and/or “use” all the churches were around 90%.

The reception of the hymns (CW-1 & CW-4) suggested some patterns that are different from the responses to the Holy Communion in CW-2. There were, moreover, differences between CW-1 which contained folk-style songs and CW-4 which were more “liturgical” in the sense that they focused on Baptism, Communion, and the church year. All the churches were between 75% and 87% in the study and/or usage categories for CW-1, with ELCC on the bottom and ALC on top. Similarly ALC was much higher in use (nearly 50%), more than twice as high as ELCC and 12 to 15 points ahead of LCA and LCMS respectively. But when it came to the sacramental/liturgical hymns of CW-4, the situation altered radically. Usage in ALC was 20% (still twice ELCC!) and both LCA and LCMS were at 25%. Similarly when “study” is added, LCA and LCMS were near 70% with ALC at 63% and ELCC at 55%.⁸⁹⁵ Given the thousands of letters sent to the ALC worship office concerning the omission of favorite hymns, one might conclude that the “popular” rather than the “liturgical” was the concern of an articulate, “unsilent” minority (?) within the ALC. And the pastors—or at least the congregational usage of CW-1 and CW-4—reflected that in the ALC.

The marriage rite (CW-3) was neither studied nor used by an average 13% of the respondents with LCMS at 19% and LCA at 8%. Again LCMS

was low in usage (about 40%) and LCA high (at 66%). ELCC and ALC were at 50% and 59% respectively.⁸⁹⁶

Those who neither studied nor used the Service of the Word (CW-5) hovered around 20%, except for ELCC (33%). Usage for ELCC was 27%, and the rest clustered around 37%.⁸⁹⁷

The popularity contest winner of the Contemporary Worship series, was clearly CW-6, especially the three-year lectionary.⁸⁹⁸ (Its subsequent adoption by LCMS, with only minor changes, also testifies to this.) The lectionary was used by almost 90% of the pastors responding.⁸⁹⁹ The wide selection of Scripture (almost trebling the one-year lectionary) was the major reason given by about half the respondents (with LCA registering highest at 62% and ALC lowest at 35%). A second reason, which about 20% of the pastors cited, was the coordination of the lessons.⁹⁰⁰

Pastors were also asked about the use of appointed psalmody: whether it was used, and if so, spoken or sung by congregation, choir, or soloists. Of the churches using psalms, it was reported that better than 90% spoke them; however only 58% of the congregations used the appointed psalmody (32% of the ELCC, 36% of the ALC, 56% of the LCMS and 76% of the LCA). Of the congregations that reported singing the Psalms, approximately 30% were sung by choirs or soloists (with LCMS slightly higher here than others) and 20% were sung by congregations (with LCA highest at 23%),⁹⁰¹ That left about half of the congregations (over 700) in which presumably the pastor sang the Psalm. But then that would not be significantly different from the "traditional" Lutheran anomaly of the pastor reading (or chanting) the gradual (or introtit)!

Those who studied and/or used the new baptismal rite (CW-7) were about 80%, with usage averaging 30% (LCA at 34%, ELCC at 21%, ALC and LCMS at about 28%). Affirmation of the Baptismal Covenant (CW-8) ran much lower in usage (average 17% with ELCC at 8% and LCMS at 9%). However the "studied but not used" category averaged 43% (with LCMS high at 48% and ELCC low at 23%).⁹⁰² The relatively recent publication of CW-7 in 1974 and CW-8 in 1975 certainly affected those statistics. Confusion over the theology and practice of confirmation (a term avoided in CW-8) certainly increased apprehension regarding such affirmation.

This was clearly the best and most accurate survey done by the ILCW. It represents the clearest picture of the actual use of the Contemporary Worship series in the parishes, but it needs to be supplemented by records of sales from the publishers. Given the large number of pastors responding, it presents very helpful data on the usage of the CW series in the parish.

Congregational Responses to Holy Communion (3 settings) [1976] & Pastor's Responses to Liturgical Texts [1976]

Early in 1977 ILCW materials were tested for the last time. Three musical settings were sent to selected congregations; all pastors and some lay leaders received *Liturgical Texts*, printed in fall 1976, containing the rites (except for Individual and Corporate Confession) that were to be included in the new book. No field-test results for ELCC or LCMS have been located. Instead, LCMS responses to *Liturgical Texts* included votes on the Brief Order of Confession and Holy Communion—as well as the rest of the rites. ALC and LCA, which did not include votes but only comments on *Liturgical Texts*, utilized the same questionnaire for the musical settings. ALC, however, made no attempt at analysis of the data; rather it simply tallied votes, setting by setting, and on *Liturgical Texts* excerpted comments, noting the number of similar sentiments. Thus comparison of reactions of different church bodies to *Liturgical Texts* is well nigh impossible, and only hints of churches' positions can be gleaned from individuals' reactions. A more detailed comparison of congregational field-test results is possible for ALC and LCA by the interpretations offered for LCMS are qualified by the use of different formats, questions, and scales.

Another methodology question—really an *authority* question—can be asked of the responses to *Liturgical Texts*, from which much of the data on ALC and all on LCMS is drawn. Even though the great majority of respondents was ordained clergy, the methodological question remains: Is the voice of the clergy the voice of God? With that in mind, a final look will be given at the more theological concerns raised in response to *Liturgical Texts*—sent to all congregations/pastors and responded to also by a few lay leaders, especially musicians. Occasional statistics are given by the churches as to numbers or percentages of given comments. For the most part I excerpted these random excerpts, looking for representative comments or unique insights. ALC and LCMS received similar numbers (265 and 260 respectively) and percentages of the approximately 5000 booklets of *Liturgical Texts* mailed to each church. LCA got a much higher number (912) and percentage of the approximately 9000 sent.

LCA alone attempted to take account of reactions to *Liturgical Texts* as a whole. Overall positive reactions were 66%: “Beautiful and relevant,” “refreshing and welcome,” “a healthy variety . . . and an ecumenical feel which builds on what SBH tried to do,” “at last we are moving out of the Victorian age into the 20th century.” Approval, but with concerns about certain texts, came from 15%. Concerns were “excessive wordiness, sexist language, inadequate rubrics, . . . [un]usable music, and too many options and alternatives.” “Negative to texts as a whole” was the response of 18%.

There were negative comparisons to SBH. "The devil himself could not have done a more perfect job of spreading confusion through the new translations and destruction of the beauty of the King James Version." Suggesting that such liturgical changes lead to loss of members, one person commented: "This movement to more words, more officiants, more rituals, obscures the gospel to the average worshippers in an average Lutheran church."⁹⁰³

Holy Communion

The first attempt is to compare the reactions of the 260 LCMS respondents (236 pastors) with the 38 ALC and 76 LCA congregations regarding the Brief Order of Confession. Reactions to this opening order were similar, with considerably lower scores in ALC and LCA for the (right column) mutual confession and forgiveness form. (This eventually ended up in *Compline*, LBW, p. 155). Over 90% of ALC and LCA congregations gave a positive ("good," "very good" or "excellent") to the traditional confession and almost 90% preferred it over the mutual confession. Comments identified the triple "fault" language (as in *Compline*) as problematic.⁹⁰⁴ There were also negative reactions to the absolution, "I forgive you. . . ."⁹⁰⁵ In spite of such objections, the traditional form of confession and forgiveness prevailed strongly in all three churches. (See Chart 1 below.)

Chart 1
Fall 1976 Liturgical Texts: Holy Communion
Brief Order for Confession

LCMS	%		ALC		LCA	
			%	%	%	%
			LT.	RT.	LT.	RT.
Completely Acceptable	67	Excellent	13	03	07	06
Acceptable, but...	15	Very Good	38	14	46	22
Questionable at ...	16	Good	41	45	39	42
Completely Unacceptable	02	Neither	06	24	05	16
		Bad	03	14	02	10
		Very Bad	0	0	0	04
		Totally Bad	0	0	0	0

Probably the most accurate assessment of reactions to the liturgy can be gained by comparing ALC and LCA reactions to the *texts* of the Holy Communion with the LCMS evaluation of *Liturgical Texts*. The problem

of adjusting differing scales is like comparing pecks of apples with liters of orange juice. Even so, the evaluations were remarkably close, with LCMS higher than ALC's or LCA's "totally acceptable" category probably because "completely acceptable" was its only unqualifiedly positive category, whereas ALC and LCA again had three positive categories.⁹⁰⁶ (See Chart 2 below.)

Chart 2
Fall 1976 Liturgical Texts: Holy Communion

LCMS	%		ALC		LCA	
			%	%	%	%
			Antecomunion	Communion	Antecomunion	Communion
Completely Acceptable	55	Totally Acceptable	08	0	10	05
Acceptable, but...	26	Mostly Acceptable	54	61	49	43
		Acceptable	33	32	34	44
Questionable at...	18	Barely Acceptable	03	05	07	08
Completely Unacceptable	01	Unacceptable	03	02	0	0

It would seem that the significantly lower scores within ALC and LCA for "the service as a whole at the end of the test period"⁹⁰⁷ could be accounted for only by the reaction to the music. If one emphasizes the *not* negative dimension of the neutral category ("neither positive nor negative"),⁹⁰⁸ one could argue that 77% of ALC congregations were "positive" (in the sense of not being "negative"); one could say with more certainty that 55% of the ALC congregations were clearly positive on the "service as a whole." (See Chart 3 below.) This was radically different from the 93-95% of those who were positive (collapsing "totally acceptable," "mostly acceptable," and "acceptable" into one category) on the *texts* of the service. (See Chart 2 above.) In LCA those not negative on the service as a whole constitute 73%, while those clearly positive were only 45%. That was less than half of those 92-93% of LCA congregations that evaluated the *texts* positively. Except for Nelson's Setting 2, no setting got much over 50% positive ratings and even Nelson got no "very positive" reactions in ALC or LCA. (See Chart 4, page 164). The Division for Parish Services had noted that as well: "The music seems consistently to raise more concern throughout the test than does the text."⁹⁰⁹

As the figures (chart 3) indicate one would have had to include the top *three* categories to bring “the response to the service as a whole,” anywhere near the positive response to the texts. While affirming the more

Chart 3
Fall 1976 Holy Communion (three settings) comparing
“Service as a whole” (with music) and text only

Holy Communion: Service as a whole			Holy Communion Text				
	ALC			ALC		LCA	
	%	%		%	%	%	%
				Antecomunion	Communion	Antecomunion	Communion
Very Positive	07	01	Totally Acceptable	08	0	10	05
Quite Positive	48	44	Mostly Acceptable	54	61	49	43
Neither + Nor -	22	28	Acceptable	33	32	34	44
Quite Negative	11	22	Barely Acceptable	03	05	07	08
Very Negative	11	04	Unacceptable	03	02	0	0

cautious statistics regarding Settings 1 and 2 discussed above, one could point out regarding ALC’s reaction to Hillert’s Setting 1 that 88% of the respondents were not negative. The LCA’s high marks for Nelson’s Setting 2 were striking: 79% were “quite positive” and the rest were “neither positive nor negative”: no one was “very positive” but at least *no one* disliked it!⁹¹⁰ (See Chart 4, page 164)

Evaluating the influence of the music in the field-tests of the Holy Communion, one wonders about the disparity between the overwhelmingly positive attitude toward the text (over 90% acceptable or better) and the approximately 50% in LCA and in ALC that clearly approved the service as a whole. Since reaction to the “flow” of the service was positive (“acceptable,” “mostly acceptable” or “totally acceptable” for 84% in LCA and 87% in ALC), the music might have been the critical factor which dragged down the overall evaluation. (See the bottom portion of Chart 5, page 165.) The responses of “easy” or “very easy to learn to sing” (ALC 46%; LCA 40%) for Settings 1 and 2 were remarkably close to the “quite” and “very positive” response to the service as a whole (ALC 55%, LCA 45%).⁹¹¹

Chart 4
 Fall 1976 Holy Communion (three settings)
 Service as a whole

	I		II		III		TOTAL	
	Hillert		Nelson		Chant/SBH		ALC %	LCA %
	ALC %	LCA %	ALC %	LCA %	ALC %	LCA %		
Very Positive	11	4	0	0	10	0	7	1
Quite Positive	44	46	59	79	40	25	48	44
Neither + Nor -	33	24	24	21	10	50	22	28
Quite Negative	11	21	6	0	20	0	11	4
Very Negative	0	5	12	0	20	0	11	4
	88	74	83	100	60	75	78	73

Response to Service as a Whole at the end of the test period. This does not take into account "no responses" of ALC.

To look at the same issue somewhat differently: 19% of ALC found Settings 1 and 2 "hard" or "very hard" to learn to sing and 22% had a "quite" or "very negative" response to the service as a whole. In LCA 30% found the service "hard" or "very hard" to learn to sing and 26% had "quite" or "very negative" response to the service as a whole. (See top portion of Chart 5, page 165.) While it was impossible to discern whether it was the same persons who agreed in their negative reactions to these two questions, these statistics suggest that the music may have been the culprit!

Even without the unpopular Setting 3, the scores "easy" or "very easy" for learning to sing paralleled the negative reactions to the "service as a whole." When including Setting 3, the average scores for the ease of learning to sing dropped from 40% to 32% in LCA, and from 46% to 44% in ALC. Overall totals (all three settings) for "hard" or "very hard" to learn were 23% in ALC and 38% in LCA. Overall totals for "hard" or "very hard" to *sing* were for ALC 29% and LCA 32%. The average scores for ease of learning *and* singing stood at 35% (LCA) and 46% (ALC). Looking at only the difficulty marks for learning *and* singing, the scores average 30% (LCA) and 26% (ALC). On the other hand, Setting 3 averaged 33% in these same categories in ALC and 48% in LCA! This seemed to point to the music as the decisive factor lowering the overall evaluation of the service. That Setting 1 and 2 survived in LBW and were well received is a

Chart 5
 Fall 1976 Holy Communion (three settings)
 Ease or difficulty of learning musical settings

	Setting I		Setting II		Setting III		TOTALS	
	ALC %	LCA %	ALC %	LCA %	ALC %	LCA %	ALC %	LCA %
Easy/very easy to learn	40	31	50	47	41	11	44	30
Hard/very hard to learn	25	41	18	27	27	52	23	40
Easy, very easy to sing	48	42	53	40	38	24	46	35
Hard/very hard to sing	26	27	24	33	38	45	29	35
Approval Rate	*Text		*Flow		**Service as a whole			
	ALC %	LCA %	ALC %	LCA %	ALC %	LCA %		
	94	93	87	84	55	45		

tribute to the introductory process, the care of pastors, and the skill of musicians. That Setting 3 would continue to be difficult to learn and sing should have been recognized from its low marks. The problem was captured by a comment recorded in the LCA report regarding setting 3: "Music was not different enough to warrant a change. It made singing more difficult because it was somewhat similar."⁹¹²

Objections of a more theological nature came from all three churches. Disagreements on the invocation included a few within ALC who protested making the sign of the cross and a number (in addition to a "rather unanimous reaction" within LCA) asserting "there is no way to 'cue' an assembly to say the invocation in unison." One person suggested "In the name of God, our Creator, Redeemer, and Sustainer" to "offset [the] male image." Some affirmed and others objected to the Brief Order of Confession being optional. Thirteen each in ALC and LCMS and almost half of LCA respondents (about 50) found the expression of original sin inadequate.

Whereas 11 in LCMS objected to the announcement of grace (cf. "Almighty God . . . hath had mercy . . ." TLH, p. 5; SBH, p. 1) as "inad-

equate as an absolution,” 17 in ALC and about 120 (90%) in LCA protested “I forgive you . . .”(with only one LCMS protest). Reactions to the mutual confession and absolution focused mainly on the triple “fault” language (24 within ALC; about 60 in LCA; in LCMS 15 suggested deleting this whole option). Five persons each in ALC and LCA supported the mutual confession and absolution.⁹¹³

There were several objections within LCMS and LCA to the use of the apostolic “benediction” as the greeting. There were a number of objections to wordings of the *Kyrie* especially “holy house,” and “many” Missourians objected to the litany form, which had precedent in WS but not in TLH. There were a half-dozen Missourians who asserted that “This is the feast” does not refer to the sacrament, and one person from ALC who argued that it does not apply to the church militant. Four persons within ALC were getting tired of the “greetings” by the time of the collect.⁹¹⁴

There were surprisingly few comments on the gospel–sermon–hymn–creed sequence, but comments on the Nicene Creed made up for it. Five from ALC and 22 from LCMS objected to the plural, “We believe.” Three LCMS and an LCA “linguist of Near Eastern language” objected to the translation, “God *from* God,” etc. The latter argued that since “King of kings means the greatest king” in *Hebrew*, thus “God of God” [translating the *Greek* of the original Nicene Creed] meant “the only God, the true God.” So he concluded “God from God has no scriptural basis” since it suggested “a transferring of power from the creator God to his Son.” If so, the Arian opponents of the Nicene Creed would be happy with the new translation, but the argument seemed tortuous!

There were 34 objections to “catholic” from LCMS, 15 from ALC, and 27 from LCA (plus 10% objecting to it in the Apostles’ Creed. Equally controverted was the *descensus* in the Apostles’ Creed, except for three in ALC, who applauded the restoration of “hell” and most supported the ICET translation (“the dead”). Within LCMS, eight supported the ICET text and about 100 (80%) of LCA respondents supported it. However, one person from LCA wrote: “For the life of me I cannot understand why any Christian in the act of worship would try to bypass the idea or concept of hell.” About 25 persons in LCA supported the translation, “He descended into hell,” with the ICET text given in a footnote. The footnote became the biggest issue for LCMS: 37 asked for its deletion and 24 said, similarly, that “hell” should be the “only permitted translation.” A few in each church insisted that the layout or punctuation place “the communion of saints” in apposition to the Church, presumably to preserve the unique Lutheran interpretation of *communio sanctorum*.⁹¹⁵

Seventy-some in LCA recommended changing the location of the peace, most suggesting after the absolution. Eleven each in ALC and LCMS and over 40 in LCA objected to the offertory procession. For 17 in LCMS the offertory's language of "sacrifice" seemed to signal the "Catholic" (ten made this explicit) *propitiatory* sacrifice they feared. One LCA member said: "Let's not get mixed up in the Catholic theology of sacrifice." Another said the offertory procession seems to emphasize "what man does (sacrifice) instead of what God does (sacrament)." Almost a hundred people objected to the use of "salutary" as outdated.⁹¹⁶

The Great Thanksgiving, the subject of controversy from almost the beginning of ILCW, received much attention. The Great Thanksgiving received 25 negative votes from LCMS, 13 from ALC, and no count was given for LCA; but there were calls from a few in all the churches to omit all eucharistic prayers as obscuring the proclamation and action of God alone. Nevertheless there was strained support from LCA's Division for Parish Services: "If there were a strong theological view among the test congregations that the *verba* alone was the most appropriate expression of Lutheran Theology, one would expect that practice to be reflected in the test." It is pointed out that Thanksgiving A was used 270 times, B was used 156 times and the *verba* alone only seven times.⁹¹⁷ However, since the congregations were asked to test this liturgy and using *verba* alone was *not* an option, the argument falters. Since no specific questions about the style, length, or theology of the Great Thanksgiving were asked (as in the CW-2 questionnaire), it was difficult to draw conclusions about popular support for the eucharistic prayer.

The new translation of the *verba* brought numerous comments. There were almost 50 objections to "he surrendered to betrayal and death" (one, as "docetic"!); "Covenant" was called a "mistranslation and misinterpretation" (LCA) and "Calvinistic" (LCMS). "Sealed by my blood" was "not biblical" (ALC). There were 19 objections to "for my remembrance" from LCMS, 8 from ALC and almost 50 from LCA. The latter ranged from "awkward" to the theological assertion: "Christ is the focal point and not simply a review or remembrance of his historical events." Amazingly enough, for all the controversy, there were only two requests to delete the *epiclesis* from LCMS; three from ALC said it was not good theology; the 31 comments from LCA were varied. One supported and one opposed a "real *epiclesis* . . . calling down the Holy Spirit on the bread and wine." Hence this nod to the Holy Spirit tended to "give the impression that the Holy Spirit has been somehow absent up to this point." Minor suggestions were made for wording changes in Prayer B (LBW, p. 70, par. 33) but no major objections.

There were a few comments on “hallowed” and “from the time of trial” in ALC and *Agnus Dei* being optional; so did over 50 in LCA. One is poignant: “The *Agnus Dei* is one of the finest preludes to the sacrament. Putting it as a fill or spiritual tie-over until the administration of the sacrament is completed does not do it justice.” Eleven Missourians objected to the distribution formula, preferring TLH. There were a few objections to “Thank the Lord” (as “doggeral”) and to various words in the new *Nunc Dimittis*. There were a few requests for changes in the prayers, most from LCA and especially the third prayer (LBW, p. 74, par. 40). Omitting the trinitarian ending of the Aaronic benediction drew three comments from ALC, none from LCMS (since it was not used in TLH, WS, or CW), and 104 from LCA; Luther, the Church of Sweden, and SBH were cited as authorities for this addition. Muhlenberg should have been added to the sources! Someone asked why omit it at this time, having finally “trained us” to place the trinitarian formula at the end of the Aaronic benediction. Presumably ALC members and pastors were not so well trained. A few did object to the “final word of law” in the dismissal (“Go in peace. Serve the Lord.”): “Too harsh” said a Missourian. Several suggested replacing it with a closing hymn.⁹¹⁸

Holy Baptism

There are no reports of *congregational* field-tests of the rite of Baptism in ALC or LCMS and only two from LCA congregations. These two rated the service “very positive” and “quite positive.” One congregation reported most people liked the use of the candle. The passing of the peace was acceptable for the baptismal party, but the “congregations did not like the sign of peace carried into their midst.”⁹¹⁹

LCMS Pastors’ evaluations gave the clearest statistical picture of the response. Out of 260 returns, there were:

- 131 completely acceptable
- 65 acceptable but . . .
- 37 questionable at . . .
- 7 completely unacceptable.

ALC had 265 pastoral respondents, but no vote: 19 said they liked it; 2 were “generally dissatisfied”; and 12 said it was too long and complicated. Six LCMS respondents also thought it too lengthy.⁹²⁰

There were theological objections from LCA and LCMS about the inadequacy of “children of a fallen humanity” as a statement about original sin. Several missed the catechism’s emphasis on “water and Word.”

One from LCA said “liberates” was “loaded”; four Missourians also objected. Some saw the charge to parents and sponsors as “too harsh” (ALC), others as lacking in “instruction” (LCMS); one said “‘reject sin’—what do you mean?” (LCA). The concept of “forces of evil” was seen as “inadequate”: Identify Satan by name (LCMS). “All his empty promises” was “inadequate” (LCMS) or “silly” (ALC); substitute “works” (LCA). Two from LCMS suggested the traditional exorcism here. The adaptation of Luther’s Flood Prayer was praised as biblical and beautiful (LCA), too long (LCA, ALC), wordy and didactic (ALC), and Calvinist (LCMS)! The theology (LCMS), the term (ALC), and the grammatical object (LCA) of “Pour out your Holy Spirit...” were all questioned. There were surprisingly few objections to the two baptismal formulas (LCMS 3; ALC 5) and the laying on of hands (LCMS 1; ALC 3; LCA 2). As many were concerned about *both* hands: “How do you hold the books?” However, there was more concern about the content of the *epiclesis*: it “cast doubt on Baptism” (LCMS). It was un-Lutheran theology (ALC 8); the change suggested was: “continue to pour. . .” No objection to chrismation was recorded by LCA; there were six from ALC (along with a question about the recipe for preparing oil and a quip about blessing Crisco) and one from LCMS along with ten “questions.” In LCMS, two favored the use of the candle, one recommended deleting it (along with everything else after the laying on of hands). In ALC, six found it distracting, sentimental, or cute. Again, no negative reactions from LCA were reported.⁹²¹

Several ALC congregations (perhaps some of those 38 that did not “answer”) provided their own questionnaires:

Congregation 1: Positive 25%, Neutral 33%, Negative 42%

Congregation 2: Good 11%, Mixed 25%, Poor 5%; Rather not use it 59%

Confirmation

The affirmation rite (here titled Confirmation, Reception into Membership, and Restoration—*not* Affirmation of the Baptismal Covenant) received comments of “good” (10) and “flexible” (4) in ALC. Except for comments that it was “too long” (ALC) or “too formal” (LCA) for receiving members or “too much crammed into one order” (LCMS), most of the general comments were favorable. Unfortunately no ALC questionnaires on this rite were returned (or at least none were found by me!).

Comparing it with the SBH rite, the parents of confirmands in one congregation found this rite “distinctly more clear.”⁹²²

This revised rite for Confirmation, Reception into Membership, and Restoration was the subject of mixed reviews, in part because of its mul-

multiple functions. LCMS respondents reacted to the lack of specificity regarding the *Lutheran* church, the *Lutheran confessions* (especially the Small Catechism), ecumenical implications of “one holy catholic and apostolic Church,” and hints of open communion. LCA respondents argued more from the perspective of the “new approach to confirmation” (viz. as a “pastoral and educational ministry” more than a *rite*). Problems were seen as

Chart 6
Affirmation of Baptism (Confirmation)

LCMS	%	LCA	%
Completely Acceptable	65	Very Positive	20
Acceptable, but...	19	Quite Positive	40
		Neither Positive or Negative	20
Questionable at ...	13	Quite Negative	20
Completely Unacceptable	03	Very Negative	0

related to its use with those already communing. One LCA respondent suggested “Renounce a sinful life” for “Reject sin.” Another suggested the renunciation read: “the devil and all his words and works.” ALC responses were random: Vow faithfulness to Scripture and church; not just “intend” but “promise”; delete “again” in the second article and change “catholic” in the third article of the Creed; change “give you faith” in the laying on of hands to “deepen” (cf. CW-8, 36 and LBW, p. 201: “confirm”). A number of LCA respondents also recommended strengthening the *promise* to include “commitment to witness to the gospel, stewardship, participation in the ministry and work of the body of Christ, and Christian living. . . .” One Missourian added “willingness to suffer persecution and death for the faith”! One person found the closing rubric, “All return to their places...” to be “out of place”; another thought it was tacky.”⁹²³

Burial

The Burial of the Dead reached a new low in LCMS with more persons voting “questionable” than any other service except marriage (59 and 60 respectively out of 244 responses); yet 143 said burial was “completely acceptable,” which was also a low percentage in comparison with other services. The seven “completely unacceptable” votes were as high as for any service.

In LCA comments were almost entirely positive. In ALC 20 persons said it was a good rite; seven said it was “too long, complicated, ceremo-

nial.” Ten thought the processional should be permissive, seven commenting on “logistical problems in meeting the casket” at the entrance of the church. There were ten persons who said that it was not practical to speak during the procession. Further, “logistical” problems were noted in the committal. Several LCMS respondents indicated it was “too elaborate” or “confusing.”⁹²⁴

Theological reactions to the burial rite ranged from a “totally unacceptable mass for the dead” to an “overwhelming positive response” to

Chart 7
The Burial of the Dead

LCMS	%		ALC %	LCA %
Completely Acceptable	59	Very Positive	50	38
Acceptable, but...	14	Quite Positive	25	31
		Neither Positive or Negative	25	31
Questionable at ...	24	Quite Negative	0	0
Completely Unacceptable	03	Very Negative	0	0

Chart 8
The Burial of the Dead

	Liturgy of the Word		Committal		Flow	
	ALC %	LCA %	ALC %	LCA %	ALC %	LCA %
Totally Acceptable	25	31	33	31	25	38
Mostly Acceptable	50	38	33	38	50	38
Acceptable	25	31	33	23	25	08
Barely Acceptable	0	0	0	08	0	15
Unacceptable	0	0	0	0	0	0

including the eucharist. Some called for a change in title to The Order for Burial from Burial of the Dead since “I assume that anyone buried will be dead.” From the ALC came objections to glamorizing death and, from LCMS, to implying that “the soul is in the grave.” On the other hand, an LCA respondent objected to the opposite: commending “our brother” to

God and committing “his body to the ground” as a seeming division between the soul and the body. But “prayers for the dead” drew negative comments from all church bodies: 44 from LCMS, 16 from ALC, and of the 45 LCA comments most disapproved: “Are we trying to pray the deceased into heaven?” “Lutherans don’t pray for the dead!” Similarly there were 22 LCMS objections to the benediction of the deceased and at least one from LCA. One LCA respondent labeled “terrible” the language “Almighty God has called our *brother*, _____, from this life to himself....” This “wrongfully perpetuated an image of God the body snatcher rather than helping people understand that body parts are worn out or damaged and death results (which is also part of God’s plan).” One ALC member designated God’s “call” as “fatalism.” The concluding prayer, “Rest eternal grant...” was designated “awkward” (“standard English, please”) and “Masonic.” (It comes from the Roman Catholic requiem mass).⁹²⁵

Marriage

The marriage rite got the LCMS’s lowest scores. One Missourian objected that it was “loaded with sexist language.” ALC respondents gave eleven “good service” reactions, four preferred SBH, three disliked communion, and one liked it as part of the wedding service.

In terms of percentages, within LCMS, marriage shared the low point (55%) for “completely acceptable” with Holy Communion and Baptism; it also had the high point (25%) in “questionable” and “completely unacceptable” (3%)—shared with Baptism and confirmation.⁹²⁶

Chart 9
Marriage

LCMS	%	LCA	%
Completely Acceptable	55	Very Positive	25
Acceptable, but...	18	Quite Positive	0
		Neither Positive or Negative	75
Questionable at ...	25	Quite Negative	0
Completely Unacceptable	03	Very Negative	0

Note: No ALC questionnaires or reports were found.

The marriage rite was characterized on the one hand, as “awkward” and “grim” (LCMS) or needing more “joy, robustness, celebration” (ALC) and, on the other hand, as “excellent contemporization congruent with the

sentiments and texts developed by couples married over the last four years” (LCA). Missourians objected to the omission of “procreation as the purpose of marriage,” obedience of the wife, and life-long commitment. (ALC and LCA echoed the latter objection.) There were 30 objections from LCMS and 17 from ALC to the language that the couple “made themselves husband and wife.” One LCA respondent argued: “The emphasis should be that God has made them husband and wife.” Respondents from all the churches insisted on changing “the family of man” to “the human family” or “all people.” There were numerous comments about communion: 7 negative and 7 positive from ALC; 20 from LCA, most raising questions about a celebration in a gathering with so many non-members present. The “redundancy” of the proposed triple benediction (May Almighty God bless you. Amen. May he direct you all the days of your life. Amen. Almighty God...direct and keep you...Amen) was designated a “juvenile stunt” by one respondent—presumably like decorating the honeymoon vehicle!⁹²⁷

Morning Prayer

Some points of comparison are possible between ALC, LCA and LCMS on Matins:

Within the ALC, among those evaluating only the texts of Morning Prayer, 11 said it was good, 3 expressing appreciation for its adaptation for the home. Two said they did not like it and suggested its omission to “save paper.” LCA respondents appreciated the theology, the silent meditation, the text, and the flow. Negative comments focused on the difficulty of the music and the singing of the Psalms, as well as tacking on the sermon. Eight Missourians agreed concerning sermon placement.⁹²⁸

Chart 10
Morning Prayer (Matins)

LCMS	%		ALC %	LCA %
Completely Acceptable	75	Very Positive	0	0
Acceptable, but...	19	Quite Positive	0	25
Questionable at ...	05	Neither Positive or Negative	25	63
Completely Unacceptable	02	Quite Negative	13	13
		Very Negative	0	0
		Divided	25	
		No Answer	38	

In Morning Prayer, questions came from each church: “What is a ‘Psalm prayer?’” As a substitution for “our fathers,” “forebearers [*sic*],” “forebears,” and “ancestors” were suggested by respondents from all the churches. Several Missourians asked for more explanation of the paschal blessing. Three persons objected to the translation of the *Te Deum*, one as “doggerel [*sic*]” (ALC).

Evening Prayer

Comparisons on *Vespers* were interesting since the rite has been subjected to radical revision in CW-9:

One ALC congregation reported its favorable response when *Vespers* was used in church council and committee meetings. Comments about ser-

Chart 11
Evening Prayer (Vespers)

LCMS	%		ALC %	LCA %
Completely Acceptable	70	Very Positive	20	14
Acceptable, but...	22	Quite Positive	40	71
		Neither Positive or Negative	20	14
Questionable at ...	06	Quite Negative	20	0
Completely Unacceptable	02	Very Negative	0	0

mon placement were made in all three church bodies. Among ALC respondents to *Liturgical Texts*, 17 were “good” and 4 negative.⁹²⁹

Evening Prayer drew a few negative comments from ALC about the overdoing of light imagery and about the confusion of the persons of the Trinity in the *Phos Hilaron*. Several LCA analyses pointed out the same problem, noting the grammar and punctuation of the translation. (It was corrected for LBW, p. 41) Several persons suggested that mentioning prayer rising as incense (Psalm 141) was “too much poetic liberty [*license?*].” For the Litany, several Missourians made the interesting suggestion of interspersing the response, “*Christe eleison*.” Someone suggested that the prayer for “favorable weather” was “nonsense because God’s sun shines upon good and evil alike” (LCA). Nine Missourians and four from ALC objected to the sequence of readings, prayers, offering, hymn, and then sermon in Morning and Evening Prayer.⁹³⁰

Prayer at the Close of the Day

The revised rite of compline got mixed reviews:

Three Missourians said they preferred the traditional (TLH) order for *Compline*. Several in LCA commented on the difficulty of the music, but at least one respondent felt it was the best received of the three daily services. Within ALC there were eleven positive and four negative evaluations.⁹³¹

Chart 12
Prayer at the Close of the Day (Compline)

LCMS	%		ALC %	LCA %
Completely Acceptable	82	Very Positive	25	0
Acceptable, but...	13	Quite Positive	50	29
		Neither Positive or Negative	25	71
Questionable at ...	04	Quite Negative	0	0
Completely Unacceptable	01	Very Negative	0	0

Prayer at the Close of the Day drew reactions from LCA such as: “This entire office is beautiful.” The language of the first confession and announcement of grace (left column—see LBW, p. 155, par. 3) was questioned by several in ALC and LCMS. The problems with the mutual confession and absolution were reiterated by all church bodies: “too many ‘faults,’” a weak or “conditional” absolution. “apple of your eye” in the responsory was found “archaic,” “silly,” or “distracting.”

Responsive Prayer

Suffrages (Responsive Prayer 1 and 2) received very positive reactions in LCMS

Chart 13
Responsive Prayer (Suffrages)

LCMS	%	LCA	%
Completely Acceptable	83	Very Positive	25
Acceptable, but...	12	Quite Positive	0
		Neither Positive or Negative	75
Questionable at ...	03	Quite Negative	0
Completely Unacceptable	01	Very Negative	0

and were virtually ignored in field-test and comments on Liturgical Texts (ALC: 2 positive; 1 negative on Responsive Prayer 1; 4 positive on Responsive Prayer 2). LCA had 10 questioning comments on “bodies and souls” in Luther’s prayer [LBW, p. 163]).

The four LCA congregations doing the testing used these suffrages 20 times in various meetings and classes.⁹³²

Responsive Prayer 1 and 2 drew minimal responses, e.g. questioning “*bountiful Spirit*” (LBW, p. 162) and “unyielding wood” as a metaphor for the cross (CW-9, 63 par. 26, subsequently dropped). This prayer was also characterized as “too romantic or sentimental.” Someone also questioned the mention of holy “*angles [sic]*” in Luther’s Evening Prayer.⁹³³

The Litany

Reactions to the Litany varied in ALC from “good service” (10), to “omit this.” Reasons given for negative responses were: infrequent use (3), and length (2). Seven Missourians objected to the length of the leader’s passages as contrasted with the brief responses of the congregation (“too little participation”).

Chart 14
The Litany

LCMS	%	LCA	%
Completely Acceptable	83	Very Positive	0
Acceptable, but...	11	Quite Positive	43
		Neither Positive or Negative	57
Questionable at ...	04	Quite Negative	0
Completely Unacceptable	02	Very Negative	0

Individuals from all church bodies suggested deleting the “perils of child-birth.” One added cancer as well as heart and brain surgery.⁹³⁴

Service of the Word

Although the vote tally on the Service of the Word in LCMS was still overwhelmingly positive, the negative comments were: “too dead” or “not needed” (4; ALC 10). One LCA congregation reported that “1 percent of the 426 who returned questionnaires responded negatively with 11 percent

neutral.” One commented: “No feeling. Didn’t hold together.” Four in ALC found it good. An LCA congregation reported it was “generally well received” as “a substitute for regular Sunday worship”—damning with faint praise! The contrast in the votes is striking:

Chart 15
The Service of the Word

LCMS	%	LCA	%
Completely Acceptable	75	Very Positive	13
Acceptable, but...	15	Quite Positive	25
		Neither Positive or Negative	13
Questionable at ...	07	Quite Negative	50
Completely Unacceptable	02	Very Negative	0

The LCA Division for Parish Services commented: “The consistency in negative responses to the Service of the Word is in striking contrast to the more positive responses of the same congregations to some other services they were testing.”⁹³⁵

The Service of the Word evoked negative comments as “unnecessary,” “confusing,” and “too dead.” From an LCA respondent came the following comment:

A skeletal “Service of the Word” implies an untenable distinction in the importance of Word over against Sacrament. God imparts *one same efficacious grace*—albeit in different ways. This feeble service appears to suggest that the sacramental grace is a higher form. . . . What God does for us is never determined by historic or contemporary practice [author’s italics].

The need for Morning Prayer, Service of the Word, and “half-mass” (ante-communion without communing) was questioned by several respondents, though with differing conclusions. The absence of confession and absolution was challenged. The substitution of a hymn for the New Testament canticle was objected to by one LCMS respondent (and the option was dropped!).⁹³⁷

Summarizing and comparing the responses within LCMS, the services of Daily Prayer (*Matins, Vespers, Compline, Suffrages, and the Litany*) as well as the Service of the Word all had better than 70% responding “completely acceptable.” The affirmation rite fell to 65%, burial service to

59%, and Baptism and marriage services to 55%. The rates for “completely unacceptable” for these four rites stood at 2 to 3%. Marriage and burial services had high numbers marking “questionable”—25% and 24% respectively.

Unfortunately, no comparison on the Baptism rite can be made with ALC or LCA, because no reports were available. Concerning the affirmation rite, the 60% positive and 20% “quite negative” in LCA seemed consonant with the LCMS reaction. (ALC is again missing.) The LCA response of 25% “quite positive” on the marriage rite and the rest neutral seemed much weaker than the 55% LCMS response of “completely acceptable,” though one can note that the other 45% in LCMS had some concerns, questions, or objections (rather than being “neither positive nor negative”—a dilemma of the categories again!). There were no returns from the ALC on the marriage rite.

The rather complete responses on burial for ALC and LCA made for a good comparison between them. The only difference that stood out comes in the committal which 8% of LCA found “barely acceptable” and the “flow” which 15% of LCA found the same. No one marked the service negative or “unacceptable.” The 75% positive response in ALC compared with 69% in LCA in relation to LCMS’s 59% in the “completely acceptable” category. Even making allowances for the wording of the LCMS categories, one could assume that the balance of the LCMS respondents were more negative than those neutral responses in ALC and LCA.

Perhaps the most surprising statistic was the 38% positive LCA evaluation of the Service of the Word as compared with 75% in LCMS “completely acceptable.” It became even more striking when the 50% who are “quite negative” are noted in the LCA sample. (No ALC figures are available.) ALC statistics on *Matins* were not clear, but were not positive. LCA’s 25% positive compared unfavorably with LCMS’s 75% “completely acceptable”; LCA’s 13% “quite negative” was unusual in its response to these rites but was hard to compare with the Missourian categories. The statistics for *Vespers* were, happily, more complete. LCA’s 85% positive contrasted with ALC’s 60% positive and 20% “quite negative.” LCMS’s 70% “completely acceptable” seemed to stand somewhere in between the other churches’ reactions. On the other hand, LCMS had 82% evaluating *Compline* “completely acceptable,” ALC had 75% positive and LCA only 29%! Again LCMS had 83% finding *Suffrages* “completely acceptable” and LCA only 25% (the rest being neutral and ALC being “delinquent” again).

Given the relatively few congregations involved in the field test of the rites other than Communion (from 4 to 13 in ALC and LCA), clear conclu-

sions perhaps cannot and surely were not drawn. In spite of unenthusiastic response to many of these services, few changes were made and none were radically revised or dropped. How carefully they were analyzed or heeded by ILCW or the churches' review committee was not clear. Furthermore, it is a moot question how seriously they should have been taken. Is the *vox populi* the *vox Dei*? Lutherans have never said so. And if five million Frenchmen can be wrong, perhaps also eight million Lutherans—or even those who responded to field-tests, questionnaires, and letter writing campaigns. The other thing that is clear is that there was no basis for predicting or justifying the LCMS pullout from the LBW on the basis of these reactions!

The Theologians' Debate as Debacle: Eucharistic Controversy III (December 1975-May 1977)

In LCMS circles the debate was just beginning. Armand Boehme suggested the reasons for this delay were “internal problems of the LCMS and lack of availability of some ILCW material.”⁹³⁸ The (resolving of the) Seminex split and the formation of the AELC in 1976 set a new stage for the debate within LCMS, which virtually began in 1975 and intensified in 1976 and 1977.

Green and Krugler

This intensification was mirrored in Lowell Green's polemical article, “Between Luther and the ‘Now’ Generation.” He attacked the use of the theology of the “Romanizing Anglo-Catholic, Gregory Dix.”⁹³⁹ He charged Eugene Brand with “rejecting the Sacrament as something that is offered by God to man . . . and placing it under the Romanizing and Calvinizing aspects of something offered to God, either as a merit or as proof of one's salvation.” Brand's central error regarding the Sacrament was seen as “withdrawing it from the Lutheran categories of Law and Gospel.” He concluded: “Thereby the concept of the Sacrament as a means of grace is lost.” Furthermore “we endanger the doctrine of justification.”⁹⁴⁰

Green said that ILCW's use of Dix's four-fold shape in CW-2 was “a radical break with Lutheran tradition at almost every point.” Dix had absolutized “the dogmatic and liturgical teaching of the time regarding the Lord's Supper (‘eucharist’)” and made them “normative for our century.” Green's criticism focused on the “eucharistic prayer, in which one approached as closely as possible to Roman usage.”⁹⁴¹ This “seems to repudiate Luther and the confessions, which saw the *verba* not as a prayer directed to God but as a proclamation of the gospel to the congregation.” Green concluded, in words designed to help arouse the sleeping giant of Missouri: “The fact that the words of institution are clearly proclaimed

neither in the *act of consecration* [eucharistic prayer!] nor in the distribution of the ILCW *mass* represents a serious distortion of Lutheran thought about the Sacrament” [emphasis mine].⁹⁴² Calling the ILCW rite a “mass” and mixing concerns regarding proclamation and “consecration,” as well as Law and Gospel, apparently heightened concerns within LCMS. This article in *The Springfielder* and Rorem’s article in *The Cresset* would have been read by diverse LCMS audiences. The number of popular and scholarly articles in ILCW’s work in general and eucharistic prayers in particular increased significantly in 1976 in LCMS publications. The dissolution of the Consultation on Lutheran Unity in 1975 and the resolution of the Seminex controversy in 1976 as the AELC was formed—all these changed and charged the atmosphere as ILCW work neared its completion. Oliver Olson’s departure from Mt. Airy Seminary, Lowell Green’s move to LCMS faculties, and Gerhard Forde’s work on the ALC Review Group had tended to focus the debate, outside LCMS’s circles, on Jenson and Forde.

In a sharp response to Green’s “potpourri of ill-formed criticisms,” Larry Bailey attempted to correct Green on several points. Against Green’s charge that Dix made the fourth century a golden age and absolutized its dogma and liturgy regarding the eucharist, Bailey quoted Dix: “There is no more reason to set up the fourth century (or for that matter the first) than the 16th as the ideal for those who have to be Christians in the 20th.”⁹⁴³ Bailey challenged Green’s assertion that the *verba* are to be proclaimed in the distribution. “The formula on page 29 of *The Lutheran Hymnal* can scarcely be constructed as being the *verba*, though they may amplify and personalize the *verba* in paraphrase.” Bailey also challenged Green’s contention that *verba* are not to be *prayed*. Bailey pointed to preface and prayer (in the TLH sequence) followed by the *verba* with the pastor normally still facing the altar and then the congregation praying “O Christ thou Lamb of God”; these, including the *verba*, are clearly addressed to God, he argued.⁹⁴⁴

Bailey countered Green’s anti-Calvinist polemic against fraction with Paul’s phrase “the bread which we break” (cf. 1 Corinthians 10:16). Green’s attack on offertory, where bread and wine are “pompously carried to the altar” turning God’s gift into a “human gift,”⁹⁴⁵ was answered by arguing that they have to be “carried” to the altar (at least by the altar guild!). Further, contended Bailey, “clearly God has chosen to use elements shaped by human hands: bread, not wheat kernels; wine, not grapes” (cf. Apol. XXIV, BC 265. 7).⁹⁴⁶

In documentation of my LCMS “projection” (at best an after-the-fact “prophecy”), in his article in the *Concordia Journal* Arnold Krugler cited approvingly the theological symposium lecture of Olson (appearing in *The Lutheran Quarterly* in May 1974), Rorem’s article (in *Cresset* in March

1975) and Green's article (in *The Springfielder* in December 1975).⁹⁴⁷ Indeed, Krugler seemed to be picking up the challenge that Green issued, to the effect that most opposition to the ILCW's works had come from within the ALC⁹⁴⁸ since LCMS "normally preeminent in theology, has not devoted sufficient time to this."⁹⁴⁹

Krugler argued from the Formula of Concord that ceremonies contrary to the word of God cannot be considered "indifferent" (*adiaphora*) and suggested that the ILCW eucharistic prayers fall under Luther's judgment of "work-righteousness." Krugler made a great deal of the "double speaking" of the *verba* as well as their two-fold purpose. The first "speaking" is "over the elements" and "before the congregation" (citing FCSD VII, BC 583.75 and 587.79) and sets apart or blesses the elements for their sacred use. Krugler noted regarding these "consecratory words." "Typical practice finds the minister facing the altar upon which bread and wine have been placed, speaking the words while making the sign of the cross over them." Citing the Large Catechism (BC 449.22) Krugler presented this first speaking as Christ's gracious invitation to undeserving communicants to eat and drink the body broken and blood shed for them. Thus the first speaking had a *duplex* "first" purpose: (i) to consecrate the elements and (ii) to invite sinners.⁹⁵⁰

The second "speaking," showing the "second" purpose of the *verba*, "is to each communicant as he personally receives the bread and the wine, promising in effective and dynamic fashion . . . the forgiveness of sins . . ." ⁹⁵¹ Krugler asserted:

For Lutherans, prayer is a sacrifice that we as Christians offer. Hence it is our work. To imbed Christ's words of promise into eucharistic prayer is to destroy their character as gospel to the congregation.⁹⁵²

He went on to charge that the synergistic prayer is set into the synergistic (below, "semi-Pelagian") context of the congregation's "first offering the gifts *needed* for the Lord's Supper" [emphasis his].^{953a}

Having criticized the concept of worship as human "action," Krugler apparently unconsciously exegeted I Corinthians 11:23f. in terms of three of the "four-action-shape" actions: "taking bread, giving thanks, breaking it, and speaking the words of promise." In Dix's formulation the fourth action is eating/drinking (cf. CW-2, 10-18). Krugler pointed to Luther's interpretation of "Do this" in the Large Catechism (cf. BC 448.17): "What Jesus does, institutes, gives, and bids us take."^{953b} In fact, it is the Formula of Concord which makes explicit both the speaking of the words of institution and the oral eating (cf. BC 584.83-86).

Interestingly, Krugler found the fifth thanksgiving (CW-01, 26f.) acceptable for it “does not meet the ILCW definition of *both* payer [*sic*] and proclamation. It is pure proclamation.” Krugler had stated above: “No one who reads it would assume it is a prayer directed to God. It does, however, clearly praise God for his goodness.”⁹⁵⁴ If it *praises* God, how is it *not* the sacrifice of thanksgiving Krugler so wants to avoid?

Bailey and Klein

Monitoring and moderating the explosion in Missouri was a series in the *Forum Letter* by Larry Bailey and Leonard Klein, pastors of St. Paul’s (Brooklyn) and Immanuel (Manhattan) churches respectively. The series, begun in 1976 and entitled “Renewing Lutheran Worship,” represented a “moderate” LCMS position that came to be embodied in AELC, which was never officially a part of ILCW.⁹⁵⁵ A position and perspective was represented here, not too different from many of the Missourians serving on ILCW and their Commission on Worship, but very different from the LCMS critics surfacing in 1976.

Bailey and Klein identified their presuppositions in the first installment: (1) ILCW is necessary, good, helpful, and Lutheran; (2) modern English, (3) the best of Christian hymnody and (4) developments in liturgy, music, and the arts demand “a common Lutheran approach.” They see unity, not uniformity, as the goal, in a common liturgy which is “not exclusive or restrictive.” They exhorted: “In all this, ILCW need to be encouraged, criticized, watched, helped,” noting that the commission “has (often in vain) asked for help and criticism.”⁹⁵⁶

Bailey and Klein began with the canon in the “classic pattern.” The “classic pattern” of the canon was discussed in relation to ILCW’s Great Thanksgiving. They criticized the “rigid historicism” of presenting the Anaphora of St. Hippolytus (CW-01, 20f.) without preface or *Sanctus* simply because they were absent from the manuscripts of this prayer. The fourth and seventh prayers (CW-01, 24f. & 30-32) were praised as good examples of contemporary canons. Bailey and Klein noted the unexplained omissions in the seventh (“ecumenical”) eucharistic prayer. The eighth prayer (CW-01, 33-35) suffered from “the conceit of ILCW contemporaneity”—“clumsy imagery” and “jarring lines.” The reviewers declared “the deepest waters you people with reverence,” was “a poetic image that drowned.”^{957a}

Bailey and Klein took up the defense of the sacrificial dimension of the ILCW rite: The human action of praise and thanksgiving was seen as an appropriate response to, not competition with, God’s gracious action. But unlike some defenses of the ILCW rite, this one asked more precise

reference to the benefits and a place for the *verba* as *consecration* not just proclamation/prayer: “ILCW has been too ambiguous . . . in affirming that the *verba* are, in the Lutheran understanding, the form and occasion of consecration.” They rejected as “false dichotomies”: “eucharist as sacrifice and as sacramental gift” and “God’s action toward us and ours toward him,” as well as “the *verba* as proclamation and as consecration.”^{957b} This final dichotomy and ambiguity was not the one criticized outside and inside Missouri between proclamation and prayer (hence, gospel and law). Rather it represented a tension among the supporters of eucharistic prayer as to what—if anything—the *verba* do.

The next several installments continued to deal with the Great Thanksgiving. Criticisms focused mostly on language, sometimes on structure.⁹⁵⁸ But a case was made again for the “*verba* as consecration”: “. . . the recitation of the *verba* [is] the bringing to effect of Christ’s promise to be present in the Sacrament of his Body and Blood. The rest of the canon may be seen as the enactment of our Lord’s command to give thanks . . . and make remembrance of him.” Then in an interesting synthesis Bailey and Klein argued: “Christ is present in virtue of his promise . . . when the *verba* are *prayed* and *proclaimed* in the liturgy (ideally within a proper canon)” [emphasis mine]. They concluded: “We see no compelling reason for rejecting the *verba* as consecration,” having referred again to Article VII of the Formula of Concord.⁹⁵⁹

Bailey and Klein added their voices to the critics of the *epiclesis*, but again for different reasons. They began: “Those who dissent from this understanding of the *verba* [as consecration] include the subcommittee that drafted the ILCW eucharistic prayers [CW-01] and many of the commission’s members and advocates.” ILCW’s inclination seemed to regard the whole action from offertory through distribution as “effecting Christ’s promise” or else “to disregard altogether what ‘happens’ to the elements and when.” “As a result,” after the *verba*, the Holy Spirit is invoked “to ‘bless’ or ‘vivify’ the bread and wine.” Following Peter Brunner (and Arthur Carl Piepkorn), they argued that for Lutherans an *epiclesis* is appropriate only *before* the *verba* “invoking the Spirit’s action through the *verba*.” If an *epiclesis* is prayed after the *verba*, it can only be for the communicants. That ILCW was following the ambiguous Eastern Orthodox practice at this point is regarded as a fault to be corrected.⁹⁶⁰

Bailey and Klein opposed the compromise (Swedish-style prayer followed by the words of institution) as “almost worse than the use of the naked *verba*.” They recognized the political necessity forced on ILCW by “the opposition.”⁹⁶¹ Support for *The Holy Communion for Trial Use* was

qualified by a few suggestions: no specific petitions in the rite of confession (“abusive of consciences”), introits and six- or nine-fold *Kyrie* as alternates, dropping the Anglican Prayer of Humble Access, strengthening the “wishy-washy” post-communion blessing with mention of Christ’s body and blood, and retaining the trinitarian option in the Aaronic benediction.⁹⁶²

Bailey and Klein addressed the Missourian approach of accusing ILCW of heresy by noting an article by Concordia–Fort Wayne professor David Scaer⁹⁶³ (who also served on the ILCW subcommittee on the ordinal) as “one of the most scurrilous examples” with its “rather nasty campaign of misconstrual and condemnation.” They challenged Scaer’s “utterly inaccurate interpretation of Moltmann and Pannenberg,” his pulling phrases out of context, and his way of presenting appreciation of the Roman canon “as if it were a sin,” and eucharistic sacrifice as the “putative horrors of representing Christ’s sacrifice to God.” They concluded: “What the conversation about worship requires is fewer ‘true Lutherans’ and more responsible ones.”⁹⁶⁴

The next installments took up the revision of Holy Baptism (CW-7). Noting reactions like that of Grace Muscarella (who took Luther’s 1526 order as the standard by which CW-7 was found wanting)⁹⁶⁵ and Robert Hughes⁹⁶⁶ who found it “less than desirable,” Bailey and Klein judged it “a good rite.” They recommended the creed immediately before the act of baptizing, where the “Western rites have almost unfailingly placed it.” They found the absence of “a clear exorcism” regrettable. Similarly they lamented that there was no suggestion of blessing the chrism before use. They found the suggestion of using “a small cloth or a bit of cotton” to be a “masterful bit of wit!”⁹⁶⁷

The objections to the rite were taken up. The communal focus was not a “cozy kind of belonging” or a sentimental and “sloppy humanism.” Forgiveness of sins and rebirth in the Holy Spirit were clearly proclaimed.⁹⁶⁸ That the rite was “cluttered with words and ritual actions” was rejected. The alternative, “bring ’em up, wash ’em and send ’em back,” was a *reductio ad absurdum*. Candle, robe, and prayers “teach and proclaim the Gospel made visible in this Sacrament.”⁹⁶⁹

The only problem found with postponing Baptism to specific days was the pastoral concern about abusing “the piety of parents who desire expeditious Baptism.”⁹⁷⁰

In the midst of a plea for hanging onto surplices, Bailey and Klein made an observation about vestments that had wider application to Lutheran worship practices: “Anything can happen among Lutherans, and nearly everything does.”⁹⁷¹

LCA and Lee

As the controversy within LCMS waxed hotter in 1976, the ALC and LCA controversies began to wane and focus on the Forde–Jenson debate. An article in *The Lutheran* in January reported on the progress of the “new hymnal.” Noting the “uproar” over the initial list of 400 hymns, Edgar Trexler suggested that was because “the singing of hymns is the best chance for participation in that worship.” Explaining the space limitations, Frederick F. Jackisch, professor of music at Wittenberg University and HTC member, said: “If we were to select ‘hymnody by popularity,’ we would have a two volume work. . . ‘balance’ becomes the key to the hymnal.”⁹⁷²

Four negative reactions from one of the 600 LCA congregations testing the liturgy was reported via organist and intern (e.g., “I don’t feel like I’ve been to church”).⁹⁷³ The balance of the article simply described the other services. The article ended with the incorrect prediction: “If any of the three churches [actually *four* churches] rejects the proposal, the hymnal will be delayed.” There followed the unfulfilled hope—first expressed by Henry Melchior Muhlenberg: “Eight million Lutherans in North America will have a common hymnal for the first time.”⁹⁷⁴

Concerns about the Great Thanksgiving, now focused on CW-01, were not limited to ALC and LCMS. Clarence Lee, professor of the history of Christianity at the Lutheran Theological Seminary (Philadelphia), added his “critical review.” The early ILCW materials contained “bizarre rubrics and theologically naïve models.” It had “recast the entire Lutheran liturgical tradition,” yet “the project as a whole seemed worthwhile and even promised to relieve certain defects or unfortunate emphases in Lutheran worship.” Moreover since the early work was “*provisional*,” the ILCW’s “idiosyncratic approach” and “controversial proposals” could be “overcome . . . by common sense or by a stricter theological monitoring” and “modified or rejected.”⁹⁷⁵

Lee objected that the same necessary process of correction was not to be followed on “the most controversial material released by the ILCW” (viz. CW-01). His objection was that “only the *sort* of eucharistic prayer” was to be “subject to review and revision.” We are supposed “to take for granted that the Great Thanksgiving will be the normative, constitutive form for our celebration of the sacrament.” This “fundamental reorientation of the Lutheran understanding of the Supper” actually was intended to *supplant*—rather than supplement—the traditional Lutheran celebration of the Lord’s Supper, according to Lee.⁹⁷⁶

For Lee, the theological issue was simple: “Is the sacrament something we do, or is it something which God alone does? Is the Supper of our

Lord constituted in any way by our act of thanksgiving, or is it constituted solely by the promise and presence of Christ?" For Lee it was an "either-or," *not* a "both-and"; otherwise "the sacrament's integrity . . . is inevitably compromised." Rather "sacrament denoted what *God* does" [italics his], not as ILCW says "what God promises to do with what we do" (CW-01, 2)—a "crude *quid pro quo*" from the medieval mass.⁹⁷⁷

Lee made the interesting point that for ILCW to assert that "the meal-fellowship is *not only* [emphasis his] the actualizing of our act of thanksgiving . . . it is *also* [emphasis his] the act of God's presence in Christ among us" (CW-01, 2, par. 7) was a concession which attempted to guarantee what should be repudiated: human activity is the *esse* of the sacrament. Like Gottfried Krodel, he saw ILCW turning the supper of Christ into the supper of Christians. He appealed for putting our action "in the proper place"—a thankful response to Christ's self-giving.⁹⁷⁸

Scaer and Krodel

David Scaer faulted *The Great Thanksgiving* (CW-01), not primarily as eucharistic prayer (though "Luther's objections to any type of eucharistic prayer" remain unrefuted), but as "a committee production." On the one hand, it "shows the marks of being a composite mosaic production." On the other hand, he objected that there were no Missouri Synod pastors on the subcommittee.⁹⁸⁰

Scaer rightly identified Robert Jenson as the drafter of the first prayer in CW-01, but he characterized its theology of hope as "atheistic" (with a "future theism") and "Marxist" (in its "new world" paradise). He believed, with Herman Sasse, that liturgy reflects theology. In the case of the ILCW Great Thanksgiving, it was "a crazy-quilt of theologies," including also existentialist (taking "the chance of life," risking "the gift of love," like Abraham on the "precarious ways of faith"), universalist ("humanity re-born in God") and Romanist (mentioning of saints). The presentation of the doctrines of the virginal conception, *descensus*, real presence (because of the *epiclesis*), sacrifice, and ascension were also found inadequate.⁹⁸¹ Thus *The Great Thanksgiving* was, in variations of the same metaphor, "a half-finished jigsaw puzzle"⁹⁸² where "the pieces fail to fit together."⁹⁸³

The most extensive response to the eight eucharistic prayers and the preface of July 1975 published in *The Great Thanksgiving* (CW01) came in 1976 from Gottfried Krodel, professor of church history at Valparaiso University.⁹⁸⁴ It began and ended with highly critical charges of clericalism and syncretism (which was virtually equivalent to ecumenism) and with the warning that adopting these eucharistic prayers would make the rite and its users no longer Lutherans, especially in the sense of Luther's

catechisms and Smalcald Articles. (Nothing was said about Melanchthon's Augsburg Confession or Apology!)⁹⁸⁵

Krodel asked: "Do the biblical experts tell us that we need a new liturgy in order to celebrate a 'proper' Lord's Supper?" He further stated that adopting CW-01 would thrust Lutherans into the "main-stream of American Christianity" and open "a fundamental gap . . . between *lex credendi* and *lex orandi*. . . ." To adopt these eucharistic prayers would be for the Lutheran church "to give up its identity."⁹⁸⁶ The ILCW's Great Thanksgiving as "our mental-ceremonial action"⁹⁸⁷ was "not the Lord's Supper but the Christians' supper."⁹⁸⁸

Embedded between these harsh charges and questionable conclusions were some important exegetical, theological, and liturgical interpretations of the *verba* with a focus on *anamnesis*. From his surprising support for the phrase "*sealed by my blood*" in the *verba* (which most other critics attacked)⁹⁸⁹ to his equally surprising sympathy for Jeremias's "arguing convincingly . . . that the phrase 'Do this in remembrance of me' was not a part of the words originally spoken by Jesus,"⁹⁹⁰ Krodel's most important contribution to the debate was his discussion of Reformation interpretations of "remembrance."

Krodel introduced his historical theology piece with a critique of the syllogistic arguments he found in the preface of *The Great Thanksgiving* (CW01, 1-4), which concluded that for ILCW our prayer in the eucharist "must contain thanksgiving, remembrance, and invocation."⁹⁹¹ Krodel argued convincingly that the immediate antecedent for the command, "Do this," was the "matter-of-fact statement regarding the bread and cup, coupled with the appropriate imperatives" (viz., "eat" and "drink"!). Krodel continued: "I am not arguing that those New Testament scholars who tell us 'Do this' refers to the *whole previous* action are wrong. But I am arguing . . . [as] to the specificity of an *immediate* antecedent" [italics his; cf. CW-01, 1, #2].

"At the center of our obedience," Krodel argued is not thanksgiving, but "the non-verbal acts of distributing and receiving *this* special food, as Luther and the *confessions* tell us" [italics his]. The "*verbal* act" [italics mine] can only be a "*proclamation* of the words by which Jesus himself designates the specificity of this food" [emphasis his].⁹⁹²

Then, followed a polemic against "narrative" as a Reformed perversion of proclamation, merely stimulating "our mental activity of gratefully remembering," thus becoming 'the Christians' supper' and "not the Lord's Supper."⁹⁹³ Even more tenuous was the supposed merging of the Zwinglian concept of "remembrance" as memorializing thanksgiving and the Roman

concept of the mass as sacrifice. Similarly the parallels between Calvin's Spirit-bridge between the Lord's table and his throne in heaven and ILCW's *epiclesis* would have been more convincing if Krodel could have shown a link with the Eastern Orthodox sources of the *epiclesis* and Calvin. In his attempt to defend the Lord's Supper as a "Christological event,"⁹⁹⁴ he failed to deal with it as the Holy Spirit's instrument of grace (AC V, BC 31.2).

Accepting Jeremias's assertion that "Do this" was a local tradition and not spoken by Jesus gave Krodel further reason for questioning this remembrance-command as "the *key* for interpreting the Lord's Supper" [italics his]. More important was his fascinating analysis of what he calls "rhetorical remembrance" in Luther's theology. Influenced, he argued, by Quintillian's linking of *recordatio*, *memoria*, and *pronunciatio*, Luther taught: "We eat and drink it and, thereafter, while doing this [not as in LW 36:173 'in so doing'], remember him and proclaim his death."⁹⁹⁵ Thus the ceremonial remembrance (i.e. eating and drinking) is "the basis for rhetorical remembrance." Hence, "use this ceremony as an occasion to remember me," i.e. proclaim Christ's death.⁹⁹⁶ Luther translated 1 Corinthians 11:26 as an exhortation or an imperative: "You have to proclaim," or "Proclaim!" This was to avoid faithless eating (*manducatio impiorum*) and strengthen faith for praise and thanksgiving. Thus "rhetorical remembrance is, therefore, fulfilled when the gospel is preached and believed. . . ."⁹⁹⁷ But rhetorical remembrance "*culminates*, then, in the proclamation of the bread and the wine as the body and blood of our Lord given and shed for us, a proclamation which is underscored through the elevation" [italics his].⁹⁹⁸

This two-fold remembrance is to remain coordinated but not confused, lest one fall into cultic *anamnesis*. The first of the theological consequences of Luther's view of "remembrance," according to Krodel, has to do with the consecration (and elevation). The "sounding" of the "bread and cup words combined with the elevation is the consecration, or the act by which the Lord's Supper is constituted." Hence "Jesus does not constitute the specificity of this, *his* supper by giving thanks, breaking the bread, or blessing the cup." Krodel argues for the sharp differentiation between "God's activity of blessing" (and corresponding human thanks) and "God's activity of saving." Krodel saw a distinction in Luther between (1) blessing/consecration as constituting the Sacrament (which *might* be identified with Jesus giving thanks) and (2) blessing/consecration (as "divine statements" of what is "as it is being said to be") which is identified with "the bread and cup words."⁹⁹⁹

It seems to me that Krodel, in the midst of the Missourian explosion of criticism of ILCW, had identified here a fundamental issue that would

divide LCMS from other critics of eucharistic prayer, like Forde in the late stages of the debate and Olson in the early stages. A particular theory of consecration was at stake, which Krodel identified as *consecratio declarationis*, referencing also the Formula of Concord.¹⁰⁰⁰ Unlike the critics outside LCMS, Krodel was concerned not only about protecting proclamation from being confused with prayer (and narrative¹⁰⁰¹), but also about propounding a theory of consecration that goes beyond the Lutheran confessions.

The further consequences of Luther's view for Krodel included freeing the Lord's Supper from "anything that even 'smacks' of sacrifice," including "remembrance or memorial sacrifice" and the ILCW eucharistic prayers.¹⁰⁰² Krodel showed that Luther makes a place for thanksgiving as a sacrifice of praise "as a *part* of our rhetorical remembrance." Luther writes: "We must therefore sharply distinguish the testament and sacrament itself from the prayers which we offer at the same time...[the] prayers avail utterly nothing...unless the testament is first *received* in faith..." [emphasis Krodel's; cf. LQ 36:50f.].^{1002b}

Krodel admitted, like Brand, that Luther does not handle the thanksgiving element well, especially in the German mass, but argued that Luther's "restraint" regarding implementing thanksgiving is the "liturgical side of justification by faith."¹⁰⁰³ He felt constrained to structure the liturgy so that "forgiveness of sins utterly overwhelms us."¹⁰⁰⁴

As he applied Luther's insights to the "theological issues," Krodel reiterated the focus on God's descent to us in the sacrament as testament.¹⁰⁰⁵ That is to be *proclaimed*—not narrated: He charges that *our* "ascending" thanksgiving becomes the "chief thing" in the sacrament. Like Krugler, Krodel charged a confusion of law and gospel which "gospelizes" the law (what "*we* should do as our thanksgiving" and "what God promises to do with what we do" [CW-01, 2, 9]) and "legalizes" the gospel (making the "facts" of Christ's body and blood which are proclaimed into promises contingent on what "*we* should do," viz. give thanks).¹⁰⁰⁶ Besides this Romanizing tendency,¹⁰⁰⁷ Krodel also saw a Calvinizing replacement of real presence by remembrance ("memorializing thanksgiving") in the ILCW's work. Further lost is the sense of becoming the body of Christ by eating the body of Christ (the movement from *metalepsis* to *synaxis* is thus reversed¹⁰⁰⁸). Without any documentation from ILCW material, Krodel asserted that this Lord's Supper is "not pure gospel, obviously there is no room here for the law with the possibility of *manducatio impiorum*." For "I am not confronted with the possibility of eating to my damnation, because it does not matter whether I eat at all. All depends on my grateful remembrance."¹⁰⁰⁹

In spite of questionable applications and generalizations, Krodel must be credited—like Oliver Olson in the early stages of the debate—with having raised serious issues from his Missouri perspective which were to remain largely unanswered, if not unaddressed. The common cause on proclamation became a house divided concerning consecration.

Judicius vs. DeLaney

The year 1977 commenced with an explosive interchange within LCMS between “Judicius” (D. Judisch), the “Theological Observer” in Fort Wayne Seminary’s *Concordia Theological Quarterly*, and Theo DeLaney. Judicius began by applauding the South Wisconsin District, which “indeed, has said what really must be said; withdraw from plans for an inter-Lutheran hymnal and . . . concentrate on developing a new hymnal for our synod,” for the LCMS constitution mandated the “exclusive use of doctrinally pure agenda [and] hymnbooks” and the “products of the ILCW are doctrinally impure in every case.” Then “a few of the many possible examples” were set forth: presupposing the validity of higher criticism and “the so-called ecumenical movement”; rejecting “narrowly defined orthodoxy” and incongruous, irrelevant, exegetically indefensible or “socially hazardous” pericopes; not distinguishing apocrypha from canon and commemorating unitarians and enthusiasts. These charges were all directed toward CW-6.¹⁰¹⁰ Besides doctrinal impurities, “undesirable tendencies” were also found there: “Agreement with Rome” was given preference over “loyalty to our heritage” and “reverence for the Western lectionary tradition” [if not Roman, what then?]. Renaming the Sundays “after Pentecost” instead of “after Trinity” was listed with other examples of “apparent erosion of the doctrine of the Trinity in America Lutheran circles.”¹⁰¹¹

The turning of the sacrament into a sacrifice “by reintroducing the eucharistic prayer rejected by Luther (CW-2, 15-17; *The Great Thanksgiving, passim*)” was emphasized by the offertory procession. Finally, misrepresenting Christ’s *descensus* as merely “to the dead” and not “into hell” paralleled another universalist concern—teaching “the brotherhood of all mankind: brothers without respect to the state of grace” (re: CW-1, 4; “God made all mankind brothers,” already dropped from LBW’s hymns). A final undesirable tendency protested the dropping of obedience from the marriage vows.¹⁰¹²

In a response to that *Christian News* (March 7, 1977) headline, “DeLaney Charges Fort Wayne Seminary Journal With Sin,” the LCMS workhorse prepared a line-by-line answer to “Judicius.” DeLaney charged “lack of knowledge,” “inaccurate information,” “innuendo to arouse latent prejudice,” “malevolent musings,” finding “guilt by association,” and “over-

statement” (e.g., that LBW was “doctrinally impure *in every case*—even in the Scriptures selected?”), asked DeLaney.¹⁰¹³ DeLaney concluded that the real intent of this “diatribe” was to “libel the members of the Synod’s Commission on Worship “as false teachers who have attempted to foist upon an unwary church body false doctrine.”¹⁰¹⁴ DeLaney also defended the commemoration of Pope John XXIII by noting that for Lutherans “the system of the papacy”—not the late Bishop of Rome—is regarded as the Antichrist.¹⁰¹⁵ He further pointed out confessional references where Apocrypha are cited as “Scriptures.”¹⁰¹⁶ Finally, DeLaney insisted that propitiatory sacrifice was not intimated, insinuated, hinted, inherent, or latent in CW-2 or LBW! Moreover he argued: “Scripture refers the *proclamation* to the eating and drinking rather than to the *verba*. . . . Scripture does not prescribe how the word is to be proclaimed” (i.e. whether as *nuda verba* or in the “framework of the eucharistic prayer”).¹⁰¹⁷

Judicius concluded: “The bad ship ILCW we must abandon as quickly as possible. It is no use trying to plug the holes; the hull is built of cheesecloth.”¹⁰¹⁸ DeLaney responded: “Following this line of reasoning, one would *per se* be forced to abandon use of *The Lutheran Hymnal* because of the confessional associations of authors and composers represented therein.” Then he went on to list Anglicans, Baptists, Congregationalists, Eastern Orthodox, Methodists, Reformed, Roman Catholics, Unitarians, and Lutherans “of all times and kinds.” DeLaney concluded regarding all these: “It is most certain that with . . . most . . . Missouri Synod is not in fellowship.”¹⁰¹⁹

An article in *Affirm* added more fuel to the fire in Missouri. After acknowledging that ILCW “worked hard and long and, no doubt, produced some excellent suggestion,” the editorial writer asserted that “after twelve years, it is abundantly clear that [the 1965] Detroit [convention] erred in speaking of a faith [Lutheran churches in America] held ‘in common.’” ALC and LCA support of the moderates in Missouri Synod made it clear how “liberal” they were. Cited as evidence was David Preus’s criticism of the Synod’s adoption of “A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles,” drafted by President J.A.O. Preus. Given the “doctrinal differences,” a joint hymnal would provide a false “show of unity.” Besides the eight examples “by way of documentation” given by Judicius, the writer noted missing hymns and the pledge of the confirmed “to the doctrine of the Evangelical Lutheran Church drawn from the Bible.” Protesting the failure to share enough information with congregations, the difficulty of the music in the LCMS *Worship Supplement*, the “patchwork liturgical maze” in alternate forms provided by ILCW, and projecting financial disaster for Concordia Publishing House, the writer urged caution and restraint (like

ALC's and LCA's "elaborate screening procedures") rather than going to press before the 1977 Dallas Convention.¹⁰²⁰

"Judicius" responded to DeLaney in the *Concordia Theological Quarterly*, July 1977—the month of the Dallas convention. The introductory remarks set the tone:

We had previously assumed that all the Missouri members of the ILCW had steadfastly but unsuccessfully opposed the doctrinal deviations of the other participants (ALC and LCA). . . . Surely, Pastor DeLaney has struggled gallantly, like the other Missouri representatives, for what remnants of orthodoxy remain in ILCW products. How sad it is then to see this man defending the false teachings of the ILCW. We pray that Pastor DeLaney may yet realize the spiritual dangers of his misplaced loyalty to a heterodox institution.¹⁰²¹

Responding to DeLaney's charge that the articles of Bornmann, Green and Scaer were "based upon lack of knowledge or inaccurate information," Judisch noted that they "consistently quote from primary sources." He cited the 1913 *Catholic Encyclopedia* to document his charge that St. John of the Cross and Theresa of Avila were "two of the most radical enthusiasts of all time" and thus not to be commemorated. John XXIII who "personally taught the doctrine of salvation by works" was "rightly called the antichrist" once he assumed the papal office.¹⁰²²

Charging DeLaney with adopting "the ILCW concept of marriage which abolishes the vow of obedience on the part of the wife," Judisch asserted: "The wife's obedience is an essential aspect of the scriptural relationship of husband and wife—an aspect in which pious Christian women still rejoice and find fulfillment."¹⁰²³

Although neither CW-6 nor LBW included readings from the Apocrypha, Judisch gave an extended, carefully reasoned interpretation of Melancthon's controverted remarks on the Apocrypha in the Apology—all this is because of DeLaney's defense of ILCW's supposed failure to distinguish the Old Testament canon and the Apocrypha.¹⁰²⁴ Perhaps some such remark was in view: "The decision to use no apocryphal selections was made on pastoral rather than confessional grounds" (CW-6, 23).

A similar ploy was made regarding the hymn, "God made all mankind brothers" (CW-1, 4). This was used as evidence of ILCW's "secular humanism" opposed to Christianity,¹⁰²⁵ in spite of the fact that it had already been dropped from the LBW hymn list (though, no doubt, as much for its sexism as its theology). As several Missourians had done with the ICET text of the *descensus*, even after the "descent into hell" was restored,

so here the dropping of the readings from the Apocrypha and the questionable hymn seemed to “Judicius” irrelevant to his charges of heterodoxy. That they had been *considered* was crime enough!

Completely unrelated to ILCW or LBW was Judisch’s charge of the heresy of modalistic monarchianism against an answer to a question sent to *The Lutheran* on the Trinity. Technically, “Judicius” is correct: equating “persons” with “ways” is modalistic. Unfortunately and unnecessarily, DeLaney attempted to defend the answer,¹⁰²⁶ apparently to prove neither LCA or ILCW were monarchians.

“Judicius” saw the cause of the “yawning chasm which separates orthodox Lutheranism from ILCW’s theology as two “woefully unsound presuppositions—the validity of higher criticism and the so-called ecumenical movement.”¹⁰²⁷ His call to the convention was clear: “The Synod can no longer in good conscience leave in such alien hands the future destiny of the liturgy and hymnody which has always exerted such a profound influence on the popular theology of the Lutheran Church.”¹⁰²⁸ Again the power of *lex orandi* had been recognized, whether or not the aliens have been correctly identified!

The Bride and Grandma Schmidt

An editorial in *The Bride of Christ* took the controversy to a new level. After lamenting the failure of any “confessional high churchman” to write a “penetrating” and “well-reasoned critique,” which could be sent to all the Dallas Convention delegates, the editor shared his “few seed thoughts” under the heading: “Whatever Became of Common [‘just plain old fashioned horse’] Sense?” The editor complained that what the low church opposition read and heard “simply indicates how little some pastors and even some theologians understand the theology of worship.”¹⁰²⁹

He asserted that Lindemann’s *The New Mood in Lutheran Worship* “sets forth many of the theoretical principles that guided the ILCW.” A case in point was that liturgy should emphasize the “immanence [*sic*] of God.” “But,” asked the editor, “is liturgy the best tool for communicating that [which?] particular motif? Indeed, is liturgy capable of doing it at all?” His conclusion was that LBW “is destined to create havoc everywhere it is used.”¹⁰³⁰

With the dropping of rich theological phrases like “by nature sinful and unclean” and “he that believeth . . .,” given the “theological poverty of contemporary Lutheranism, shouldn’t common sense have told us we were doomed before we started?” This enterprise was compared to editing out “Round yon virgin” from “Silent night.”¹⁰³¹

Furthermore, LBW “is musically absurd.” *The Lutheran Hymnal’s* Scottish chant in the Gloria is “the tune that history has wedded to the text.” It was dropped “for sake of Joy, Joy and more Joy,” i.e. the principle that “multiplied musical settings equal multiplied joy.”¹⁰³²

If Grandma Schmidt objected to tunes or text, “we’ll just have to tell her to shut up and mind her own business. Most laymen [!] don’t know the difference between good and bad music anyway.” But Grandma presumably did and, though she would not be able to vote in Dallas, “in the long run she is going to vote—in the only way she knows how.” It was implied that Grandma would vote with her feet—followed by the rest of the family. Unless LBW was rejected “we shall someday celebrate our liturgy in the presence of the angels . . . alone!”¹⁰³³ So much for “a well-reasoned critique”!

Foelber vs. Schmidt

Articles juxtaposed in the May 1977 *Concordia Journal* represented the range of opinions within LCMS before its decisive convention. Paul Foelber, a professor at Concordia College at Ann Arbor, chair of the LCMS Commission on Worship and a member of ILCW, wrote a historical and theological defense of the proposed book. He pointed to the Missouri initiative for the book and to past and present opportunities to review the ILCW’s work. ILCW’s standards for orthodox doctrine and controversies surrounding its work were set forth. Concerning the Great Thanksgiving Foelber asked:

If the eucharistic prayer is unorthodox one wonders why objection to the eucharistic prayer was not raised years ago since the *Worship Supplement*, which included eucharistic prayers, has been in print over eight years and is being used extensively in our schools and churches.

Foelber concluded with a reminder that the 1971 LCMS convention asked that the new hymnal be available by 1975.¹⁰³⁴ This was said to counter the threat of further delays by the upcoming Dallas Convention.

The conservative counterpoint was provided by Professor Wayne Schmidt of Concordia Seminary at St. Louis. His Wisconsin Synod background showed in the opening “warning against indiscriminate purchase”: *Caveat emptor!* If the buyer did not beware “purchase . . . could be regretted or leave the purchaser unnecessarily poor for his mistake.”¹⁰³⁵

The tone of the article improved in the rather objective discussion of the history and accomplishments of the ILCW.¹⁰³⁶ “And yet,” Schmidt continued, “something has been lacking.” The lack was a “final copy” before synodical approval could be given with “theological and professional re-

sponsibility.” He contrasted the advanced distribution procedures suggested for the 1941 hymnal—like those already cited by President J.A.O. Preus and challenged by the Commission of Worship. Schmidt admitted the procedure was “cumbersome” but defended it since a hymnal was “a layman’s book on Christian doctrine and guides the thinking of pastors as well.” A “shaper of theology,” it must avoid ambiguity and possible misconceptions. Nor should it have been the “product of compromise where a confession of truth is demanded.” Having said this, Schmidt expressed his regret at having pushed a “procedural” issue.¹⁰³⁷

Having contrasted the decision-making situation of the conventions of the other three church bodies with LCMS, meeting a year later, he found the Missouri convention in a better but still not adequate position: There was not enough time to study a proposal even if finalized by June 1, 1977. But the “entire matter of hurry would not be of so much concern if other considerations were not also present.” For even when LCMS launched the ILCW project, “many . . . were quite convinced that the expressions of unity among Lutherans in the 1960s were at best sham and a glossing over of really serious doctrinal disunity.” Time showed that “unity does not exist.” Indeed, “any objective observer would have to admit that Lutherans in America today stand further apart on more issues than at any other time in American Lutheran history.” Hence “it becomes almost hypocrisy to issue a Lutheran book for worship under the guise that it demonstrates a unity.” He gave as textual evidence of this the “page-cluttering liturgical options” which indicate “an inability to reconcile two different point of view.”¹⁰³⁸

Schmidt cited a Commission on Worship report from 1965 stating that doctrinal unity was “the *sine qua non* of common worship materials.” An earlier report (1953) had warned “days of tension and turmoil are not ideal for publishing new hymnals.” He commended these earlier reports of the commission—presumably in contrast to the current report—to the 1977 convention.¹⁰³⁹

Schmidt went on to draw the parallel with the adiaphoristic controversy in the 16th century which Article X of the Formula of Concord addresses. Though admittedly not persecution, “pressure” was being put on LCMS to approve the book. If the Formula makes a “plain confession” regarding adiaphoristic worship practices for “the prevention of offense to the weak in faith,” there must now be “no attempts to gloss issues with thin veneer or sanctimonious façade.”

For the ordinary worshipper the hymnal and the order of service frequently become the most powerful outward signs of agreement in doctrine and Christian confession. A common hymnal may well blur doctrinal issues and be an occasion for stumbling.¹⁰⁴⁰

Therefore, as a “matter of integrity” the LCMS convention and publishing house must “examine both the nature and the impact of a *quasi imprimatur* which their endorsement or publications gives. “ Schmidt suggests that, utilizing *Worship Supplement* and ILCW materials, LCMS could still do a hymnal revision of its own. In a restatement of his argument that paralleled the LCMS position on inter-communion, Schmidt stated that a worship book “can be a testimony of unity, but it does not create it.” As if in warning to the many LCMS congregations that might have been tempted to buy LBW even if LCMS did not approve it, Schmidt repeated his *caveat emptor*.¹⁰⁴¹

The Lutheran Witness

In May 1977, the *Lutheran Witness* had a series of articles on the proposed book. The initial article supported LBW in terms of (a) LCMS congregations preferring and using more contemporary hymns and (b) standardizing Lutheran hymns and liturgies. ILCW’s responsiveness was defended on the basis of (1) its change in the *descensus* clause of the Apostles’ Creed, (2) the inclusion of popular Missouri hymns in LBW and (3) availability of Contemporary Worship materials and subsequent revisions for field-testing and review by congregations and pastors. The article ended with the final prediction/plea: LBW “should serve as a blessing to the worship life of Missouri Synod congregations.”¹⁰⁴²

The negative was argued in the article that followed. (1) Unused hymns in TLH did not recommend approval of the new hymnal. (2) Official approval “tends to promote acceptance while sanctioning the doctrinal content of all its material.” (3) Serious doctrinal differences were being overlooked in the attempt to improve inter-Lutheran relations with a hymnal. Even the “correction” of the descent into *hell* in the Creed was given as evidence of misleading error. “Although . . . the original phrase is now reinstated, we still believe that the ILCW has produced a type of liturgy that contains impure, improper, and misleading elements.” Since it did not follow from the opening clause, the writer wisely continued: “Why do we make such a charge? Simply because they have said so.” The author went on to quote ILCW’s defense of the selection of commemorations: “A narrowly defined orthodoxy has been consciously avoided . . .” (CW-6,12). This was taken to mean: “So the ILCW states clearly its intent, namely, a precise agreement in the gospel [Augsburg Confession VII] has been avoided . . . with critical awareness, ‘consciously.’”¹⁰⁴³

Evidence of “this tendency of impurity,” included the commemoration of unitarians, enthusiasts, and the Antichrist (Pope John XXIII), the rewriting of sexist language from the Bible, the creeds, and the hymns,

and—since “masculine terminology would not be appropriate”—the omission of the ministry section because ALC and LCA were ordaining women. (This was restored in LBW 283-286 under “Pastors”.) Warning that “the Synod will violate its own constitution if it approves of the *Lutheran Book of Worship*,” for these “ILCW materials are ‘impure in every case’ (*Concordia Theological Quarterly*, January 1977, p. 50), they should not be approved at Dallas.”¹⁰⁴⁴ The citation of the *Judicius* column was given presumably to give theological weight to the author’s opinion.

The final article was an ironic approach, seemingly written to assure all that the hymnal, if approved, would be imposed on no congregation. Constitutional provisions were cited for congregational resolutions voluntarily adopting and confirming synodical resolutions. The precedent of C.F.W. Walther’s congregation allowing “only purely Lutheran hymns” was examined as it broadened beyond “orthodox German Lutherans” to include other hymns.¹⁰⁴⁵

Noting that most members know only Luther’s Small Catechism, the author asserted: “No convention could properly be a platform for discussing strict purity of a publication unless all delegates are 100 percent knowledgeable in every point of doctrine.”¹⁰⁴⁶ Aye, there’s the rub!

The opening assurance was repeated and expanded: “A synodical convention can accept and advise, but not impose or prohibit ‘in matters of its own ecclesiastical and congregational affairs’ as many congregational constitutions have it.” Also quoting Augsburg Confession VII, the focus was presumably on “ceremonies instituted by men” in which uniformity was “not necessary.” So came the conclusion: “Whatever the Dallas convention decides concerning the new hymnal, autonomous Lutheran congregations can sing their Hallelujahs anyway!”¹⁰⁴⁷ So the positions of moderate ecumenists, conservative critics, and canon lawyers were all represented in the official church organ.

Finalizing the Revisions: Amen to the New “Final Proposal” of Hymns

In its first meeting after ILCW’s “final” proposal of 510 hymns, HTC met March 31, 1976, to complete its final work on hymns, add up to 20 hymns including a dozen ethnic hymns of Finnish, Baltic, Polish, and native American origin,¹⁰⁴⁸ and deal with church review committees’ recommendations. The latter were legion. HTC agreed to *none* of the ALC’s 37 requests for deletions. Of its 16 recommendations for inclusion, only one, “All who would valiant be,” was accepted. LCA recommended deleting

only two hymns, Eight hymns recommended for inclusion—including “Rise up O men of God” and “Turn back, O man”—were declined, but four others—including “Unto the hills around do I lift up,” “Come with us, O blessed Jesus” and “Not alone for mighty empire”—were approved. Only three LCMS reviewers had reported (individually) at this point. Of the 17 suggestions for deletion, all were declined except for one (“Christ is alive! Let Christians sing”), which was referred to ILCW and ultimately included in LBW (but not LW), Charges of limited atonement, universalism, synergism, “misty, meaningless romanticism,” the sentimentality of the “fortunate Fall,” “humanistic self-contemplation,” and millennialism were sprinkled throughout the reviews. At the ELCC’s request, “God save our gracious queen” was included, but their two suggestions for deletion were rejected. At ILCW’s insistence, “We are one in the Spirit” was “assigned for preparation of a final version.” “Joyful, Joyful, we adore thee” was excluded for “millennialistic overtones.”¹⁰⁴⁹

When the hymn committees met together as the JHC, they recommended approval of the five hymns added by HTC. In a significant step towards being “inclusive,” JHC responded to the concerns of a black group requesting for “All hail the power of Jesus name” the tune Miles Lane, and Bradbury’s Solid Rock for “My hope is built on nothing less,”¹⁰⁵⁰ adding these to the tunes already chosen. (Both tunes for those hymns appear in LBW; LW retained Coronation for “All hail the power of Jesus’ name” and returned to TLH’s Magdalen for “My hope is built on nothing less.”)

An inconclusive discussion of when to use Alleluia or Hallelujah and *Kyrie eleison* or “Lord, have mercy” led to the decision to print both and leave it up to local options.¹⁰⁵¹ This was reversed at the final JHC meeting and the suggestions of DeLaney¹⁰⁵² were adopted, to wit: “All praise to you, eternal Lord:” Hallelujah (LBW 48; cf. the rather wooden translation in LW 35 using Alleluia); “Christ is arisen:” Alleluia, avoiding the “Germanized Greek”; “Kyrie, God Father in heaven above:” *Eleison*; “O Lord, we praise you, bless you, and adore you:” “Lord have mercy.” JHC also added “Lord, have mercy” to *Nun bitten wir* (LBW 317 and LW 155).¹⁰⁵³

A complex set of principles were decided on for the use of “Amen” in hymns: (1) if it is part of the text and not an addition after the final line: (2) if it is demanded by the music (e.g., the plainsong *Veni, Creator Spiritus*) or (3) if the final stanza is a trinitarian doxology or an intercessory petition.¹⁰⁵⁴ In a painstaking application of these principles to the hymns in question, DeLaney made applications and sometimes contrary recommendations (“Rule says yes . . . but music says no.”).¹⁰⁵⁵ One way or another JHC was convinced to rescind its “rules” in favor of the following:

That editors and publishers be instructed that all “Amens” be excluded except those which are integral to text or tune and except where in plainsong compositions there has been a long association of “Amen” with the tune.”¹⁰⁵⁶

A special subcommittee on indexing had met in April 1976 recommending, besides indexes, that the hymnal begin with hymns of praise (invocation, entrance, doxologies, etc.) to be followed by the hymns for the church year, hymns regarding the Church (the faith, means of grace, morning and evening worship, rites, mission, etc.), hymns regarding the Christian life, and finally a section for canticles and national songs. Affirming the primary usage for corporate worship, the rationale suggests this “trinitarian” structure of four (!) parts. In fact a *creedal* structure might have been a better term—although the “time of the Church” and the “time of the Spirit” are in the “wrong” sequence.¹⁰⁵⁷ When JHC met in October, they voted to place first the “time of Christ,” i.e. the hymns of the church year.¹⁰⁵⁸ They also condensed to two the other major sections: the rites of the Church and the Christian life, thus breaking any creedal or trinitarian structure—the *three* parts notwithstanding. Before the meeting ended Egge proposed beginning with the canticles, then the church year, but dropping major subject headings like rites or Christian Life. The matter was referred to the Hymn Text Committee for decision.¹⁰⁵⁹ The upshot was to follow Egge’s suggestion of beginning with canticles and to retain the sections more or less as JHC had decided, but labeled the Church Year, the Church at Worship, and the Life of Faith (LBW, p. 292).

LW’s organization differed slightly with its special section of the Church itself, more like the subcommittee’s proposal (LW, pp. 269f.). Hymns for morning and evening, harvest and thanksgiving, and national songs are included in a small section entitled Times and Seasons. An appendix called Spiritual Songs (presumably as distinct from hymns) included for example, “Go tell it on the mountains,” “Were you there,” “Beautiful Savior,” “Jesus, lover of my soul,” “Amazing grace,” “Jesus, Savior, pilot me,”* “Nearer my God to thee,” “What a friend we have in Jesus,” “I am Jesus’ little lamb,” * “Onward Christian soldiers,” *and “How great thou art.” (Those marked with an asterisk were in TLH’s Carols and Spiritual Songs section. Some of the others were new or redesignated as “spiritual songs” like “Jesus, lover of my soul” and “There stands a fountain where for sin,” the revision of “There is a fountain filled with blood,” TLH 157.) A new hymn was proposed to ILCW, “Jerusalem, whose towers touch the skies” (LBW 348; LW 306 in a different translation), bringing the number of hymns to 530.¹⁰⁶⁰

DeLaney’s October 1976 memorandum contained his comments on the “final versions of texts for the new hymnal” for the final meeting of the

hymn committees. He picked up some themes reiterated in LCMS reviewers' comments. Other points were clearly his own. He suggested Hawhee's translation of "Cold December" be designated a paraphrase or an original poem inspired by the Catalonian carol. He objected to the last two lines of "I know that my Redeemer lives" (which were retained in both LBW 352 and LW 264) as "contrary to all other known usage" (cf. TLH 200), as well as the SBH translation of stanza eight, "blest assurance," for the same ecumenical reason. He questioned Janzow's willingness to allow the alteration of "men" to "pain" in stanza five of LBW 63 (cf. LW 71). His objection to the non-literal rendering of the reference to the deaf and mute was ignored in both LBW 380 and LW 313 (cf. TLH 514, st. four). The poetic quality in the translation of the Ambrosian "Savior of the nations, come" evoked "one great big 'ugh!!!" from DeLaney. Several of his suggestions were heeded for that text; LW 13 carried the alterations even further. Both books seemed to have heeded DeLaney's negative judgment of the translation as "miserable."¹⁰⁶¹ Regarding Aquinas' hymn, "Thee we adore, O hidden Savior," DeLaney opined: "Stanza two will possibly be objected to (without warrant) as Calvinistic"—at least, no one who knows history (or even chronology) could make that anachronistic error. Yet he suggested stanza two or the word "memorial" should be dropped. DeLaney protested against the line in "Where charity and love prevail," in stanza five: "For love excludes no creed or clan." This was changed in LBW to "race or clan" (LBW 126).

DeLaney's final comments underlined a fundamental difference between LCMS and other Lutherans' concerns. Regarding the hymn, "Once to every man and nation," DeLaney asserted that the mention of a "new Messiah" could "cause LCMS to reject the hymn section!"¹⁰⁶² After toying with a revision of the first stanza, ILCW at its May 1977 meeting finally voted to delete the hymn. The revised stanza began, "To each proud aspiring nation," dealing with the sexist language issue. The fifth line was altered to make it clear that it is the same old Messiah—"through high causes God's Messiah offers." After further debate about deleting stanza three (which deletion was defeated), the entire hymn was deleted.¹⁰⁶³

The Future of the Liturgy: Brand's Bombshell

After the LTC's rationale, the next most significant document that both served to guide future revisions and summarize the changes made in 1974 and 1975 was a "confidential" position paper on liturgical matters from early 1976. Summarizing the situation as he saw it, Brand observed a change in mood since the 1960s with Lutheran unity concerns fading, a new conservatism growing, and respect for "official church" actions eroded. Broad-based discussion of liturgical and sacramental questions had not

happened through ILCW's Contemporary Worship series, either in seminaries or the church at large. "Changes in liturgy are especially threatening" in the current climate of "everything falling apart around and under us." Hence

the diversity of theological positions and liturgical practices, always just below the surface of apparent confessional unity, has now surfaced, though it remains to be recognized openly. Myths of *the* Lutheran position and *the* Lutheran way of worship remain.

Brand seemed to be suggesting that ILCW also had its own myths.¹⁰⁶⁴

He argued that ILCW "must continue to affirm" that a new book could be catalyst for needed vitality and common endeavor in corporate worship—the contact point between the church's mission and the people's life. Activating lay leadership and employing vernacular cultural forms should remain priorities.¹⁰⁶⁵

Brand commented on the ILCW's work "in the context of church life." Significant change comes by careful teaching—a new book would embody this—and stimulate "the illumination of a deepened liturgical piety." A new book may "break new ground" but should not become a battleground!

If important differences in theology and practice are not resolved prior to publication, they cannot be resolved *by* publication. Either a compromise must be found or alternate forms provided.¹⁰⁶⁶

A new book should be regarded as a "beginning" not a "goal." Continuing work could stem the "between-the-projects indifference" that created "the vacuum into which the new books are launched."¹⁰⁶⁷

Concrete recommendations followed which focused on the critical debates still unresolved. These were both pragmatic, in that they went contrary to Brand's personal convictions and preferences, and prophetic in that they were resolved in a compromise and/or used by LCMS critics as further major reasons for rejecting/modifying LBW. In fact the very existence of the need for compromise became *prima facie* evidence of LBW's unworthiness for many Missouri critics. Brand recommended in the Brief Order of Confession, *Ego te absolvo* ("I forgive you") as an alternative absolution because of "firmly embedded Missouri Synod practice." He recommended allowing rubrically for a separate ante-communion, a footnote permitting "he descended into hell," the traditional form of the Lord's Prayer as an option, and use if the term "confirmation" for the affirmation rite. Most painful for Brand, since it "cripples the expression of sacramental fullness," was his conclusion that the Holy Communion needed to contain

three options: (a) a full eucharistic prayer, (b) a prayer followed by the *verba*, and (c) the *verba* alone.¹⁰⁶⁸

The bombshells came in the final paragraph: (1) With the above compromises, can other controversies be resolved by the Advent 1978 publication date? (2) “Has the *kairos* for a new book passed and should we, therefore, withdraw the plan for a new hymnal and service book?” Whether Brand was serious in this final “unavoidable” question or simply trying to “rally the troops” is not clear.

Final Compromises

Faced with ILCW’s request for inclusion of the CW-2 Setting 2 by Ronald Nelson, LMC asked Nelson to explore providing a new *Gloria* and “Thank the Lord,” plus “any of the following items that may seem feasible: *Kyrie*, *Nunc Dimittis*, “What shall I render,” and *Agnus Dei*.” It was also reported to LMC that the issue of the Psalm translation remained undecided.¹⁰⁶⁹

At the April 1976 meeting of LTC, review committee responses took the major time. The LCMS reviewers’ request to change the ICET text of the *descensus* in the Apostles’ Creed from “the dead” back to “hell” was approved after some discussion; the ICET translation was to be given in a footnote.¹⁰⁷⁰ ALC and LCA objections to the new translation of the Lord’s Prayer led to the compromise of printing traditional and ICET versions in parallel columns.¹⁰⁷¹

Brian Helge reported for the office subcommittee, noting the potential for reconciliation and peace-making in the community with the Ash Wednesday and Holy Thursday services. He also noted that the *Tenebrae* Service, popular in some circles for Good Friday, was rejected since it is part of the office.¹⁰⁷² LTC later decided to recommend that *Tenebrae* and *Tre Ore* (a three-hour service) be published, along with an introduction about Lenten rites, in a Contemporary Worship volume. (This never happened.)¹⁰⁷³ LTC rejected a motion to drop the Palm Sunday gospel from “Sunday of the Passion.”¹⁰⁷⁴ The *Gloria* was to be added to Old Testament and New Testament canticles except those in the eucharist and others determined by subcommittee chair Pfatteicher (e.g. LBW 7-17). LTC also recommended that the title of the book avoid the word “Lutheran.” Lindemann’s involvement in a project for a leader’s manual was reported.¹⁰⁷⁵

Brand reported that most of the Old Testament scholars responding (Frederick Gaiser, Thomas Ridenhour, Walter Rast, and Horace Hummel) preferred the RSV Psalter and overwhelmingly preferred the Grail version over the new Episcopal translation. He also noted Mark Bangert’s concurrence that the Grail was the “most singable,” followed by the Episcopal

version, with RSV last (“deadly”).¹⁰⁷⁶ After much discussion, LTC voted to recommend the Episcopal Psalter “provided we can do minimal editing” (e.g., Psalm 8, “O Lord, our Governor”). Reasons given were (1) no church body uses RSV, and its modernization is not yet complete, (2) possible collaboration with Episcopalians on music, (3) ease of speaking, and (4) versifications were better than Grail.¹⁰⁷⁷ At the next LMC meeting Mark Bangert was selected to point the whole Psalter.¹⁰⁷⁸

It was reported at the May Executive Committee meeting that “funding for introduction of ILCW materials in the field is virtually non-existent.”¹⁰⁷⁹ The Nelson setting from CW-2 was approved as the basis for a third setting in the new book. The Episcopal Psalter, with alterations, was approved, along with a “concise eucharistic prayer on the classic model” and a brief prayer followed by the *verba*. The Executive Committee urged the three publishers to develop a leader’s manual with Herbert Lindemann as editor of the project.¹⁰⁸⁰ Frederick Gaiser and Jack Kingsbury of Luther Seminary were asked to recommend a daily lectionary on the basis of the Roman Catholic and Episcopal selections. The target date of Advent 1978 for the new book was reaffirmed.¹⁰⁸¹

The November meetings of ILCW and the Executive Committee added other names to the list of suggested editors for the companion to the hymnal, including Marilyn Stulken.¹⁰⁸² Much time was spent on hymn matters, and the hymnal as amended was adopted and transmitted to the churches for approval. Further changes could be made by the project director and the HMC and HTC chairs or their subcommittee.¹⁰⁸³ The LMC was instructed to provide “simple tones” for the Litany and Responsive Prayer. (A musical setting of the latter was not finally included in LBW).¹⁰⁸⁴ The rites for Corporate and Individual Confession and the Daily Lectionary were approved “in principle.” A third option following the two eucharistic prayers proposed by ILCW was approved: adding the *verba* alone, as the ALC Review Group had virtually demanded.¹⁰⁸⁵ A motion that a book of occasional services, containing the ordinal, rites for opening and closing of synods, etc. be “developed on an inter-Lutheran basis” was to be brought to the attention of the participating churches.¹⁰⁸⁶

The heads of the publishing houses, Albert Anderson of Augsburg Publishing House, Ralph Reinke of Concordia Publishing House, and Frank Rhody of Fortress Press, were introduced, and Leonard Flachman, the publishers’ representative to ILCW, reported on the progress of publication. The publishers expressed concern that the book be kept under 960 pages, that its color be green, and that its title be short but contain the word Lutheran. The first two suggestions were passed, and the title was voted on by secret ballot, voting first, second, and third choices. *Lutheran Book of Worship*

prevailed with *Book of Common Worship* a relatively close second (28 and 20 votes respectively). *Lutheran Worship* came in sixth (five votes).

The LTC subcommittee (Hans Boehringer, Paul Peterson, and Philip Pfatteicher) met in December to complete the revision of liturgical texts. Robert Jenson, Gordon Lathrop, and Frank Senn met with them for the discussion of the eucharistic prayer. The group recommended that “betrayed” be reinserted but that “sealed” not be changed. In light of the ILCW’s decision to include the *verba* only option, the subcommittee recommended dropping “option B” (prayer with *verba* afterwards). They also recommended as the eucharistic prayers for the pew edition the revision of CW-2. For the leader’s edition they recommended Jenson’s prayer with the same structure as the CW-2 prayer (LBW:MDE, pp. 293-295), the revision of the SBH/WS prayer (LBW:MDE, p. 297), the Hippolytus prayer (LBW:MDE, p. 298), and the “ecumenical prayer” (CW-01, VII).¹⁰⁸⁷ The Holy Week services, marriage and affirmation rites, and confessional rites were recommended to LTC as revised, along with a number of modifications to calendar and colors.¹⁰⁸⁸

LTC had its next meeting in January 1977. The marriage, affirmation, and confession rites were approved with minor changes.¹⁰⁸⁹ The prayer for the “gifts of grace” was changed from “the spirit of wisdom and understanding . . . counsel and power . . . knowledge and reverence” [Isaiah 11:2] . . . wonder and awe in your presence [ILCW interpolation]” (CW-8,24) to “joy in your presence” (LBW, p. 122, par. 13).¹⁰⁹⁰ At least this reduced the eight gifts to the traditional “seven-fold gifts”—a tradition that goes back at least to Thomas Aquinas. The confirmation formula was also changed to prayer form: “Father in heaven . . . stir up . . .” (LBW, p. 201, par. 16). CW-8 had followed the SBH formula: “(Name), the Father in heaven . . . strengthen . . .” (CW-8, 36). This brought all such LBW prayers into conformity with the *epiclesis* pattern. At its March 1977 meeting the ELCC Review Committee expressed itself in favor of this prayer form.¹⁰⁹¹ However, they protested the phrase, “to see Christ and serve him in all people,” as “theologically unsound,” implying universalism¹⁰⁹² (see LBW, p. 201).

LTC overrode its subcommittee recommendation that option B in eucharistic prayers be dropped but suggested that “by rubrics or design” options B (prayer plus *verba*) and option C (*verba* alone) be combined.¹⁰⁹⁴ A translation of the 1942 Swedish Mass prayer was accepted for option B (LBW, p. 70, par. 33).

Numerous minor changes were made in the services for Lent and Holy Week, and they were accepted as amended.¹⁰⁹⁵ The ending of Psalm prayers

were standardized so that most ended “through your Son, Jesus Christ our Lord” or “. . . one God, now and forever” (LBW:MDE, pp. 341-440), like the Prayers of the Day (LBW, pp. 13-41) and *most* of the other prayers (LBW, pp. 42-51).

It was a consensus to publish the ordinal with or without “Commissioning of a Pastor as a Missionary” which had been criticized for specially recognizing *ordained* missionaries. If further flack on that rite was received from churches, then it was to be omitted from the ordinal.¹⁰⁹⁶

The LMC subcommittee (Gerhard Cartford, Donna Elkin, and Richard Hillert) met in March 1977 in preparation for the final JLC meeting. Problems with Bangert’s pointing of the psalms were discussed, as well as the Hillert, Nelson, and Fryxell/Cartford settings (revision of SBH Setting 2 and the CW-2 Setting 3).¹⁰⁹⁷ The LMC, meeting in April, approved the Psalter as pointed and asked Bangert to point the other canticles without through-composed settings (e.g. LBW 15, 18-21). Texts of verses and of-fertories which were to be included in the Minister’s Edition were not to be pointed.¹⁰⁹⁸ Recommendations were made on which canticles from CW-9 and previous works to include.¹⁰⁹⁹

LTC decided to coordinate its propers in the post-Pentecost season with Episcopal and Roman Catholic systems, and action on the daily lectionary was deferred, pending ILCW’s action on the three-year lectionary.¹¹⁰⁰

At the joint session of the liturgical committees the problems with the Brief Order for Confession and Forgiveness were confronted yet one more time. The ALC Review Group (ALC/ RG) had protested the failure to acknowledge original sin and the LCA Division for Parish Services (LCA/ DPS) disliked the triple “fault” of the confession from *Compline*. LCA/ DPS suggested if “fault” were used only once, it would point to our “basic, sinful condition.” ELCC Review Committee suggested: “We who are born children of a fallen humanity confess . . .” in light of the baptismal rite (LBW, p. 121). Brand suggested adding to the end of the first sentence: “that we cannot free ourselves from bondage to sin.”¹¹⁰¹ It was placed at the beginning: “Most merciful God, we confess that we cannot free ourselves from bondage to sin . . .” (ALC/ RG made the following recommendation which prevailed: “We confess that we are in bondage to sin and cannot free ourselves . . .”).¹¹⁰²

ALC/ RG opposed the declaration of grace (“Almighty God . . . forgives us”) as too weak; LCA/DPS opposed its sexist language and proposed the passive phrasing that was adopted in LBW: “In the mercy of Almighty God, Jesus Christ was given . . .” (LBW, p. 56). Both LCA/DPS

and ALC/RG opposed the direct absolution, “I forgive you,” and expressed strong preference for “I *declare* . . . forgiveness.” (ALC/RG subsequently asked that the declaration of grace be changed from “Almighty God...forgive *us*” to “*you*.”) Conversely, LCMS/C/W asked that the *Compline* absolution be changed from “grant” to “Almighty . . . *grants* you pardon”¹¹⁰³

Another suggestion by ALC/RG was to substitute the prayer of confession from Corporate Confession, “. . . I, a troubled and penitent sinner” (cf. LBW, p. 194), for the mutual confession from *Compline*. Brand recommended this, along with the SBH-style *declaration* of entire forgiveness.¹¹⁰⁴ LTC finally decided to delete the second (right column) option, using neither *Compline* nor the Corporate Confession form. Rather LTC recommended the LCA/DPS recommendation on an inclusive language version of the declaration of grace (“In the mercy of Almighty God”) and a *declaration* of forgiveness (cf. SBH, p. 248), adding “called and ordained” as in the TLH formula and the April 1977 ILCW *Liturgical Texts*.¹¹⁰⁵

In spite of ALC/RG and LCA/DPS favoring “he descended to the dead,” the descent into “hell” prevailed at the strong pleading of LCMS delegates, who also asked that the ICET reading *not* be given as a footnote.¹¹⁰⁶ LTC deferred to ILCW for the decision regarding the footnote (which was retained).¹¹⁰⁷

The disagreement over the rubrics for the offertory continued with ALC/RG. Their primary concern was that offertory processions not be mandated. Both LTC and ILCW declined their suggested reading. The RG’s counterproposal (“The offering is received while the table is prepared”) was finally accepted (LBW, p. 66, par. 24) with the understanding that options with the elements already on the altar or credence would be explained in the general rubrics (LBW:MDE, p. 28, par. 24f.).¹¹⁰⁸

LTC overruled its subcommittee and dropped the word “sealed” in the *verba* (hence the reading, “new covenant in my blood”). They also followed the subcommittee’s suggestion, changing, “Do this for my remembrance,” to “Do this for the remembrance of me.”¹¹⁰⁹ (ALC/RG’s subsequent objections were not heeded.)

Brand had suggested expanding the final word of the representative of the congregation in the baptismal rite which read as follows:

God has given us these new *sisters and brothers*. Let us receive them with love and assure them of our joy over their entrance into our fellowship.¹¹¹⁰

Brand proposed the theme of “ordination into the ministry” be introduced at this point:

Through baptism God has ordained these new *sisters and brothers* into the service of Christ Jesus, the priesthood we all share, that as the Church of God we may bear this creative and redeeming love to the world and all its people.¹¹¹¹

LTC modified Brand’s proposal by dropping the terms “ordained” and “service:” “Through Baptism God has made these . . . members of the priesthood . . .” (see LBW, p. 124, par. 18). The problem with the Baptism of only one candidate was handled by italicizing “*these . . . sisters and brothers . . . members,*” but the problem with the plurals in the congregational response was never corrected (LBW, p. 125).

While ALC had protested the use of “fathers” in a prayer in Evening Prayer, LCA protested it in the quotation from Hebrews 1:1f in Morning and Evening Prayer: “In many and various ways God spoke of old to our fathers by the prophets; but now in these last days he has spoken to us by his Son.” ALC recommended “forebears” for “fathers” in the prayer; LCA recommended some different term, and Brand suggested “his ancient people.” No one picked up the interpolated “*his* Son.” LTC simply dropped the text, but with ALC/ RG support, ILCW reinstated it.¹¹¹² LTC also changed “fatherly” to “loving” in the burial rite¹¹¹³ (CW-9,11; LBW, p. 210).

ALC/ RG had supported changing the absolution to the “declare” form, even in Individual Confession. This was raised by Brand, but LTC declined to change it because this is an “exercise of the Office of the Keys as spoken about in the catechism and confessions.” Teig noted, “LCMS is strong on this position which ALC and LCA are less so.”¹¹¹⁴ ALC/ RG did not protest this further, and ILCW let it stand.

Final Changes

In the final meeting of the entire commission, ILCW made a host of changes; some confirming and occasionally overriding recent LTC changes, others acting on pending or unresolved questions. They approved the ALC/ RG’s wording on the disputed original sin text: “We confess that we are in bondage to sin and cannot free ourselves” (LBW, p. 56). They also dropped the addition appearing in Doberstein’s *Minister Prayer Book*: Forgive what we have been, amend what we are, direct what we shall be.”¹¹¹⁵ They restored the *Book of Common Prayer* ending: “For the sake of Jesus Christ your dear Son” (as LTC recommended) and added “renew us, and lead us” to “forgive us” (LBW p. 56; cf. DBCP, p. 322). The problems in the *Compline* mutual confession were dealt with by deleting it, leaving one form of confession with two absolutions: the inclusive-language declaration of grace

based on the common service and the SBH-style declaration of forgiveness with the addition of “called and ordained” (as LTC recommended).¹¹¹⁶

The request of the LCMS Commission on Worship to delete the ICET footnote regarding the *descensus*¹¹¹⁷ was declined. They retained a full explanation of the offering and the various options (later changed). They also accepted the new translation of the *verba* (as LTC recommended) over ALC/RG’s objections.¹¹¹⁸

The new “royal priesthood” emphasis in the baptismal rite was approved (LBW, p. 124, par. 18). In the travel prayer, “Sarah” was added to Abraham.¹¹¹⁹ In another inclusive language issue, the attempt to change the ICET translation of the Nicene Creed to “made human” rather than “made man” was defeated.¹¹²⁰ In the marriage rite, “until death parts us” was substituted in the vow for “as God gives us life together.” It was also decided to add “obey” in one of the vows in the general rubrics (LBW:MDE, p. 36, par. 3).

The language of the committal prayer in the burial service was changed from “Give our *brother* peaceful rest in the grave” to “Keep our *brother*, whose *body* we now lay to rest, in the company of your saints” (LBW p. 212, par. 22).

Some 14 pages of changes (almost as many as those made at the ILCW meeting) were made *after* the meeting “in response to submitted criticism referred to the editorial group.” In nine texts, all of them prayers, “Father” was changed, usually to “Lord” (e.g. LBW, p. 65). In several instances, the changes became more than “editorial”: changing “Heavenly Father” to “Gracious Lord” loses the adoption imagery and hopelessly confuses trinitarian identities in “fear of the Lord” and “Jesus Christ, your Son, our Lord” (LBW, p. 201, par. 15). Similarly something significant was lost at the outset of the SBH’s Prayer of the Church when “Father of our Lord Jesus Christ” becomes “Giver of all things” (LBW, p. 52). More serious was the altering of biblical language in 2 Corinthians 1:3 in the burial rite: “Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of mercies and the God of all comfort.” Not only is the poetic structure ruined by “source of all mercy,”¹¹²¹ but the personal and parental relationship is missed. A funeral is hardly the time to omit that.

On the other hand, the editorial group explained the traditional usage of “man” in the ICET Nicene Creed, noting that “the generic sense is clearly implied in the original text” (LBW:MDE, p. 28, par. 21).

A new section on first communion stood in tension with what became the ALC/LCA Communion Practices Statement of 1978, which precluded infant communion.

First communion is the moment when a privilege granted in Baptism is first exercised. The gift of communion is the birthright of the baptized(LBW:MDE, p. 31).

The rest of the language and examples seemed to presuppose something like fifth-grade communion.¹¹²²

The Executive Committee meeting of September 1977 dealt mostly with the responses of the churches, all positive except for LCMS which had set up a "blue ribbon" committee at its convention to do a further, final review of LBW: the Special Hymnal Review Committee (SHRC). The SHRC had already met twice with Brand in attendance at the second meeting. Henry Abram, ILCW and Commission on Worship member and liaison with SHRC, met with the Executive Committee,¹¹²³ in part to deliver a communique from SHRC.¹¹²⁴ The Executive Committee outlined the procedure, timetable, and limits on modification.¹¹²⁵ Summer institutes, interchurch groups (Consultation on Ecumenical Hymnody and Consultation on Common Texts) and publication matters (acknowledgments, introduction, and final count of hymns) were discussed. At the request of the ALC and LCA, the Executive Committee voted to delete the reproaches from the Good Friday rite.

CHAPTER FIVE
ECCLESIA

THE DECISION FOR SCHISM & THE PATH TOWARD UNITY

Missouri in Convention and Committee

At the May 1977 ILCW meeting, Paul Foelber's status report on the situation in Missouri Synod on the eve of the Dallas Convention seemed quite positive. He highlighted fall 1976 conferences that reached 80% of LCMS pastors and teachers and said the materials were "well received." Returns on liturgical materials sent to all pastors in February 1977 were "overwhelmingly favorable." The "vast majority" of the district presidents were "in favor of receiving LBW." The Sharron Report indicated 60% of LCMS clergy "favorable toward LBW." The Commission on Theology and Church Relations had recommended a delay in the approving of LBW so that it (and the seminaries) could study the final proposal. To counter this, the Commission on Worship was preparing a cassette and planning to send the liturgical corpus and hymns to each delegate.¹¹²⁹

One final victory for the LCMS Commission on Worship came in the deletion of "Once to every man and nation." The LCMS doctrinal reviewer and the commission found it unacceptable,¹¹³⁰ and after motions to revise the first stanza (carried) and delete the third stanza (defeated), the hymn was deleted.¹¹³¹

The 1977 LCMS Dallas Convention

The President's Report of J.A.O. Preus prepared for the Dallas Convention fueled the fires of doubt and delay.

More and more it appears that others who are involved in the production of the hymnal, including a significant number of individuals in the American Lutheran Church and the Lutheran Church in America, had some second thoughts concerning its

content and the advisability of publishing the materials which have been presented.

Preus then pointed to William Rusch's study and its assertion that the inconsistent theological base and incompatible alternatives had to be resolved before publication. "Therefore, I have cautioned that perhaps the best course would be one of some delay."¹¹³² This recommendation for delay, although Preus does not mention it here, was in accord with the recommendation of the Commission on Theology and Church Relations.

Preus explicitly did commend that commission's recommendation to declare a state of "fellowship in protest" with ALC. This compromise between continuing and breaking fellowship both protested "the doctrinal aberrations which we feel that the ALC, at least at the official level, is guilty of" and maintained the fellowship for those who found it a God-pleasing relationship.¹¹³³

Responding to the Dallas Convention's passing the "fellowship in protest" resolution, ALC president David Preus expressed the ALC's hurt and sadness, as well as an ALC "list of concerns" about LCMS.¹¹³⁴ Robert Marshall, president of LCA, spoke before the final vote on the LBW resolution. Marshall countered the impression given by Jacob Preus that ALC and LCA were hesitant to publish LBW. "There is every reason to believe that the Executive Council of the LCA will give that approval when it meets in September and that the Church Council of the ALC will act similarly when it meets in August." Then he indicated, inaccurately, that ELCC had already given full approval. (The ELCC Church Council also acted in September to approve LBW as "an official hymnal."¹¹³⁵) Marshall expressed his devout hope that LCMS would also approve.

One wonders whether Marshall's attempts to explain the Church's true greatness—and his appeal for LBW—foundered on his "misquotation" (i.e. using SBH rather than TLH translation) of "A mighty fortress." Similarly his explanation of ILCW's correction of the fundamental theological error of "Rise up, O men of God" might not have been heard after he said that "the use of the word 'men' . . . slighted women."¹¹³⁶

Brand observed that neither the ILCW nor the Commission on Worship had "direct access to the delegates," with no open hearings or presentation. Nor did LBW have a "positive resolution" or "presidential support."¹¹³⁷ Commission on Worship officers were on the platform to answer questions during the initial discussion, but not during the final discussion before voting; only the CTCR executive secretary was on the platform.¹¹³⁸ Brand noted the regular distribution of *Affirm* to delegates outside the convention center, calling for withdrawal from the ILCW project and getting

on with “the overdue updating of our own present hymnal *which could incorporate many of the good things which are to be part of the new hymnal*...[emphasis Brand’s].”¹¹³⁹ Brand concluded his observations with a lament that “Missouri appears to be a different church from that which passed the ILCW resolutions in 1965 and 1971.” The Seminex and AELC splits had, of course, occurred. Brand continued: “Further, the resolution attempts to place the blame for a possible withdrawal upon the other participating churches (Resolved 5).”¹¹⁴⁰

The key part of the convention resolution on LBW, after rehearsing its history, stated:

WHEREAS, Theological questions have been raised by agencies and members of the LCMS (e.g., CTCR, faculty members of the two seminaries, worship material reviewers) concerning the proposed *Lutheran Book of Worship* (e.g. commemorations, eucharistic prayer forms, adequacy of expressions, option use of “he descended to the dead” in the Apostles’ Creed, theological implications of hymn text alterations, confirmation promise, fellowship implications). . . .¹¹⁴¹

Added to this, “the *final* draft” [italics theirs] of LBW had not been reviewed; they resolved to commend ILCW for its work and appoint a “blue ribbon” committee to review the final draft and recommend adoption, modification, or rejection of LBW. Congregations could then study the LBW and the report, and the blue ribbon committee would report to the 1979 convention.¹¹⁴²

At session 8, a substitute motion was made to accept LBW “as one of the resources for worship available to the congregations, subject to successful completion of the doctrinal review process.” This was defeated 548 to 501. At session 13 a compromise was suggested, authorizing Concordia Publishing House to participate in the scheduled printing, making sample copies available to congregations before the final action in 1979. This substitute was finally ruled unconstitutional. Instead, a bylaw was passed disallowing the convention from delegating power to authorize hymnals to any group other than the Synod in convention.¹¹⁴³ At session 15, resolution 3-04A was adopted as presented.¹¹⁴⁴

One immediate result of the convention action was the *final* resignation of Theo DeLaney. In spite of his earlier resignation, he had continued to function as executive secretary at the request of the LCMS Commission on Worship. His letter of resignation characterized the convention actions as “an attack against my personal integrity . . . a shoddy expression of gratitude for faithful service.” DeLaney predicted that the entire Com-

mission on Worship would also resign, probably by the end of the summer.¹¹⁴⁵

The “Blue Ribbon” Special Hymnal Review Committee

As the LBW process went into “overtime,” ALC’s and LCA’s councils gave final approval to LBW while LCMS’s “blue ribbon” committee, naming itself the Special Hymnal Review Committee began its final review. The seven members were appointed from C/W and CTCR, the seminaries, a vice-president, and two others appointed by President Preus.¹¹⁴⁶

Their initial meeting, held August 23, 1977, was organizational. Herbert Mueller, a member of the Committee on Constitutional Matters, interpreted the Synod resolution to the committee. Vice-President Robert Sauer was elected chairman. He had already assembled the liturgical and hymnic materials, plus all the doctrinal reviewers’ comments and the C/W’s responses to the reviewers on the 30 contested hymns.¹¹⁴⁷

Horace Hummel made a presentation on the LBW Psalter, indicating there was nothing there to prompt a negative recommendation on its use. He also gave an unsought defense of eucharistic prayers.¹¹⁴⁸

Ralph Reinke of Concordia Publishing House insisted on *not* relinquishing copyrights so camera-ready materials could be used if LCMS produced its own book. He also reported a study which predicted that within three years a minimum of 1500 LCMS congregations would be using LBW.

The second meeting of the SHRC was held in September. Eugene Brand was invited to make a presentation on the Great Thanksgiving. The group discussed the focus of Luther’s objections. Brand noted that “doctrinal reviewers” in all four church bodies had raised protests over eucharistic prayers and that 80% of Lutheran pastors did not use them, but primarily because of time factors. Questions were also raised about the *descensus* and commemorations.¹¹⁴⁹

The next day, Jaroslav Vajda of Concordia Publishing House staff and a member of C/W and ILCW, was present to discuss hymns, especially the criteria ILCW used. Seven contested hymns were acted on—e.g., deleting “At the cross, her station keeping” (LBW 110) because the presentation of Mary’s grief should include sorrow over her own sins, to fend off any Roman ideas of her sinlessness! The second stanza of “Amazing grace” (LBW 448) was altered to begin: “ ’Twas grace that brought my Savior near.”¹¹⁵⁰

Meanwhile, ALC, ELCC, and LCA councils had met and given final approval to LBW. The nature of such approval suggested some not-so-subtle differences on the place of LBW in the churches: ELCC approved it “an official hymnal and service book.”¹¹⁵¹ ALC approved its publication

and commended it for use as “an enriching addition to the worship tradition of the ALC.” LCA used similar language but added approval as “an authorized body of hymnic and liturgical material for use in this church.”¹¹⁵² The LCMS was still trying to decide whether LBW was a “doctrinally pure” liturgy and hymn book.

The ALC Church Council—undoubtedly mindful of the LCMS decision regarding fellowship—responded in August directly to the LCMS action on the LBW:

WHEREAS, the LCMS action offers no assurance that a final decision will be reached at the 1979 convention, the earliest such action could be taken . . . RESOLVED, that the Church Council of the American Lutheran Church reaffirm the plan for publication of the *Lutheran Book of Worship* in 1978 under the auspices of as many of the participating church bodies as are willing. . . .

The Church Council had also noted the provision of LCMS Resolution 3-04A that “directed” the LCMS Commission on Worship “to gather materials for a new hymnal.” The resolution helped slam the fast closing door, while still expressing “the strong hope that LCMS will become full partners”—apparently impossible if the other churches proceeded “unilaterally.”^{1153a}

ILCW’s Executive Committee attempted a more mediating response. An SHRC communique delivered by Henry Abram at the beginning of its September meeting asked whether ILCW would consider making changes in the liturgy and hymns—e.g., capitalizing “sun” in “Cold December” (LBW 53, 2:6) and reconsidering selection of stanzas three and four; changing a semi-colon to a period in “I know of a sleep” (LBW 342); deleting “At the cross, *his[sic]* station keeping” (LBW 110); and modifying “Amazing grace” (LBW 448, 2) to “’Twas grace that brought my Savior near.” Regarding “The first Noel” no modification was suggested, simply the judgment: “Excessive piety and poetic license.” The “modification” of the liturgy sought ranges from “complexity of the liturgy” and “the Great Thanksgiving” to specifics such as “use of the ambiguous term, ‘forces of evil’” in Baptism (LBW, p. 123, par. 10), yet with no alternative proposed.^{1153b}

Advising SHRC of a timetable agreed upon by the four participating churches in April 1975 (final responses due first in October 1976, then May 1977), the Executive Committee noted that machinery for considering changes was still intact (e.g., the deletion of Good Friday Reproaches by recent ALC and LCA council action).¹¹⁵⁴ This was in response to a rather vague request of the SHRC that ILCW “declare whether it is willing to consider any changes in the liturgical and hymnic material submitted in

June, 1977." ILCW's response, since it "has not heard whether any formal requests for specific alterations will be made" by SHRC, set forth its willingness to "receive and debate . . . proposed modifications of materials already submitted to the churches" unless their approval actions or the printing schedule would be unduly affected. The project director was to clarify the printing schedule issue.¹¹⁵⁵

Brand's memo regarding the printing schedule gave early January 1978 as the deadline for substantive changes (which would have to be cleared with participating churches) and the end of January for editorial changes.¹¹⁵⁶ As a sample of an *editorial* change Brand used one of the proposed modifications from the SHRC communique: changing "*Or, He descended to the dead*" to the original ILCW proposal, "ICET text: He descended to the dead." Dropping the footnote altogether would be a substantive change needing approval of the other churches. In a communication to the SHRC, Sauer said: "It is not altogether clear as to precisely which modifications would be acceptable." He suggested that SHRC "complete our studies of the contested areas" and present this to ILCW for "consideration." In a note to Brand, Abram (who styled himself as "optimistic" at the first SHRC meeting¹¹⁵⁷) now wrote: "Looks as tho' Sauer will continue to prevent voting till we 'complete our studies.' By then it will be too late...! He's machiavellian!" At the October 14, 1977, SHRC meeting, Abram presented a resolution that since "our seven-week study . . . now places us in a position to do what the church asked is to do," that the SHRC "recommended LBW to the LCMS with our modifications [Option B of Dallas Resolution 3-04A] and that our Committee continue its critical analysis with this mutual understanding." After extensive discussion, action was deferred to the end of the session.¹¹⁵⁹ The majority concluded their assignment had not yet been completed, and Abram's resolution was defeated 6-1, whereupon Abram announced his intention to resign from SHRC.¹¹⁶⁰

The October meeting also analyzed the marriage and burial rites with comments like unscriptural, inadequate, shallow, unsuitable; in a few instances, substitutes were proposed. The lay representatives of CTCR pressed the questions: What bearing do the comments have on "our specific assignment?" What modifications would meet "favorable consideration and acceptance by the ILCW . . . of a specific option?"¹¹⁶¹ Specificity continued to elude the committee, and many comments remained "lacking in doctrinal clarity."¹¹⁶²

Speculations abounded in the weeks after Abram's resignation. The moderate *Missouri in Perspective* reported: "The Missouri Synod's 'blue ribbon' panel . . . has declined to give assurances that it will give final approval to the new book—even if every change requested by the panel is

made.” This was interpreted as the meaning of the defeat of Abram’s resolution. The article continued: “The ILCW, however, is not likely to consider changes without prior assurances that if all the ‘blue ribbon’ committee’s changes are made then the committee will recommend Synod approval of the hymnal.”¹¹⁶³ This was presumably extrapolated from the ILCW Executive Committee resolution.

Predictions in the same direction from a different source appeared in the same issue of the LCMS organ, the *Lutheran Witness Reporter*. Robert Sauer was quoted as saying: “It appears unlikely that the book would be recommended in its present form for use in the Synod.” That went beyond the SHRC’s negative vote on Abram’s resolution because its assignment was not yet completed! Sauer explained that “some of the changes considered might involve more than ‘words and phrases.’” Moreover the timetable needed for the SHRC assignment and the publishing schedule did not mesh.¹¹⁶⁴

One might wonder whether such media “hype” can be blamed for the resignations and further escalation that followed. (*Missouri in Perspective* had also predicted a collision between the SHRC and Concordia Publishing House over the publisher’s intention to stay involved in publication decisions.)¹¹⁶⁵ During November the entire Commission on Worship resigned, except for Willis Wright, president of Alabama Lutheran Academy and College. (Wright therefore became the Commission’s SHRC representative in December.)

In a *Des Moines Register* story, Commission member Rodney Schrank was quoted as saying: “As soon as we felt they were looking at the book only to destroy or delay it indefinitely, we felt we had no choice [but to resign].”¹¹⁶⁶ Sauer was quoted as saying that there had been no “strategy of delay.”¹¹⁶⁷ Paul Peterson, chair of LTC and a C/W member, stated:

What the committee is doing was never intended to lead to acceptance of the book. We’ve asked for assurances that if the other churches would accept the suggested changes, they would accept the book. But there’s been no willingness to give us that assurance.¹¹⁶⁸

The commissioners’ letter of resignation charged that the real motive behind rejecting was the fellowship issue: that acceptance of LBW might imply accepting the doctrine of the other Lutheran bodies. They stated that CTCR had first raised the fellowship issue in November 1976: “Could the LCMS be a part of a book that would also be used by LCA? It is our conviction that this is the central issue that has caused the acceptance of the LBW to be delayed in LCMS.” They also went on to note that in 1965

when the LCMS issued the invitation to do a hymnal jointly, LCMS was not in fellowship with ALC either.¹¹⁶⁹

This same issue had been raised earlier by Abram in his resignation letter to SHRC: "I don't think the LBW really ever had a chance after the CTCR decided during the past year that even if the LBW were acceptable to every congregation in the LCMS, we still couldn't use it because of the fellowship problem."¹¹⁷⁰ *Missouri in Perspective* had hazarded the same judgment:

The reason for the panel [SHRC] not to promise eventual support in the event that all changes are made is that some "conservatives" will reject the joint hymnal on the grounds that it may give the impression that Synod is in formal fellowship with other participating Lutherans.¹¹⁷¹

Sauer was quoted as saying that "the implications of pan-Lutheran worship materials for fellowship may be of concern" to some synod officials, "but it is not the *central* issue before the review committee" [*italics mine*].¹¹⁷²

The November meeting took up the balance of the 29 or 30 contested hymns and continued discussion of the ICET text of the Nicene Creed from the previous meeting (including the strange logic that "We believe" that the second and third articles are "an alteration from the original.")¹¹⁷³

More important was the appearance of President Jacob Preus at the meeting. In addition to his call for a new Commission on Worship as soon as possible Preus stated:

The members of the SHRC should promulgate and at the earliest possible time release a plan for publication of a book of worship—including reasons why some of the contents of the proposed Book of Worship by the ILCW are unacceptable.¹¹⁷⁴

Any pretense of objectivity or neutrality was taken away by such a charge to the committee. Presumably the SHRC was free to follow its own path, but the intensification of the criticisms in the final meetings seemed to be sealing LBW's fate. Preus's suggested "plan for publication" seemed to substantiate the "well-founded" fear of the now resigned Commission on Worship that the SHRC "process has served to delay a decision on the LBW until after the other church bodies have proceeded with publication, thereby giving the LCMS the convenient opportunity to prepare its own worship book which could be easily excerpted in large measure from LBW."¹¹⁷⁵

After the November meeting the SHRC issued a news release charging LBW with having some hymns "not compatible with Lutheran theology," language changes which "alter Scripture and creedal statements,"

and prayers in the burial rite with “pagan and universalistic concepts.”¹¹⁷⁶ Brand responded for ILCW noting that the members of the Commission on Worship had all been appointed by Preus. These persons were involved in the translating, approving, and revising of creeds and *verba*.¹¹⁷⁷ In his letter to the LCMS/Commission on Worship members who resigned, Brand pointed not only to the press release but also to SHRC’s “failure to respond to the Executive Committee’s resolution” as evidence that the “hard line will continue and prevail.” Agreement of sorts came also from the high-church conservatives. In an editorial in *The Bride of Christ*, Herb Barry pontificated: “But conservatives and moderates alike, who have worked closely with the Preus administration, recognize the Dallas resolution for what it is—a political charade to dump the book without having to forthrightly condemn its doctrinal-liturgical abominations.”¹¹⁷⁸ Small comfort!

Thus the recommendation at the December meeting was both predictable and surprising (e.g., deleting the entire Service of the Word “because of Scriptural paraphrases, and the footnote ‘He descended to the dead,’ . . . and ‘Save us from the time of trial’ . . .”¹¹⁷⁹ Even more amazing and ambiguous was the recommendation, as Abram had suggested: “that the LBW be accepted with modifications.” Yet the only thing unmodified in the liturgy was the rite of Individual Confession: everything else needed major or minor changes—not just “words and phrases.” Of the 569 hymns and canticles 504 were approved, dropping 16 for heretical content and 42 for “inferior quality.”¹¹⁸⁰ (One wonders about the other 7!)

An angry response from an LCMS member of LTC, Hans Boehringer, charged “shamelessness” in the Synod’s “manipulation of its own processes to achieve predetermined results.” That LBW “represents watered down Lutheranism and contains false teaching” was offensive to the truth and insulting to ILCW members. If these remarks accurately reflected SHRC’s judgment, Boehringer argued, it simply showed the committee’s “incompetence and bias.”¹¹⁸¹

The resigned members of the Commission on Worship were retained on the ILCW/Executive Committee: Paul Peterson represented LTC and Carlos Messerli LMC; Paul Foelber and Jaroslav Vajda also continued on the Executive Committee, all having been elected by ILCW to serve through 1978.¹¹⁸²

The “Blue-ing” of the Hymnal

The blue ribbon Special Hymnal Review Committee met from August to December 1977. Their response to the hymns is the concern here. In the committee’s recommendation, “that the LBW be accepted with modifications,” the hymnal portion fared well by contrast with the liturgies, of

which only “Individual Confession” was accepted as they appeared. Of the 569 hymns of LBW, 504 were to be accepted. Sixteen hymns were given detailed critiques and recommended for deletion. Among these were “At the cross, her station keeping” (LBW 110) since the “hymn directs the worshipper to Mary”; “Look now he stands” (LBW 152) which “teaches unscriptural universalism”; “Lord, who in the night you were betrayed” (LBW 206) which suggested sacramental unity without doctrinal concord; “O God, empower us” (LBW 422) had a “humanistic and work-righteous tone”; “Breathe on me, breath of God” (LBW 488) espoused mysticism and perfectionism “and could well be accepted and used by Unitarians.”¹¹⁸³ Furthermore, so that 65 more hymns from TLH could be included¹¹⁸⁴, “it is proposed that the following 42 hymns, because of their inferior quality, be deleted.”¹¹⁸⁵ Of these, seven finally appeared in LW. (“When o’er my sins,” wrongly designated LBW 152, did not appear on the January 1976 ILCW list but did make it from TLH to LW 367.) Among the unrecommended inclusions were “From shepherding of the stars” (LBW 63; LW 71), “In Adam we have all been one” (LBW 372; LW 292), and “Earth and all stars” (LBW 558; LW 438). Thirteen hymns marked for retaining needed revising.¹¹⁸⁶ “Fling wide the door, unbar the gate” (LBW 32) was said to be “trite and in poor taste” (though few understand how “ye mighty gates” in fact “lift up your heads”—whatever they are!). The chiasm of the final stanza of “It came upon a midnight clear” (LBW 54) was to be corrected. LW 62 replaced the popular alternative recommended by SHRC with a new ending. Regarding “A Lamb goes uncomplaining forth,” the Blue Ribbon Committee recommended using the TLH version; what appears in LW 111 is a *new* translation, bearing resemblance to the LBW 105 text at several points. The problem of “Amazing grace” teaching “my heart to fear” was overcome in LW 509 by dropping the offensive second stanza—for all Lutherans know that “God’s *law* and not his grace makes the heart fear.” The interesting suggestion was made that “fear” means “reverence” (as in Luther’s “fear and love God”), as opposed to the “fears” grace relieves. The suggestion was raised and then promptly dismissed.¹¹⁸⁷

Five hymns were simply to be returned to their TLH version: “Comfort, comfort” (LBW 29)—LW 28 reflected some of the LBW alterations. “A mighty fortress” appeared in the SBH isometric version and the new LBW translation as LW 297; the TLH version appeared as LW 298. LW 192 basically followed the new Grindal translation but returned to the SBH/TLH first line, “Behold, a host.” “Come, you thankful people come” was to have been restored to its TLH version but Alford’s “ye” became “you” (LW 495; LBW 407). “You are the way” (LW 283), after second person pronouns were changed, came out like LBW 464—except for the first stanza

which LBW had altered significantly from George Doane's original (SBH 390/TLH 355). The section ended with the blanket criticism:

The modernizations in the LBW do not seem to be improvements. Note especially the changing of the quotation from John Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress* in Hymn 498.

Presumably that referred to changing "he who would valiant be... His first avowed intent To be a pilgrim" (SBH 563) to the plural "All . . . Their . . . pilgrims." Ironically this "modernization" made it into LW 384 untouched!

Strangely enough, the SHRC recommendation that all the canticles (except LBW 17, "How blest are they") be kept was almost totally ignored. *Benedicite, omnia opera* was retained (LW 9) but, unlike LBW 18 which is pointed for chanting, was given a musical setting. The *Te Deum* (LW 8) was given a setting and translation different from LBW 3. Besides those two, none of the rest of the 21 canticles of LBW appear in LW, nor are the 11 LW canticles in LBW.

Whereas TLH and SBH shared 271 hymns, making 41% or 45% of their total respectively, LBW and LW have 337 hymns in common (considerably less than the 504 SHRC recommended), still making the common core 59% of LBW and 65% of LW. LW has 139 TLH hymns not included in LBW, but LBW has 24 TLH hymns not included in LW. 74% of LW's hymns come from TLH whereas 64% of LBW's are from SBH [Jan. 1976 statistics!].¹¹⁸⁸

LCMS: Before and After LBW

The immediate ecclesial context for the liturgical changes introduced by ILCW included the merger negotiations of the 1950s producing the American Lutheran Church in 1960 and the Lutheran Church in America in 1962. Moderating trends within the LCMS led to the Little Norwegian Evangelical Lutheran Synod suspending fellowship in 1955 and the Wisconsin Synod suspending fellowship in 1961. This meant the end of the Synodical Conference and freed LCMS to explore closer relations with other Lutherans. The formation in 1966 of the Lutheran Council in the United States of America (LCUSA) and declaration of pulpit and altar fellowship with the ALC in 1969 were high-points in this development.

The first crisis for fellowship came with the ALC's 1970 decision to ordain women. That same year President John Tietjen publicly admitted that Concordia Seminary-St. Louis faculty taught the historical-critical method in biblical studies. This began a series of events which eventuated the investigation and condemnation of Tietjen and other faculty and the walkout of students and faculty to form Seminex in 1974. ALC and LCA seminary presidents heightened tensions with LCMS. "A Statement of Re-

gret" by LCMS President J.A.O. Preus protested the meddling of other Lutheran seminary presidents and warned of its negative effects on fellowship. The ALC executive committee of the Church Council made a conciliatory response which refrained "from expressing judgments" on the LCMS situation. A letter from ALC President David Preus to LCMS stated that the opinions of its seminary faculties were not "official ALC statements."¹¹⁸⁹ The formation of the AELC made the LCMS schism concrete, but the AELC stayed on the sidelines of ILCW to avoid an embarrassing situation with LCMS.

Perhaps the most serious threat to fellowship with the ALC came from the ecumenical engagements of ALC. Lutheran–Episcopal and Lutheran–Reformed dialogues were moving toward inter-communion. ALC and LCA entered into "interim eucharistic sharing" with the Episcopal Church in 1982. The ALC alone declared fellowship with the Presbyterian and Reformed churches in 1986, an action placed in limbo by the formation of the ELCA in 1988.

The same 1977 LCMS Dallas convention that set up the blue ribbon committee [SHRC] to evaluate LBW passed a resolution declaring "a state of 'fellowship in protest' with the ALC on account of doctrinal disagreements." Such agreements were primarily over the interpretation of the Bible, both its (historical-critical) method and results (e.g. ordination of women). Already in 1978, with the withdrawal of LCMS from the LBW project and heightened tensions over fellowship, a new Committee on Lutheran Unity was formed to include AELC. In 1981 LCMS broke fellowship with ALC. In 1982 these three churches' conventions authorized the 70 member Commission for a New Lutheran Church. The 1987 constituting convention brought the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America into being in 1988.

The interplay between matters of ecclesial fellowship and developing inter-communion with other Christian churches, changing understanding of communion practices (including confirmation), doctrinal disagreements (including women's ordination and biblical interpretation), all interacted with concerns about liturgies and hymns which had clearly been both expressions of and means toward unity for Lutherans. This collage of concerns both affected the process and the results in the *Lutheran Book of Worship* and effected its rejection by LCMS.

LCMS Reactions Against SHRC

Nearly 200 letters were sent to SHRC in the months that followed their reports. They seemed about evenly divided, positive and negative, with the negatives overwhelmingly so and those positive toward SHRC action more critically so. Use of "catholic" evoked numerous positive and

negative responses. Phillip Bohlken of Amherst, Ohio, noted: “Your comments on LBW (Creeds) seem to be based on the German versions of those creeds while giving no hint of awareness of the original Greek texts.”¹¹⁹⁰ A letter from David Scaer, professor at Concordia Seminary—Fort Wayne, sent to the editor of the *Lutheran Witness*, defended the ICET translation of the Nicene Creed against the SHRC critique:

The *new* translation is much stronger in its confession of the Son’s deity, because his begottenness, or birth from the Father is, in fact, ‘an on-going process,’ something which the committee finds objectionable.

Scaer went on to argue that the current version of the Creed “lends itself more easily to the Arian understanding that the Son of God came into existence at a specific time before the world’s creation.” He also welcomed the rendering “God *from* God.”¹¹⁹¹ The subsequent Commission on Worship was not persuaded, and the TLH original of the Nicene Creed remained virtually intact in LW (pp. 141f.).

A number of letters pointed out that no rationale was given for changes in the Athanasian Creed¹¹⁹² nor, I might add, were the borrowings acknowledged. One pastor liked the format of the Athanasian Creed and suggested it be used for the other LBW creeds.¹¹⁹³

An interesting slant on the sexist language issue came from Winfred Schaller of Indio, California. Regarding the controverted translation of “A Lamb goes uncomplaining forth,” Schaller wrote: “Who wants a synod so orthodox that they will not allow Paul Gerhardt to say... ‘*mein Kind*’ ...[but] insists that Gerhardt be corrected to say ‘*mein Sohn*’”¹¹⁹⁴ ([sic] st. 2, TLH 142; LW 111).

A number of pastors expressed their preference for the traditional LCMS absolution over the declaration of forgiveness. Angry criticisms ranged from “a crash action by a committee with a foreordained goal,” “a bunch of nit-picking Pharisees,” to the observation that “what is ostensibly the pursuit of doctrinal purity is actually a scheme for separateness.”

Publishing *Lutheran Book of Worship*

In a December letter to the ALC, ELCC, and LCA presidents, Brand as project director raised both legal and moral questions about the stated intention of LCMS to begin a “revised edition” of LBW early in 1978. He quoted the 1976 ILCW Rules of Organization and Procedure to the effect that a joint committee of the *participating* churches would “speak for ILCW in matters of publication of ILCW materials” if ILCW were dissolved. He quoted a letter by President J.A.O. Preus as having agreed to this. He con-

cluded: "Though the churches own the copyright, they regard it as applying to material held in common." Brand stated his assumption that the legal questions would be handled by the publishing houses.¹²⁰⁶

Albert Anderson of Augsburg Publishing House announced in January that the two publishers "intend to take whatever steps may be necessary to prevent LCMS from using the title, "Lutheran Book of Worship—Revised Edition." He continued that it would be "misleading for anyone to think it [the LCMS book] is anything like the *Lutheran Book of Worship*." Anderson also gave a different interpretation from Brand's: Since "LCMS continues as a copyright holder," it has the "right to change any material prepared by the churches" through ILCW. "The *Lutheran Book of Worship* is indeed a common worship book for all Lutherans in North America," said Anderson. "The fact that the Missouri Synod has not been able to approve its own work does not change that fact."¹²⁰⁷

The ILCW Executive Committee met in January 1978 with LCMS's former commissioners in attendance. Brand reported that the ILCW's revision of Merrill's "Rise up, O men of God" was not acceptable to "those who claim the right to . . . decline clear emendations."

He noted that the Methodist had also adopted the "Episcopal solution," leaving only Lutherans and Presbyterians not following the Proper of the Day system.

Sauer of SHRC informed Brand "that ILCW would need to take no action" regarding the SHRC report. The committee therefore moved to announce that it was proceeding with scheduled publication of LBW "since no specific requests for changes in the LBW were made by the SHRC prior to 16 January 1978."¹²⁰⁸

Brand noted that further work on a book of occasional services would not be carried out by ILCW, but that a manual on the liturgy was to appear at the same time as LBW, the joint roduct of Lindemann, Messerli, and Pfatteicher.¹²⁰⁹

Ralph Van Loon reported that 12 of the 15 LCMS districts were expected to participate in the introductory process for LBW. Leonard Flachman noted that Concordia Publishing House would not be listed on the title page as one of the publishers, but LCMS would be listed as participating in ILCW.¹²¹⁰

Prices of the books and honoraria to certain contributors were discussed. A list drafted by Brand was to be submitted to the Executive Committee. Brand suggested that, although ILCW was to continue through the end of 1978, the office staffed by himself and Rev. Robert Rimbo should close at the end of June, since only proofreading and organizing the archives remained. The Executive Committee approved this.¹²¹¹

By the time of the final Executive Committee meeting in late November 1978, LBW was already in its fourth printing. The publishers of the three church bodies played a major role in the process of developing LBW. In addition to funding the work of the ILCW, in 1970 the three publishers (Augsburg Publishing House, LCA Board of Publication, and Concordia Publishing House) appointed Leonard Flachman from Augsburg Publishing House to the ILCW as publishers' representative. In addition to assisting the ILCW in the preparation of LBW materials for publication, Flachman was to manage the publishing of the CW materials. Karen Walhof, also from Augsburg, was assigned by Flachman in 1974 to monitor the work of the hymn committees for purposes of establishing a publication calendar. Walhof's careful attention to detail in helping organize the work won the confidence of the committees, and she became the defacto manuscript secretary to the committees, working with the committees through the engraving and final proofing of the LBW music.

With two objectives, Flachman proposed a new format for hymns in CW-4, a format in which only the hymn number and title appeared at the top of the page. First, his proposed format had text, tune, and setting identified at the left bottom instead of leaving the uninitiated to guess who was the poet and who the composer (see TLH or SBH). The title of the tune and the meter were to be printed at the bottom right.¹²¹² This format would allow non-musicians to easily identify the author of the text and the composer. Secondly, the format would allow placement of the copyright symbol so congregations could easily determine which pieces were copyrighted and which were in public domain.

The publishers established a rights and permissions budget which amounted to an average of \$225 in payment to copyright holders for rights to print text, tune, and setting of a hymn. One German publisher asked \$1000.00 for its settings; Flachman negotiated a fee of \$100.00 (\$75.00 being the normal limit for setting alone). Similar negotiations were carried out concerning "How great thou art." Manna Music had claimed copyrights to tune, setting, and text. Flachman showed them that the tune was in public domain by duplicating the hymn from a 19th century Swedish hymnal. He further documented that other text translations, including one done by an HTC member, were available to ILCW. An amicable agreement was finally reached.¹²¹³

The question relating to what editions of the hymnal should be published was focused on the unison singing of hymns. The publication of a tune-text edition got strong support especially from LCMS representatives, but other commissioners felt that the first pew edition published should be

a harmony edition. An edition with tune only might follow. An accompaniment edition for organists was planned, as well as an Altar Book. The Ministers Desk Edition was an idea concocted by Brand and Flachman as they worked on the contents of the Altar Book. The Ministers Desk Edition would permit pastors to have the Altar Book material in their study as they prepared for worship.¹²¹⁴

The final contents of the pew edition received considerable attention by the publishers and the ILCW. The agreed-upon principle was that the book would include those text/services which were used by the congregations in Sunday worship. The inclusion of the marriage and funeral rites was not only pressed by the liturgical committees but also by Fortress Press. Flachman understood the decision not to publish all the Psalms to be a matter of including those which were in the lectionary. A second consideration for the pew edition was matter of cost and size of the book¹²¹⁵—as it is the 930-page “limit” was exceeded by 30 pages.

Questions of editorial style were proposed by the publishers and reviewed by the Hymn and Liturgical Text Committees, the Language Review Committee, the church review committees, and the Editorial Policy Committee. Even the unidentified group that met after the final ILCW meeting in May 1977 made “editorial” changes. Flachman characterized the publishers’ official editorial role as one focusing on grammar, punctuation, capitalization, etc. Even here differences in practice among the publishers complicated the work: Augsburg, following the RSV Bible, did not capitalize pronouns referring to God; Concordia did. Fortress had some editors following each style. Concordia also followed a more Germanic style, capitalizing more nouns.¹²¹⁶

The Editorial Policy Committee (EPC), chaired by Glen Stone, met only twice—in September 1975 and January 1976—to review the editorial styles proposed by the publishers. Two interesting decisions emerged from the first meeting: Proper nouns “referring to the divinity which are governed by possessives (e.g., my Redeemer)” were to be capitalized. Interesting decisions concerning capitalization included capitalizing “Church” when referring to the “whole body of Christians, worldwide or throughout time.” Events in Christ’s life were to be capitalized (e.g. Incarnation and Resurrection). Alleluia and Hosanna were to be capitalized and followed by an exclamation point in hymns but not in liturgical texts!¹²¹⁷ Liturgical music in the pew edition was to appear in tune-text form.¹²¹⁸ At the second meeting, Flachman presented samples of work of two European music engravers and design prototypes by two designers. A German engraver was recommended by EPC. Subsequently, York Graphic Services of York, Pennsylvania, was chosen because they were not overseas and because they had

developed a new engraving technology.¹²¹⁹ As it happened the master engraver of the German firm originally selected, died before the LBW music composition was completed, and the company closed because they were working with an antiquated art and one master engraver.

A series of interchanges took place between Robert Wetzler of Art Masters Studios Inc. and the ILCW. In a letter with copies to Flachman and Anderson of Augsburg, he asserted that the \$55.00 per page being paid for music engraving was a “rip-off.” He also asserted that “apparently an engraver in Pennsylvania was hired to do the job, and was not even equipped to engrave music. They had to buy equipment and learn how to do it.” He concluded: “Someone has ripped-off the church to the tune of about \$20,000.00. It looks like the church paid to set up a printer in Pennsylvania with equipment to do the engraving, plus paid for their time to learn how.” He laments how missionaries could have used the money! He finds it “shocking” and “scandalous.”¹²²⁰

Flachman responded, characterizing the letter as “misinformed and slanderous.”¹²²¹ Anderson noted the “libelous charges” and invited Wetzler in for a discussion.¹²²² That discussion eventuated in a letter of “apology,” in which Wetzler acknowledged his embarrassment over his “misunderstanding.” He said “It is simply not true that [the graphics engravers] were not equipped to do the job.”¹²²³ However, Flachman acknowledged that the engraver had done mostly textbooks with “bars of music here and there.” They were, however, a company with a new photocomposition technology. “The York Graphics technology was so new that they had not tested their costing. After they completed the work, their top management discovered that their costs were two and one-half times what they estimated. Their top management wanted us to pay those costs. They wouldn’t release the film until we paid their fee.” Flachman had to go over the contracts and correspondences with York’s officers before they realized the cost over-runs were their problem, and released the film. “They have since gone out of the music engraving business. This was the last major job they did.”¹²²⁴

“The engraving,” said Flachman, “was amazingly accurate and the reproduction quality was the best available anywhere in the world.” The Wetzler connection continued in his rather negative review of the hymns, followed by the circulation of four pages of highly critical “excerpts I have been receiving from Lutheran pastors, and others.”¹²²⁵ Later in 1978 Art Masters Studios published “100 carefully selected” *Christian Hymns*, advertised with 14 positive “kudos.”

The EPC also reviewed the publishers’ proposals for opacity of paper, hymn numbering and format, rubric form, matters of type, etc. Paper was

selected of such a weight and opacity that the *three* hymns visible in SBH pages could not be seen. Cover material was tested by a testing company to select the most durable brand and to minimize fraying of the corners. The green dye used in the initial printing turned into a green jelly when in contact with the foam rubber padding used in some pew racks and was revised. The boards used in the covers had to be shipped under low humidity weather conditions to prevent the warping experienced by one denomination when their hymnals were shipped during a rainstorm.¹²²⁶

Between the ILCW staff, committee members, and publishers' staff, all of the LBW material was proofread sixteen times. One of the more obvious errors in a remarkably error-free publication was in the Apostles' Creed in Responsive Prayer 1 and 2 (LBW, pp. 162 & 165): "Again" was omitted from the last line of the second article. This error was corrected after the first printing.¹²²⁷ Perhaps unnoticed by anyone except the translator (not even by the LCMS blue ribbon committee in its revised translation!) were the omissions in the Athanasian Creed: line 20 omits "by anyone" and line 22 omits "nor begotten" (cf. BC 20. 20 & 22). The late decision to include the *Athanasianum* and the trans-Atlantic modifications of the translation (because of Quere's sabbatical) left the omissions undetected.

The *Lutheran Book of Worship* was scheduled to be printed and available in time for congregations to begin using them in Advent 1978. To meet this deadline, inordinately long hours, seven days a week, from Thanksgiving 1977 through March 1978, were spent by Flachman and Walhof in readying the ILCW materials for printing. An advance copy was delivered to Brand in July 1978, also in time for display at the LCA convention. The final meeting of the ILCW Executive Committee was held in November 1978. Reports regarding prices, sales, copyrights, and corrections were made. The Executive Committee moved that, in subsequent printings, explanations be included about the circles in Morning and Evening Prayer (for family use) as well as the intended usage of the "years" in the Daily Lectionary and the Psalm table during Epiphany season.¹²²⁸

Pfatteicher reported on the delay of the *Manual on the Liturgy*: publication was now scheduled for mid-January 1979. Van Loon noted that some 1400 LCMS congregations requested introductory materials "and, apparently, a comparable number participated in the events."

It was noted that both the Consultation of Ecumenical Hymnody and International Consultation on English Texts were no longer meeting. ILCW remained involved only in the Consultation on Common Texts. Pfatteicher reported that its office project was nearly complete. The three-year lectionary

project continued with Stanley Schneider, formerly of ILCW's lectionary subcommittee, representing the Lutherans. Hans Boehringer of LTC served as chair of the Consultation on Common Texts. The Executive Committee recommended to the church presidents that such representation be continued, possibly through Lutheran World Ministries.¹²²⁹

The resignation of Brand's assistant, Robert Rimbo, was announced, the budgetary funds were to be dispersed and remaining monies returned to the participating churches, and, "with thanksgiving to God and with gratitude to the participating churches," the ILCW declared the *Lutheran Book of Worship* to be complete and its mandate fulfilled.¹²³⁰

CONCLUSION

LUTHERANS IN FELLOWSHIP AND COMMUNION

Common Practices

For almost a century, liturgy has been a meeting ground for Lutherans who could agree formally on little else. Even after the rejection of the *Lutheran Book of Worship*, the production of *Lutheran Worship* was technically and truly a modification of LBW. Like many advances in the Kingdom, that modification known as *Lutheran Worship* is a “mixed bag.” It is so similar that it proves our unity; it is enough different that it perpetuates and increases our liturgical chaos. In addition to the expected change in the color of the binding, the little changes in certain translations are most disturbing; thus the Lord’s Prayer and the Creeds kept traditional Lutheran translations without historical warrant and in the face of ecumenical consensus and usage, viz. “I believe” and “Christian Church”! This is a setback not only for the expression of Christian, but also Lutheran unity. Does that help the witness of the Christian Church or even of the Lutheran Church–Missouri Synod?

By 1976 a new issue was clearly emerging in the LCMS discussions of the LBW: the question of pulpit-and-altar fellowship. This had existed with ALC since 1969. But since the Seminex split there were growing tensions in inter-Lutheran relations. Questions began to be raised by CTCR and others about how a common hymnal could be produced with those whose doctrine and practice were in question. Introducing issues of practice was not new for Lutherans, although they tended to argue that doctrinal agreement sufficed—until identity seemed threatened! Even after the 1949 Common Confession had settled all doctrinal issues between ALC and LCMS, the Missourians demanded a statement on “the life and activity of the Church” in 1952.¹²³¹ The demand came in part because ALC was negotiating regarding merger with the other members of the American

Lutheran Conference and in part because LCMS was receiving pressure from the other members of the Synodical Conference. As the move toward the formation of the American Lutheran Church in 1960 progressed, LCMS quietly set aside the Common Confession “as a functioning union document.”¹²³² In some parallel ways, the American Lutheran Conference document that became the basis for the American Lutheran Church, the United Testimony on Faith and Life, included statements on “liturgical trends” and the “elements in the Lord’s Supper.” These were hardly doctrinal matters, but were included to satisfy concerns regarding the *lex orandi*. So also as the production of the LBW spawned fellowship concerns in LCMS, it also brought up in LCA and ALC concerns about communion practices. New confirmation practices growing out of the study completed in 1970 and recent advocacy and practice of infant communion complicated the issue further.

Communion Practices: Public Doctrine in Ecclesial Mergers

There is great irony in the move from “closed communion”—typified by the Galesburg Rule’s phrase, “Lutheran altars for Lutheran communicants only”¹²³³—of much of 19th and early 20th century Lutheranism to the “open communion” that characterizes most of late 20th century Lutherans. The descendants of the General Council (who formed the ULCA and LCA) wrote the rule at the prodding of the Iowa Synod (whose descendants merged into the old and new ALC). These church bodies gave up the practice and theory of “closed communion” by the 1960s. (The euphemism of “close communion” in the ALC was clearly a transitional stage while new ecumenical attitudes were being inculcated by international, national, and local ecumenical dialogues.) The irony emerges in the fact that the Missouri and Wisconsin Synods, among the major Lutheran bodies, are the only churches that abide by the teachings of the Galesburg Rule, though they had nothing to do with its origin. Their rationale is not the Galesburg Rule, but the precedent of Luther at Marburg contra Zwingli and Bucer, the “old Lutherans” standing against the “unionism” and “American Lutheranism” in the 19th century, and the dictum that they share with official Roman Catholicism: Inter-communion is to be an expression of unity, not a means to it.

In a document that seemed to help set the agenda for post-war liturgical reform, the 1953 study of the LWF Commission on Liturgy set forth the christological center of worship and sacraments. Specific suggestions included the “complete disappearance” of the order of confession and absolution, a *Kyrie* lity, and a eucharistic prayer.¹²³⁴ Interestingly enough, the commission warns against the “naturalistic interpretation” linking the offertory with the elements used for Holy Communion.¹²³⁵

The breakdown of pulpit-and-altar fellowship between ALC and LCMS was related not only to biblical issues (e.g., inerrancy and higher criticism), the Seminex controversy, and women's ordination, but also to the approval of "interim eucharistic sharing" with the Episcopalians (1982) and limited inter-communion with the Presbyterians and Reformed (1986).

The largely midwestern churches of the American Lutheran Conference published their United Testimony on Faith and Life in 1952 because of the Conference's unwillingness to consider merger with the ULCA. The Augustana Lutheran Church withdrew from the negotiations leading to the American Lutheran Church merger of 1960. The pietistic elements of the Norwegian ELC and the Danish UELC had demanded that the meaning and celebration of the Lord's Supper be agreed upon in doctrine and practice. Hence the doctrinal section of the United Testimony gave this interesting description of the benefits of the sacraments: not only forgiveness of sins and strengthening of faith but also "the increase of holiness of life."¹²³⁶ Similarly under "sanctification," the United Testimony asserted that "every earthly relationship is sanctified through fellowship with God, every honorable vocation is holy when dedicated to the service of God"¹²³⁷ (United Testimony, p. 176). Finally "the Lord of the church summons every believer to a more earnest striving for holiness. . . ."¹²³⁸ The linking of holiness and Holy Communion here was somewhat unique.

Part II of the United Testimony on Life and Practice began with "Liturgical Trends." A careful attempt was made to balance what is sufficient for church unity (*satis est*—Augsburg Confession VII) with evangelical freedom in liturgical forms, while still affirming the historic liturgy's "rather uniform pattern as a guide to man's true worship of God."¹²³⁹ The ambivalence was expressed in the final warning against equating form and faith or stultifying or losing the faith by "an inordinate passion for form."¹²⁴⁰

The most significant liturgical principle articulated here was really the traditional Lutheran reversal of *lex orandi, lex credendi*, usually understood to mean: the rule of prayer establishes the rule of belief. In its common Lutheran version, it has normally been altered to assert: the rule of faith determines the rule of worship. This latter sense was explicit in the assertion "that every part of the service should relate the sound theology of Law and Gospel to the worshipper."¹²⁴¹

LCA Churchliness

The 1960 ULCA statement, "The Sacrament of the Altar and Its Implications," represented a first stage of transition from SBH to LBW. The statement summarized the consensus that had shaped and emerged in SBH. Though it continued the traditional Lutheran *doctrinal* approach to liturgy

(*lex credendi, lex orandi*), the statement did not start and center on christology and soteriology as Lutheran approaches usually did.¹²⁴² The Lord's Supper was rather set in the context of the doctrines of the *Church* (where Christ is present and active through proclamation of the gospel)^{1243a} and the *Word*—which was defined as “God himself in his creative, redemptive, and sanctifying activity,” i.e. both Christ and the message about Christ.^{1243b} In this ecclesiological context of Church and Word, the statement presented the Lord's Supper as mystery, memorial, eschatological expectations, and evangelical proclamation.^{1243c} *Mystery* is the category for discussing Christ's presence in the statement. The ubiquity, particularity, and objectivity of the presence of the “total Christ” is “in the entire action of the Lord's Supper”^{1243d}—a concept much like Melancthon's “ritual presence.”¹²⁴⁴ The rejection of the term “sign” and the reintroduction of “symbol” (in Tillich's sense¹²⁴⁵) gave a new way to talk about the relation of presence and elements—a concern of Luther. *Memorial* was the historical category. But it went beyond history:

What was, is; he who was, is present; what was given in self-sacrifice is at every moment of need newly available. This kind of memorial is not caught on past time; and it is not caught in the sequential unfolding of future time. For just as what one was is present in the fullness of time, so the consummation with its sign of the heavenly banquet is present in the Holy Supper.^{1246a}

It is interesting that the influence of the studies of Brilioth (1930) and Aulen (1958) cannot yet be discerned clearly in the ULCA document. Brilioth's categories (eucharist, communion, and fellowship, commemoration [the historical aspect], eucharistic sacrifice [the memorial aspect], and mystery) and Aulen's modest proposal of “sacrifice” seem to have made little positive impact—although the statement's position is not far from Aulen's.^{1246b} At least the terms “memorial” and “self-sacrifice”—untraditional in Lutheran usage—were introduced. The thinking and reinterpretation were yet to come.

Neither the ALC nor the LCA constitutions as such dealt with the kind of liturgical/theological issues that emerged in the ILCW debates. The 1964 LCA statement on the Sacrament of the Altar and its implications constituted an “adaptation” of the 1960 ULCA statement.^{1246c} Some of the themes continued, but the focus was functional and practical. It was less apologetic than the United Testimony in seeking “basic uniformity of communion practice.” Guidelines for inter-communion included a warning against implying “a unity which is not a reality in other realms of faith and order.”^{1246d} “Preparation” (called “admission” in later documents) for bap-

tized Christians (who are not “open and impenitent sinners under the discipline of the church”) involved self-examination regarding faith and obedience—normally involving private or public confession and absolution. Various suggestions as to when a service of public confession “may be held” were given, but with no hint that it might be omitted.^{1246c} Because of the joint commission studying confirmation, the relation of confirmation to admission was left unstated.^{1246f}

Addressing the problem of whether it was necessary to recite the “words of institution” (*verba*) over additional bread and wine when the initial supply of bread and wine ran out, the statement answered negatively. This is so since “the ‘words of institution’ are not in themselves a formula of consecration, for there is not precise moment of consecration.”^{1246g} Differences on this issue might well have been behind aspects of the “eucharistic controversy” which dominated the 1970s.

ALC Revisited

The 1968 ALC “Statement on Communion Practices”^{1247a} was a giant step in the direction ILCW would be moving for the next decade. Eugene Brand’s influence on the document is discovered by comparing the statement with his presentations to the LCA Commission on Worship meeting January 31-February 2, 1968 and to the ALC Church Council (undated) appended to the statement. In the opening theological statement the *giving* of Christ’s body and blood is affirmed in, with, and under bread and wine for forgiveness, life, and salvation.^{1247b} These dimensions of the sacrament were discussed: (1) *anamnesis* “rendered somewhat inadequately as ‘memorial’” meaning “the present reactualization (becoming a present reality) of God’s deed in Christ”; (2) communion with Christ and all the members of his body; (3) “thanksgiving” . . . traditionally termed sacrificial, the grateful dedication of God’s gifts [offertory] to his redeeming purpose; and (4) anticipation—a “foretaste” of the “messianic banquet.” The much-debated “four-action shape” of the eucharist as described by Gregory Dix was clear in the description of the “shape” of the meal: “bread and wine are taken (offertory), blessed (consecration), broken for distribution, and received.” The statement further asserted that the “preaching of the Word interprets the *dramatic action* [emphasis mine].”^{1247c} In its guidelines for liturgical experimentation, the statement insisted: “The basic shape of the sacramental action and its meaning must be maintained as it was instituted by our Lord and developed in the history of the Christian Church.”^{1247d} Ironically, those issues which were to be debated for the next decade in and around ILCW had, for the most part (the *epiclesis* being one exception), been affirmed by the ALC which had more than its share of the controversy!

Another interesting feature of this statement—as contrasted with the 1978 Joint ALC-LCA Statement of Communion Practices—lies in its sole criterion for inter-communion: “whether the proclamation of the Gospel is compromised or enhanced.”^{1247c} The vagueness of such a principle and the controversy over the “four-action shape” language undoubtedly led to the dropping of the latter and the expanding of the former in the 1978 statement! If the ALC reversed itself in the new joint statement, how did it come out in the new joint worship book? That is one of the questions this study seeks to answer.

Confirmation: Revised

The report of the Joint Commission on the Theology and Practice of Confirmation^{1248a} was presented to ALC, LCA, and LCMS in March 1970. The commission’s recommendation for fifth-grade communion (now widely practiced) and tenth-grade confirmation (virtually ignored or tried and found wanting) set the stage for new debates on infant communion. These recommendations were rooted in a new focus on Baptism and Communion. The report asserted:

The saving benefit of Baptism is entirely God’s doing. . . . It is not conditioned in any way by any decision or promise or act of man, whether by his parents or sponsors or by himself, as in a confirmation rite. To assert or even imply that the saving power of Baptism is in any way contingent on any subsequent event is to deny its status. It is therefore theologically indefensible to give a confirmation rite meaning whereby it is elevated to a position in which it either complements or supplements the sacrament of Holy Baptism.^{1248b}

The further rationale for communion *before* confirmation was included in the treatment of Holy Communion and the *preparation* implied (which would “preclude” infant communion!):

the apostolic teaching in 1 Corinthians 11:28 makes it incumbent upon the church to exercise its pastoral concern for its growing members to help them prepare for a meaningful participation in the Lord’s Supper, each at his own level of development. This means an understanding of the simple meaning of the gospel and participation in the sacrament in the context of the gospel. It also involves a basic understanding of the nature of Holy Communion and a desire to participate in its benefits.^{1248c}

Such “understanding” and “desire” was spelled out in terms of (1) understanding Christ’s redemptive work, (2) accepting the presence and promise of Christ, (3)/(5) understanding sin and recognizing/anticipating God’s forgiveness in Sacrament and Word, (4) awareness and appreciation of life in

Christ, and (6) expectation of seeing and banqueting with Christ.^{1248d} The learning goals were summarized in terms of “comprehension of certain basic facts of salvation history and certain formulations of faith,” as well as “attitudes and conduct responses.” The section concluded with the warning: “To receive Holy Communion without understanding would be to perform a meaningless act that would contribute nothing to the process of growth.”^{1248e}

A new definition of confirmation was set forth by the commission:

Confirmation is a pastoral and educational ministry of the church which helps the baptized child through Word and Sacrament to identify more deeply with the Christian community and participate more fully in its mission.^{1248f}

This definition and commentary, which ignored the *rite* of confirmation^{1248g} served to encourage the ILCW to drop the term “confirmation” (CW-8, 8) and to substitute “Affirmation of the Baptismal Covenant” (CW-8)!

ELCA Previewed

In spring 1974 LCA proposed a joint statement on communion practices, and the ALC Executive Committee responded positively in September. A 14 member committee met the following November and produced its “final draft” on February 2, 1976. The 1976 LCA (Boston) convention in July approved it provisionally as a “working document” and asked the *task force* to consider certain changes (e.g., “that those sections that seemingly localize Christ’s presence ‘in’ the elements...be revised to incorporate more fully the historic Lutheran concept of Christ’s presence in the sacraments”). It is striking that the LCA convention’s objection to phrases like “the reality of Christ’s presence in sacramental bread and wine”¹²⁴⁹ as too “localized” were objected to by Lowell Green as too “vague” and “Protestant,” rather than Lutheran.¹²⁵⁰ In the final (1978) statement, the compromise has it both ways: “...the reality of Christ’s presence in the Sacrament, his body and blood, given ‘in, with, and under’ the bread and wine.”^{1251a}

The LCA convention also questioned the omitting of confession and forgiveness from the service of Holy Communion. The 1976 draft had read: “Corporate confession with its proclamation of forgiveness has great value, but it is not required as a part of every service of Holy Communion.”^{1252b} The convention suggested dropping the final clause. The adopted 1978 statement read: “Corporate confession . . . is the normal preparation for the celebration of Holy Communion.”^{1251c}

The July 1976 LCA convention assumed the report should go back to the Joint Committee, but the October (Washington) convention of the ALC

authorized President Preus to appoint a review group, in consultation with LCA President Marshall, to *revise* the document and submit it to the congregations before the convention in 1978. Preus, Charles S. Anderson, and Roger Fjeld served as ALC review group members,^{1252a} and Robert Marshall, Dorothy Marple, and Steven Bremer constituted their LCA counterparts. The most significant change in the final draft submitted to the conventions in 1978 was the conclusion in the admission section. After the recommendation of age 10/fifth grade, the statement continued (as in the 1976 draft): “. . . but it may occur earlier or later. The responsibility for deciding when to admit a child is shared by the pastor, the child, the family or sponsoring persons, and the congregation.” Then the implication is drawn: “Thus infant communion is precluded.”^{1252b} Considerable debate went on in various pockets of the church, disciplinary action against seminary faculty members was taken or threatened, open debates happened before and after the statement was passed and published. All this happened when the practice of communing infants which was being tried in various segments of the Lutheran churches was rather suddenly “precluded.” A significant addition to a partial quotation from the Apology to the Augsburg Confession was made by the LCA convention: “In our churches mass is celebrated every Sunday and on other festivals when the Sacrament is offered to those who wish for it. . . .” (Apology XXIV, 1).^{1252c} There the quotation had ended because the Statement was arguing for weekly communion. But Melancthon had continued, “. . . after they have been examined and absolved.” That quotation seemed to make examination (undoubtedly by the pastor) and (*private*) absolution prerequisites to communion. This would seem to preclude infants, as would the self-examination of 1 Corinthians 11:28.

The 1978 standards for admission *and* inter-communion were much more precise than the 1964 LCA or the 1968 ALC Communion Practices Statement. The “considerations” informing inter-communion paralleled the “guidelines” for admission which follow. (The bracketed material indicates 1976 draft; material in parentheses indicates 1978 additions).

- a. That there be a simple trust that the (crucified and) risen Lord is here (present), giving himself to his people, (as his words declare);
- b. That there be a basic understanding and appreciation of the [nature and benefits of] gifts (God gives through) the Sacrament;
- c. That there be an acceptance of one’s place as a communicant in the fellowship of believers; and
- d. That there be self-examination appropriate to the level of maturity and recognition of the need of forgiveness.^{1252d}

To the terminology of the 1970 Confirmation Report such as understanding, acceptance, appreciation, and recognition, the 1978 Statement added “self-examination” and “trust.” This faith category came closest to Luther who said that *all* that was required to “worthy and well prepare” was to *believe* these words: “for you” and “for the forgiveness of sins” (BC 352.10).

Similarly, inter-communion considerations were expanded from “whether the Gospel is compromised or enhanced” to the following:

- a. That the participants be baptized Christians;
- b. That the real presence of Christ in the Sacrament[al elements—1976 draft] be affirmed;
- c. That the Sacrament be celebrated as a means of grace;
- d. That the words of institution be proclaimed; and
- e. That the elements associated with our Lord’s institution be used.^{1252c}

In a way the 1968 ALC Communion Practices Statement set or at least symbolized the ILCW’s eucharistic agenda—in large measure through Brand’s influence—and the 1978 joint ALC/LCA Statement represented the moderating of the CW experiment in LBW. The dropping of the theological language of the “four-action shape” used in the 1968 ALC Statement gave further testimony to this moderating.

Whereas the 1964 LCA statement had discouraged practices which “imply a unity which is not a reality in other realms of faith and practice” and then spelled out guidelines for ecumenical situations, the 1968 ALC statement gave less detailed guidelines and set forth this criterion: “whether the proclamation of the Gospel is compromised or enhanced.” However the 1978 ALC/LCA statement, in setting forth roughly the same criteria for the admission of Lutherans and non-Lutherans, seemed to “open” Lutheran altars even more. Moreover, from 1976 on, the statement read:

For Lutheran clergy to be involved as presiding or assisting ministers in the celebration of Holy Communion in other churches, a reciprocal relationship between the congregations and clergy should prevail.^{1252f}

Such guidelines/considerations for the admission of individuals and for joint celebration set the stage for the inter-communion that was to happen in the 1980s. From the perspective of LCMS, this must have seemed a further compromise with “unionism” (communion without concord in doctrine and practice) and thus further reason for suspicion regarding the LBW project. When ALC and LCA entered into “interim eucharistic sharing” with the Episcopal Church in 1982 and ALC declared intercommunion

with the Presbyterians and Reformed in 1986, Missourian fears and prophecies were fulfilled: “American Lutheranism” and “unionism” had triumphed among the majority of Lutherans!

Early Evaluations of LBW

Routley Revisited on Hymnody

Erik Routley’s “Preview of the Hymns,” written after reviewing a preview copy of the hymnal, was really an “afterview,” in light of the extensive evaluation of Lutheran hymnody he did for the ILCW in 1967. He regarded LBW as “an enormous advance” on TLH and SBH. He regarded it as a “thoroughly professional piece of work” and found himself “much more comfortable with this book than I expected to. . . .” He saw that “a lively liturgy . . . conditions the contents,” as it began with Advent and ended with praise. He found the arrangement “sensible and logical.” His pointed wit noted the “few tribal songs” (“national songs”) at the conclusion (LBW 566-569).¹²⁵³

He saw the initial problem confronting the ILCW as blending German and Scandinavian traditions. The SBH contained much Scandinavian material, “by no means all of which exports very well.” TLH contained chorales “of massive length and complexity.” Overall he felt Luther, Grundtvig, and the Lindemann school were appropriately represented.¹²⁵⁴

Routley did notice “a slightly cavalier treatment of English material,” given that “tendency of the more professional Lutherans (whose standards I immensely admire) to regard English composers as a bunch of amateurs whose work is always better for being touched up.” The “most outrageous example” of this tendency was the reharmonization of “O God, our help in ages past.”¹²⁵⁵ The nearly 80 rearrangements (and compositions) of Jan Bender and “that strenuous trio” from Concordia, River Forest—Carl Shalk, Paul Bunjes, and Richard Hillert—are “too much.” For, Routley argued: “Enthusiasm for purity of style often obscures from the enthusiast the fact that a piece is a period piece.” Admitting that in many 18th century tunes, “the composer’s bass was subliterate” (e.g., Barnaby’s “Just as I am”), “these composers knew exactly what they were doing.” If “we don’t approve...look the other way or drop them.” The result of the reharmonizations were, for Routley, “bland and tasteless.”

Routley noted with regret: “the music is normally, in a very large majority of cases in fact, set for unison singing.” Admitting that most modern tunes are set for unison singing, he questioned the necessity of its application “so freely to tunes not so composed”—especially Welsh tunes—

“unison singing is unknown in Wales.” Regarding the prejudice against singing in harmony, Routley confessed: “I don’t agree with Bonhoeffer on this (there’s heresy for you!).”¹²⁵⁶

Routley commended the ILCW “for declining to abridge texts so ruthlessly.” He applauded the restoration of Newton’s lost stanzas of “How sweet the name of Jesus sounds” (LBW 345, 4 and 5), and the final stanzas of “Oh, worship the King” (LBW 548), and “Glorious things” (LBW 358). But to the new translation of the latter, “Glories of your name are spoken,” Routley objected strenuously.

Finally, other textual matters—like the emendation of LBW 358—come in for some criticism. Admitting the pressures to change “thou,” “man” and “he,” Routley found some of the changes unnecessary, “even granting the presuppositions.” The revision of Bunyan’s “He who would valiant be” (LBW 498) would not have “got to first base” if the revision had been the original. But Routley finally granted that “these adjustments of text are better made here than one often finds.”¹²⁵⁷

The balance of hymns was also questioned: eleven from Paul Gerhard “doesn’t really compensate for only eleven from the two Wesleys.” More from Isaac Watts (only twelve), George Herbert (only one, LBW 513) and Richard Baxter (none) were needed. On the other hand, “Dear Lord and Father of mankind” (LBW 506) and “Joyful, joyful” (LBW 551) could have been omitted.¹²⁵⁸

Routley reported 88 comments under “Wow,” 75 under “Ugh” (“How could you?”) and 54 questions under “Why?” He concluded that this indicated a “good score” for editors. “Considered as a Lutheran manifesto . . . it is an impressive piece of work.”¹²⁵⁹

Bailey and Klien on Augsburg-Style Worship

Important evaluations of LBW in relation to the Augsburg Confession were done for the 1980 anniversary of its presentation. This is doubly significant since Melancthon’s contributions to Lutheran worship—not only his influence on the Mecklenburg liturgy but even his confessional writings—were largely ignored in the debates concerning ILCW/LBW. Admitting Luther’s greater importance in liturgical and theological writings, the elevation of any and every opinion of Luther’s to near infallible status and the failure to differentiate between his confessional and other writings gave the controversy an odd twist. Even where we have liturgies by Luther himself, what basis do *confessional* Lutherans have to give them inspired and inerrent status? The series by Bailey and Klein and the study by Lutheran World Federation added a confessional perspective largely overlooked in the debates over LBW in favor of appeals to “Luther only.”

Bailey and Klein began their multi-part study with the Augsburg Confession's description of worship: "True perfection and right service [*cultus/Gottesdienst*] of God consist of fear of God, confidence in him, trust in Christ, prayer to the Father, etc." (AC XXVII, BC 78.49). Arguing that "worship is never a matter of indifference"—an *adiaphron* even though worship uses many *adiaphora*, they asserted that "faith and right believing are always lived out in worshipping." These *adiaphora*—"humanly instituted ceremonies"—dare not hide God's grace, but Lutherans have used "whatever ceremonies we have inherited that best carry the message of God's love and forgiveness in Christ for all people."¹²⁶⁰

At the outset of the series, they affirmed "the confessional integrity of the LBW" as "the best we yet have of tradition—"the living faith of the dead,""—to quote Pelikan.¹²⁶¹

The article on "Christology and Worship" affirmed that *Lutheran* liturgy (which is also "thoroughly catholic") "worships the Trinity and confesses the God-Man Jesus Christ." These doctrines are also the "dogmatic center of Lutheranism," along with justification. Thus these normative confessions "provide substantive guidelines not only for *thinking* theologically but for doing liturgically" [*italics author's*].¹²⁶²

Regarding the *lex orandi, lex credendi* issue, Bailey and Klein rightly stated that "Lutherans have usually put the emphasis on the rule of faith determining the rule of prayer." Thus 16th century liturgical reforms were "largely, although not entirely, governed by theological norms." But they contended, somewhat hopefully perhaps, "Historically, this has been taken in a flexible way, accenting the fact that the influence between doctrine and worship moves in both directions."¹²⁶³

Finally, the confessional loyalty triumphed:

A church that confesses the historic creeds in the context of its liturgical life, and that believes God is truly given and at work in Word and Sacrament, cannot easily surrender doctrinal substance to the breezes of novelty. Practice must likewise be judged and formed by these creedal and confessional affirmations.¹²⁶⁴

By way of example, they asserted: "Classical and biblical trinitarian language will not be altered to meet the demands for 'non-sexist' liturgies."¹²⁶⁵

The practical and liturgical implications of Augustana's doctrine of justification were spelled out in Article V: "To obtain such faith God instituted the office of the ministry, that is, provided the Gospel and the sacraments" (BC p. 31). This does *not* mean that "it doesn't matter what you do in worship so long as you have faith" because the sacraments and preaching are "not only divine activity but also palpably human undertakings."¹²⁶⁶

Thus, failing to proclaim good news, confusing law with gospel, reading Scripture without preaching, or celebrating the Sacrament without a sermon have no justification in the Lutheran doctrine of justification. Similarly, a “sermon without Supper” is worship done “in spite of the confessions.”¹²⁶⁷

Picking up on a current Vatican warning against the delaying of baptizing infants, Bailey and Klein rejected a parallel with the European situation which led some liturgiologists to make adult Baptism the “norm.” They found that the LBW rite “reflects to some degree this feeling,” as well as some uneasiness with original sin. For “Christian love” of the parents rather than the “need of the child” was given as the motive for the Baptism (LBW, p. 121, par. 6). They admitted that “nothing in LBW advocates only adult Baptism. But “often the road is short between merely stating something as the norm and then prescribing it as the usual.”¹²⁶⁸

Citing the Augsburg Confession that “private absolution should be retained and not allowed to fall into disuse” (AC XI), Bailey and Klein lamented that it has happened. They pointed to absolution’s links with both Baptism and the Sacrament of the Altar and our need to receive the assurance of forgiveness. Admitting that LBW was correct in stating that “general confession before every Holy Communion is not a theological necessity,” they warned “people must know where and when they can confess”—lest even general confession disappear! And to promote private confession, they recommended that pastors themselves become penitents.¹²⁶⁹

Some more general comments on the role Bailey and Klein see for confessionalism in “renewing Lutheran worship” closed this section. They characterized the “high church” liturgical movement that began in the 19th century as “predominantly confessional and historical” with a “dash of romantic medievalism.” Charges of “smells and bells,” “dressmaking and rubrics,” concerns for ceremonial, “consecration and reception of eucharistic elements” had given way in the current liturgical movement to a focus on “accessibility and hospitality” and the total eucharistic “action.” Whereas medieval precedents influenced the old “high church” movement, the early church had become the current standard. The danger for the older movement was an *ex opere operato* view of the ritual performance; the current problem was the emphasis on the *ex opere operantis* performer.¹²⁷⁰ An even greater danger was “a cavalier disregard of theology”—especially, they said, “among non-Lutheran liturgiologists.” They regarded the older movement with its confessional roots as more responsible at this point. Yet in both liturgical movements, rigidity in style (“rubricism”) and legalism intruded. The new “musts” included:

Bread *must* be leavened, one *must not* be fussy especially about eucharistic elements, vestments *must* be flowing and graceful, exclusive language *must* be avoided and the celebrant (oops, presiding minister) *must* appear strong, loving, and wise.¹²⁷¹

Earlier Bailey and Klein had identified the current phase of liturgical studies as the “experiential/anthropological” with the focus on what Gordon Lathrop described as a “skilled host” celebrating “well” to realize the “availability of the holy.” Their caution was: “We must remember that the liturgy is the celebration where first and foremost we receive forgiveness of sins, life, and salvation: the true cause for joy!” They concluded: “The ‘new’ book will not solve our liturgical problems.” If we saw the eucharist as our “celebration of solidarity as broken people in need of healing”—rather than “proclaiming the Lord’s death until he comes,” our problems would only worsen. They suggested that “people seek worship done alright” so that the mystery of the cross—not human religiosity—penetrates their lives.¹²⁷² They also sympathized with “those conservatives who remember with love and awe the power of the old liturgical forms . . . [and who] knew that the power was with the promise, not with the performance or the performers.”¹²⁷³

EPILOGUE

THE LUTHERAN CONFESSIONS AS NORM OF LITURGICAL REFORM AC, ILCW & LBW¹²⁷⁴

Consensus and Confession

There is a dialectical relationship between theology and liturgy. Sometimes theology determines liturgical piety; sometimes the existential sequence is *lex orandi, lex credendi*. This reality has not always been admitted by Lutherans. In any case, as Pelikan said, "Liturgy is the melody of theology."¹²⁷⁵

The difficult thing to determine is how the dynamics of the interrelation between liturgy and theology function with regard to authority. The obvious contenders for the role of "authority-figures" are Scripture and tradition. In this arena the Lutheran confessions have a unique role as the Lutheran church's interpretation of Scripture.¹²⁷⁶ From the formula of the Augsburg Confession, "Our churches teach . . ." to the Formula's "We believe, teach, and confess. . .," Lutherans have defended the apostolicity and catholicity of their doctrine. Melancthon further concluded that "nothing has been received among us in doctrines or in ceremonies that is contrary to Scripture or the Church catholic" (Augsburg Confession, BC 95.5).¹²⁷⁷ But in matters theological and liturgical this evokes the knotty question as to how consensus is to be reached and decisions made. Leaders in ILCW saw the dilemma. The specter of "liturgical anarchy" rose in which "canonicity and catholicity" were displaced by "individual judgment" and "personal taste."¹²⁷⁸ The "democratization of decision-making"¹²⁷⁹ opened up the possibility that "our new look will be the result of a mere popularity poll."¹²⁸⁰ Furthermore, "if one gives any weight to 'what the majority of our people are doing,' however, we must raise some further questions: 'who are our people?' 'Do we really want to suggest that the people of God and the ALC are coterminous?'"¹²⁸¹ This drives us back to the ecumenical *consensus* of the people of God, past and present—which is a comfortable context in which to discuss the *Confessio Augustana*.

Augustana contra Americana

In explaining the resolution of the 1965 Detroit Convention of the LCMS to the initial meeting of the Inter-Lutheran Consultation on Worship in February 1966, President Oliver Harms expressed the “strong hope that in this endeavor all might walk together in complete submission to Holy Scripture and in full harmony with the Lutheran Confessions.”¹²⁸² At the same session, Walter Buszin expressed concern about doctrinal indifference creeping into the Lutheran churches via liturgical practices from Roman Catholic or Reformed churches.¹²⁸³ Yet the press release emanating from the Consultation indicated that there was a consensus to express both “ecumenical and Lutheran traditions of worship.”¹²⁸⁴ This indicated that the Consultation saw no necessary contradiction between ecumenical borrowings and confessional integrity.¹²⁸⁵

Concern for “theological soundness and confessional integrity”¹²⁸⁶ was manifested by theological responses elicited by the Inter-Lutheran Commission on Worship (ILCW) to its first liturgy for Holy Communion, published in the Contemporary Worship series (CW-2) in 1970. The theological symposium in October 1973 dealt with the topics of the absolution in relation to the eucharistic rite, offertory processions, and eucharistic prayers (in light of AC XXIV, 21-38).

The October 1974 ALC Convention instructed its newly appointed Review Committee to pay particular attention to the theology of the liturgy and hymns and further instructed its ILCW representatives to vote to include in the new hymnal not only the three ecumenical creeds, but also Luther’s Small Catechism and the Augsburg Confession!¹²⁸⁷

The November 1974 progress report of the ILCW chairperson, Clifford Swanson, asserted that the hymn committees “carefully scrutinize every text for its congruity with Scripture and its fidelity to the gospel as it is preached and taught in the churches of the Book of Concord.”¹²⁸⁸

The review processes went beyond expectations in several churches: LCMS involved its Commission on Theology and Church Relations and a special blue ribbon committee in summer 1977, and LCA added a special seminary review conducted in January 1977—all this to indicate the seriousness with which the churches took the doctrinal implications of the LBW.¹²⁸⁹

More important than the mere statement of any of the above principles—significant as that may be in itself—is the acid test of implementation. What is central in confessional Lutheranism—and in such sharp contrast to the consensus of evangelicalism and liberalism in Puritan and post-

Puritan America—is the balance of Word and sacrament in worship. In the LBW there are provisions for restoring Baptism to a prominent place in the Church's eucharistic worship, thus reflecting the Augustana's assertion that it is "necessary for salvation." (AC IX, 1). In urging weekly celebration of Holy Communion, the ILCW mirrored the practice of the 16th century reformers (Apol. XXIV, BC 249.1). More controversial was the provision made for the possibility of the celebration of marriages and funerals with Communion.

The fact that the opening Brief Order for Confession and Forgiveness is detachable from the eucharistic rite emphasized the sameness of the sacramental benefits of both the Communion and the absolution.¹²⁹⁰ The concern about making the opening order optional probably reflected fears about communing unworthily. Luther assured us that "where," as in the eucharist, "there is forgiveness of sins, there is also life and salvation" (Small Catechism VI). This indicates that absolution is not necessary to prepare for eucharistic absolution! The Augustana made the same point with regard to the *anamnesis*: "To remember Christ is to remember his benefits" (AC XXIV, 31).¹²⁹¹

Restoring Individual Confession and Forgiveness (LBW, pp. 196f.), modeled after Luther's Small Catechism, not only underscored the sacramental character of absolution but also restored a lost treasure to Lutheran piety and practice. "Private absolution should be retained and not allowed to fall into disuse" (AC XI, 1). Lutheranism had been unfaithful to its confessional heritage at this critical points and we have "paid the piper" because of our neglect of this resource of pastoral care!

The Augsburg Confession's strong statement of "original sin" (AC II) is reflected in the addition to the prayer of confession adapted from the new rite of the *Book of Common Prayer*. Like the rites in *The Lutheran Hymnal* (1941) and the *Service Book and Hymnal* (1958), the LBW prayer begins with an acknowledgment of our sinful condition: "We confess that we are in bondage to sin and cannot free ourselves" (LBW, p. 56). The strong insistence of the ALC Review Group must be credited with this improvement.¹²⁹²

The Augustana's doctrine of baptism begins precisely at this point. Like Luther, Melancthon connected the same benefits given in absolution and the eucharist with the sacrament of Baptism.¹²⁹³ In a somewhat parallel way, the LBW reflected the content and (lack of) organization of the Augsburg Confession's doctrine of Baptism. In the pastor's opening address (LBW, p. 121, par. 2) deliverance from bondage, regeneration, eternal life, and the gift of the Spirit, incorporation into Christ's body, faith,

love, and obedience are stressed. The adaptation of Luther's "Flood Prayer" picked up the deliverance theme, cleansing, regeneration, new life, and the inheritance of God's Kingdom (LBW, p. 122).

After the renunciation of "all the forces of evil" and the confession of faith (LBW, p. 123), the baptismal washing occurs. Thereafter the major baptismal benefits are "acted out"—ritualized in the church's ancient rites. With the laying on of hands, the pastor prays for those baptized who are now freed from the power of sin and given new life: "Pour out you Holy Spirit. . . ." The gift of the Spirit—promised, expected, prayed for, and given through Baptism (AC V, 2)—is thus symbolized in the baptismal rite. The trinitarian structure of the *epiclesis* and of the signing of the cross is evident, as is the latter's christological focus. Being "sealed by the Holy Spirit" and "marked with the cross of Christ" are one and the same action (LBW, p. 124, par. 4). No separating of "water-baptism" and "Spirit-baptism" is allowed, nor yet a division between the Spirit's sanctifying work and Christ's redeeming work.¹²⁹⁴

The permissive use of a white garment (LBW Altar Book, p. 31, par. 15) allows for the rich biblical symbolism of the robe of righteousness (Isaiah 61:10; cf. Revelation 7:9ff.).¹²⁹⁵ Also the lighted candle introduced the ethical implications which Luther suggested (Small Catechism IV, Q.4) and which Melancthon stated: ". . . faith should produce good works" (AC VI). The candle is given with the words of our Lord: "Let your light so shine. . ." (Matthew 5:16). For Melancthon concluded, "It is necessary to do the good works commanded by God . . . because it is God's will" (AC VI).

Critics charged a needless and confusing multiplication of ritual acts in the rite, as if the Baptism were invalid without them.¹²⁹⁶ Rather ILCW was attempting to "spread out" the manifold meaning of baptism so that its various benefits could be clearly seen and heard. This was grounded, not in a denial that Baptism itself brings all these benefits, but in the distinction between Baptism and its theological explanation on the one hand and the baptismal rite and its liturgical language and action on the other hand (see CW-8, 8, 19f; cf. FC, SD VII, BC 583f.: 73-87).

The prominence given to Baptism in LBW is accompanied by a "down-playing" of confirmation as a *de facto* Lutheran sacrament. Confirmation became instead an affirmation of Baptism (LBW, pp. 198, 201). In effect the reintroduction in the baptismal rite of laying-on-of-hands with prayer for the Spirit restored confirmation to its ancient place in Baptism. In the Affirmation of Baptism rite a kind of *epiclesis* is prayed: "Father. . . stir up in _____ the gift of your Holy Spirit. . . ." This contrasted with the language of SBH: "The Father in heaven, for Jesus' sake, renew and increase

in thee the gift of the Holy Ghost. . . ." (SBH, p. 246). To some this sounded as if the pastors themselves were giving the Holy Spirit to the children (though *not* for the first time).

There were some significant christological points at which the Augustana triumphed over some of the critics and reviewers of the ILCW as well as over the ILCW itself. The latter is seen in the ILCW's reluctant acceptance of the request of LCMS representatives that the traditional English rendering of the *descensus* clause of the Apostles' Creed be retained, *viz.*, "hell" and not "the dead."¹²⁹⁷ The ICET favored the latter, but the Augsburg Confession clearly renders it "hell" *auf Deutsch* (AC III). It is further interpreted in the Formula of Concord in the sense of Christ's victorious triumph over the powers of hell (FC IX, BC 492 & 610).¹²⁹⁸

A major controversy centered around the language of sacrifice. The concept of sacrifice was questioned not only by those who feared the implications of "eucharistic sacrifice" language,¹²⁹⁹ but also by those who wanted to absorb all discussion of Christ's saving work under the rubric of *Christus Victor*.¹³⁰⁰ This was in reaction to Lutheran and Reformed orthodox theologians, who had tried to make vicarious satisfaction the one overarching rubric into which all other word-pictures of the atonement had to be squeezed. In the Augsburg Confession, *Christus Victor*, vicarious satisfaction, and the sacrificial interpretation of the atonement can all be found. Sacrifice is linked, in good Pauline fashion, to both reconciliation and propitiation (AC III & IV).

Beyond Augustana

SBH moved beyond the Lutheran consensus of the Common Service and reintroduced the ancient pre-Gregorian *Kyrie* litany preserved in the Eastern Orthodox church, just as it borrowed the *epiclesis* from the East. Does not the Reformers' understanding of the Spirit's work, embodied in the Augsburg Confession, allow for and even call for such a liturgical formulation? The unique contribution of the Augustana's doctrine of the Holy Spirit is the subtle tension and delicate balance between the promise and freedom of God. We cannot bind the Holy Spirit to the means of grace or manipulate the Spirit thereby: the Holy Spirit is free to work faith "when and where he pleases in those who hear the Gospel" (AC V). Yet Melancthon asserted that the Spirit has freely bound itself to the means of grace and has promised to work through them. Thus in faithfulness, *God* "gives the Holy Spirit" through the Word and Sacraments as through means/instruments (AC V). Therefore language that speaks of "beseeching" rather than "bestowing" the Spirit (i.e. prayers that "implore" rather than formu-

lae that “impart”) seems more appropriately to reflect the careful distinctions and implicit dialectic of Augustana.

Another point at which LBW went beyond Augustana, as did SBH, is in the inclusion of a eucharistic prayer. Luther rejected this prayer because he thought the canon of the mass reeked of sacrifice, i.e. an attempt to repeat the propitiatory sacrifice of Calvary.¹³⁰¹ This negative polemic is embodied in the Augustana: the positive appreciation of “eucharistic sacrifice” is found in the Apology (Apol. XXIV, BC 252.21-258.49). Brilioth notes that Melancthon saw the whole service as “an act of thanksgiving and commemoration.”¹³⁰² Thus Melancthon wrote, “Although the ceremony is a memorial of the death of Christ...the *commemoration* [i.e. the remembrance of faith which is faith or knowledge of Christ] is the real daily sacrifice, the *proclamation* and the *faith* which truly believes that by the death of Christ God has been reconciled” (Apol. XXIV, BC 257. 38). Although Brilioth lamented the distinction of sacrament and sacrifice¹³⁰³ Melancthon here introduced (Apol. XXIV, BC 261.68-263.77), Melancthon did *not* make the exclusivistic application of the distinction that some critics¹³⁰⁴ of the ILCW employed, as if:

LAW	SACRIFICE	PRAYER
-----	-----	-----
GOPEL	SACRAMENT	PROCLAMATION

We have already noted that Melancthon identified proclamation with sacrifice. He also observed that the Holy Communion can have more than one purpose (Apol. XXIV, BC 262.74)—a point the critics of the ILCW often forgot. “The remembrance of Christ” is first and foremost “the remembrance of Christ’s blessings and the acceptance of them by faith so that they make us alive” (Apol. XXIV, BC 262.72). The same event can be both the remembrance of faith and the remembrance of praise. Thus Melancthon argued “the Fathers speak of a two-fold effect, of the comfort for the conscience and of thanksgiving or praise; the first belongs to the nature of the sacrament and the second to praise” (Apol. XXIV, BC 263.75). But both belong to the very same eucharistic event.¹³⁰⁵

One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church

I have attempted to show explicit and implicit influences of the Augsburg Confession, as well as those developments that go beyond Augustana, which nevertheless seem to me to move in directions, if not pointed to, at least not precluded by the confession. I want to conclude with comments on 1) freedom in *adiaphora* and commonality in liturgy, 2) faith

and ethics, 3) cultural and counter-cultural forms as expressions of America and universal dimensions of worship, 4) biblical and confessional factors, and finally, 5) identity and doxology.

(1) The *unity* of the Church¹³⁰⁶ is well-expressed in common liturgical texts shared by Christians worldwide. The diversity of Christians is affirmed by the Lutherans in the Augustana's assertion that "human traditions or rites and ceremonies" need not be alike everywhere (AC VII, 3).¹³⁰⁷ "For everything there is a season, and a time for every matter under heaven" (Ecclesiastes 3:1): a time to stress liturgical freedom and diversity in *adiaphora* and a time to seek a "common service." Discerning the signs of the times as to which is which *kairos* is always our task. Living responsibly and faithfully within this dialectic affirms their unity in diversity and diversity in unity of the many members of the one body of Christ (1 Corinthians 12:12ff.). LBW's use of texts common to Western and Eastern rites and hymns shared by Christians worldwide testifies to the unity of "the one holy church" marked by the gospel and the sacraments (AC VII, 2).

(2) The *sanctity* of the Church is explained by the *communio sanctorum* understood as holy saints gathered around the holy Scriptures and the holy sacraments (AC VII-VIII). Through these means the Holy Spirit works faith (AC V). By this faith we are moved to holy service (AC VI). All this because we belong to God by virtue of creation, redemption, and sanctification. Thus those who gather for worship are told to scatter for service. The liturgy is *not* ended; it continues in service: "Go in peace. *Serve* the Lord."

(3) The *catholicity* of the "one holy Christian Church" (AC VII) is experienced in cultural and counter-cultural forms. More than half of the LBW hymns were written in England or America since the beginning of the 18th century and are thus "modern"; many are old and foreign; some are ancient. The psalter comes from the Old Covenant; some canticles come from the New Testament. Tunes range from medieval plainsong to modern folksong. Texts are translated from Hebrew, Greek, German, Polish, Spanish, etc., as well as a few from African, Asian and Native American languages. Most of the hymns are in the idiom of American English, including some African American spirituals. ILCW sought to avoid or change racist or sexist language—though by current standards many objections remain. Other hymns reflect a catholicity that spans centuries and continents and links us with Christians in other times and places, most notably those European lands of Lutheran origins. Honoring our fathers and mothers in the faith demands that. Affirming the "mutual conversation and consolation" of Christian sisters and brothers demands (Smalcald Articles, III, IV, BC 310) that we do more in the future to include the hymnody of Africa, Asia,

and the rest of the Americas! It is “our duty and delight!”

(4) The apostolicity of the Church has been understood by Lutherans primarily in terms of faithfulness to the apostolic message we are commissioned to proclaim. “We believe, teach, and confess” apostolic doctrine understood in terms of law and gospel—the word that justifies the terrified. The biblical message—summarized in the Apostles’ Creed, described and defended in the Nicene Creed, delimited and defined in the Athanasian Creed, taught in Luther’s catechisms—is interpreted in the Augsburg Confession and the other Lutheran symbolical writings in the Book of Concord. Of these the *Lutheran Book of Worship* is a doxological expression!

Thus LBW is a *Lutheran* book of worship—unashamedly Lutheran, in spite of the debates over its title. Thus it mirrors the fact that we understand our identity as confessional *Lutheran* Christians. But I would insist that it is more important that we understand ourselves as confessional *Lutheran Christians*. There is really no such thing as Lutheran Baptism or a Lutheran eucharist—in spite of popular usage. And no one forgives sin as a Lutheran pastor but only as “a servant of the Word” and “a minister of the Church of Christ.” Thus it would be better not to speak of *Lutheran* worship!

It will not hurt to reiterate in this history of liturgies, the final warning of the Augsburg Confession: “We obtain grace through faith in Christ, and not through certain observances or acts of worship instituted by men.” Worship is God’s gracious address to us which faith answers in prayer, praise, and thanksgiving. The sacramental and sacrificial in worship may not be so neatly divided as some theologians wish, yet God’s Word has the priority and the initiative. Like the Augsburg Confession, the *Lutheran Book of Worship* is confession: the contrite confession of sin and guilt, bondage and brokenness, and the doxological confession that blesses the Father through the power of the Spirit for salvation in Jesus Christ, our crucified and risen Lord. To God alone be glory in the Church forever!

ENDNOTES

- ¹ Luther Reed, *The Lutheran Liturgy* (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg, 1947), p. 176.
- ² *Ibid.*, p. 153.
- ³ *Ibid.*, p. 183.
- ⁴ E.C. Nelson, *The Lutheran Church Among the Norwegian-Americans* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1960), II, 124, 342f.; E.K. Johnson, "The Liturgy of the Norwegian Lutheran Church," in *Memoirs of the Lutheran Liturgical Association*, Luther D. Reed, ed. (Pittsburgh: Lutheran Liturgical Association, 1906) VII, 42-45; Mandus Egge, "Tradition and Meaning in Our Worship Today: The American Lutheran Church," in *Liturgical Reconnaissance: Papers Presented at the Inter Lutheran Consultation on Worship*, Edgar S. Brown, Jr., ed. (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981), pp. 5-11.
- ⁵ John M. Jensen, *The United Evangelical Church* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1964), p. 215f.; R. Harold Terry, "Lutheran Hymnody in North America," in *Hymnal Companion to the Lutheran Book of Worship*, by Mary Kay Stulken (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981) pp. 102-104.
- ⁶ Egge, "The ALC," in *Liturgical Reconnaissance*, p. 7.
- ⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 6.
- ⁸ Reed, *Lutheran Liturgy*, p. 176; cf. Edgar S. Brown Jr., "Tradition and Meaning in Our Worship Today—The Lutheran Church in America," in *Liturgical Reconnaissance*, pp. 26-30.
- ⁹ Reed, *Lutheran Liturgy*, pp. 182-204; Terry, "Lutheran Hymnody," in *Hymnal Companion*, pp. 95-100.
- ¹⁰ Egge, "The ALC," in *Liturgical Reconnaissance*, pp. 8-10.
- ¹¹ Reed, *Lutheran Liturgy*, pp. 205-227; Edward T. Horn III, "Preparation of the Service Book and Hymnal," in *Liturgical Reconnaissance*, pp. 91-101; E.E. Ryden, "The History of the New Common Hymnal," in *Liturgy, Worship, Music in the Lutheran Church* [title on cover: *Liturgy Theology Music in the Lutheran Church...*], Mandus A. Egge, ed. (Lectures at the 1955 Berkeley, CA Church Music Seminar of the Choral Union of the Evangelical Lutheran Church; Minneapolis: SPA, Inc., 1959), pp. 111-122; Terry, "Lutheran Hymnody," in *Hymnal Companion*, pp. 108-110.
- ¹² Reed, *Lutheran Liturgy*, pp. 754f.
- ¹³ *Ibid.*, pp. 755f.
- ¹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 756f.
- ¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 758. cf p. 351 where Reed lists numerous examples.
- ¹⁶ Yngve Briilioth, *Eucharistic Faith and Practice—Evangelical and Catholic*, trans. A.G. Herbert (London: Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, 1930).
- ¹⁷ Gustav Aulen, *Eucharist and Sacrifice* (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg, 1958).
- ¹⁸ Olof Herrlin, *Divine Service: Liturgy in Perspective*, trans. Gene L. Lund (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1966), pp. 47-53.
- ¹⁹ Paul Zeller Strodach, *A Manual on Worship* (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg, 1931; revised 1946), pp. 235-238, revised ed., 249-256 and Luther D. Reed, *The Lutheran Liturgy* (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg, 1959), pp. 205-227; pp. 356-363.
- ²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 352.
- ²¹ Odo Casel, *The Mystery of Christian Worship, and other Writings*, ed. Burkhard Neunheuser (Westminster, MD: Newman Press, 1962).
- ²² Gregory Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy* (New York: The Seabury Press, c. 1982).
- ²³ Peter Brunner, *Worship in the Name of Jesus*, trans. M.H. Bertram (St. Louis: Concordia, 1968).
- ²⁴ Joseph A. Jungmann, S.J., *The Mass of the Roman Rite*, trans. Francis A. Brunner, C.S.S.R. (New York: Benziger, 1951; revised 1959).
- ²⁵ Louis Bouyer, *Eucharist*, trans. Charles U. Quinn (Notre Dame: University Press, 1968).
- ²⁶ Alexander Schmemmann, *For the Life of the World* [=Sacraments and Orthodoxy and World as Sacrament] (New York: National Student Christian Federation, 1963).
- ²⁷ See John Meyendorff, *Christ in Eastern Christian Thought* (Washington and Cleveland: Corpus Books, 1969).
- ²⁸ E.C. Nelson and E.L. Fevold, *The Lutheran Church Among Norwegian Americans* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1960), I, 241-253; II, 4-8.
- ²⁹ *Ibid.*, I, 341, par. 20.
- ³⁰ *Ibid.*, II, 144f.
- ³¹ *Ibid.*, Thesis 1.
- ³² *Ibid.*, Thesis 3.
- ³³ *Ibid.*, Thesis 4.
- ³⁴ *Ibid.*, Thesis 5.
- ³⁵ [United Norwegian Lutheran Church] *Altar Book* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1915) p. 94.
- ³⁶ *Church Liturgy* (Decorah: Luther Publishing House, 1891) p. 22.
- ³⁷ Richard C. Wolf (ed.), *Documents of Lutheran Unity* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1966), p. 273.
- ³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 364.
- ³⁹ Fred W. Meuser, *The Formation of the American Lutheran Church* (Columbus: Wartburg Press, 1958), pp. 300f.
- ⁴⁰ Wolf, *Documents*, pp. 381f.
- ⁴¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 394f.
- ⁴² *Ibid.*, pp. 357f.
- ⁴³ *Ibid.*, pp. 378f.
- ⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 415-428.

- ⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 501.
- ⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 630.
- ⁴⁷ The document is dated April 19, 1965 by the committee: Charles Anderson, George Aus, Robert Bertram, and Herbert Bauman.
- ⁴⁸ Luther D. Reed, *The Lutheran Liturgy* (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg, 1947), pp. 215-217.
- ⁴⁹ Wolf, *Documents*, p. 533.
- ⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 566f.
- ^{50a} This same year the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod and the Evangelical Lutheran Synod ("the Little Norwegian Synod"—the home denomination of Jacob A.O. Preus and Robert Preus, who were later to enter the LCMS clergy roster and seminary faculties) left the Synodical Conference charging LCMS with "syncretism," viz. engaging in intra-Lutheran ("unionistic!") dialogues with other Lutherans and even other Christians.
- ^{50c} Eugene Brand, "Liturgical Reconnaissance" in *The Future of Worship in the ELCA* (A Report to the Church from Orlando, Florida, Nov. 18-20, 1998) prepared by Paul R. Nelson and Frank Stoldt (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1999), 13, note 2, cf. 4f.
- ^{50d} William R. Seaman, "The Service Book and Hymnal Since 1958" in *Liturgical Reconnaissance*, ed. Edgar S. Brown, Jr. (Papers presented at the Inter-Lutheran Consultation on Worship, Feb 10-11, 1966, Chicago), 113f.
- ⁵¹ The papers of this consultation were published as: Edgar S. Brown Jr. (ed), *Liturgical Reconnaissance* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1968). See p. vi for participants' list.
- ⁵² Minutes of the Inter-Lutheran Consultation on Worship, February 10, 1966, p. i.
- ⁵³ *Ibid.*, p. 3; cf. Walter E. Buszin, "Traditions and Meaning in Our Worship Today: The Synodical Conference," in *Liturgical Reconnaissance*, ed. Edgar S. Brown, Jr. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968), pp. 85-87.
- ⁵⁴ Press Release of the Inter-Lutheran Consultation on Worship, February 10-11, 1966; Minutes, p. 7.
- ⁵⁵ Minutes of the ILCW, February 6-7, 1967, Appendix [=App.] A, 67-1; cf. Edward A. Hansen, "Hymn Texts: Languages, Images and Forms for Today," address presented to the ILCW, April, 1969, pp. 3 and 5, citing A.R. Kretzmann, "The Definition of the Task Before Us," also in *Liturgical Reconnaissance*, pp. 131 & 133: "This, then, must be a book of confessional principle, as well as a cultural sampling—a book of quality, as well as a treasury of favorite hymns—a book of sound theology, as well as a social instrument." Again: "Our work is an attempt, once more, on the basis of the best in the old and in the new, to take a world, far from God, to beauty and truth also by means of the Scripture and the confessional character of our liturgy and hymnody."
- ⁵⁶ ILCW Min. of Feb. 6-7, 1967, App. A 67-1.
- ⁵⁷ ILCW Min. of Nov. 9-10, 1967, 67-20.
- Chapter II**
- ⁵⁸ HTC Min. of Oct. 16-17, 1967, 67-69. See ILCW/HTC Min. of May 23-24, 1967, Exhibit [=Exh.] A, 76-1, "Exhibit: Points to be included in Drafting Criteria for Hymns" which also adds a set of music criteria. Cf. ILCW/HTC Min. of October 16-17, 1967, Exh. D 67-1—67-2: "Exhibit: The Essential Elements of a Good Hymn" (adapted from W. Scott Westermann).
- ⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 67-7.
- ⁶⁰ A straw vote in ILCW indicated favor toward this plan (ILCW Min. of Nov. 6-8, 1968, 68-12). This idea had been set forth already in a resolution of the 1965 Detroit Convention of LCMS.
- ⁶¹ ILCW Min. of Nov. 6-8, 1968, 68-11f.
- ⁶² Erik Routley, "Critique of the Service Book and Hymnal," Preface, [p.1] June 1967.
- ⁶³ *Ibid.*, [pp. i-ii].
- ⁶⁴ Erik Routley, "The Lutheran Hymnal, 1941: A Report to the Inter-Lutheran Commission on Worship," June 1968, p. 2.
- ⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 3.
- ⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 1f.
- ⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 3.
- ⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 4.
- ⁶⁹ ILCW Min. of Nov. 6-7, 1969, HTC Exh. 69-A, 17.
- ⁷⁰ HTC Min. of Jan. 22-23, 1969, 69-7.
- ⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 69-8.
- ⁷² *Ibid.*, 69-5.
- ⁷³ Position Paper of the HTC, p. 1.
- ⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 2.
- ⁷⁵ ILCW Min. of Nov. 6-7, 1969, 69-27—69-32.
- ⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 69-25—69-27.
- ⁷⁷ ILCW/XC Min. of Feb. 19-20, 1971, 71-11.
- ⁷⁸ ILCW Min. of Nov. 4-5, 1971, 71-3.
- ⁷⁹ ILCW/XC Min. of Feb. 1-2, 1972, 72-1.
- ⁸⁰ ILCW/XC Min. of June 16-17, 1972 72-15; also Exh. K&L.
- ⁸¹ ILCW Min. of Feb. 6-7, 1967, App. B, pp. 1f.
- ⁸² LTC Doc. 23, p. 8.
- ⁸³ LTC Doc. 13, p. 244.
- ⁸⁴ LTC Doc. 23, p. 8.
- ⁸⁵ LTC Doc. 14, p. 1.
- ⁸⁶ LTC Doc. 16. See LTC. Min. of Aug. 22-24, 1968, Exh. A, 68-1.
- ⁸⁷ LTC Doc. 42b, pp. 1-5.
- ⁸⁸ ILCW Min. of Nov. 6-8, 1968, Exh. C 68-1.
- ⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, Exh. C, 68-3.
- ⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 68-16.
- ⁹¹ ILCW/XC Min. of Apr. 27, 1969, App. A, 69-2.
- ⁹² LTC Min. of Jan. 2-4, 1969, Exh. A, 69-4.
- ⁹³ *Ibid.*, 69-11, par. 17.
- ⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, Exh. A, 69-6.
- ⁹⁵ LTC Exh. A, 69-6.
- ⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 69-14.
- ⁹⁷ LTC Min. of Apr. 27-29, 1969, 69-2—69-9.
- ⁹⁸ LMC Min. of July 22-24, 169-, 69-8f.
- ⁹⁹ LTC Min. of July 22-24, 1969, 69-17f.
- ¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 69-19—69-22 and 69-25—69-28.
- ¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, 69-30ff.: App. A, 69-a.
- ¹⁰² *Ibid.*, 69-26.
- ¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, App. C, 69-d.
- ¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, App. G, 69-b.
- ¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 69-j.
- ¹⁰⁶ LTC Min. of Dec. 28-30, 1969, 69-34f.
- ¹⁰⁷ ILCW/XC Min. of Feb. 15-16, 1970, 70-6—70-8.
- ¹⁰⁸ ILCW Min. of July 24-26, 1969, 69-38f.
- ¹⁰⁹ ILCW/XC Min. of Feb. 1-2, 1972, Exh. B, 72-1.
- ¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, Exh. A, 72-1.
- ¹¹¹ ILCW Min. of Nov. 4-5, 1971, 71-15.
- ¹¹² ILCW Min. of Nov. 5-6, 1970, 70-9.
- ¹¹³ *Ibid.*, 70-5.
- ¹¹⁴ ILCW/XC Min. of Feb. 19-20, 1971, 71-9.
- ¹¹⁵ The Marriage Service: draft 1, ditto copy, p. [1].
- ¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*, par. 2, p. [3].
- ¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, par. 4.

- ¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*, par. 13, p. [5].
- ¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*, par. 15.
- ¹²⁰ *Ibid.*, par. 16, p. [4].
- ¹²¹ *Ibid.*, par. 21, p. [6].
- ¹²² *Ibid.*, par. 25, p. [8].
- ¹²³ LTC Min. of June 15-17, 1970.
- ¹²⁴ The Marriage Service, draft 3, n.d., p. 3.
- ¹²⁵ *Ibid.*, drafts 1-3, p. 5.
- ¹²⁶ *Ibid.*, drafts 1 and 2, p. 5.
- ¹²⁷ LTC Min. of June 15-17, 1970, 70-8.
- ¹²⁸ The Marriage Service, draft 4, n.d. p. 1.
- ¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 4.
- ¹³⁰ LTC Min. of Oct. 22-23, 1970, 70-16f.
- ¹³¹ The Marriage Service, draft 6, n.d. p.3.
- ¹³² *Ibid.*
- ¹³³ LTC Min. of Oct. 22-23, 1970, 70-14.
- ¹³⁴ LTC Min. of June 21-24, 1971, 71-13.
- ¹³⁵ The Marriage Service, draft 8, December, 1971; LTC Min. of November 19-30, 1971, 71-17; CW-3, 22.
- ¹³⁶ ILCW/XC Min. of June 16-17, 1972, 72-9.
- ¹³⁷ *Ibid.*, 72-10.
- ¹³⁸ *Ibid.*, The articles below without page numbers may be seen in ELCA Archives in Chicago in the CW-3, *The Marriage Service* file.
- ^{138a} *Ibid.*, p. N38 L+++ , Sect. 1, p.38.
- ¹³⁹ LTC Min. of June 15-17, 1970, 70-3—70-6.
- ¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 70-6.
- ¹⁴¹ LTC Min. of Oct. 22-23, 1970, 70-15f.
- ¹⁴² *Ibid.*, 70-16.
- ¹⁴³ *Ibid.*, 70-21f.
- ¹⁴⁴ LMC Min. of Feb. 3, 1971, 71-1.
- ¹⁴⁵ JLC Min. of Feb. 3, 1971, 71-1f.
- ¹⁴⁶ LTC Min. of Feb. 3, 1971, 71-3f.
- ¹⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 71-8—71-10.
- ¹⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 71-11.
- ¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 71-10f.
- ¹⁵⁰ ILCW Min. of Nov. 4-5, 1971, 71-14f.
- ¹⁵¹ ILCW/XC Min. of Feb. 1-2, 1972, 72-3.
- ¹⁵² ILCW/XC Min. of June 16-17, 1972, Exh. A, 72-1.
- ¹⁵³ LTC, Proposed Preaching Services, May 28, 1971, p. 14.
- ¹⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 25.
- ¹⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 8-23; LTC Services of the Word, July 1971, pp. 9-29.
- ¹⁵⁶ Dennis L. Paulson, "The Great Thanksgiving: The Eucharistic Debates among American Lutherans." Unpublished STM thesis, Wartburg Theological Seminary, 1988, pp. 15-36.
- ¹⁵⁷ LTC Min. of Oct. 22-23, 1970, 70-20.
- ¹⁵⁸ ILCW Min. of Nov. 5-6, 1970, 70-12.
- ¹⁵⁹ Eugene Brand, "A Eucharist for all Lutherans," *Lutheran Forum*, Vol. 4, No. 6, (June 1970), p. 17.
- ¹⁶⁰ "Contemporary Worship 2—The Services," *Lutheran Standard*, Vol. 10, no. 23 (Nov. 10, 1970) p. 29; Melva Rorem, "New Style for Worship," *Lutheran Standard*, Vol. 10, No. 25 (Dec. 8, 1970), pp. 6f; Hans Boehringer, LCMS Commission on Worship, *Worship-Gram*, (January 1971) pp. 1-5; Edgar Trexler, "Color the Hymnal Blue," *The Lutheran* (Feb. 3, 1971) pp. 17-20; Ralph Van Loon, "Contemporary on CW-2," *Celebration!* Vol. 5, 1-6 (1971).
- ¹⁶¹ LMC Min. of Feb. 19-20, 1971, 71-4.
- ¹⁶² LMC Min. of July 19-20, 1971, 71-7; LTC Min. of June 21-24, 1971, 71-15 & Min. of Nov. 29-30, 1971, 71-19.
- ¹⁶³ LTC Min. of Nov. 29-30, 1971, 71-19.
- ¹⁶⁴ "A Look at the New Liturgy," *Lutheran Forum*, Vol. 3, No. 7, (July/August 1969), pp. 16f.
- ¹⁶⁵ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁶⁶ Roy Enquist, "The New Rite—Mission Impossible?" *Response*, Vol. XI, Nos. 1 & 2, 1970, pp. 12 & 15.
- ¹⁶⁷ Oliver K. Olson, "Luther's Catholic Minimum," *Response*, Vol. XI, Nos. 1 & 2, pp. 17-31.
- ¹⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 30 referring to *The Book of Common Worship: Provisional Services* (Philadelphia, 1966), pp. 29-31.
- ¹⁶⁹ Aclred Tegels, "A Viable Structure," *Response*, Vol. IX, Nos. 1 & 2, 1970, pp. 32 & 35.
- ¹⁷⁰ Leigh Jordahl, "A New Rite of Holy Communion for American Lutherans," *Worship*, Vol. 44, No. 10 (Dec. 1970), pp. 578-587; cf. Id., "The Holy Communion Rite—I: Encouraging and Disappointing," *Lutheran Forum*, Vol. 5, No. 4 (April 1971), pp. 10-12.
- ¹⁷¹ Robert Jensen, "Concerning and Illustrating, New Orders for the Eucharist," *Dialog*, Vol. 10, (Winter 1971), p. 68.
- ¹⁷² *Ibid.*, pp. 68-72.
- ¹⁷³ Lowell C. Green, "The New Holy Communion Rite—II: Historical and Practical Questions," *Lutheran Forum*, Vol. 5, No. 4 (April 1971), p. 12.
- ¹⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 13.
- ¹⁷⁵ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁷⁶ Leigh Jordahl, "The New Holy Communion Rite I: Encouraging and Disappointing," *Lutheran Forum*, Vol. 5, No. 4 (April 1971), p. 10.
- ¹⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 11.
- ¹⁷⁸ Philip H. Pfatteicher, "The New Holy Communion Rite—III: Seven clear achievements," *Lutheran Forum*, Vol. 5, No. 4 (April 1971), pp. 14f.
- ¹⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 15.
- ¹⁸⁰ Hans Boehringer, "Liturgical Minimalism—A Second Look," *Response*, Vol. X, Nos. 3 & 4 (1971), 89-95.
- ¹⁸¹ Eugene Brand, "Responses," *Response*, Vol. X, Nos. 3 & 4 (1971), 97f.
- ¹⁸² *Ibid.*, p. 97.
- ¹⁸³ *Ibid.*, p. 97f.
- ¹⁸⁴ Frank Senn, "Open Forum," *Lutheran Forum*, Vol. 5, No. 8 (October 1971), p. 20.
- ¹⁸⁵ Arthur Carl Piepkorn, "The Rite, I," *Church Music*, 71:2 (1971), pp. 33-42.
- ¹⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 36.
- ¹⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 39.
- ¹⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 36.
- ¹⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 37.
- ¹⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 33-36.
- ¹⁹¹ Walter R. Bouman, "The Rite, II," *Church Music*, 71:2 (1971), pp. 42-45.
- ¹⁹² *Ibid.*, p. 42.
- ¹⁹³ *Ibid.*, p. 44.
- ¹⁹⁴ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 45.
- ¹⁹⁶ Oliver K. Olson, "The Mix makes a Muddle," *Lutheran Standard* 12 (June 12, 1972), p. 11, citing Brand in *Response*, Vol. 8, p. 95.
- ¹⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, citing *The New Mood in Lutheran Worship*, p. 53.
- ¹⁹⁸ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁹⁹ ILCW/XC Min. of June 16-17, 1972, 72-20.
- ²⁰⁰ Gordon W. Lathrop, "On Bringing the Ark from Ashdod to Jerusalem: Reflections on the Use of the Eucharistic Prayer in Lutheran Celebrations," *Response* 13 (Pentecost 1973), 6.
- ²⁰¹ *Ibid.*, p. 9.
- ²⁰² *Ibid.*, p. 11.
- ²⁰³ *Ibid.*

- ²⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 12, citing BC 265.88.
- ²⁰⁵ LTC Min. of Nov. 29-30, 1971, 71-19.
- ²⁰⁶ JLC Min. of Mar. 19-20, 1973, 73-1.
- ²⁰⁷ LTC Min. of Oct. 10-12, 1973, 73-10; ILCW/XC Min. of Nov. 9, 1973, 73-28.
- ²⁰⁸ Ralph W. Quere. Report on CW-2: The Holy Communion, March 1974 (LTC May 13-15, 1974 Min. Exh. C); Letter from Ralph Quere to Eugene Brand, April 5, 1974.
- ²⁰⁹ LTC CW-2 Subcommittee Min. of May 28-29, 1974, 74-1.
- ²¹⁰ Frank C. Senn. "The ILCW Communion Service: a liturgical critique," *Lutheran Forum* 7 (Aug. 1973), 12f.
- ²¹¹ Frank C. Senn. "Martin Luther's Revision of the Eucharistic Canon in the *Formula Missae* of 1523," *Concordia Theological Monthly* 44 (Mar. 1973), 109.
- ²¹² *Ibid.*, p. 118; cf. pp. 106-108.
- ²¹³ Memo from Theo. DeLaney, dated August 10, 1973.
- ²¹⁴ Philip Gehring, Thomas Gieschen, Paul Neve and Nathan Eickmann. "The Music," *Church Music*, 71:2 (1971), pp. 34-43.
- ²¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 34.
- ²¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 41.
- ²¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 48.
- ²¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 43.
- ²¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 40.
- ²²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 34.
- ²²¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 41-43.
- ²²² *Ibid.*, p. 35.
- ²²³ *Ibid.*, p. 40.
- ²²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 43.
- ²²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 35.
- ²²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 40.
- ²²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 47.
- ²²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 43.
- ²²⁹ Eugene L. Brand, "A New Lutheran Rite for North America," *Studia Liturgica* 8:4 (1971/72), pp. 239f.
- ²³⁰ Memo from Arthur Halbardier to LMC, Feb. 1, 1974, pp. 2-4.
- ²³¹ Letter from James Boehringer to LMC, Jan. 14, 1974, p. 1.
- ²³² Letter from Paul B. Bouman to LMC, n.d., pp. 1-2.
- ²³³ Letter from Frederick Jackisch to Eugene Brand, Jan. 21, 1974, pp. 1-2.
- ²³⁴ No Note.
- ²³⁵ Letter to Brand, pp. 2f.
- ²³⁶ Letter to LMC, p. 2.
- ²³⁷ Memo to LMC, pp. 6f.
- ²³⁸ Letter to LMC, p. 1.
- ²³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 2.
- ²⁴⁰ Letter to LMC, pp. 2-4.
- ²⁴¹ Memo to LMC, p. 9.
- ²⁴² *Ibid.*, pp. 11f.
- ²⁴³ Letter to Brand, pp. 4f.
- ²⁴⁴ Letter to LMC, pp. 2f.
- ²⁴⁵ LTC Min. of May 13-15, 1974, 74-3.
- ²⁴⁶ Published in Mandus A. Egge (ed.) *Worship: Good News in Action* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1973).
- ²⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 9ff.
- ²⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 14ff.
- ²⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 17ff.
- ²⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 22.
- ²⁵¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 24ff.
- ²⁵² *Ibid.*, pp. 25f.
- ²⁵³ *Ibid.*, pp. 27-30.
- ²⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 31f.
- ²⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 39.
- ²⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 41ff.
- ²⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 42-45.
- ²⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 48.
- ²⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 49ff.
- ²⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 57ff.
- ²⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 57.
- ²⁶² *Ibid.*, pp. 59-61.
- ²⁶³ *Ibid.*, p. 62.
- ²⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 64f.
- ²⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 65.
- ²⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 66-69.
- ²⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 111ff.
- ²⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 112.
- ²⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 119.
- ²⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 123-126.
- ²⁷¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 94ff.
- ²⁷² *Ibid.*, p. 101.
- ²⁷³ *Ibid.*, pp. 103-107.
- ²⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 127ff.
- ²⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 144.
- ²⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 70ff.
- ²⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 72-76, cf. Eugene L. Brand, "Baptism and Communion of Infants," *Worship* (Jan. 1976), pp. 29-42.
- ²⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 77f; 71.
- ²⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 80-88.
- ²⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 88-91.
- ²⁸¹ Oliver K. Olson, "Liturgy as 'Action'," *Dialog* 14 (Spring 1975), 112f. quotes the resolution.
- ²⁸² Reports and Actions of the Sixth General Convention of the American Lutheran Church, 1974, Action E 73.3.17, pp. 535f.
- ²⁸³ Oliver K. Olson, "Contemporary Trends in Liturgy Viewed from the Perspective of Classical Lutheran Theology," *Lutheran Quarterly* 26:2 (May 1974), p. 111. Hereinafter LQ 26:2.
- ²⁸⁴ *Ibid.*
- ²⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 115-119.
- ²⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 121-124.
- ²⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 124-145.
- ²⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 155-157.
- ²⁸⁹ Gordon Lathrop, "The Prayers of Jesus and the Great Prayer of the Church," LQ 26:2, pp. 157-159.
- ²⁹⁰ Paulson, "The Great Thanksgiving," p. 79.
- ²⁹¹ Ronald M. Hals, "The Concept of Sacrifice as a Background for the Eucharist," LQ 26:2, pp. 175f.
- ²⁹² *Ibid.*, pp. 176f.
- ²⁹³ *Ibid.*, p. 180.
- ²⁹⁴ Robert E. Jenson, "Liturgy of the Spirit," LQ 26:2, pp. 194-198.
- ²⁹⁵ Paulson, "The Great Thanksgiving," pp. 89-91.
- ²⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 195; cf. p. 196 where he speaks of the offertory consecrating to their *use* as body and blood.
- ²⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 197f.
- ²⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 198.
- ²⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 202.
- ³⁰⁰ Herbert F. Lindemann, "CW-2 Passes in Review," LQ 26:2, p. 224.
- ³⁰¹ Walter R. Bouman, "Confession-Absolution and the Eucharistic Liturgy," LQ 26:2, pp. 204-208.
- ³⁰² *Ibid.*, pp. 208-213.
- ³⁰³ *Ibid.*, pp. 212-215.
- ³⁰⁴ Group B Report, p. 1.
- ³⁰⁵ Group A Report, p. 1.
- ³⁰⁶ Group C Report, p. 1.
- ³⁰⁷ *Ibid.*

- ⁹³⁸ Group B Report, p. 1.
- ⁹³⁹ Group A Report, p. 2.
- ⁹⁴⁰ Group C Report, p. 2.
- ⁹⁴¹ Group B Report, p. 2.
- ⁹⁴² ILCW/XC Min. of June 16-17, 1972, 72-14.
- ⁹⁴³ LTC Min. of June 21-22, 1972, 72-2.
- ⁹⁴⁴ Memo from Lou Neuchterlein to New England District Pastoral Conferences, Mar. 7, 1973.
- ⁹⁴⁵ Eugene Brand, "A Beginning—Interpreting the CW-2 Questionnaire," p. 1.
- ⁹⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 1f.
- ⁹⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 2.
- ⁹⁴⁸ Edward G. Hintz, Steven C. Olson, and Lynn Schlessmen of Wartburg Seminary.
- ⁹⁴⁹ In my comparison of the letters and ILCW survey I have collapsed these six categories into two: "positive" and "negative."
- ⁹⁵⁰ In the ILCW survey of 86 congregations, some 300 persons participated. The highest number of answers noted was 301; most questions had between 270 and 280 responses. Total letters were 165 but on some topics as few as seven persons commented. The 22 unofficial questionnaires often gave no indication as to how many persons participated in the survey. Statistical analysis verifies that the differences between the letters, the unofficial surveys and written articles ("letters etc." below) and the ILCW surveys are "significant" but it does not show *where* the difference lies.
- ⁹⁵¹ Ralph W. Quere, Report on CW-2: The Holy Communion, March 1974, pp. 2-10. Inaccuracies may have been perpetuated by simply evaluating the responses as positive or negative, but in every instance this method agreed with the "strong general approval" evaluation of Brand. Brand weighted 30+ in the "strongly agree/disagree" column and 40+ in the "agree/disagree" column (out of 86 questionnaires) as a "strong response." Convergences of 40+ in adults, musicians and clergy, or two 40+ and one 30+ in adults, musicians and clergy and 40+ in musicians and clergy were considered "significant." Divergences on both sides of the "slightly agree/disagree" line of approx. equal numbers were considered "significant."
- ⁹⁵² L. David Miller, Report on Worship Research Project, Apr. 15, 1973, pp. 8f.
- ⁹⁵³ *Ibid.*, pp. 17-21, 64.
- ⁹⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 21.
- ⁹⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 57.
- ⁹⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 61; cf. CW-2 Questionnaire Statistical Report, QQ 1-18.
- ⁹⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 62ff. cf. CW-2 Questionnaire, QQ. 23-49.
- ⁹⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 64; cf. CW-2 Questionnaire, QQ. 59-62.
- ⁹⁵⁹ CW-2 Questionnaire, QQ 28f., 48f., 63, 66; Quere, Report on CW-2, pp. 5-10.
- ⁹⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 111 & 113.
- ⁹⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 111 citing *Lexicon fuer und Kirche*, Appendix Volumes: *Das Zweite Vatikanische Konzil* (Freiburg: Herder, 1966), I, 51.
- ⁹⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 111.
- ⁹⁶³ Paul Korem, "Luther's Objection to a Eucharistic Prayer," *The Cresset* 38 (March 1975), 5, 12. Italics are author's.
- ⁹⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 15.
- ⁹⁶⁵ *Ibid.*
- ⁹⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 16.
- ⁹⁶⁷ Robert W. Jenson, "Eucharist: Its Relative Necessity, Specific Warrant and Traditional Order," *Dialog* 14 (Spring 1975), p. 122.
- ⁹⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 124f.
- ⁹⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 125f.
- ⁹⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 126f.
- ⁹⁷¹ *Ibid.*
- ⁹⁷² *Ibid.*, p. 130.
- ⁹⁷³ *Ibid.*, p. 131.
- ⁹⁷⁴ *Ibid.*
- ⁹⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 132.
- ⁹⁷⁶ Ralph W. Quere, *Melanchthon's Christum Cognoscere: Christ's Efficacious Presence in the Eucharistic Theology of Melanchthon* (Nieuwkoop: B. deGraaf, 1977), pp. 352-359.
- ⁹⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 133.
- ⁹⁷⁸ Dennis L. Paulson, "The Great Thanksgiving," pp. 154f.
- ⁹⁷⁹ Gerhard Forde and Robert W. Jenson, "A 'Great Thanksgiving' for Lutherans?" (NYC: ILCW, n.d.), p. 1. Cf. *Response* 15 (Fall 1975) 3 and 4, 49-52.
- ⁹⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 6f.
- ⁹⁸¹ *Ibid.*, p. 1.
- ⁹⁸² *Ibid.*, p. 2.
- ⁹⁸³ Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition*, (5 vols.; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989), 5:80f., 259, 265; cf. 1:333-339.
- ⁹⁸⁴ Robert W. Jenson, "A 'Great Thanksgiving' for Lutherans?" (NYC: ILCW, n.d.), p. 2.
- ⁹⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 1f.
- ⁹⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 3.
- ⁹⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 3f.
- ⁹⁸⁸ *Ibid.*
- ⁹⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 4.
- ⁹⁹⁰ Johann Gerhard, *Loci theologici XXI*, 149.
- ⁹⁹¹ Jenson, "A 'Great Thanksgiving,'" p.5.
- ⁹⁹² Gerhard Forde, "From One Academic Theologian to Another: Reply to Robert Jenson" (NYC: ILCW, n.d.), pp. 6f.
- ⁹⁹³ *Ibid.*
- ⁹⁹⁴ SC/CW-2 Min. of May 28-29, 1974, 74-1.
- ⁹⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, Exh. C-1.
- ⁹⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 74-1—74-5.
- ⁹⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 5; cf. Exh. C-1f.
- ⁹⁹⁸ LTC Agenda of Oct. 29-31, 1974, Exh. C-6.
- ⁹⁹⁹ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁰⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, C-7.
- ¹⁰⁰¹ LTC Min. of Oct. 29-31, 1974, 74-16.
- ¹⁰⁰² *Ibid.*, 74-17.
- ¹⁰⁰³ *Ibid.*, Agenda C-8f.
- ¹⁰⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, 74-17.
- ¹⁰⁰⁵ ILCW Min. of Nov. 13-14, 1974, 74-10.
- ¹⁰⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, 75-4.
- ¹⁰⁰⁷ DBCP p. 354; cf. ILCW Liturgical Materials, July 1975, p. 1.
- ¹⁰⁰⁸ John Doberstein (ed.) *Minister's Prayer Book* (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg, 1959), p. 18 citing John

- Hunter, *Devotional Services for Public Worship* (London: Dent, 1901), p. 52.
- ³⁸⁷ LTC Min., 75-4.
- ³⁸⁸ Cf. ILCW Liturgical Materials, July 1975, p. 2.
- ³⁸⁹ Penitential Rites SC Min. of Feb. 27-28, 1975, 75-5.
- ³⁹⁰ JLC Min. of June 9-13, 1975, 75-2; cf. ILCW Liturgical Materials, July 1975, p. 2.
- ³⁹¹ Euch. Prayers SC Min. of Mar. 12-13, 1974, 74-1f.
- ³⁹² Euch. Prayers SC Min. of Sep. 27f., 1974, 74-3f.
- ³⁹³ LTC Min. of Oct. 29-31, 1974, 74-15.
- ³⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, Exh. A, Jensen p. 5.
- ³⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 74-15.
- ³⁹⁶ The Committee for a Common Eucharistic Prayer, Marion J. Hatchett, chair, "A Common Eucharistic Prayer" (1975). Eugene Brand was ILCW representative to this committee.
- ³⁹⁷ Euch. Prayers SC Min. of Mar. 15f., 1975, 75-1.
- ³⁹⁸ *Ibid.*
- ³⁹⁹ LTC Min. of Apr. 14-16, 1975, 75-7.
- ⁴⁰⁰ *Ibid.*
- ⁴⁰¹ LMC Min. of June 9-13, 1975, 75-8f.
- ⁴⁰² LTC Min. of Oct. 20-22, 1975, 75-17.
- ⁴⁰³ LTC Min. of Oct. 29-31, 1974, 74-19.
- ⁴⁰⁴ *Ibid.*
- ⁴⁰⁵ *Ibid.*
- ⁴⁰⁶ *Ibid.*
- ⁴⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, 74-20f.
- ⁴⁰⁸ ILCW Min. of Nov. 13f. 1974, 74-8.
- ⁴⁰⁹ JLC Min. of June 9-13, 1975, 75-6.
- ⁴¹⁰ JLC Min. of June 9-13, 1975, 75-2f.
- ⁴¹¹ *Ibid.*
- ⁴¹² *Ibid.*, 75-12f.
- ⁴¹³ *Ibid.*, 75-13.
- ⁴¹⁴ LMC Min. of June 9-13, 1975, 75-6—75-9.
- ⁴¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 75-8.
- ⁴¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 75-13.
- ⁴¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 75-12.
- ⁴¹⁸ LTC Min. of Oct. 20-22, 1975, 75-18f.
- ⁴¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 75-19.
- ⁴²⁰ *Ibid.*, 75-21.
- ⁴²¹ *Ibid.*, 75-23.
- ⁴²² LTC Min., 75-24.
- ⁴²³ *Ibid.*, 75-25.
- ⁴²⁴ ALC/RG Min. of Aug. 18-20, 1975, p. 12.
- ⁴²⁵ LTC Min. 75-25.
- ⁴²⁶ *Ibid.*, 75-28.
- ⁴²⁷ ILCW Min. of Nov. 11-13, 1975, 75-8—75-10.
- ⁴²⁸ *Ibid.*, 75-14.
- ⁴²⁹ *Ibid.*, 75-5; cf. ILCW/XC Min. of Nov. 10 & 13, 1975, 75-15.
- ⁴³⁰ ILCW Agenda of Nov. 13-14 1974, Exh. I, 74-1.
- ⁴³¹ *Ibid.*
- ⁴³² *Ibid.*
- ⁴³³ *Ibid.*, 74-6.
- ⁴³⁴ *Ibid.*, 74-1.
- ⁴³⁵ *Ibid.*, 74-1f; cf. 74-5.
- ⁴³⁶ *Ibid.*, 74-3.
- ⁴³⁷ *Ibid.*, 74-5f. citing the "Progress Report of the ILCW to the Participating Churches, pp. 9-13.
- ⁴³⁸ *Ibid.*
- ⁴³⁹ *Ibid.*, 74-6.
- ⁴⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 74-4.
- ⁴⁴¹ *Ibid.*
- ⁴⁴² *Ibid.*
- ⁴⁴³ HMC Min. of Mar. 31- Apr. 1, 1976, 76-1.
- ⁴⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 74-5.
- ⁴⁴⁵ Gilbert Doan Jr., "American Lutherans," *Liturgy* 20 (June/July 1975), p. 177.
- ⁴⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 178.
- ⁴⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 177.
- ⁴⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 179.
- ⁴⁴⁹ ILCW Min. of Nov. 13-14, 1974, Exh. A, 74-3.
- ⁴⁵⁰ One such list of excluded hymns was published by Rev. Williams F. Schmidt Jr., from Hope Lutheran Church, Dayton, Ohio. He exhorted: "In November 1975 there will be an ILCW meeting. Do not delay writing to Rev. Mons Teig now, so that he may carefully consider your opinion, and be able to report to this important meeting." People heard and heeded such exhortations!
- ⁴⁵¹ ILCW Min. of Nov. 13-15, 1975, 75-12.
- ⁴⁵² ALC's later collation of survey results tallied *usage* of other hymns without a separate category for *recommendations*. The high usage may be read as a recommendation of sorts.
- ⁴⁵³ Memo from Brand to Church Review Committees, Jan. 15, 1976.
- ⁴⁵⁴ ILCW Min. of Nov. 11-13, 1975, 75-6.
- ⁴⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 75-7.
- ⁴⁵⁶ *Ibid.*
- ⁴⁵⁷ "Hymnic News," *The Hymn* 31 no. 1 (Jan. 1980) p. 59.
- ⁴⁵⁸ ILCW Agenda of Nov. 11-13, 1975, Exh. N-8.
- ⁴⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 75-12.
- ⁴⁶⁰ Edgar R. Trexler, "Almost everything you wanted to know about the new hymnal," *The Lutheran* (Jan. 7, 1976), p. 5.
- ⁴⁶¹ John E. Halborg, "A Review of ILCW hymnal selections: First judgment on a 'final proposal'," *Lutheran Forum* 10 no. 1 (Feb. 1976) p. 13.
- ⁴⁶² *Ibid.*, pp. 13f.
- ⁴⁶³ *Ibid.*, pp. 14f.
- ⁴⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 14.
- ⁴⁶⁵ *Ibid.*
- ⁴⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 15.
- ⁴⁶⁷ Eugene L. Brand, "The ILCW: Dimensions of its Task," *Dialog* 14 (Spring 1975), 90.
- ⁴⁶⁸ *Ibid.*
- ⁴⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 91f.
- ⁴⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 92f.
- ⁴⁷¹ *Ibid.*, p. 94.
- ⁴⁷² *Ibid.*, pp. 93f.
- ⁴⁷³ *Ibid.*, p. 94.
- ⁴⁷⁴ *Ibid.*
- ⁴⁷⁵ *Ibid.*
- ⁴⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 95.
- ⁴⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 95f.
- ⁴⁷⁸ Gilbert E. Doan, Jr., "American Lutherans," *Liturgy* 20 (June/July 1975), p. 174.
- ⁴⁷⁹ *Ibid.*
- ⁴⁸⁰ *Ibid.*
- ⁴⁸¹ *Ibid.*
- ⁴⁸² *Ibid.*, pp. 175f.
- ⁴⁸³ ILCW/XC Min. of July 24-26, 1969, App. A, 69-2.
- ⁴⁸⁴ Report of Cambridge, England, meeting between Walther Kuenneth and Eugene Brand, by Brand, April 30, 1969.
- ⁴⁸⁵ LWF/CWSL Min. of May 8, 1969.
- ⁴⁸⁶ ILCW/XC Min. of July 24-26, 1969, App. A, 69-1.
- ⁴⁸⁷ ILCW/XC Min. of Nov. 4 & 6, 1970, 70-16.
- ⁴⁸⁸ LTC Lectionary Subcommittee, An Introduction to the 1971 Revision of the 'Old Line' Western Pericopes for the Church Year (June 1971) p. 1.
- ⁴⁸⁹ *Ibid.*

- ⁴⁹⁰ Ibid.
- ⁴⁹¹ Ibid., p. 2.
- ⁴⁹² LTC/Lec. SC Min. of Oct. 8-9, 1971, [7i]-[2].
- ⁴⁹³ ILCW Min. of Nov. 5-6, 1970, 70-1.
- ⁴⁹⁴ LTC/Lec. SC, Intro., p. 3.
- ⁴⁹⁵ Ibid., p. 2; printed edition, p. 1.
- ⁴⁹⁶ ILCW Min. of Nov. 5-6, 1971, 71-13f.
- ⁴⁹⁷ Eugene Brand, Report on LWF Conference on Pericopes, Oct. 5-7, 1972, p. 1.
- ⁴⁹⁸ Ibid., p. 2.
- ⁴⁹⁹ Ibid., pp. 4f.
- ⁵⁰⁰ One principle of selection/exclusion became an issue in the LCMS debate that grew in 1976-1977. It concerned the rejection of some traditional lessons as "no longer exegetically defensible." Paul Foelber wrote to Brand on Feb. 7, 1977 asking which selections were meant. John Reumann, chair of the LTC Lectionary SC, responded to Foelber, Feb. 18, 1977, citing the allegory in Gal. 4:21-31, the end of Mark (16:14-20), I John 5:7f, and for Trinity IV Num. 6:22-27.
- ⁵⁰¹ LTC/Lec. SC Min. of Oct. 8-9, 1970, 70-3.
- ⁵⁰² LTC/Lec. SC Min. of Feb. 10-12, 1972, 72-1f.
- ⁵⁰³ LTC/Lec. SC, Intro., edited 1st draft, n.d. p. 20.
- ⁵⁰⁴ Ibid., p. 24.
- ⁵⁰⁵ No note.
- ⁵⁰⁶ Ibid.
- ⁵⁰⁷ Ibid.
- ⁵⁰⁸ Ibid.
- ⁵⁰⁹ LTC/SC on Prayers Min. of March 6-7, 1970 in LTC Min. of June 15-17, 1970 Exh. B. 70-3.
- ⁵¹⁰ LTC Min. of Oct. 16-17, 1972, 72-9.
- ⁵¹¹ LTC Min. of Oct. 10-11, 1973, 73-8.
- ⁵¹² LTC Min. of March 19-20, 1973, 73-3.
- ⁵¹³ LTC Min. of June 21-24, 1971, 71-12.
- ⁵¹⁴ Ibid., 71-12—71-14.
- ⁵¹⁵ LTC Doc., dated June 15, 1972, p. 3.
- ⁵¹⁶ LTC. Holy Baptism, June 12, 1971, p. 5.
- ⁵¹⁷ Ibid., p. 7.
- ⁵¹⁸ LTC Min. of June 21-24, 1971, 71-11.
- ⁵¹⁹ LTC. Doc. Dated June 15, 1971.
- ⁵²⁰ See Frank W. Kloss, *Confirmation and First Communion* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1968, A Study Book with the Report Appended as pp. 183-213).
- ⁵²¹ LTC Min. of June 21-24, 1971, 71-11.
- ⁵²² LTC Holy Baptism, Introduction, June 15, 1971, p. 2.
- ⁵²³ Ibid., p. 1.
- ⁵²⁴ Ibid., p. 4.
- ⁵²⁵ LTC Min. of June 21-22, 1972, 72-3.
- ⁵²⁶ Ibid., 72-4.
- ⁵²⁷ LTC. Core of Baptismal Rite, June 15, 1972, p. 4.
- ⁵²⁸ Ibid.
- ⁵²⁹ LTC Min. of Oct. 16-17, 1972, 72-10.
- ⁵³⁰ LTC. Doc., dated June 16, 1972, par. 18.
- ⁵³¹ Ibid., par. 22.
- ⁵³² LTC Min. of Oct. 16-17, 1972, 72-11.
- ⁵³³ LTC Min. of Oct. 16-17, 1972, 72-11.
- ⁵³⁴ ILCW Min. of Nov. 9-10, 1972, 72-3f.
- ⁵³⁵ Ibid., 72-5.
- ⁵³⁶ Memo to Initiatory Rites SC, Nov. 6, 1972.
- ⁵³⁷ ILCW "Holy Baptism", Nov. 1973, par. 31; of CW-7, 21, par. 32.
- ⁵³⁸ Dec. 3, 1973 Memo from Mandus Egge to Eugene Brand with Wietzke Critique enclosed.
- ⁵³⁹ ILCW, "Holy Baptism," November 1973, p. 20, par. 22; of CW7-28, par. 22.
- ⁵⁴⁰ LCA News Bureau Release Feb. 13, 1973.
- ⁵⁴¹ ILCW/XC Minutes of Nov. 7 & 9, 1973.
- ⁵⁴² Eugene Brand, "Provisional Rite of Confirmation," n.d., p. 4.
- ⁵⁴³ Affirmation of Baptismal Covenant, 2nd draft, August, 1974, pp. 14f.
- ⁵⁴⁴ Ibid., p. 17.
- ⁵⁴⁵ Ibid.
- ⁵⁴⁶ Affirmation, Aug. 1974, p. 17.
- ⁵⁴⁷ LTC Min. of May 13-15, 1974, 74-8.
- ⁵⁴⁸ LTC/SC on Confirmation Min. of Aug. 26-27, 1974, 74-4.
- ⁵⁴⁹ LTC Min. of Oct. 29-31, 1974, 74-15.
- ⁵⁵⁰ Letter to Eugene Brand, June 27, 1975, pp. 1-3.
- ⁵⁵¹ LTC/SC on Confirmation Min. of Aug. 26-27, 1974, 74-4.
- ⁵⁵² LTC Min. of Jan 15-17, 1970, 70-5f.
- ⁵⁵³ Luther Reed, *The Lutheran Liturgy* (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg, 1947), p. 641.
- ⁵⁵⁴ ILCW/XC Min. of Nov. 9, 1973, 73-28.
- ⁵⁵⁵ LTC/SC on Office Min. of March 4-5, 1974, 74-1.
- ⁵⁵⁶ Ibid., 74-2.
- ⁵⁵⁷ Ibid.
- ⁵⁵⁸ SC/Office, Matins, 1st Draft, June 1974, pp. i-ii.
- ⁵⁵⁹ Ibid., p. 4.
- ⁵⁶⁰ Ibid., p. 7.
- ⁵⁶¹ Ibid., p. 8.
- ⁵⁶² Ibid., p. 9.
- ⁵⁶³ Ibid., pp. 10-15.
- ⁵⁶⁴ SC/Office of Matins, 2nd Draft, September 1974, p. 1.
- ⁵⁶⁵ SC/Office Min. of October 16-19, 1974, 74-4 & 74-9.
- ⁵⁶⁶ SC/Office 2nd Draft, p. i.
- ⁵⁶⁷ Ibid., p.6.
- ⁵⁶⁸ LTC/SC on Office Min. of October 16-19, 1974, 74-9.
- ⁵⁶⁹ Ibid., 74-4.
- ⁵⁷⁰ Ibid.
- ⁵⁷¹ LTC/SC on Office Min. of January 27-28, 1975, 75-1f.
- ⁵⁷² SC/Office, Vespers, 1st Draft, June 1974, pp. i-ii.
- ⁵⁷³ William G. Storey, D.M.S., *Morning Praise and Evensong* (Notre Dame, IN: Fides, 1973), p. 26.
- ⁵⁷⁴ Vespers, June, 1974, p. 2.
- ⁵⁷⁵ Ibid., pp. i-iv & 2.
- ⁵⁷⁶ LTC SC on Office Min. of October 16-19, 1974, 74-10.
- ⁵⁷⁷ Vespers, June, 1974, p. 1.
- ⁵⁷⁸ Ibid.
- ⁵⁷⁹ SC/Office, Compline, 1st Draft, June 1974, p. 1.
- ⁵⁸⁰ SC/Office, Compline, 2nd Draft, September 1974, p. 1.
- ⁵⁸¹ Compline, June 1974, p. 2.
- ⁵⁸² Compline, September 1974, p. 2.
- ⁵⁸³ ILCW/XC Min. of March 11-12, 1975, 75-4.
- ⁵⁸⁴ LTC Min. of April 14-16, 1975, 75-3f.
- ⁵⁸⁵ Ibid., 75-8.
- ⁵⁸⁶ Liturgical Materials, July 1975, p. 49.
- ⁵⁸⁷ LTC Min. of October 20-22, 1975, 75-23 re 49:3; see CW-9, 52, par. 12-14.
- ⁵⁸⁸ Compline, June 1974, p. 1.
- ⁵⁸⁹ SC/Office, Litany, 1st Draft, June 1974, p. 1.
- ⁵⁹⁰ SC/Office, Litany, 2nd Draft, September 1974, p. 1.
- ⁵⁹¹ LTC/SC on Office Min. of Oct. 16-19, 1974, 74-5f.
- ⁵⁹² SC/Office, Litany, 3rd Draft, n.d., p. 1.
- ⁵⁹³ Ibid., pp. 1f.
- ⁵⁹⁴ LTC Min. of June 9-13, 1975, Exh. C-28f.
- ⁵⁹⁵ Ibid., C-26.
- ⁵⁹⁶ LTC SC on Office, October 16-19, 1974, 74-B.
- ⁵⁹⁷ The Joint Committee on Worship for the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, the Presbyterian Church in the US, and the United Presbyterian Church in the USA,

- The Worshipbook* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1972), p. 28.
- ⁵⁸⁸ LTC Min. of April 14-16, 1975, Exh. C-22.
- ⁵⁹⁹ LTC Min. of Oct. 20-22, 1975, 75-21f.
- ⁶⁰⁰ ILCW Min. of Nov. 13-14, 1975, 75-9.
- ⁶⁰¹ Larry Bailey and Leonard Klein, "Renewing Lutheran Worship: Installment #13, *Forum Letter* 6 (Feb. 1977) 2, p. 8.
- ⁶⁰² LTC SC on Sickness and Death Min. of April 5-7, 1970, 70-3.
- ⁶⁰³ LTC Min. of June 15-17, 1970, 70-9.
- ⁶⁰⁴ SC/Death, the Funeral Service, 2nd Draft, March 1971, p. 2.
- ⁶⁰⁵ LTC Min. of June 21-24, 1971, 71-15.
- ⁶⁰⁶ The Funeral Service, March 1971, pp. 4-7.
- ⁶⁰⁷ LTC Min. of Nov. 29-30, 1971, 71-18.
- ⁶⁰⁸ The Funeral Service, Feb. 1972, p. 3.
- ⁶⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 6-15.
- ⁶¹⁰ LTC Min. of June 21-22, 1972, 72-5.
- ⁶¹¹ LTC Min. of Oct. 16-17, 1972, 72-12.
- ⁶¹² ILCW Min. of Nov. 9-10, 1972, 72-5f.
- ⁶¹³ *Ibid.*, Agenda, 72-1, The Funeral Service, p. 5.
- ⁶¹⁴ JLC Min. of March 19-20, 1973, 73-3.
- ⁶¹⁵ SC/Death, The Funeral Service, 6th Draft, Sept. 1973, p. 7.
- ⁶¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 12.
- ⁶¹⁷ LTC Min. of Oct. 10-12, 1973, 73-8.
- ⁶¹⁸ LTC Min. of May 13-15, 1974, 74-4.
- ⁶¹⁹ LTC Min. of Oct. 29-31, 1974, 74-11.
- ⁶²⁰ LTC Min. of April 14-16, 1975, Exh. E, pp. 1f.
- ⁶²¹ LTC Min. of June 9-13, 1975, 75-10.
- ⁶²² ILCW Min. of Nov. 11-13, 1975, 75-9.
- ⁶²³ LTC/Burial Rites SC, ILCW Agenda of Nov. 11-13, Exh. H-6.
- ⁶²⁴ LTC Min. of April 26-28, 1976, Exh. J-1.
- ⁶²⁵ *Ibid.*, Exh. J-3.
- ⁶²⁶ LTC Min. of April 26-28, 1976, Exh. J-4f.
- ⁶²⁷ *Ibid.*, J-7-9.
- ⁶²⁸ The Funeral Service, 6th Draft, Sept. 1973, p. 9.
- ⁶²⁹ LTC Min. of April 26-28, 1976, Exh. J-6f.
- ⁶³⁰ *Ibid.*, 76-4.
- ⁶³¹ *Ibid.*, Exh. J-7.
- ⁶³² ILCW *Worshipbrief*, No. 6, March 1977, pp. 1f.
- ⁶³³ *Ibid.*
- ⁶³⁴ LTC Min. of April 26-28, 1976, Exh. J-10.
- ⁶³⁵ *Ibid.*, J-11, cf. DBCP, p. 501; SBH, p. 268.
- ⁶³⁶ *Ibid.*, J-12.
- ⁶³⁷ SC/LTC Min. of July 16-18, 1976, p. 4.
- ⁶³⁸ LTC Min. of April 26-28, 1976, Exh. J-4.
- ⁶³⁹ Larry Bailey and Leonard Klein, "Renewing Lutheran Worship: Installment #15" *Forum Letter* 6 no. 5 (May 27, 1977) pp. 7f.
- ⁶⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 8.
- Chapter IV**
- ^{641a} Memo from Brand to Church Review Committee Chairpersons, Apr. 22, 1975.
- ^{641b} ILCW *Worshipbrief*, no.1 (Sep 1975), 1.
- ⁶⁴² No Note.
- ⁶⁴³ ALC, Reports and Actions of the Seventh General Convention, October 9-15, 1974, Detroit, pp. 57, 490f.
- ⁶⁴⁴ ALC/ RG Min. of Feb. 21-22, 1975, p. 1.
- ⁶⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 4-6.
- ⁶⁴⁶ Progress Report to Pres. Preus, Oct. 13, 1975.
- ⁶⁴⁷ ALC/ RG Min. of June 5-7, 1975, Exh. B.
- ⁶⁴⁸ ALC/ RG Min. of Aug. 18-20, 1075, Exh. A.
- ⁶⁴⁹ ALC/ RG Min. of June 5-7, 1975, Exh. C & D.
- ⁶⁵⁰ ALC/ RG Min. of Aug. 18-20, 1975, Exh. A-5.
- ⁶⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 2.
- ⁶⁵² ALC/ RG Min. of June 5-7, 1975, p. 5.
- ⁶⁵³ *Ibid.*
- ⁶⁵⁴ Memo from Brand to Church Review Committee, Apr. 22, 1975.
- ⁶⁵⁵ Memo from Brand to Bonderud, July 16, 1975.
- ⁶⁵⁶ Memo from Forde to ALC/ RG, June 26, 1975.
- ⁶⁵⁷ ALC/ RG Min. of Aug. 18-20, 1975, pp. 4-8.
- ⁶⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 13.
- ⁶⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 8.
- ⁶⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 9.
- ⁶⁶¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 9-11.
- ⁶⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 17f.
- ⁶⁶³ ALC/ RG Min. of Feb. 25-27, 1976, Exh. G: Notes by Deneff; also my personal notes.
- ⁶⁶⁴ *Ibid.*
- ⁶⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, Exh. G-4—G-6.
- ⁶⁶⁶ Memo from Rogness to ALC/ RG, Feb. 1976.
- ⁶⁶⁷ ALC/ RG Min. of Feb. 26-29, 1976, Exh. G-2.
- ⁶⁶⁸ *Ibid.*
- ⁶⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, Exh. G-3.
- ⁶⁷⁰ *Ibid.*
- ⁶⁷¹ *Ibid.*
- ⁶⁷² *Ibid.*, Exh. G-6.
- ⁶⁷³ ALC/ RG Min. of Feb. 26-29, 1976, pp. 12f.
- ⁶⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 13; cf. LBW p. 201 where this was followed.
- ⁶⁷⁵ *Ibid.*
- ⁶⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 14.
- ⁶⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 14f.
- ⁶⁷⁸ ALC/ RG Min. of Feb. 26-29, 1976, Exh. A.
- ⁶⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, Exh. B.
- ⁶⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, Exh. C.
- ⁶⁸¹ Report from Bonderud to David Preus, Mar. 16, 1976.
- ⁶⁸² ALC/ RG Min. of June 1-2, 1976, 76-21.
- ⁶⁸³ *Ibid.*, Exh. 76-H.
- ⁶⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 76-23.
- ⁶⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 76-23—76-26.
- ⁶⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 76-27f.
- ⁶⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 76-29.
- ⁶⁸⁸ Report of the ALC Review Group for ILCW Materials to the Church Council of the ALC, June 1976, pp. 8f.
- ⁶⁸⁹ ALC/ RG Min. of Oct. 1-3, 1976, 76-32—76-34.
- ⁶⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 76-36—76-40.
- ⁶⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 76-40f.
- ⁶⁹² *Ibid.*, 76-41.
- ⁶⁹³ *Ibid.*, 76-42.
- ⁶⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, Exh. 76-K2.
- ⁶⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, Exh. 76-K3.
- ⁶⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 76-42f.
- ⁶⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 76-44.
- ⁶⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, 76-45f.
- ⁶⁹⁹ Liturgical Texts, Jan. 1977, pp. 1f.
- ⁷⁰⁰ ALC/ RG Min. of Oct. 1-3, 1976, 76-47.
- ⁷⁰¹ *Ibid.*
- ⁷⁰² *Ibid.*
- ⁷⁰³ Memo from Brand to Edward Hansen, T.S. Liefeld, and Clifford Swanson, Oct. 5, 1976.
- ⁷⁰⁴ Reports and Actions of the Eighth General Convention, ALC, pp. 36f.
- ⁷⁰⁵ ALC/ RG Min. of Mar. 18-20, 1977, 77-4.
- ⁷⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, 77-6.
- ⁷⁰⁷ Liturgical Texts, Jan. 1977, p. 47.

- ⁷⁰⁸ ALC/RG Min. of Mar. 18-20, 1977, 77-7 & 77-13.
- ⁷⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, 77-7.
- ⁷¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 77-8f.
- ⁷¹¹ *Ibid.*, 77-10.
- ⁷¹² *Ibid.*, 77-15.
- ⁷¹³ *Ibid.*, 77-12—77-17.
- ⁷¹⁴ Memo from Bonderud to David Preus, Apr. 11, 1977.
- ⁷¹⁵ Memo from Teig to ALC/RG, Apr. 28, 1977.
- ⁷¹⁶ Memo from Teig to ALC/RG, May 5, 1977.
- ⁷¹⁷ ALC/RG Min. of May 6-7, 1977, 77-19f.
- ⁷¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 77-20f.
- ⁷¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 77-21.
- ⁷²⁰ *Ibid.*, 77-22.
- ⁷²¹ *Ibid.*
- ⁷²² *Ibid.*, 77-27.
- ⁷²³ *Ibid.*, 77-23—77-25.
- ⁷²⁴ *Ibid.*, 77-27.
- ⁷²⁵ *Ibid.*, 77-28—77-30.
- ⁷²⁶ Memo from Bonderud to Preus, May 16, 1977.
- ⁷²⁷ Letter of Bonderud to Brand, July 1, 1977.
- ⁷²⁸ ALC News Release, July 12, 1977.
- ⁷²⁹ LCA News Release, June 23, 1977.
- ⁷³⁰ ELCC ILCW Material Review Committee, Min. of Mar. 13, 1975, p. 1.
- ⁷³¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 2-4.
- ⁷³² *Ibid.*, pp. 3f.
- ⁷³³ ELCC/MRC Min. of Oct. 20-22, 1975, p. 1.
- ⁷³⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 1f.
- ⁷³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 2.
- ⁷³⁶ ELCC/MRC Min. of Mar. 9, 1976, p. 1.
- ⁷³⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 1f.
- ⁷³⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 2f.
- ⁷³⁹ Letter from L.R. Likness to Brand, June 18, 1976.
- ⁷⁴⁰ Cf. Liturgical Materials, April 1977, pp. 62f., par. 27, left col.
- ⁷⁴¹ ELCC/MRC Min. of Mar. 28, 1977, p. 1f.
- ⁷⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 2.
- ⁷⁴³ *Ibid.*, pp. 2f.
- ⁷⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 3.
- ⁷⁴⁵ Letter from Pres. S.T. Jacobson to Brand, Oct. 17, 1977.
- ⁷⁴⁶ LCA/DPS/MC Preliminary Unofficial Report of Apr. 3-5, 1975, CCW Exh. B-1, 2/24/75, p. 1.
- ⁷⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 2f. "With God and his mercy" is suggested as a "great evangelistic hymn" from the Rosenius movement in Sweden.
- ⁷⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 4.
- ⁷⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 3f.
- ⁷⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, re: CCW Exh. A-1, p. 1.
- ⁷⁵¹ LCA/DPS/MC Min. of Sept. 25-27, 1975, pp. 1f.
- ⁷⁵² Liturgical Materials, July 1975, p. 49.
- ⁷⁵³ *Ibid.*, p. 2.
- ⁷⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 9.
- ⁷⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 3.
- ⁷⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 9.
- ⁷⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 3f.
- ⁷⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 5-7.
- ⁷⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 7.
- ⁷⁶⁰ LCA/DPS/MC, Min. of Mar 19-21, 1976, p. 26.
- ⁷⁶¹ Memo from Brand to Church Review Committees, Jan. 15, 1976, p. 2.
- ⁷⁶² Letter from Hoefler to Van Loon, Jan. 7, 1976.
- ⁷⁶³ *Ibid.*
- ⁷⁶⁴ *Ibid.*
- ⁷⁶⁵ Letter of Dean Robert P. Roth to Van Loon, Jan. 8, 1976. Roth also served as chair of CCW.
- ⁷⁶⁶ LCA/DPS/MC Unofficial Preliminary Report of Mar. 19-21, 1976, with CCW Min. of Mar. 8-9, 1976, p. Lit. 3—Lit. 5.
- ⁷⁶⁷ LCA/DPS/MC Min. of Mar. 19, 1976, pp. 22-25; cf. pp. 1-4.
- ⁷⁶⁸ William G. Rusch, "A Background Paper for a Theological Review of Materials Produced by the Inter-Lutheran Commission on Worship," January 1977, unpublished paper, pp. 30f.
- ⁷⁶⁹ LCA/DPS Test and Review of Liturgical Materials, April 1977, E6-E7.
- Found in ILCW Agenda Exh. K-18-k-19 of April 27-29, 1997.
- ⁷⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 7.
- ⁷⁷¹ Liturgical Texts, [Fall 1976], pp. 6f.
- ⁷⁷² LCA/DPS Test & Review. The five points in this rationale are exactly the same as those made in one (unidentified) seminary's report (see E6). Their suggestion was, however, two options—with the *verba* alone facilitated in option B by a rubric.
- ⁷⁷³ *Ibid.*, D2-D3.
- ⁷⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, E1.
- ⁷⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, D3; cf. Liturgical Texts, Jan. 1977, p. 13.
- ⁷⁷⁶ *Ibid.*
- ⁷⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, D2-D3.
- ⁷⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, E4-E5.
- ⁷⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, D3.
- ⁷⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, D3; E10-E11.
- ⁷⁸¹ Rusch, "Background Paper," p. 41.
- ⁷⁸² LCA/DPS Test and Review, E13-E14.
- ⁷⁸³ Liturgical Texts, pp. 49-52; cf. LCA/DPS Test and Review, E15.
- ⁷⁸⁴ LCA/DPS Test and Review,
- ⁷⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, E15.
- ⁷⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, E17.
- ⁷⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, D3.
- ⁷⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, E17.
- ⁷⁸⁹ J.L. Barkenquist, "Some Statistics Pertinent to Defining *Testamentum*," unpublished paper, pp. 6f.
- ⁷⁹⁰ J.L. Barkenquist, "Some Notes on Proposed Liturgical Texts," unpublished paper, pp. 6f.
- ⁷⁹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 8.
- ⁷⁹² Letter from Chair Mary H. Whitten to Robert P. Roth, CCW Chair, Apr. 4, 1977.
- ⁷⁹³ LCA/DPS/MC Min. of Apr. 22-23, 1977, p. 1.
- ⁷⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 2f. & 6.
- ⁷⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 5-8.
- ⁷⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 3, 10f.
- ⁷⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 10.
- ⁷⁹⁸ *Ibid.*
- ⁷⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 6.
- ⁸⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 8f.
- ⁸⁰¹ *Ibid.*, p. 12; but see LBW:MDE, p. 17, par. 11.
- ⁸⁰² *Ibid.*, pp. 18f.
- ⁸⁰³ Memo from Van Loon to Brand, June 21, 1977.
- ⁸⁰⁴ Letter of Rev. Carl E. Mangold to Van Loon, received Apr. 11, 1977.
- ⁸⁰⁵ No Note.
- ⁸⁰⁶ No Note.
- ⁸⁰⁷ Letter from Rev. Edward W. Voosen to Van Loon and John Becker, June 8, 1977.
- ⁸⁰⁸ Letter to Brand from Rev. Frederick G. Gotwald, Asst. to the Pres., UNYS, Apr. 4, 1977.
- ⁸⁰⁹ LCA News Release, July 27, 1977; LCA Executive Council Min. of Sep. 14-16, 1977, p. 857.
- ⁸¹⁰ ILCW/XC Agenda of Sep. 23-24, 1977, Exh. A-5.

- ⁸¹¹ Most of the documents cited in this section are found in the LCMS Archives at the Concordia Historical Institute in St. Louis.
- ⁸¹² Carl Bormann "The Twenty-Seventh Institute of Liturgical Studies," *The Springfielder* 39, no. 1 (June 1975) pp. 40-43.
- ⁸¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 40.
- ⁸¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 42.
- ⁸¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 43.
- ⁸¹⁶ Letter from Preus to Bormann, Jan. 22, 1975.
- ⁸¹⁷ Letter from Bormann to DeLaney, Mar. 25, 1975, pp. 1-3.
- ⁸¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 4.
- ⁸¹⁹ Letter from Rev. R.R. Krueger of Christ Lutheran Church, Parkville, MO to DeLaney, Apr. 8, 1975.
- ⁸²⁰ Letter from DeLaney to Krueger, Apr. 10, 1975.
- ⁸²¹ Letter from Bormann to DeLaney, Apr. 28, 1975.
- ⁸²² Letter from DeLaney to Bormann, May 1, 1975.
- ⁸²³ Letter from Janzow to DeLaney, Mar. 10, 1975.
- ⁸²⁴ Liturgical Materials, July 1975, pp. 1f.
- ⁸²⁵ Letter of Bormann to Peterson, Nov. 7, 1975, encl. 2, p. 1, no. 1.
- ⁸²⁶ *Ibid.*, encl. 1, nos. 4 & 5.
- ⁸²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 20, nos. 7 & 15.
- ⁸²⁸ *Ibid.*, no. 8.
- ⁸²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 2, no. 13.
- ⁸³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 1.
- ⁸³¹ *Ibid.*, citing CW-01, 21, I. 42 & p. 32, II. 71-75.
- ⁸³² *Ibid.*, citing CW-01, 21, II. 38-40.
- ⁸³³ Letter from DeLaney to Preus, Jan. 28, 1976, p. 1.
- ⁸³⁴ Letter from Bormann to Sauer, St. Matthew the Apostle [=Feb. 24], 1976, p. 8.
- ^{834b} ILCW Doctrinal Reviewer Response File, n.d. re: "Cold December".
- ⁸³⁵ Letter from DeLaney to Brand, June 28, 1976.
- ⁸³⁶ Memo from C/W to Doctrinal Reviewer, June 29, 1976, in ILCW Doctrinal Reviewer Response File, n.d., p. 3, re: comments on First Batch of Hymn Texts.
- ⁸³⁷ Memo from DeLaney to ILCW Hymnal Doctrinal Reviewer, Dec. 8, 1976.
- ⁸³⁸ Letter from DeLaney to Brand, June 28, 1976.
- ⁸³⁹ Memo from C/W to Doctrinal Reviewer, Aug. 25, 1976, pp. 1-3. This parallels a change in the "first batch" (6/29/76 Memo) re: "Come, Risen Lord" (LBW 209, 2): this seems to refer to "Christ's personal presence at the sacrament" rather than his "real presence in the sacrament" (emphasis his). He seems to be arguing one must not say Christ is personally present as host, lest someone think the real presence is being denied or ignored. A strange, strained logic!
- ⁸⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 2.
- ⁸⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 11.
- ⁸⁴² Carl Bormann, "Notes on the Proposed Hymnal," March 1976.
- ⁸⁴³ Letter from DeLaney to Bormann, Apr. 6, 1976.
- ⁸⁴⁴ *Ibid.*
- ⁸⁴⁵ F. Samuel Janzow, Comments on the proposed ILCW Hymnal, Mar. 15, 1976, p. 1.
- ⁸⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 2-4.
- ⁸⁴⁷ Harold W. Schnaible, Preliminary Evaluation of Texts for "Final" Hymn Proposal of the New Hymnal and Service Book, Mar. 19, 1976, p. 1.
- ⁸⁴⁸ *Ibid.*
- ⁸⁴⁹ Godfrey Thring (ed.), *Church of England Hymn Book*, 1880.
- ⁸⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 3f.
- ⁸⁵¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 2f.
- ⁸⁵² Letter from Bormann to Nafzger, Sept. 16, 1976, p. 1.
- ⁸⁵³ *Ibid.*
- ⁸⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 2f.
- ⁸⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 4.
- ⁸⁵⁶ Proposed Response of C/W to Objections by Doctrinal Reviewer, (7th batch) n.d.
- ⁸⁵⁷ [LCMS Doctrinal Reviewer's List] n.d., pp. 2-4.
- ⁸⁵⁸ Letter from DeLaney to Jarasov Vajda, CPH, Apr. 1, 1977, pp. 1-3.
- ⁸⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 1 & 4.
- ⁸⁶⁰ Memo from DeLaney to Brand, Flachman, Doan, and Vajda, May 19, 1977.
- ⁸⁶¹ "LBW" April 1977, pp. 62f., left col.
- ⁸⁶² C/W Min. of Apr. 17-19, 1977, pp. 348-350.
- ⁸⁶³ ILCW/ILC Agenda of Apr. 27-29, 1977, Exh. E-3; cf. Memo from DeLaney to C/W, June 24, 1976 pointing to TLH 140, 4:3.
- ⁸⁶⁴ ILCW Agenda May 18-19, 1977, Exh. L-3ff.; Doctrinal Review: ILCW Liturgical—April 1977-Holy Communion (text) white; ILCW: Doctrinal Reviewer Responses, n.d.
- ⁸⁶⁵ *Ibid.*
- ⁸⁶⁶ *Ibid.*
- ⁸⁶⁷ ILCW Agenda, May 18-19, 1977, Exh. L-5—L-8 [=S].
- ⁸⁶⁸ ILCW: Doctrinal Reviewer Responses, n.d.
- ⁸⁶⁹ ILCW Agenda of May 18-19, 1977, Exh. L-8.
- ⁸⁷⁰ Letter from DeLaney to the Doctrinal Reviewer, May 4, 1977; cf. Letter from Foelber (C/W Chair) to LCMS Board of Directors, Mar. 28, 1977.
- ⁸⁷¹ Response to Doctrinal Reviewer re: LBW MSS Salmon pages, *Propers*, p. 8, [July 11, 1977].
- ⁸⁷² *Ibid.*, pp. 11f.
- ⁸⁷³ No Note.
- ⁸⁷⁴ *Ibid.*
- ⁸⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, [n.d.] no pg.
- ⁸⁷⁶ (Carl Bormann), "Not Covered by Comments on General Mailings to Pastors," 5pp. [end of March 1977], p. 1.
- ⁸⁷⁷ ILCW, Comparative Report on Testing the Trial Service for Holy Communion, May 1976, pp. 1f.
- ⁸⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 3f.
- ⁸⁷⁹ Robert R. Strohl, Liturgical Testing in the LCA: A Report to the DPS Management Committee and Cabinet etc. Jan. 27, 1976, p. 8, Q. 23. Norman Wegmeyer, ALC Test Results from Use of the ILCW, April 24, 1976, p. 7. ELCC and LCMS did not analyze the comments, so no comparison may be done on their reactions.
- ⁸⁸⁰ ILCW, Comparative Report, pp. 4f.
- ⁸⁸¹ *Ibid.*, p. 5.
- ⁸⁸² In studying the categories, it finally became apparent to me that such pairing was intended by the designers but that it was either not noticed or not followed by most of the respondents, except for "challenging" & "dull" where better than ¾ of ALC, LCA, and LCMS respondents marked one or the other; so also with "easy" and "difficult" where 70% or more of the ALC, ELCC, and LCA marked one or the other.
- ⁸⁸³ Since these categories are not mutually exclusive, people could and did mark more than one response. This makes any definitive statistical analysis impossible.
- ⁸⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 8.
- ⁸⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 6f.
- ⁸⁸⁶ ILCW, "Pastors: Your Response is Needed," [n.d.], p. 1.
- ⁸⁸⁷ There is unfortunately no way to compare or correlate this pastors' survey with the pastors' responses to the penultimate distributed edition of the rites, *Liturgical Texts*, circulated in winter, 1976-1977. Further cross-

- tabulating within the surveys is impossible without the original questionnaires cross-tabulating the 1976 and 1977 surveys might have been facilitated by coding the respondents.
- ⁸⁸⁸ Concordia Teachers College, River Forest, IL, Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, SPSSH-Version 6.01. FILE: ILCW, 4/24/76, p. 60.
- ⁸⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 55-59.
- ⁸⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 61.
- ⁸⁹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 74-81.
- ⁸⁹² *Ibid.*, p. 82.
- ⁸⁹³ *Ibid.*, pp. 74-76.
- ⁸⁹⁴ The "Pastors...Response" dealing the CW-01, although it involved only seven questions, generated a wealth of data. (*Ibid.*, pp. 55-86 and Statistical Package.../25/76, pp. 1-41). The latter Package cross-tabulated the categories of "Used" and "Not Used" with "Unacceptable," "Acceptable," and "Good." Had such cross-tabulation been done with other questions, much more could have been learned. For example, 622 ALC pastors reported using the SBH Prayer of Thanksgiving. (How did they evaluate it? This was not even asked.) Of the 234 ALC respondents who evaluated the revision of the SBH prayer (CW-01, III), about 80% regarded it as OK ("Acceptable" or "Good") and 20% found it unacceptable. (Had the latter used the SBH prayer? How had they evaluated it?)
- ⁸⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 2 & 5.
- ⁸⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 4.
- ⁸⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 6.
- ⁸⁹⁸ This portion of the "Pastors...Response" is clearly the best-designed and analyzed of all the ILCW field-tests and surveys. The 14 questions generated 44 pages of print-outs (pp. 10-54.), tabulating and analyzing the responses to CW-6, as well as 13 pages regarding the use of psalmody organized by individual church bodies. (4/25/76 Statistical Package, pp. 42-56.)
- ⁸⁹⁹ 4/24/76 Statistical Package, p. 7.
- ⁹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 11.
- ⁹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 22f.
- ⁹⁰² *Ibid.*, pp. 8f.
- ⁹⁰³ LCA, Test and Review, C4-C6.
- ⁹⁰⁴ LCA Division for Parish Services, Test and Review of Liturgical Material, April 1977, B9-B10. [LCMS], Evaluation of Draft Liturgical Texts, n.d. p. 1. [ALC] Holy Communion Service Questionnaire, one for each setting, pp. 3f.; cf. Norman Wegmeyer, [ALC] Liturgical Texts, Feb. 1977, p. 3. notes 24 negative comments on triple "fault" language, e.g. "phony," "O.K. for Catholics," "breast beating." (Hereafter cited as [ALC] LT).
- ⁹⁰⁵ One was recorded in the LCA, Test and Review, B10, "too priestly and arrogant" and 14 in [ALC] LT, p. 3. LCMS, Evaluations, p. 2 notes 11 objections to the declaration of grace as an "inadequate absolution" and one request for deletion of the form "I forgive you...."
- ⁹⁰⁶ LCA, Test and Review, B10-B16. ALC Questionnaires, pp. 4-7. LCMS, Evaluation, p. 1.
- ⁹⁰⁷ LCA, Test and Review, B4. ALC Questionnaire, p. 9.
- ⁹⁰⁸ The difficulty of comparing reactions within the ALC and LCA field-tests is exacerbated by the neutral category, "neither positive nor negative." One could interpret such a not negative category as comparable to "acceptable." That seems dangerous however. Its ambiguity tempts one not only to question the wisdom of its inclusion but to disregard it. Nonetheless, I am attempting to utilize it in this interpretation.
- ⁹⁰⁹ LCA, Test and Review, B12.
- ⁹¹⁰ ALC, Questionnaire 1, p. 9. LCA, Test and Review, B4.
- ⁹¹¹ It could be argued that one should discard the "acceptable" category since, as a middle category, it might tend to attract neutral reactions. If that were done, "mostly" and "totally acceptable" responses to the text would be at 62% in ALC and 54% in LCA. In ALC "Flow" would be rated at 44% "mostly" or "totally acceptable"; in LCA it falls to 41%. Even so these statistics are remarkably close to the Ease of Learning category and may simply parallel the evaluation of the music. However, since the category "barely acceptable" follows "acceptable" I choose to regard the latter as a positive and not a neutral category. Even "barely acceptable" is slightly tending toward the positive.
- ⁹¹² LCA, Test and Review, B12-B16; ALC Questionnaires, pp. 5, 9.
- ⁹¹³ LCA, Test and Review, C6-C8; Wegmeyer, [ALC] LT, pp. 2f.
- ⁹¹⁴ Wegmeyer, [ALC] LT, p. 3; LCA Test and Review, C9-C10; LCMS, Evaluations, p. 3.
- ⁹¹⁵ LCMS, Evaluations, p. 4; Wegmeyer [ALC] LT, p. 4.
- ⁹¹⁶ LCMS, Evaluations, pp. 4f.; Wegmeyer, [ALC] LT, p. 5; LCA, Test and Review, C12-C14.
- ⁹¹⁷ LCA, Test and Review, B11-B15; ALC Questionnaires, p. 10; LCMS, Evaluations, pp. 4-6.
- ⁹¹⁸ LCA, Test and Review, C9-C18; Wegmeyer, [ALC] LT, pp. 3-7; LCMS, Evaluations, pp. 2-7.
- ⁹¹⁹ LCA, Test and Review, B20.
- ⁹²⁰ LCA, Test and Review, B20. LCMS, Evaluations, pp. 1, 7; [ALC] LT, p. 8.
- ⁹²¹ LCA, Test and Review, C18-C20; Wegmeyer, [ALC] LT.
- ⁹²² LCA, Test and Review, B25-B26; [ALC] LT, p. 22; LCMS, Evaluations, pp. 1, 15.
- ⁹²³ Wegmeyer, [ALC] LT, pp. 22f.; LCA Test and Review, C26-C27; LCMS, Evaluations, pp. 14-16.
- ⁹²⁴ ALC Questionnaire, pp. 2f.; [ALC]LT, p. 24, 27; LCMS Evaluations, pp. 1, 16; LCA Test and Review B26-B27.
- ⁹²⁵ LCMS, Evaluations, pp. 16-18; Wegmeyer, [ALC] LT, pp. 24-29; LCA, Test and Review, C27-C30.
- ⁹²⁶ LCMS, Evaluations, pp. 1, 18; [ALC] LT, p. 30; LCA, Test and Review, B27.
- ⁹²⁷ LCA Test and Review, C30-C31; Wegmeyer, [ALC] LT, pp. 30-32; LCMS, Evaluations, pp. 18f.
- ⁹²⁸ ALC Questionnaire, p. 3; LCA Test and Review, B20; [ALC] LT, p. 12; LCMS, Evaluations, pp. 1, 10f.
- ⁹²⁹ ALC Questionnaire, p. 3. [ALC] LT, p. 14; LCA, Test and Review, B21-B22, LCMS, Evaluations, pp. 1, 11f.
- ⁹³⁰ Wegmeyer, [ALC] LT, pp. 12-15; LCMS, Evaluations, pp. 10-13; LCA, Test and Review, C23.
- ⁹³¹ ALC Questionnaire, p. 2; [ALC]LT, p. 16; LCMS, Evaluations, pp. 1, 13; LCA, Test and Review, B22-23.
- ⁹³² LCA Test and Review, B23; LCMS, Evaluations, pp. 1, 13; [ALC]LT, pp. 18f.
- ⁹³³ Wegmeyer, [ALC] LT, pp. 16-20; LCA, Test and Review C-24; LCMS, Evaluations, pp. 13f.
- ⁹³⁴ LCA, Test and Review, B24; [ALC] LT, p. 20; LCMS, Evaluations, pp. 2, 14.
- ⁹³⁵ LCA, Test and Review, B24-B25; LCMS, Evaluations, pp. 1, 14; [ALC] LT, p. 21.
- ⁹³⁶ LCA, Test and Review, C25.
- ⁹³⁷ LCMS, Evaluations, p. 14; Wegmeyer, [ALC] LT, p. 21.
- ⁹³⁸ Armand A. Boehme, "Sing a New Song," *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 43 (April 1979), p. 105.
- ⁹³⁹ Lowell C. Green, "Between Luther and the 'Now'

- Generation: Some thought about 'Contemporary Worship' as Advanced by the Inter-Lutheran Commission on Worship," *The Springfielder* 39 (Dec. 1975), p. 81.
- ⁹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 82.
- ⁹⁴¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 83f.
- ⁹⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 84.
- ⁹⁴³ Larry Bailey, "In Defense of CW-2's Eucharistic 'Shape': On the 'Greening' of the Liturgy," *Lutheran Forum* 10 (Feb. 1976), p. 11.
- ⁹⁴⁴ *Ibid.*
- ⁹⁴⁵ Green, "Between Luther..." p. 84.
- ⁹⁴⁶ Bailey, "In Defense..." p. 12.
- ⁹⁴⁷ Arnold T. Krugler, "The Words of Institution: Proclamation or Prayer?" *Concordia Journal* II no. 2 (March 1976), p. 53f.
- ⁹⁴⁸ Green, "Between Luther..." p. 81.
- ⁹⁴⁹ Krugler, "The Words of Institution..." p. 53.
- ⁹⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 54f.
- ⁹⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 55.
- ⁹⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 57.
- ^{953a} *Ibid.*, pp. 57f.
- ^{953b} *Ibid.*, pp. 56-59.
- ⁹⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 60.
- ⁹⁵⁵ In a Dec. 19, 1976 letter to Paul Cornell of LCA staff, chairing the process of introduction of LBW into the congregations, Brand reported on off-the-record conversation with Pres. Ressemeyer of AELC to the effect that they were fully supportive of the ILCW's work and would prefer not to participate simply at the congregational level but perhaps become full members of the steering committee. The need not to alienate LCMS was also recognized.
- ⁹⁵⁶ Larry Bailey and Leonard Klein, "Renewing Lutheran Worship: Installment #1," *Forum Letter* (Jan. 1976), pp. 5f.
- ^{957a} *Ibid.*, #5 (Mar. 1976), p. 8.
- ^{957b} *Ibid.*, #2 (Feb. 1976), p. 8.
- ⁹⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, #3 & #4 (Mar. & Apr. 1976), p. 8 & p. 7.
- ⁹⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, #5 (May 1976), p. 7.
- ⁹⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, cf. #3 (Mar. 1976), p. 8.
- ⁹⁶¹ *Ibid.*, #7 (Aug. 1976), p. 8.
- ⁹⁶² *Ibid.*, #6 (June 1976), p. 8.
- ⁹⁶³ David Scaer, "The Great Thanksgiving of the ILCW," *The Springfielder* XL, no. 1 (June 1976), pp. 36-41.
- ⁹⁶⁴ Bailey and Klein, "Renewing Lutheran Worship," #7, *Forum Letter* (Aug. 1976), p. 8.
- ⁹⁶⁵ Grace Freed Muscarella, "A Critical Point in the Transmission of Our Tradition: CW7 versus Luther's Baptismal Rite," *Lutheran Forum* 9, no. 4 (Nov. 1975), pp. 18-20.
- ⁹⁶⁶ Robert G. Hughes, "CW7: A Critique," *The Mt. Airy Parish Practice Notebook*, no. 10 (June 1976), pp. 1-5.
- ⁹⁶⁷ Bailey and Klein, *Forum Letter* #8 (Sep. 1976), p. 8.
- ⁹⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, #9 (Oct. 1976), p. 8.
- ⁹⁶⁹ *Ibid.*
- ⁹⁷⁰ *Ibid.*
- ⁹⁷¹ *Ibid.*, #11 (Dec. 1976), p. 8.
- ⁹⁷² Edgar R. Trexler, "Almost everything you wanted to know about the new hymnal," *The Lutheran* (Jan. 7, 1976), pp. 4f.
- ⁹⁷³ *Ibid.*, p. 6.
- ⁹⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 4-7.
- ⁹⁷⁵ Clarence L. Lee, "The Great Thanksgiving: A Critical Review," *The Mt. Airy Parish Practice Notebook* 50, no. 10 (June 1976), p. 5.
- ⁹⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 5f.
- ⁹⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 6.
- ⁹⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 7.
- ⁹⁷⁹ No Note.
- ⁹⁸⁰ David P. Scaer, "The Great Thanksgiving of the ILCW," *The Springfielder* XL, no. 1 (June 1976), p. 36.
- ⁹⁸¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 38f.
- ⁹⁸² *Ibid.*, p. 39.
- ⁹⁸³ *Ibid.*, p. 41.
- ⁹⁸⁴ Gottfried G. 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: I, 1976.
- ⁹⁸⁵ In 1980, a study done under the auspices of the Lutheran Council in the USA and Lutheran World Ministries was published commemorating the 450th anniversary of the Augsburg Confession. Among other topics it examined the LBW in the light of the Augsburg Confession. Eugene L. Brand (ed.), "The Augsburg Confession in the United States," in *Currents in Theology & Mission* 7, no. 2 (April 1980), pp. 81-85.
- ⁹⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 30f.
- ⁹⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 3, 7f., 13, 29.
- ⁹⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 11, 18.
- ⁹⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 6.
- ⁹⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 16.
- ⁹⁹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 7f.
- ⁹⁹² *Ibid.*, pp. 10f.
- ⁹⁹³ *Ibid.*, pp. 11f.; cf. pp. 25-28.
- ⁹⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 13f.
- ⁹⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 17; n.b. p. 33, n. 79.
- ⁹⁹⁶ *Ibid.*
- ⁹⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 17f.
- ⁹⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 19.
- ⁹⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 19f.
- ¹⁰⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 20, n. 132; cf. Solid Declaration VII (BC 582.73-584.84).
- ¹⁰⁰¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 25-28.
- ¹⁰⁰² *Ibid.*, p. 21.
- ^{1002b} *Ibid.*, p. 22.
- ¹⁰⁰³ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁰⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 24.
- ¹⁰⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 25.
- ¹⁰⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 27f.
- ¹⁰⁰⁷ Cf. "Our action vs. Christ's action," p. 29.
- ¹⁰⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 28.
- ¹⁰⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 29.
- ¹⁰¹⁰ [D. Judisch], "The Deepening Liturgical Crisis," *Concordia Theological Quarterly*, XLI, no. 1 (Jan. 1977), p. 50.
- ¹⁰¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 51.
- ¹⁰¹² *Ibid.*, pp. 50f.
- ¹⁰¹³ Theo. DeLaney, "The Deepening Liturgical Crisis: A Response," unpublished document, Concordia Historical Institute file ETD 848, pp. 1, 9-12.
- ¹⁰¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 13.
- ¹⁰¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 3.
- ¹⁰¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 7.
- ¹⁰¹⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 7-9.
- ¹⁰¹⁸ Judisch, "Deepening...Crisis," p. 52.
- ¹⁰¹⁹ DeLaney, "Response," p. 14.
- ¹⁰²⁰ "Some Thoughts on the New Hymnal," *Affirm* (Feb. 21, 1977), p. 4.
- ¹⁰²¹ [D. Judisch], "Theological Observer: DeLaney's Defense of the ILCW" *Concordia Theological Quarterly* XLI, no. 3 (July 1977), p. 46.
- ¹⁰²² *Ibid.*, pp. 46f.

- ¹⁰²⁴ Ibid., p. 48.
¹⁰²⁵ Ibid., pp. 47f.
¹⁰²⁶ Ibid., pp. 48f.
¹⁰²⁷ Ibid., p. 49.
¹⁰²⁸ Ibid.
¹⁰²⁹ Ibid., p. 50.
¹⁰³⁰ Editorial, *The Bride of Christ* I, no. 2 (May 1977), n.p.
¹⁰³¹ Ibid.
¹⁰³² Ibid.
¹⁰³³ Ibid.
¹⁰³⁴ Paul J. Foelber, "Lutheran Book of Worship," *Concordia Journal* 3, no. 3 (May 1977), pp. 107-109.
¹⁰³⁵ Wayne E. Schmidt, "Lutheran Book of Worship—A Perspective," *Concordia Journal* 3, no. 3 (May 1977), p. 99.
¹⁰³⁶ Ibid., pp. 100-102.
¹⁰³⁷ Ibid., pp. 102f.
¹⁰³⁸ Ibid., p. 104.
¹⁰³⁹ Ibid.
¹⁰⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 105.
¹⁰⁴¹ Ibid., pp. 105f.
¹⁰⁴² David Held, "Issues at Dallas: The Proposed New Hymnal" *The Lutheran Witness* (May 22, 1977), pp. 198f.
¹⁰⁴³ Kenneth P. Kothe, "Issues at Dallas," p. 199.
¹⁰⁴⁴ Ibid., p. 200.
¹⁰⁴⁵ Richard T. DuBrau, "Issues at Dallas," p. 200.
¹⁰⁴⁶ Ibid., p. 201.
¹⁰⁴⁷ Ibid.
¹⁰⁴⁸ ILCW Min. of Nov. 11-13, 1975, 75-12—75-13.
¹⁰⁴⁹ HTC Min. of Mar. 31-Apr. 1, 1976, 76-1—76-5; 76-5—76-8; 76-10f.
¹⁰⁵⁰ JHC Min. of Mar. 31-Apr. 1, 1976, 76-6.
¹⁰⁵¹ Ibid.
¹⁰⁵² JHC Min. of Oct. 18-20, 1976, Exh. B.
¹⁰⁵³ Ibid., 79-9.
¹⁰⁵⁴ JHC Min. of Mar. 31-Apr. 1, 1976, 76-6.
¹⁰⁵⁵ JHC Min. of Oct. 18-20, 1976, Exh. A.
¹⁰⁵⁶ Ibid., 76-9.
¹⁰⁵⁷ JHC SC in Indexing Min. of Apr. 21-22, 1976, 76-1f.; Rationale.
¹⁰⁵⁸ JHC Min. of Oct. 18-20, 1976, 76-8.
¹⁰⁵⁹ Ibid., 76-10.
¹⁰⁶⁰ Ibid., 76-10f.
¹⁰⁶¹ Ibid. p. 7.
¹⁰⁶² Memorandum of DeLaney to HTC, Oct. 4, 1976, pp. 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9.
¹⁰⁶³ ILCW Min. of May 18-19, 1977, 77-6.
¹⁰⁶⁴ Eugene L. Brand, Position Paper on Liturgical Matters, Mar. 4, 1976 (Confidential), p. 1.
¹⁰⁶⁵ Ibid., pp. 1f.
¹⁰⁶⁶ Ibid., p. 2.
¹⁰⁶⁷ Ibid.
¹⁰⁶⁸ Ibid., pp. 2f.
¹⁰⁶⁹ ILCW/LMC Min. of Feb. 26-27, 1976, 76-2f.
¹⁰⁷⁰ LTC Min. of Apr. 26-28, 1976, 76-2.
¹⁰⁷¹ Ibid., 76-6.
¹⁰⁷² Ibid., 76-3.
¹⁰⁷³ Ibid., 76-5.
¹⁰⁷⁴ Ibid., 76-4.
¹⁰⁷⁵ Ibid., 76-11.
¹⁰⁷⁶ Ibid., 76-8.
¹⁰⁷⁷ Ibid., 76-10.
¹⁰⁷⁸ LMC Min. of June 13-16, 1976, 76-16.
¹⁰⁷⁹ ILCW/XC Min. of May 3-4, 1976, 76-4.

- ¹⁰⁸⁰ Ibid., 76-6f.
¹⁰⁸¹ Ibid., 76-9f.
¹⁰⁸² ILCW/XC Min. of Nov. 9 & 11, 1976, 76-16.
¹⁰⁸³ ILCW Min. of Nov. 10-11, 1976, 76-8.
¹⁰⁸⁴ Ibid., 76-8f.
¹⁰⁸⁵ Ibid., 76-9.
¹⁰⁸⁶ Ibid., 76-10.
¹⁰⁸⁷ LTC/SC Report of Dec. 5-8, 1976, 76-7.
¹⁰⁸⁸ Ibid., 76-7—76-9.
¹⁰⁸⁹ LTC Min. of Jan. 19-21, 1977, 77-1f.
¹⁰⁹⁰ Ibid., 77-6.
¹⁰⁹¹ JLC Agenda, Exh. B-1.
¹⁰⁹² Ibid., Exh. B-2.
¹⁰⁹³ ILCW Approved Changes May 20, 1977, p. 7.
¹⁰⁹⁴ LTC Min. of Jan. 19-21, 1977, 77-2f.
¹⁰⁹⁵ Ibid., 77-4f.
¹⁰⁹⁶ Ibid., 77-4.
¹⁰⁹⁷ LMC/SC Min. of Mar. 24-26, 1977, 77-1f.
¹⁰⁹⁸ LMC Min. of Apr. 27-29, 1977, 77-1.
¹⁰⁹⁹ Ibid., 77-2f.
¹¹⁰⁰ LTC Min. of Apr. 27-29, 1977, 77-1f.
¹¹⁰¹ JLC Agenda Apr. 27-29, 1977, Exh. A-1.
¹¹⁰² Memo from Bonderud to Preus, May 16, 1977, p. 1.
¹¹⁰³ LCMS/CW Min. of Apr. 17-19, 1977, p. 348.
¹¹⁰⁴ JLC Agenda of Apr. 27-29, 1977, Exh. A-1f.
¹¹⁰⁵ Memo from Mons Teig to ALC/RG, May 5, 1977, p. 3.
¹¹⁰⁶ Ibid., p. 4.
¹¹⁰⁷ ILCW Approved Changes in Liturgical Materials, May 20, 1977, p. 4.
¹¹⁰⁸ ALC/RG Min. of May 6-7, 1977, 77-23.
¹¹⁰⁹ Teig memo, p. 5.
¹¹¹⁰ Ibid., p. 6; Agenda of Apr. 27-29, 1977, Exh. A-3.
¹¹¹¹ Ibid.
¹¹¹² ILCW Approved Changes, May 20, 1977, p. 5.
¹¹¹³ Ibid., p. 9.
¹¹¹⁴ Teig memo, p. 7.
¹¹¹⁵ John W. Doberstein, ed., *Minister's Prayer Book* (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg, 1959) pp. 18f.
¹¹¹⁶ ILCW Approved Changes in the Liturgical Materials (Apr. 1977), May 10, 1977, p. 3.
¹¹¹⁷ LCMS/CW Min. of Apr. 17-19, 1977, p. 349.
¹¹¹⁸ ILCW Changes, May 20, 1977, p. 4.
¹¹¹⁹ Ibid., p. 6.
¹¹²⁰ ILCW Min. of May 18-19, 1977, 77-10.
¹¹²¹ ILCW Approved Changes, May 20, 1977, p. 18.
¹¹²² Ibid., pp. 22f.
¹¹²³ ILCW/XC Min. of Sep. 23, 1977, 77-8.
¹¹²⁴ Ibid., Addendum B.
¹¹²⁵ Ibid., 77-10.
¹¹²⁶ No Note.
¹¹²⁷ No Note.
¹¹²⁸ No Note.
- Chapter V
- ¹¹²⁹ ILCW Min. of May 18-19, 1977, 77-4f.
¹¹³⁰ Letter from Jaroslav Vajda to Gilbert Doan, Feb. 9, 1977.
¹¹³¹ ILCW Min. of May 18-19, 1977, 77-6.
¹¹³² Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, Convention Proceedings, 52nd Regular Convention, Dallas, Texas, July 15-22, 1977, p. 67.
¹¹³³ Ibid., pp. 125f.
¹¹³⁴ Ibid., pp. 107f.
¹¹³⁵ ILCW/XC Min. of Sep. 23, 1977, Addendum A.
¹¹³⁶ Ibid., pp. 109f.

- 1137 Memo from Brand to ILCW, July 25, 1977, p. 1.
- 1138 *Missouri in Perspective*, Dec. 5, 1977, p. 10.
- 1139 Brand's memo to ILCW, July 25, 1977, pp. 1f.
- 1140 *Ibid.*, p. 4.
- 1141 LCMS Convention Proceedings, p. 127.
- 1142 *Ibid.*, pp. 127f., Resolution 3-04A.
- 1143 *Ibid.*, pp. 128f.
- 1144 *Ibid.*, p. 128; cf. "LCMS Delay Action of Hymnal Amounts to a Withdrawal," *Missouri in Perspective* (Aug. 1, 1977), p. 3.
- 1145 *Ibid.*
- 1146 Letter from Henry Abram to Paul Foelber and Eugene Brand, Aug. 24, 1977, p. 2. Letter from Robert Sauer to SHRC, Aug. 26, 1977.
- 1147 *Ibid.*, p. 1.
- 1148 Abram's letter, pp. 2f.
- 1149 SHRC Min. of Sep. 21, 1977, pp. 5f.
- 1150 SHRC Min. of Sep. 22, 1977, p. 8.
- 1151 ILCW/XC Min. of Sep. 23, 1977, Addendum A.
- 1152 ILCW/XC Agenda of Sep. 23-24, 1977, Exh. A-2 & A-5.
- 1153A *Ibid.*, A-3.
- 1153B *Ibid.* Addendum B.
- 1154 *Ibid.*, A-3—A-5; cf. Memo from Brand to Sauer, Sep. 26, 1977.
- 1155 ILCW/XC Min. of Sep. 23-24, 1977, 77-10.
- 1156 Memo of Brand to Sauer, Sep. 26, 1977, pp. 1f.
- 1157 Letter from Abram to Brand and Foelber, Aug. 24, 1977, p. 4.
- 1158 Note on memo from Sauer to SHRC, Oct. 3, 1977.
- 1159 SHRC Min. of Oct. 14-15, 1977, p. 9.
- 1160 *Ibid.*, p. 13. Explaining Abram's resignation, the SHRC secretary, Lorenz Wunderlich, later wrote (June 11, 1978) "Pastor Henry Abram...felt that he could not in good conscience work with committee members with whose opinions he was frequently in disagreement."
- 1161 *Ibid.*, p. 10.
- 1162 *Ibid.*, pp. 11f.
- 1163 *Missouri in Perspective*, Oct. 24, 1977, p. 2.
- 1164 *Reporter* 3, no. 43 (Oct. 24, 1977), p. 3.
- 1165 *Perspective*, Oct. 24, 1977, p. 2. Cf. Reinke's denials of the conflict in *Perspective*, Nov. 7, 1977, p. 3.
- 1166 *Des Moines Register*, Nov. 17, 1977, p. 5A.
- 1167 *Los Angeles Times*, Nov. 22, 1977, Pt. I, p. 28.
- 1168 *Minneapolis Tribune*, Nov. 17, 1977, p. 8B.
- 1169 *Missouri in Perspective*, Dec. 5, 1977, p. 10.
- 1170 Letter of Henry Abram to SHRC, Oct. 18, 1977.
- 1171 *Missouri in Perspective*, Oct. 24, 1977, p. 2.
- 1172 *Minneapolis Tribune*, Nov. 17, 1977, p. 8B.
- 1173 SHRC Min. of Nov. 18-19, 1977, p. 17; cf. Report and Recommendations of SHRC, p. 22 which seems to make the Latin, German, and English translations authoritative.
- 1174 *Ibid.* cf. Pres. David Preus's Sep. 7, 1977 letter to Marvin Roloff, the Recorder of the Steering Committee for Introducing the LBW, about involvement of LCMS congregations, ends with a cryptic reference to everything being handled satisfactorily soon!
- 1175 CW Resignation Statement, *Missouri in Perspective*, Dec. 5, 1977, p. 10.
- 1176 SHRC News Release, Nov. 21, 1977.
- 1177 Eugene L. Brand, Statement in response to release from SHRC (Nov. 21, 1977), Nov. 22, 1977.
- 1178 Herb Berry, "The Late Great *Lutheran Book of Worship*," *The Bride of Christ* 2, no. 1 (Advent 1977), p. 34.
- 1179 SHRC Min. of Dec. 9-10, 1977, p. 20.
- 1180 Report and Recommendations of the SHRC, pp. 31-36, 42.
- 1181 Letter from Hans Boehringer to Robert Sauer, Dec. 29, 1977.
- 1182 Letter from Brand to LCMS/C/W, Nov. 28, 1977.
- 1183 LCMS, Report and Recommendations of the Special Hymnal Review Committee, n.d. pp. 31-37.
- 1184 *Ibid.*, pp. 4-6; 19 of these were ultimately *not* included in LW.
- 1185 *Ibid.*, p. 42.
- 1186 *Ibid.*, pp. 37-41.
- 1187 *Ibid.*, p. 41.
- 1188 Based on Fred L. Precht and Kay E. Cogswell, Comparative Hymn List, October 1982.
- 1189 *Reports and Actions of the ALC Convention*, October 6-12, 1976, Washington, DC, pp. 537-541.
- 1190 Letter from Rev. Phillip Bohlken to SHRC, May 16, 1978.
- 1191 Letter from David Scaer to *Lutheran Witness*, May 10, 1978.
- 1192 Reports and Recommendations of SHRC, pp. 19-21.
- 1193 Letter from Robert Schaible to SHRC, June 6, 1978.
- 1194 Letter from Winfred Schaller to SHRC, June 11, 1978.
- 1195-1205 No Note.
- 1206 Letter from Brand to Jacobsen, Marshall, and D.W. Preus citing a letter of J.A.O. Preus to ILCW's secretary, Feb. 2, 1976.
- 1207 ALC/Office of Communication News Release, Jan. 25, 1978, pp. 1-3.
- 1208 ILCW/XC Min. of Jan. 16, 1978, 1789, 78-2f.
- 1209 *Ibid.*
- 1210 *Ibid.*, p. 4.
- 1211 *Ibid.*, 78-2 & 78-6.
- 1212 Interview with Leonard Flachman, Oct. 26, 1989, typescript, pp. 10f., 26f.
- 1213 *Ibid.*, pp. 8f.
- 1214 *Ibid.*, pp. 15f.
- 1215 *Ibid.*, pp. 16f.
- 1216 *Ibid.*, pp. 11-13.
- 1217 EPC Min. of Sep. 22-23, 1975, 75-3f.
- 1218 EPC Min. of Jan. 20-21, 1976, 76-5.
- 1219 Letter from Robert Wetzler to Leland Sateren of Augsburg College, Feb. 1, 1978; copies to Leonard Flachman and Albert Anderson.
- 1220 Letter from Flachman to Wetzler, Feb. 7, 1978.
- 1221 Letter from Anderson to Wetzler, Feb. 7, 1978.
- 1222 Letter from Wetzler to Sateren, Feb. 2, 1978.
- 1223 Flachman Interview, Oct. 26, 1989, pp. 20f.
- 1224 Some thirty-five anonymous comments from one-liners ("I'll give LBW a life-expectance of eight years at most.") to lengthy paragraphs, Wetzler letterhead, n.d.
- 1225 EPC Min. of Jan. 20-21, 1976, 76-2f.
- 1226 Flachman interview, Oct. 26, 1990, pp. 22f.
- 1227 *Ibid.*, p. 21.
- 1228 ILCW/XC Min. of Nov. 27, 1978, 78-9f.
- 1229 *Ibid.*, 78-11f.
- 1230 *Ibid.*, 79-13.
- 1231 Wolf, *Documents*, pp. 408-430.
- 1232 *Ibid.*, p. 430.
- 1233 *Ibid.*, pp. 170f.
- 1234 *Ibid.*, pp. 15f.
- 1235 *Ibid.*, p. 14.
- 1236 Handbook of The American Lutheran Church, Edition of 1960 (revised to 1963), p. 175. Hereafter cited as United Testimony.
- 1237 *Ibid.*, p. 176.
- 1238 *Ibid.*

- ²³⁹ Ibid., p. 179.
- ²⁴⁰ Ibid., pp. 179-180.
- ²⁴¹ Ibid.
- ¹²⁴² Michael B. Aune, "Doctrine and Doxology: Toward a Creative Balance in American Lutheran Liturgical Theology and Practice." (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Notre Dame, 1981), p. 138.
- ^{1243a} Edgar S. Brown (ed.), *Liturgical Reconnaissance* (Papers presented at the Inter-Lutheran Consultation of Worship, Feb. 10-11, 1966, Chicago, Illinois; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968), p. 34, par. 2. Hereafter 1960 ULCA Statement.
- ^{1243b} 1960 ULCA statement, p. 34, par. 5.
- ^{1243c} Ibid., pp. 35f., par. 12-16.
- ^{1243d} Ibid., p. 37, par. 19.
- ¹²⁴⁴ Quere, *Melanchthon*, pp. 352-362.
- ¹²⁴⁵ Paul Tillich, *Systematic Theology* Vol. III (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963), p. 123.
- ^{1246a} 1960 ULCA statement, p. 36, par. 14.
- ^{1246b} Ibid., pp. 35-40.
- ^{1246c} Second Biennial Convention of the Lutheran Church in America, Pittsburgh, PA, July 2-9, 1964, Minutes. Hereafter cited as 1964 LCA Statement, p. 296.
- ^{1246d} Ibid., p. 298.
- ^{1246e} Ibid., p. 330.
- ^{1246f} Ibid., pp. 299f.
- ^{1246g} Ibid., p. 301.
- ^{1247a} The American Lutheran Church, "Statement on Communion Practice," A statement adopted by the Fourth General Convention of the ALC on Oct. 19, 1968. Hereafter cited as 1968 ALC Statement.
- ^{1247b} 1968 ALC statement, p. 2.
- ^{1247c} Ibid., p. 3.
- ^{1247d} Ibid., p. 4; cf. P. 2.
- ^{1247e} Ibid., p. 5.
- ^{1248a} The Report of the Joint Commission on the Theology and Practice of Confirmation to the honorable Presidents of the American Lutheran Church, the Lutheran Church in America, The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, March 7, 1970 in Fifth Biennial Convention of the Lutheran Church in America, Minneapolis, June 25-July 2, 1970, minutes p. 577. Hereafter cited as Confirmation Report.
- ^{1248b} Ibid., p. 577.
- ^{1248c} Ibid., p. 578.
- ^{1248d} Ibid., p. 578f.
- ^{1248e} Ibid., p. 579.
- ^{1248f} Ibid., p. 582.
- ^{1248g} Ibid.
- ¹²⁴⁹ Report of the ALC-LCA Committee to Study Communion Practices, February 26, 1976, Part I, Par. 3; cf. II A7b.
- ¹²⁵⁰ Lowell C. Green, "The Statement on Communion Practices: A Critical Appraisal," *Concordia Review* II, no. 2 (July 1976), p. 7.
- ^{1251a} The American Lutheran Church and The Lutheran Church in America, Statement on Communion Practices, Advent 1978, adopted by the 1978 Conventions, I, 3. Cf. II A2a: "...the Crucified and Risen Lord is here truly present." Cf. II A7b. See Ninth General Convention of the American Lutheran Church, Moorhead, MN, Oct. 18-24, 1978, Reports and Actions, p. 909.
- ^{1251b} Eighth Biennial Convention of the Lutheran Church in America, Boston, July 21-28, 1976, Minutes, p. 388; cf. pp. 392f.
- ^{1251c} ALC Reports and Actions, p. 909.
- ^{1252a} Ibid., p. 849f.
- ^{1252b} Ibid., II A2, p. 909.
- ^{1252c} Ibid., II B2, p. 911.
- ^{1252d} Ibid., II A2, p. 909; cf. LCA 1976 Minutes, p. 387
- ^{1252e} ALC Reports and Actions, II A7, p. 910.
- ^{1252f} Ibid.
- ¹²⁵³ Erik Routley, "The New Lutheran Book of Worship: A Preview of Hymns" *Worship* 52, no. 5 (Sept. 1978), pp. 403f.
- ¹²⁵⁴ Ibid., p. 404
- ¹²⁵⁵ Ibid., pp. 404f.
- ¹²⁵⁶ Ibid., p. 407.
- ¹²⁵⁷ Ibid., p. 405.
- ¹²⁵⁸ Ibid., pp. 406f.
- ¹²⁵⁹ Ibid., p. 408.
- ¹²⁶⁰ Larry Bailey and Leonard Klein, "Renewing Lutheran Worship: Installment #38," *Forum Letter* 9, no.3 (Mar. 21, 1980), p. 8.
- ¹²⁶¹ Ibid.
- ¹²⁶² Bailey and Klein, "Renewing...Installment #39," *Forum Letter* 9, no. 9 (Sept. 26, 1980), p. 8.
- ¹²⁶³ Ibid.
- ¹²⁶⁴ Ibid.
- ¹²⁶⁵ Ibid.
- ¹²⁶⁶ Bailey and Klein, "Renewing...: Installment #40," *Forum Letter* 9, no. 11 (Nov. 14, 1980), p. 8.
- ¹²⁶⁷ Ibid.
- ¹²⁶⁸ Bailey and Klein, "Renewing...: Installment #42," *Forum Letter* 10, no.1 (Jan. 23, 1981), p. 8.
- ¹²⁶⁹ Bailey and Klein, "Renewing...: Installment #42," *Forum Letter* 10, no. 2 (Mar. 6, 1981), p. 8.
- ¹²⁷⁰ Bailey and Klein, "Renewing...: Installment #46," *Forum Letter* 10, no. 11 (Nov. 30, 1981), p. 8.
- ¹²⁷¹ Ibid.
- ¹²⁷² Bailey and Klein, "Renewing...: Installment #17," *Forum Letter* 6, no. 8 (Aug. 26, 1977), pp. 7f.
- ¹²⁷³ Bailey and Klein, "Renewing...: Installment #18," *Forum Letter* 6, no. 10 (Oct. 21, 1977), pp. 7f
- ¹²⁷⁴ Eugene L. Brand (ed.), "The Augsburg Confession in the United States," *Currents in Theology & Mission* 7 (April 1980) 2, 82-85 contain excerpts from this section which I prepared for the Lutheran World Ministries/LCUSA study published here.
- ¹²⁷⁵ Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition*, Vol. 2: *The Spirit of Eastern Christendom (600-1700)* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1974), p. 6.
- ¹²⁷⁶ Edmund Schlink, *Theology of the Lutheran Confessions*, trans., Paul F. Koehnke and Herbert J.A. Bouman (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1961), pp. xv-xxiii.
- ¹²⁷⁷ AC XXI (BC 47.1) adds "the church of Rome." Cf. Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition*, 1:333 on the dictum of Vincent of Lerins concerning universality, antiquity and consensus in doctrine. The Hymn Text Committee had stated that it was a basic purpose of a hymnal to express the doctrine of a church body (HTC Minutes, Jan. 16, 1971, 71-4). Strangely enough, the ALC Review Group criticized the hymns as "overburdened by doctrinal statements" and the attempt to tell the "whole story of salvation" (ALC/ RG Minutes, Feb. 26-29, 1976, 76-11).
- ¹²⁷⁸ Clifford J. Swanson, Progress Report of the Inter-Lutheran Commission on Worship (by the LLCW Chairperson), November, 1974, p. 1.
- ¹²⁷⁹ Ibid.
- ¹²⁸⁰ Gilbert E. Doan, Jr., "American Lutherans," *Liturgy* 20 (June-July 1975): 179. The danger here is that vox

- populi* is confused with *vox dei*. While being attentive to the preferences and protests of the people of God, all issues cannot be resolved by voting. There are times when a solitary prophetic voice is virtually alone against a majority of Christian opinion. The excesses of "you and me against the world" cannot rule out lonely witnesses like Maximus Confessor or Martin Luther.
- ¹²⁸¹ James Haney, Remarks as a Respondent, Theological Consultation on Liturgical Rites (ILCW), February 25-27, 1976.
- ¹²⁸² Minutes of the Inter-Lutheran Consultation on Worship, February 10, 1966, p. 1.
- ¹²⁸³ *Ibid.*, p. 3. Cf. Walter E. Buszin, "Tradition and Meaning in Our Worship Today: The Synodical Conference," in *Liturgical Reconnaissance*, ed. Edgar S. Brown, Jr. (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1968), pp. 85-87.
- ¹²⁸⁴ Press Release of the Inter-Lutheran Consultation on Worship, February 10-11, 1966; Minutes, p. 7.
- ¹²⁸⁵ In its statement of purpose, adopted February 6-7, 1967, the ILCW was "to re-evaluate and to continue the church's rich tradition of worship and music" (Minutes of the ILCW, February 6-7, 1967, Appendix A, 67-1). Cf. Edward A. Hansen, "Hymn Texts: Languages, Images, and Forms for Today," address presented to the ILCW, April 29, 1969, pp. 3 and 5, citing A.R. Kretzmann, "The Definition of the Task Before Us," also in *Liturgical Reconnaissance*, pp. 131 and 133: "This, then, must be a book of confessional principle, as well as a cultural sampling—a book of quality, as well as a treasury of favorite hymns—a book of sound theology, as well as a social instrument." Again: "our work is an attempt, once more, on the basis of the best on the old and in the new, to take a world, far from God, to beauty and truth also by means of the Scripture and the confessional character of our liturgy and hymnody."
- ¹²⁸⁶ Minutes of the ILCW Executive Committee, February 1-2, 1972, Exhibit B.
- ¹²⁸⁷ News Release of the ALC Convention, October, 1974.
- ¹²⁸⁸ Swanson, Progress Report, p. 11; cf. ILCW Agenda, Nov. 13-14, 1974, Exhibit I, 74-1.
- ¹²⁸⁹ ILCW Memorandum from Eugene L. Brand, July 25, 1977. Swanson had astutely observed that "the theology of most church members is determined far more powerfully by the hymnal than by sermons or by the lessons of the church school or the catechetical class." On pp. 2-3 of the same report, in "The Rationale for the Proposed Service Book," Swanson noted the ILCW's priorities. He stated that three current emphases in liturgical renewal are evident in the format of the book: (1) the primacy of Baptism in the life of the Church; (2) an emphasis on the involvement of the laity in the leading of worship, growing out of a new appreciation of the biblical concept of the people of God; and (3) the centrality of the Holy Communion in the worship of the Church. The reference to laity "leading" worship did not mean ILCW supported lay persons "presiding" in sacramental actions or preaching, but rather serving as "assisting ministers" in the Holy Communion or "leading" in the various services of Daily Prayer.
- ¹²⁹⁰ Cf. Swanson, Progress Report, p. 3.
- ¹²⁹¹ Cf. Philip Melancthon, *Loci Communes Theologici (1521)*, in *Melancthon and Bruer*, Vol. XIX, *The Library of Christian Classics*, ed. Wilhelm Pauck (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1969), p. 21, where "to know Christ means to know his benefits" is the soteriological theme of this early dogmatics.
- ¹²⁹² ILCW Approved Changes in the Liturgical Materials (April 1977 edition), May 20, 1977, p. 3.
- ¹²⁹³ It is interesting to note the Hymn Text Committee meeting, April 15-17, 1970, stated that the number of baptismal hymns had been steadily decreasing during this century. Of the eight new hymns on Baptism on CW-4 (1972), six mention the Holy Spirit. Two of these (LBW 195 and 387) are primarily about the Spirit's work in Baptism. "Regeneration" is celebrated in LBW 189, 2; 193; 195, 2. ILCW Minutes, Nov. 5-6, 1970, Exh. B.
- ¹²⁹⁴ A study report at the Hymn Text Committee meeting, April 15-17, 1970, stated that the number of baptismal hymns had been steadily decreasing during this century. Of the eight new hymns on Baptism in CW-4 (1972), six mention the Holy Spirit. Two of these (LBW 195 and 387) are primarily about the Spirit's work in Baptism. Regeneration is celebrated in LBW 189, 2; 193; 195, 2. See ILCW Minutes, Nov. 5-6, 1970, Exh. B.
- ¹²⁹⁵ It is suggested that as the garment is given, a representative of the congregation may say, "Put on this robe, for in Baptism you have been clothed in the righteousness of Christ, who calls you to his great feast."
- ¹²⁹⁶ Critique submitted by Walter R. Wietzke, ALC Division for Theological Education and Ministry, November 26, 1973.
- ¹²⁹⁷ A complex tension is seen here in the (anachronistic) confessional literalism which argues that what the Apostles' Creed *meant* is what the Book of Concord says it *means*. This would imply that the Book of Concord's changes in the received texts of the creeds are authoritative and definitive, e.g. from "catholic" to "Christian" in the third article. However, in the same way that no Lutheran would allow the Book of Concord to determine the text of Scripture, similarly the task of textual criticism and historical-grammatical investigation of the text of the ecumenical creeds must proceed freely.
- ¹²⁹⁸ It would seem from "A Brief Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles" by J.A.O. Preus that the actual concern of many in the LCMS was a fear that the new translation was a denial of hell and promotion of universal salvation. (See Preus, "Statement" 1, 3. Cf. Report and Recommendations of the Special Hymnal Review Committee, pp. 23-24).
- ¹²⁹⁹ See Paul Rorcem, "Luther's Objection to a Eucharistic Prayer," *The Cresset* (March 1975), 12-16.
- ¹³⁰⁰ See Gerhard O. Forde, *Where God Meets Man* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1972), pp. 10, 34, 41-44; *idem.*, *The Law-Gospel Debate* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1969), pp. 36-38.
- ¹³⁰¹ See Eugene L. Brand, "Luther's Liturgical Surgery," in *Interpreting Luther's Legacy*, eds. Fred W. Meuser and Stanley D. Schneider (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1969), pp. 108-119. Cf. Lutherans and Catholics in Dialogue III, *The Eucharist as Sacrifice*, eds. Paul C. Empie and T. Austin Murray (Minneapolis: Augsburg, n.d.) pp. 7-26, 187-99.
- ¹³⁰² Yngve Brilioth, *Eucharist Faith and Practice*, trans. A.G. Herbert (London: S.P.C.K., 1965), p. 131.
- ¹³⁰³ *Ibid.* Cf. Paul Zeller Strodtach, *A Manual on Worship*, rev. ed. (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg, 1946), pp. 205 and 365; and Luther D. Reed, *The Lutheran Liturgy* (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg, 1947), pp. 21, 69, and 772.
- ¹³⁰⁴ See Arnold F. Krugler, "The Words of Institution: Proclamation or Prayer?" *Concordia Journal* 2 (March 1976), 56: "For Lutherans, prayer is a

sacrifice that we as Christians offer. Hence it is our work. To imbed Christ's Words of Promise into the Eucharistic Prayer is to destroy their character as Gospel to the congregation." Cf. Rorem, "Luther's Objection," *Cresset* (March 1975), pp. 12-16.

¹³⁰⁵ Gerhard Forde in an ILCW Pamphlet, "A 'Great Thanksgiving' for Lutherans?" and Oliver K. Olson in "The Mix Makes the Muddle," *Lutheran Standard* 12 (June 20, 1972), 11 cite Luther's "Babylonian Captivity," *Luther's Works* 36:52: "The same thing cannot be received and offered at the same time...." But Luther goes on to say: "For the bread and wine are offered beforehand for blessing in order that they may be sanctified by the Word and by the prayer (I. Tim. 4:5), but after they have been blessed and consecrated they are no longer offered, but received as a gift from God" (p. 54).

¹³⁰⁶ Unity has throughout Christian history been understood as an important aspect of Holy Communion, which has been called the "sacrament of unity," in spite of the controversies that have clustered about it. The incorporation into the body of Christ wrought in Baptism is nourished and received through eating the sacramental body of Christ. Although it was a common theme in the early years of the Reformation, because of the polemical situation in the 1520s this motif fell into disuse in Lutheran polemical theological writings. The theme reappears in LBW 221, 206, 255, 204 st. 2.

¹³⁰⁷ It was the early conviction of some in ILCW in 1967 that "it is conceivable that the day of one rite, uniform in most particulars, for all English-speaking Lutherans is past.... We may finally provide a basic structural framework for common use which would allow for optimum change and variation" (Eugene Brand cited in ILCW Minutes, February 6-7, 1967, Appendix D. 67-2). Similarly, Philip Pfatteicher asserted that one form of liturgy cannot speak to all people. "We live in widely divergent cultures and sub-cultures and there is no reason to insist on one rite." This, Pfatteicher suggested, was based on the "good Lutheran principal" of Augustana VII (cited in Liturgical Text Committee Study Documents 20, undated, but presumably ca. 1970).

Appendix A

ABBREVIATIONS

AELC	American Evangelical Lutheran Church
AELC	Association of Evangelical Lutheran Churches
ALC	The American Lutheran Church
BC	Book of Concord, Tappert ed., 1959
BCP	Book of Common Prayer
CCW	Consulting Committee of Worship- LCA
CTCR	Commission on Theology and Church Relations- LCMS
C/W	Commission on Worship- LCMS
CW	Contemporary Worship booklets (in 10 volumes)
DBCP	Draft Proposed Book of Common Prayer
DPS/MC	Management Committee of the Division of Parish Services- LCA
ELCA	Evangelical Lutheran Church in America
ELCC	Evangelical Lutheran Church of Canada
EPC	Editorial Policy Committee
FC Ep	Formula of Concord Epitome
FC SD	Formula of Concord Solid Declaration
HMC	Hymn Music Committee- ILCW committee
HTC	Hymn Text Committee- ILCW committee
ICET	International Consultation on English Texts
ILCW	Inter-Lutheran Commission on Worship

JHC	Joint Hymn Committee- ILCW, combines HMC and HTC
JLC	Joint Liturgical Committee- ILCW, combines LMC and LTC
LBW	Lutheran Book of Worship
LBW:MDE	Lutheran Book of Worship: Ministers Desk Edition
LCA	Lutheran Church in America
LCMS	Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod
LCUSA	Lutheran Council in the United States of America
LMC	Liturgical Music Committee- ILCW committee
LSTC	Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago
LTC	Liturgical Text Committee- ILCW committee
LW	Lutheran Worship
LW 35 etc.	Luther's Works, American ed.
LWF	Lutheran World Federation
MRC	Material Review Committee- ELCC
RG	Review Group- ALC
SBH	Service Book and Hymnal
SC	Subcommittee
SHRC	Special Hymnal Review Committee- LCMS (also called the "Blue Ribbon Committee")
TLH	The Lutheran Hymnal
UELC	United Evangelical Lutheran Church
ULC[A]	United Lutheran Church in America
WA	Luther's Works, Weimar ed.
WS	Worship Supplement

Appendix B

Commission, Committees, Subcommittees, et al

INTER-LUTHERAN COMMISSION ON WORSHIP

ALC

Louis Accola	1975-78
Eugene L. Brand	1966-71
Mandus A. Egge	1966-78
Paul Ensrud	1966-68
Carl Fischer	1968-74
Edward A. Hansen	1966-78
Richard P. Hermstad	1975-78
Hans F. Knauer	1966-68
Theodore S. Liefeld	1966-78
Vice-Chairperson	1966-68 1970-72
Secretary	1968-70
Harold W. Moench	1968-74
Alf Romstad	1966-67
Leland B. Sateren	1966-78
Clifford J. Swanson	1971-78
Chairperson	1972-78

ELCC

L.R. Likness	1966-78
Vice-Chairperson	1969-70
Chairperson	1970-72

LCA

John W. Arthur	1966-78
Ruth Becker	1972-73
Eugene L. Brand	1972-75
Edgar S. Brown, Jr.	1966-70
L. Crosby Deaton	1966-72
Secretary	1966-68
Chairperson	1968-70
Gilbert E. Doan Jr.	1970-78
Secretary	1970-78

Toivo K.I. Jarjunpaa	1970-78
Edward T. Horn III	1966-72
Frederick F. Jackisch	1966-78
Ulrich S. Luepold	1966-70
Shirley McCreedy	1974-78
Daniel Moe	1966-78
Constance Parvey	1972-78
Krister Stendahl	1966-70
Ralph R. Van Loon	1970-71 1975-78

LCMS

Henry C. Abram	1976-78
Paul G. Bunjes	1966-72
Walter E. Buszin	1966-68
E. Theodore DeLaney	1969-76
Paul Foelber	1969-78
Vice-Chairperson	1972-78
Herbert Kahler	1966-75
Treasurer	1966-70
A.R. Kretzmann	1966-69
Herbert F. Lindemann	1966-69
Chairperson	1966-57
Vice-Chairperson	1968-69
Paul K. Peterson	1972-78
Fred L. Precht	1966-76
Warren G. Rubel	1968-74
Treasurer	1970-72
Rodney Schrank	1974-78
Ralph C. Schultz	1969-72
Martin L. Seltz	1966-67
Secretary	1966
Jaroslav J. Vajda	1966-78
Treasurer	1972-78
Willis Wright	1972-78

ILCW STAFF

Eugene L. Brand	
Project Director	1975-78
Robert A. Rimbo	
Project Assistant	1976-78

Walter E. Buszin	1967-69
Paul Foelber	1970-78
Edward Klammer	1967-78
Ludwig Lenel	1967-74
Carl Schalk	1968-78

CHURCH STAFF

ALC

Mandus A. Egge	1966-76
Jerry A. Evenrud	1976-78
Janet Moede	1966-73
Mons A. Teig	1974-78

LCA

Jon Becker	1974-78
Eugene L. Brand	1972-74
Edgar S. Brown Jr.	1966-70
R. Harold Terry	1973-74
Ralph R. Van Loon	1972-78

LCMS

E. Theodore DeLaney	1969-78
---------------------	---------

PUBLISHERS STAFF

Leonard Flachman	1970-1978
Project Director for:	
Augsburg Publishing House	
Concordia Publishing House	
Board of Publication - LCA	

Karen Walhof

Assistant	1974-1978
Augsburg Publishing House	

Rodney Schrank	1976-1978
Concordia Publishing House	
Ralph Bagger	1976-1978
Board of Publication - LCA	

HYMN MUSIC COMMITTEE

ALC

Paul Christiansen	1967-69
Jerry A. Evenrud	1975-78
Ronald Nelson	1974-78
Ruth Olson	1969-74
Leland B. Sateren	1967-78
Dale Warland	1967-74

LCA

Charles R. Anders	1967-78
Larry Houff	1974-78
Frederick F. Jackisch	1967-78

LCMS

Jan Bender	1967-70
------------	---------

HYMN TEXT COMMITTEE

ALC

Bessie Coleman	1970-73
Gracia grindal	1973-78
Edward A. Hansen	1967-78
John Milton	1967-68
Gerald Thorson	1968-78
George Utech	1967-70

LCA

L. Crosby Deaton	1968-70
Gilbert E. Doan Jr.	1967-78
Edward T. Horn III	1967-69
Joel W. Lundeen	1967-70
Marilyn Waniek	1970-72
Stanley Yoder	1973-78

LCMS

E. Theodore DeLaney	1967-78
Hilton C. Oswald	1967-78
Martin L. Seltz	1967
Jaroslav J. Vajda	1967-78

LITURGICAL MUSIC COMMITTEE

ALC

Gerhard M. Cartford	1967-78
Paul Ensrud	1967-68
Carl Fischer	1968-78
Richard P. Hermstad	1975-78
Rueben G. Pimer	1967-75

LCA

Robert A. Bornemann	1967-71
L. Crosby Deaton	1967-68
Donna Zierdt Elkin	1973-78
Donald Hinkle	1971-78
Ulrich S. Leupold	1967-70
Daniel T. Moe	1967-78
Stanley Yoder	1970-72

LCMS

Paul G. Bunjes	1967-72
Richard W. Hillert	1967-78
Carlos R. Messerli	1967-78
Fred L. Precht	1973-78

LITURGICAL TEXTS COMMITTEE

ALC

Eugene L. Brand	1967-71
Ralph Quere	1971-78
Clifford J. Swanson	1967-73
Johan A. Thorson	1967-78

ELCC

L.R. Likness	1973-78
--------------	---------

LCA

John W. Arthur	1967-78
Charles A. Ferguson	1968-78
Edward T. Horn III	1967-68
Philip Pfatteicher	1968-78
Krister Stendahl	1967-68

LCMS

Hans C. Boehringer	1967-78
A.R. Kretzmann	1967-69
Herbert F. Lindemann	1967-78
Paul K. Peterson	1973-78
Fred L. Precht	1969-72

EDITORIAL POLICY COMMITTEE

ALC

Gerhard M. Cartford	1975-78
Gracia Grindal	1975-78

ELCC

Raymond Yauk	1975-78
--------------	---------

LCA

Henry Horn	1975-78
Glenn Stone	1975-78

LCMS

Paul K. Peterson	1975-78
Carl Schalk	1975-78

INTER-LUTHERAN COMMITTEE FOR INTRODUCING LBW

ALC

Eldon G. DeWeerth
Marvin L. Roloff
Mons A. Teig

ELCC

L.R. Likness
Alvin Miller

LCA

Paul M. Cornell
Donald R. Pichaske
Ralph R. Van Loon

NAME INDEX

A

Abram, Henry 145, 210, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 268, 274
Alford, Henry 122
Anderson, Albert 123, 204, 224, 268
Anderson, Charles S. 237, 253
Anderson, Philip V. 106, 107
Arthur, John 25, 28, 35, 42, 47, 48, 52, 68, 69, 149, 184, 255, 274, 276
Aulen, Gustav 14, 252

B

Bach, Johann Sebastian 74, 114, 128, 134
Bagger, Ralph 275
Bailey, Larry 104, 110, 181, 183, 184, 185, 240, 241, 242, 243, 260, 265, 269, 270
Bangert, Mark 98, 99, 100, 203, 204, 206
Barkenquist, J.L. 136, 262
Baxter, Richard 240
Bemis, Sterling 33
Bender, Jan 50, 239, 275
Berry, Herb 268
Boehringer, Hans 25, 28, 41, 92, 96, 98, 106, 205, 219, 229, 254, 255, 268, 276
Bohlken, Phillip 223, 268
Bonderud, Omar 113, 119, 120, 123, 125, 126, 127, 261, 267, 276
Bonhoeffer, Dietrich 240
Bornmann, Carl 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 146, 147, 149, 155, 193, 262, 263
Bouman, Walter 43, 48, 49, 50, 56, 102, 255, 256, 270
Bouyer, Louis 252
Brand, Eugene 7, 9, 15, 24, 25, 28, 32, 39, 40, 42, 43, 44, 47, 50, 53, 55, 57, 58, 62, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 79, 80, 81, 82, 86, 96, 97, 105, 106, 108, 111, 113, 114, 123, 127, 129, 132, 140, 141, 142, 180, 190, 201, 202, 203, 206, 207, 208, 210, 212, 213, 214, 216, 219, 223, 224, 226, 228, 229, 234, 238, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 261, 262, 263, 265, 266, 267, 268, 270, 271, 274, 275, 276
Bremer, Steven 237
Briotho, Yngve 14, 252, 271
Brown, Edgar 27, 29, 82, 252, 253, 269, 270, 274, 275
Brunner, Peter 15, 39, 45, 54, 55, 62, 184, 252
Bucer, Martin 231
Bunjes, Paul 239, 274, 275
Bunyan, John 78, 221, 240
Buszin, Walter 19, 20, 245, 253, 270, 274, 275

C

Calvin, John 155
Carey, William 87
Carl, Richard Hoefler 132
Carlson, J. Bert 35
Cartford, Gerhard 46, 49, 59, 66, 70, 121, 123, 206, 275, 276
Casel, Odo 15, 39, 54, 61, 252
Christiansen, Paul 275
Cochran, John 102
Confessor, Maximus 87, 270
Conzelmann, Hans 64, 65, 66
Cranmer, Thomas 87
Crombie, Thetis 107

D

Damascus, John of 87
Damm, John 105
Davick, Wade 115
Deiss, Lucian 35
DeLaney, Theodore 29, 66, 82, 111, 142, 144, 145, 147, 150, 151, 152, 154, 191, 192, 193, 194, 199, 200, 201, 213, 255, 263, 266, 267, 274, 275
Denef, Larry 115, 116, 117, 261
Dix, Gregory 15, 40, 42, 43, 46, 54, 57, 180, 181, 182, 234, 252
Doan, Gilbert 23, 28, 74, 75, 76, 79, 81, 82, 142, 150, 151, 221, 258, 259, 263, 267, 270, 274, 275
Doane, George 221
Doberstein, John 258
Doermann, Ralph 90

E

EGge, Mandus 29, 44, 66, 67, 82, 95, 111, 200, 252, 256, 259, 274, 275
Eickmann, Nathan 46, 47, 255
Elkin, Donna Zierdt 70, 71, 206, 275
Enquist, Roy 40, 255
Evenson, G.O. 127
Evenson, Richard 96

F

Ferguson, Charles 66, 69, 90, 93, 105, 276
Fischer, Robert 56, 84, 274, 275
Fjeld, Roger 237
Flachman, Leonard 9, 111, 127, 204, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 263, 268, 269, 275
Foelber, Paul 195, 211, 219, 259, 263, 266, 268, 274, 275
Forde, Gerhard 64, 65, 66, 114, 116, 117, 120, 121, 122, 126, 181, 186, 190, 257, 261, 271, 276

Forest, River 158, 239, 264
Fousek, Mariana 98, 99, 102
Fox, George 155
Fritz, John H.C. 153
Fryxel, Regina 70, 206
Fulton, Robert 107

G

Gaiser, Frederick 203, 204
Gehring, Philip 46, 47, 50, 255
Gerhardt, Paul 145, 223
Gieschen, Thomas 46, 255
Glazier, Tom 23
Gotwald, Frederick 105
Graham, Billy 130
Green, Lowell 41, 180, 181, 236
Grundtvig, Nicolai 148, 239

H

Hagen, Kenneth 62
Halbardier, Arthur 47, 48, 255
Halborg, John 78
Hals, Ronald 55, 56, 256
Hammerskjold, Dag 86
Hampton, Calvin 50
Haney, James 116, 270
Hansen, Edward 32, 253, 261, 270, 274, 275
Hanson, John R. 106
Hanson, Richard Simon 90
Harms, Oliver 19, 245
Hassler, Hans 23
Hauge, Hans 14, 15, 16, 155
Helge, Brian 98, 99, 100, 101, 203
Herbert, George 240
Herlin, Olof 14, 252
Hillert, Richard 35, 70, 156, 206, 239, 275
Hintz, Edward 45
Hippolytus 68, 69, 100, 125, 127, 129, 143, 159, 183, 205
Hoefler, Richard Carl 132, 262
Horn, Henry 19, 50, 51, 252, 274, 275, 276
Hovland, Egil 35, 50
Hoyer, George 66
Hughes, Robert 185
Hummel, Horace 62, 203, 214, 257

I

Ingemann, Frances 66

J

Jackisch, Frederick 48, 49, 186, 256, 274, 275
Janzow, F. Samuel 142, 147, 201, 263
Jenson, Robert 15, 9, 41, 55, 56, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 68, 69, 114, 125, 128, 181, 186, 187, 205, 255, 257
Johnson, Ben 56
Jones, Gordon 50
Jordahl, Leigh 41, 56, 57, 94, 255
Judicius [=D. Judisch] 191, 192, 193, 194, 198
Judisch, D. (see Judicius) 191, 193, 194, 266
Jungmann, Joseph 15, 252

K

Kagawa, Toyohiko 86
Kalb, Friedrich 82
Kierkegaard, Soren 155

King, Martin Luther Jr. 86, 155
Kingsbury, Jack 204
Klein, Leonard 104, 110, 183, 184, 185, 240, 241, 242, 243, 260, 265, 269, 270
Klos, Frank, Jr. 96, 259
Knutson, Kent S. 44
Krapf, Gerhard 35
Krodel, Gottfried 187
Krugler, Arnold 180, 181, 182, 183, 190, 265, 271

L

Lathrop, Gordon 44, 54, 55, 56, 68, 69, 94, 115, 205, 243, 255, 256
Lee, Clarence 186
Lee, Fred 116
Liefeld, Theodore 44, 261, 274
Likness, L. R. 127, 262, 274, 276
Lindblom, David 105
Lindemann, Herbert 20, 33, 34, 44, 55, 90, 194, 203, 204, 224, 239, 256, 274, 276
Loeche, Wilhelm 13
Luther, Martin 86, 155, 255, 270

M

Maahs, Charles 116
Macker, Nancy 114, 119, 276
Manilow, Barry 23
Marple, Dorothy 237
Marshall, Robert 81, 212, 237, 268
Martensen, Daniel 106
Melanchthon, Philip 270
Melchior, Henry Muhlenberg 186
Merrill, William Pierson 224
Messerli, Carlos 145, 219, 224, 275
Michelangelo 155
Miller, L. David 59, 257
Moe, Daniel 46, 47, 48, 50, 59, 274, 275
Moltmann, Juergen 185
Mueller, Herbert 214
Mullins, Terence 136
Muscarella, Grace 185

N

Nafzger, Samuel 149, 263
Nagel, Norman 45
Near, Gerald 50, 77, 91, 128, 157, 167, 200, 222
Nelson, Ronald 8, 46, 48, 59, 73, 121, 128, 163, 164, 203, 204, 206, 252, 253, 275, 276
Nesting, James 97
Neve, Paul 7, 46, 47, 110, 168, 255
Newton, John 240

O

Olson, Oliver 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 53, 54, 56, 61, 62, 114, 181, 190, 191, 255, 256, 257, 271, 275
Olson, Steven C. 45, 256

P

Pannenberg, Wolfhart 185
Paulson, Dennis 39, 54, 64
Pelikan, Jaroslav 51, 52, 241, 244, 257, 270
Peterson, Paul 66, 102, 109, 142, 145, 205, 217, 219, 263, 274, 276

Petrich, Roger 50
Pratteicher, Philip 9, 25, 31, 41, 98, 99, 103, 109, 203,
205, 224, 228, 255, 271, 276
Piepkorn, Arthur Carl 42, 43, 45, 84, 149, 184, 255
Pope, John Paul XXIII 192, 197
Powell, Robert 50
Preus, David 81, 112, 123, 125, 192, 212, 222, 261,
268
Preus, Jacob A.O. 45, 81, 140, 141, 192, 196, 211,
212, 218, 222, 223, 268, 271

Q

Quere, Ralph 45, 58, 115, 116, 228, 255, 257, 269,
276
Quintillian 189

R

Ramshaw, Gail 68
Rast, Walter 203
Reed, Luther 14, 44, 57, 125, 252, 253, 260, 271
Rehfeldt, Richard 115
Reinke, Ralph 204, 214
Repp, Ray 48
Rhody, Frank 204
Ricoeur, Paul 50
Ridenhour, Thomas 203
Rimbo, Robert 224, 229, 275
Ritschl, Dietrich 50
Roe, Edward 98, 99, 101, 102
Rogness, Michael 116, 261
Rorem, Paul 62, 114, 181, 254, 257, 271
Rosetti, Christina 78
Routley, Erik 21, 22, 75, 77, 239, 240, 253, 269
Rusch, William 134, 136, 212, 262

S

Saffen, Wayne 53
Sasse, Herman 187
Sateren, Leland 35, 268, 274, 275
Sauer, Robert 144, 152, 214, 216, 217, 218, 224, 263,
268
Scaer, David 185, 187, 223, 265, 268
Schalk, Carl 50, 275, 276
Schaller, Winfred 223, 268
Schlessman, Lynn 45
Schmemmann, Alexander 15, 252
Schmidt, Wayne 195
Schmucker, Samuel Simon 12
Schnaible, Harold 142
Schneider, Stanley 83, 229, 271
Schrank, Rodney 217, 274, 275
Schwartz, Hans 116, 122
Schweitzer, Albert 86
Segerhammar, Carl 66
Seltzer, George 19
Senn, Frank 42, 45, 61, 69, 96, 205, 255, 257
Sittler, Joseph 50
Soederblom, Nathan 155
Sovik, E.A. 52
Spener, Philip Jacob 87
St. John of the Cross 193
St. Lawrence [=Laurence] 86
Stack, James 33
Stendahl, Krister 26, 274, 276
Stevick, David 52

Stone, Glen 226, 276
Storey, William G. 99, 260
Strodach, Paul Zeller 14, 252, 271
Strohl, Robert 157
Stulken, Marilyn 204, 252
Stumme, Wayne 115
Swanson, Clifford 25, 33, 34, 113, 245, 261, 270, 274,
276

T

Tappert, Theodore 84
Tegels, Aelred 40, 255
Teig, Mons 67, 82, 113, 120, 123, 125, 126, 208, 258,
261, 267, 275, 276
Theresa, of Avila 193
Thorson, Johan 105, 106, 275, 276
Thring, Godfrey 148, 263
Tietjen, John 221
Tillich, Paul 41, 269
Trexler, Charles, Jr. 90
Trexler, Edgar 186, 254

U

Utech, George 23, 275

V

Vajda, Jaroslav 150, 214, 219, 263, 267, 274, 275
Van Loon, Ralph 82, 132, 139, 224, 228, 254, 262,
274, 275, 276
Vogel, Robert 115

W

Walhof, Karen 9, 225, 228, 275
Walther, C.F.W. 198
Watts, Isaac 240
Wegmeyer, Norman 123, 263, 264
Werberg, Robert 105
Wesley, Charles 155
Wetzler, Robert 227, 268, 269
White, James 51
Whittier, John 78
Wietzke, Walter 95
Wilder, Amos 52
Williams, Vaughn 134
Winkworth, Catherine 22
Wood, Dale 35
Wright, Willis 217, 274

Y

Ylvisaker, John 46, 47, 49, 59
Yoder, Stanley 77, 275

SUBJECT INDEX

A

Absolution 15, 16, 25, 26, 27, 39, 42, 43, 44, 48, 59, 60, 62, 63, 64, 70, 71, 74, 75, 76, 105, 106, 118, 132, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 142, 144, 145, 146, 148, 151, 155, 173, 193, 203, 204, 211, 212, 237, 242, 244, 256, 262, 267, 269, 271

adiaphora 141, 146, 182, 241, 249, 250

Advent 34, 35, 36, 37, 83, 85, 87, 89, 90, 102, 113, 131, 146, 162, 204, 206, 231, 241, 269, 270

AELC 18, 180, 181, 183, 213, 222, 265, 272

Affirmation of Baptism 96, 123, 170, 247, 259

Agnus Dei 25, 46, 48, 49, 71, 135, 157, 169, 203

American Lutheran Church 7, 13, 18, 19, 20, 212, 215, 221, 231, 232, 252, 253, 256, 269, 272

American Lutheranism 12, 75, 81, 231, 239

anamnesis 54, 55, 56, 61, 62, 63, 68, 69, 188, 189, 234, 246

Ante-communion 33, 58, 178, 202

Apostles' Creed 26, 34, 35, 46, 57, 67, 72, 92, 99, 103, 114, 143, 157, 167, 197, 203, 213, 228, 248, 251, 271

Arian 167, 223

Assisting ministers 40, 238, 270

Association of Evangelical Lutheran Churches 272

Athanasian Creed 72, 124, 137, 223, 228, 251

Augsburg Confession 72, 108, 116, 188, 197, 198, 232, 237, 240, 242, 244, 245, 248, 249, 251, 266, 270

Augsburg Publishing House 8, 123, 204, 224, 225, 275

B

Baptismal remembrance 35, 99, 100, 107

Baptismal rite 91, 95, 96, 117, 120, 126, 133, 135, 140, 143, 152, 160, 206, 207, 209, 247, 259, 265

BCP 14, 87, 272

Benediction 28, 30, 33, 34, 35, 45, 57, 72, 100, 101, 105, 109, 167, 169, 173, 174, 185

Berakah 44

Berakoth 54

Blue Ribbon Committee 213, 220, 222, 228, 245, 273

Book of Common Prayer 14, 15, 25, 67, 107, 109, 157, 208, 246, 272

Book of Concord 73, 90, 245, 251, 271, 272

Brief Order 72, 122, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 131, 132, 133, 135, 138, 152, 161, 162, 163, 166, 202, 206, 246

Burial of the Dead 105, 109, 136, 139, 171, 172, 173

C

Calvinist 41, 136, 152, 170, 181

Canticles 33, 34, 35, 37, 71, 78, 99, 124, 126, 200, 203, 206, 219, 221, 250

CCW 130, 131, 133, 137, 140, 262, 272

Christmas 34, 35, 36, 37, 74, 85, 123, 125, 134, 162

Church Fathers 101

Church Year 24, 73, 78, 82, 83, 85, 159, 162, 200, 259

Clericalism 187

Close communion 231

Closed communion 152, 231

Collect 25, 33, 87, 90, 108, 133, 167

Commission on Theology and Church Relations 112, 140, 149, 211, 212, 245, 272

Commission on Worship (C/W) 144

Committal prayer 209

Common Confession 17, 230, 231

Common Service 6, 7, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 43, 79, 80, 209, 248, 250

Communion 4, 5, 7, 24, 27, 28, 29, 30, 39, 54, 55, 66, 70, 71, 73, 75, 92, 94, 113, 116, 118, 124, 128, 129, 133, 136, 141, 142, 152, 156, 159, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 167, 173, 179, 184, 202, 209, 230, 231, 232, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 242, 245, 246, 249, 255, 256, 257, 259, 263, 264, 269, 270, 271

communion 7, 11, 25, 32, 33, 53, 54, 58, 65, 71, 72, 92, 95, 96, 107, 113, 118, 126, 127, 131, 132, 133, 135, 138, 140, 152, 167, 171, 173, 174, 178, 185, 197, 202, 209, 210, 222, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238

Compline 70, 72, 98, 99, 101, 102, 105, 122, 123, 124, 131, 138, 162, 176, 177, 178, 179, 206, 207, 208, 260

Concordia Publishing House 144, 145, 149, 150, 192, 204, 213, 214, 217, 224, 225, 275

Confession and Forgiveness 72, 122, 156, 162, 206, 236, 246

Confirmation 70, 72, 95, 96, 132, 170, 235, 236, 238, 247, 259, 269

confirmation 24, 38, 92, 93, 95, 96, 97, 98, 115, 116, 118, 129, 136, 153, 156, 160, 171, 173, 202, 205, 213, 222, 231, 234, 235, 236, 247

Congregations 24, 27, 29, 34, 40, 44, 46, 47, 48, 49, 57, 58, 59, 60, 70, 71, 75, 76, 111, 112, 113, 120, 121, 122, 139, 143, 147, 156, 157, 158, 160, 161, 162, 163, 168, 169, 170, 177, 178, 179, 186, 192, 197, 198, 213, 214, 225, 226, 228, 237, 238, 256, 265, 268

Consecration 38, 40, 45, 55, 56, 57, 61, 65, 109, 181, 184, 189, 190, 191, 234, 242

Consultation of Ecumenical Hymnody 228

Consulting Committee of Worship 130, 272

Contemporary Worship booklets 4, 21, 272

Corporate Confession 124, 129, 161, 207, 236

Creeds 25, 72, 114, 138, 198, 219, 223, 230, 241, 245, 271

CTCR 140, 154, 212, 213, 214, 216, 217, 218, 230, 272

CW-01 39, 64, 68, 69, 70, 71, 115, 116, 125, 128, 132, 133, 142, 158, 159, 183, 184, 186, 187, 188, 190, 205, 263, 264
 CW-1 21, 23, 24, 29, 77, 159, 191, 193
 CW-10 105, 108, 109, 110, 121
 CW-2 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 33, 35, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 49, 50, 52, 54, 55, 56, 59, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 87, 91, 107, 111, 117, 121, 124, 128, 131, 132, 133, 134, 139, 142, 156, 157, 158, 159, 168, 180, 182, 191, 192, 203, 204, 205, 206, 245, 254, 255, 256, 257
 CW-3 29, 32, 54, 136, 159, 254
 CW-4 21, 23, 24, 77, 159, 225, 271
 CW-5 33, 35, 36, 66, 98, 99, 160
 CW-6 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 160, 162, 191, 193, 197, 264
 CW-7 91, 93, 94, 95, 96, 115, 116, 117, 132, 135, 160, 185, 259
 CW-8 36, 92, 95, 96, 97, 98, 115, 116, 117, 118, 130, 136, 160, 171, 205, 236, 247
 CW-9 98, 104, 175, 177, 206, 208, 260

D

Daily Lectionary 204, 206, 228
 DBCP 107, 108, 208, 258, 260, 272
 descensus 127, 167, 187, 191, 193, 197, 203, 209, 214, 248
 Deutsche Messe 41, 44
 Dialogue 13, 31, 17, 30, 31, 36, 115, 123, 140, 271
 Dix(s four-fold shape) 180
 Doctrinal reviewers 112, 140, 143, 152, 214
 Doxology 55, 56, 68, 199, 250, 269
 DPS/MC 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 138, 139, 262, 272
 Draft Proposed Book of Common Prayer 107, 109, 272
 E
 Easter 9, 34, 36, 37, 69, 74, 79, 84, 85, 86, 87, 123, 162
 Eastern Orthodox 14, 15, 36, 38, 68, 87, 103, 105, 116, 138, 184, 189, 192, 248
 Ecclesiastical review 67, 112
 Ecumenism 22, 187
 Editorial Policy Committee 226, 272, 276
 ELCA 8, 75, 222, 236, 253, 254, 272
 ELCC 20, 29, 60, 72, 80, 112, 120, 127, 129, 130, 140, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 205, 206, 212, 214, 215, 223, 261, 262, 263, 264, 272, 273, 274, 276
 Entrance Rite 40
 EPC 226, 227, 228, 268, 269, 272
 epiclesis 15, 26, 38, 39, 41, 43, 45, 46, 54, 55, 61, 62, 68, 92, 93, 95, 96, 115, 116, 117, 118, 120, 125, 126, 128, 129, 134, 135, 136, 149, 153, 168, 170, 184, 187, 189, 205, 234, 247, 248
 Epiphany 34, 35, 36, 37, 83, 84, 85, 156, 162, 228
 Episcopalians 26, 82, 84, 115, 204, 232
 Eucharistic Prayer 7, 11, 14, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 44, 45, 46, 54, 55, 56, 60, 62, 64, 69, 115, 116, 118, 120, 122, 125, 127, 132, 133, 134, 140, 149, 168, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 186, 187, 190, 191, 192, 195, 203, 204, 205, 213, 231, 249, 255, 258, 271
 Evangelical Lutheran Church in America 7, 10, 222, 272
 Evangelical Lutheran Church of Canada 20, 127, 272

Evening Prayer 98, 121, 124, 127, 138, 174, 175, 177, 208, 228
 Executive Committee 24, 28, 29, 35, 44, 45, 57, 73, 81, 82, 96, 102, 204, 210, 215, 217, 219, 222, 224, 225, 228, 229, 236, 270

F

Fellowship 11, 13, 18, 25, 108, 129, 146, 153, 187, 192, 207, 212, 213, 215, 217, 218, 221, 222, 230, 231, 232, 233, 237
 Fellowship in protest 212
 Field-testing 10, 11, 71, 75, 112, 123, 134, 156, 197
 Flood Prayer 93, 117, 120, 170, 247
 Folk songs 23, 24, 76
 Formula of Concord 43, 63, 64, 65, 152, 182, 184, 190, 196, 248, 272
 Fortress Press 204, 226, 253, 269
 Fraction 28, 40, 41, 42, 54, 57, 62, 66, 67, 72, 132, 135, 149, 181
 Frequency 73, 133

G

Gloria Patri 99, 100
 Gospel hymns 74, 79, 128, 130
 Gradual 66, 160
 Great Thanksgiving 11, 26, 28, 39, 42, 43, 46, 58, 59, 60, 64, 68, 70, 117, 118, 121, 128, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 138, 142, 158, 159, 168, 183, 184, 186, 187, 188, 191, 195, 214, 215, 254, 256, 257, 265, 266
 Greeting 28, 36, 46, 57, 66, 105, 107, 109, 135, 167

H

High church 38, 40, 242
 historical criticism 140
 HMC 20, 21, 23, 24, 27, 74, 150, 204, 258, 272, 273
 Holy Communion 4, 7, 27, 28, 29, 30, 39, 55, 66, 70, 71, 75, 92, 94, 113, 118, 128, 129, 133, 136, 141, 142, 152, 156, 159, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 167, 173, 184, 202, 231, 232, 235, 236, 238, 242, 245, 246, 249, 255, 257, 263, 264, 270, 271
 Holy Communion for Trial Use 4, 66, 71, 128, 133, 156, 184
 Holy Spirit 17, 25, 30, 31, 38, 55, 61, 71, 87, 89, 91, 93, 95, 97, 98, 99, 101, 103, 114, 117, 118, 125, 129, 133, 138, 153, 168, 170, 184, 185, 247, 248, 250, 271
 Holy Week 86, 87, 162, 205
 HTC 20, 21, 23, 24, 27, 73, 76, 114, 118, 147, 186, 198, 199, 204, 225, 253, 266, 267, 270, 272, 273
 Hymn Music Committee 20, 272, 275
 Hymn Text Committee 20, 21, 75, 200, 270, 271, 272, 275
 Hymns 18, 21, 22, 23, 24, 28, 29, 51, 59, 71, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 98, 111, 112, 113, 114, 118, 119, 127, 128, 129, 130, 132, 134, 140, 141, 142, 144, 145, 146, 147, 149, 150, 151, 155, 159, 186, 191, 192, 197, 198, 199, 200, 210, 211, 214, 215, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 225, 226, 227, 228, 239, 240, 245, 250, 253, 258, 269, 270, 271

I

ICET 25, 27, 40, 67, 79, 101, 114, 128, 135, 152, 157, 167, 193, 203, 207, 209, 216, 218, 223, 248, 272

ILCW 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 35, 39, 40, 44, 45, 47, 53, 57, 58, 59, 60, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 92, 94, 97, 98, 104, 105, 106, 107, 111, 112, 114, 115, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 125, 126, 127, 128, 130, 132, 133, 134, 136, 138, 140, 141, 142, 146, 148, 149, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 158, 160, 161, 168, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 204, 205, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 233, 234, 236, 239, 240, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 275, 276

Impartation 15, 16, 93

Imprecatory 70, 99, 101

Inclusive language 126, 207, 209

Individual Confession 123, 124, 204, 208, 219, 220, 246

Inter-communion 11, 197, 222, 231, 232, 233, 235, 237, 238

Inter-Lutheran Commission on Worship 6, 10, 20, 134, 156, 245, 253, 262, 265, 266, 270, 272, 274

Intercessions 33, 34, 56, 67, 90, 100, 101, 103, 108, 109, 110, 132

International Consultation on English Texts 6, 79, 229, 272

introit 43, 66, 67, 160

Invocation 28, 56, 57, 61, 67, 93, 133, 138, 151, 166, 188, 200

J

JHC 20, 23, 29, 76, 199, 200, 267, 273

JLC 20, 125, 151, 206, 254, 255, 258, 260, 263, 267, 273

Joint Hymn Committee 20, 76, 273

Joint Liturgical Committee 58, 273

K

Kyrie eleison 25, 66, 199

L

Lament 70, 73, 99, 213

Language Review Committee 226

Large Catechism 43, 182

Lay leadership 202

Laying on of hands 15, 16, 92, 93, 95, 96, 98, 100, 170, 171, 247

LBW:MDE 36, 70, 104, 125, 153, 154, 205, 206, 207, 209, 210, 262, 273

LCA 18, 19, 20, 29, 32, 39, 58, 59, 60, 67, 72, 74, 76, 80, 81, 82, 102, 112, 120, 123, 127, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 139, 140, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 186, 192, 193, 194, 198, 203, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 212, 214, 215, 217, 222, 223, 225, 228, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 245, 259, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 269, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276

LCMS 7, 10, 11, 13, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 28, 29, 32, 43, 44, 45, 46, 54, 58, 60, 64, 75, 76, 80, 81, 82, 86,

89, 91, 107, 112, 118, 121, 124, 125, 129, 130, 131, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 147, 148, 149, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 186, 190, 191, 192, 195, 196, 197, 199, 201, 202, 203, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 221, 222, 223, 224, 226, 228, 230, 231, 232, 235, 238, 245, 248, 253, 254, 259, 262, 263, 264, 265, 267, 268, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276

LCUSA 18, 53, 80, 221, 270, 273

Lectionary 82

Lent 34, 84, 85, 86, 100, 162, 205

lex orandi 7, 10, 11, 42, 51, 64, 80, 116, 126, 188, 194, 231, 232, 233, 241, 244

Litany 15, 27, 28, 30, 33, 36, 66, 70, 99, 100, 101, 102, 104, 105, 106, 108, 138, 143, 157, 167, 175, 176, 177, 178, 204, 231, 248, 260

Liturgical movement 2, 12, 15, 54, 242

Liturgical Music Committee 20, 273, 275

Liturgical Text Committee 8, 20, 271, 273

Liturgical Texts 161, 162, 163, 175, 177, 207, 261, 262, 264, 276

LMC 20, 27, 34, 35, 40, 69, 70, 71, 73, 106, 123, 203, 204, 206, 219, 254, 255, 256, 258, 267, 273

Lord(s) Prayer 25, 26, 27, 30, 40, 44, 58, 59, 60, 67, 100, 101, 102, 103, 105, 121, 149, 152, 157, 202, 203, 230

LTC 20, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 39, 40, 41, 44, 45, 57, 58, 64, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 83, 84, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 102, 104, 105, 106, 107, 109, 117, 142, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 217, 219, 229, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 267, 273

Lutheran Book of Worship: Ministers Desk Edition 273

Lutheran Church in America 7, 10, 14, 18, 20, 212, 221, 222, 252, 269, 272, 273

Lutheran Church (Missouri Synod [LCMS]) 10, 22
Lutheran Council in the United States of America 221, 273

Lutheran World Federation 9, 26, 82, 240, 273

Lutheran Worship 16, 22, 111, 123, 151, 156, 183, 194, 205, 230, 255, 260, 265, 269, 273

Lutheran worship 14, 15, 185, 186, 218, 240, 242, 251

LW 16, 22, 23, 24, 52, 57, 65, 66, 75, 86, 87, 89, 90, 96, 101, 108, 118, 121, 124, 141, 142, 148, 150, 151, 155, 189, 199, 200, 201, 220, 221, 223, 268, 273

LWF 26, 82, 83, 84, 231, 259, 273

M

Management Committee, Div. of Parish Services, LCA 130, 272

manducatio impiorum 189, 190

Marriage rite 30, 31, 32, 54, 151, 153, 159, 173, 179, 209

Marxist 187

Material Review Committee, ELCC 127, 261, 273

Matins 33, 70, 98, 99, 100, 103, 174, 175, 178, 179, 260

Modalistic monarchians 194

Morning Prayer 98, 104, 124, 174, 175, 178

MRC (ELCC) 127, 128, 129, 130, 261, 262, 273
Musical settings 27, 47, 58, 60, 70, 113, 124, 161,
167, 195
Mysticism 220

N

Nicene Creed 10, 27, 46, 58, 59, 67, 72, 73, 113, 114,
152, 157, 167, 209, 218, 223, 251

O

Occasional services 7, 82, 105, 204, 224
Offertory procession 25, 38, 44, 54, 58, 60, 62, 115,
116, 124, 128, 168, 191
Office of the Keys 208
One-year lectionary 26, 82, 83, 160
Open communion 11, 171, 231
Ordinal 8, 185, 204, 206
Ordination of women 222
Ordination rites 38
Original sin 68, 116, 125, 133, 135, 152, 166, 169,
206, 208, 242, 246
Orthodox Lutheranism 194

P

Passing the peace 58
Pastors 6, 8, 32, 39, 45, 80, 81, 86, 115, 133, 137, 143,
147, 153, 155, 156, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 166,
169, 183, 187, 194, 196, 197, 198, 211, 214, 223,
226, 227, 242, 248, 263, 264
pax 56, 66, 67
Penitence 25, 27, 28, 133, 135, 151
Pentecost 51, 84, 86, 87, 89, 123, 125, 137, 162, 191,
206, 255
pericopes (historic) 83, 90
Popular theology 194
Post-communion prayer 152
Prayer of the Day 30, 34, 35, 57, 89
Preaching service 33, 34, 35, 98, 103
Preface 4, 6, 9, 26, 28, 35, 40, 44, 68, 69, 124, 149,
181, 183, 187, 188, 253
Proclamation/prayer 184
Proper of the Day system 224
Psalms 31, 63, 71, 90, 91, 100, 101, 107, 122, 126,
160, 174, 226
psalms 70, 90, 91, 99, 102, 105, 122, 127, 160, 206
Psalter 70, 90, 98, 99, 122, 125, 132, 138, 203, 204,
206, 214, 250
Pulpit-and-altar fellowship 11, 13, 221, 230, 232

R

Rationale(s) 55, 68, 69, 70, 72, 73, 79, 85, 131, 135,
138, 141, 142, 200, 201, 223, 231, 235, 262, 267,
270
Real presence 40, 41, 53, 54, 78, 143, 146, 187, 190,
238, 263
Reformed 11, 12, 19, 26, 38, 41, 53, 62, 98, 99, 135,
153, 188, 192, 222, 232, 239, 245, 248
Remembrance 35, 36, 38, 61, 62, 63, 69, 99, 100, 107,
120, 124, 126, 143, 168, 184, 188, 189, 190, 207,
249
Repentance 70, 72, 86, 92, 101, 143
Responsive Prayer 124, 138, 176, 177, 204, 228
Review 5, 65, 72, 102, 112, 113, 117, 118, 120, 123,
127, 135, 137, 140, 144, 147, 151, 181, 204, 205,
206, 210, 214, 219, 226, 245, 246, 256, 258, 261,

262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 268, 269, 270, 271, 273,
274
review 39, 40, 42, 45, 53, 66, 67, 70, 71, 72, 74, 75,
76, 78, 104, 111, 112, 113, 114, 120, 121, 123, 130,
134, 137, 138, 140, 142, 144, 146, 147, 149, 152,
153, 154, 168, 180, 186, 195, 197, 198, 203, 210,
213, 214, 218, 226, 227, 237, 245
Review Committee (ELCC, LCA or LCMS) 72, 74,
102, 104, 112, 114, 127, 140, 144, 147, 151, 180,
203, 205, 206, 210, 214, 218, 219, 226, 245, 261,
268, 271, 273
Review committees 39, 67, 70, 71, 75, 76, 104, 111,
112, 144, 258, 262
Review Group (ALC) 65, 72, 113, 118, 120, 123, 135,
181, 204, 206, 237, 238, 247, 262, 270, 273, 276
RG (ALC) 113, 114, 115, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122,
123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 206, 207, 208, 258, 261,
267, 270, 273
Rubrics 29, 30, 31, 32, 94, 101, 104, 105, 106, 114,
117, 120, 123, 124, 126, 161, 186, 205, 207, 209,
242

S

Sacrament 27, 38, 40, 43, 44, 55, 61, 63, 64, 70, 95,
96, 97, 116, 118, 128, 131, 140, 143, 145, 146, 150,
167, 168, 169, 178, 180, 181, 184, 185, 186, 187,
189, 190, 191, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238,
241, 242, 246, 247, 249, 252, 263, 271
Sacrifice 14, 38, 41, 43, 46, 53, 54, 55, 56, 61, 62, 63,
65, 116, 121, 143, 158, 168, 182, 183, 184, 185,
187, 189, 190, 191, 192, 233, 248, 249, 252, 256,
271
Sanctus 25, 44, 48, 49, 55, 68, 121, 124, 149, 157, 183
SBH 6, 7, 14, 15, 18, 19, 21, 22, 24, 25, 32, 36, 38,
40, 41, 43, 50, 64, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 76, 77, 78,
79, 80, 87, 89, 91, 93, 96, 97, 98, 99, 101, 103, 105,
107, 113, 119, 121, 123, 125, 128, 129, 130, 131,
133, 134, 139, 141, 147, 148, 149, 156, 158, 161,
162, 164, 166, 169, 170, 173, 201, 205, 206, 207,
209, 212, 220, 221, 225, 228, 232, 239, 247, 248,
249, 260, 264, 273
Seminaries 17, 45, 46, 53, 112, 132, 134, 135, 136,
202, 211, 213, 214
Seminox controversy 146, 181, 232
Service Book and Hymnal 6, 14, 18, 19, 36, 54, 81,
135, 246, 252, 253, 273
Service of the Word 34, 35, 36, 70, 99, 113, 124, 128,
137, 160, 177, 178, 179, 219
Sexist language 89, 113, 114, 119, 137, 147, 161, 173,
198, 201, 206, 223, 250
SHRC (LCMS) 210, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 220,
221, 222, 223, 224, 268, 273
Small Catechism 61, 72, 73, 116, 124, 143, 171, 198,
245, 246, 247
Special Hymnal Review Committee (LCMS) 140, 144,
151, 210, 214, 219, 268, 271, 273
Suffrages 71, 98, 99, 103, 104, 105, 128, 176, 177,
178, 179
suffrages 177
Swedish Mass 205
Synodical Conference 14, 19, 221, 231, 253, 270

T

Tenebrae 203
terminations for the lessons 126

The Lutheran Hymnal 14, 36, 181, 192, 246, 253, 273
Theologians 6, 7, 26, 39, 47, 64, 65, 87, 143, 155,
194, 248, 251
Three-year lectionary 26, 82, 83, 84, 85, 87, 90, 160,
206, 229
TLH 4, 19, 21, 22, 24, 67, 75, 76, 77, 87, 89, 91, 99,
101, 103, 105, 113, 118, 121, 122, 124, 125, 128,
129, 141, 145, 146, 148, 149, 150, 152, 157, 166,
167, 169, 176, 181, 197, 200, 201, 207, 212, 220,
221, 223, 225, 239, 263, 273
Trinitarian 72, 87, 89, 169, 185, 199, 200, 209, 241,
247
Tunes 22, 46, 47, 74, 75, 76, 77, 128, 129, 131, 134,
141, 195, 199, 239, 250

U

ULC[A] 14, 16, 17, 18, 231, 232, 233, 269, 273
unionism 22, 231, 238, 239
unitarianism 155
United Lutheran Church in America 14, 273
Universalism 130, 141, 145, 146, 147, 155, 199, 205,
220

V

verba 26, 27, 38, 41, 44, 45, 46, 54, 55, 57, 61, 63, 64,
65, 66, 68, 69, 115, 116, 117, 118, 120, 121, 122,
124, 125, 126, 127, 132, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138,
139, 149, 151, 152, 158, 168, 180, 181, 182, 184,
188, 192, 203, 204, 205, 207, 209, 219, 234, 262
Vespers 33, 70, 71, 98, 99, 100, 103, 104, 174, 175,
178, 179, 260
vox populi 4, 74, 156, 180, 270

W

Worship Supplement 19, 40, 54, 79, 156, 192, 195,
197, 273
WS 19, 69, 77, 158, 167, 169, 205, 273

X

XC (ILCW) 253, 254, 255, 256, 258, 259, 260, 262,
267, 268, 269

Z

Zwinglian 149, 188

IN THE CONTEXT OF *Unity*

The work required to produce a service book and hymnal is necessarily multifaceted both because of the nature of its contents and because worship is the focal point for the various aspects of the life of the church. Pastors, liturgists, theologians, students of congregational life and cultures, musicians of varying skills, poets, and hymn writers are needed for the process, and their work must be coordinated to make a coherent whole. To produce *Lutheran Book of Worship* the participating churches established the Inter-Lutheran Commission on Worship, and it established working committees and numerous subcommittees and task forces consisting of persons with skills enumerated above. It is difficult to imagine a more participatory process. To produce a historical description and analysis of that process requires a mastery of endless detail while keeping the larger picture in view. This the author has achieved, and in an exemplary manner, making this book a mother lode of information about the making of the *Lutheran Book of Worship*.

Eugene L. Brand



LUTHERAN
UNIVERSITY PRESS

ISBN 1-932688-00-5
53500>



9 781932 688009