

Review Essay: *The Reform of Baptism and Confirmation in American Lutheranism*

Armand J. Boehme

The Reform of Baptism and Confirmation in American Lutheranism. By Jeffrey A. Truscott. Drew University Studies in Liturgy 11. Lanham, Maryland & Oxford: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 2003.

This book¹ is a study of the production of the baptismal and confirmation rites contained in *Lutheran Book of Worship (LBW)*.² The theology that underlies *LBW* and its understanding of worship has significantly altered the Lutheran understanding of baptism and confirmation. The theological foundation of *LBW* has influenced other Lutheran church bodies, contributing significantly to profound changes in the Lutheran landscape. As Truscott wrote, those crafting the baptismal liturgy in *LBW* would have to “overturn” old theologies of baptism, deal with “a theology that” believed in “the necessity of baptism for salvation,” and “would have to convince Lutherans of the need for a new liturgical and theological approach to baptism” (p. 15).

Many of these theological and practical changes were previously encouraged in a book entitled *Confirmation and First Communion: A Study Book*. This book was a joint Lutheran study of the theology and practice of confirmation in America.³ Klos’s study was a continuation of the Lutheran World Federation’s (LWF) call for a thorough study of confirmation, which began with a seminar in Germany in 1955. The papers and study documents from these LWF seminars were reported to the LWF at its 1963 Helsinki gathering. American Lutherans began serious study of confirmation at an intersynodical conference held in Racine, Wisconsin in 1954. Klos’s 1968 study is a continuation of these previous examinations of the place of confirmation in Lutheranism.⁴ This examination of confirmation was part of a broader ecumenical study of baptism, Christian initiation, confirmation, and the reception of Holy Communion within global Christendom.⁵ Anyone interested in a better understanding of the changed perspectives on baptism, catechetical instruction, and confirmation within Lutheranism and Christianity should read this book.

Those producing *LBW* worked with an overt agenda to downplay confirmation and to uplift baptism. Truscott concludes by stating that the reforms instituted by the ILCW and put into *LBW*’s “Affirmation of Baptism” service did not go far enough to “downplay confirmation” as some had desired (p. 225).

Truscott’s book begins with a brief overview of Lutheran baptismal rites before the production of *LBW*. *LBW* views baptism primarily as “a liturgical action of

the church.” Thus the crafters of *LBW* greatly expanded the “assembly’s participation in the baptismal act” (pp. 33, 205). These changes flow from a theology of action (liturgy as the work of the people), which emphasizes the fact that the church or the congregation is the mediating agent of God’s saving activity (p. 33).⁶ For *LBW* the sacraments are understood ecclesologically—as actions of the congregation (pp. 205-206)—rather than soteriologically—as God acting to give his people grace and forgiveness. This leads to an emphasis on baby drama, water drama, and other congregational acts (pp. 24–26, 220). This theology of action is tied to an analytic view of justification, that is, God calls human beings righteous since he sees that they have or will gradually become righteous because of their righteous deeds. This analytic view of justification is that of Karl Holl, the New Perspectives on Paul (NPP), the Finnish view of Luther, Roman Catholicism, and the Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification (JDDJ).⁷

The “sacraments are essentially acts of prayer” (p. 219).⁸ This statement summarizes a view of the sacraments that sees them as ecclesiological acts, as celebrations of the faith community, and as the sacramental living of one’s Christian faith. The church itself is seen as sacramental (pp. 33, 217–221). Greater emphasis is placed upon human liturgical gestures, actions, words, prayers, and symbols as the self-actualization of the sacramental nature of the church. This changed view of the sacraments that underlies *LBW*’s understanding of baptism has helped bring about the acceptance of Eucharistic Prayers, prayers of thanksgiving for the water, and other practices in Lutheranism. This view of the sacraments entered Lutheranism from the ecumenical/Roman Catholic Liturgical movement (pp. 217–221). Defining the sacraments as human acts of prayer [sanctification/law] conflicts with Scripture and the Lutheran Confessions, which view the sacraments as God at work giving sinners faith, forgiveness, and many other spiritual blessings [justification/gospel] (Matthew 26:26–28; Acts 2:38; 22:16).⁹

Truscott readily admits the influence of Aidan Kavanagh on *LBW*’s push to see baptism as a rite primarily for adults rather than for infants (pp. 19, 32,

205). For Kavanagh infant baptism is “a benign abnormality” (p. 32, also pp. 19, 206–207).¹⁰ This abnormality of infant baptism is viewed from the perspective that sees Baptism as entrance into the community of faith rather than as “insurance against damnation” (pp. 51-52), or as “an antidote for original sin” (p. 117). Faith can be planted and grow whether one is baptized shortly after birth or not - “whether one is baptized at two months or forty years” (p. 51). Hence the encouragement to store up baptisms for special occasions in the church year (pp. 24, 31-32, 50-53, 76-77, 110-111, 117). Truscott states that “a baptismal theology based on the dogmatic defense of infant baptism is problematic, since the infant focus potentially hinders the church’s mission to unbaptized adults” (p. 117). What is needed is a Lutheran theology of Baptism “centered on *conversion*” (p. 117). The abnormality of infant baptism was also the view of Gregory Dix.¹¹ In spite of its being a “benign abnormality,” infant baptism is to be retained because infant communion cannot be defended without the regular practice of infant baptism. “If there was no practice of infant baptism in the first century, there could have been no infant Communion—unless one wants to conjecture a practice of communing the unbaptized.”¹² As will be seen later, there is tremendous irony in this last quotation.

Infant communion flows from believing that communion is the immediate birthright of the baptized. This idea lies behind the “early communion” movement in Lutheranism that encourages having much younger and insufficiently instructed children admitted to Holy Communion (pp. 149-151, 229–232). Infant communion advocates have openly admitted that the push for early communion was merely the starting point for making infant communion a regular church practice.

In 1970, however, the Joint Commission on the Theology and Practice of confirmation declared, in its infinite wisdom, that it was indeed proper and Evangelical for persons to participate in the Eucharist prior to their confirmation. “*Lex orandi!*” To keep pace with this ‘new theology’, our worship book changed too. Confession was no longer a precondition for reception of the Sacrament; the rite of confirmation was restored to the baptismal liturgy; confirmation became “Affirmation of baptism”. The old traditional gap which had existed between baptism and the Eucharist (and which had been filled by Confession, confirmation and the age of discretion) had been eradicated. Our new theology and practice seemed to indicate that the Eucharist should be the natural and immediate consequence of baptism...hence, infant Communion. “*Lex orandi...Lex credendi!*”¹³

Advocates of infant communion believe that John 6 speaks of the Eucharist, and on this basis as well as others believe that the Eucharist cannot be denied infants.¹⁴

Truscott notes the fact that the *LBW* baptismal affirmation rites are given to people (youth and adults)

“who have received little or no Christian nurture/instruction following their baptism” (p. 230).

Truscott’s comments correctly reflect *LBW*’s practice and theology. *LBW* contains a rite called “Affirmation of baptism.”¹⁵ In the *LBW: Minister’s Desk Edition*, this rite is referred to as “First Communion.”¹⁶ Its purpose is to admit to the Lord’s Table baptized individuals who have received little if any instruction in Christian doctrine. The *LBW* rubrics say that coming to communion for the first time should “not be blurred by loading it down with such embellishments as public catechesis, vows, white robes, or group songs.” Thorough instruction in the chief articles of Christian doctrine appears to be described as an embellishment, an unnecessary addition to “coming to communion for the first time,” something that blurs communion and loads it down with unnecessary humanly added “embellishments.”¹⁷ The reader is encouraged to compare this *LBW* service with the similar service (designed like the *LBW* service, to admit individuals to communion before confirmation) in the *Agenda* for the LCMS’s *Lutheran Service Book (LSB)*.¹⁸

The admission to communion of individuals with little or no instruction was observed by this reviewer while serving in Wisconsin. In visiting a Lutheran couple new to the community it was discovered that the pastor of their former Lutheran congregation had spoken with the unchurched husband for about five minutes and said that he could be baptized and admitted to communion the next Sunday. No catechesis was ever given. When this reviewer noted that instruction would be necessary before admission to communion, the couple did not return to his congregation.

The movement in Lutheranism is clear: the historic practice stated that a baptized person would be fully catechized, confirmed, and then admitted to communion. That practice changed to early communion before confirmation around the fifth-grade level with minimal instruction in the Lord’s Supper. The practice of early communion before confirmation was then invoked to push for infant communion because communion was the birthright of the baptized. Infant communion is not only encouraged and practiced in the ELCA, but it is also being encouraged and practiced in the LCMS.¹⁹

But the question must be raised, is communion the birthright of all the baptized without distinction? If reception of communion solely on the basis of baptism is true, then there could be no distinctions between religious groups; if all the Methodists, Baptists, Episcopalians, Roman Catholics, Lutherans, and Dutch Reformed are baptized, what prevents them from communing at one another’s altars? After all they are baptized—and communion is the birthright of the baptized! And what of other eventualities: lack of consciousness, affliction with Alzheimer’s, a sinful division among the baptized? Here one needs the correction of Elert: “Even though a man must first be baptized before he may partake of Holy Communion,

this does not mean that all the baptized may without distinction partake of the Eucharist together.”²⁰

Now things have progressed beyond infant communion, for some are practicing communion without baptism (CWOB). This CWOB movement is alive and well in Episcopal, Baptist, Lutheran, and other church bodies. The seeds for the CWOB movement were sown by the early communion and infant communion movements in the church. This is evident from the writing of a Lutheran Pastor commenting on the infant communion movement in the ELCA in 1996:

I am not very optimistic that the ELCA can do much to stop infant Communion. I suspect that the question of whether the Church should commune infants is becoming a moot issue. Few pastors are going to have the conviction or the strength that will respond to transferring families whose young children have been communed elsewhere: ‘That’s not the way we do it here.’ Similarly, we can expect that some pastors will make it very clear that even baptism is not necessary for reception of communion. There are those doing that now.²¹

Arthur Carl Piepkorn expressed concerns about Lutherans communing the unbaptized already in the 1970s:

In principle, the eucharistic assembly is always the company of those who have been made members of the body of Christ upon earth by Holy Baptism and who are gathered together in this capacity alone... I am suggesting that it is wrong to admit individuals to the Holy Eucharist indiscriminately merely because they are physically present, with no effort to determine if they have been baptized, with no effort to determine their continuing status as members of the church, and with no assurance that they have the requisite dispositions of sorrow for their wrong-doing and faith in the atoning work of our Lord that is made present again in this mystery.

I submit that it is misguided—regardless of the good faith of those who do so—to use the celebration of the Holy Eucharist as such as an evangelistic device and to impose on the celebration of the Holy Eucharist a burden that it was never intended to bear, that is, to serve as the means of communicating the basics of the Gospel to people to whom the Gospel has never been communicated. There are other vehicles for this task.²²

One is led to the thought that the seeds for people coming to communion without baptism were possibly sown in the modern ecumenical/Roman Catholic Liturgical movement, which put forth ideas like the following: “In the offertory, then, the wine and the bread represent one’s complete self and work. They are also the symbolic expression of the union of all the faithful into a community offering the Holy Sacrifice. Moreover, the bread and wine represent the apostolate: all men, pagans, and non-Catholics are offered on the paten.”²³ By these words the modern ecumenical/Roman Catholic

Liturgical movement would see “pagans” as part of “the apostolate” offering themselves on the paten as Christ’s body.

Today more pastors in Lutheranism and other denominations are communing individuals without the benefit of baptism than there were in Piepkorn’s day or Lundeen’s. Methodists have historically practiced communion without baptism.²⁴ A survey of the Southern Baptist Convention (SBC), which officially restricts communion to those who are baptized and hold church membership, indicated the fact that 65% of the SBC Pastors and congregations commune individuals who are unbaptized.²⁵ CWOB has also made significant inroads among the Episcopalians.²⁶ Lutherans have also traveled the path from catechesis/confirmation leading to communion, to early communion before full catechesis, to infant communion, to communion without baptism.

The Lutheran, the ELCA’s official lay publication, featured an article by an ELCA Pastor who communes everyone, including the unbaptized, and who encouraged the practice in the ELCA.²⁷ The 2013 ELCA Churchwide Assembly approved “a process to review current documents concerning administration of the Sacrament of Holy Communion.” This memorial originated at the ELCA’s Northern Illinois Synod Assembly. The memorial states that some of the denominations with which the ELCA is in full communion “do not share the same understanding” as the ELCA officially does about admission to communion. This difference then becomes a difficulty that could inhibit the ELCA from extending “sacramental hospitality” to members of other denominations who may not be baptized. After noting that some ELCA congregations already “welcome everyone present to partake” of the Supper “without stipulating the need for baptism” the memorial encouraged “clarification concerning Lutheran Sacramental theology and practice.” First Lutherans embraced early communion before confirmation, then came the official acceptance of infant communion at the ELCA church-wide assembly in 1997,²⁸ now the attempt to regularize communion without baptism. The beginning of the movement to regularize communion without baptism in Lutheranism is clear.²⁹

The movement from thorough catechization as a requirement for attendance at communion, to early communion before full catechization and confirmation, to infant communion is now coming to its radical conclusion. Baptism and confirmation have certainly been reformed in Lutheranism—so reformed they are being eliminated entirely in reference to the reception of the Lord’s Supper.

Truscott writes that the reforms and changes in the understanding and practice of baptism and confirmation in *LBW* “represent significant developments” in the area of the Lutheran understanding of “Christian initiation.” They are but a “stone tossed into a pond,” for these changes “have

stirred the waters by raising new questions” (p. 232). The ripple effect of these new ideas have now questioned the very need for baptism much less confirmation for the reception of Holy Communion and have led to communion without baptism in Lutheranism. The changes in the understanding of baptism and Christian initiation are now becoming a more “troublesome” matter for Lutherans and other Christians (p. 225).

Admission to communion without baptism or proper instruction is at odds with Scripture and is contrary to the historic practice of Lutheranism. Scripture teaches the need for instruction before receiving Holy Communion in a proper Scriptural manner! (1 Corinthians 11:22–34; Matthew 28:18–20; Ephesians 6:1–4; 2 Timothy 3:14–17; Luke 1:4. See also these Old Testament passages on teaching the faith: Deuteronomy 6, Psalm 78, Proverbs 22:6; Exodus 12:25–27).

The Lutheran Confessions follow this scriptural injunction. The Confessions chided the Roman Church for failing to instruct its people properly in the chief articles of Christian doctrine before communing them. “With us there is a more frequent and more conscientious use [of the Sacrament of the Altar]. For the people use it, but after having first been instructed and examined. For men are taught concerning the true use of the Sacrament that it was instituted for the purpose of being a seal and testimony of the free remission of sins, and that, accordingly it ought to admonish alarmed consciences to be truly confident and believe that their sins are freely remitted.”³⁰

Again the Confessions say: “With us many use the Lord’s Supper [willingly and without constraint] every Lord’s Day, but after having been first instructed, examined [whether they know and understand anything of the Lord’s Prayer, the Creed and the Ten Commandments], and absolved...With the adversaries there is no catechization of the children whatever, concerning which even the canons give commands. With us the pastors and ministers of the churches are compelled publicly [and privately] to instruct and hear the youth; and this ceremony produces the best fruits.”³¹

Luther expressed his concerns about the lack of religious knowledge on the part of laity in the prefaces to his catechisms. He lamented the fact that many lay people were receiving the Lord’s Supper without much if any knowledge of the Christian faith. He excoriated the clergy who failed to instruct the people. He exhorted them to perform the duties of their office and to “teach the catechism to the people” because those who remain uninstructed or who refuse instruction “should not be admitted to the sacrament.”³²

Further, Luther wrote: “It remains for us to speak of our two sacraments, instituted by Christ. Every Christian ought to have at least some brief, elementary instruction in them because without these no one can be a Christian,”³³ In the *Large Catechism* Luther wrote that Lutherans “do not intend to admit to the sacrament, and administer it to those who do not know

what they seek or why they come.”³⁴ The Lord’s Supper was not to be given to those without instruction in the elementary articles of the faith. This is the clear practice of Lutheranism from its inception.

In the instructions for the communion of the laity given to Nicholas Hausmann in 1523 Luther wrote these words:

Here one should follow the same usage as with baptism, namely, that the bishop be informed of those who want to commune. They should request in person to receive the Lord’s Supper so that he may be able to know both their names and manner of life. And let him not admit the applicants unless they can give a reason for their faith and can answer questions about what the Lord’s Supper is, what its benefits are, and what they expect to derive from it. In other words, they should be able to repeat the Words of Institution from memory and to explain that they are coming because they are troubled by the consciousness of their sin, the fear of death, or some other evil, such as temptation of the flesh, the world, or the devil, and now hunger and thirst to receive the word and sign of grace and salvation from the Lord himself through the ministry of the bishop, so that they may be consoled and comforted; this was Christ’s purpose, when he in priceless love gave and instituted this Supper, and said, “Take and eat,” etc...Those, therefore, who are not able to answer in the manner described above should be completely excluded and banished from the communion of the Supper, since they are without the wedding garment [Matt. 22:11–12].³⁵

In a 1533 letter Luther wrote:

But because our dear youth grow daily away from it [confession] and because among the people there is so little understanding, we maintain such a practice for their sakes, that they may be well brought up through this Christian training and understanding. For such Confession does not go on only for their recounting of sins, but also one should listen to them concerning whether or not they understand the Lord’s Prayer, the Creed, the Ten Commandments and whatever else the Catechism gives them. For we have come to know quite well how little the common crowd and the youth learn from the sermon, unless they are individually questioned or examined. Where better would one want to do this and where is it more needed than for those who should go to the Sacrament?

It is quite true that wherever the preacher administers only bread and wine in the Sacrament, he is not very concerned about to whom he gives it, what they know or believe, or what they receive. There one sow feeds with the others, and such preachers simply see themselves above such caring. They would rather have uninstructed ecstatic saints than have the care of nurturing Christians.

However, because we are concerned about nurturing Christians who will still be here after we are gone, and because it is Christ’s body and blood

that are given out in the sacrament, we will not and cannot give such a sacrament to anyone unless he is first examined regarding what he has learned from the Catechism and whether he intends to forsake the sins of which he has again committed. For we do not want to make Christ's church into a pig pen [Matthew 7:6], letting each one come unexamined to the sacrament as a pig to its trough. Such a church we leave to the Enthusiasts.

And all of this we have received from the beginning of Christendom. For there we see and grasp the way in which the Creed, the Our Father, and the Ten Commandments were put together as a short summary and doctrine for the young and for those in need of instruction. From early on this was what was called a "catechism." For "catechism" (say the Greeks) is a way of teaching with questions and answers, just as a schoolmaster has his pupils recite their lessons to see if they know it or not. In this way, those in need of instruction are to be examined and by their answers show that they know the parts of the Catechism, that they recognize the sin they again have done, and are willing to learn more and desire to do better. If they will not do this, they may not come to the Sacrament. The pastor is there as Christ's faithful servant and as far as it is possible for him, he may never cast the Sacrament to swine or dogs [Matthew 7:6].³⁶

A statement from Luther often used by infant communion advocates needs to be read in its context. "Therefore let every head of a household remember that it is his duty, by God's injunction and command, to teach or have taught to his children the things they ought to know. Since they [the children] are baptized and received into the Christian church, they should also enjoy this fellowship of the sacrament so that they may serve us and be useful."³⁷ Note the first sentence (often not included) speaks about instructing children in the faith so that they can enjoy coming to the Lord's Supper.

From Luther's own words noted above, It is difficult to understand how he can be described as an advocate for infant communion when all of his words—including those in his table talks which are taken by some to approve of infant communion—are read together.³⁸

The use of Luther's Catechisms in Reformation times and beyond is very clear. Reu quotes the *Kirchenordnung fuer Kursachsen* of 1580 which says: "Fifth: The pastors shall particularly subject those who go to the blessed Sacrament for the first time to a thorough examination in the Catechism to determine if they have learned it, as well as to inquire whether they are otherwise fit to be admitted to the Communion."³⁹

Some who advocate for infant communion claim that the Lutheran Confessions do not ever use 1 Corinthians 11:27–29 in a way that militates against infant communion. The claim is also made that the usage of this passage to deny communion to infants is a later innovation, a novel interpretation of the text, and an error which the church needs to correct.⁴⁰

However, the Confessions actually do what the supporters of infant communion deny.

With regard to the time, it is certain that most people in our churches use the sacraments, absolution, and the Lord's Supper, many times a year. Our clergy instruct the people about the worth and fruits of the sacraments in such a way as to invite them to use the sacraments often. On this subject our theologians have written many things which our opponents, if they are but honest men, will undoubtedly approve and praise. The openly wicked and despisers of the sacraments are excommunicated. We do this according to both the Gospel and the ancient canons. But we do not prescribe a set time because not everyone is ready in the same way at the same time. In fact, if everyone rushed in at the same time, the people could not be heard and instructed properly. The ancient canons and the Fathers do not appoint a set time...Christ says (1 Cor. 11:29) that those who receive in an unworthy manner receive judgments upon themselves. Therefore our pastors do not force those who are not ready to use the sacraments.⁴¹

Note the references to instruction of the baptized in relation to the proper use of the sacrament, and that no one is compelled to use the sacraments who is lacking sufficient instruction and thus is not ready to use the sacraments because they would fall under the injunction of 1 Corinthians 11:29.

The necessity for baptism and instruction before one receives the Lord's Supper is also stated by Chemnitz:

It is clear that one cannot deal with infants through the bare preaching of repentance and remission of sins, for that requires hearing (Rom. 10:17), deliberation and meditation (Ps. 119), understanding (Matt. 13:51), which are not found in infants. With regard to the Lord's Supper Paul says: "Let a man examine himself." Likewise: "Let him discern the Lord's body," a thing which cannot be ascribed to infants. Moreover, Christ instituted His Supper for such as had already become His disciples.⁴²

The ILCW's changes in the theology of Baptism and the practice of confirmation reflect its overt move "away from a 'Lutheran obsession with theology'" and towards its desire "to make worship a truly communal act" (p. 21).⁴³ The move away from the theology which teaches that in the sacraments God is giving to his people, and toward "a truly communal act" of human beings has traveled beyond the ILCW's desire to exalt Baptism. Now sacramental hospitality is given to uninstructed Christians and even to unbaptized unbelievers.

The ILCW baptismal rite attempted to "reunite the four-fold pattern of primitive Christian initiation" (p. 28; also pp. 22, 26, 30, 39–40, 70). This emphasis on the shape of the baptismal rite reflects the influence of Aidan Kavanagh (p. 48, fn. 104).⁴⁴

The ILCW's shape for baptism included a revision

of Luther's Flood Prayer recast as a prayer of thanksgiving for water that included an *epiclesis*. This is the baptismal liturgy's equivalent of the eucharistic prayer (The Great Thanksgiving/the canon of the Mass) (pp. 2–3, 22–23, 59–67, 77–80, 94–95, 99–100, 104–113). This conforms to the idea that the sacraments are acts of prayer.

The thanksgiving prayer for water with an *epiclesis* appears in *LBW*,⁴⁵ *Evangelical Lutheran Worship*,⁴⁶ *Lutheran Service Book*,⁴⁷ and *The United Methodist Hymnal*.⁴⁸ The flood prayer or prayer of thanksgiving for the water with an *epiclesis* is part of the ecumenical consensus about the shape of the baptismal liturgy, and also appears in the Eastern Orthodox baptismal liturgy,⁴⁹ the Roman Catholic baptismal liturgy,⁵⁰ the Anglican,⁵¹ the Church of Scotland,⁵² the Caribbean Conference of Churches,⁵³ and the Lima baptismal Liturgy.⁵⁴ This desired four-fold shape also reflects the influence of Gregory Dix and his four-action shape for the Eucharist. This reshaping of the baptismal rite as well as the redefinition of confirmation and Christian initiation have been major emphases of the modern liturgical movement.

Truscott's book got its start as his doctoral thesis. Though this book examines the history and theology of the ILCW's work in great detail, it reads more like a defense of the ILCW's work rather than as an objective or critical examination of that work. Truscott is to be highly commended for conveniently including in his book's appendices the various liturgies he writes about and studies! Readers can thus read the texts that Truscott examines (pp. 233–298).

Truscott believes that the changes in *LBW* did not go far enough to downplay confirmation and to bring about a more elevated view of baptism in Lutheranism (pp. 224–225). Truscott is correct about baptism not being regarded as it should by some Lutherans and other Christians. One reads statements from some Christian theologians who say that the Eucharist is an initiatory or formative rite of the Church that gathers Christians into the fold rather than baptism. The Eucharist is seen to be the sacrament that truly unites Christians as one. Baptism is often described as a half-step measure that leads to the Eucharist, which alone grants full incorporation in the Church (pp. 31–32, 80, 230). Truscott asks these questions, "...can infants who receive their first communion at the same service of their baptism continue to commune regularly thereafter?...Does not refusing to commune them after their baptismal communion amount to an excommunication?" (p. 231)

One *LBW* participant, reflecting others, wrote that "because we have not connected admission to the Lord's Table with baptismal initiation, Lutherans have not understood the Eucharistic community [as being] coterminate with the community of believers. It is anomalous to distinguish the two. Can members in good standing of the family be denied [admission to] the family table and still regard themselves as full members? Does not the situation force a

second-class-citizen mentality? On what grounds can a baptized person be regarded as a second-class citizen?" (p. 31)

These ideas have entered Lutheranism from the modern ecumenical/Roman Catholic liturgical movement. "New in the RICA's (Rome's *Rites of Christian Initiation of Adults*) proposal was its introduction of the argument that baptism, confirmation and eucharist were initiatory sacraments."⁵⁵ As another theologian put it: "The Eucharist is the event by which the Church is given existence and permanence... Baptism exists as a first step towards the Eucharist. It unites us to Christ and the Church, but by relating us to the Eucharist... Union with Christ and the Church remains the proper effect of the Eucharist, which alone gives it in full... [T]he Church receives its full existence in a given place by the event of the eucharistic assembly."⁵⁶ Another leading exponent of the modern liturgical movement has written: "For example, baptism only regenerates because it is ordered to the Eucharist; it is common teaching that a catechumen who would consciously refuse the Eucharist would receive only a sterile baptism."⁵⁷ From these statements one can see that the modern ecumenical/Roman Catholic liturgical movement downplays the importance and significance of baptism because everything is oriented to the Eucharist. Lutherans also advocate this position. "Put boldly, the Eucharist makes the Church."⁵⁸

The modern ecumenical liturgical movement sees Christian initiation "as a single process occurring over a variable period of time." This idea has been received with enthusiasm by many. However, William Lazareth expressed the concern "that baptism ought not be portrayed as a mere means to something else, namely, the Eucharist."⁵⁹ Yet this is exactly what has occurred. The Lord's Supper has become the birthright of the baptized, which cannot be denied baptized infants. This perspective makes baptism appear to be the one qualification for receiving the Lord's Supper and little else. To believe that the Eucharist constitutes the church and that it alone gives full church membership denies the fact that baptism itself is a means of grace, that the forgiveness of sins baptism bestows on sinners is effective and saving and is sufficient for salvation in its own right, and denies the fact that those who have been baptized have real saving faith and are full members of the church.

The evidence leads to the conclusion that an unintended consequence of viewing baptism as merely a half-step qualification for church membership because only the Eucharist gives it in full, and of seeing baptism as a mere qualification or stepping stone for receiving the Lord's Supper, has led to questions about the place of baptism in Christianity, and its overall necessity. Why is this said? Because as was seen above the necessity of being baptized in order to receive the Lord's Supper is now growing more suspect in ever widening parts of the Christian church. Communion is now becoming (and for some has already become) the birthright of

everyone—the baptized and the unbaptized, believers and unbelievers, the catechized and the uncatechized, the instructed and the uninstructed, Christians and non-Christians. Some of this flows from the new understanding of the Lord's Supper as a family meal (p. 20),⁶⁰ a de-emphasis on doctrine, and the emphasis on human actions, inclusiveness, and hospitality.⁶¹ These changes have resulted in an *ex opere operato* view of the Lord's Supper—it is effective and works simply because it is being enacted (performed) by the faith community (the family of God)—and there is no need for faith, knowledge of or trust in the words of Christ, remembrance of what Christ has done for sinners, self-examination, discernment or sorrow over one's sin, or discernment of the presence of Christ's body and blood.

Communion without baptism is the legacy of the modern liturgical movement's emphasis on early communion before full catechetical instruction, and the movement toward infant communion. Truscott wrote that the work of the ILCW raised new questions. One of the new questions now being raised is whether faith, baptism, or any instruction and knowledge of Christianity is necessary for receiving the Lord's Supper. The answer increasingly coming to the fore is a loud "No!" The push for communion without baptism or faith is a position far removed from the desire to enhance "the role of baptism in the spiritual and liturgical life of the church" (p. 225). It would appear that the new theological and liturgical approach to baptism promoted by the ILCW and *LBW* has unintentionally resulted in the denigration of baptism. This denigration of Baptism could be a result of the ILCW's downplaying of the understanding of Baptism as being necessary for salvation (p. 15, 206-207). This downplaying of the necessity of Baptism for salvation stands in contrast to the Lutheran Confessions which state: "Moreover, it is solemnly and strictly commanded that we must be baptized or we shall not be saved."⁶²

Truscott's book enables Lutherans to examine carefully the similarities and differences between the first communion rites in *LBW*⁶³ and the very similar first communion service in the Missouri Synod's new hymnal.⁶⁴ For the LCMS objections to the *LBW* baptismal rites and to communing children without full instruction, see pages 104–116 and 186–191 of Truscott's book.

With the publication of Truscott's book and Ralph Quere's book *In the Context of Unity: A History of the Development of the Lutheran Book of Worship*,⁶⁵ Lutherans are now better able to examine the similarities and differences between the theologies and ideas underlying the Lord's Supper, baptism, confirmation, and first communion liturgies in *LBW* and *LSB* as well as the sacramental liturgies in the ELCA's more recent worship books—*With One Voice (WOV)*⁶⁶ and *Evangelical Lutheran Worship (ELW)*. Truscott's and Quere's books also enable one to see how the theologies underlying *LBW* have influenced other Lutheran liturgical works and hymnals, and have been

influenced by the modern ecumenical/Roman Catholic liturgical movement.

Truscott's book sets forth the theological roots of the changes Lutheranism has experienced in recent years and continues to experience in its sacramental liturgies, in its understanding of the sacraments—specifically in its understanding of baptism—as well as the changes in catechesis, confirmation and its practice, the push for early communion before full instruction, infant communion, and communion without baptism.

Truscott's book reveals that many of the changes in the Lutheran perspective of baptism, initiation (confirmation), and the Lord's Supper have strayed from Lutheranism's foundational roots. Admission of the unbaptized and unbelieving to the Lord's Supper runs counter even to the desires of those who in times past championed Lutheran liturgical renewal. Careful study and examination of this book will help Lutherans see the roots of the theological and liturgical changes that have occurred and are continuing to occur in their midst, and reasons for the de-emphasis on catechesis before communion, as well as the growing demise of the requirement of baptism before attending communion, so that they can respond in ways in accord with Scripture and the Lutheran Confessions.

ENDNOTES

1. An expansion of some of the material in the text of this review and its footnotes can be seen in Armand J. Boehme, "THE CHURCH AND THE CULTURE OF THE MILLENNIALS-THE BEST OR WORST OF TIMES?" *Missio Apostolica* Vol. 21, No. 1 (Issue 41 – May 2013), pp. 95-124 – esp. pp. 103-115. This issue is available online at http://lsfmissiology.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/MA-5-13_Final_Online.pdf The endnotes for this article can be found at <http://lsfmissiology.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/Boehme-The-Church-and-the-Culture-of-Millennials-End-Notes.pdf>
2. *Lutheran Book of Worship* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House/Philadelphia: Board of Publication, Lutheran Church in America, 1978).
3. Frank W. Klos, *Confirmation and First Communion: A Study Book* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House/Philadelphia: Board of Publication of the Lutheran Church in America/St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1968). This book expounds much of the theological foundation that came to fruition in the printing of *LBW*, and that now is extant in most of Lutheranism.
4. Klos, *Confirmation and First Communion*, p. 191. Many of those significant American Lutheran studies of confirmation previous to the publication of Klos's book are noted in Edward Keratin Perry, "What Is Really Going On Here? An Essay on the Rhetoric, Process, and the 'Doing of Theology' about the so-called 'Infant Communion' issue" (np: Upper New York Synod LCA, November 1, 1979), pp. 2–11, 57–58. *The Bride of Christ* Vol. 13, No. 3 (Pentecost, 1989) was devoted to the subject of Confirmation - having 5 articles on the subject.
5. Cheslyn Jones, Geoffrey Wainwright, Edward Yarnold, SJ, eds., *The Study of Liturgy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978), pp. 79–146 deal with baptism and the role of confirmation (initiation) in the Christian church throughout its history. The study of baptism and confirmation began in earnest in the Oxford Movement. Discomfort with the separation of baptism from the Eucharist came to fruition in the twentieth century through the modern ecumenical/Roman Catholic liturgical movement and in work promoted by the World Council of Churches (WCC). David R. Holeton, "The Communion of Infants and Young Children," also David R. Holeton and Eberhard Kenntner, "Eucharist with Children in the Churches of the World," in *...And Do Not Hinder Them: An Ecumenical Plea for the Admission of Children to the Eucharist* (Geneva: World Council of Churches Faith and Order Paper #109, 1982), pp. 59–69 & pp. 70–81. For reports on studies of the relationship of baptism and confirmation in American Christianity (Roman Catholic, Episcopal, Methodist, and Presbyterian - UPC) see Perry, "What's Going on Here?," pp. 12–21; Richard Robert Osmer, *Confirmation: Presbyterian Practices in Ecumenical Perspective* (Louisville, KY: Geneva Press, 1996); Dom Gregory Dix, *Confirmation, Or Laying on of Hands?* (London, SPCK, 1936); Gregory Dix, *The Theology of Confirmation in Relation to Baptism: A Public Lecture in the University of Oxford delivered on January 22nd 1946* (London: Dacre Press, 1946).

See also the articles about baptism, confirmation, and Chrismation in Max Thurian ed., *Ecumenical*

Perspectives on Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry (Geneva: World Council of Churches – Faith and Order Paper 116, 1983), pp. 12–89, which speak about the changes in the understanding and practice of baptism and confirmation, including the push for infant communion encouraged by the modern liturgical movement. For a more recent exposition of confirmation see Craig L. Nesson, "Confirmation as Youth Ministry: The Task of Christian Formation," *Currents in Theology and Mission* Vol. 22, No. 4 (August 1995), pp. 268-274.

The classic text for the study of the Christian rites of initiation is E.C. Whitaker, *Documents of the Baptismal Liturgy* (London: SPCK, 1960) which was reissued in a revised and expanded edition - E.C. Whitaker, *Documents of the Baptismal Liturgy* - revised and expanded by Maxwell E. Johnson (Collegeville, MN: A Pueblo Book/Liturgical Press, 2003). See also Adian Kavanagh *Confirmation: Origins and Reform* (Collegeville, MN: Pueblo Books, 1988); G.W.H. Lampe, *The Seal of the Spirit: A Study in the Doctrine of Baptism and Confirmation in the New Testament and the Fathers* (London: Longmans, Green, 1951). Maxwell E. Johnson, ed., *Living Water, Sealing Spirit: Readings on Christian Initiation* (Collegeville, MN: A Pueblo Book/The Liturgical Press, 1995) – essays in this book deal with Baptism and confirmation and including essays by Lutherans Eugene Brand, Georg Kretschmar, and Maxwell E. Johnson.

Two significant Lutheran books which set forth the idea that all the baptized should be admitted to the Lord's Supper are Eugene L. Brand, *Baptism: A Pastoral Perspective* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing house, 1975), pp. 75 & 107; and Edmund Schlink, *The Doctrine of Baptism*, trans. Herbert J.A. Bouman (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1972), pp. 73 & 110.

The modern ecumenical/Roman Catholic liturgical movements have been designed to change the doctrine of every church body in existence and to bring their practices and rites into uniformity with one another. All church bodies have been affected by these movements. "What is going on at the present time is a great rethinking of the content of our faith. The liturgical, biblical and catechetical revivals are busy, not simply with practical matters, but with a doctrinal revival... [The liturgical movement] is a movement of pastoral renewal, intimately connected with the biblical and catechetical revivals." Charles Davis, *Liturgy and Doctrine: The Doctrinal Basis of the Liturgical Movement* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1960), p. 23.

With the liturgical movement one is "dealing with a very extensive doctrinal revival which is influencing most parts of our Christian faith... We need, then, to set to work to spread abroad the doctrinal insights that motivate the desire for liturgical reform... Let no one, then, underestimate the significance and power of the liturgical movement. What is taking place is... a change, a renewal in the pastoral work of the Church. And the concern is not with incidentals, but with the fundamentals of doctrine." Davis, *Liturgy and Doctrine*, pp. 121–123.

"In many ways the ecumenical movement and the liturgical movement are twins." Eugene L. Brand, "The Lutheran Book of Worship—Quarter Century Reckoning," *Currents in Theology and Mission* Vol. 30, No. 5 (October 2003), p. 331. "The more recent liturgical books of the Lutheran communion reflect the growing consensus among the confessional groupings of churches triggered

by the liturgical reforms following Vatican II and the progress made in ecumenical dialogues. One example is the *Lutheran Book of Worship*...Lutherans are now stepping beyond their Reformation tradition. By reintroducing fuller eucharistic prayers and, in some instances, more elaborated offertory sections, the eucharistic rites of the new books exhibit the convergence in structure and texts characteristic of the contemporary ecumenical scene. This is also true of new forms of baptism, ordination, the divine office, and the occasional services." Eugene Brand, "Liturgies: Lutheran," in J.G. Davies, ed., *The New Westminster Dictionary of Liturgy and Worship* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1986), p. 331. "The Liturgical movement of the present century [20th] is not therefore primarily a liturgical movement at all...It is essentially a theological movement. It is active alike in the Roman Catholic Church, in the Church of England, and in the other Protestant Churches...It began with a revival of the theology of the Church as the mystical Body of Christ, of which clergy and laity alike are equally members. It has gone on to reconsider both baptism and Eucharist in the light of that theology...It is prepared to ask radical questions...Inevitably the revision of services involves a reconsideration of the doctrine underlying them. The Roman Catholic Church is seeking to restore the balance of its Eucharistic teaching, by insisting on the character of the Mass as the function of the Christian community." A.H. Couratin, "Liturgy," in R.P.C. Hanson, ed., *The Pelican Guide to Modern Theology, Vol. II* (Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, Ltd., 1971), pp. 234-236.

For bibliographies on infant communion see Gary V. Gehlbach, "Infant Communion: Bibliography – Denominational" at http://wctc.net/~gehlbach/IC/Bibliographies/IC-Bibliography_denom.pdf; for a bibliography of materials both pro and con on the subject of infant communion see <http://www.paedocommunion.com/links.php>; see also Ronald Bagnall, "The Communion of the Baptized—From Paul to Luther via Augustine, Alcuin, and Aquinas." Ph.D. diss., Lutheran Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, PA, 1991.

6. "The Mysterium is a holy cultic action in which the redemptive act is rendered present in the rite; since the cultic community accomplishes this rite, it participates in the saving act and through it attains redemption." Ernst Benjamin Koenker, *The Liturgical Renaissance in the Roman Catholic Church* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1966), pp. 106–107. "The sacraments are the corporate actions of the Church, which actualize the Kingdom of the Holy Trinity by uniting in Christ and regenerating their participants." Massey Hamilton Shepherd, Jr., "The History of the Liturgical Renewal," in Massey Hamilton Shepherd, Jr., ed., *The Liturgical Renewal of the Church* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1960), p. 52. "The Faith and Order statement on the Eucharist invites the Lutheran churches to understand Holy Communion not one-sidedly in terms of the forgiveness of sins but as a eucharistic act of the Church, and this as a basic, essential interpretation of the Lord's Supper." John Reumann, *The Supper of the Lord: The New Testament, Ecumenical Dialogues, and Faith and Order on Eucharist* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985), p. 193. "The modern, post Vatican II liturgical movement has brought about great changes: one now talks of worship as action; worship belongs to the whole

people of God; leadership is spread among the people." Henry E. Horn, "Worship: The Gospel in Action," in Mandus A. Egge, ed., *Worship: Good News in Action* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1973), p. 24; Herbert F. Lindemann, *The New Mood in Lutheran Worship* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1971), pp. 54–55; "Liturgy means 'work of the people'...liturgy has always been the responsibility of all of the people of God." Philip H. Pfatteicher & Carlos R. Messerli, *Manual on the Liturgy: Lutheran Book of Worship* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1979), p. 9; "The liturgy is an act of the community. This is even indicated in the etymology of the term 'liturgy' – *leitourgia* – service of the people. It is not a clerical solo performance but a *concert* of the whole Christian community." "Appendix II: The eucharistic liturgy of Lima" in Thurian, *Ecumenical Perspectives on Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, p. 226; "liturgy...is literally the 'work of the people' in their common life of prayer. It involves a responsible and active participation by all the worshippers, the congregation no less than the ministers." Massey M. Shepherd, Jr., *The Worship of the Church* (Greenwich, Connecticut: The Seabury Press, 1953), p. 49; "Here it is enough to say that all eucharistic worship is of necessity and by intention a *corporate action*." "It was the fact that the eucharist as a whole was a corporate act of the whole church which everywhere maintained the rigid fixity of the outline of the liturgy, through the conservatism of the laity." Gregory Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy* (London: Dacre Press/Adam & Charles Black, 1978), pp. 1, 7. Further Dix wrote that the Eucharist is primarily an "action" of the whole church in contrast to something primarily associated with words. This was also the view of Vatican II. The older view of the Eucharist saw it primarily as "something which is *said*." Dix and the modern ecumenical/Roman liturgical movement view the Eucharist "as primarily something *done*" and the words spoken are only "one incidental" part of the action. Dix, *The Shape*, p. 12. See also Simon Jones, *The Sacramental Life: Gregory Dix and His Writings* (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2007), pp. 4-6, 9-14, 28-32. Through the influence of the modern Roman Catholic Liturgical movement and Gregory Dix the view of the sacraments changed from right words to right actions – from God giving believers gifts to the actions and sacrifices of believers in the direction of God.

7. Robert Preus, *Justification and Rome* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1997), p. 74; James M. Stayer, *Martin Luther, German Saviour: German Evangelical Theological Factions and the Interpretation of Luther, 1917–1933* (Montreal & Kingston/London/Ithaca: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2000), pp. 3–47, 118–136.

"God sees in the sinner the righteous person that he will ultimately fashion out of him or her. This means that the basis upon which people are justified or forgiven is the new life which God brings about in them through Christ...The *basis* upon which one is justified is the new life of righteousness and obedience to God's law brought about by God through Christ; this is what God requires and demands in order to justify human beings...Strictly speaking, God does not declare human beings righteous on account of their faith, but on account of the sanctification, righteousness and obedience God brings about in them...[Luther's] analytic understanding of justification maintains that *they must still become*

perfectly righteous and free of sin in order to be justified, while affirming simultaneously that in Christ some day they will attain this perfect righteousness...The life of perfect righteousness constitutes the *basis* upon which they are forgiven...the purely analytic view bases [justification] entirely on the new life of righteousness and obedience brought about by Christ *in nobis*..." David A. Brondos, "Sola Fide and Luther's 'Analytic' Understanding of Justification: A Fresh Look at Some Old Questions," *Pro Ecclesia* (Vol. 13, No. 1), pp. 45–49; David A. Brondos, *Redeeming the Gospel: The Christian Faith Reconsidered* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2011). In this book Brondos writes that "Jesus' death saved no one" (p. 4), and that "the New Testament offers no explicit and clear evidence that Christ's death" paid for human sin and satisfied "God's justice" (p. 67). Faith is said to be saving because "it leads to a life of obedience to God's will" (p. 150). "Ultimately it is our faith that constitutes the grounds for our certainty" of salvation (p. 182).

"Holl distinguished between analytic and synthetic justification. Synthetic [forensic] justification was defined as a declarative judgment of God whereby the sinner was justified solely on the basis of the work of Christ. Holl maintained that Luther rejected this view of justification, as did Holl himself... Luther allegedly understood justification as a real transformation of persons from the state of sinfulness to that of righteousness... Holl described Luther's view of justification as an analytic judgment, based on what a person already is or shall surely become, namely, righteous. This places regeneration before justification. God's justification is an analytic judgment of the renewal that is taking place within a human subject." Carl E. Braaten, *Justification: The Article by Which the Church Stands or Falls* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990), pp. 13–14.

"Whereas the Lutherans typically emphasize justification as the imputation of the righteousness of Christ apprehended by faith followed by renewal, love, and good works, the Catholics look upon justification...as meaning the whole process of making sinners into righteous persons." Braaten, *Justification*, p. 104. "Justification in its Pauline usage is a forensic metaphor." Braaten, *Justification*, p. 113. See also pp. 69–70, 105–126. On the distinction between the Lutheran (forensic, synthetic, righteousness *extra nos*) understanding of justification and the Roman analytic view (Christ within us, infused grace), see Gerhard Forde, "Forensic Justification and Law in Lutheran Theology," in H. George Anderson, T. Austin Murphy, Joseph A. Burgess, eds., *Justification by Faith: Lutherans and Catholics in Dialogue VII* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1985), pp. 278–303; also Anderson, Murphy, Burgess, *Justification by Faith*, pp. 50–52.

Luther came to see that Scripture and especially Paul taught that "justification by faith is not a gradual process or renewal or becoming righteous. It is rather the bestowal of the righteousness of Christ by imputation. God justifies the sinner by forgiving his sins and reckoning him innocent and blameless for the sake of the atoning work of Christ." Uuras Saarnivaara, *Luther Discovers the Gospel: New Light Upon Luther's Way from Medieval Catholicism to Evangelical Faith* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1951), p. 123; see also pp. 9–18, 74–126. Also Lowell C. Green, *How Melancthon Helped Luther Discover the Gospel: The Doctrine of Justification in the Reformation* (Fallbrook,

CA: Verdict Publications, 1980).

The analytic view of justification is also that of the New Perspectives on Paul (NPP), the Finnish view of Luther, and the understanding of justification in the Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification (JDDJ). Armand J. Boehme, "New? Old? Recycled? Historical Prolegomena to the New Perspectives on Paul" at <http://www.logia.org/features/Boehme-HistoricalProlegomenatotheNewPerspectivesonPaul.pdf>; "Tributaries into the River JDDJ: Karl Holl and Luther's Doctrine of Justification," pp. 1–16 (Summer 2009) at <http://www.logia.org/features/TributariesJDDJ-Boehme.pdf>; Guy Prentiss Waters, *Justification and the New Perspectives on Paul: A Review and Response* (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R Publishing Company, 2004); and F. David Farnell, "The New Perspective on Paul: Its Basic Tenets, History, and Presuppositions," *The Masters Seminary Journal* Vol. 16, No. 2 (Fall 2005), pp. 189–243.

One advocate of infant communion in the LCMS uses the Finnish Luther view of justification advanced by Maneerma (the Christ in us is the ground of our justification—that is, sinners are justified by being incorporated into Christ—a position similar to Osiander) to promote the practice of infant communion. Patrick S. Fodor, "A Case for Infant Communion in the Lutheran Church (Missouri Synod)" <http://www.scribd.com/doc/18759332/A-Case-for-Infant-Communion-in-the-Lutheran-Church-Missouri-Synod>;

see the material in footnotes 44–54 of Fodor's paper. For an orthodox Lutheran rejection of the Finnish Luther position see Timo Laato, "Justification: The Stumbling Block of the Finnish Luther School," *Concordia Theological Quarterly* Vol. 72, No. 4 (October 2008), pp. 327–346; Timo Laato, "'God's Righteousness' – Once Again," in Lars Aejmelaeus and Antti Mustakallio, eds., *The Nordic Paul: Finnish Approaches to Pauline Theology* (London: T & T Clark, 2008), pp. 40–73; Timo Laato, "Paul's Anthropological Considerations: Two Problems," in D. A. Carson, Peter T. O'Brien, Mark A. Seifrid, eds., *Justification and Variegated Nomism: Volume 2 – The Paradoxes of Paul* (Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck/ Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2004), pp. 343–359; Anssi Simojoki, "Martin Luther at the Mercy of His Interpreters: The New Helsinki School Critically Evaluated," in John A. Maxfield, ed., *2001 A Justification Odyssey* (St. Louis, MO: The Luther Academy, 2002), pp. 117–136; Lowell C. Green, "The Question of Theosis in the Perspective of Lutheran Christology," in Dean O. Wenthe, William C. Weinrich, Arthur A. Just, Jr., Daniel Gard, and Thomas L. Olson, eds., *All Theology is Christology: Essays in Honor of David P. Scaer* (Ft. Wayne, IN: Concordia Theological Seminary Press, 2000), pp. 163–180.

One exposition of the new baptismal rites in the Reformed churches invokes the understanding of justification found in NPP theologians E. P. Sanders and James D. G. Dunn and advocates for greater inclusivity. Iain Torrance, "Fear of being left out and confidence in being included: The liturgical celebration of ecclesial boundaries – A comment on the baptismal liturgies of the *Book of Common Worship* (1993) and *Common Order* (1994)," in Bryan D. Spinks & Iain R. Torrance, eds., *To Glorify God: Essays on Modern Reformed Liturgy* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1999), pp. 159–172.

See also Armand J. Boehme, "Sing a New Song: The Doctrine of Justification and the *Lutheran Book of Worship* Sacramental Liturgies," *Concordia Theological Quarterly* Vol. 43, No. 2 (April 1979), pp. 96–119.

An analytic view of justification is tied to the introduction of Eucharistic Prayers. "The unembellished words of Institution cannot really be understood as a 'remembrance', for a remembrance is a narrative. The Words of Institution, when used in their isolated liturgical setting, have no narrative attached to them...Which is why it is so easy to construe them as the 'moment of consecration' when the elements in some way 'become' the body and blood. But then this clearly ignores the Lord's command to do this sacred meal of bread and wine precisely as a *remembrance* of him. It is the Eucharistic Prayer that adds the narrative to the words in order to make it a remembrance. The remembrance is what we bring to the Eucharist, and so is part of our sacrifice, our offering -- of our tradition, our memory, our instruction, our scholarship, our upbringing of Christ...But this does not reduce the Eucharist to a mere 'memorial meal'...His [Christ's] Words of Institution, set in the narrative of his life and Israel's life and his Church's life, emerge as the powerful and performative word of his holy promise made real and effective by his continuing incarnate life among his people here in the Sacrament. This is something that the Verba alone could never do; by themselves, the Words of Institution just hang there...Embodied in the dialogue of the Eucharistic Prayer, the Words of Institution become incarnate as the living Christ and his living Bride in holy conversation and communion. And *that* is salvation...The case for the 'bare Verba' rests on the forensic metaphor for justification being the normative one." Mark Chapman, "The Eucharistic Prayer in Lutheran Liturgy," *The Bride of Christ* Vol. 15, No. 3 (Pentecost 1991), p. 25.

Earlier in this same essay, Chapman wrote that "the full Eucharistic Prayer" is historically "alien to Lutheran theology" because of the "strict emphasis on the objective efficacy of the Word," and the Lutheran "avoidance" of an emphasis on human action and work righteousness. (Chapman, "The Eucharistic Prayer in Lutheran Liturgy," p. 22.

To gain greater understanding of the increased emphasis on human actions, gestures, and motion in worship today see R. Kevin Seasolts, O.S.B., "Non-Verbal Symbols and the Eucharistic Prayer," in Frank C. Senn, ed., *New Eucharistic Prayers: An Ecumenical Study of their Development and Structure* (New York: Paulist Press, 1987), pp. 214–236.

8. Understanding the sacraments as acts of prayer has been the perspective of Rome and the Reformed. It is also the theological perspective of the modern liturgical movement.

A. Rome: "This is what is stated with supreme clarity in the very prayer in which and by which the Church consecrates the Eucharist, that prayer which is the Eucharist properly speaking, prayer in which the Word of God to man and the response of man to God are one." Louis Bouyer, "The Word of God Lives in the Liturgy," in *The Liturgy and The Word of God* (Collegeville, MN: The Order of St. Benedict, Inc., 1959), p. 63.

Pope Benedict XVI, when he was Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger, wrote, "Accordingly, the Eucharist was recognized as the essential reality of the Last Supper, what we call today the Eucharistic Prayer, which derives

directly from the prayer of Jesus on the eve of his passion and is the heart of the new spiritual sacrifice, the motive for which many Fathers designated the Eucharist simply as *oratio* (prayer), as the 'sacrifice of the word', as a spiritual sacrifice, but which becomes also material and matter transformed: bread and wine become the body and blood of Christ, the new food, which nourishes us for the resurrection, for eternal life." Quoted from Timothy Maschke, *Gathered Guests: A Guide to Worship in the Lutheran Church* 2nd Edition (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 2009), pp. 168–169, fn. 14.

In days past Rome also struggled with the efficacy of Christ's Words without accompanying eucharistic prayers. Martin Chemnitz, *Examination of the Council of Trent, Part II*, trans. Fred Kramer (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1978), pp. 224–231, 508–509, 527.

"There is a booklet of Bessarion in which he argues this question at length, whether the consecration comes about through the words of institution or through the words of the canon, or whether both together are necessary for the consecration. The theologians of Cologne, in their Antidigama, contend earnestly and with many words that those are raving mad who think that the bread and wine are consecrated into the body and blood of Christ through the words of institution if there are not also added the words and prayers of the canon. And among the papalists many write publicly that those churches which use the words of institution of Christ in the Supper without adding the papalistic canon do not have the true body and blood of Christ, as Lindanus says, only a bread-sacrament." Chemnitz, *Examination, Part II*, pp. 224–225.

"For some rejected the papalistic consecration in such a way that they imagined the Lord's Supper could also be celebrated without the words of institution. This is manifestly false. For it is most certain that there is no sacrament without the Word... But what if someone now asks what that word of blessing is which, coming to the bread and wine, makes it the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ? Surely this is beyond controversy, that...the Eucharist has a certain specific word which belongs to it, namely, the divine institution... [H]e acts wickedly who takes away the consecration of the Eucharist from the words of divine institution and transfers it to the prayers of the canon, which have been patched together by men out of unsound and sound, or, rather mostly out of unsound materials. And surely this blessing or consecration is not to be divided between the Word of God and words handed down by men. For it is not just any word, but the Word of God which is necessary for a sacrament. And to the Word of God, seeing it has been tried with fire, nothing is to be added (Prov. 30:6). And especially, nothing is to be added to the testament of the Son of God (Gal. 3:15–17)." Chemnitz, *Examination, Part II*, pp. 225–226. "Let the reader observe, however, that very many among the papalists, although they are not able to banish the words of institution entirely from the consecration of the Eucharist, have nevertheless cut off a large part... But when Paul was about to instruct the Corinthians how they could celebrate not a common but the Lord's Supper, he recites and prescribes the entire institution." Chemnitz, *Examination, Part II*, p. 228. Also pp. 230–231.

"5. *The institution narrative.* This [part of the Eucharistic Prayer]...contains what are no longer called *verba consecrationis* but *verba Domini*." Adian

Kavanagh, "Thoughts on the New Eucharistic Prayers," in R. Kevin Seasoltz, ed., *Living Bread, Saving Cup: Readings on the Eucharist* (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 19), p. 104. This quotation describing the Verba as "the words of the Lord" emphasizes the fact that the modern/Roman/ecumenical liturgical movement no longer considers the Verba consecratory hence the change in terminology. Kavanagh's words note that a change in liturgical terminology reflects a shift in doctrine. "A liturgical change has historically signaled a change in doctrine." Richard Klann, "Editorial: Inter-Lutheran Commission on Worship," *Concordia Journal* Vol. 2, No. 2 (March, 1976), p. 41).

The Kavanagh quote above prompted a study of various Lutheran hymnals to see how they label the Verba.

The communion liturgy in *The Concordia Hymnal: A Hymnal for Church, School and Home* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1932 – revised and enlarged 1960), p. 416, refers to the Verba as "Words of Institution." This hymnal does not have Eucharistic Prayers. *The Lutheran Hymnal (TLH)* refers to the Verba as "The Words of Institution." *The Lutheran Hymnal* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1941), p. 27. *TLH* contains no Eucharistic Prayers.

Service Book and Hymnal (SBH) did not mention or label the Verba because they are simply part of "The Prayer of Thanksgiving." *Service Book and Hymnal* (Minneapolis/Philadelphia: Augsburg Publishing House/Board of Publications Lutheran Church in America, 1958), pp. 11, 34, 62. But the Verba are identified as "The Words of Institution" when they are to be used as the bare Verba without being buried in The Prayer of Thanksgiving/the Eucharistic Prayer. *SBH*, pp. 12, 35, 63. The Missouri Synod's *Worship Supplement* of 1969 (*WS 69*) contained numerous Eucharistic Prayers. *WS69* does not identify the Verba since they are simply part of the text of its multiple Prayers of Thanksgiving. *Worship Supplement* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1969), pp. 45-46, 60-62, 65-67. The Verba do not receive any designation in *LBW* because they are simply one part of The Great Thanksgiving. The Verba are not even identified when they are to be used outside of The Great Thanksgiving/the Eucharistic Prayer. *LBW*, pp. 68-71, 88-91, 109-112.

The Verba were designated "The Words of Institution" in *Lutheran Worship (LW)* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1982), pp. 149, 171, 190, 198. This hymnal does not have full Eucharistic Prayers. *Evangelical Lutheran Hymnary* (St. Louis: MorningStar Music Publishers, Inc./The Evangelical Lutheran Synod, 1996) refers to the Verba as "The Words of Institution" on pages 54, 78-79, 102-103. This hymnbook also does not contain Eucharistic Prayers.

The Verba were designated "The Words of Institution" in the LCMS's *Hymnal Supplement 98* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1998), p. 12. There are no Eucharistic Prayers in the 98 Supplement. On pages 92-93 *Evangelical Lutheran Worship (ELW)* outlines its patterns for worship. Under the outline for the "Meal" on page 93, *ELW* lists "Great Thanksgiving, Dialogue and Preface, Holy, Holy, Holy, Thanksgiving at the Table with Words of Institution Or Words of Institution." Here *ELW* identifies the Verba as "Words of Institution" both when they are a part of the Great Thanksgiving and when they are used as the bare Verba without a Eucharistic Prayer.

However, in the actual liturgies the Verba never receive any separate identification. *Evangelical Lutheran Worship* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress Publishers, 2006), pp. 108-111, 130-133. The *ReClaim Hymnal*, which does not contain Eucharistic Prayers, refers to the Verba as "Words of Institution." *ReClaim Lutheran Hymnal for Church and Home* (St. Paul, MN:ReClaim Resources, 2013), pp. 36, 63, 90.

The only hymnal that changed the title of the Verba from the Words of Institution to something else was the most recent LCMS hymnal, *Lutheran Service Book (LSB)*. It identifies the Verba as "The Words of Our Lord." *Lutheran Service Book* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 2006), pp. 162, 179, 197, 209, 217. *LSB* contains two liturgies with the option of full Eucharistic Prayers. *LSB*, pp. 161-163 & 178-180. Whether the Verba are part of *LSB*'s Eucharistic Prayers or whether they stand alone, they are designated by the term "The Words of Our Lord."

B. The Reformed: Reformed theology states that Christ's Words do not consecrate, but that human Eucharistic prayers of thanksgiving do.

"When Christ wished to solemnize the Supper, he uttered the thanksgiving prayer, in which he thanked the Father for all he had received from Him...and by which he set apart from profane use the elements to be used for the celebration of the Supper.--Bucan (XLVIII, 25): 'By prayer to God he prepared and appointed and sanctified the bread and wine for sacred use.'--Pictet (XIV, iv. 9): 'By this blessing the symbols are consecrated; for in this blessing were contained thanksgiving to God for benefits received and a petition that the symbols might be rendered effective for the spiritual use and benefit of the recipients. And so the ancients were wont to consecrate with prayer, as is clear from their liturgies and writings'...That in this thanksgiving, by which he consecrated the elements of his Supper, Christ availed himself of the customary liturgical formula is probable. At the same time we do not know what prayer formula it was." Heinrich Heppe, *Reformed Dogmatics: Set Out and Illustrated from the Sources*, trans., G.T. Thomson (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1978), p. 632.

"As Christ at other times by blessing and thanksgiving sanctified loaves and other foods to a natural use, Mt. 14.19 (loaves and fishes) Lk. 9.16 (ditto)—so Christ by this blessing and thanksgiving set bread apart from a natural to a sacred use, that there might exist a sacrament of his body. This original blessing and sanctification of the bread (and the like blessing also of the cup) conferred by Christ, the Lord and Author of the Eucharist, is so important, that by it the Eucharist observed everywhere according to its institution is effective to the end of the world. What an immense gap between this and the Mass priests' consecration of Christ's words *hoc enim est corpus meum*... That Christ had blessed and consecrated by these words [the Words of Institution] is utterly absurd, since before he had uttered these words he has already blessed, given thanks and by blessing and giving thanks has consecrated the elements. He was undoubtedly heard when blessing bread and cup, and so made the bread blessed by the blessing and the cup likewise previously to his pronouncing the word *hoc est corpus meum*... And since blessing and consecration are a kind of prayer, there is assuredly no sort of praying in the words *hoc enim est corpus meum*." Heppe, *Reformed Dogmatics*, p. 633.

"By prayer to God, thanksgiving and the whole sacred

action Christ prepared, appointed and sanctified the bread and wine for sacred use, that they might be the sacrament of his own body and blood... We deny that consecration must be attached to the pronouncement of the sacramental words [the Verba]. It must be placed in the entire action and especially by the blessing, by which the elements are transferred from a common and natural use and applied to a holy use, since Christ is said by the evangelist to have blessed and given thanks after the bread was accepted." Heppe, *Reformed Dogmatics*, p. 634. See also pp. 592–595, 599–610.

"The later Reformed liturgies included these words [the Verba] either in an admonition or in a sort of eucharistic prayer, as is still done by Reformed congregations in the Prussian Union. This leads to an outward similarity with the Catholic liturgies, which also include the words of institution in the eucharistic prayer. The Reformed liturgies and confessions make it clear that the words are not consecratory... Reformed dogmatists... deny, however, that the words 'This is my body...' have ever been or are today the blessing (eucharistia, eulogia) in the celebration of the sacrament. This blessing is performed either by the prayer or by the whole action." Hermann Sasse, *This Is My Body: Luther's Contention for the Real Presence in the Sacrament of the Altar* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1959), p. 165, fn. 66.

"Christ takes us up into his sacrifice on the cross when we offer our sacrifice of praise in the eucharistic prayer. The epiclesis belongs to the last part of the eucharistic prayer... There is therefore no isolated epiclesis over the gifts but the epiclesis over the assembly is linked with the symbolic action of the eucharistic gifts. That is why the eucharistic prayer, structured on a trinitarian pattern from the Preface onwards, is consecratory as a whole, rather than any specific part of it." Bruno Burki, "The celebration of the Eucharist in *Common Order* (1994) and in the Continental Reformed liturgies," in Spinks and Torrance, *To Glorify God*, p. 232. See also Ronald P. Byars, *Lift Your Hearts on High: Eucharistic Prayer in the Reformed Tradition* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2005).

C. The Modern/Roman Catholic Ecumenical Liturgical Movement: "After the brief act of offertory, the bishop offered the Eucharistic Prayer (or as it is called today, the Prayer of Consecration)." Richard M. Spielmann, *History of Christian Worship* (New York: The Seabury Press, 1966), p. 29; see also pp. 33–37, 44–46, 69–72, 77, 88, 102–105, 137, 143–144, 150, 166–170. Shepherd, Jr., *The Worship of the Church*, pp. 159–162; G. D. Kilpatrick, "Liturgical Reform, The Anglican Heritage and Ecumenical Development," in Fredrick Wilhelm Katzenbach and Vilmos Vajta eds., *Oecumenica: An Annual Symposium of Ecumenical Research – 1968* (Minneapolis, MN/Neuchatel/Gutersloh: Augsburg Publishing House/Editions Delachaux et Niestle/Gutesloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1968), pp. 239–248.

The commentary to *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry* says, "It is in light of the significance of the Eucharist as intercession [prayer] that references to the Eucharist in Catholic theology as 'propitiatory sacrifice' may be understood." *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry* (BEM) (Geneva: World Council of Churches Faith and Order Paper No. 111, 1982), p. 11. "This union makes it clear that the Eucharist is not a magical or mechanical

action but a prayer addressed to the Father... In the early liturgies the whole 'prayer action' was thought of as bringing about the reality promised by Christ." BEM No. 111, p. 13. Charles J. Evanson, "The Lord's Supper according to the World Council of Churches," *Concordia Theological Quarterly* Vol. 49, Nos. 2 & 3 (April–July 1985), pp. 117–134.

"One of the many names of the eucharistic prayer" is "anaphora." W. Jardine Grisbooke, "Consecration, Prayer of," in J.G. Davies, ed., *The New Westminster Dictionary of Liturgy and Worship* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1986), p. 195. Anaphora is a "Greek word... which has from a very early date been the normal Greek name for the eucharistic prayer, commonly called in English the prayer of consecration... In the Roman rite for many centuries this prayer has been entitled canon." Grisbooke, "Anaphora," in Davies, *The New Westminster*, p. 13.

"The eucharist is an action--'do this'--with a particular meaning given to it by our Lord Himself--'for the anamnesis of Me'. The action is performed by the rite as a whole, the meaning is stated by the eucharistic prayer... In seeking, therefore, to determine the meaning of the eucharist, it is to the rite as a whole, to the Shape of the Liturgy, that we must look first of all, looking at it, however, always in the light of the interpretation given by the prayer. In saying this and in asserting that the prayer is by original intention neither a 'prayer of consecration' nor a 'prayer of oblation' but a 'eucharistic prayer', there is no need to question the universally accepted notion that the prayer 'consecrates'. Nor, on a complete understanding of the matter, need there be any denial of the fact that 'consecration' is in and by itself the completion of a fully sacrificial action, by which something is offered to God--in adoration, thanksgiving, petition, and propitiation--and is accepted by Him. 'Consecration is in fact only the description of the offering and acceptance of sacrifice." Dix, *The Shape*, p. 238. See also Dix's excursus on "The Theology of Consecration" on pp. 268–302.

D. Lutherans – Especially Those Influenced by the Modern/Roman Catholic Liturgical Movement Also Believe and Promote the Teaching that Human Acts of Prayer Rather than Christ's Words are What Consecrate the Elements:

"In every Liturgy there is a *Prayer of Consecration*. It usually is long,... formal, majestic, and wonderfully, gloriously solemn in its tone of thankful adoration and consecration... [T]his Prayer of Consecration is followed by the Lord's Prayer." Paul Zellar Strodach, *A Manual on Worship: Venite Adoremus* (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1946), p. 236; see also pp. 237–238.

"In the original institution of the Lord's Supper the 'consecration' in all probability was an unrecorded prayer." Luther D. Reed, *The Lutheran Liturgy: A Study of the Common Liturgy of the Lutheran Church in America* (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1959 – revised edition), p. 350.

"But if we go back further into history, to the development of the Christian Eucharistic prayer out of the genre of the Jewish *berakah*, it will be seen that the whole act of thanksgiving was regarded as consecratory... Thanksgiving serves to consecrate everything created by God... Luther's consecration theology, however, remained within the Western tradition established by Ambrose of Milan. The words of Christ consecrate the bread and wine.

This in itself may be removed from the Biblical idea that the act of thanksgiving consecrates the things of creation." Frank C. Senn, "Martin Luther's Revision of the Eucharistic Canon in the Formula Missae of 1523," *Concordia Theological Quarterly* Vol. 44, No. 2 (March, 1973), pp. 108 & 118.

"The celebration of the Lord's Supper, too, is prayer worship from beginning to end... This is not to be an ordinary meal with bread and wine. Bread and wine are to be lifted out of the purpose which they ordinarily serve in a meal and assigned to this special service of rendering Christ's body and blood present. This Jesus did as He took bread into His hand, spoke a prayer of thanksgiving over it, broke it, and distributed it, and then proceeded to do something similar with the cup. And then this bread must be received to be eaten and this wine to be drunk." Peter Brunner, *Worship in the Name of Jesus*, trans. M. H. Bertram (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1968), p. 179.

"But what is here meant with 'the Word of God'? Some regard it as a reference to the creative word of the almighty God, which is, indeed, effectual here and now. But it seems more reasonable to assume that it refers to a word actually uttered by the praying person and connected with the prayer. 'It seems best to relate *λογος θεου* ('Word of God') to table prayers couched in Biblical phraseology.'... The hallowing or consecrating of the food by God's Word and prayer is of basic significance for an understanding of the organization of Holy Communion... The cup becomes the cup of Holy Communion by the *ευλογία* spoken over it. And this *ευλογία* is unquestionably prayer, glorifying, anamnetic prayer of thanksgiving. But this prayer directed to God simultaneously relates to the cup. For the cup is the object of praise and the blessing. This also applies to the bread. The *ευλογία* over the bread is contained in the breaking of bread. The bread becomes the bread of Holy Communion by virtue of this particular 'breaking' which is inseparably connected with the glorifying prayer of thanksgiving (Mark 8:6; Matt. 15:36). In 1 Cor. 10:16 the *ευλογία* even appears as the factor that virtually constitutes the sacrament as such. And this *ευλογία* was definitely prayer... [T]his Holy Communion prayer, the *ευλογία*, is an essential factor in blessing and hallowing the food as the Holy Communion food... The prayer which dare not be omitted according to apostolic testimony, and the example of Christ, is the *ευλογία*, 'a prayer of thanksgiving in the form of a blessing and spoken for the purpose of blessing.'... In the *ευλογία* spoken over bread and wine, the fully developed Eucharistic epiclesis (= invocation) is a prayer with a double content: for the descent of the Holy Spirit on bread and wine, to consecrate the food and make it body and blood of Christ, and for a salutary reception of the Meal's gifts and graces." Brunner, *Worship in the Name of Jesus*, pp. 296-299.

"Here we do not have a confession of faith: we could say that it is an 'anamnesis of Christ,' a commemoration of Christ. One finds similar formulas in the prayers of the early church and in its thanksgiving, hymns, and praises... To pray and to give thanks in the name of Jesus does not mean simply that one made use of the formula 'in the name of Jesus,' but that in prayer and thanksgiving one mentioned the name of Jesus and generally also what made him Savior and Lord of the church (cf. e.g., Acts 4:24-30). 'Remembrance' and 'commemoration' have

held a central place in early Christian worship, in the preaching in the churches, and in thanksgiving and prayer... Historians of liturgy belonging to diverse confessions agree in seeing in *anamnesis*, commemoration... the fundamental theme of the celebration of the Lord's Supper in the early church... The celebration itself, i.e., thanksgiving, sacrifice, and sacrament (*mysterion*) was a commemoration, an *anamnesis* of the death and resurrection of Jesus... In the thanksgiving, the death of Jesus is commemorated before God. And this same act, the death of Jesus, is also proclaimed to the faithful... Such 'commemorations' of Christ correspond in form and type to the eucharistic thanksgiving formulas of Hippolytus... At that time there would have been no contradiction between commemoration celebration and Christ's real presence in the bread and wine. It was the bread and wine consecrated by the commemorative thanksgiving [prayer] that gave a share in his body and blood." Nils Alstrup Dahl, *Jesus in the Memory of the Early Church* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1976), pp. 20-24. See also the title for Principle 43 of the ELCA's document, *The Use of the Means of Grace: A Statement on the Practice of Word and Sacrament*, which says that "HOLY COMMUNION IS CONSECRATED BY THE WORD OF GOD AND PRAYER," p. 47.

"The primitive church never had anything which resembled the Lutheran 'bald canon,' a consecration void of everything except the words of institution. Consecration in the primitive liturgies was always by prayer, never by proclamation; prayer which remembered God's gracious activity in the history of salvation (the *anamnesis*) and which invoked the Holy Spirit upon the people and their gifts so as to transform both gifts and people into the Body of Christ (the *epiklesis*). Along with the discarding of the traditional eucharistic prayer, Protestant worship obscured anything which created action in the liturgy or which promoted involvement." Frank C. Senn, "The unity of Word and Sacrament: Prerequisites for parish renewal," *Lutheran Forum* Vol. 5, No. 4 (April 1971), p.20. See also Gordon Lathrop, "The Prayers of Jesus and the Great Prayer of the Church," *Lutheran Quarterly* Vol. 26, No. 2 (May 1974), pp. 158-173; Mark E. Chapman, *The Eucharist as Prayer*, "The Bride of Christ" Vol. 18, No. 4 (St. Michael and All Angels, 1994), pp. 10-12; Yngve Brilioth, *Eucharistic Faith and Practice: Evangelical and Catholic*, trans. A.G. Hebert (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1930), pp. 43 & 48.

"Hans Christoph Schmidt-Lauber, liturgical scholar from Vienna, has argued that the Lord's Supper should be understood in terms of the eucharistic meal. According to Schmidt-Lauber Christ becomes present in the thanksgiving of the congregation. This view is supported by the observation that the words of institution appear relatively late in the liturgies. Only since the fourth century have they been understood as words which bring about the presence of Christ in the bread and wine... [Luther] made the words of institution the key to the eucharistic service... if we are aware of Luther's dependence on the problematic liturgical tradition of the Western church, we may be able to overcome Luther's insistence on the words of institution. In this kind of [liturgical] renewal, the Lutheran churches of today could formulate their eucharistic liturgies so that the eucharistic prayer could become the key event of the celebration."

Wolfgang Simon, "Worship and the Eucharist in Luther Studies," *Dialog* Vol. 47, NO. 2 (Summer 2008), p. 143.

Robert Jenson writes about the problematic Western liturgical tradition which is centered in consecration by means of the verba rather than by the actions of the church - its praying, remembering, and its sacrificial thanksgiving including an epiclesis. "if the ancient liturgical tradition was faithful to the biblical mandate, the later Western liturgical tradition and the relevant dogmatic tradition have not been. The Supper's fidelity to the founding mandate has been deeply compromised. This is not our discovery, the desires stated in the following are in large part only urgent established goals of the liturgical movement in all denominations." Robert Jenson, "The Supper," in Carl F. Braaten and Robert W. Jenson, eds., *Christian Dogmatics, Vol. 2* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), p. 341; also pp. 342, 343, 350-351.

E. Unnecessary words: This de-emphasis on the consecratory power of Christ's Words has led some liturgical movement advocates to state that Christ's Words are not only not consecratory of the Lord's Supper because what consecrates is human prayer action, but even makes them unnecessary.

"reciting the verba cannot be conceived as consecration...The offertory is the only consecration we can perform. I suggest that this act should appropriately be accompanied by prayer, and that the prayer be invocation in the Spirit...a consecration epiclesis." Robert W. Jenson, "The Liturgy of the Spirit," *Lutheran Quarterly* Vol. 26, No. 2 (May, 1974, p. 196.

"As transmitted in the New Testament, the Narrative [of Institution] is not a part of the service, but rubrics for the whole service. Whenever it was that it came to be recited as itself a part of the Great Thanksgiving, it came in as the 'cult-legend' of the service; i.e., it explains and justifies that we do this particular performance before God and each other... It is in the context of a tradition that has deteriorated...that the Formula of Concord demands that the Narrative must always be spoken (SD, VII, 79). But recitation of the Narrative cannot be considered an *essential* part of the Eucharist, and if the Formula means this, it lacks all biblical support. Whatever 'Do this' may include, it cannot possibly include 'Recite this narrative in which Jesus is quoted as saying "Do this".' The Eucharistic promises *could* come to word otherwise than by recitation of the Narrative." Robert W. Jenson, "EUCCHARIST: Its Relative Necessity, Specific Warrant, and Traditional Order," *Dialog* Vol. 14 (Spring, 1975), p. 130. Italics in original.

"We suppose, for example, that the one thing which must always be done in the celebration of the Lord's Supper is that the narrative of institution be recited. But that is clearly the one thing in all heaven and earth that cannot possibly belong to the necessary structure of the Lord's Supper." Robert Jenson, "Toward Reform of the Lutheran Liturgical Tradition," *Bulletin of the Lutheran Theological Seminary Gettysburg* Vol. 56, No. 1 (February, 1976), pp. 44-45.

"In the New Testament church, of course, the Narrative was not handed on as a *part* of the service, but as rubrics *for* the service. And indeed, contrary to much piety and theology, which make the Narrative the one indispensable verbal part of the Supper, there is no strict biblical compulsion to include it at all. Whatever 'Do this' may comprehend, it cannot possibly order 'Recite the narrative in which Jesus is quoted as saying, "Do this".'

We do not know when the Narrative came to be recited as itself a part of the thanksgiving. Whenever it was, the purpose is clear: the Narrative functions as the *haggadah* of the Supper, the explanatory story that justifies—before God and the company—our performance of the rite and the hopes we attach to it." Robert W. Jenson, *Visible Words: The Interpretation and Practice of Christian Sacraments* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1978), p. 98.

"Much of our difficulty, ironically and somewhat surprisingly, has come from the exclusivity with which the Western church has attended to the Supper as 'sacrament' rather than as 'sacrifice.' It is, after all, a sacrifice, an audible and visible act of prayer, that is directly commanded by Scripture...The medieval dogmatic developments forgot this entirely...the Council of Florence [said]...the words of the Savior by which he created this sacrament...makes the sacrament. The direct content of the biblical command, the act of thanksgiving, is omitted altogether from this list of items necessary to a valid sacrament. In its place appears the priest's recital of the words of institution, an act that can be no part of what the biblical 'Do this' commands." Jenson, "The Supper," in Braaten and Jenson, *Christian Dogmatics Vol. 2*, pp. 341-342.

The significance of Jenson's statements come from the fact that he helped author the Eucharistic Prayers in LBW: "At the same time, Eugene Brand...appointed me to the committee that drafted the Lutheran Book of Worship's eucharistic prayers--attending a service that uses them, it is still a shock to hear my own words offered by the celebrant." Robert W. Jenson, "A Theological Autobiography, to Date," *Dialog* Vol. 46, No. 1 (Spring 2007), pp. 53-54.

"Since the exact text of the Narrative of Institution...often concerns people deeply, it may require further comment. The liturgical narrative [of The Great Thanksgiving - TGT] is not the reading of a Scripture excerpt or of a conflation of excerpts; it is our telling the story now." The story or narrative of institution is "a recital of the particular event which justifies our present act of praise." *The Great Thanksgiving* (New York: Inter-Lutheran Commission on Worship, 1975), p. 3.

"For TGT Christ and his Word are not constitutive for the Lord's Supper, but our memorializing thanksgiving is." 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 #1* (Valparaiso, IN: Valparaiso University Press, 1977), p. 28.

"Some have offered historical reconstructions which allow for the existence of [eucharistic] prayers that do not include the narrative [of institution]...the Presbyterian collection of prayers examined in this book does have examples of prayers of this kind...In any case, these various hypotheses allow us to move firmly away from attaching a consecratory power to the words of Jesus in the eucharist, while at the same time grasping the import and importance of including the story and memorial command in the anaphora." David N. Power, O.M.I., "The Eucharistic Prayer: Another Look," in Senn, *New Eucharistic Prayers*, pp. 241-242.

"Yet, it seemed necessary, so as not to confuse the faithful, to retain in these renewed eucharists certain of the most salient elements of the Roman canon's structure, particularly the distinction (which, as we saw, was original) between a properly consecratory epiclesis,

corresponding to the *Abodah* prayer of the synagogue, retained before the institution narrative and the communion epiclesis at the conclusion of the anamnesis.” Louis Bouyer, *Eucharist: Theology and Spirituality of the Eucharistic Prayer*, trans. Charles Unherhill Quinn (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1968), p. 448.

For a study of early liturgical anaphoras without the Verba in contrast to the Pauline tradition with the Verba see Jonathan Schwiebert, *Knowledge and the Coming Kingdom: The Didache's Meal Ritual and Its Place in Early Christianity* (London/New York: T&T Clark, 2008); Robert F. Taft, S.J., “Mass Without the Consecration? The Historic Agreement on the Eucharist Between the Catholic Church and the Assyrian Church of the East Promulgated 26 October 2001,” in James F. Puglisi, ed., *Liturgical Renewal as a Way to Christian Unity* (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 2005), pp. 199-224; Nicholas V. Russo, “The Validity of the Anaphora of *Addai and Mari*: Critique of the Critiques,” in Maxwell E. Johnson, ed., *Issues in Eucharistic Praying in East and West: Essays in Liturgical and Theological Analysis* (Collegeville, MN: A Pueblo Book/The Liturgical Press, 2010), pp. 21-62. Also Brilioth, *Eucharistic Faith and Practice*, p. 41.

For a refutation of the thought that the Western liturgical tradition traveled a totally wrong pathway, that the Lutheran emphasis on the consecratory power of the Verba is the height of that wrong pathway, that our sacrifice, praying, and remembering are really constitutive of the Lord's Supper rather than the Verba see Dorothea Wendebourg, “Traveled the Full Extent of Rome's Erroneous Path?” *Lutheran Forum* Vol. 44, no. 4 (Christmas/Winter 2010), pp. 18-33. An excellent response to the ILCW's view of consecration is found in Gottfried G. Krodel's unpublished essay “Consecration in the Lord's Supper: An Examination of the Proposal of the ILCW in Light of FC.SD VIII. 83/83 and Johann Gerhard's *Loci Theologici XVIII/XXI*” which was read at the 1986 Concordia Theological Seminary Symposium (Ft. Wayne, IN) on the ILCW. The author's copy was obtained from Dr. Krodel.

In contrast to the modern Roman/ecumenical liturgical movement's view of the Verba, Luther wrote these words: “We shall first learn what is of greatest importance, namely, God's Word and ordinance, which is the chief thing to be considered” in the Lord's Supper. LC V, 4. “Here we have Christ's word...Here we shall take our stand and see who dares to instruct Christ, and alter what he has spoken.” LC V, 13. “For upon these words rest our whole argument, protection, and defense against all errors and deceptions that have ever arisen or may yet arise.” FC V, 19. See also LC IV, 3-9. “Luther's defenses of infant baptism are predicated upon the utter primacy and unshakeability of the divine word of command and promise which is at the heart of his theology of baptism...The foundation of Luther's defense of *Kindertaufe* is the core of the whole of his baptismal theology; the water of baptism joined to the word which ordains, founds, and establishes it. The unshakable, objective validity of baptism is grounded upon the dominical word...At each stage of Luther's treatment of baptism in the *Grosse Katechismus* he refers back to its foundation in the word.” Jonathan D. Trigg, *Baptism in the Theology of Martin Luther* (Boston/Leiden: Brill Academic Publishers, Inc., 1994), p. 107. “The expression,

'The bread is Christ's body' is a precise statement of the consecratory words of Christ Himself, 'This is My Body.' The nature of the Real Presence of Christ in the Sacrament depends on that word of Christ, 'This is My Body,' and therefore cannot be described apart from the consecratory words, the words of Christ's own institution.” Erling Teigen, “Luther and the Consecration,” in Paul T. McCain and John R. Stephenson, eds., *Mysteria Dei: Essays in Honor of Kurt Marquart* (Ft. Wayne, IN: Concordia Theological Seminary Press, 2000), p. 324.

The Chemnitz quotes in footnote 8A above note that Lutherans have been down this pathway before - having to answer those who denied the validity of the consecratory power of the Verba, those who wondered if the actual words of Christ are recorded in Scripture, those who stated that the Verba could not consecrate unless they are contained in the canon (eucharistic prayers), or who said that Christ's words were only an historical account of the past.

“Some indeed simply remove the Word from the Eucharist, and others retain only the narration of the history of the institution...However, we cannot simply accept the understanding of the papalists concerning the consecration of the Eucharist. For when they dispute concerning the word through which the blessing or consecration of the Eucharist comes about, they either mutilate the greater part of the institution itself, as was said above, as though with the exception of four words all the rest of the institution either did not belong or did not do anything in the consecration, or they patch human traditions onto the Word of God, as though the consecration could not come about through the words of institution unless there were added on also the things which have been patched together in the canon of the Mass. In this way, so far as in them lies, they render the whole sacrament of the Eucharist uncertain. For Peter Comestor says that the words of institution are not the words for the blessing, because it is not known what words Christ used when He blessed the Eucharist. But Ambrose and Chrysostom assert the opposite. A certain Proclus supposes that the apostles composed the canon between the day of the Ascension and Pentecost, in order that it might be the form of consecration...Therefore the canonical blessing is wholly doubtful and uncertain. Therefore also that sacrament which they say is consecrated with the canonical prayer will be doubtful. We however, when we ascribe the blessing to the words of Christ in the institution, have a sure and firm foundation...These things deserve and need to be censured, in order that the true foundation may be shown on which this greatest of all mysteries rests, namely, that we believe that in the Lord's Supper there is present, offered, and received, not common bread and ordinary wine but the body and blood of Christ.” Chemnitz, *Examination, Part II*, pp. 230-231. Bjarne Wollan Teigen, *The Lord's Supper in the Theology of Martin Chemnitz* (Brewster, MA: Trinity Lutheran Press, 1986), esp. pp. 68-140 which speak about the consecration by means of the Verba.

The unimportance of Jesus' words is also tied to doubt that Jesus actually spoke the words recorded in the Scriptures. This is a result of an historical-critical approach to the Scriptures. Thus as the Granskou quotation below states, less importance should be attached to Jesus' supposed words. The result is that

greater importance must be given to human words and actions in the celebration of the sacraments.

Paul Bradshaw writes that “we do not really have four independent witnesses in the New Testament to the Last Supper tradition as containing the sayings of Jesus about body and blood.” There is only “one witness, Paul.” Paul influenced the author of Mark to “clumsily” insert this material in his gospel which was then copied by the authors of Matthew and Luke. The tradition of the Last Supper and its association with the Passover developed from Jesus’ other meal incidents and the fellowship meals of the Christian community. It was through the influence of Paul that the Last Supper moved the “focus of eucharistic thought from feeding to sacrifice.” Paul Bradshaw, “Did Jesus Institute the Eucharist at the Last Supper?” in Maxwell E. Johnson, *Issues in Eucharistic Praying in East and West*, pp. 17-20.

“...readers may be surprised at his {Schweizer’s} conclusion that all of these words of interpretation [the Verba] may be developments within the early church, rather than something that the historical Jesus spoke on the final evening of his life in Jerusalem.” John Reumann, “Introduction,” in Eduard Schweizer, *The Lord’s Supper According to the New Testament*, trans. James M. Davis (Philadelphia: Fortress Press – Facet Books Biblical Series 18, 1967), p. xii. “Jesus instituted a rite. But what does that say if at the same time one must affirm that we know the contents of this rite only in formulations which cannot come from Jesus—since he did not think in Hellenistic terms? We would be faced, then, with these two affirmations: Jesus instituted a rite; the content of this rite was later on stated by the Christian community in different ways. This can only lead to the judgment that we cannot state the actual content of what Jesus instituted... Thus, the findings of a literary investigation of the passion history cast doubt on the historicity of the institution of the Lord’s Supper.” Willi Marxen, *The Lord’s Supper as a Christological Problem*, trans. Lorenz Nieting (Philadelphia: Fortress Press – Facet Books Biblical Series 25, 1970), pp. 17-18. “If there is to be a liturgical renewal in our times, then a truly prophetic statement on the relation between the Bible and the liturgy is in order... As Bultmann has shown, the primary historical datum of the New Testament is the faith of the primitive Christian community. This radically revises older understandings of the founding of the sacraments like Baptism and the Lord’s Supper by Jesus, and the Lutheran criteria for a sacrament stressing the command of Jesus needs redefinition.” David M. Granskou, “Historical Critical Exegesis and the Renewal of the Liturgy,” *Lutheran Quarterly* Vol. 19, No. 1 (February 1967), pp. 74 & 80.

“The origin of the Supper was probably not one event but several... there was a special event of this fellowship ‘in the night in which he was betrayed.’ Little can be said about this night with any certainty. We do not know for sure whether it was a Passover meal, or how much of the institution narrative is an actual report of events at that meal... the Supper as known by Paul and the Synoptics was created by interpretation of the renewed meal-fellowship by the theology of the cross... However the institution narratives may have come into being, and whatever relation to the events to the events of Jesus’ Last Supper they may have, it is as rubrics and interpretation of the church’s Supper that we have them. Within the narrative structure of the accounts, it is decisive for the

meaning of the sayings that they appear in the mouth of Jesus.” Jenson, “The Supper,” in Braaten and Jenson, *Christian Dogmatics, Vol. 2*, pp. 344-345, 347. See also the Koester quotation in footnote 14 below.

“The eucharist, then, manifests the true being of the church as the Body of Christ... The eucharist, the characteristic vital act of the Body of Christ, is performed by the church as a whole... in these two actions in which all have their part, offertory and communion. These are summarized by the twofold plural command, ‘Take ye; eat ye...’ (*labete,, phagete*). These words are no part of the authentic text of our oldest account of the institution, in 1 Cor. xi. 24, and the second, at all events, is very doubtfully original in Mark xiv. 22. Their real source in the liturgical tradition appears to be Matt. xxvi. 26, from which they have been interpolated into the other scriptural accounts of the last supper in many biblical MSS. But even if they are an addition to the absolutely primitive report of what our Lord actually said at that supper, they are in Matt. a first century addition—a sufficient indication that the apostolic church already understood by the command to ‘do this’ a *double* action, offertory and communion and not one action only, to ‘eat.’” Dix, *The Shape*, p. 268.

In the modern liturgical movement, the historical critical view of Scripture which lessens the authority of God’s Word has been coupled with a theology of sacramental action – liturgy as the work of the people/sacraments as acts of prayer. Gregory Dix was perhaps the most important liturgical scholar in “distancing himself from those who believed that there was a common verbal core to the primitive Eucharistic rites.” Dix rather believed that there was a common structure or shape (the four-action shape) as well as common human actions that were associated with the sacraments. Jones, *The Sacramental Life*, p. xvii.

There is also a tie here to our postmodern culture’s veneration of the visual over against the verbal. The exaltation of the visual over the written word was given greater visibility through the work of Marshall McLuhan and has been followed by others. Marshall McLuhan, *The Gutenberg Galaxy: The Making of Typographic Man* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press Incorporated, 1962 – released in an updated edition Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2011); Marshall McLuhan, *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1965); Marshall McLuhan & Quentin Fiore, *The Medium is the Massage: An Inventory of Effects* (New York: Bantam Books, 1967); Sven Birkerts, *The Gutenberg Elegies: The Fate of Reading in an Electronic Age* (Boston: Faber and Faber, 1984); Arthur W. Hunt III, *The Vanishing Word: The Veneration of Visual Imagery in the Postmodern World* (Wheaton: Crossway Books, 2003).

There also needs to be an examination of the possible ties between an emphasis on the visual over the verbal, McLuhan’s theories, and the work of the Frankfurt School and its promotion of critical theory especially seen in the work of Walter Benjamin, Max Horkheimer, and Theodor W. Adorno. James Carey, “Walter Benjamin, Marshall McLuhan and the Emergence of Visual Society,” *Prospects: An Annual of American Cultural Studies* Vol. 11 (October 1986), pp. 29-38; Walter Benjamin, “The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction,” in Hannah Arendt, ed., *Illuminations: Essays and Reflections* (New York: Schocken Books, 2007), pp. 217-252; Max Horkheimer and Theodor W. Adorno,

Dialectic of Enlightenment, trans. John Cumming (New York: Herder & Herder, 1972); Judith Stamps, *Unthinking Modernity: Innis, McLuhan and the Frankfurt School* (Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press, 1995); Paul Grosswiler, "The Dialectical Methods of Marshall McLuhan, Marxism, and Critical Theory," *Canadian Journal of Communication* Vol. 21, No. 1 (January 1996) <http://www.cjc-online.ca/index.php/journal/article/view/925/831>

F. Prayer a Means of Grace: Understanding the sacraments as acts of prayer which give spiritual benefits to believers makes prayer a means of grace.

Prayer is understood to be a means of grace by the Roman Catholics, John Wesley, the Reformed, the Baptists, and some Lutherans. *Prayer: The Great Means of Grace* (Charlotte, NC: TAN Books – St. Benedict Press, 2009); St. Alphonsus Ligouri, *Prayer: The Great Means of Obtaining Salvation and All the Graces which We Desire of God* (Scotts Valley, CA: np, 2010) – the subtitle to Chapter 1 is "Prayer Is a Means Necessary to Salvation"; "Prayer is the third and last branch of the means of grace especially mentioned in the Standards, and it is a very important practical matter." Francis R. Beattie, *The Presbyterian Standards: An Exposition of the Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms* (Richmond, VA: The Presbyterian Committee of Publication, nd), p. 335; "In the following discourse, I propose to examine at large, whether there are any means of grace. By 'means of grace' I understand outward signs, words, or actions, ordained of God, and appointed for this end, to be the ordinary channels whereby he might convey to men, preventing, justifying, or sanctifying grace... The chief of these means are prayer, whether in secret or in the great congregation; searching the Scriptures...and receiving the Lord's Supper." *The Works of John Wesley, 3rd ed., Vol. 5 First Series of Sermons (1–39)*, Sermon 16, II, 1 - "Means of Grace" (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2007), p. 187 – this sermon can also be accessed at <http://www.umcmission.org/Find-Resources/John-Wesley-Sermons/Sermon-16-The-Means-of-Grace>;

Grace Reformed Baptist Church stated "that faith is a grace or gift of God. Faith comes in conjunction with the ministry of the Spirit and Word of God. Faith, once born in the heart, is strengthened through means: the Word of God, baptism, the Lord's Supper, prayer and other means. The means of grace are God's delivery systems, ordained conduits, through which grace comes to souls from heaven to the earth." <http://reformedbaptistfellowship.org/2013/08/07/brief-thoughts-on-the-means-of-grace/>

Some Lutherans also believe and teach that prayer is one of the means of grace. An ELCA document entitled "Workshop Descriptions for Prayer and Revival Events" says this in #8 "Somebody Prayed for Me": "The desired outcome of this workshop is to create new possibilities for you to take full advantage of prayer as a means of grace to foster your spiritual growth and discipleship." www.elca.org/~media/Files/Faith%20Practices/Resources/Workshop%20Descriptions%20for%20Prayer%20and%20Revival%20Events.pdf (this document can best be accessed by simply typing in the title above into your search engine).

"The proposal is this: we should consider prayer as one of the means of grace" (p. 281). "To realize the real character of prayer is, in effect, to view prayer as a means

of grace. What I am proposing is that we Lutherans give explicit recognition to Christian prayer as a means of grace" (p. 282). "More recently Gustaf Aulen in *The Faith of the Christian Church* has recognized three means of grace: the word of God, the sacraments (baptism and Lord's Supper), and prayer... Aulen says the main hindrance to considering prayer a means of grace is that prayer has been interpreted as an exclusively human act... 'Prayer is not only our turning to God, but also God's approach to us...It [prayer] is therefore a means of grace'... The various means of grace, to which previous reference has been made, are indissolubly connected with prayer and become effective means of grace only in this connection... I agree with Aulen that along with Word and sacraments we should regard prayer as the third means of grace thorough which God works" (p. 283). Bradley Hanson, "Lutherans and Prayer," *Currents in Theology and Mission* Vol. 20, No. 4 (August, 1993), pp. 278–285. This article can also be accessed at http://www.worship.ca/docs/p_12_bh.html For the references in Aulen, see Gustaf Aulen, *The Faith of the Christian Church*, trans. Eric H. Wahlstrom and G. Everett Arden (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1948), pp. 356, 401.

"Similarly, the assembly says that it is engaged in prayer... But here, prayer is not simply any conversation with God. It is a thanksgiving that proclaims and acknowledges the truth about God to the listening community at the same time that it goes out in praise toward God. It is beseeching which truly waits for God but also publicly describes our situation of need. It is, surprisingly, also more. The washing [baptism] is prayer, 'an appeal to God' (1 Pet. 3:21); preaching is prayer...the eating and drinking [Holy Communion] is prayer, being the action that goes with the words of the thanksgiving." Gordon Lathrop, *Holy Things: A Liturgical Theology* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), pp. 156–157.

One of the advocates of Eucharistic Prayers in Lutheran liturgies admits that they are alien to Lutheran theology and at odds with the sole sufficiency of God's Word. "The case can be made that all of this recovery of the ancient liturgy, and most particularly the full Eucharistic Prayer, while historically interesting, is alien to Lutheran theology with its strict emphasis on the objective efficacy of the Word and its studied avoidance of any work or action on our part that would seem to cooperate with the communication of divine grace. For a prayer is clearly *our act*, something we as humans do in addressing God. In the context of the Eucharist, a prayer is then clearly an *offering*...The unembellished declaration of the Words of Institution, then, as pure proclamation unattached to any work of prayer on our part is the means by which a separation is made between God's act (the sacrament) and our response (thanks and praise). For generations, this has been a convincing argument among Lutherans (although it has remained unconvincing to almost the whole rest of ecumenical Christianity), and it is supported by the actual liturgical practice of Luther himself who excised the whole canon of the Mass except for the simple proclamation of the Words of Institution in his 1526 German Mass, a liturgical practice continued in the mainstream of Lutheran liturgy." Chapman, "The Eucharistic Prayer in Lutheran Liturgy," p. 22. Chapman is opposed to this historic Lutheran position.

10. Aidan Kavanagh, *The Shape of Baptism: The Rite of Christian Initiation* (New York: Pueblo Publishing Company, 1978), pp. 109–110.
11. “While not opposed to the continuation of infant baptism, he [Dix] emphasized that it is an abnormality, ‘wholly incomplete by itself and absolutely needing completion by the gift of the Spirit and the conscious response of faith.’” Ruth A. Meyers, *Continuing the Reformation: Re-Visioning Baptism in the Episcopal Church* (New York: Church Publishing, 1997), p. 71. For Dix, see *The Theology of Confirmation in Relation to Baptism*, pp. 70–71. Robert Jenson also expressed concerns about infant baptism. “The history of baptism since ca. A.D. 500 can be told as the history of ancient baptism’s disintegration... The universalized practice of infant baptism was the main disintegrating force... General infant baptism ended the catechumenate, silenced the bath, and created separate confirmation.” Jenson, *Visible Words*, pp. 159–160, 164.
- Perry wrote about “some continental theologians” who in the late 1970s were already urging “the complete elimination of infant baptism” in favor of adult baptism. It appears that the retention of infant baptism is based on the preparation and commitment of the parents which would then enable the infant to be baptized and thus receive communion. Perry, “What Is Really Going on Here?”, p. 54.
12. Reumann, *The Supper of the Lord*, p. 48 – see also pp. 85, 140–145, 152, 176; Eugene L. Brand, “A Lutheran Agenda for Worship after Dar-Es-Salaam,” in *A Lutheran Agenda for Worship: Resource Materials for the Churches’ Study in the Area of Worship* (Geneva: Department of Studies Lutheran World Federation, 1979), pp. 28–29; Roger W. Nostbakken, “The Core of Christian Worship” in *A Lutheran Agenda for Worship*, pp. 48–49. The ELCA’s document, *The Use of the Means of Grace*, also posits the necessity of baptism (infant or otherwise) as a prerequisite for coming to the Lord’s Supper (Principle 37 & 49, pp. 37 & 52). So also Pieper: “A person must have been baptized before he may partake of the Lord’s Supper.” Franz Pieper, *Christian Dogmatics, Volume III* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1953), pp. 291–292; also p. 383. See also Truscott, 229–230.
13. John J. Zoppi, “Infants at the Eucharist,” *The Bride of Christ* Vol. 4, No. 2 (Lent–Easter, 1980), p. 4; Eric W. Gritsch, “The Birthright of the Baptized,” *Lutheran Forum* Vol. 14, No. 3 (Reformation 1980), 25–28; Carl A. Volz, “A Focus on the Basics,” *Lutheran Forum* Vol. 14, No. 3 (Reformation 1980), p.23; Jenson, *Visible Words*, pp. 163–164. One infant communion advocate describes the denial of communion to baptized infants as at best “odd,” and at worst “demonic.” Larry David McCormick, “Children at Communion: Some Biblical Factors,” *The Bride of Christ* Vol. 4, No. 1 (Advent 1979), 20; Patrick Fodor, “The HHistory of Infant Communion,” *The Bride of Christ* Vol. 28, No. 3 (June A.D. 2003), pp. 3–10, esp. p. 5.
14. Thomas A. Fudge, “Hussite Infant Communion,” *Lutheran Quarterly* Vol. 10, No. 2 (Summer 1996), pp. 184–185; David Holeyton, *Infant Communion—Then and Now* (Bramcote Notts.: Grove Books, 1981), pp. 4–7, 13–15, “That John 6:51–59 deals with the Supper is manifest, some older Reformation exegesis to the contrary.” Jenson, *Visible Words*, p. 84; also pp. 85–87. “By all theological right, infant baptism must be accompanied by infant communion.” Jenson, *Visible Words*, p. 163. See also Robert W. Jenson, “On Infant

Communion Again,” *Lutheran Forum* Vol. 30, No. 4 (Christmass – Winter, 1996), p. 18; Jenson, writes that John 6:35–50 is one of “the other chief New Testament passages about the Supper,” Jenson, “The Supper,” in Braaten and Jenson, *Christian Dogmatics, Vol. 2*, p. 346; Reumann, *The Supper of the Lord*, pp. 17–21, 48–49, 59–60, 143–144, 152–153, 193; Brunner, *Worship in the Name of Jesus*, trans. Martin H. Bertram (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1968), pp. 173–175, 298–309 – a eucharistic understanding of John 6 is part of the perceived need for an epiclesis in the Eucharistic Prayer, p. 365, fn. 370; Brilioth, *Eucharistic Faith & Practice*, pp. 54–59.

Rome sees John 6 as *sedes doctrinae* for the Lord’s Supper. The denial of the cup to the laity, transubstantiation, and an *ex opere operato* understanding of the sacraments are tied to interpreting John 6 as referencing the Lord’s Supper. Craig R. Koester, “John Six and the Lord’s Supper,” *Lutheran Quarterly* Vol. 4, No. 4 (Winter 1990), pp. 423–424; Th. Engelder, W. Arndt, Th. Graebner, F.E. Mayer, *Popular Symbolics: The Doctrines of the Churches of Christendom and of Other Religious Bodies Examined in the Light of Scripture* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1934), pp. 186–187. John A. Hardon, S.J., *The Catholic Catechism* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1975), pp. 457–460; *Understanding the Catholic Faith: An Official Edition of the revised Baltimore Catechism No. 3* (Notre Dame, IN: Ave Maria Press, 1955), pp. 216 & 220; F.W. Wenzel, *The Wenzel Commentary: An Exegetical Study Based on a Harmony of the Gospels* (Bemidji, MN: Arrow Printing, 1986), p. 338; Joseph I. Malloy, C.S.P. *A Catechism for Inquirers* (New York: Paulist Press, 1965 – revised by Edward H. Peters, C.S.P.) emphasizes the eucharistic nature of John 6, uses John 6:52–54 as part of the proof for transubstantiation, and uses John 6:55 and 6:57 as part of the proof for the spiritual benefits Christians receive from partaking of the Lord’s Supper (pp. 46–47, 51–52).

Many in the Reformed camp do as well: The joint statement of the Reformed and Roman Catholic dialogues produced a document entitled *The Presence of Christ in Church and World*. This document notes that both the Roman Catholic and Reformed theologians see John 6 as eucharistic.

“He himself constantly calls this community to the memorial of his death; he himself comes into its midst as the living One through his word and causes this word to take shape in the celebration of the Supper in which he deepens and seals (cf. Jn 15.4f.; 6.56f.; 1 Cor 10.16) his fellowship with us and in which the new life of fellowship of Christendom is represented to the world (1 Jn 1.3).” *The Presence of Christ in Church and World*, p. 16. This document can be found at http://warc.jalb.de/warcajsp/side.jsp?news_id=883&part_id=59&navi=38#17

Much of the modern understanding of John 6 as referencing the Eucharist is a result of historical critical scholarship. “Beginning in the nineteenth century, developments in historical critical scholarship significantly weakened the arguments for a non-sacramental reading of the text. The Reformers maintained that a reference to the Lord’s Supper would be incongruous in John 6 since the sacrament had not yet been instituted. Critical scholars, however, understood the Johannine discourses as creative compositions by the

evangelist, not transcriptions of Jesus' own words, therefore a reference to the sacrament, which would have been incongruous on the lips of the historical Jesus, could simply reflect the interest of the later church. The Reformers also had insisted that John 6:51c–58 be read in the context of the whole discourse, but literary critics recognized that the Gospels were comprised of various sources and levels of redaction, which meant that the sacramental character of John 6:51c–58 could be attributed to a redactor. Finally, many interpreters had objected that a sacramental reading of John 6 would suggest that the Lord's Supper guaranteed eternal life. The history-of-religions school responded that such attitudes toward cultic meals did appear in Hellenistic mystery religions and were evident in the second century among Christians like Ignatius of Antioch, who viewed the Lord's Supper as "the medicine of immortality." Koester, "John 6 and the Lord's Supper," p. 425; John T. Pless, "Implications of Recent Exegetical Studies for the Doctrine of the Lord's Supper: A Survey of the Literature," *Concordia Theological Quarterly* Vol. 48, Nos. 2 & 3 (April–July 1984), pp. 209–216.

Lutheranism has historically rejected John 6 as speaking about the Lord's Supper. *LW*, 36, pp. 14–15, 19–20; *LW* 37, pp. 79, 99–100, 121–122, 163–165, 247–251, 286–288, 360; *LW* 23, p. 118. Lowell C. Green, "Philosophical Presuppositions in the Lutheran-Reformed Debate on John 6," *Concordia Theological Quarterly* Vol. 56, No. 1 (January 1992), pp. 17–37. More can be seen in Armand J. Boehme, "John 6 and Historic Lutheranism," an unpublished paper prepared for courses taught at People of God Evangelical Lutheran Seminary in Almaty, Kazakhstan – 2005–2008. This paper may be obtained from the author.

15. *LBW*, pp. 198–201.
16. *Lutheran Book of Worship: Ministers Desk Edition* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House/Philadelphia: Board of Publication, Lutheran Church in America, 1978), p. 31.
17. *LBW: Minister's Desk Edition*, pp. 31–32. Truscott writes about ELCA worship materials that are meant to succeed *LBW – Renewing Worship* (RW). These materials envision "a process leading to affirmation of baptism by youth and adults who have received little or no Christian nurture/instruction following their baptism." Truscott, p. 230; see also pp. 163–165.
18. "First Communion Prior to Confirmation," *Lutheran Service Book: Agenda* (St. Louis; Concordia Publishing House, 2006), pp. 25–27. For a brief overview of the LCMS objections to *LBW*'s "Affirmation of Baptism" liturgy see Truscott pp. 190–191. Those LCMS objections which led to the LCMS's rejection of the "Affirmation of Baptism" on these pages and in other parts of Truscott's book should be compared with the rite of "First Communion Before Confirmation" in the *LSB: Agenda*. Klos's book contains a proposed order for "Admission to First Communion." Klos, *Confirmation and First Communion*, pp. 137–139. See also the discussion "Making the Case for an Earlier First Communion Age" at <http://cyberbrethren.com/2007/08/18/making-the-case-for-an-earlier-first-communion-age/>
19. "Response to 'Concerns of South Wisconsin District Circuits 18 and 19 Regarding Infant Communion,'" *To the Ends of the Earth: Convention Workbook - Reports and Overtures: 60th Regular Convention The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, July 11–17, 1998*, pp. 61–65; Scott M. Marincic, "Truly Worthy and Well Prepared: A Reexamination of Infant Communion in Light of Scripture and the Lutheran Confessions with A Brief Historical Introduction," Scott M. Marincic, "A Statement of Concern;" Scott M. Marincic, "Jeepers Creepers Where'd You Get That, Pieper? A Look at the Inconsistency in Francis Pieper's Treatment of Faith Especially as it relates to Infant Faith and the Lord's Supper;" Richard Futrell, "Does Our Lord Invite Baptized Infants to His Supper?" (presented to the Missouri District's Springfield Circuit 'Winkel' of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod – 8 November 2011); "A Place at the Table: Why We Welcome Infants and Children in Our Church to Commune at the Lord's Table" (a tract from Holy Trinity Lutheran Church—LCMS, LaGrange, Kentucky). See also Patrick S. Fodor, "A Case for Infant Communion in the Lutheran Church (Missouri Synod)" <http://www.scribd.com/doc/18759332/A-Case-for-Infant-Communion-in-the-Lutheran-Church-Missouri-Synod> For a defense of communing a six year old see Rick Stuckwisch, "Catechesis, confirmation and Admittance to the Holy Communion" in the article "Making the Case for an Earlier First Communion Age" at <http://cyberbrethren.com/2007/08/18/making-the-case-for-an-earlier-first-communion-age/>
- In the past few months the Lutheran blogosphere was abuzz with a discussion of infant communion. For examples, see John T. Pless, "Theses on Infant/Toddler Communion" <http://logia.org/blogia/?p=617> and David Jay Webber, "Infant Communion in the Lutheran Church?" <http://steadfastlutherans.org/?p=32959&cpage=1>
20. Werner Elert, *Eucharist and Church Fellowship in the First Four Centuries*, trans. Norman E. Nagel (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1966), p. 80.
21. Lyman T. Lundeen, "Should Lutherans Commune Infants?" *Lutheran Forum* Vol. 30, No. 4 (Christmass/Winter 1996), pp. 19–20.
22. Arthur Carl Piepkorn, "The One Eucharist for the One World," in Michael P. Plekon and William S. Weicher, eds., *The Church: Selected Writings of Arthur Carl Piepkorn* (Delhi, NY: ALPB Books, 1993), p. 164. This article was originally published in *Concordia Theological Monthly* Vol. 43, No. 2 (February 1972), pp. 94–108.
23. Koenker, *The Liturgical Renaissance in the Roman Catholic Church*, p. 97.
24. "Methodists practice communion as an 'open table.' They believe that the communion table is not the property of any sect, denomination, or congregation, but the property of God alone. When communion is offered, it is God's table spread before the people, and the rules of man should keep no one from receiving spiritual nourishment at God's table. All are welcome to receive communion, regardless of church membership or affiliation, state of baptism, or profession of faith. Methodists believe communion is God's gift and should not be denied to anyone who will, by God's grace, receive it." http://www.ehow.com/way_5269133_methodist-communion-rituals.html
 "The Wesleyan tradition has always recognized that Holy Communion may be an occasion for the reception of converting, justifying, and sanctifying grace." [\[http://www.jimlane.org/A-Response-to--This-Holy-Mystery--A-United-Methodist-Understanding-of-Holy-Communion-19.html\]](http://www.jimlane.org/A-Response-to--This-Holy-Mystery--A-United-Methodist-Understanding-of-Holy-Communion-19.html)

The official United Methodist Church statement on baptism, [By Water and the Spirit: A United Methodist Understanding of baptism](#), says about communion: "Because the table at which we gather belongs to the Lord, it should be open to all who respond to Christ's love, regardless of age or church membership. The Wesleyan tradition has always recognized that Holy Communion may be an occasion for the reception of converting, justifying, and sanctifying grace. Unbaptized persons who receive communion should be counseled and nurtured toward baptism as soon as possible." [This Holy Mystery: A United Methodist Understanding of Holy Communion](#), the official statement on communion, says: "Invitation to partake of Holy Communion offers an evangelical opportunity to bring people into a fuller living relationship with the body of Christ. As means of God's unmerited grace, Holy Baptism and Holy Communion are to be seen not as barriers but as pathways...Nonbaptized people who respond in faith to the invitation in our liturgy will be welcomed to the Table. They should receive teaching about Holy Baptism as the sacrament of entrance into the community of faith—needed only once by each individual—and Holy Communion as the sacrament of sustenance for the journey of faith and growth in holiness—needed and received frequently."

<http://www.umc.org/site/apps/nl/newsletter.asp?c=lwL4KnN1Lth&b=5070513>

25. "It's Not Just Us," *Forum Letter* Vol. 42, No. 2 (February 2013), p. 7.
26. James Farwell, "Baptism, Eucharist, and the Hospitality of Jesus: On the Practice of Open Communion," *Anglican Theological Review* Vol. 86, No. 2 (Spring 2004), pp. 215–238; Kathryn Tanner, "In Praise of Open Communion: A Rejoinder to James Farwell," *Anglican Theological Review* Vol. 86, No. 3 (Summer 2004), pp. 473–485; James Farwell, "A Brief Reflection on Kathryn Tanner's Response to Baptism, Eucharist, and the Hospitality of Jesus," *Anglican Theological Review* Vol. 87, No. 2 (Spring 2005), pp. 303–310. To see the extent of the practice of communing the unbaptized in some Episcopalian dioceses see Kendall Harmon, "How Widespread Is Communion without Baptism?" [<http://www.kendallharmon.net/t19/index.php/t19/article/4150/>] See also Derek Olson's essay, "Communion Without Baptism?" at http://www.episcopalcafe.com/daily/sacraments/communion_without_baptism.php. Also consult the Deirdre Good essay linked there and the interview with the leaders of St. Gregory of Nyssa in San Francisco who practice "Open Communion" or Communion without baptism (CWOB). See also David Holeton, *Infant Communion—Then and Now* (Bramcote, Notts.: Grove Books – Grove Liturgical Study No. 27, 1981).

Often the practice of CWOB leads to no or mostly minimal education in the doctrines of the church. It is difficult to move people to the commitment of baptism since they have been given a free pass to the altar. Some CWOB advocates believe that baptism before admitting one to the Lord's Supper is a mistake and an obstacle to active participation in the church. Farwell, "Baptism, Eucharist, and the Hospitality of Jesus," pp. 236–238.

27. Olin K. Sletto, "My View – Christ invites the unbaptized...to 'take and eat,'" *The Lutheran* (March 2005) [http://www.thelutheran.org/article/article.cfm?article_id=5025]. For a response see Russell E. Saltzman, "Cheap

grace at the table," *Forum Letter* Vol. 34, No. 4 (April 2005), pp. 1 & 2.

28. *The Use of the Means of Grace: A Statement on the Practice of Word and Sacrament* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1997). Principles 49, 49a & 49b affirm the fact that all baptized persons are welcomed to communion. And Principle 37G speaks about the communing an un-baptized person.
29. Richard O. Johnson, "Always being made new," *Forum Letter* Vol. 42, No. 10 (October 2013), p. 7.
30. AP XXIV, 49 – *Triglotta*, p. 401.
31. AP XV, 41–42 – *Triglotta*, p. 325.
32. *Small Catechism* (SC), Preface, 6 & 11. In his preface the *Large Catechism* (LC) Luther writes in the same vein: The instruction of the children in the basics of Christianity in the Catechism are the "minimum of knowledge required of a Christian." Those without this minimum knowledge are not to be "admitted to a sacrament." LC, Preface, 2. See also Luther's words about the need for catechesis especially for the young in his instructions for the German Mass. *LW* 53, pp. 63–69. Luther's statements about communion being given even to children should not be read as Luther condoning the practice of infant communion.
 - Attempts at having Luther say that infants are to be communed without any instruction run counter to his urgent pleas for instruction and his words denying infants and adults admission to the Lord's Supper if they lack faith and an understanding of the Lord's Supper on the basis of the God's words instituting the sacraments. Luther said that anyone coming to the Lord's Supper must know those words.
 33. LC IV, 1.
 34. LC V, 2.
 35. *LW* 53, pp. 32–33.
 36. Martin Luther, "An Open Letter to Those in Frankfurt on the Main," *Concordia Journal* Vol. 16, No. 4 (October 1990), pp. 342–343.
 37. LC V, 87 – Tappert, pp. 456–457.
 38. *LW* 54, p. 58. It must be remembered that it is one thing to give communion to infants, it is another to give it to instructed children. The question, "Should infants be communed?" is a different question than "Should children be communed?" See also the letter to Nicholas Hausmann – 1523 #678 quoted in Martin Luther, "Whether the Eucharist Should be Given to Children" *Lutheran Forum* Vol. 30, No. 4 (Christmass/Winter 1996), p. 13.
 39. M. Reu, *Dr. Martin Luther's Small Catechism: A History of Its Origin, Its Distribution and Its Use – A Jubilee Offering* (Chicago, IL: Wartburg Publishing House, 1929), p. 157. "And above all it is needful that in addition to the usual study of the Catechism the children, who are about twelve years old, should be instructed for several successive days and weeks in doctrine as Catechism before they receive the Lord's Supper, at some opportune and unoccupied time during the year." Reu, *Dr. Martin Luther's*, p. 165. "When in spite of all these efforts of the Church it sometimes happened that people had no knowledge at all of the Catechism, they were refused the Sacrament [of the Altar] until they had acquired this knowledge." Reu, *Dr. Martin Luther's*, p. 167. "The young people must completely memorize the questions in addition to the Catechism and explanations of Luther and must not be admitted to Communion till they can repeat them intelligently in the confirmation and public

examination customary in these regions, and are able to give a good account of their Christian faith and religion.” Reu, *Dr. Martin Luther’s*, p. 188. See also pp. 227–228. See also Arthur C. Repp, *Confirmation in the Lutheran Church* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1964), pp. 21–59, 196–199.

40. Futrell, pp. 10–28. For “error,” see p. 23; “misapplication,” p. 24; “new and novel way,” pp. 25–27; a departure “from the Church catholic!” p. 25; “our Confessions simply do not use 1 Corinthians 11:27–29 as we do, to bar infants from the Lord’s Table,” p. 26. The implication of misapplication is also noted in the brochure, “A Place at the Table.”
41. AP XI, 5 (Tappert, p. 181) – Triglotta pp. 249–251 (AP X, XI, 60–62). In AC XXIV. 1 Corinthians 11:27 is invoked by Melancthon who writes that ceremonies in Latin need to be supplemented by hymns in German in order “to teach the people.” The ceremonies in German are needed so “that the unlearned be taught” about Christ and His word and works. The people are accustomed to partake of the Sacrament together, if any be fit for it...For none are admitted except they be first examined.” Melancthon continues noting that the Mass is celebrated devoutly by the Lutherans, and mentions the abuses of the private masses invoking 1 Corinthians 11:27.

For the advocates of infant communion the question remains as to how an infant is able to receive the Lord’s Supper “in remembrance of Christ.” (Luke 22:19).

For an exposition of the applicability of 1 Corinthians 11:27–29 to the infant communion issue see Craig R. Koester, “Infant Communion in Light of the New Testament,” *Lutheran Quarterly* Vol. 10, No. 3 (Autumn 1996), pp. 233–239. Also Todd W. Nichol, “Infant Communion in Light of the Lutheran Confessions,” *Lutheran Quarterly* Vol. 10, No. 3 (Autumn 1996), pp. 241–247.

42. Chemnitz, *Examination, Part II*, pp. 165–166. See also p. 435 where Chemnitz notes that the Lutherans are in agreement with Rome that baptized infants and uninstructed little children should not receive the Sacrament of the Altar.

Johann Gerhard reiterates this practice when he writes about those to whom communion must be denied since communion is to be offered only to baptized and instructed Christians. “The minor children, who have not yet arrived at the age of understanding, for they cannot examine themselves and discern the body of Christ.” Johann Gerhard, *A Comprehensive Explanation of Holy Baptism and the Lord’s Supper*, trans. Elmer Hohle (Malone, Texas: Repristination Press, 1996), pp. 430. In his commentary on the above statement, Gerhard rejects the argument of those who, on the basis of John 6:53, believe that infants and minor children should be receiving the Lord’s Supper. He emphasizes the fact that John 6 does not speak about the Lord’s Supper, and states that minor children should not be communed because they are not able to examine themselves nor are they able to discern the body of Christ in the Sacrament (1 Corinthians 11:28–29). Minor children are not excluded from salvation because they have received faith and God’s grace in baptism. Gerhard, pp. 434–435. For other words from Gerhard on this subject see Johann Gerhard, “Whether the Eucharist Should Be Given to Infants?” *Lutheran Forum* Vol. 30, No. 4 (Christmass – Winter, 1996), p. 14.

Advocates of infant communion often invoke John 6

as a reference to the Lord’s Supper and on that basis believe that communion should not be denied to any baptized individual. Walther’s response echoed Luther’s: “It was an obvious misuse when it [communing children] was rather generally done, from the third to the fifth centuries, out of a misunderstanding of John 6:53, which was [incorrectly] understood as referring to receiving the sacrament. This misuse was also practiced by the Bohemian Hussites and is the rule still today in the Greek church.” C. F. W. Walther, *Pastoral Theology*, trans. John M. Drickamer (New Haven, MO: Lutheran News, Inc., 1995), p. 146.

43. Klos’s book included this lament: “Facts began to overshadow feelings... Adult understanding in adult language and even adult attitudes were soon being demanded of children... The adult-standard syndrome is still very much a part of the mind-set of most Lutherans in North America today.” *Confirmation and First Communion*, Klos, p. 92.
44. For the Kavanagh book reference see footnote 10 above. Kavanagh writes that the liturgy is not “merely” or “primarily” a text, but that it is a “complex of acts” (p. xi). This is reflective of the theology of action noted above (footnote 6). The shape of baptism is parallel to the ecumenical movement’s emphasis on the shape of the liturgy. This shape of the baptismal liturgy necessitates a flood prayer or prayer of thanksgiving for the water just like the liturgy for the Sacrament of the Altar must include a eucharistic prayer, otherwise it lacks its proper ecumenical shape. This is reflective of the influence of Gregory Dix (*The Shape of the Liturgy*) and his emphasis on the four-action shape for the liturgy. “Christian initiation early took on a four fold shape.” Truscott, p. 39.
45. *LBW*, p. 122. Robert Jenson’s Flood Prayer (*Visible Words*, pp. 168–173) should be compared to the Flood Prayer in *LBW* (p. 122) & in the Missouri Synod’s *LSB* (pp. 268–269).
46. *Evangelical Lutheran Worship (ELW)* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, Publishers, 2006), p. 230. A modified form of the Flood Prayer is found at the beginning of Setting One and Setting Two in *ELW* and is entitled “Thanksgiving for Baptism.” pp. 97 & 119.
47. *LSB*, pp. 268–269. In contrast to *SBH*, *LBW*, *LW*, *LSB*, and *ELW* there is a new Lutheran hymnal that does not contain either Eucharistic Prayers or a Flood Prayer in its sacramental liturgies - *ReClaim Lutheran Hymnal for Church and Home* (St. Paul, MN: ReClaim Resources, 2013). The *ReClaim Hymnal* also has a traditional confirmation service (pp. 99-101) in contrast to the affirmation of Baptism and the first communion before confirmation services in *ELW* and *LSB*. For the theological foundation of the *ReClaim Hymnal* see Oliver K. Olson, *Reclaiming the Lutheran Liturgical Heritage* (Minneapolis: ReClaim Resources – Blue Papers, Volume 1, 2007), For a brief review of the *ReClaim Hymnal* see Mark Mattes, “Reclaiming Lutheran worship for church and home: A review,” *Lutheran CORE Connection* (February 2014), pp. 5-6, 13-14. This review can also be viewed at <http://www.lutherancore.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/feb-2014-FINAL.pdf>
48. *The United Methodist Hymnal* (Nashville: The United Methodist Publishing House, 2001), pp. 36, 41–42, 51–52.
49. Max Thurian and Geoffrey Wainwright, eds., *Baptism and Eucharist: Ecumenical Convergence in Celebration*

- (Geneva: World Council of Churches – Faith and Order Paper 117/Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1983), p. 12.
50. Thurian & Wainwright, *Baptism and Eucharist*, pp. 22, 27–28.
 51. Thurian & Wainwright, *Baptism and Eucharist*, pp. 32–33, 37.
 52. Thurian & Wainwright, *baptism and Eucharist*, pp. 56–57; James F. Kay, “The new rites of baptism: A dogmatic assessment,” in Spinks and Torrance, *To Glorify God*, pp. 201–212, esp. pp. 207–212.
 53. Thurian & Wainwright, *Baptism and Eucharist*, pp. 91.
 54. Thurian & Wainwright, *Baptism and Eucharist*, p. 94–95. See also John Fenwick & Bryan Spinks, *Worship in Transition: The Liturgical Movement in the Twentieth Century* (New York: The Continuum Publishing Company, 1995), pp. 135–145.
 55. David P. Scaer, “Theological Observer: Delay of Infant Baptism in the Roman Catholic Church,” *Concordia Theological Quarterly* Vol. 68, Nos. 3/4 (July/October 2004), 342–343; Nathan D. Mitchell, *Forum Essays: Eucharist as Sacrament of Initiation, Forum Essay #2* (Chicago: Liturgy Training Publications, 1994). RICA’s influence on the ILCW and LBW is noted in Truscott’s book – pp. 19, 33–35, 56, 68–69, 71, 212–214, 229. Thomas H. Morris, *The RICA: Transforming the Church: A Resource for Pastoral Implementation* (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1997 – revised & updated edition).
 56. Davis, *Liturgy and Doctrine*, pp. 69–70, 72.
 57. Louis Bouyer, “The Word of God Lives in the Liturgy,” p. 71.
 58. Michael P. Plekon, “Communion in Holy Things: The Eucharist Makes the Church,” *Lutheran Forum* Vol. 30, No. 4 (Christmass Winter, 1996), p. 48. “It is the Eucharist that makes the Church...the Eucharist is rightly celebrated through the formal and traditional Eucharistic Prayer” which the modern liturgical consensus has now put into Lutheran liturgies. The Eucharistic Prayer having been restored to Lutheran liturgies means that “the Reformation is over” as to the “form of the Eucharistic liturgy,” and that all the reasons the Reformers had for removing the Canon of the Mass from their liturgies have been “erased” and “are no longer relevant.” The Reformation is also over because the Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification “must be considered a normative and determinative ecumenical text for any further interpretation of what it means to be Lutheran and the reason for being Lutherans.” Evangelical catholic Lutherans look forward to “the full reunion of Lutherans with Catholics and the restoration of one Church under the Bishop of Rome.” The Joint Declaration is “a non-negotiable statement for the right interpretation of the central concern of Reformation doctrine.” Mark Chapman, “Fundamental Unity: Evangelical-Catholic Non-Negotiables,” *Lutheran Forum* Vol. 39, No. 4 (Christmass/Winter 2005), pp. 13, 18–19.
 59. Avery Dulles, S.J., “Faith and Order at Louvain” *Theological Studies* Vol. 33, No. 1 (January 1972), p. 41.
 60. J. Robert Jacobson, “Welcoming the Entire Baptized Family of God to the Lord’s Table,” *Lutheran Forum* Vol. 30, No. 4 (Christmass – Winter, 1996), pp. 28–29; Reumann, pp. 46–48, 147–153, 162–171, 188–190. Joachim Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, trans. Norman Perrin (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977), pp. 15–88, 204–207; Paul G. Bretscher, “The Hand of A Child,” *Lutheran Forum* Vol. 30, No. 4 (Christmass – Winter, 1996), pp. 23–25.
- “Where I live, communing very young children is a trend that seems to get almost immediate acceptance and accommodation from those in leadership roles... Even considering that there might be some negative consequences seems to put you against the broadest ecumenical currents, against inclusiveness and even against children... This is now compounded by the trend in biblical research and church practice to understand Communion almost exclusively under the ‘meal’ motif. Important Lutheran emphases on real presence, forgiveness and doctrinal understanding just seem out of place with regard to the communion meal. Lundeen, “Should Lutherans Commune Infants?” p. 19. For a corrective to the applicability of the family meal imagery favoring infant communion see Marc Kolden, “Infant Communion in Light of Theological and Pastoral Perspectives,” *Lutheran Quarterly* Vol. 10, No. 3 (Autumn 1996), pp. 249–251.
- Infants are not seated at the Thanksgiving table nor do they eat turkey, dressing, and cranberries. Not everyone in the family is able to partake of the same meal. Thus the analogy breaks down.
61. On the pros and cons of inclusivity, see Mark D. Tranvick, “Should Infants Be Communed? A Lutheran Perspective,” *Word & World* Vol. 15, No. 1 (Winter 1995), pp. 85–86, 89–90. For a thoughtful study of the infant communion issue see William J. Reese, “Infant Communion and the Spirit of the Age,” *The Bride of Christ* Vol. 13, No. 3 (Pentecost, 1989), pp. 22–26.
 62. LC IV, 6.
 63. *LBW*, pp. 198–201.
 64. *LSB: Agenda*, pp. 25–27.
 65. Ralph W. Quere, *In the Context of Unity: A History of the Development of the Lutheran Book of Worship* (Minneapolis: Lutheran University Press, 2003). In reviewing Quere’s book, Gracia Grindal noted: “The real secret, one that Quere does not mark, is that the ecumenical movement of the 1960s convinced these scholars [who produced *LBW*] that Vatican II had instituted the reforms Lutherans thought necessary. It was time to close up shop and go home to Rome. They could not say so bluntly, although they did in so many other ways. They used our common confessions to get their way, by twisting every wax nose in order to progress ‘beyond’ the *Augsburg Confession*. A significant number of this party has ultimately gone home to Rome. Would that they had done so before all this turmoil broke out. Ralph Quere has done us a service in telling the story, even though he rejoices in it for bringing unity in its use of ecumenical liturgical texts [like the tradition of eucharistic prayers, etc.]...Unfortunately, he does not see quite so clearly the division and strife it brought in its wake.” Gracia Grindal, “Book Reviews: *In the Context of Unity: A History of the Development of the Lutheran Book of Worship*,” *Lutheran Quarterly* Vol. 19, No. 1 (Spring 2005), p. 92.
- The comparison between the Baptism, Confirmation, First Communion, Affirmation of Baptism, and Lord’s Supper liturgies in *LSB* and *LBW/ELW/WOV* should also make use of these writings: Paul J. Grime, D. Richard Stuckwisch, Jon D. Vieker, eds., *Through the Church the Song Goes On: Preparing a Lutheran Hymnal for the 21st Century* (St. Louis: Commission on Worship - The Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod, 1999) especially the essays Bruce E. Keseman, “A Defense of Eucharistic

Prayer in the Evangelical Lutheran Liturgy: And a Concern That Now May Not Be the Time to Introduce One," pp. 43-50; William E. Thompson, "The Usage of a Eucharistic Prayer: Theological and Pastoral Concerns." pp. 51-56; William C. Weedon, "Eucharistic Prayer: The Middle Ground," pp. 57-67; "The Celebration of the Lord's Supper with Thanksgiving: Worship Statement No. 32 from the Lutheran Church in Australia," pp. 68-72; Kent J. Bureson, "Confirmation: Living and Rejoicing in the Sacramental Life," pp. 203-211; *Lutheran Hymnal Project Field Test Materials 2002* (St. Louis: The Commission on Worship of The Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod, 2002) - especially pages 49-53 which includes the Hymnal Committee's defense of the introduction of the Eucharistic Prayer in LSB and its proposed text. *Lutheran Hymnal Project Field Test Materials 2003* (St. Louis: The Commission on Worship of The Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod, 2003) - especially page 13 which includes a brief paragraph defending their inclusion of the Eucharistic Prayer; pages 24-25 which speak briefly about the rites for Holy Baptism and Confirmation, and pages 72-80 which include the proposed rites for Baptism, Confirmation and First Communion before Confirmation. "The Service of the Sacrament and Praying Eucharistically as Lutherans" (unattributed and unpublished essay) which is another defense of Eucharistic Prayers in Lutheran liturgies. D. Richard Stuckwisch, "Praying Eucharistically as Lutherans: Questions and Answers Concerning Eucharistic Prayer for the Lord's Supper Working Group of the Liturgy Committee of the (LCMS) Lutheran Hymnal Project," *The Bride of Christ* Vol. 28, Nos. 1-2 (December A.D. 2004), pp. 3ff. Also D. Richard Stuckwisch, *Philip Melancthon and the Lutheran Confession of Eucharistic Sacrifice* (Bynum, Texas: Repristination Press, 1997); Don Richard Stuckwisch, "Truly Meet, Right, and Salutary--or Not? The Revision of the Order of the Holy Communion of the Lutheran Book of Worship in the Preparation and Development of Lutheran Worship" - a doctoral thesis submitted to the Graduate School of the University of Notre Dame.

66. *With One Voice (WOV)* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2001).