

Episcopal Address to the 2021 Synod of the ELDoNA

In the Name of the Father and of the † Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

Dear Brothers in Christ and Office,

As we again gather in synod in the week of *Quasimodogeniti*, there is much for us to consider as we reflect on the two years which have passed since we last gathered together in this place. Before turning to matters of the world which have impinged on the Church, I would have us to reflect on that which the Lord has granted within the fellowship of this diocese.

On the Sixteenth Sunday after Trinity in 2019, our esteemed brother in Christ and Office, the Rev. Charles Hudson, was called from this vale of tears into the presence of the Triune God and the assembly of the saints gathered around the throne of the Lamb. The world takes little notice of the passing of the teachers of the Bride of Christ, but the Church militant must needs observe that for twenty-three years, Fr. Hudson served the saints in Richmond, Missouri, and served as an instructor in St. Ignatius Lutheran Theological Seminary throughout its first triennium of classes, during which time he trained the seminarist who would become his successor at Christ Ev. Lutheran Church, and offered guidance to the pastor who would assume his duties on the seminary faculty. It was my pleasure and privilege to know Fr. Hudson for almost three decades as a dear friend and faithful confessor. It is our assessment that the contributions which he made in the course of his labors are most worthily remembered as a doctor of the Church, for there is no one who failed to gain much from his expansive knowledge of Church history and doctrine, and his insightful reflection on the Word.

It has also been a profound blessing to this diocese that five additional stewards of the mysteries of God have entered this fellowship: Pastor Daniel Mensing, Pastor Randy Moll, Pastor Brandon Warr, Deacon Martin Jackson, and Deacon Floyd Smithey. It is to be observed that this is their first synod and, for several of them, their first visit to Salem. In addition, Faith Lutheran Church in Beaverton, Oregon, having been served by many of our pastors over the course more than five years, was able to call a pastor in the last days of 2020. By the grace of God, the pastors of this diocese now serve congregations and missions in fifteen states. Brethren of our fellowship serve congregations in Colombia and the Philippines, and it is our hope that as the global pandemic, and its associated restrictions, recedes, we will be able to visit with these brethren and continue to strengthen our ties.

By the grace of God, our seminary is now over half way through the first year of a new triennium of instruction. Our full-time seminarians continue to make steady progress in their studies. And we are encouraged by the involvement of part-time and auditing students as part of the work of the seminary. I believe that as we explore the options which Fr. Ahonen will set before the synod, we will find that the work of the seminary has only begun.

As we consider that which has transpired within our diocese, we must also turn our thoughts to what has been happening within the world around us. The world has spent the past year debating the efficiency and efficacy of fulfilling a wide variety of worldly vocations in as sterile of a fashion as physically possible. The new standard has been expressed in terms such as “contactless” and “virtual,” with “distance” and “remote” governing the workplace and education. One might feel hard pressed to think of terms more antithetical to the labors of the holy office and the life of the Bride of Christ. When we read in the Gospels of our Lord’s granting of sight to the blind man of Bethsaida (Mark 8:22-26), or the way in

which He presented His wounds to St. Thomas, we are reminded that there is an intimacy to the means of grace which is immediately in tension with that intentional remoteness.

In the Word and Sacrament, the Lord of heaven and earth is present with His people; time and again, the Apology of the Augsburg Confession speaks of the Absolution as a "voice from heaven" (e.g., AP Ch. V, Art. XI:59; Ch. V, Art. XII:40). We do not doubt the efficaciousness of the Gospel proclaimed at a distance, for it has been a regular part of the life of the Church that the holy doctrine is taught both through the living voice and through other media; as St. Paul wrote to the Thessalonians: "Therefore, brethren, stand fast and hold the traditions which you were taught, whether by word or our epistle." (2 Thessalonians 2:15) The printed devotion or the text of a sermon in a Postil still proclaim the Law and the Gospel. The proclamation of the Word making use of a variety of means in this past year has presented the opportunity for the faithful teaching to be presented to those who otherwise would not hear it.

The Lord's instrumental use of His ministers does not alter the fact that it is a divine action. As pertains to the Sacraments of Holy Baptism and the Lord's Supper, the administration or distribution of the Sacrament establishes the intimacy of the action. It is the Lord who is at work in the administration of the Sacraments. In the words of the Apology: "When they offer the Word of God, when they offer the sacraments, they offer them in the stead and place of Christ. The Word of Christ teaches this, in order that we may not be offended by the unworthiness of the ministers." (Ch. IV, Arts VII & VIII:28) Again: "For the Church has the command to appoint ministers, which should be most pleasing to us, because we know that God approves this ministry, and is present in the ministry. And it is of advantage, so far as can be done, to adorn the ministry of the Word with every kind of praise against fanatical men, who dream that the Holy Ghost is given not through the Word, but because of certain preparations of their own, if they sit unoccupied and silent in obscure places, waiting for illumination, as the enthusiasts formerly taught, and the Anabaptists now teach." (Ch. VII, Art. XIII:12-13) Or, as Johann Gerhard wrote in his *Comprehensive Explanation of Holy Baptism and the Lord's Supper*: "So just as God the Lord does not reveal His counsel and will to us through Himself but through men, so also He administers Baptism not through Himself but through men, and it is just as powerful as if He Himself did the baptizing without intermediaries." (p. 34)

There have been those who have imagined that the Sacrament of the Altar might be administered remotely by means of either a 'live' broadcast or even through recorded means. This is reprehensible for several reasons, not least of which is that it utterly overthrows the obligation of the minister to be a steward of the mysteries of God (1 Cor. 4). The very nature of such "internet communion" runs contrary to the obligations of the steward and the character of the Sacrament, for we teach in the Unaltered Augsburg Confession: "The people are accustomed to partake of the Sacrament together, if any be fit for it, and this also increases the reverence and devotion of public worship. For none are admitted except they be first proved." (XXIV:5-6) The Body and Blood of Christ "are truly present, and are distributed to those who eat in the Supper of the Lord" (AC X:1); that is, the Body and Blood are present in all three parts of the sacramental action, for "We believe, teach and confess that, in the Holy Supper the body and blood of Christ are truly and essentially present, and are truly distributed and received with the bread and wine." (FC Ep. VII:6) The *distribution* of the Sacrament is an essential part of the sacramental action: "Now forasmuch as the Mass is such a giving of the Sacrament, we hold one communion every holiday, and also other days, when any desire the Sacrament it is given to such as ask for it. ... Chrysostom says that the priest stands daily at the altar, inviting some to the Communion

and keeping back others.” (§ 34, 36) There is no distribution with “internet communion”; in fact, the steward of the mysteries of God would never have even laid eyes on that which would purportedly be taken for the Body and Blood.

The Word is often communicated at a distance; the essential character of Holy Baptism and the Lord’s Supper is such that, on account of the administration or distribution of the divinely-established elements—water, bread, and wine—they must be administered or distributed immediately by the pastor to the one who is receiving the holy Sacrament.

The Integrity of the Rite and the Promise of Grace

It is useful in the context of this past year—and in consideration of questions which arise periodically in modern/post-modern Lutheran theology—to revisit what our Book of Concord teaches regarding the Holy Sacraments. It is not simply a matter of whether Lutherans count two, three, or even four Sacraments. It is not our intention here to recount the various ways in which the term ‘Sacrament’ has been utilized throughout the history of the Church Catholic. Our concern is for that which is confessionally defined for us, and the definition of a Sacrament is provided in Article XIII of the Apology of the Augsburg Confession as follows:

From the Latin text (Jacobs trans.)

If we call the sacraments, “rites which have the command of God and to which the promise of grace has been added,” it is easy to decide what are properly sacraments. For rites instituted by men will not in this way be sacraments properly so called. For it does not belong to human authority to promise grace. Wherefore signs instituted without God’s command are not sure signs of grace, even though they perhaps instruct the rude, or admonish as to something. Therefore *Baptism*, the *Lord’s Supper* and *Absolution*, which is the sacrament of repentance, are truly sacraments. For these rites have God’s command and the promise of grace, which is peculiar to the New Testament. For when we are baptized, when we eat the Lord’s body, when we are absolved, they ought certainly to assure us that God truly forgives us for Christ’s sake. (§3-4)

From the German text (Henkel trans.)

If we call the sacraments external signs and ceremonies which have the command of God and an appended, divine promise of grace, it is easy to determine what are sacraments; for ceremonies and other external things, instituted by men, are not sacraments in this sense; because men, without a command, have not the grace of God to promise. Signs, therefore, which are instituted without the command of God, are not marks of grace; although they might otherwise effect a remembrance in children and rude persons like a painted cross.

The right sacraments are, therefore, Baptism and the Eucharist, and Absolution; for these have the command of God and the promise of grace, which especially belongs to, and is the New Testament.

At several points, this passage touches on the rite or ceremony itself. First, a Sacrament is established by “the command of God” in contradistinction to anything which may be commanded by men. Second, the rites and ceremonies which are Sacraments have “the promise of grace”—a point which is made repeatedly in this brief passage. Third, it is implicit that the means of grace are not abstracted from the context of the ceremonial life of the Church, for the very use of the terms ‘rites’ and ‘ceremonies’ (*ritus* in the Latin text, *Zeichen und Ceremonien* in the German) the Sacraments are never considered as an abstraction, but as *rites* or *ceremonies*, concerning which that which is said and seen is in conformity with the divine Word. And the character of the Sacrament is not restricted to the Word, but extends to the “external sign” as is then testified to in the Apology:

From the Latin text (Jacobs trans.)

And God, at the same time, by the Word and by rites, moves hearts to believe and conceive faith, just as Paul says (Rom. 10:17): “Faith cometh by hearing.” But just as the Word enters the ear in order to strike hearts; so the rite itself meets the eyes, in order to move hearts. The effect of the Word and of the rite is the same, as it has been well said by Augustine that a sacrament is “a visible word,” because the rite is received by the eyes, and is, as it were, a picture of the Word, signifying the same thing as the Word. Wherefore the effect of both is the same. [*Quare idem est utriusque effectus.*]

(¶ 5)

From the German text (Henkel trans.)

Because the external signs were instituted for the purpose of awaking our hearts, viz., by the word and the external signs together, to believe, when we are baptized, when we receive the Lord’s body, that God will truly be merciful to us, through Christ, as Paul, Rom. 10, 17 says: “Faith cometh by hearing.” But as the word enters our ears, so the external signs are presented before our eyes, so as to excite and move our hearts within to faith. For the word and the external signs work one and the same thing in our hearts; as Augustine has excellently said: “The Sacrament,” says he, “is a visible word;” for the external signs are as a picture, by which is signified the same thing that is preached by the word; both, therefore, effect one and the same thing.

(Henkel, p. 183)

These passages from our confession have a certain similitude to an earlier observation of Hugh of Saint Victor: “A sacrament is a corporeal or material element *set before the senses* without, representing by similitude and signifying by institution and containing by sanctification some invisible and spiritual grace.”¹ That aside, what we find is that in these few paragraphs of our confessions we have one of the most important statements regarding everything which the Unaltered Augsburg Confession and its Apology have to say concerning the rites and traditions instituted by men. And it becomes clear why the confessors were defenders of retaining as much of the ecclesiastical rites as possible:

Falsely are our churches accused of Abolishing the Mass; for the Mass is retained on our part, and celebrated with the highest reverence. All

¹ Hugh of Saint Victor, p. 155. Emphasis added.

the usual ceremonies are also preserved, save that the parts sung in Latin are interspersed here and there with German hymns, which have been added to teach the people. For ceremonies are needed to this end alone, that the unlearned be taught. [AC XXIV:1-2]

The ecclesiastical rites and ceremonies of the Church surround the divinely-established rites; the ecclesiastical rites (which include the hymnody) “teach the people,” while the divinely established rites ‘move hearts to believe and conceive faith’. They are thus bound up together, the works of men being simply in service to the divinely-established rites.

The significance of such ecclesiastical rites and ceremonies is readily apparent from the way in which they are maintained and upheld in the confessions. Thus the Unaltered Augsburg Confession declares, “Of Rites and Usages in the Church, they teach, that those ought to be observed which may be observed without sin, and which are profitable unto tranquillity and good order in the Church, as particular holidays, festival, and the like.” (AC XV) Throughout the Unaltered Augsburg Confession and its Apology, we regularly insist that we are upholding the Canons of the Church more faithfully than the Papists (e.g., “Inasmuch then as our churches dissent in no article of the Faith from the Church Catholic, but omit some Abuses which are new, and which have been erroneously accepted by fault of the times, contrary to the intent of the Canons” [Jacobs, p. 47], “These things are thus done, both according to the Gospel, and according to the old canons.” [AP Ch. IV, Art. XI: 62]). In the second portion of our Unaltered Augsburg Confession, we confess: “But it can readily be judged that nothing would serve better to maintain the dignity of worship, and to nourish reverence and pious devotion among the people than that the ceremonies be rightly observed in the churches.” (§6) It is thus that we confess with all boldness: “Falsely are our churches accused of Abolishing the Mass; for the Mass is retained on our part, and celebrated with the highest reverence. All the usual ceremonies are also preserved, save that the parts sung in Latin are interspersed here and there with German hymns, which have been added to teach the people.” (AC XXIV:1-2) The absence of Latin is now determined by the widespread ignorance in our culture regarding this language. But the striving for unity in rite and vesture continues to serve the maintenance of the ‘dignity of worship’ and the ‘pious devotion’ of the people as the Mass is ‘celebrated with the highest reverence.’ And we teach thus in the Apology of the Augsburg Confession: “And the usual public ceremonies are observed, the series of lessons, of prayers, vestments, and other like things.” (XXIV:1)

As was observed in the Address two years ago, these confessional declarations are not merely descriptive: They are prescriptive. In the preservation and restoration of such liturgical continuity in this diocese we proceed with a hermeneutic of continuity: Where the historic practice has been retained, it will be preserved. Where it has been neglected or injudiciously discarded, it will be restored.

Recognizing the distinction between ecclesiastical rites as ceremonies which “teach the people” it becomes clear how we may understand that which is a matter of adiaphora, defined as “matters of indifference,” that is, “Ceremonies and Church Rites which are neither commanded nor forbidden in God’s Word, but have been introduced into the Church with a good intention, for the sake of good order and propriety, or otherwise to maintain Christian discipline” (FC SD X:1). Often, that which is *not* a matter of adiaphora can be readily perceived, as well, for most certainly the rites instituted by God are not among the adiaphora, and neither are ecclesiastical rites, properly speaking. So, too, the Formula of Concord declares: “Likewise, when there are useless, foolish spectacles, that are profitable neither for good order, nor Christian discipline, nor evangelical propriety in the Church, these are not genuine adiaphora, or matters of indifference.” (FC SD X:7)

With regard to the continued restoration of the rite, there are, at present, none of the pressures which might give pause to a restoration: "We believe, teach and confess that in time of persecution, when a bold confession is required of us, we should not yield to the enemies in regard to such adiaphora, as the apostle has written (Gal. 5:1): 'Stand fast, therefore, in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again in the yoke of bondage.'" (FC Ep. X:6) As regards the fulfillment of our commitment to upholding the Reformation Lutheran rites and practices, there is no persecution which is endeavoring to force us into such a restoration; rather, the pressure is almost entirely from the other side, between those who would ape post-Vatican II Papistic innovations (e.g., the three year lectionary), or the practices of Protestant sectarians for spectacle and innovation. It is an age in which confessing the Athanasian Creed and marking time with the Trinity season and Gesimatide are acts which draw the disdain of those outside.

Ours is not the first age to find such restoration to be possible and even necessary on confessional grounds. One may find that already in Nuremberg and Lübeck in the sixteenth century it was necessary for the Lutheran churches to reinstitute adiaphoristic practices regarding the saints to mark their difference with the Calvinists, while in Augsburg a confrontation with Papists minimized such practices.² And this restorationist movement was manifested in the Church Orders of the later Lutheran Reformation:

For Lutheran churches exposed to the threat of Calvinism the need to defend the ecclesiastical arts took on a new urgency. The preface to the church order produced for the duchy of Prussia in 1568, for example, marks out the Lutheran position from that of the Calvinists, saying that the authors could not agree with 'the wretched Calvinists and enthusiasts, who themselves think that one cannot be evangelical if one does not attack all paintings, pull down all images, abolish all ceremonies and rudely, immodestly, without discipline and order let everything become confused like senseless cattle.' ... In Brandenburg, for example, 'liturgical traditionalism' was seen as a mark of genuine Lutheranism in the face of the growth of crypto-Calvinist and Calvinist sentiment during the 1570s. Here adherents of the Augsburg Confession argued that Calvinists would be kept at bay by the retention of old ceremonies.³

In Danzig, behind enemy lines in an increasingly Calvinistic territory, the Lutherans of the last days of the sixteenth century pushed back even harder, even in the realm of Marian piety, so that, in the assessment of one scholar, "the immediate threat of Calvinism even encouraged some Lutherans to maintain or revive traditions that had been abandoned elsewhere."⁴

Where even the most adiaphoristic of practices may need restoration for the sake of confession, how much greater is the significance of the restoration of historic ecclesiastical rites and usages, on account of their importance for teaching.

² Bridget Heal, p. 141.

³ Heal, p. 143.

⁴ Heal, p. 145.

The Restoration of the Rite for the English-speaking Church

The efforts to establish a common English service have been undertaken since the earliest days of the American Republic. Beginning with the Dr. John Kunze's *Hymn and Prayer Book for the Use of such Lutheran Churches as use the English language* (1795), there has been an ongoing understanding of the necessity of having a faithful Lutheran service—and even a faithful Church Order. However, the effects of Rationalism and Pietism profoundly subverted such efforts, since many of the clergy and laity who came to the United States were opposed to any such restoration, and often brought the worst that the Old World had to offer and combined that which the Arminianism and fanaticism which thrived in the English milieu of the New World. The assessment of Dr. Charles P. Krauth stands: “We had a weak, indecisive pulpit, feeble catechisms, vague hymns, and constitutions which reduced the minister to the position of a hireling talker, and made Synods disorganizations for the purpose of preventing anything from being done.”⁵

The creation and promotion of an intentionally Unionistic hymnbook in 1817—the *Gemeinschaftliche Gesangbuch*—by the Moravian pastor, Gottlieb Schober, who would be president of the South Carolina Synod when the Henkel family led the walkout which became the Tennessee Synod—was consistent with the direction which threatened the destruction of the Lutheran confession in North America. Schober said concerning this hymnbook: “This meritorious undertaking paves the way to universal harmony, union, and love among our Lutheran and Reformed Churches, removing all the obstacles which hitherto prevented that happy effect, and establishes a uniformity in that part of divine worship which cannot fail to be highly gratifying to all those who consider brotherly love an indispensable attribute of Christianity.”⁶

The first Lutheran body which can be accurately described as “confessional” was the Evangelical Lutheran Tennessee Synod, which was established by six pastors in 1820. From its inception, the Tennessee Synod strove to counter the Unionist and Rationalist theologies of the majority of American Lutheranism. That synod's publication of the first complete, and (arguably) only accurate translation of the 1580 Dresden *Concordia* alone would be sufficient for that fellowship to be held in reverent memory. However, the efforts of that synod toward a restoration of the Lutheran rite were limited, at best, and their hymnal relied very heavily on hymns written by their own clergy. The second confessional synod of note—the Lutheran Synod of Buffalo (formally, *Synode der aus Preussen ausgewanderten lutherischen Kirche*) was the first to self-consciously establish a unity with the historic Lutheran Church Orders; when the synod opened on June 12, 1845, with three pastors, one candidate, and representatives of eight congregations “No constitution was adopted because they felt this would create the impression that they were about to start something new; instead they reaffirmed their stand on the old European-Pommeranian and Saxon-*Kirchenordnungen* (church orders). P. Grabau was chosen the Senior Ministerii, a position which he held until 1866.”⁷

The passing of generations would see the existence of the Evangelical Lutheran Tennessee Synod and the Lutheran Synod of Buffalo virtually expunged from the history of the Evangelical Lutheran Church; when they are mentioned, they serve as the bogeyman in

⁵ Socrates Henkel, p. 5.

⁶ Socrates Henkel, p. 6.

⁷ Reuben Clarence Lang, *The History of the Buffalo Synod up to 1866*, (Dubuque, Iowa: Wartburg Theological Seminary, 1949) p. 32.

the legends of Synodicalists. If we are to consider the twisting paths of the Synodicalists on their way to a restorationist movement, we begin with Beale Melancthon Schmucker (1827–1888), and Edward T. Horn (1850–1915)⁸, both of whom were instrumental in the work of the Common Service Book Committee, of 1885, serving as the committee's chairman and secretary, respectively.⁹ The labors of these men (and many others) oversaw the work which took the quite serviceable *Church Book* of 1868 and labored for generations to reach the level of the *Church Book* of 1893.¹⁰

In the April 1881 issue of *The Quarterly Review of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*, Rev. Edward T. Horn's essay, "Feasibility of a Service for All English-Speaking Lutherans" set forth the call for a universal English Church Order, which would be conformed to the historic Lutheran orders:

We claim that the ideal Lutheran Service is easily discoverable. It is to be found in the Lutheran Liturgies of the sixteenth century. We refer to these because they are the work of the representative teachers of our Church. They embody the principles of the Reformation. If it can be shown that the great representative teachers of the Lutheran Church substantially agreed upon the proper constituents of Christian worship and upon the order in which these ought to be used, and that those parts of the earlier worship which they retained accurately agree with the Gospel they restored, while the parts rejected were the outcome of the errors they opposed, and if it is evident that the same general conception of Christian worship exists and flourishes wherever the Lutheran doctrine lives in the faith of Lutheran Christians, then it is possible to show a characteristic Lutheran Cultus, a departure from which by a Lutheran Church is blameworthy and cannot endure.

The Evangelical *Kirchenordnungen* of the sixteenth century contain not only a Liturgy for the Chief Morning Service (*Hauptgottesdienst*), of which the Holy Communion was the central feature, but also orders for the Morning and Evening Services on Sundays and workdays, precise directions for the Festivals, and the arrangement of *Catechetical Services*, besides minute directions for the government of the church, the Orders for Ministerial Acts, and the sphere occupied by the former Canon Law. All these points deserve and require to be studied by the Lutheran liturgist... (p. 165–166)

Horn painstakingly reconstructed the basic structure of the most significant liturgies of the Reformation-era Lutheran church, and contrasted them with those of the contemporary American Lutheran synods.

⁸ Among the memorable works of Rev. Horn may be found *The Christian Year* (Philadelphia: Lutheran Book Store, 1876) and *Outlines of Liturgics* (Philadelphia: Lutheran Publication Society, 1890).

⁹ *The Lutheran Church Review* (1917), p. 505.

¹⁰ It must always be noted regarding this later work that Harriett Krauth Spaeth (daughter of Charles Porterfield Krauth and wife of Adolph Spaeth, who also served on the Common Service Book Committee) was largely responsible for the musical setting for the liturgies in this work.

The Lutheran Service in the Sixteenth Century

Luther's Formula Missae (1523)	Luther's Deutsche Messe (1526)	Melanchthon Bucer, Reformation of Köln (1543)	Brenz- Osiander, Brandenburg (1533)	Bugenhagen, Braunschweig (1528)	Jonas, Duke Henry of Saxony (1539)	Kliefoth's "Normal Type"
Introit.	Psalm.	Confession & Absolution	Confiteor.	A German Psalm	Introit	Introit
Kyrie Eleison.	Kyrie Eleison.	Introit.	Introit (or German Song)	Kyrie Eleison	Kyrie	Kyrie
Gloria in Excelsis	Collect.	Kyrie Eleison	Kyrie	Gloria in Excelsis	Gloria in Excelsis	Gloria in Excelsis
Collect.	Epistle	Gloria in Excelsis	Gloria in Excelsis	Collect	Collect	Salutation & Response
The Epistle	German Hymn	Collect	Salutation and Response	Epistle	Epistle	Collect & Response
Gradual w/ Hallelujah	Gospel	Epistle	Collect	Hallelujah	Sequence or German Psalm	Epistle
The Gospel	Creed	Gradual w/ Hallelujah, Sequence or German hymn	German Collect for common need of Christendom	German Song out of the Scriptures	Gospel	Sentence. Tract.
Nicene Creed	Sermon	Gospel	Chapter from Epistle	Gospel	Nicene Creed	Gospel
Sermon (might precede Introit)	Paraphrase of Lord's Prayer & Admonition	Sermon	Gradual. Hallelujah.	Nicene Creed	Sermon	Creed
Salutation & Response	Words of Institution	General Prayer	Chapter from Gospel	Sermon	Paraphrase of Lord's Prayer & Admonition	Sermon
Sursum Corda	Sanctus (during Communion) Agnus Dei (during cup)	Creed	Creed	Song (while communicant s go to Choir)	(Preface & Sanctus permitted)	Prayer (Litany)
Preface	Thanksgiving	Salutation & Response	Sermon	Preface	Words of Institution	Preface w/ Sanctus
Words of Institution	Benediction.	Sursum Corda	Admonition	Sanctus	Song (Agnus Dei permitted)	Admonition
Sanctus		Preface	Words of Institution	Lord's Prayer	Thanksgiving	Lord's Prayer
Lord's Prayer		Sanctus	Sanctus	Words of Institution	Benediction	Words of Institution

Luther's Formula Missae (1523)	Luther's Deutsche Messe (1526)	Melanchthon Bucer, Reformation of Köln (1543)	Brenz- Osiander, Brandenburg (1533)	Bugenhagen, Braunschweig (1528)	Jonas, Duke Henry of Saxony (1539)	Kliefoth's "Normal Type"
Pax Vobiscum		Words of Institution	Lord's Prayer	Communion		Distribution with song
Agnus Dei (during communion)		Lord's Prayer	Pax Vobiscum	Agnus Dei		Agnus Dei
Thanksgiving		Pax Vobiscum	Distribution (w/ Agnus Dei or other hymn)	Thanksgiving		Versicle
Benediction (Numbers 6)		Communion w/ Agnus Dei	Thanksgiving	Benediction		Thanksgiving
		Salutation & Response	Benediction			Benediction
		Thanksgiving				Closing Hymn
		Benediction				

In compiling his comparison between American synods, Horn noted that the General Synod North had not yet published its English Divine Service (!). Also, the Synodical Conference rite was taken from the German service.

General Council Church Book	Synodical Conference	General Synod South
Confession & Absolution	Hymn	Sentence
Introit w/ Gloria Patri	Gloria in Excelsis	Psalm with Gloria Patri
Kyrie	Salutation & Response	Confession
Gloria in Excelsis	Antiphons for the season	Kyrie
Salutation & Response	Collect	Absolution
Collect for the day	Epistle	Gloria in Excelsis
Epistle	Gospel	Epistle
Hallelujah, Psalm or sentence	Sermon	Gospel
Gospel w/ versicles	Confession & Absolution	Creed
Creed	Prayer	Prayer
Hymn	Lord's Prayer	Hymn
Sermon	Hymn	Sermon
Offertory Sentence	Sursum Corda	Lord's Prayer
General Prayer	Preface	Hymn
Hymn	Sanctus	Salutation & Response
Sursum Corda	Lord's Prayer	Sursum Corda
Preface	Words of Institution	Preface
Sanctus	Agnus Dei	Sanctus
Exhortation	Communion	Exhortation
Lord's Prayer	Thanksgiving	Lord's Prayer
Words of Institution	Aaronic Benediction	Words of Institution
Agnus Dei		Agnus Dei
Communion		Communion
Nunc Dimittis		Nunc Dimittis
Thanksgiving		Thanksgiving
Aaronic Benediction		Aaronic Benediction

It was with good reason that Horn was heartened by the possibility of restoring the historic rite, for he observed:

We have examined five liturgies of Brenz. In 1533 in the Brandenburg-Nuremberg *Kirkenordnung*, working with Osiander, he is fuller than in the *Kirkenordnung* for Halle in 1526; but after a much shortened form for Württemberg prepared with the assistance of Schnepf in 1536, he returns to the normal form in the KO. for Schwäbisch Hall. in 1543. In 1529, 1532, 1535, and 1542 Bugenhagen repeats the form of 1528, which had become the model of many liturgies. No student can fail to mark the persistence of one type throughout these variations.¹¹

With a zeal which befits a 31 year old engaged in such a breathtakingly vast project, Horn exclaimed:

Revision will not end until we adopt the ideal, the normal Lutheran Service. We must advance toward it, if we continue in the doctrine of Luther and grow in knowledge of the Gospel. Those who know its beauty and fitness dare not cease to criticize any liturgy which stops short of it and to tell of that better and almost perfect thing which it is so easy to get; and those who lead the thought and worship of Christian people will not dare to defend and recommend a service as final, while they do not examine this treasure of our Church. All *must* seek, applaud, wish for and serve it.¹²

For a time, it seemed Horn's zeal might be warranted. The English rite which was developed for the Synodical Conference was largely similar to that of the General Council and General Synod traditions; the *Evangelical Lutheran Hymn-Book* (1912), *The Lutheran Hymnary* (1913) and *The Lutheran Hymnal* (1941) were clearly on a trajectory which was converging with the *Common Service Book* tradition, though important differences remained between the *Service Book and Hymnal* (SBH) and *The Lutheran Hymnal* (TLH). The decision to include a "Eucharistic Prayer" in the SBH, as well the practice of placing the Lord's Prayer *after* the Words of Institution continued to mark a substantial difference from the Synodical Conference tradition, and from the preponderance of Lutheran liturgical precedent. It is also quite telling that the Exhortation, which features prominently in many (perhaps most) of the Divine Services of Reformation-era Lutheran Church Orders, and which was included in the service in the *Evangelical Lutheran Hymn-Book*, was relegated to a separate "Order of the Confessional Service" in TLH. Much of the exactitude regarding observances and options in the Divine Service which were carefully brought to the fore in the 1893 *Church Book* and further explicated by private works such as Harry Archer and Luther Reed's *Choral Service Book* (1901) was obscured or omitted as time went on. And a markedly different spirit was at work in the 1970s, with an agenda which has marched forward ever since.

The spirit at work in the book which was intended to unite American Lutheran practice—the *Lutheran Book of Worship* (1977)—was far removed from that of Schmucker, Horn, and their faithful coworkers. In the *Commentary on the Lutheran Book of Worship—Lutheran Liturgy in its Ecumenical Context* (1990), Dr. Philip Pfatteicher begins his analysis of the *Lutheran Book of Worship* with the declaration:

¹¹ *ibid.*, p. 171.

¹² *ibid.*, p. 177–178.

A study of the liturgy used by Lutherans in North America during the transition from the twentieth to the twenty-first century may properly begin not with a Lutheran person or event but with the principal work of a Roman Catholic bishop of Rome. That fact in itself reminds Christians that no longer is any one church or denomination self-sufficient, able to carry on without the support of the rest of Christ's church, and it reminds Lutherans in particular of their origins (reemphasized in recent times) as a confessional movement within the Catholic Church of the West.¹³

It must be noted that Pfatteicher's assessment is the formal, official account of the process of the creation of the *LBW*, and his other works include the official *Manual on the Liturgy—Lutheran Book of Worship* (1978).

When the Inter-Lutheran Commission on Worship was established following the 1965 synodical convention of The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, Pfatteicher carefully documents the ecumenical concerns which dominated the process of crafting the book; as he observes, "The work of the Inter-Lutheran Commission on Worship depended to a considerable degree on the work of the Roman Catholic and Episcopal churches."¹⁴ Ecumenism was such a powerful force among those drafting the new book that "The Liturgical Text Committee and the Inter-Lutheran Commission on Worship expressed no preferred title for their work, although many indicated their hope that 'Lutheran' not be part of the title. ... There is, moreover, no such thing as 'Lutheran worship'; there is only the worship of the church used by Lutherans."¹⁵ It would take many more years for the term 'virtue signaling' to enter common parlance, but such vacuous pedantry by supposed liturgical experts simply highlights the anti-Lutheran spirit which was at work in the project.

The kindest assessment would be that progress along the lines of the original goal of formulation of an English Lutheran liturgy and complete Church Order essentially died with the *Service Book and Hymnal* (1958) and *The Lutheran Hymnal* (1941). These words are carefully chosen: We are not denouncing that which was faithful within such projects as the hastily reconstructed *Lutheran Worship* (1982) and even within the Lutheran Service Book. It is not our purpose here to enumerate hymn choices (sometimes good, sometimes shockingly bad), or liturgical elements (the appalling confusion of the three-year lectionary, the endless proliferation of different services, the novel setting of the Psalter). Such later works did not advance toward a more faithful reconstruction of the historic rite, and they did not lend themselves to a unified Confessional Lutheran Church Order. All the productions of the ELCA are unworthy of mention. The ELS' *Evangelical Lutheran Hymnary* (1996) has many commendable aspects, though its decision to include four settings of the Divine Service once again bespeaks an inability to understand the reason why there is a common liturgy. The most commendable aspect of WELS' *Christian Worship* (1993) is its tasteful choice of a color for its cover.

It has been a stated intention of this diocese since its beginning in 2006 to work toward a unified Confessional Lutheran Church Order; it has been a principle throughout

¹³ p. 1.

¹⁴ p. 9.

¹⁵ p. 13.

these years that the congregations affiliated with this diocese would continue to use such hymnbooks and agendas as were in use when they entered this fellowship. This process has been as gradual as could reasonably be anticipated. Volumes such as Pr. Dulas' *Psalter* have been a tremendous resource, and his many helpful recommendations regarding liturgical resources have been greatly appreciated by many of the members of this diocese. Various rites have been formulated, and the Charter, Visitation Articles, Diocesan Protocol, Sanctoral Calendar, selection of Office Hymns, work on a Diocesan Ceremonial, and other documents have been developed as elements of a complete Church Order. The Divine Service and the Prayer Offices will be very familiar in many respects to those of the Synodical Conference tradition, but will reintegrate elements neglected in many recent revisions (including *The Lutheran Hymnal*) which excluded parts of the service which have always been a part of the Lutheran Divine Service.

Progress toward a Confessional Lutheran Church Order has been gradual, but steady. We will have more to say regarding this work throughout this synod. Building from those points which are now established, we will be in need of several working groups to assist in further progress.

Perhaps there will be some outside of this diocese who will question such a concern at this time, and will invoke all manner of worldly concerns and contentions which might absorb the energy and time of the Church. We are not disengaged from such concerns, but the priorities of the world are not our priorities. We are not called to reform society. We are here to adore the Holy Trinity even as we live out our vocations in this fallen world. Johann Gerhard well defines the final cause of the Church:

Therefore the purpose or end of the call to the church, and thus the purpose of the preservation and propagation of the church in this world, is twofold. The subordinate purpose is the conversion of men from darkness to light, their transfer from the state of wrath to the state of grace, and the granting of an inheritance of eternal life. The principal purpose is the glorification of God. Surely, that God might show the incomprehensible riches of His grace, He did not want mankind to remain bound by the chains of eternal destruction with which the first humans willingly entangled themselves and their descendants. Therefore He sent His Son, the Redeemer, to the world and offers his benefits to men through the preaching of the Gospel, through which He calls them into the kingdom of grace and the fellowship of the church. If any yield to this holy call by the power of the Holy Spirit, He transfers them into the kingdom of grace, that in it they may rightly know Him, serve Him in holiness and righteousness, and show Him due obedience. After this life, if they persevere in true faith and worship, He transfers them into the kingdom of glory, that in it they may be joined with the assembly of angels and sing eternal praises to Him." (*Loci Theologici*, Commonplace XXV, §303.)

Rt. Rev. James D. Heiser,
Bishop, The ELDoNA
Thursday of Quasimodogeniti, A.D. 2021

Church Order/Missal/Hymnal Committees

Hymn Committee—Finding and setting hymns, determining classification by season and topic(s). Reclamation efforts should begin with known hymns which are now in the public domain (including, but not limited to, ELHB, *Lutheran Hymnary*, *Church Book*, *Common Service Book*).

- First Section of Hymnal (~100 hymns) should be Office Hymns for all Sundays & Festivals. Those Office Hymns which have already been settled may be typeset in a preliminary fashion. The committee will provide a proposed list of the remaining Office Hymns as soon as possible. The bishop shall review the proposed list and work with the committee regarding revisions to the proposed list. Phase 1 publication should proceed as soon as possible, preferably by the 2022 Synod.

- The Hymnal should probably have between 450 and 600 hymns; this means that 350–500 hymns beyond the Office Hymns will need to be selected, and preliminary assignment regarding season/festival/sacrament/doctrinal topic, etc. shall be established.

- Preference must be given to Lutheran hymnody
- The second tier of hymnody is from the early Church and undivided Church of the West.
- Very limited space may be afforded to post-Reformation hymnody which is not explicitly Lutheran in origin. Such hymns will be subject to review by the bishop.

- The list of proposed hymns and complete texts shall be presented to the bishop, with documentation demonstrating that they are in the public domain. The bishop shall review the proposed list and work with the committee regarding revisions to the proposed list. Work should be underway typesetting the rest of the hymnody after approval by the bishop.

- After approval by the bishop, the list will be submitted to the full diocese for review. After approval by the diocese, Phase 2 publication will take place. This should take place following (ideally) the 2022 Synod, or, at the latest, the 2023 Synod.

- After Phase 2 publication, the year between synods will allow for completion of the typesetting of hymnody. Feedback from the congregations will be solicited and given serious consideration, including proposals regarding further hymns which should be considered by the bishop and Hymn Committee. However, decisions regarding inclusion or exclusion of hymnody must be subject to review by the bishop and the entire diocese.

- At the conclusion of the review period, all approved hymnody should be typeset and the Hymn Committee will cooperate with other committees regarding indices, etc. to incorporate the hymns in the Lutheran Service Book and Hymnal.

Publication Phases:

Phase 1—Publication of Office Hymns as a stand-alone booklet.

Phase 2—A booklet of the complete titles (with authors and other pertinent information) will be made available to pastors to present to the congregations. The proposed organization of the hymnody within the Lutheran Service Book and Hymnal should be included.

Phase 3—finished Hymnody published within the Lutheran Service Book and Hymnal.

Hymn Committee Members:

Deacon Oncken; Pastor Rydecki; Pastor Dulas; Pastor Stefanski; Deacon Jackson

Liturgical Committee—In coordination with the Content Coordination Committee, to recover rites which are still needed for the Missal, Church Order, Service Book and Hymnal, and any other resources.

- First phase of work will be establishing the text for remaining rites currently enumerated as needed for all liturgical resources. Also, designation and typesetting of approved resources needed for the Divine Service, Matins and Vespers, and other rites, including (but not limited to) Invitatories, Antiphons, Responsories, and Versicles. The committee shall coordinate with the bishop regarding sources for such materials. When approved by the bishop, the materials developed for the first phase shall be presented to the diocese for review at synod. First phase should be completed by the 2022 synod and will be presented in printed form.

- Second phase will be consideration of rites and various resources beyond those presently enumerated, coordinating such considerations with the bishop. Approved materials will be considered no later than the 2023 synod.

- Having received and reviewed the proposed materials (presumably following the 2023 synod), all the work of the Committee will be integrated into the various resources for publication by the Content Coordination Committee for presentation to the 2024 synod for final approval.

Liturgical Committee Members:

Pastor Dulas; Pastor Heimbigner; Pastor Rutowicz; Pastor Stefanski; Pastor Sullivan

Catechetical Committee—The committee shall develop a proposed common text for the Small Catechism and explanation which is consistent with the American English tradition of translation of Luther’s Small Catechism, beginning with the text in the Henkel Book of Concord through the translations of the Synodical Conference.

- First phase of work will develop a proposed common text of the Small Catechism suitable for inclusion in the Lutheran Service Book and Hymnal. The proposal is subject to the approval of the bishop; after such approval, it will be presented to the diocese in synod for approval, preferably at the 2022 synod. The Catechetical Committee will also coordinate with the Liturgical Committee for formulation of a ‘Catechetical Service’ after the model of earlier Church Orders and Loehe’s *Liturgy*. This work would be presented to the bishop for approval before the 2022 synod.

- Second phase of work will be a creation of a complete explanation of the Small Catechism, which is consistent with the tradition of such resources and which will make use of original material and that which is adapted from earlier resources. After approval by the bishop, the draft of the second phase will be presented at the synod (preferably in 2023) for review by the entire diocese throughout the year, with a final, approved text being presented to the 2024 synod for final approval. Working with the Content Coordination Committee, the translation of the Small Catechism would be incorporated into the Hymnal, and the Small Catechism with Explanation would be published in its own volume.

- A potential third phase of work would be the development of congregational resources for use in catechization.

Catechetical Committee Members:

Pastor Henson; Pastor Rydecki; Pastor Stefanski, Deacon Oncken; Pastor Moll

Content Coordination Committee—The Content Coordination Committee will oversee the work of all other committees in determining the overall content of all published works of the Confessional Lutheran Church Order, including (but not limited to) the Church Order, Missal, Psalter, Service Book and Hymnal. The Committee will work to insure uniformity of style and content and will offer direction and correction regarding all matters pertaining to publication.

- At all phases of the work of various committees, the Content Coordination Committee will oversee integration of the labors of all other committees and coordinate creation of various phases of publication.

- The Committee shall determine the order and contents of the various volumes associated with the overall project, and submit such guidelines for content to the diocesan synod for review.

- After approval by the bishop and synod, the Content Coordination Committee, as funded by the diocese, will oversee the various phases of publication.

Content Coordination Committee Members:

Bishop Heiser, Deacon Oncken, Pastor Henson, Pastor Ahonen