

6-1-1953

Leiturgia-An Opus Magnum in the Making

Walter E. Buszin

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm>



Part of the [Liturgy and Worship Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Buszin, Walter E. (1953) "Leiturgia-An Opus Magnum in the Making," *Concordia Theological Monthly*. Vol. 24, Article 35.

Available at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm/vol24/iss1/35>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Print Publications at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Concordia Theological Monthly by an authorized editor of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

Leiturgia — An Opus Magnum in the Making

By WALTER E. BUSZIN

THE liturgical revival which is wending its way through the churches of Christendom today has made its influence felt also within the Lutheran Church. This movement is not chiefly a seeking after forms and ceremonies, nor is it merely a reaction against irreverent and amorphous worship practices. While excesses are to be noted within the movement, it is hardly just and fair to regard these as inevitable and essential earmarks of this liturgical revival, since revivals and movements in areas other than the liturgical likewise suffer because of the intemperate endeavors of a zealotistic minority.

Even a cautious and skeptical student and observer of the liturgical movement of the 20th century cannot ignore the fact that this movement is already several generations old and should really no longer be referred to as a revival. It is today a revival for those only who had no part in the movement in the earlier stages of its development. The liturgical movement of our day originated as far back as the early years of the second half of the 19th century. The movement is in large part ecumenical in character and crosses many denominational lines without much difficulty. It is by no means sectarian and separatistic. It is really not interested in liturgy for liturgy's sake, but it does manifest an awareness of the very important and intimate relationships which must of necessity exist between liturgical worship and Christian doctrine, Christian art, and Christian culture. Those who have followed and taken part in the movement have learned long ago that sound and healthy liturgical activities and interests, if they are to flourish, must and do quite readily go hand in hand with sound Biblical theology. This then likewise implies that a healthy liturgical practice is in reality incompatible with the various false and unsafe types of much present-day theology.

While many within the Christian Church fail or refuse to acquaint themselves with the real character and objectives of the

liturgical movement of our own day, the fact remains that liturgical worship is still the very center of attraction to countless Christians on all continents of the world, because their Christian faith impels them to concern themselves about the comforts and the problems of Christian worship. Since this situation has obtained for more than twenty years, and in some branches of the Church for almost a century, the movement or revival may hardly be considered a passing fad. It has grown and matured to such an extent that one can no longer brush it aside with a bare gesture.

Among Lutherans the liturgical movement has allied itself with the Luther renaissance of more recent times. It has likewise been accepted by many who militate against an orthodoxy which is either anemic or dead. Among Lutherans, too, much liturgiology has united with ecclesiastical musicology; this, too, extends as far back as the early years of the second half of the 19th century. The Church has learned that it is calamitous to divorce liturgics from church music, just as it is disastrous to divorce church music and liturgics from Biblical theology and Christian doctrine, and vice versa. The relatively small amount of liturgical literature written and published by Lutherans and Lutheran church bodies of America in recent years, together with what is likely to come off the presses within the next few years, is among the best literature written by Lutherans of America. This includes also Lutheran hymnals. This literature is exerting a widespread and wholesome influence on American Lutheranism. In Europe, notably in Germany and in Sweden, a tremendous influence is exerted among Lutheran people by much excellent liturgical literature published within the last century. Since the liturgical movement of Europe is much older than that of America, its influence found its way to the shores of America many years ago. Ludwig Schoeberlein's *Schatz des liturgischen Chor- und Gemeindegesangs* (Göttingen, 3 vols., 1868, 1872, 1880) was found in the libraries of not a few schools and parsonages and exerted a marked influence on our own Friedrich Lochner (1822—1902), whose *Der Hauptgottesdienst der Evangelisch-Lutherischen Kirche* (St. Louis, 1895) reveals the influence of the eminent German liturgical scholars Wilhelm Löhe and Friedrich Hommel. Georg Rietschel's *Lehrbuch der Liturgik* (Göttingen, 2 vols., 1900, 1909) was by no means unknown to

Lutherans of America, and the same might be said of the literature written by men like Heinrich Alt, Th. Kliefoth, Leonhard Fendt, Julius Smend, and others. In more recent times we have become acquainted with Paul Graff's exhaustive and very illuminating *Geschichte der Auflösung der alten gottesdienstlichen Formen in der evangelischen Kirche Deutschlands* (Göttingen, 2 vols., 1939), likewise with Paul Graff's new and revised edition of Rietschel's *Lehrbuch der Liturgik* (Göttingen, 1951), with literature written by members of the *Michaelsbruderschaft* (Wilhelm Stählin, Karl Bernhard Ritter, Walter Lotz, Horst Schumann, and others), and with the excellent *Agenden* and their accompanying literature of very recent years prepared by such eminent scholars and theologians as Christhard Mahrenholz, Peter Brunner, and others. Two liturgico-musical periodicals of Germany have been read by not a few Lutherans of America: *Monatsschrift für Gottesdienst und Kirchliche Kunst*, published by Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht in Göttingen, but discontinued to this day because of World War II, and *Musik und Kirche*, published by the Bärenreiter Verlag of Kassel and Basel and edited by Walter Blankenburg, Christhard Mahrenholz, Günther Ramin, and Wolfgang Reimann. Among the more recent publications of Germany which are finding ready acceptance in America is a *magnum opus* of which to date only one sixth of the entire work has been made available. The remaining five sixths are still in the making. We refer to *Leiturgia — Handbuch des evangelischen Gottesdienstes*. This major work has the endorsement of the Lutheran Liturgical Conference of Germany. Its editors are Karl Ferdinand Müller and Walter Blankenburg. It is being published by the Johannes Stauda Verlag of Kassel, an affiliate of the Bärenreiter Verlag. *Leiturgia* is intended for theologians, liturgiologists, church musicians, church architects, students, and for members of the laity who desire to acquaint themselves better with the Church and her rich cultus. The editors as well as the publisher pledge that *Leiturgia* will take into account the historical, the theological, the ecclesiastical, and the practical backgrounds and problems which are related to the worship life of the Christian Church. The entire opus will consist of three volumes; it will include a total of eighteen *Lieferungen* of eighty pages each, of which the first three* are

* The fourth *Lieferung* has appeared since this article went to press.

available today. A new *Lieferung* appears every other month at the price of DM 3.50.

Volume I discusses the historical and theological foundations of corporate Christian worship. It presents a comprehensive and learned discussion of the places, times, and seasons of Christian worship, likewise its prayers, notably those related to the Sacrament of Holy Communion. It will treat the ordinary as well as the propers of liturgical worship, also the readings, the sermon, the Order of Morning Service, and the Lutheran breviary. Volume II, which will not be published until the third volume has been completed and released, will treat the rite of Holy Baptism and all that is related thereto. It will discourse upon private confession and the Confessional Service, the marriage ceremony, the Christian burial, ordination, dedication, the duties of the custodian (*Küster*), also liturgical conduct, procedure, and rubrics. Volume III will be devoted to the music of liturgical worship. Subscribers to this three-volume work are assured that church music will be discussed not as a mere adjunct, but as an integral part of the church service. Volume III, like I and II, will be written by scholars and experts who speak with authority and with a thorough understanding of corporate liturgical worship.

The first issue (*Lieferung*) of Volume I was written by Rudolph Stählin. In keeping with its title, it covers the history of corporate Christian worship from the early centuries of the Christian Church to the present. To accomplish this within eighty pages is in itself a herculean achievement. While Stählin succeeded in performing a remarkable task, the limitations of space imposed upon him are likely responsible for the lack of balance which is evident at times and which must embarrass particularly the author. Stählin aptly begins his discussion by stating that corporate Christian worship is like a tree whose leaved branches spread out into many directions, but which derives its sap and strength from but one source, from Jesus Christ. Not only through the blessed Sacrament of Holy Communion, but likewise through all her worship activities does the Church strive to obey the mandate of Maundy Thursday: "This do in remembrance of Me" (Luke 22:19). Corporate Christian worship can best be understood, says Stählin, when one is well acquainted with its history and development through the centuries.

Only thus can one become acquainted with the causes and impulses which have brought into being and likewise developed distinction and character. The liturgy, like the tree and like nature itself, is often beautiful and attractive not only because of its unmistakable unity and completeness, but also because of its anomalies, accidents, irregularities, and inconsistencies. No segment of the Church can possibly make full use of the entire liturgical heritage of the Church. This is true not only because it is humanly impossible, but also because religious worship would then become so highly complex and varicolored that our worship would lack the beauty and impressiveness which go with a wholesome but not extreme type of simplicity; it would confuse the worshiper and be unlike the worship service of pristine and early medieval Christianity.

Various factors have been responsible for the multifarious character of the Christian liturgy. These are chiefly political, sociological, geographical, cultural, or theological in nature. All these influencing factors prove, however, that the Christian liturgy is related to human life and experience; in fact, they prove that the Church's liturgy is often the very core and center of life's activities. Stählin goes so far as to claim that in corporate worship "begegnen sich Weltgeschichte und Heilsgeschichte" (p. 3). He then continues to claim that modern man's insistence on distinguishing strictly between the inner spiritual life and the outward form was unknown to the ancient Church and that the religious individualism so rampant in the churches of our day prevents many from understanding the liturgies prepared with such infinite care by the Fathers of the Church.

Liturgiology, as a scientific study, is still relatively young. It did not blossom forth as such until the 17th and 18th centuries. The many problems which confront the expert liturgiologist of the Church are not easily solved, because the available source materials are in large part sporadic and do not present a complete, unified, and well-integrated picture. The Christians of antiquity knew and used their liturgies from memory and did not read them from the printed pages of liturgical publications and hymnals. In addition, the Eastern Church soon developed the practice of not presenting its liturgies in *conspectu omnium*; much liturgical action took place behind screens and curtains that it might not be desecrated by the

eyes of sinful people. All this caused the Christian liturgy to grow and to develop very slowly, and it likewise left posterity in the dark regarding many of its practices.

Stählin gives the names of a large number of liturgiologists who enjoy widespread fame as authorities in their field. He leans quite heavily on the works of Josef Andreas Jungmann (*Missarum Sollemnia*, 2 vols., Vienna, 1949), Hans Lietzmann (*Messe und Herrenmahl*, Bonn, 1926), Oscar Cullmann (*Urchristentum und Gottesdienst*, Zürich, 1950), Odo Casel (various writings), and on the English scholars James Herbert Srawley (*The Early History of the Liturgy*, Cambridge, 1947), Frank Edward Brightman (*Liturgies, Eastern and Western. I. Eastern Liturgies*. Oxford, 1896), and Dom Gregory Dix (*The Shape of the Liturgy*, Dacre Press, Westminster, 1945). His bibliography does not include F. E. Brightman's *The English Rite* (London, 1915), and his two-page discussion of the Anglican Rite (pp. 66—68) is woefully inadequate. Neither does he say anything of developments in America, and his bibliography contains no references to such noteworthy publications as *The Memoirs of the Lutheran Liturgical Association* (edited by Luther D. Reed), the various issues of *Pro Ecclesia Lutherana* (published by the Liturgical Society of St. James and edited by Adolph Wismar), the *Essays*, presented at the first two liturgical institutes of Valparaiso University (Adolph Wismar, editor), and Luther D. Reed's *The Lutheran Liturgy* (Philadelphia, 1947). He faults Georg Rietschel's *Lehrbuch der Liturgik* (p. 5), but does not call attention to the new and revised edition prepared by Paul Graff and published in 1951.

However, Rudolf Stählin's patent loyalty to the fundamentals of the Christian religion and to the Holy Scriptures as well as his sound judgment and evident liturgical balance soon establish confidence in the mind of the reader of the first *Lieferung* of *Leiturgia*. While discussing developments in Apostolic times, he remains cautious and does not seek to make deductions which can hardly be made on the basis of Holy Writ. He manifests no influence by Biblical criticism of the 19th and early 20th centuries and hence does not make mistakes made by Brilioth and others of the first quarter of the present century. Stählin rightly stresses the eschatological character of early Christian worship and points to the

charismatic nature and values of early Christian preaching. He calls attention to the pronounced doctrinal character of early Christian prayer and bases his deduction in part on the doxological (Trinitarian) close of the early collects of the Church. Stählin is aware of the liturgical values of the First Epistle of St. Peter, of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and of the Apocalypse. It is possible, he says, that the formulas used by St. Paul when discussing the Lord's Supper (cf. 1 Cor. 10:16) were not of Paul's own invention, but part of the religious vocabulary used by Christian people in Apostolic times. Stählin does not agree with Joachim Jeremias (*Die Abendmahls Worte Jesu*, Göttingen, 1949, p. 24), who links up the institution of the Lord's Supper with the *Kiddush*, insisting that it is to be linked up with the paschal meal instead. Stählin points out that Jewish terms were not adopted in connection with the Lord's Supper; the terms adopted were rather the terms of a new era and of a new dispensation. Following the example of Lietzmann, Cullmann, and Jungmann, Rudolf Stählin calls special attention to the liturgical significance of the words and benedictions with which St. Paul closed his Epistles. One thinks, too, of the *Maranatha* of 1 Cor. 16:22, which appears in the *Didache* (10,6) as part of the Communion Liturgy. Stählin agrees with Cullmann and others who insist that the celebration of the Eucharist was always accompanied by the preaching of the Word. As the Church grew older and matured, she established more and more congregations, and these in turn separated their Order of Holy Communion not from the preaching of the Word, but from the *agapai*. Nowhere in the Holy Scriptures, says Stählin, do we find anything which would encourage us to regard the Eucharist as a sacrifice rather than as a Sacrament. It remained for later generations to develop and stress this idea, which plays such an important part in the Roman Mass. Since the early Christian Church related the Eucharist to the *Maranatha* petition and to her outspoken eschatological thinking, the Roman Catholic stress on the idea of sacrificial offering is hardly in keeping with what was intended originally. Rudolf Stählin is perhaps at his best while discussing the development that took place in Christian worship between the third and fourth centuries. His discussion is here not only informative and interesting, but likewise penetrating and warm. The liturgical developments of

these years were, on the whole, healthy and moderate. The Church was sensitive and cautious while permitting her liturgies to unfold and grow, and neither the Eastern nor the Western Church resorted to the extremes they resorted to after the time of Gregory. Hippolytus comes into the picture. *The Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus* (ca. 215 A. D.) is today known to be an extremely important document of these early years of the Christian Church. The Western Church soon forgot Hippolytus, because he employed the Greek language rather than the Latin. Despite his importance, he is still unknown to many branches of Western Christendom. Hippolytus was a staunch defender of the old Apostolic tradition of the Christian Church, was thoroughly conservative, and a great representative of early Roman ecclesiastical thought. Brilioth's view that Hippolytus was a schismatic is today rejected by theologians; he was rather a defender of Christian truth. That he discussed the Sacraments without discussing the office of the Word is no longer held against him, since various circumstances are believed to have validated what he did.

It is from Hippolytus that we have the first version of the Eucharistic Prayer still extant today. This great prayer of the Church was introduced by the Salutation and its Response, by the *Sursum Corda*, and the *Gratias Agamus*. The Eucharistic Prayer, Stählin holds, included the *Verba*, *Anamnesis*, and *Epiclesis*. We thus find here the classical structure of the Eucharistic Prayer. The prayer is not merely a heterogeneous compilation, like the Canon of the Roman Mass, but it is a well-integrated unit. In it Hippolytus uses the word "sacrifice," but he refers it to the bringing of bread and of wine as well as of other gifts by the people. In this use of the word "sacrifice" he helped to pave the way for the Offertory. The *Epiclesis* is a distinctive feature already in the Eucharistic Prayer of Hippolytus. Here God is implored to send the Holy Ghost that He may sanctify the "sacrifice" and let it serve as spiritual food for the communicants. No indications of the doctrine of transubstantiation are present. Stählin remarks: "Im Grunde bleibt das ganze Gebet des Hippolyt streng im Rahmen des zweiten Artikels. Es ist ein rein christologisches Gebet, einem der christologischen Hymnen des Neuen Testaments vergleichbar.—Auch die Bitte um den Geist führt eigentlich nicht über diesen Rahmen hinaus." (P. 22.)

The Words of Institution are the very heart and center of the Eucharistic Prayer. Though they enjoy great stress, they are not used as an isolated consecratory formula, but are linked up with the entire prayer very organically. It is important to take note of Hippolytus' wording of the Anamnesis. The Church of the third century, unlike that of the fourth, refused to disconnect the various historical events of the life of Christ. Easter was thus thought to include all of the Savior's life and was not separated from His birth, ascension, etc. So, too, when in the Anamnesis the suffering and death of Christ are referred to, they are regarded as representative of all events of the life of Christ which link up with the Atonement. For some reason Hippolytus referred to Christ's descent into hell and to His resurrection in *expressis verbis* in addition to the suffering and death of Christ. Stählin (p. 22) agrees with Jungmann that it is possible that other versions of the Eucharistic Prayer were used in the days of Hippolytus. It is possible, says he, that the stress may have been different in these, but not the structure. Since Hippolytus had been a pupil of Irenaeus of Lyons, it is possible that his Eucharistic Prayer betrays the theological influence of his great teacher, who is perhaps the soundest of all ante-Nicene Church Fathers. At any rate, the liturgy of Hippolytus was so strongly and soundly doctrinal in character that Stählin (p. 22) refers to it as "gebetetes Dogma." Already in the fourth century, in which Christians were no longer exposed to the martyrdom of former centuries in which the Church established herself, many pronounced changes took place in corporate Christian worship. In the Anamnesis the various important events of Christ's life were named individually, beginning with the time of his conception and birth and extending to the time of his return to judge the world in righteousness. Under Constantine the Church became a *Volkskirche*, some rites and ceremonies practiced among pagans were adopted and purged by the Church, and the segregation of the clergy from the laity now took place. Monasticism was introduced, and the Church began to lust for political prestige and power. The Church now began to write down her liturgies, liturgical formularies were written out in detail, the collects became longer, and the prayers of the Church became more Christocentric in their effort to stave off Arianism. The sermon began to flourish more

and more beginning with the fourth century, and centuries four to six constituted the greatest era of liturgical development for the Eastern Church. In these years the Eastern Church was far more creative and productive liturgically than the Western Church, and important liturgies came into being in Egypt, Syria, and Constantinople. A rich and profuse use of symbolical rites, forms, and ceremonies added to the dramatic character of the Eastern rites. While Hippolytus had attached great importance to the Verba, the Church now changed this and stressed the importance of the Epiclesis. Stählin succeeds very well in presenting a clear picture of these developments. His discussion of the development of the Roman Mass (pp. 34—44) does not disappoint; however, this development is better known to the student of liturgics and is covered quite adequately also in much literature written in the English language.

The same applies in large measure also to developments which took place in other countries, notably in England, France, and Germany; this is true already because the Western Church followed the example and precepts of Rome. However, conditions declined very rapidly in Rome in the ninth and tenth centuries, whereas a resurgence took place in northern Europe. While no new copies of the Mass were prepared in Italy, they were prepared most artfully and with the utmost care in the North. Puritanical sobriety reigned in Rome during this era of decline; in the North, on the other hand, there was exuberant vitality and recognition of the inherent dramatic qualities of the Mass. The Mass was explained to the people, and there was much outward proof for the existence of Gallic-Germanic piety. Stählin's description of these developments (p. 45 ff.) is in itself vital and dramatic. Stählin likewise points out (p. 45), however, that there was no lack of reverence; in fact, it was reverence which prompted the people to be mere spectators in their services of worship; they observed from afar and with awe what transpired at the altar. The Mass revolved around the rites and acts of the clergy, and the altar was moved farther away from the people. Charlemagne was in part responsible for these unfortunate changes. In the Gothic age the Papacy made use of the greatest power it has ever enjoyed. Since the days of Gregory VII the Pope was the supreme ruler also in the realm of

liturgics. In 1215 the doctrine of transubstantiation became an official dogma of the Church and helped to bring many abuses into the Church. As set forth by Rudolf Stählin, these developments clearly illustrate what Martin Luther was up against; they help one to understand why Luther and the Confessional Writings of the Lutheran Church expressed themselves as they did and force one to marvel at Martin Luther's profound insights and sense of balance.

However, Stählin's discussion of Lutheran developments of the 16th century is somewhat disappointing. He has much to say about Luther's work that is true and very good, but one senses a certain lack of sympathy and approval. This is not unusual, for one notes the same lack also in certain other liturgical literature written by Lutherans and others. This is perhaps a reaction against what has been said and written by some who have gone too far in singing the praises of Luther. It is well to bear in mind that Luther himself did not regard his liturgical work as a *ne plus ultra*; he thus gave evidence of a bigness of spirit and understanding which one does not often find among the sons of men. If any faulting is to be done, is it not rather to be applied to those who have not caught the spirit of bigness shown by Luther, notably in his *Deutsche Messe*, and who have been remiss in adjusting themselves to liturgical standards of a higher quality? That, too, is what Luther had in mind when he urged that his *Deutsche Messe* be rejected when it had outlived its usefulness. Stählin insists (p. 59) that, from the standpoint of liturgical history, Luther's *Deutsche Messe* brought on a collapse of the old classical form and structure of the liturgy and quotes the expression used by Franz Rendtorff, who referred to the *Deutsche Messe* as being a *zusammenhangloser Trümmerhaufen* — "desultory heap of ruins." He likewise refers disparagingly to Luther's introduction of hymns into the *Deutsche Messe*, insisting that their folksonglike character amputates the liturgical parlance of the service of worship. While these views are expressed also by others, they ignore the fact that with the Reformation began a new era, the era of the "new song." One should judge Luther's work in liturgics not only by healthy standards of the Middle Ages, but also by healthy standards which developed in and after the 16th century; these may not be many in number, but they do have their value and for their purpose and their time are perhaps superior

to those of the Middle Ages, when congregational participation in the Mass was negligible. Stählin's discussion of early Lutheran liturgical developments does call attention to a few important and encouraging facts which should not be overlooked. Basing his remark on Th. Knolle's article "*Luthers deutsche Messe und die Rechtfertigungslehre*" (*Lutherjahrbuch* X [1928], pp. 170—203), he mentions that the principal theme of the Lutheran liturgy is the doctrine of justification; by stressing this doctrine in the liturgy, says Stählin (p. 59), Luther provided the Lutheran liturgy with great dogmatic unity and symmetry. Since the *Confiteor* was to be spoken by the officiant privately in the sacristy and not in the chancel and before the congregation, Luther omitted it and thereby followed the example of the early medieval Church. Luther here, as well as on other occasions, proved that he possessed liturgical sensitivity.

A short excursion follows which discusses Yngve Brilioth's *Eucharistic Faith and Practice, Evangelical and Catholic* (Engl. transl. by A. G. Hebert, London, 1930), the Swedish liturgy, and notably the work of Olaus Petri and his brother Laurentius Petri. Since the Lutherans of Sweden have done remarkable work in the field of Lutheran liturgics, the inclusion of this chapter is most welcome, though we regret that it had to be so short. The chapter on corporate worship practices among the Reformed is adequate as far as Calvinism and Zwinglianism are concerned, but it does not at all take American Protestantism, which is Reformed, into consideration. For Americans this is a defect, though the short and altogether inadequate discussion of Anglican worship (pp. 66—68) is a much greater defect. After a short but good chapter on the liturgical reforms of the Council of Trent, Stählin discusses developments in the so-called Era of Enlightenment and relates these in part to Protestantism.

The final chapter of *Lieferung* One is a concise but gratifying discourse upon the liturgical revival of the 19th and 20th centuries which, like the rest of this *Lieferung*, might well be translated into English, since it contains much information concerning the liturgical revival within the Lutheran Church in particular which would be of interest to many English-speaking members of the Lutheran Church.

While Rudolf Stählin's historical approach to corporate Christian worship is cursory, the same can hardly be said of Peter Brunner's very thorough and profound discussion of the nature and character of corporate Christian worship. Professor Brunner's treatment of this difficult subject is presented in the second, third, and fourth *Lieferungen* of *Leiturgia*. Time and space do not permit us to discuss the content of these two issues at the present time. A synopsis will hardly do justice to Professor Brunner's work — he makes full use of his *deutsche Gründlichkeit* — for unless one progresses with him slowly, inch by inch, one can easily get off on a tangent and derive very little, if any, benefit from his exhaustive effort. The few words we shall put down are to do no more than try to arouse the curiosity of the reader.

One is impressed already with Peter Brunner's bibliography. It covers pages 84 to 98 of the second issue of the series. As one checks the literature referred to, one understands why the learned professor's discussion of liturgics is not merely a discourse on liturgics, but rather an extensive discourse on theology, of which liturgics is but one area. That already forces one to listen to what Peter Brunner has to say; it enables one to understand, too, why the reports that have reached us regarding the paper Professor Brunner read to the Lutheran World Federation in Hanover last summer impressed very favorably also those who attended as guests from our own synodical body.* Professor Brunner, a member of the theological faculty of the University at Heidelberg, writes not only like a specialist, but also like a scholar whose learning is as broad as it is profound. He is clearly aware of relationships and inter-relationships and does not go off the deep end because of lack of balance. Not only liturgiologists, but theologians of all areas of theology might well emulate the example set by Peter Brunner. An expert liturgiologist must be at home in practically all areas of theology if he is to be an expert at all.

There is much in Professor Brunner's investigation which is exegetical in the real sense of the word. He does not discuss *Gottesdienst* without examining roots and their offshoots. He looks

* The managing editor will remember throughout his life the excellent classroom lecture on the Third Article in Brunner's course in catechetics in the summer of 1947. F. E. M.

into the meaning of words like *latreia*, *proskynein*, *threskeia*, *sebesthai*, *leiturgia*, *ekklesia*, *bierurgen*, *douleuein*, *synaxis*, and a host of others. His discussion of such words is by no means dull and abstract. On the basis of these pregnant words he then proceeds to discuss Christian worship.

From the exegetical approach he proceeds to the dogmatic. He knowingly and wisely refuses to reverse the procedure, since getting his start in exegetics enables him best to draw his conclusions out of the Scriptures rather than force his own ideas into basic Biblical truth. He applies his exegetical approach to arrive at Christian doctrine and dogma and makes full use of it while discussing the worship locale used by Christian people. He relates his findings to man's fall into sin and to Christ's sacrificial work of atonement. With Christian worship he compares the worship of pagan peoples and arrives at the conclusion that all pagan worship is self-deception and a lie, a perversion and an abortion. In connection with this problem, he discusses not only pagan ritualism (Romans 1), but also how much is involved when man is born again and becomes a Christian. God's presence in Christian worship plays into the problem, as does also the real character of a priesthood and a ministry. The problem relates itself to revelation, universal grace, and eschatology. The author remains thoroughly evangelical and gives evidence of a healthy sobriety while arriving at his conclusions.

From the theological approach he proceeds to the anthropological. This leads over into *Lieferung* III, which the author of the present article has not as yet been able to read in its entirety with due deliberation and reflection. Suffice it to say that one finds in the issues released to date not only a good beginning, but seemingly also the early stages of a *gradatio ad majus*. Reading and actually studying literature of this type enhances one's knowledge, but it also makes one more appreciative of Scriptural truth and of the Church's great worship traditions. The two must never be divorced from each other. We find ample proof for this in *Lieferungen* I—IV of *Leiturgia — Handbuch des Evangelischen Gottesdienstes*.

St. Louis, Mo.