

Senior Church History
Professor Fredrich
April 7, 1988

The Influence of Pietism & Rationalism
Upon the Distinctively Lutheran Theology of Worship

M. W. Anderson

Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary Library
11831 N. Seminary Drive. 65W
Mequon, Wisconsin

In 1870, Muhlenberg's idea of "one church, one book" was revived by John Bachman, pastor of St. John's church, Charleston, South Carolina. He sent a letter to the General Synod promoting this idea which received approval from that same synod. By 1879 the General Council also had entered into the picture consenting to cooperate with the General Synod in preparing a Common Service Book. And in 1882 the General Synod of the South joined the effort. Finally, in 1884 a joint committee, made up of representatives from the General Synod, the General Council, and the General Synod of the South, was formed.

The results of this committee's work were three editions of the Common Service with decided variations in the text. Although the goal of one identical service was not yet achieved, the work of the Joint Committee had taken a step in that direction. The committee, however, was not satisfied with the results of the first effort. Reed notes: "Because of the discrepancies in the several editions, however, the joint committee was called together for its third meeting in Philadelphia, November 30, 1888. The entire work was reviewed and the edition of the United Synod in the South was formally recognized and adopted as the correct exhibit of the standard text."¹

Once the Common Service, in one form, was established, what were the results? According to Reed:

The Common Service immediately drew the constituencies of the three general bodies closer together. Appreciation of a common birth-right quickened a common spirit and endeavor. All sections began to study it. Other synods and general bodies . . . secured permission to use it. The Iowa Synod, the Joint Synod of Ohio, the Missouri Synod, the Norwegian synods, and later the Augustana Synod and the Icelandic Synod provided it for their English services. . . . We may ask whether any other single achievement did as much in its time to elevate and unify the Lutheran Church in this country.²

From the perspective of those who developed the Common Service, the above observation could be seen as a positive step. In fact, in 1918, the ULC was

organized as the result of the merging of the three general bodies whose representatives had prepared the Common Service of 1888 and Common Service Book of 1918. Reed seems to intimate that this merger was made possible because of the joint work done in developing the Common Service:

It was quite remarkable that when the new body (ULC) was organized it had ready for immediate use a complete and carefully prepared service book and hymnal. The fact that such a work, whose preparation had required many years of labor, should have been brought to completion just when the new body was formed, can only be understood when we recognize that identical principles were working out separately in different fields.³

It may be very true that identical principles were working out separately in different fields. Thus, the merger of three bodies, having been tied together by a common service, may have been the logical step. Questions, however, arise: What were these identical principles? Were they orthodox Lutheran principles? Were they reflected in the Common Service and in its final development, the Common Liturgy? If these principles were not orthodox principles of worship, and if they were reflected in the Common Service and Liturgy, what business would orthodox Lutheranism have in adopting this form, without at least revising it?

What were the principles with which the constituents of the ULC were working in their development of the Common Service? As already noted, the basic principle was that of Muhlenberg; "one church, one book." Although this study will not permit us to go into a detailed discussion of the theology of Muhlenberg or the ULC, it should be noted that all three of the synods involved were heavily influenced by and trained in Pietism. Lutheran Doctrine had been de-emphasized in favor of religious experience and piety. As the result of their pietistic

theology, naturally they were less concerned about doctrinal agreement, and more concerned about Christian unity and fellowship without first establishing doctrinal unity. Quite obviously, in answer to the second question above, these were not principles which were becoming of Confessional Lutheran orthodoxy. The pietism of eastern Lutheranism along with its synergistic tendencies was denounced by the orthodox synods of the Synodical Conference. Because of this there could be no fellowship between them. 4

The real question becomes: Is the theology of eastern Lutheranism, i.e. the ULC, reflected in the Common Service? Do ideas really have consequences? If Reed, who is the definitive apologist for the Common Service, is correct, then the answer must be yes! Several quotations from his apology serve to demonstrate this: "The Common Service was a purely literary effort. The text of the historic liturgy of the Lutheran Church was set forth completely and in admirable English." 5 "The Service Book and Hymnal is a flexible and powerful instrument for the promotion of church consciousness, unity, and loyalty. Intelligent and general use of it will harmonize and unify the Church in a constructive development which has the promise of permanence because it is doctrinally and historically grounded, comprehensive and consistent." 6 "In spirit and form the Common Liturgy is historic and not individual or sentimental; its tone is devotional and not dogmatic; its outlook is ecumenical rather than narrowly confessional or provincial." 7 "We realize how far all of us have come when we now find responsive services, chancels, altars, crosses, vested choirs, and clerical gowns in many churches of the so called non-liturgical communions." 8 The main thrust of the Common Service is not to reflect doctrinal distinctiveness, but rather, to reflect the historical forms of the liturgy. By emphasizing the historical aspect and de-emphasizing the doctrinal, the worship service cannot stand in the way of uniting different churches.

It may even promote it.

Was this Luther's idea of what the service should do? Reed contends, "The Common Liturgy is a new work on foundations laid centuries ago. It conforms closely to the ideas expressed by Luther in his classic *Formula Missae* of 1523, which was a purified form of the historic rite of the Western Church."⁹ This statement shows a lack of understanding Luther. For the Common Liturgy does not conform closely to the "ideas" expressed by Luther, but only the liturgical forms used by Luther. Luther was concerned with liturgical forms only in so far as they served the proclamation and teaching of the Gospel to sinners. He employed those forms from the Roman liturgy not in order to trick people into thinking his church was the same as the Church of Rome. For the sake of the weak who might have been offended with such a drastic change he used those familiar forms from the Roman liturgy that could be used to serve the Gospel. Also Luther would never have measured progress by the presence of responsive services, chancels, altars, crosses, vested choirs, or clerical gowns. They were all adiaphora. The fact is, that Luther was critical of all liturgical orders and externals if they were not used to promote faith; just as he was critical of works that did not stem from faith, and just as he was critical of the Lord's Supper of the Papists which turned the Sacrament into a sacrifice. As noted earlier, Luther recognized that "an order is an external thing. No matter how good it is, it can be abused."¹⁰ This is what the formulators of the Common Service did. They utilized the external forms of Luther's *Formula Missae* (with some theologically significant alterations) in order to appear Lutheran, but played down the theology behind it by making vague or omitting distinctively Lutheran practices of worship, favoring an ecumenical outlook.

The problem, however, with any unionistic document, and that is what

the Common Service seems to have been, is that it is not so much what is in them that is wrong but what is left out. It is quite true that every liturgical form in the Common Service was used in Luther's Formula Missae. However, several significant changes occur in the Common Service that deviate from Luther's Formula Missae and tend to obscure its theology. The deviations tend to draw the attention away from the sacramental prominence of worship and emphasize more the sacrificial aspect.

What, then, are some of these changes? First, the Common Service does not provide for individual absolution prior to the regular Sunday Service or the Confessional Service. The Confessions are full of comments which command the retention of private or individual absolution. Why? In his article on the Number and Use of the Sacraments, (Apology XIII), Melanchthon argues thus:

We believe we have the duty not to neglect any of the rites and ceremonies instituted in Scripture, whatever their number. We do not think it makes much difference if, for purposes of teaching, the enumeration varies, provided what is handed down in Scripture is preserved. . . . If we define sacraments as "rites which have the command of God and to which the promise of grace has been added," . . . The genuine sacraments, therefore, are Baptism, the Lord's Supper, and Absolution (which is the sacrament of penitence), for these rites have the command of God and the promise of Grace, which is the heart of the New Testament.¹¹

For Melanchthon, the important thing was not the word "sacrament." The important thing was that we observe all of those things instituted in Scripture, i.e. all those things which have God's command (Mandatum Dei), and His promise of grace. In the Smalcald Articles Luther concurs: "Since absolution or the power of the keys, which was instituted by Christ in the Gospel, is a consolation and help against sin and a bad conscience, confession and absolution should by no means be allowed to fall into disuse in the Church, especially for the sake of timid consciences, and for the sake of untrained young people who need to be examined and instructed in Christian doctrine."¹²

The retention of individual absolution harmonizes well with the Lutheran theology of worship which lays its stress on the Sacramental aspect of worship. Individual absolution is but another form which the Gospel takes. It is a means of grace as much as preaching the Gospel, Baptism, and the Lord's Supper also are. And since it is a means of grace, it offers the same unconditional forgiveness of sins as the other means of grace, even though it does so in its own unique way. Therefore, for the reformers, it would have been as serious to let individual absolution fall into disuse as it would have been to let the Lord's Supper, Baptism, or preaching fall into disuse. Melanchthon uses quite strong language in his defense of individual absolution:

For we also keep confession, especially for the sake of absolution, which is the Word of God that the power of the keys proclaims to individuals by divine authority. It would therefore be wicked to remove private absolution from the church. And those who despise private absolution understand neither the forgiveness of sins nor the power of the keys.¹³

The problem for the confessors, however, was not that private absolution had fallen into disuse, but that it was being abused. Under the Roman Church, private absolution had been robbed of its Sacramental character by being placed in the context of the Roman Sacrament of penance. The Catholics taught that penance consisted of three parts, contrition, confession, and satisfaction. Within this framework, a person was supposed to mention to the priest all mortal sins of which he had knowledge and the circumstances under which they were committed. With this information the priest as a divinely appointed judge was to decide what needed to be done to secure the forgiveness of sins. He was not only to absolve the penitent from sin, but he also had the authority to decide what the penitent would have to do to make satisfaction.¹⁴ Thus the unconditional absolution of Scripture had been imbedded in the conditional Sacrament of Penance.

The Lutheran Reformers attacked this practice especially in connection with the sale of indulgences which were supposed to remit the punishment still due for a sin after the guilt had been forgiven in the Sacrament of Penance. The third part of Penance, i.e. satisfaction, introduced the semi-Pelagian cooperation of man in his justification. This the Lutherans could not accept. Because of this rejection, the Catholics charged that the Lutherans had abolished confession. But this was not the case. What the Lutherans did with confession was much the same as what they did with the Lord's Supper. The Reformers did not abolish the Lord's Supper (at least not the true Lutherans); they simply restored it to its Sacramental use and freed it from the sacrificial work righteousness imposed upon it. Likewise with confession; they did not abolish it, but restored it to its correct use as "the voice of the Gospel forgiving sins and consoling consciences." 15

Even though it was not the intent of the Reformers to abolish absolution but only to purify it, there were already those in Luther's day who missed the point of what Luther was doing. Carlstadt was one. While Luther was hiding at the Wartburg Castle with a price on his head in 1521-1522, his colleague Andrew Carlstadt declared that confession before communion was unnecessary. Carlstadt seemed to be good at raising Luther's dander, and this case was no exception. In this case, Carlstadt was not entirely wrong, but it appears that he must not have had a very high opinion of the power of the Word in the Means of Grace. B. W. Teigen remarks:

Luther would have agreed with Carlstadt that there was no absolute necessity for private confession, he nonetheless wanted the practice retained for the comfort it can give the individual Christian. He recognized that there is a kind of confession that cannot be forced on one. But at the same time there is a legitimate confession in which one takes another aside and tells him what troubles him, so that he may have from him a word of comfort. 16

Carlstadt was unable to see that confession had its greatest value in the absolution which Melanchthon defines as the "Word of God that the power of the keys proclaims to individuals by divine authority." 17 Luther declares:

I will allow no man to take private confession away from me, and I would not give it up for all the treasures in the world, since I know what comfort and strength it has given me. No one knows what it can do for him except one who has struggled often and long with the devil. Yea the devil would have slain me long ago if the confession had not sustained me.18

The point in all of this is that Luther and the Confessions remained conscious of the fact that in matters "which concern the external, spoken Word, we must hold firmly to the conviction that God gives no one his Spirit or grace except through or with the external Word which comes before."19 Luther contends, "Since absolution or the power of the keys, which was instituted by Christ in the Gospel, is a consolation and help against sin and a bad conscience, confession and absolution should by no means be allowed to fall into disuse in the Church. . . .20 Therefore Luther concludes, ". . . since private absolution originates in the Office of the Keys, it should not be despised (neglected), but greatly and highly esteemed (of the greatest worth), as (also) all other offices of the Christian Church."21

Individual Absolution is another form of the Gospel. And regarding the Gospel Luther has this to say:

. . . the Gospel . . . offers counsel and help against sin in more than one way for God is surpassingly rich in his grace: First, through the spoken word, by which the forgiveness of sin (the peculiar function of the Gospel) is preached to the whole world; second, through Baptism; third, through the holy Sacrament of the Altar; fourth, through the power of the keys; and finally, through the mutual conversation and consolation of brethren.22

Since the ministry of the Word and Sacraments is the most important aspect of worship for the Lutherans, it is no wonder that they were concerned

with retaining individual absolution. Eliminating it, as Carstadt seemed willing to do, would have been to restrict the Gospel which God wants to be given free course. In practice, Luther never gave up private confession and absolution because he considered absolution to be "a work which God does, when he absolves me of my sins through a word placed in the mouth of a man. This is the surpassingly grand and noble thing that makes confession so wonderful and comforting."²³ It was carried out in much the same fashion as it always had been, i.e. people would come before the service, enter the confessional booth, make a general confession of sin (specific confession was optional), be examined in preparation for the Lord's Supper, and absolved. After all, the churches used by the Lutherans were originally Catholic, and so they made use of the facilities they had at their disposal.

It is interesting to note that neither of Luther's orders of service begins with a General Confession of Sin followed by a General Absolution. The reason for this is that both the Formula Missae and the German Mass presuppose private confession and absolution. Luther considered the Sermon to be the general absolution, which, by the way, says something for what the content of Lutheran sermons ought to be. In order for the sermon to be faithful to Scripture and the Confessions, it must proclaim the forgiveness of sins and offer the comfort of the Gospel to those who have been stricken by the Law. In other words, the Gospel must be applied and not just explained.

From this we can see that Luther utilized all the forms of the Gospel that Scripture provided him, in his development of worship practices. He did so on the basis of his theology of worship. The Common Service, however, makes no provisions for individual absolution before the service and no mention of it otherwise. Why? Against the intent of the Lutheran Confessions and under the influence of 19th century rationalism and pietism, individual

absolution had already fallen into disuse in much of Europe. For our purposes we will, as an example, consider the situation in Denmark during the life of N.F.S. Grundtvig. In Ernest D. Nielson's discussion of Grundtvig, he delineates the changes that were taking place in Denmark concerning individual absolution:

According to the prescribed ritual of 1685 and the authorized Altar Book of 1688, which had had a direct bearing upon the liturgical life in the Church of Denmark down to the present, the Communicant was obligated by law to present himself at the appointed preparatory service, known as Skriftemaal, prior to receiving the sacrament. The Skriftemaal or Confessional Service reached its culmination when the pastor laid his hand on the head of the communicant and pronounced the unconditional absolution: "I declare unto you the gracious forgiveness of all your sins in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." The instructions to the pastor were very specific. The absolution must be given to each individual communicant.

Within a century, the Confessional Service gradually changed. Instead of each individual's acknowledging his sins, the pastors began to divide the individuals who came to the Confessional Service into groups of not more than 8 to 10 persons. Normally the Skriftemaal was held on Saturday, and it was not uncommon for pastors to devote from two to three hours each Saturday to this pastoral responsibility of their office.

In Grundtvig's time the impetus for change in the Confessional Service had gained momentum. The stress on the examination of conscience had diminished, and pastors were beginning to make a brief address (Skriftetale) to those who desired to commune. Even so, the unconditional absolution caused much distress on the part of the clergy and laity alike. . . . Many pastors tampered with the text of the prescribed form for absolution. . . . Some demanded that the Confessional Service be discontinued altogether. . . . 24

The attacks against the unconditional absolution of the Skriftemaal came from two sides, namely, Rationalism and Pietism. The Rationalists sought its discontinuance on the ground that it "constituted an admixture of Christian faith, superstition, credulity, and papistry."²⁵ The Pietists opposed it because they thought it would lead to carnal security and wanted to hedge it by making it conditional on faith (i.e. the relying on faith as opposed to having faith) or on degrees of sorrow and terrors of conscience. Grundtvig opposed

both of these objections. He defended the retention of the Skriftemaal as follows:

I . . . have chosen to retain the Skriftemaal on its own merit. I regard it as a human innovation of obscure origin, standing in an ambiguous relation to both baptism and the Lord's Supper. It has become clear to me that I cannot withhold absolution from those to whom I am able in good conscience to administer communion, because I cannot administer Holy Communion without declaring . . . that his blood is poured out for them for the forgiveness of sins. . . . In my communion addresses (Skriftetaler) I constantly relate the forgiveness of sin to the Lord's Supper and to baptism . . . with the result that I have discovered, that I, without reservation, can pronounce the absolution in the service of preparation for the Lord's Supper to the believer, even as the Lord himself in the communion assures them that he has purchased them with his blood. I have discovered that the danger of taking grace for granted and of going on in sin is neither greater nor less because of the absolution that it always is wherever the gospel of Christ is faithfully preached as God's power for salvation, which offers the forgiveness of sins by calling not the just but sinners to repentance.²⁶

Whatever else that could be said about Grundtvig aside, he certainly understood that the promises of the Gospel are not conditioned on anything except the mercy of God; thus, they are unconditional. In defending the Skriftemaal, Grundtvig defended the Lutheran Confession's teaching of an unconditional Gospel. This Gospel takes different forms, all of which offer the forgiveness of sins, and should, therefore, be used.

Unfortunately, Grundtvig was fighting a losing battle, and Rationalism and Pietism opposing him eventually prevailed. Nielsen sums up the effort of Grundtvig:

Grundtvig stemmed the dissolution of a time-honored practice within the Danish Church, but little did he realize, I am certain, that the place of the Skriftemaal would again be questioned, that the Skriftetale would disappear by default, that a general absolution would replace the individual absolution in an increasing number of congregations, and finally, that many would receive Communion without having taken part in the preparatory service or Skriftemaal. All this has taken place in less than a century, since Grundtvig, in the spirit of Martin Luther, fought a lonely battle for evangelical freedom for that not insignificant minority who could embrace neither Rationalism nor Pietism. . . .²⁷

The situation in America was much the same as in Europe. As we have already noted, Pietism was transplanted into America by Muhlenburg. However, not everyone in America was willing to swallow the pill of Rationalism or Pietism. C.F.W. Walther was one. He saw that individual absolution was beginning to be neglected. But he was not pleased by this nor was he willing to let it go if he had anything to say about it. As a pastor, he realized the necessity of retaining individual absolution. Certainly, the general proclamation of the Gospel was also necessary and that it was often sufficient for conscience stricken sinners. At the same time, however, Walther was aware that at times Christ also directed the Word of absolution to one person as in Matthew 9:1-8. In this text the man sick with the palsy was burdened more by his sin and guilt than by his physical ailment. Because he was so burdened, Christ personally assured him of forgiveness to make sure he understood that he was also included in the salvation which is for all men. In a sermon on this text, the pericope for the 19th Sunday after Trinity, Walther explains the difference between general absolution and individual absolution and the need for both:

. . . bear in mind that Christ came into the world for all men; he atoned for the sins of all men through his suffering and death; he earned for all men a perfect righteousness by his obedience to divine Law. This is now told to all men. The Word of God is, therefore, a general absolution for all men; it says to all men, "Son, be of good cheer," etc., for Jesus is the Savior of all of you. And whenever a person is baptized, whenever he partakes of Holy Communion, especially whenever he hears the absolution (individual), then especially is he told, "You, you be of good cheer; thy sins be forgiven thee." 28

In another sermon on the same text, Walther deals more specifically with the problem of individual absolution falling into disuse. He deplored the idea of eliminating it because it would have been, for him, no different than

eliminating baptism or the Lord's Supper. Since individual absolution was given as another form of the Gospel, Walther taught that it should be used. In an illustration, Walther again demonstrates its uniqueness and importance by comparing it with general absolution. The general proclamation of forgiveness is like a rich man throwing out gold coins to the congregation. If a person picked up a coin, he would surely benefit from the rich man's generosity. However, Walther realized that some people may be hesitant to pick up a coin, thinking that it might not be intended for them. Individual absolution solves this problem. It is like a rich man who goes up to each person, places the gold in his hand, and says, "this is for you."²⁹

Walther, like Grundtvig, also seems to have been waging a losing battle in his fight for individual absolution, for it has fallen out of use in most Lutheran churches, including the so-called Confessional ones. The Common Service made no attempt to remedy this problem. The reason is that the formulators of the Common Service were not of the same ilk as men like Walther. Because they were influenced by Pietism and Rationalism, they saw no need for restoring individual absolution. In fact, Pietists often objected most to general absolution which was unconditional. It shows the lack of emphasis Pietism and Rationalism placed on the power of the Word in all of its forms, and on the centrality of proclaiming the forgiveness of sins in Lutheran worship. E. T. Teigen gives a concise explanation of Pietism and Rationalism which demonstrates this lack of emphasis:

Pietism had its outgrowth in a dissatisfaction with Lutheran Orthodoxy's understanding of the centrality of justification preaching, a preaching which saw the comfort of the sinner in the proclaiming of the biblical doctrines of justification, the sacraments, atonement, etc. Orthodoxy's preaching was strictly exegetical and saw the biblical texts always under the biblical categories of justification and the Means of Grace. Pietism was dissatisfied with what it mistakenly saw as a lack of "life situation" preaching and insisted on a shift to more ethical

encouragement. Religious Rationalism, which simply represented a sort of secularized Pietism, carried on that ethical preoccupation.... The ethical preoccupation of Religious Rationalism builds also on Pietism's emphasis on the subjective experience of the believer to the neglect of the Gospel's (Justification's) objectivity. A further consequence was a preoccupation with the subjective response of the hearer in proceeding to live the ethical life, a theme....which, seen outside of the perspective of sin and grace, becomes destructive of true Law and Gospel Christianity.³⁰

At this point, one might contend that it is not fair to criticize the Common Service for not including an order for individual absolution. After all, even though Luther continued the practice of individual confession and absolution, he did not incorporate it into either of his two orders of service. The Common Service was simply (for the most part) following Luther's Formula Missae. Therefore, to level charges of Pietism against the Common Service for simply following Luther's order is hardly justifiable. At first glance, this argument may seem legitimate. But a closer look will show that it does not stand. As already noted, Luther did not have individual absolution in the service proper because he did have it beforehand. This practice was carried on in Lutheran churches at least through the 19th century. In "Danmarks og Norges Kirkeritual" of 1855, which is patterned after Luther's German mass, there was no general confession or absolution at the beginning of the service. As we have noted in our discussion of Grundtvig, the Skriftemaal was provided before the service proper in which the people were examined and absolved individually. However, also noted in that discussion was the fact that the Skriftemaal was eventually abandoned under Rationalism and Pietism. The latest edition of the Danish order (now used by the ELS) however, contains an addition. An order for Public Confession and Absolution has been incorporated into the Communion Service. This was done by the editors in order to recover this Means of Grace which the Lutheran Confessors did not want

abolished. This was a significant innovation on the part of the editors because it shows that they were not as concerned with Luther's liturgical format, for its own sake as they were with Luther's theology behind it. It would have been practically impossible to reinstate the Skriftemaal because by this time the laity was no longer familiar with the practice. Therefore, incorporating it into the Communion Service seemed to be a fitting way to restore the individual reassurance which this Means of Grace offers. This order does not provide for individual confession and absolution, which Luther also favored, but it was a step in the right direction, provided it was made use of.

In a time when individual absolution had fallen into disuse, the fact that the Common Service made no mention of it, either prior to the Sunday service or otherwise, is evidence of a Pietistic or Rationalistic influence on the Common Service. At least in this respect, it down-plays the Sacramental aspect of worship. It also shows that the Common Service was not so much concerned with Luther's theology of worship as it was with the naked external forms of the liturgy. The danger with this kind of approach is that elements of distinctively Lutheran theology can get lost in the shuffle. And when sacramental elements of worship are lost, the sacrificial tends to become the dominant thrust in worship.

End Notes

1. Luther D. Reed, The Lutheran Liturgy, (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1947.)
2. Reed, p. 198.
3. Reed, p. 204.
4. Class notes from Professor Erling T. Teigen, Bethany Lutheran College, Mankato, Minnesota, Spring 1981.
5. Reed, p. 199.
6. Reed, p. 222.
7. Reed, p. 212.
8. Reed, p. 226.
9. Reed, p. 212.
10. Ulrich S. Luepold, ed., Luther's Works, vol. 53 (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1965), p. 90.
11. Theodore G. Tappert, ed., The Book of Concord, (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1959), p. 211.
12. Tappert, p. 312.
13. Tappert, p. 197.
14. Bjarne W. Teigen, I Believe, A Study Of The Augsburg Confession And The Apology Of The Augsburg Confession vol. V, (Mankato: Lutheran Synod Book Company, 1980), p. 54.
15. Tappert, p. 197.
16. Teigen, Bjarne Wl, vol. V, p. 55.
17. Tappert, p. 197.
18. J.W. Doberstein, ed., Luther's Works, vol. 51 (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1965), p. 98.
19. Tappert, p. 312.
20. Tappert, p. 312.

cont'd...

End Notes continued

21. Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States, Triglot Concordia, (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1921) p. 495.
22. Tappert, p. 310.
23. Tappert, p. 459.
24. Jaroslav Pelikan, ed., Interpreters of Luther, (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968), pp. 177-178.
25. Pelikan, p. 179.
26. Pelikan, pp. 179-180.
27. Pelikan, p. 180.
28. Donald E. Heck, trans., Year Of Grace by C.W. Walther (La Valle: Donald E. Heck, 1964), p. 329.
29. C.F.W. Walther, Evangelie Postille, (Bergen: F. Beyers Forlag, 1878), pp. 225-331.
30. Erling T. Teigen, The Role Of Worship In Our Christian, Collegiate Community, (August, 1981), p. 3.

Bibliography

- Dahle, John, and Johnshoy, M. Casper., The Liturgical Service of the Lutheran Church. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1922.
- Doberstein, John W., ed. Luther's Works, vol. 51. Philadelphia: Muhlenburg Press, 1959.
- Luepold, Ulrich S., ed. Luther's Works, vol. 53. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1965.
- Pelikan, Jaroslav, ed. Interpreters of Luther. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968.
- Reed, Luther D. The Lutheran Liturgy. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1947.
- Tappert, Theodore G., ed. The Book of Concord. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1959.
- Teigen, Bjarne W. I Believe, A Study of the Augsburg Confession and the Apology of the Augsburg Confession. Mankato: The Lutheran Synod Book Company, 1980.
- Teigen, Bjarne W. I Believe, A Study of the Formula of Concord. Mankato: The Lutheran Synod Book Company, 1979.
- Teigen, Erling T. "The Role of Worship in our Christian, Collegiate Community." A Faculty Study Paper, Mankato, 1981.
- Triglot Concordia. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1921.
- Walther, C.F.W. Evangelie Postille. Bergen: F. Beyers Forlag, 1878.
- Walther, C.F.W., Heck, Donald E., translator. Year of Grace. La Valle: Donald E. Heck, 1964.