

# **The Ways of Our Fathers as to the Age of Communicants (Confirmation and the Age of First Communion)**

[Presented to the Northern Wisconsin District Pastoral Conference at Marinette, Wisconsin on  
October 25-26, 1971]

*Harold E. Warnke*

## **Introduction**

It is comparatively easy to trace the development of confirmation from the first extant reference to it about 200 AD to its formal designation as a sacrament by the Council of Lyon in 1274. True, one cannot assign definite dates for each major innovation. Neither were all of the confirmation customs universally accepted within a short time after they were first introduced. Yet, a careful reading of Church History leads to this conclusion: In the course of the 1000 years after 200 AD, confirmation developed quite methodically, even inexorably, into the comparatively well-defined, anti-Scriptural doctrine that is still almost universally accepted in the Roman Catholic Church of our day.

In contrast, there is really no Lutheran doctrine of confirmation; except for a few facets, there has seldom, if ever, been a general agreement upon a definition for confirmation within the Lutheran Church; it is assuredly not a purified continuation of the pre-Reformation Sacrament of Confirmation; it was by no means always practiced in our Church; and it certainly did not develop in an orderly or methodical manner. Confirmation in the Lutheran Church over the years has headed into various directions, influenced (wrongfully at times) by various historical movements. Consequently, one writer could state at the beginning of the 20PP<sup>th</sup> century that there are as many Lutheran opinions regarding confirmation as there are pastors. However, the emphasis upon prior instruction of the confirmand was almost always observed.

This lack of a clear-cut definition or a general agreement regarding confirmation within the Lutheran Church is not necessarily reprehensible or even deplorable, for the entire matter is an adiaphoron. True, everything must be done “decently and in order” (I Corinthians 14:40); yes, we should like to have a certain amount of uniformity in these customs; yet, if a brother has different confirmation customs from ours without violating adiaphoristic principles, it behooves us to remember this paragraph from Article X of the Formula of Concord:

Therefore we believe, teach, and confess that the congregation of God of every place and every time has, according to its circumstances, the good right, power, and authority [in matters truly adiaphora] to change, to diminish, and to increase them, without thoughtlessness and offense, in an orderly and becoming way, as at any time it may be regarded most profitable, most beneficial, and best for [preserving] good order, [maintaining] Christian discipline [and for *εὐταξία* worthy of the profession of the Gospel], and the edification of the Church. Moreover, how we can yield and give way with a good conscience to the weak in faith in such external adiaphora, Paul teaches Rom. 14, and proves it by his example, Acts 16, 3:21, 26; 1 Cor. 9, 19. (Triglotta p. 1055)

With these thoughts in mind, we shall then first survey the development of confirmation in the Western Church from the earliest extant references through the codification of its doctrine at the Council of Trent (1545-1563).

## **Development of Confirmation in the Western Church**

The earliest extant reference to the rite which eventually became confirmation is by Tertullian (died c. 220 AD) in his *De Baptismo*. There he speaks of a post baptismal anointing, an imposition of hands, and an invocation of the Holy Ghost upon the baptized person. Cyprian (c. 250) writes of the baptized persons being presented to the leaders of the Church so that “by our prayer and by the imposition of hands, they may receive the Holy Spirit and be perfected by the seal of the Lord”; he also said that one may be reborn “by both Sacraments,” (Ep. 73),<sup>i</sup> although one must remember that the term sacrament was not clearly defined at this time. An additional custom, the signing of the forehead, was mentioned by that important theologian, St. Hippolytus, in his famous *Apostolic Traditions* with its detailed descriptions of the rites and practices of the Church, presumably in Rome in the early part of the third century.

In the fourth and fifth centuries a number of references speak of confirmation as an anointing with the consecrated oil (the chrism), a giving of the Holy Spirit, and a completion of baptism. Yet, for the most part, confirmation in those early years was undoubtedly a part, really an appendage, of the baptismal ceremony.<sup>ii</sup> The Eastern Church generally retains baptism and confirmation (and Holy Communion, too, for that matter) as one ceremony to this day, even for babes; however, in the Western Church baptism and confirmation were gradually separated, a custom that was quite universally observed by the eighth century.

One of the major reasons for separating confirmation from baptism in the Western Church was the custom of normally allowing only bishops to administer confirmation. The Church based this contention upon two Bible stories written in Acts 8:12-17 and 19:1-7. In the first instance Philip, the evangelical deacon, was successfully preaching the Gospel in Samaria, when the Apostles at Jerusalem, greatly concerned about these people, sent Peter and John unto them. When these two Apostles arrived, they prayed that the Samaritans might receive the Holy Ghost. “Then laid they their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost,” Acts 8:17.

The Acts 19 passage tells us that St. Paul asked some of the Ephesian disciples, “Have you received the Holy Ghost since you believed?” They answered that they had never heard of the Holy Ghost. When the Apostle asked them unto which baptism they had been baptized, they answered, “Unto John’s baptism.” When St. Paul thus understood that they had not been properly baptized in the name of the Holy Trinity, he or his co-workers baptized them, whereupon “When Paul laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came on them; and they spoke with tongues and prophesied,” Acts 19:6.

From these two episodes some people within the early church made the following deductions: An ordinary deacon like Philip or missionaries like those in Ephesus could preach and baptize, but they could not impart the gift of the Holy Ghost to anyone. Only Apostles like John, Peter, and Paul could lay their hands upon the Christians and thus impart the Holy Spirit. Now we have among us the bishops, the apostolic successors, who through the magic of their ordination possess a much higher spiritual authority than the ordinary parish priests. By virtue of their great authority they (but not the ordinary parish priests) are able to impart the gift of the Holy Spirit to the confirmands, just as John, Peter, and Paul did to the people in their day.<sup>iii</sup>

(How anyone could explain the two Acts passages as referring to the usual gifts of the Holy Spirit remains a mystery—these passages obviously refer to the charismatic gifts of the Holy Ghost, like speaking with tongues, working miracles, etc., as Acts 8:18 and 19:6 indicate or plainly state. [Read I Corinthians 12:1-11 and Lenski’s explanations of the Acts passages.] These miraculous gifts were bestowed upon certain people for a time to confirm the message of salvation which they preached, John 10:25; Acts 8:6. The idea of apostolic succession is equally absurd, when one recalls that a true apostolic successor has to accompany the Lord Jesus and be

a witness of His resurrection, Acts 1:21, 22. Yet, we hear Cyprian, 250 AD, stating: “All chief rulers by vicarious ordination succeed to the apostles.<sup>iv</sup> Shortly, many others would be following his anti-Scriptural thinking.)

We know that the custom of restricting the administration of confirmation to the bishop developed quite early, for St. Jerome (c. 400) speaks of visitations by the bishop to the congregation for the laying on of hands, the anointing with oil, and the invocation of the Holy Ghost. The tragedy was compounded by the Synod of Orleans (511 AD) which made one’s Christianity depend on confirmation, not upon one’s baptism.<sup>v</sup> Thus baptism, the divine institution, became less important than confirmation, the churchly rite.

One can understand that the restriction by which only the bishop could confirm would rather quickly lead to a complete separation of confirmation from baptism, since the bishop could visit his parishes only infrequently.

A second movement that hastened the separation of baptism and confirmation was the conversion of large groups of people, like the Goths and the Vandals, from Arianism to the truly Trinitarian faith of Nicaea and Athanasius. Schaff tells us that this happened in the sixth century.<sup>vi</sup> The Western Church accepted the Arian Baptism, because it was administered in the name of the Trinity, but the Church also insisted upon a public confession or confirmation in these instances.

The anti-Scriptural idea that confirmation is a sacrament also gradually crept into the Western Church. These are the major points in that development: Cyprian (c. 250) claimed that confirmation was a sacrament instituted by the disciples. Both Augustine (c. 400) and Leo I (c. 450) called confirmation a sacrament, although their definition of the word sacrament may have been different from that of today. Peter Lombard (c. 1150) promoted the idea of seven sacraments including confirmation. Thomas Aquinas (c. 1250) maintained that confirmation was instituted by Christ, since it is implied in the promise of the Holy Ghost, John 16:7. The Councils at Lyon (1274) and at Florence (1439) elevated confirmation to a sacrament, thus validating a doctrine that had won gradual acceptance. Finally, the all-important Council of Trent (1545-1563) codified the Roman Catholic teachings on confirmation as follows:

#### On The Sacraments In General.

CANON IX.—If any one saith, that, in the three sacraments, Baptism, to wit, [*sic*] Confirmation, and Order, there is not imprinted in the soul a character, that is, a certain spiritual and indelible sign, on account of which they cannot be repeated; let him be anathema.

#### On Confirmation.

CANON I.—If any one saith, that the confirmation of those who have been baptized is an idle ceremony, and not rather a true and proper sacrament; or that of old it was nothing more than a kind of catechism, whereby they who were near adolescence gave an account of their faith in the face of the Church; let him be anathema.

CANON II.—If any one saith, that they who ascribe any virtue to the sacred chrism of confirmation, offer an outrage to the Holy Ghost; let him be anathema.

CANON III.—If any one saith, that the ordinary minister of holy confirmation is not the bishop alone, but any simple priest soever; let him be anathema.<sup>vii</sup>

Canon Law also stipulates the age for confirmation: “In the Latin Church children receive confirmation about the age of seven.”<sup>viii</sup> Some authorities state that the Council of Trent allowed confirmation anytime between the ages of seven and twelve, although this writer can find no reference to that in any of the Canons of the Council. Yet, in practice, the Roman Catholic Church today, at least in some areas, tends to have confirmation at a much higher age than seven. According to a knowledgeable authority in the Green Bay Diocese, the trend is toward confirmation when one is seventeen or eighteen or even in the twenties, when the commitment to the Church is strong. Communion, of course, is given at a much earlier age.

Thus the Roman Catholic Church finally regarded confirmation as a sacrament to be performed by the bishop,\* whereby the Holy Ghost and His blessing of grace were imparted in a fuller way to the confirmand to complete the bestowal begun in Baptism, that the confirmand might be fortified in his faith and in his conflict with evil, and that a seal might be set upon his soul. One would hardly find the foregoing sentence given as a definition of confirmation in the Roman Catholic Church, yet those are essentially the parts of that doctrine as they developed before the time of the Reformation and as they are accepted by this Church today.

### **The Attitude of the Reformers toward Confirmation**

From the preceding, somewhat cursory examination, this much is clear and certain: The Lutheran Rite of Confirmation has, except for the name, practically no similarity whatsoever with the Confirmation Sacrament which developed over the course of the centuries in the Western Church. In fact, during the earliest history of the Lutheran Church after the posting of the 95 Theses, this rite apparently was rarely, if ever, practiced. That will become apparent as we discuss the position of the Reformers toward confirmation.

Dr. Luther seldom wrote about confirmation, although he left no doubt about his position toward it in his monumental *The Babylonian Captivity of the Church*, in which four paragraphs are devoted to confirmation. That definitive, 1520 treatise on the sacraments “was the most devastating assault Luther had yet undertaken against Roman teaching and practice.”<sup>ix</sup> We shall quote parts of Dr. Luther’s remarks from this treatise:

It is amazing that it should have entered the minds of these men to make a sacrament of confirmation out of the laying on of hands ...

I do not say this because I condemn the seven sacraments, but because I deny that they can be proved from the Scriptures. Would that there were in the church such a laying on of hands as there was in apostolic times, whether we chose to call it confirmation or healing! But there is nothing left of it now but what we ourselves have invented to adorn the office of bishops, that they may not be entirely without work in the church. For after they relinquished to their inferiors those arduous sacraments together with the Word as being beneath their attention (since whatever the divine majesty has instituted must needs be despised of men!) it was no more than right that we should discover something easy and not too burdensome for such delicate and great heroes to do, and should by no means entrust it to the lower clergy as something common, for whatever human wisdom has decreed must be held in honor among men! Therefore, as the priests are, so let their ministry and duty be. For a bishop who does not preach the gospel or practice the cure of

---

\* Anointing the forehead of the confirmand with the chrism (the visible means)

souls—what is he but an idol in the world [I Cor. 8:4], who has nothing but the name and appearance of a bishop?

But instead of this we seek sacraments that have been divinely instituted, and among these we see no reason for numbering confirmation. For to constitute a sacrament there must be above all things else a word of divine promise, by which faith may be exercised. But we read nowhere that Christ ever gave a promise concerning confirmation ...

For this reason it is sufficient to regard confirmation as a certain churchly rite or sacramental ceremony, similar to other ceremonies, such as the blessing of water and the like ... they have no divine promise connected with them, neither do they have; but the sacraments do save those who believe the divine promise.<sup>x</sup>

Approximately two years later, in his treatise on *The Estate of Marriage*, Dr. Luther spoke just as sharply against the confirmation of that day: “In particular, avoid that monkey business (*Affenspiel*), confirmation, which is really a fanciful deception. I would permit confirmation as long as it is understood that God himself knows nothing of it, and has said nothing of it, and that what the bishops claim for it is untrue.”<sup>xi</sup> In keeping with this principle, Dr. Luther rather late in life approved of Bugenhagen’s introduction of a purely evangelical confirmation in Pomerania.<sup>xii</sup>

Dr. Melanchthon in his *Loci Communes Theologici*, the first Protestant dogmatics, highly valued by Dr. Luther as one of the clearest statements of the Christian religion ever written, states: “Confirmation, in my opinion, is the laying on of hands.”<sup>xiii</sup> In the same work, which incidentally was issued in a number of editions, while not specifically mentioning confirmation, Dr. Melanchthon wrote: “Therefore we marvel the more how it ever came into the minds of the Sophists to include among the sacraments things which the Scriptures do not mention by so much as a word.”<sup>xiv</sup> In the 1035 edition Dr. Melanchthon stated that he desired a confirmation that consisted of an examination and a confession of faith.

Our Confessions with their many pages of material have just two brief references to confirmation (with the exception of two other times where the reference is only incidental). The Apology to the Augsburg Confession Article XIII states: “Confirmation and Extreme Unction are rites received from the Fathers which not even the church requires as necessary to salvation, because they do not have God’s command.”<sup>xv</sup> Again, Dr. Luther wrote in the 1537 Smalcald Articles in the sections “Of the Power and Jurisdiction of Bishops”: “Nor is it indeed necessary to speak of confirmation, nor of the consecration of bells (nor other tomfoolery [*Gaukelspiel*] of this kind).”<sup>xvi</sup> Dr. Luther had permanently discarded confirmation as practiced in the Roman Catholic Church, nor, did he ever, as far as we know, personally confirm anyone. That does not mean that he was completely opposed to an evangelical confirmation, as we have previously heard.

What age did Dr. Luther then suggest for a first communion? In all of the hundreds of pages that the Great Reformer wrote about the sacraments, he never (as far as this writer knows) suggested any specific age for receiving the Sacrament of Holy Communion. We can only add that this was indeed wise, because, Scripture itself has only the general requirements of being able to examine oneself (I Corinthians 11:28), believing the Words of Institution, refraining from public offense, and the like. Therefore Dr. Luther wrote in his familiar *An Order of Mass and Communion (Formula Missae)*: “They (the communicants) should request in person to receive the Lord’s Supper so that, he (the pastor) 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 ...<sup>xvii</sup> When children, have done this, when they have understood and used the Catechism as a preparation for Communion, then they are ready go partake of the Sacrament, according to Dr. Luther.

Our Confessions agree—one example is from Article XIII of the Apology of the Augsburg Confession: “Here we condemn the whole crowd of scholastic doctors, who teach that the Sacraments confer grace *ex opera operato*.”<sup>xviii</sup> In other words a little child who does not understand the Sacrament cannot benefit by its mere reception.

One can only conclude that both Dr. Luther and our Confessions require that a child reach an age of proper understanding and be instructed in the Christian faith before he can partake of his first Communion. Undoubtedly that is what actually happened. When the pastor and the congregation were satisfied that the Scriptural requirements for receiving Communion had been fulfilled, the child was invited to partake of the Lord's Supper. At least two German Church orders, (Liegnitz and Mansfeld), undoubtedly dating from either the 1530's or the 1540's, state that the children after growing in age and grace, publicly render an account of their progress in the Christian faith and renew their confession of faith before they receive their first Communion.<sup>xix</sup>

This public examination seems to have replaced confirmation in many, perhaps in most areas where the Reformation had penetrated. Nowhere, as far as this writer knows, is any specific age for confirmation mentioned.

We must not finish this section without clearly stating something that we have referred to repeatedly, and that is Dr. Luther's major emphasis in this entire matter: His strenuous efforts on behalf of Christian education for young and old. That emphasis is so well documented in many places that we need here refer only to his custom of preaching many series of Catechism sermons, beginning as early as 1516, and to his preface to the 1529 edition of the Small Catechism:

The deplorable, miserable condition which I discovered lately when I, too, was a visitor, has forced and urged me to prepare [publish] this Catechism, or Christian doctrine, in this small, plain, simple form. Mercy! Good God! what manifold misery I beheld! The common people, especially in the villages, have no knowledge whatever of Christian doctrine and, alas! many pastors are altogether incapable and incompetent to teach [so much so, that one is ashamed to speak of it]. Nevertheless, all maintain that they are Christians, have been baptized and receive the [common] holy Sacraments. Yet they [do not understand and] cannot [even] recite either the Lord's Prayer, or the Creed, or the Ten Commandments; they live like dumb brutes and irrational hogs; and yet, now that the Gospel has come, they have nicely learned to abuse all liberty like experts.

O ye bishops! [to whom this charge has been committed by God,] what will ye ever answer to Christ for having so shamefully neglected the people and never for a moment discharged your office? ... you do not care in the least ... whether the people know the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, the Ten Commandments, or any part of the Word of God. Woe, woe, unto you forever!

Therefore I entreat [and adjure] you all for God's sake, my dear sirs and brethren, who are pastors or preachers, to devote yourselves heartily to your office, to have pity on the

people who are entrusted to you, and to help us inculcate the Catechism upon the people, and especially upon the young.<sup>xx</sup>

This laudable emphasis upon the previous Christian education of young and old remains just about the only part of confirmation that almost all the movements that affected this rite in the Lutheran Church during the coming centuries agreed upon.

### **Confirmation in the Lutheran Church during the Century after Dr. Luther's Death**

A Christian form of confirmation was introduced into various Lutheran areas of Germany shortly before and shortly after Dr. Luther's death. Meusel, for example, mentions its introduction into Hesse, Brandenburg, Pomerania, etc., during the years from 1539-1571.<sup>xxi</sup> Pastor Brenner lists a number of church orders like those of Ulm, Prussia, Saxony, etc., which introduced confirmation in the years from 1526-1557 and prescribed a definite ritual for its observance.<sup>xxii</sup> Frequently those congregations which introduced the rite were careful not to regard it as a sacrament; they stressed the examination, which centered almost exclusively on the Small Catechism, and the confession of faith.

However, two events happened which eliminated confirmation from many Lutheran congregations and prevented its introduction into others. The one event was the Augsburg Interim (1548), that unfortunate attempt to reintroduce Roman Catholic customs and doctrine, including confirmation, into the Lutheran churches. Most Lutherans strenuously resisted these efforts. Rather than have a pseudo-confirmation sacrament, many pastors and laymen decided to have nothing whatsoever to do with this custom, lest a false impression be given.

The other event that affected not only confirmation but almost every other facet of life in Central Europe was the Thirty Years War, 1618-1648. The devastating effects of this horrible calamity are almost impossible for us to imagine. Armies swept back and forth year after year, pillaging, robbing, burning, murdering, and in the process reducing the population from 17 million to 4 million. It has been said that no people ever suffered more since the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 AD and that a hundred years passed before there was a full recovery.

Church life, too, was seriously and in many cases totally disrupted. Confirmation was a casualty in many areas that had previously celebrated it; or it was not introduced into areas that in normal times might have considered it.

Consequently, an almost entirely new beginning had to be made with confirmation in the days following the Thirty Years War, or from approximately 1650 onward. These are the developments that we shall consider in the final part of our paper.

### **Confirmation in the Lutheran Church since about 1650**

In contrast to the years immediately following the Reformation, most Lutheran churches in both Germany and in other countries began promoting the Rite of Confirmation during the later part of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, a custom that prevails to our day. Several influences contributed to this emphasis. For one thing, a number of notable Lutheran scholars saw the value of an evangelical confirmation rite, and they advocated it with their preaching and with their writings. Philipp Melancthon, for example, in his 1543 edition of his *Loci Communes* stated that confirmation should include "examination in the Catechism, public confession of faith, and an intercessory consecration of the confirmands accompanied by the laying on of hands. The final form of Melancthon's confirmation order is found in the Wittenberg Church Orders of 1545.... This 1545 order, incidentally, had Luther's approval."<sup>xxiii</sup> We shouldn't be greatly surprised at

this apparent change of heart on Melancthon's part, for he did vacillate. (Previously he seemed to be cool or opposed to confirmation.)

A number of other well-known men from the 16<sup>th</sup> century also advocated some form of confirmation including Martin Bucer (1491-1551), who was somewhat of a humanist and who strove for unity even, if necessary, at the expense of doctrine. Frank W. Klos, following the example of Dr. Arthur Repp who wrote the article on confirmation in *The Encyclopedia of the Lutheran Church*, calls Bucer "the father of Lutheran confirmation."<sup>xxiv</sup> That seems, to this writer, to be going too far, although it is certain that Bucer's efforts on behalf of confirmation influenced the development of this custom in the Lutheran church.

Another highly important figure in the development of confirmation as we know it today is Martin Chemnitz (1522-1586), the co-author of the Formula of Concord and author of the valuable *The Two Natures in Christ*, ably translated by Dr. J. A. O. Preuss and published by Concordia Publishing House in 1971.

In his notable *Examen Concilii Tridentini*, Chemnitz wrote a detailed (and generally excellent, we might add) exposition of confirmation as listed in various church orders and as proposed by the older dogmatists. According to his compilations, confirmation consisted of the following seven points: 1) the admonition that the confirmand is to be sincerely reminded of his baptism; 2) the special and public profession in which he publicly confesses his doctrine and the faith in which he was baptized; 3) the examination in the major doctrines of the Christian faith, that he (the confirmand), when asked, might give an account of the major articles of faith; 4) the renunciation of all unbelief and superstition; 5) the earnest exhortation to persevere permanently in one's baptismal covenant and in the state of grace; 6) the public prayer, the intercession for the children; 7) the ceremony of the laying on of hands. In connection with the last point, Chemnitz cautioned that one should not attach any particular powers to the imposition of hands as such (at one time the Roman Catholic Church regarded this as the visible sign<sup>\*</sup>); it is not commanded in Scripture, although frequently used as gesture of blessing. Its only purpose is to signify that the prayer and the blessing are meant specifically for the confirmand.<sup>xxv</sup>

The preceding paragraph is translated somewhat freely from Pastor Brenner's article in *Lehre and Wehre*. A paging through our school's copy of the *Examen* (it has no index) fails to unearth this particular quotation by Chemnitz, but since both Pastor Brenner and Frank W. Klos<sup>xxvi</sup> mentioned essentially the same thoughts, Klos without citing the reference, it may be safely assumed that Chemnitz did write the words ascribed to him. May we also assume that those congregations which followed Chemnitz's guidelines confirmed their children at about the same age as we do today in our own Synod? It would seem so.

In the years beginning with the second half of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, when confirmation was gradually introduced into Lutheran churches everywhere, this rite was influenced, temporarily or permanently, by no less than six different ideas or historical movements. We shall describe each one briefly, referring the reader to Klos,<sup>xxvii</sup> Meusel,<sup>xxviii</sup> and to Brenner<sup>xxix</sup> for a much fuller treatment.

The group which held and holds *the sacramental view* of confirmation added something to Bucer's ideas that he did not intend. They began to include expressions like "Receive ye the Holy Ghost" in their ceremonies. These people felt and feel that confirmation, especially the prayer and the imposition of hands, conveys or adds something to baptism, like a fuller outpouring of the Holy Ghost or the grace of God. Meusel<sup>xxx</sup> lists a number of 16<sup>th</sup> century church orders which definitely provide for a sacramental type of confirmation. This aberration,

---

\* Of the Sacrament of confirmation.



which finally was not much different from the Roman Catholic Sacrament has by no means disappeared from the scene, as Klos<sup>xxxix</sup> shows in quoting the LCA and TALC's *Service Book and Hymnal*: "The Father in Heaven, for Jesus sake, *renew and increase in thee* the gift of the Holy Ghost ..." Even our own *Lutheran Agenda* can be misunderstood with its rather vague I invite you "to participate with us in all the rites and privileges of the Evangelical Lutheran Church." That *may* sound as if confirmation bestows something upon the confirmand, while we have shown before that confirmation really doesn't bestow anything. That is something we need to clarify for our children. They must not think that this is a magical rite that bestows some kind of indelible character.

A second emphasis in the Rite of Confirmation is called the *hierarchical view*, not hierarchical in the Roman Catholic sense, but to be understood as referring to the government of the local congregation. The people who emphasize this point also derived their ideas in part from Bucer who felt that "When the baptized child has come to the age of discretion ... he then can be asked whether he would willingly place himself under church discipline. This would be a good time too for the children ... to confess for themselves the vows their sponsors made for them at baptism.... This was (also) the first time that the Rite of Confirmation and First Communion were actually merged ..."<sup>xxxix</sup>

For those who were influenced by the hierarchical view, confirmation became, at least to some extent, the act, whereby one was received into complete communion with Christ, and Meusel lists three church orders of the 16<sup>th</sup> century that actually contained this stipulation.<sup>xxxix</sup> Now the confirmand was a true member of the Church (before he had been somewhat of an inferior member) who was entitled to all the rites and privileges of the Christian congregation. Thus the Church really became a visible communion of those who were confirmed, certainly a heretical doctrine. The Church is the communion of *all* believers. Unfortunately, we aren't completely rid of these hierarchical ideas in our day.

A third emphasis upon confirmation is called the *traditional* by Klos.<sup>xxxix</sup> He cites the Brandenburg Church Order, authorizing the production of a Lutheran Rite of Confirmation "which they wished to observe according to tradition." They felt this could include an evangelical understanding of the laying on of hands and the bishop's participation in the ceremony. Melancthon's later thoughts placed him into this category also.

In addition to these three emphases, there was a fourth, the *catechetical*, which we shall discuss shortly.

Frank W. Klos writes of these four emphases, "As the 16<sup>th</sup> century drew to a close then, the four emphases in confirmation ... were in full use in one form or another."<sup>xxxix</sup> That probably continued well into the 17<sup>th</sup> century; indeed, some of these evils have, unfortunately, not altogether disappeared in the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

In addition to these four emphases, two important historical movements greatly influenced the Rite of Confirmation within the Lutheran church. One was *Pietism*, that late 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> century movement which began as a reaction to the so-called dead, dogmatic orthodoxy within the Lutheran church. Pietism (Philip Spener, 1635-1705, is commonly regarded as its father) emphasized the Christian life; instead of doctrine, the fruits of faith, based upon Bible passages like Galatians 5:22-26 ("But the fruit of the Spirit is ..."), and the edification or even the perfection of the Christian man, while Word and Sacrament were neglected. Nicholas Ludwig Zinzendorf (1700-1760) was also one of the important Pietists. He stressed the religion of the heart and the felt experience; later his excessive emotionalism influenced Methodism.

Also Pastor Henry Melchior Muhlenberg, of Revolutionary War fame, was sent to minister to the Lutherans in America from the pietistic center in Halle.

One can understand that this movement, for all of its good intentions, soon led to serious abuses, and it was vigorously opposed by the orthodox theologians. Yet, Pietism did have its effects upon confirmation, not always bad ones either, we might add, but the evil influences eventually seemed to outweigh the good. For one thing Spener did advocate confirmation at every opportunity, desiring to have it introduced everywhere “as something necessary and of the highest worth.”<sup>xxxvi</sup> In fact, he did so much for confirmation that Professor August Pieper could say in his classroom lectures, “*Spener gab uns wieder eine richtige Konfirmation, etwas Vernunftiges*” (Spener again gave us a correct confirmation, something sensible). The Pietists also stressed Bible reading and they fought against the “sterile question and answer, sheer memorization of doctrines that catechetics had become.”<sup>xxxvii</sup> Furthermore, the confession of faith had to be developed by the confirmands themselves; they were not simply to repeat a dead form devised by someone else.

However, and now the writer of this paper will freely translate several sentences from Pastor Brenner’s *Lehre and Wehre* article: For the Pietists confirmation became a renewing of the baptismal vow so that thereby the child could be awakened and quickened. These spiritually awakened confirmands were then to quicken and to renew the church. The emphasis upon instruction diminished; memorization became pedantic rubbish; the only purpose of instruction was to bring to light the inner experiences and battles for repentance necessary for conversion; and the church would be renewed by these small groups of quickened Christians who were to be the penetrating salt that would bring about the conversion of all.<sup>xxxviii</sup> That’s the way in which an idea that may be noble and useful at the beginning can be abused and finally lead to nothing good. For the Pietists, confirmation had become a rite that does something for people; it also stressed the renewal of the baptismal vow, the only one of the various influences on confirmation that stressed this point. (The baptismal vow should be renewed through *daily* contrition and repentance.)

A second major historical movement that influenced confirmation was the 18<sup>th</sup> century *Age of Rationalism*, that finally led to the 19<sup>th</sup> century Scientific Age with its emphasis upon the scientific method. That age is still with us in the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

Frank W. Klos excellently characterized this era in our history as follows:

The Age of Reason came roaring into human history seeking explanations, logical and plausible, for all the facts of human existence. Old opinions would have to stand the test of thorough scrutiny. If they should be found wanting, do away with them. So the Age of Reason fathered the Age of Revolution. To honor man’s mind, honor man himself. Down with the decadent monarchy—and the French revolution was born. Up with democracy—and the American colonies severed their ties with Great Britain.

The Rationalists believed that there wasn’t anything that a man couldn’t do if he put his mind to the task. Newspapers could hardly keep up with the reports of new inventions, of innovations in industry and transportation and the arts. Even more radical changes were coming. The thinking man had a tremendous task; he had to weigh in his mind the ideas, the new facts, the changes and determine which were worth accepting. Like a sonic boom, rationalism echoed loudly in the church; Christians are still vibrating from the blast.<sup>xxxix</sup>

Among many other writers, Pastor Brenner has much to say about Rationalism's influence on confirmation. Using as his sources W. Caspari's *Die ev. Konfirmation*, various church orders, and other sources, he wrote at length about this point. We shall freely translate a few of his thoughts in the following paragraph.

Rationalism is the congregation of reasonable people; healthy human understanding is its motto; baptism is a receptional ceremony for the rationalists, a solemn initiation into Christianity, but the real reception takes place in confirmation; thus confirmation became a renewing, a solemn consecration by the confirmand himself. Confirmation instruction, in addition to instructing in the Catechism, also stressed other useful matters like science, health, etc. Above all else, virtue was taught, while the Catechism was neglected. Great stress was laid upon the oath, with the following being an example: "Step before the altar with a proud feeling that from this day onward you are dedicating yourselves to the Holiest One, the One before whom scepters and crowns bow, and thereby confess that He has the preeminence. O, if thereby your heart does not tingle, when you consider that I am now dedicating myself to the Priest of Truth and Virtue and to a God-fearing life on earth, then you are no longer worthy of being called human beings."

The confirmand answered: "I lift up my hand and swear: by the honor of Jesus I will remain true and faithful to virtue. (This oath then became the basis of one's salvation.) After the blessing, the pastor would conclude with: "Once again, my children, by the love of your parents ... by the ashes of the glorified saints ... by the unseen, living God, I pray, admonish, adjure you: remain faithful."<sup>xi</sup>

Again, Pastor Brenner wrote, among other things, if confirmation (in the Age of Reason) was lacking a real content, it became all the more pretentious outwardly. Garlands of flowers, foliage, ringing of bells, and antiphonal singing and other accessories dared not be missing. People tried to make the celebration as attractive and elevating as possible for parents, children, and listeners. Thus the Rite of Confirmation was theatrically decked out and developed into a tear-jerking melodrama. (Examples are mentioned of confirmands going to their parents just before the confirmation rite to beg for their forgiveness and blessing, whereupon the parents spoke a few words and laid their hands upon the child's head.)<sup>xli</sup>

During this time confirmation frequently marked the end of formal schooling, about the time of the child's 14<sup>th</sup> year. He who did not have the necessary classroom knowledge could not be confirmed. Indeed, confirmation was joined to civil life, for he who was not confirmed could not become an apprentice or a servant.<sup>xlii</sup>

There remains to be discussed just one more major influence upon confirmation, and that is the instruction or *catechization* previous to confirmation. In keeping with the many Bible passages that require the child to be instructed in the Christian faith (e.g., Deuteronomy 6:6-9; Psalm 78:1-7; Matthew 28:19, 20; Ephesians 6:4; etc.), the Church has always pursued that goal.

M'Clintock and Strong have a good survey of the history of catechetics.<sup>xliii</sup> They tell us that in the early years of New Testament History the Apostolic Constitutions fixed three years as the period of instruction. In the Middle Ages, however, catechetics fell into disuse and the confessional took its place. During the Reformation there was great emphasis upon catechization and a tremendous upswing in doing this work. This largely resulted because Dr. Luther promoted it so vigorously and God blessed these efforts so wondrously. Dr. Luther may indeed be called the modern father of catechization. He stressed these principles: 1) use of the catechism for instruction; 2) instruction was meant to convey revealed truths; 3) catechists were to have the children memorize the Catechism, explain the meaning, and impress these truths upon the

children. (Unfortunately, after the Thirty Years War, when the church was hard-pressed just to keep any kind of a congregation in existence, some pastors probably stressed the memorization and the dogma but neglected to explain the Catechism's meaning and its application to one's life.)

Fortunately, many, probably most of Dr. Luther's spiritual descendants followed his excellent example of stressing the catechetical instruction previous to confirmation. Church History since the Reformation contains almost innumerable references to the necessity of such a thorough catechesis. That is really the essential part of confirmation, and thus the Word confirms the children.

Almost everywhere also confirmation led to one's first Communion, and I Corinthians 11:28 was regularly quoted to show the necessity for being able to examine oneself before partaking of the Sacrament. Meusel, for example, writes: "Since all importance was attached to one's first confession and communion, one was frequently satisfied with a simple examination of the children either individually and privately or together and publicly by the pastor."<sup>xliv</sup> This, too, was exactly in keeping with Scriptural doctrine that Word and Sacrament (not prayer or laying on of hands or anything else) are the Means of Grace. Nor does the Holy Ghost come through prayer, but only through the Gospel.

Dr. Edmund Wolf in his *Lutherans in America*, a book that was so popular that it was soon translated into German in 1891, expresses these thoughts well: "A pastor without the Catechism is an absurdity. He is not in the right church. He has missed his calling. Every historian praises the fathers for their faithfulness in catechetical instruction and the result which they achieved through thorough preparation of the youths for confirmation."<sup>xlv</sup> Then he quoted the resolutions of the General Synod to publish the necessary English edition of the Catechism, beginning in the 1820's (almost immediately after that Synod was formed). He also mentioned the dreadful spiritual decay that results when instruction is neglected.

Our own spiritual fathers in the former Synodical Conference always stressed catechetical instruction. Dr. Walther, for example, in the 1872 edition of his *Pastoral Theology*, used for decades in the Missouri Synod, stated that confirmation is a church custom that can be a great blessing if correctly used ... The pastor is to continue it or if the custom had been discontinued, to reinstate it.<sup>xlvi</sup> (There must have been Missouri Synod congregations at that time that did not practice confirmation.) Yet, he also quoted Pastor Loescher's 1713 remark, without disapproval, that confirmation is a praiseworthy and edifying ceremony, but it cannot be introduced everywhere and that is not absolutely necessary either.<sup>xlvii</sup> He specifically warned against considering confirmation as an addition to or a completion of baptism, as if the confirmand were now for the first time making the baptismal confession and vow that was spoken for him by his sponsors his own. Much rather, confirmation was to remind the confirmand and the congregation of the glory of baptism that had been received in childhood.<sup>xlviii</sup>

Dr. Walther, following Dr. Luther's example, stressed the thorough instruction in the Catechism, quoting the Missouri Synod's Constitution which required that the confirmand memorize at least the Small Catechism without explanation and that he have an understanding of the same so that he could examine himself according to I Corinthians 11:28. The more able catechumens should, wherever possible, be able to substantiate the doctrines of the Christian faith with clear Bible passages and to refute the false doctrines of the sects. Wherever possible, a minimum of 100 hours was to be spent on catechetical instruction.<sup>xlix</sup> As we might expect, he had much to say about the catechetical instruction on the part of the pastors.

As far as age is concerned, Dr. Walther recommended the close of the twelfth year at the very earliest, and he based this upon the example of Christ in the Temple, Luke 2:41, 42.<sup>1</sup> That is hardly a compelling reason for having confirmation at age twelve, but Dr. Walther undoubtedly was emphasizing the need for a previous instruction and that could hardly be done adequately if the child were confirmed at seven. Dr. Walther probably also knew about Bucer's objection to the Church of England's custom of early confirmation, stating that children must first have the opportunity of testifying to their faith and expressing the desire of living to God (the Church of England, in part, claimed that confirmation assisted the children in manifesting their faith and practice, the old error that confirmation does something for one.)

Dr. John H. C. Fritz in his 1932 *Pastoral Theology*, based upon Dr. Walther's work and used many years in the Missouri Synod, has a greatly condensed article on confirmation. In it he also stressed the need for the scripturally required indoctrination of the young, the characteristic feature of confirmation, so that the child could examine himself before partaking of Holy Communion, I Corinthians 11:28. He added: "It is not asking too much that the average child be able to recite the entire six. chief parts of the Catechism with the explanations and the necessary prooftexts." He quoted from Dr. Luther's Preface to the Small Catechism: "First, teach the text; secondly, teach the sense; thirdly, impart a richer and fuller knowledge, giving special attention to that which is most needed." He followed Dr. Walther in suggesting that the child not be confirmed before he was twelve. "The usual age is fourteen; a year or two older is always better than a year or two younger. A congregation should, however, make no strict, rule in reference to the age of confirmation, but leave this to the discretion of the pastor and perhaps the church council."<sup>li</sup>

In Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod circles Professor John Schaller's 1913 *Pastorale Praxis*, long used as a Seminary textbook, has no less than five pages on confirmation. Professor Schaller began by completely rejecting such points as the sacramental character of confirmation, the idea that the imposition of hands imparts spiritual strength, the thought that confirmation is a supplement or a completion of baptism or a renewing of the baptismal vow (this covenant depends entirely on God), and that confirmation is a means for acceptance into the restricted circle of Christians.<sup>lii</sup> Apart from the particular petition of the congregation, children receive nothing new through confirmation, for "whosoever is not confirmed before he is confirmed, will not be confirmed when he is confirmed."<sup>liiii</sup>

"Therefore the final act (confirmation) is not the most important thing for either the children or the congregation, despite its impressive and unforgettable solemnity, but for the children it is the previous instruction (an inner confirmation in the knowledge of the Gospel) and for the congregation it is the public confession of the children, (especially in the confirmation examination)."<sup>liiv</sup> The aim of the instruction is to be the promotion of and the thorough grounding in the pure doctrine, as much as this is possible with the Catechism as the basis.

After more admonition along similar lines, Professor Schaller continued with, "The correct age for confirmation is difficult to determine, for certainly not the number of years, but the state of one's understanding is the criterion for admission to the Lord's Supper. Luke 2:41 is no proof, but at best an analogy. Yet, there is a consensus, that the real age of discretion in respect to the Lord's Supper begins with the end of the twelfth year.... It is likewise true that with a greater age no guarantee of a sufficient amount of spiritual, understanding can be given. In the final analysis only the *Seelsorger* can understand and determine with certainty how matters stand with the confirmand. A determination of an age by a congregational resolution can

therefore only have the import that confirmation is not to take place earlier, but not that it must take place then ... such resolutions can be rudely misused.”<sup>lv</sup>

For Professor Schaller confirmation was really an act of the congregation which publicly prays for the confirmands, applies this petition to the individual confirmand through the laying on of hands, and then receives the children as communicant members. A confession of faith and the Christian conviction (determined through examination and the avowal to remain faithful to the Confessions of the Lutheran Church) naturally precede the three-fold Confirmation act.<sup>lvi</sup>

For Professor August Pieper, who later taught pastoral theology for many years at the WELS Seminary, confirmation was a double act: “On the part of the confirmand not simply a renewal of the baptismal vow which everyone is to do daily through contrition and repentance, but it is the solemn, personally spoken repetition of the baptismal vow as a public confession to Christ, and a public renunciation of the devil. On the part of the congregation, confirmation is a declaration of a sufficient ‘maturity to receive Holy Communion, or expressed differently, a reception into the number of the independent (to be understood relatively) congregational members with an acceptance of spiritual responsibility before the entire congregation.” He also stressed the catechetical preparation for receiving first Communion.

Professor Pieper had this to say about the age for confirmation: “You cannot set a law when a child must be confirmed ... my mother said, ‘*Warte bis du vernünftig bist,*’ and I waited until I was sixteen.... Confirmation is to take place when the child is at an age where a learning of the way of salvation and confession before the world is necessary and a strengthening against the evils of one’s flesh is mandatory—this is the time when the child begins to doubt his father’s and mother’s authority; he also learns to doubt the Word of God—this is the time to strengthen the youths against unchastity, etc.” (These quotations are translated directly from the author’s class notes of the early 1930’s when Professor Pieper had reached the peak of his powers.)

\* \* \* \*

The major points that we have been trying to make in this paper are the following:

1. Confirmation is an adiaphoron. Even the *New Catholic Encyclopedia* states: “Absolutely nothing in the Gospel indicates that Jesus Himself instituted the Sacrament of Confirmation.”<sup>lvii</sup>
2. During the 1,000 years after 200 AD, confirmation gradually developed into an anti-scriptural, sacramental doctrine in the Western Church.
3. In the early years of the Reformation the Lutheran Church did not generally practice confirmation (the Reformers, especially Dr. Luther, emphasized catechetical instruction). When it was gradually introduced, it, for the most part had few similarities to the Roman Catholic rite.
4. Although confirmation had previously been practiced in various Lutheran areas its almost universal acceptance did not occur until after the close of the Thirty Years’ War, about 1650.
5. During the two or more centuries after Dr. Luther’s death, six different ideas or historical movements affected confirmation to a greater or lesser degree, often detrimentally. They and their influences are listed in the fine Graph by Klos, reproduced on page 19 of this paper.
6. Dr. Luther’s spiritual descendants stressed the catechetical instruction of the young, in keeping with the admonition of Scripture and as a preparation for Holy Communion (I

Corinthians 11:28). This pre-confirmation emphasis is one of the few parts of the rite on which all Lutheran Church bodies are agreed.

7. Our spiritual fathers generally refrain from suggesting an age for confirmation. Although many suggested that children should not be confirmed before the end of their twelfth year, they also agree that, spiritual maturity, not age, should be the criterion.
8. Martin Chemnitz has some excellent ideas regarding a definition for confirmation, perhaps the best of any that we have studied (see page 9).

\* \* \* \*

We shall close this paper with a few comments on *Confirmation and First Communion* by Frank W. Klos, 1968. This book is the most comprehensive treatment, of confirmation in English. (Many German studies have been written, with Pastor E. Eckhardt, in his 1907 *Reallexikon* listing all Synodical Conference literature on the subject, having no less than nine pages of references.) It is the result of a study by a fifteen-man Joint Commission on Theology and Practice of Confirmation with representatives from TALC, LCA, and the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod. It has enough valuable information so that all of us might well purchase a copy or at least borrow it from a library. The Commission spent a great deal of time in formulating a definition for confirmation, in defining the work of the pastoral and educational ministry, in forming a description of the confirmand's identification with the Christian congregations and in describing the rite itself. All of the definitions are listed in the book, pages 140-153. Confirmation is defined as follows:

Confirmation is a pastoral and educational ministry of the church that is designed to help baptized children identify with the life and mission of the adult Christian community and that is celebrated in a public rite.

After much study, the Commission recommended to the three bodies that confirmation and first Communion be separated, that the children be admitted to their first Communion about the end of the fifth grade, and that confirmation take place approximately at the end of the tenth grade. The Commission admits that such a recommendation comes close to Roman Catholic practice, yet the members felt that compelling spiritual and psychological reasons required these recommendations, which were then accepted by TALC and LCA, but rejected by the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod. The religious reasoning may be summarized as follows:

A careful study of age level characteristics indicates that the baptized child may be ready to participate in Holy Communion much earlier than he is ready to identify with the adult Christian community as he does at confirmation.<sup>lviii</sup>

Again, the Commission was confronted with the widespread opinion that confirmation represents the climax and frequently the end of catechetical instruction at the very moment when psychologically the child desperately needs formal, and informal religious instruction. This tendency to consider eighth grade confirmation as the end of religious instruction was seldom illustrated more graphically than by a boy in one of our congregations who handed his catechism to the pastor on confirmation day with the remark, "You can have my catechism, since I won't be needing it anymore." Even though Dr. Luther, Dr. Walther, Professor Pieper, and many others have stressed the desperate need for religious instruction beyond the eighth grade, we have not succeeded in doing much of this work, except for those pupils who attend Lutheran high schools.

Therefore, "the Commission feels strongly that depth studies of Christian faith and life in the catechetical program should be continued on the junior high age level, grades seven, eight,

and nine ... the tenth grade should be a time of private and small group conferences with the pastor and other lay leaders.”<sup>lix</sup>

The psychological reasons for the recommendations are briefly these: both the fifth grade and the tenth mark important periods in the life of the child, the one marking the end of late childhood and early puberty (approximately 10-12 years); the other, the end (about 16-17) of early adolescence. The Commission quotes Gesell, *Youth, the Years from Ten to Sixteen*, and others for thoughts like the following: a fifth grader has reached a teachable moment, ready biologically and psychologically for instruction; he looks for adult guidance; he has an almost built-in readiness to be taught about repentance, confession, forgiveness in Christ, and strengthening through the Lord’s Supper. Tenth graders are moving toward a new life of independence from their parents (sometimes there are conflicts); they are beginning to make more of their own choices; they are becoming self-confident; they are acquiring a set of values to guide them in their behavior for the rest of their life; they are struggling to find themselves.

As long as these points (and many others the Commission makes) are not rigidly pressed, they are surely psychologically and educationally sound. Whether our Synod will or should consider these recommendations is another matter. There are sound educational arguments that one could cite in opposition to these proposals and the Commission is aware of them.

For example, the Commission itself admits that “A later confirmation may make it difficult to keep pupils in instruction classes once they have been admitted to Communion. The church faces the possibility that the practice of confirmation may disappear entirely and Christian education be confined for most persons to early childhood.”<sup>lx</sup>

In our own Synod with its relatively high number of children in parochial schools, would any pastor of a congregation with a school recommend a change in eighth-grade confirmation? That seems doubtful, for how can one compare regular, perhaps daily, morning confirmation instruction attended by all the catechumens with an irregular, poorly attended, afternoon class?

However, in one point all of us will surely agree with the Commission: Religious education for our youth beyond the eighth grade is mandatory, and the best (by far) agency that the church has devised for such formal Christian training on the secondary level is the Lutheran high school. Where it does not exist, the pastor will be sore pressed to achieve an adequate program of religious training for his high school youth. Where it does exist, may we make strenuous efforts to have our youth attend it, pray for the Lord’s continued blessing on it, and support it faithfully and generously (Resolution, Committee 13, No. 12, 1971 WELS Synod Convention).



- 
- <sup>i</sup> *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, p. 145, 146.
- <sup>ii</sup> *Lehre und Wehre*, p. 65, 66. (all translations from the German are mine.) Hereafter entitled *L. u. W.*
- <sup>iii</sup> *L. u. W.*, p. 67.
- <sup>iv</sup> *Schaff-Herzog*, Vol. IV, p. 157.
- <sup>v</sup> *L. u. W.*, p. 67.
- <sup>vi</sup> Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, Vol. IV, p. 157.
- <sup>vii</sup> *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. IV, pp. 145, 151.
- <sup>viii</sup> Rene Metz, *What Is Canon Law?* (Hawthorn books, NY, 1960).
- <sup>ix</sup> *Luther's Works*, Vol. 36, p. 8, Editor's Introduction.
- <sup>x</sup> *Luther's Works*, Vol. 36, p. 91, 92.
- <sup>xi</sup> *Luther's Works*, Vol. 45, p. 24, 25.
- <sup>xii</sup> *L. u. W.*, Vol. 51, p. 74.
- <sup>xiii</sup> *Melanchthon and Bucer*, p. 146.
- <sup>xiv</sup> *Melanchthon and Bucer*, p. 135.
- <sup>xv</sup> *Concordia Triglotta*, p. 309, paragraph 6.
- <sup>xvi</sup> *Concordia Triglotta*, p. 525, paragraph 73.
- <sup>xvii</sup> *Luther's Works*, Vol. 53, p. 32.
- <sup>xviii</sup> *Concordia Triglotta*, p. 313, paragraph 18.
- <sup>xix</sup> *L. u. W.*, p. 74, 75.
- <sup>xx</sup> *Concordia Triglotta*. p. 533.
- <sup>xxi</sup> Meusel, Vol. IV, p. 47.
- <sup>xxii</sup> *L. u. W.*, p. 75.
- <sup>xxiii</sup> Klos, *Confirmation and First Communion*, p. 60.
- <sup>xxiv</sup> Klos, *Confirmation and First Communion*, [p. ?]
- <sup>xxv</sup> *L. u. W.*, p. 75.
- <sup>xxvi</sup> Klos, *Confirmation and First Communion*, p. 65. (Hereafter called Klos)
- <sup>xxvii</sup> Klos, pp. 56-72.
- <sup>xxviii</sup> Meusel., Vol. IV, pp. 47-50.
- <sup>xxix</sup> *L. u. W.*, pp. 124-135.
- <sup>xxx</sup> Meusel, Vol. IV, p. 48.
- <sup>xxxi</sup> Klos, p. 62.
- <sup>xxxii</sup> Klos, p. 60.
- <sup>xxxiii</sup> Meusel, Vol. IV, p. 49.
- <sup>xxxiv</sup> Klos, p. 63.
- <sup>xxxv</sup> Klos, p. 65.
- <sup>xxxvi</sup> *L. u. W.*, p. 126.
- <sup>xxxvii</sup> Klos, p. 68.
- <sup>xxxviii</sup> *L. u. W.*, p. 126, 127.
- <sup>xxxix</sup> Klos, p. 69.
- <sup>xl</sup> *L. u. W.*, p. 128, 129.
- <sup>xli</sup> *L. u. W.*, p. 130.
- <sup>xlii</sup> *L. u. W.*, p. 131.
- <sup>xliiii</sup> M'Clintock, *Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature*, Vol. II, p. 149, 150.
- <sup>xliiv</sup> Meusel, Vol. IV, p. 48.
- <sup>xlv</sup> Wolf, *Die Lutheraner in America*, p. 474.
- <sup>xlvi</sup> Walther, *Pastoraltheologie*, p. 261. (Hereafter called Walther)
- <sup>xlvii</sup> Walther, p. 264, 265.
- <sup>xlviii</sup> Walther, p. 266.
- <sup>xlix</sup> Walther, p. 265.
- <sup>l</sup> Walther, p. 265.

---

<sup>li</sup> Fritz, *Pastoral Theology*, pp. 127-129.

<sup>lii</sup> Schaller, *Pastorale Praxis in der Ev. -Lutheran Freikirche Amerikas* (Hereafter called Schaller) p. 50.

<sup>liii</sup> Schaller, p. 51.

<sup>liv</sup> Schaller, p. 51.

<sup>lv</sup> Schaller, p. 53.

<sup>lvi</sup> Schaller, p. 50.

<sup>lvii</sup> *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. IV, p. 147.

<sup>lviii</sup> Klos, p. 202.

<sup>lix</sup> Klos, p. 165.

<sup>lx</sup> Klos, p. 200.



Promise loyalty to denomination or local church							
Memory verses to live by							
Lifelong catechumenate							
Other:							

(Chart copied from Frank W. Klos, *Confirmation and First Communion*, p.72)

## Bibliography – Books

- Bente, F.; Dau, W. H. T. (eds.). *Concordia Triglotta*. Reprinted by Mott Press, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 1955. Original edition: Concordia Publishing House, 1921.
- Bodensieck, Julius (ed.). *The Encyclopedia of the Lutheran Church*. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Augsburg Publishing House, 1965 (3 vols.)
- Cross, F. L. (ed.). *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*. New York, Toronto: London Oxford University Press, 1958.
- Eckhardt, E. *Homiletisches Reallexikon*. St. Louis, Mo.: Success Printing Co. (4 vols.). 1907 ff.
- Fritz, John H. C., D. D. *Pastoral Theology*. St. Louis, Mo.: Concordia Publishing House, 1932.
- Jackson, Samuel Macauley, D. D., LL. D. (ed.). *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Book House, 1960 (15 vols.) (Reprint of 1960 edition).
- Klos, Frank W. *Confirmation and First Communion*. Augsburg Publishing House, Board of Publication of the Lutheran Church in America, Concordia Pub. House, 1968.
- Lenski, R. C. H. *The Interpretation of the Acts of the Apostles*. Columbus, Ohio: Lutheran Book Concern, 1934.
- Lueker, Erwin L. (ed.) *Lutheran Cyclopedia*. St. Louis, Mo.: Concordia Pub. House, 1954.
- M'Clintock, The Rev. John, D. D. & Strong, James, S. T. D. *Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature*. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1878.
- Meusel, Carl (ed.). *Kirchliches Handlexikon*. Leipzig: Justus Naumann, 1894. (7 vols.)
- Mueller, John Theodore, TH. D. *Christian Dogmatics*. St. Louis, Mo.: Concordia Publishing House, 1955.
- Pauck, Wilhelm (ed.). *Melanchthon and Bucer*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1969.
- Pelikan, Jaroslav (ed.). *Luther's Works*. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House; Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press; Philadelphia: Fortress Press. 1958 ff. (various vols.)
- Schaff, Philip. *History of the Christian Church*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans, Publishing Co., 1910 (8 vols.)
- Schaller, John. *Pastorale Praxis in der Ev. -Lutheran Freikirche Amerikas*. Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 1913.
- Walther, C. F. W. *Pastoraltheologie*. St. Louis, Mo.: The Mo. Synod Press, 1872.
- Waterworth, Rev. J. *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*. Chicago, Ill.: The Christian Symbolic Publication Soc., 1848.
- Wolf, Edmund Jakob. *Die Lutheraner in America*. New York: J. A. Hill & Co. 1881.
- Catholic Univ. of America. *New Catholic Encyclopedia*. Washington, D.C., 1967.

### **Bibliography – Magazines**

Ev. Luth. Synod, Mo., Ohio & Other States. *Lehre and Wehre*. St. Louis, Mo.: Concordia Publishing House, (Vol. 51, 1905)

Wis. Ev. Luth. Synod. *Theologische Quartalschrift*. Northwestern Publishing House, (Vol. 68, 2)