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Last year witnessed the anniversaries of two significant liturgical reforms in the life of the church. The better known anniversary marked 50 years since the Second Vatican Council promulgated the first of its conciliar documents, Sacrosanctum Concilium, the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy. While the conciliar documents that followed in the years to come would cover many areas of faith, life and church practice, it is not insignificant that attention to the liturgy signalled the beginning of the church’s reform. And so it was for another ecumenical reform agenda, albeit less happily received. Some 490 years ago, in the relative obscurity of medieval Wittenberg, a recently excommunicated monk was finally persuaded by his friends to supply directions for an ‘evangelical’ form of the mass. In 1523, Luther’s Formula Missae et Communionis pro Ecclesia Wittenbergensi was published, marking profound differences in the way communities of Christians would celebrate that gathering where ‘the work of our redemption takes place.’ For the Lutheran tradition, reform also began at the foot of the altar.

It goes without saying that from the Catholic perspective such developments could be regarded as a tragic liturgical rupture rather than a necessary liturgical reform. But Luther’s liturgical proposals have not always been appreciated by Protestants either. This is especially the case with the liturgically aware, who possibly see the Reformer as a bit on the liturgically ‘challenged’ side, and who can only describe his eucharistic meddling as haphazard at best, and destructive at worst. To introduce this charge further, we turn to a work by Bryan Spinks in the well-known Grove liturgical study series, Luther’s Liturgical Criteria and his Reform of the Canon of the Mass.³

Luther’s liturgical disinterest?

In his 1982 study, Spinks surveys the opinion ‘that in this particular field, the Wittenberg Reformer was conservative, hasty, and singularly inept, and that when he came to the reform of the canon, his method was one of drastic curtailment, amputation, and displacement.’² Spinks finds this view represented in Catholic, Protestant, and even Lutheran liturgical scholarship. And what they all share in common, to a greater or lesser degree, is a basic affinity with the assessment of Yngve Brilioth. In his 1930 work the Swedish scholar maintained that:

the liturgical side [of] the Lutheran Reformation showed little creative power; and this is especially true of Luther himself. The conservative and unpractical side of his mind comes out in the fact that he was never really interested in liturgical forms; to him they were indifferent things wherein [one] might be content to conform to the established usage.⁴

There is a sense, of course, in which Brilioth’s assessment is true. From the perspective of the modern liturgical movement, Luther was hardly a liturgiologist; nor was he interested in matters of ritual and ceremony for their own sake; nor were ad fontes and aggiornamento his starting points for the renewal of the liturgy. His various writings and instructions on worship were occasional and situational, often penned in great haste. But if one can resist the temptation to judge Luther by contemporary liturgical sensibilities, the question remains: could Luther have done differently, or better, by the standards of his own times?

Spinks’ view is that Luther knew exactly what he was doing liturgically, and that it was anything but the careless ‘hatchet job’ of an unhalligraphic conservative. Focusing on Luther’s revision of the canon of the mass, Spinks discerns a deliberate, radical, and theologically consistent approach stemming from the Reformer’s theological

1 December 4, 1965.
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starting point; justification by grace through faith alone. Everything flows from this theological foundation, and nothing can contradict it. In Spink's words, '[Luther's] reformed canon represents none other than a quintessence of the doctrine of justification by faith.'

In this article I am spurred on by Spink's central claim to pursue two further tasks. First, I examine two specific liturgical writings by Luther, both from his early period, in order to show how justification and liturgy are indeed integrally connected. The first of these is primarily theological, the other more pastoral and practical. The second task is to show from these writings that for Luther, the doctrine of justification is not the cause for liturgical disinterest, but of intense liturgical attention. It is not the case that because we are justified by faith, liturgy is thereby unimportant. Rather, because liturgy mediates God's justifying work, it is of the highest importance. While Luther did not think like a modern liturgiologist, his liturgical innovations were anything but arbitrary.

A Treatise on the New Testament, that is, the Holy Mass (1520)

This treatise, written in the middle of 1520, is one of Luther's earliest works on the theology of the mass. In it he spells out with vividness and clarity the logic of his liturgical thinking which would underlie all his practical liturgical decisions in the years to come. I discuss the thrust of this treatise under three headings, to capture more systematically the concerns that Luther returns to repeatedly.

Freedom – Justification – Testament and Promise

Luther begins by observing that 'no well-regulated community ever existed long, if at all, where there were many laws.' Laws – and here he has ceremonial regulation in mind – are utterly useless for making people righteous. They may lead to outwardly good works, but works done involuntarily lead only to hypocrisy, as well as to sects and divisions each despising the other. Luther thus flags a theme that will take on great prominence in his liturgical writing, that of freedom. And as Spinks notes, this is simply a corollary of his treatment of justification by faith.

In contrast to law, writes Luther, we must realize that it is God who comes first with his promise; humankind, being purely receptive, can only take hold of this promise in faith. "This word of God is the beginning, the foundation, the rock, upon which afterward all works, words, and thoughts of man must build. This word man must gratefully accept." Upon this distinction Luther understands the basis of the spiritual life. On the other hand, if the word of God is not given first place, a disastrous spiritual chain reaction sets in: our faith suffers, leading to the natural inclination to justify oneself by works, drawing us into the mire of false security or despair, debilitating our conscience, and ultimately robbing us of a gracious God. And because he believed that the current state of the mass exemplified this pathology, Luther never tired of stressing the double helix of God's promise and human trust. As it was for Adam, Noah, the patriarchs and Moses, and so too it must be for us in the mass: we give nothing to Christ, he only gives to us.

And what Christ gives to us in the mass is his last will and testament. Luther develops this novel, if exegetically dubious, notion on the model of human testament as customarily practiced at the time. Just as a will bequeaths the goods of one who has just died, so too Christ, before his impending death, left us his will. 'What then is this testament, or what is bequeathed to us in it by Christ? Truly a great, eternal, and unbreakable treasure, namely, the forgiveness of all sins..." Summarized, Luther's scheme relates every part of a last will and testament to the heart of the mass, the Lord's Supper: the testator is Christ; all Christians are the heirs; the testament itself are the words of Christ, in particular the central words of the institution narrative, 'This is my body which is given for you. This is my blood which is poured out for you, a new and eternal testament'; the seal or token of the testament are the bread and wine, the body and blood of Christ; the inheritance is the forgiveness of sins and eternal life; the duty, or requiem, is his remembrance, which entails preaching his love and grace, and hearing and meditating upon it. In short 'it is nothing else than an exceedingly rich and everlasting good testament bequeathed to us by Christ himself..." This notion of the sacrament as testament was henceforth the primary way Luther conceived of the mass as an liturgical expression of God's justifying work.

Word and Sign – Visible Ceremonies

Understanding the mass as testament leads Luther to raise a question which occupied all the reformers of that era, the relationship of word and sign, itself a variation of the centuries old res-—signum discussion. And this in turn impinges on the question under consideration here: whether or not Luther was liturgically disinterested.

---

8 The privileging of justification would become a distinctive trait within the Lutheran dogmatic tradition. See, for example, Article IV of the 'Apology of the Augsburg Confession' in Robert Kolb and Timothy J. Wengert, eds., The Book of Concord: The Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000), 120-73. It should be noted that in this article, as within Lutheranism, the word 'evangelical' relates specifically to this concept of justification. That is, evangelical does not have to do so much with being conservative or 'biblical-based', as with promoting and expressing God's justifying work.

9 Spink, Luther's Liturgical Criteria and his Reform of the Canon of the Mass, 31.

Luther notes that to his verbal promises God almost always adds a visible sign. This is necessary for us ‘poor [humans], living as we do in our five senses.’ The sign, being accessible to the senses, would then draw us through the external into the spiritual. That said, Luther felt compelled to observe a very clear distinction between the promise and the sign, between the verbal word and the visible sacrament. In fact, the word always takes priority – it is greater than the sign: ‘Now as the testament is much more important than the sacrament, so the words are much more important than the signs.’ Indeed, for Luther, one might well receive salvation without the sacraments, for faith can be fed and strengthened on the word and testament alone. Yet the reverse could not be the case, which explains why Luther was so critical of the priestly practice of reciting the words of the testament silently. In fact, the inaudibility of the words of institution were for him simply one symptom of a more endemic silencing of the gospel: ‘I fear that the holy words of the testament are read so secretly, and kept so hidden from the laity, because God in his wrath is thereby indicating that the whole gospel is no longer publicly preached to the people...’

But Luther’s privileging of the word cannot be read as a dismissive attitude towards the sign, or towards liturgy more generally. The elevation of the host and cup provides an interesting case. For a start, Luther judged that the elevation ought to be retained as a pastoral concession, given its importance in congregational piety. But such a concession might even have positive value if people could be taught an evangelical interpretation of the elevation, that is, one that views the sign in light of the word. Luther therefore interprets the elevation as directed towards the congregation to highlight its sacramental, rather than sacrificial, significance. When the priest elevates the consecrated host and cup, he does not say a word about the sacrifice. But...he elevates it not toward God but toward us, to remind us of the testament and to incite us to faith in that testament.

An example like this demonstrates that Luther was by no means liturgically disinterested. On the contrary, he was deeply interested. But this interest showed itself first in a deep ‘hermeneutic of suspicion’ towards the human inclination to obscure the message of justification by means of the very liturgical tokens that bear witness to it. And if this was the case with signs mandated by Christ himself, it was all the more so with those externals of a purely human origin: vestments, bells, songs, ornaments, prayers, processions, elevations, prostrations, organ playing, gestures, and so on. Because of the temptation to idolatry offered by such externals ‘the greatest and most useful art is to know what really and essentially belongs to the mass, and what is added and foreign to it. For if there is no clear distinction, the eyes and the heart are easily misled by such sham into a false impression and delusion.’

---

**Offering and Sacrifice**

Even more than word and sign, the distinction between sacrament and sacrifice served to express for Luther the liturgical enactment of justification. It is accurate to say that nothing vexed him more than understanding the mass in terms of a sacrifice that humans offer to God, rather than a sacrament which God presents to us. For Luther, this is the ‘very worst abuse.’ Conceiving of the mass as a sacrifice or offering replaces divine promise with human presumption, and ultimately leaves one under the wrath of God. Therefore ‘we must let the mass be a sacrament and testament; it is not and cannot be a sacrifice any more than the other sacraments...are sacrifices. Otherwise we should lose the gospel, Christ, the comfort [of the sacrament], and every grace of God.’

Nevertheless, sacrifice and offering are still of vital importance in the Christian life. The sacrifice we bring is our very selves, all that we have, unceasing prayer, our yielding to God’s will, our praise and thanksgiving. Furthermore, such offering should even take place in the liturgical assembly. But his concern is to prevent this legitimate and necessary language of sacrifice from seeping into those parts of the liturgy where the emphasis should be solely on God’s sacramental self-giving. Following on from the previous quotation he continues: ‘Therefore we must separate the mass clearly and distinctly from the prayers and ceremonies which have been added to it by the holy fathers. We must keep these two as far apart as heaven and earth...’ There certainly exist liturgical expressions of sacrifice and offering, but these must be quarantined from the mass, by which Luther means the canon, or in today’s terminology, the ‘eucharistic prayer’ or ‘holy communion liturgy.’

In later years, Luther’s attack on the notion of sacrifice would become increasingly strident and forceful. But in this early document Luther is still willing to explain the origin of the sacrificial elements of the mass in non-polemical terms. He recognizes, for example, that liturgical uses such as the collects, officitory processions, and elevation, testify to the very ancient roots of oblationary concepts and language in the liturgy. But even more striking – despite everything that has been said so far! – is his attempt to justify the use of sacrificial language within the canon itself. If it is understood that ‘we do not offer Christ as a sacrifice, but that Christ offers us....

---

12 Ibid., 86. Thus Noah was given the rainbow, Abraham received circumcision, and Gideon was presented with the fleece.
13 Ibid., 91.
14 Ibid., 106.
15 Ibid., 95-96.
16 Ibid., 81.
17 Ibid., 94. Later that year, in *The Babylonian Captivity of the Church*, Luther would describe the sacrifice of the mass as the third and worst ‘captivity’ that the church found itself in.
18 Ibid., 97.
19 Ibid., 97. Frank Senn notes in this regard that Luther distinguished between das Gedeihnis (the liturgical memorial leading up to the words of institution) and das Sacrament selbs (the consecrated elements) which cannot be offered to God because they are the gift of God to the people. Frank C. Senn, Christian Liturgy: Catholic and Evangelical, Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1997, 272.
20 Luther nevertheless stresses that these offerings were kept distinct from the consecrated gifts, which were not regarded as our offering to God, but as God’s testament to us. In fact, Luther contends that even the text of the canon, of which he was so critical, maintains this distinction.
it is permissible, yes, profitable, to call the mass a sacrifice; not on its own account, but because we offer ourselves as a sacrifice along with Christ. Luther could even say that through faith we offer Christ to God, that is, we move Christ and give him occasion to offer himself for us and to offer us with himself. But given his assessment that only 'few...understand the mass in this way' such overtures towards an evangelical understanding of sacrifice would soon vanish from his vocabulary altogether.

**An Order of Mass and Communion for the Church in Wittenberg (1523)**

We now turn to our anniversary piece in which Luther outlines the practical and liturgical implications of a justification based theology. Here it is important to note that Luther does not compose a text of the mass de novo, but simply provides notes for retaining, adjusting, or abrogating sections of the traditional rite as he knew it. Once again, I examine his text under several broad categories, beginning with a chart outlining Luther’s basic ordo.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introit</th>
<th>Preface dialogue with proper preface for the day [Omission of Canon of the mass]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kyrie</td>
<td>Words of Institution (still introduced with Qui...)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloria</td>
<td>Sanctus (with elevation during Benedictus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collect (reduced to one)</td>
<td>Lord's Prayer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistle</td>
<td>Pax Domini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gradual of two verses and Alleluia</td>
<td>Agnus Dei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gospel</td>
<td>Distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicene Creed</td>
<td>Post-communion collect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sermon</td>
<td>(Various prayer suggestions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of bread and wine</td>
<td>Benedictamus or Aaronic Blessing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Theology and Church History**

Writing in a pastoral and practical vein, Luther states that 'we are not going to prove again that the mass is neither a sacrifice nor a good work.' Nor does he need to, for in this work it is the liturgical implementation of his theology that speaks the loudest. As can be seen from the chart, Luther has removed every prayer in the canon (excepting the institution narrative); likewise, all the offertory prayers of the 'little canon' have been excised. Into the large empty space, home for centuries to various manifestations of the eucharistic prayer, Luther supplied only the Lord's Prayer, judged to be the most appropriate on account of its dominical status. More than anything else, it was this act of eucharistic triage that gave rise to the charge of Luther's liturgical recklessness.

Luther nevertheless justifies his decision in the light of ecclesial history, as he sees it. This narrative could be summarized as a devolution from evangelical simplicity and purity to contemporary corruption and sacrificial excess. In the beginning, the mass, as Christ's testament, was observed simply. The initial additions of the fathers, such as the singing of psalms, and the addition of the Kyrie, Gloria, Epistle and Gospel witnessed to this ancient purity. But eventually the tyranny of priestly greed and pride entered in. Framing the church's downward story in terms of Old Testament apostasy, Luther relates how 'our wicked kings' set up their own pagan altars by turning the mass into a sacrifice. Just as 'wicked King Ahaz removed the brazen altar and erected another copied from one in Damascus' so had the canon, 'that abominable concoction drawn from everyone's sewer and cesspool,' replaced the true testament of Christ. And just as the ark of the covenant once stood in Dagon's temple, so too were the words of institution embedded in the prayers of the canon. But since the ark eventually wreaked havoc on the temple that imprisoned it, so too Luther felt that the moment of liturgical liberation had finally arrived. In short, as Luther had written previously, 'the nearer our masses are to the first mass of Christ, the better they undoubtedly are; and the further from Christ's mass, the more dangerous.' And the first step towards restoring Christ's mass is to 'repudiate everything that smacks of sacrifice.'

**Pastoral Concerns – Freedom**

Despite this state of affairs, Luther begins by explaining his hesitancy to implement liturgical changes too quickly; first, out of concern for the weak in faith who can't handle rapid changes, and secondly, because of 'fickle and fastidious spirits...who

---
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delight only in novelty and tire of it as quickly. Nevertheless, he recognizes that the

time may have come to 'dare something in the name of Christ,' since if no changes

are made, nobody would be provided for, and 'abominations' would continue to be

endorsed. Luther recognizes the danger both of offending the weak through pushing
through changes, and confirming the weak in their superstition through inaction.

But in moving ahead, one cannot proceed by force or law. His goal remains that

people might discover an evangelical disposition towards worship through the

reception and thoughtful appropriation of gospel preaching, and thereby gain the

capacity to discern for themselves a better order of worship.

The consequence for liturgical reform is, as noted in the Treatise, that liberty must

prevail. If the order proposed by Luther pleases his auditors, they may use it, but he
does not want to prejudice others if they have come up with something better. All

must be persuaded in their own mind, and act according to their conscience and what

the Spirit suggests. As 'children of the free woman' Christians are 'free to change

rites' how and when ever they may wish. For this reason Luther was critical of

those who insisted upon purely 'biblical' orders, because such a move only made the

Scriptures, the vessel of the gospel, into yet another legal code.

Liturgical Revision as Evangelical Adjustment

Christian freedom and pastoral sensitivity, stemming from the doctrine of

justification, therefore inform Luther's approach to liturgical revision, rather than matters of style, ritual or ordo. This explains both his conservative starting point

and evangelical intent: 'It is not now nor has ever been our intention to abolish the

liturgical service of God completely, but rather to purify the one that is now in use...

and to point out an evangelical use.' Most, if not all, of the specific directives that

now follow are oriented towards this 'evangelical use.' They served either to advance

the liturgical enactment of justification by faith, or remove whatever hindered it. Even

those changes which perhaps seem arbitrary, indecisive or purely pragmatic, give

expression to the gospel freedom of the Christian assembly.

One way of assessing Luther's liturgical criteria is to envisage a scale ranging from 'no

change' to 'absolute change', with numerous types of revision falling in the middle.

Some things, which did not obscure or compromise the centrality of justification,

were to be retained without any alteration. Examples are the Introits for Lord's days

and feasts of Christ, or the phrase 'taught by Thy saving precepts,' or for that matter,

anything that Luther doesn't mention. But at the negative end of the 'evangelical scale'

were things to be completely abrogated. First to fall under the axe are the prayers of

the canon and oratory, along with their accompanying actions: 'all the signs they

were accustomed to make over the host and with the host over the chalice.' In the

middle were those things which Luther neither prohibited nor prescribed, such as

the use of candles and incense with the Gospel reading. In line with Luther's pastoral

concern, some things, such as the elevation, were conceded 'for the benefit of the

weak in faith who might be offended if such an obvious change in this rite of the mass

were suddenly made.' In like manner, some parts were temporarily permitted (some

Introits, some private masses), while other matters pertaining to the Kyrie, Gloria,

Sequences and Proses, and the singing of the Creed were simply referred to the local

pastor.

- By and large, Luther's wish to promote an evangelical use of the traditional order

could simply be implemented with a degree of evangelical 'tweaking'. Here are some

examples:

  - Because the post-communion collect 'sounds almost like a sacrifice' Luther

    suggested some kind of evangelical substitution for this prayer.

  - Because he felt that 'the Epistles seem to have been chosen by a singularly unlearned

    and superstitious advocate of works' he envisaged the time when a more

    evangelical selection could be made with the lectionary.

  - Some changes entailed no more than a degree of evangelical enhancement, as seen

    with Luther's insistence on the audible recitation of the Institution Narrative.

  - Luther also considered a more fitting evangelical placement of some parts of the

    mass: the sermon, for example, might be best placed at the beginning, for while 'the

    Gospel is the voice crying in the wilderness and calling unbelievers to faith...the

    mass consists in using the Gospel and communing at the table of the Lord.'

- Some parts of the mass called out for evangelical interpretation, such as the feasts

  of Purification and Annunciation, which Luther desired to be framed in more

  explicitly Dominical, rather than Marian, terms. Evangelical interpretation was also

  given to the Pax Domini, which was to be interpreted as a kind of public absolution,

  and the elevation of the consecrated host, was henceforth to be regarded as a visible

  sign of God's testament towards the congregation.
While Luther gave an evangelical ‘twist’ to most of the existing parts of the liturgy, he also introduced some evangelical innovations, such as the Aaronic Blessing, based on the presumed practice of Christ.\textsuperscript{41}

Other changes, intended to better express the priesthood of believers, can also be understood from Luther’s overall desire to communicate and express the message of justification: the pre-communion prayers were to be changed from singular to plural; the prayers were to become audible; the sermon was to be preached in the vernacular; congregational singing was to be introduced into the mass. Even liturgical reduction (as in the length of certain graduals) for the sake of reducing congregational tedium can be seen in this light.

In sum, if Luther said that liturgical forms are a matter of indifference, this could only mean that precise ceremonial forms are not prescribed in the gospel. But as we have seen, because the liturgy serves its function precisely as a framework for the proclamation and enactment of God’s justifying work, he was anything but indifferent towards liturgical forms.

Impact and Legacy

The impact of legacy of Luther’s liturgical logic is another story altogether – one that is complex, contested, and still evolving. By way of conclusion, two broad trends can be discerned within Lutheranism today.

The first is what we could call the ‘red alert’ approach to liturgical revision. With Luther, one remains ever vigilant lest Christ’s testament is any way compromised by sacrificial thinking, as the recent trend to incorporate eucharistic prayers into the Lutheran liturgy is thought to do.\textsuperscript{42} For the ‘red alert’ position, the very notion of a eucharistic prayer liturgically mingles divine and human agency and strikes at the heart of God’s justifying action. It turns the testament of Christ (addressed to us) into a something of a human work (addressed to God).\textsuperscript{43} In turn, the pure receptivity of faith (the sole corollary of justification) is gradually nudged to the side by our praying, our thanking, our remembering, and our offering. For proponents of this view, such developments mark a troubling fusion of God’s work with man’s work [which is] consistent with post-Vatican II Roman Catholic liturgical theology.\textsuperscript{44}

The other trend might be called a ‘rapprochement’ line of liturgical thinking. It welcomes the adoption of new eucharistic prayer forms, and recognizes that the problems which Luther perceived in the Roman canon are not mirrored in Catholic liturgical celebration today. Nor does the language of sacrifice and offering, traceable to the very earliest anaphoras, automatically signal the perceived works righteousness which Luther and the reformers so vigorously opposed. On the contrary, recent eucharistic liturgies serve to amplify and celebrate the creative and saving activity of the triune God. Liturgical thanksgiving can hardly be seen as our ‘work’, but is instead the most natural and fitting reflection of God’s justifying work accomplished in Christ and now mediated to his people.\textsuperscript{45}

The communion liturgies of the Lutheran Church of Australia demonstrate both these trends. Its traditional communion liturgy represents the more cautious and pared down ‘red alert’ form of communion, where in place of the canon one finds only the Lord’s Prayer and institution narrative. But more recent orders incorporate a number of elements from the broader eucharistic tradition, such as a post-Sanctus thanksgiving prayer, memorial acclamation, and Epiclesis.\textsuperscript{46} Furthermore, full eucharistic prayers expressing different dimensions of the saving economy have been prepared for trial use. And most promisingly, one gathers that the eucharistic frame of reference in recent Lutheranism now reaches well beyond the traditional sacrament-sacrifice impasse, to include the much neglected biblical themes of justice, charity, hospitality, and eschatological renewal.

\textsuperscript{41} Ibid., p.301 believe Christ used something like this when, ascending into heaven, he blessed his disciples.

\textsuperscript{42} From the mid-20th century onwards, and influenced by Vatican II, a number of Lutheran bodies worldwide began introducing eucharistic prayers into their liturgies. Examples are found in the latest two hymnbooks of the Evangelical Church in America: Lutheran Book of Worship (1978) and Evangelical Lutheran Worship (2006).

\textsuperscript{43} This position maintains that, above all, the words of institution must be addressed to the people, as from Christ, rather than in prayer form addressed to God. The irony is that Luther’s Formula Missae itself still retained the words of institution in prayer form, beginning with the usual gui....

\textsuperscript{44} Timothy C. J. Quill, The Impact of the Liturgical Movement on American Lutheranism (London: The Scarecrow Press, 1997), 186.

\textsuperscript{45} At the very least, such prayers recognize that the dominical mandate ‘Do this’ includes thanksgiving, and not just eating or drinking ‘for the forgiveness of sins’.

\textsuperscript{46} Although the prayer for the Spirit is for those communing, rather than the eucharistic elements themselves.