

Ceremonies That Teach; Ceremonies That Confess

Regarding ceremonies that are neither commanded nor forbidden by God's Word – and that are therefore in the category of *adiaphora* – the Formula of Concord confesses that “the community of God in every time and place has the right, power, and authority to change, reduce, or expand such practices according to circumstances.” But this is not an unrestrained and unregulated right, power, and authority. According to the Formula, such changes in ceremonies are to be made only

in an orderly and appropriate manner, without frivolity or offense, as seems most useful, beneficial, and best for good order, Christian discipline, evangelical decorum, and the building up of the church.

The Formula is also quite clear that “useless, foolish spectacles, which are not beneficial for good order, Christian discipline, or evangelical decorum in the church, are not true *adiaphora*,” and are therefore specifically ruled out as permissible for a Lutheran congregation (SD X: 7,9, Kolb/Wengert).

In the Apology of the Augsburg Confession Lutherans acknowledge that “different rites instituted by human beings do not undermine the true unity of the church,” and there have in fact always been some differences within and among the various church orders adopted by various Lutheran churches over the centuries. But even so, Lutherans also state in the Apology that

it pleases us when universal rites are kept for the sake of tranquillity. Thus, in our churches we willingly observe the order of the Mass, the Lord's day, and other more important festival days. With a very grateful spirit we cherish the useful and ancient ordinances, especially when they contain a discipline by which it is profitable to educate and teach [the] common folk and [the] ignorant.” (VII/VIII:33, Kolb/Wengert)

The thoughtful retention of these “universal rites” and cherished “ancient ordinances” – which are useful for promoting tranquillity and good order in worship and for teaching the faith to worshipers – has always been understood to be “best practice” for the church under most circumstances, even if other less conservative approaches have also been seen as permissible or tolerable under certain conditions. Elsewhere in the Apology Lutherans accordingly affirm that

we do not abolish the Mass but religiously retain and defend it. Among us the Mass is celebrated every Lord's day and on other festivals, when the sacrament is made available to those who wish to partake of it, after they have been examined and absolved. We also keep traditional liturgical forms, such as the order of readings, prayers, vestments, and other similar things. ... Ceremonies should be observed both so that people may learn the Scriptures and so that, admonished by the Word, they might experience faith and fear and finally even pray. For these are the purposes of the ceremonies. ... We also use German hymns in order that the [common] people might have something to learn, something that will arouse their faith and fear. (XXIV: 1, 3, Kolb/Wengert)

Recalling the Biblical exhortation to Christians to “offer to God acceptable worship, with reverence and awe” (Hebrews 12:28, ESV), we with great interest also take note of the Augsburg Confession's observation that

it can readily be judged that nothing contributes so much to the maintenance of dignity in public worship and the cultivation of reverence and devotion among the people as the proper observance of ceremonies in the churches. (Part 2 Intro.:6, Tappert).

Another important point made in the Formula of Concord concerning *adiaphora*, is that

we must not include among the truly free *adiaphora* or indifferent matters ceremonies that give the appearance...that our religion does not differ greatly from the papist religion or that their religion were not completely contrary to ours... (SD X:5, Kolb/Wengert)

The context of this statement was a context in which the Roman Catholic Church and a Roman Catholic Emperor had been attempting – through political and military pressure – to draw Lutherans into the Roman Catholic fold, and to acclimate them to Romanist doctrine and worship, by imposing upon them and their churches certain Romanist rites and ceremonies, under the guise of *adiaphora*. Historic Christian ceremonies that most Lutheran churches had always retained – such as clerical vestments, altar and chancel appointments, chanting, and the sign of the cross – would not in themselves have been seen by Lutherans as symbols of Roman error, even if such ceremonies also happened to be found in the Roman Church. However, if ceremonies that had been set aside by most Lutherans, but that were still common among Romanists, would now be forcibly reintroduced under such circumstances, then this could indeed signal an impending submission to Roman authority and an impending return to Roman error, and could be seen as preparing the way for that kind of ecclesiastical shift.

In other times and places, though, this principle of the Formula of Concord was re-articulated in different ways, and was applied in response to different threats. For example, the Prussian King Frederick William I, who was a Calvinist, took it upon himself in the 1730s to make the Lutheran congregations of his realm look and sound like Reformed congregations. His long-term goal was no doubt to get the Lutherans accustomed to the Reformed way of worship, so that someday they could more easily *become* Reformed. Peder Severinsen recounts this history:

Through a Decision of 1733 he “prohibited the remnants of Popery in the Lutheran Church: copes, Communion vestments, candles, Latin song, chants, and the sign of the cross.” ... Many complained and counted the whole event a “betrayal of genuine and pure Lutheranism.” ... The brutal king repeated the decision in 1737, with the addition: “Should there be those who hesitate or who desire to make it a matter of conscience, we wish to make it known that we are ready to give them their demission.” At least one priest was discharged for refusal to submit.

Confessional Lutherans in Prussia resisted these efforts, and Lutherans in other territories encouraged them in this resistance. Regarding the Lutheran ceremonies that were prohibited by the king’s decree, the orthodox Lutheran theologian Valentin Ernst Löscher wrote in 1737 that

These things are admittedly not of any inner necessity, but they have become no insignificant mark of our church, and must therefore be safeguarded under these circumstances.

Löscher and others understood that we must not include among the truly free *adiaphora* or indifferent matters ceremonies that give the appearance that our religion does not differ greatly from the *Reformed* religion or that *their* religion were not completely contrary to ours. Frederick William I was succeeded by his son Frederick II (the Great) in 1740. Severinsen reports, with respect to the new king, that

Immediately on ascending the throne, he issued a cabinet order allowing the churches and their priests full liberty in the matter of religious services. A number made use of the liberty granted. The Communion vestments were restored in Berlin and other places. (Severinsen)

The Formula of Concord also declares that

in a time when confession is necessary, as when the enemies of God's Word want to suppress the pure teaching of the holy gospel, the entire community of God, indeed, every Christian, especially servants of the Word as the leaders of the community of God, are obligated according to God's Word to confess true teaching and everything that pertains to the whole of religion freely and publicly. They are to do so not only with words but also in actions and deeds. In such a time they shall not yield to the opponents even in indifferent matters... (SD X:10, Kolb/Wengert)

The Missouri Synod's C. F. W. Walther, writing in his nineteenth-century American context, was referring to this statement from the Formula when he said: "that 'time' is for us 'always,' because we are everywhere surrounded by Reformed and other sects" (Walther EC, I:197). In his American setting

Walther was relatively unconcerned about the threat of Rome as compared with the weaknesses of Protestantism. Above all he feared that Lutheranism itself might lose its distinctiveness, its confessional character, and its mission. Liturgically therefore he was not iconoclastic with respect to Rome, and in this respect also he reinforced the moderately high-church views of the [Norwegian] Synod pastors. (Belgum, 372)

The orthodox and liturgical Lutheran pastors of the Missouri and Norwegian Synods had reason to be concerned about the influence of Reformed and sectarian churches in America. Most of the "east coast" Lutherans – whose forebears had arrived in the colonial era, and who had later organized the General Synod – had not successfully resisted the temptation to conform to the Puritan and revivalist religious culture of the new world, or to embrace many of the beliefs of that religious culture. William Julius Mann, in 1855, described the degenerative process that over time had brought so much harm to these Lutherans:

Gradually a desire manifested itself to gain popularity for the Lutheran Church in this country. The hard dogmatical knots of the old Lutheran oak were to give way under the Puritan plane. The body was deprived of its bones and its heart, and the empty skin might be filled with whatever was most pleasing, if only the Lutheran name was retained! ...in the desire to make the Lutheran Church as much as possible like others, her leaders were much more ready to adopt foreign elements than to retain her own distinctive features. Thus the Liturgy, the ancient lessons of the Gospels and Epistles, the festivals of the Church Year, the gown, and other usages were given up, in order that as little as possible might be seen of these Lutheran peculiarities. Hoping to gain others, they lost themselves. The Lutheran Church had given away her own spirit, her own original life and character. (quoted in Spaeth, I:354-55)

The Confessional Lutherans centered in the American midwest, who had arrived in the United States in the nineteenth century, did not want to see this happen among their descendants. The Missouri Synod's Martin Guenther accordingly warned in 1881 that

Church usages, except in the case when the confession of a divine truth is required, are indeed *adiaphora*. But they are nevertheless not without an importance of their own. Congregations that adopt the church usages of the sects that surround them, will be apt to conform to their doctrines also, more easily and quickly than those that retain their Lutheran ceremonies. We should in Lutheran services...as much as possible use the old Lutheran forms, though they be said to be antiquated and not suiting this country. (Guenther, 77)

Walther also encouraged the *restoration* of Lutheran ceremonies and liturgical forms that had previously been lost – through the influence of Calvinism, Pietism, and Rationalism – not only because of their usefulness in teaching the faith and in fostering reverence and

devotion in worship, but also as a testimony against the errors of the Reformed and sectarian churches. He wrote, therefore, that

as we continue to hold and to restore our wonderful divine services in places where they have been forgotten, let us boldly confess that our worship forms do not tie us with the modern sects or with the church of Rome; rather, they join us to the one, holy Christian Church that is as old as the world and is built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets. (Walther L, 163)

Walther admitted the obvious – that “the Lutheran Church has a few things that are also found in the Catholic Church.” But this cannot mean that the Lutheran Church embraces or tolerates the errors of Romanism. Walther pointed out that

if that were so, this charge would apply to every Christian denomination. For don't all parties in Christianity also have the same Bible, the same Apostles', Nicene, and Athanasian Creeds, the same Baptism, the same preaching office, the same Sabbath observance, etc., as the Romanists? Don't even other so-called Protestants also have church buildings with steeples on them, bells, organs, the custom of folding hands, kneeling, uncovering the head when praying, and the like? Who would charge the Reformed, the Methodists, the Evangelicals, etc., with Catholic tendencies for those things? Certainly no one. Whoever regards the mere acceptance of certain innocent ceremonies...as papism cannot possibly know what papism actually is... (Walther DOLLR, 266-67)

Elsewhere Walther spoke in a similar way, focusing especially on the ancient forms of singing and chanting that have always been used in Christian worship:

Whenever the divine service once again follows the old Evangelical-Lutheran agendas (or church books), it seems that many raise a great cry that it is “Roman Catholic”: “Roman Catholic” when the pastor chants “The Lord be with you” and the congregation responds by chanting “and with thy spirit”; “Roman Catholic” when the pastor chants the collect and the blessing and the people respond with a chanted “Amen.” Even the simplest Christian can respond to this outcry: “Prove to me that this chanting is contrary to the Word of God, then I too will call it ‘Roman Catholic’ and have nothing more to do with it. However, you cannot prove this to me.” If you insist upon calling every element in the divine service “Romish” that has been used by the Roman Catholic Church, it must follow that the reading of the Epistle and Gospel is also “Romish.” Indeed, it is mischief to sing or preach in church, for the Roman Church has done this also...

Those who cry out should remember that the Roman Catholic Church possesses every beautiful song of the old orthodox church. The chants and antiphons and responses were brought into the church long before the false teachings of Rome crept in. This Christian Church since the beginning, even in the Old Testament, has derived great joy from chanting... For more than 1700 years orthodox Christians have participated joyfully in the divine service. Should we, today, carry on by saying that such joyful participation is “Roman Catholic”? God forbid! (Walther L, 163)

To be sure, instruction was needed for those who incorrectly thought that some or many of the historic Christian customs that had traditionally been embraced and followed by Lutherans are distinctively Roman Catholic. Walther noted that

It is truly distressing that many of our fellow Christians find the difference between Lutheranism and Roman Catholicism in outward things. It is a pity and dreadful cowardice when a person sacrifices the good ancient church customs to please the deluded American denominations just so they won't accuse us of being Roman

Catholic! Indeed! Am I to be afraid of a Methodist, who perverts the saving Word, or be ashamed in the matter of my good cause, and not rather rejoice that they can tell by our ceremonies that I do not belong to them? (Walther EC, I:194)

But to Walther the pastor, this instruction, and this restoration, were worth the effort, since

It creates a solemn impression on the Christian mind when one is reminded by the solemnity of the divine service that one is in the house of God where the children of God, in childlike love to their heavenly Father, also give expression to their joy in such a lovely manner. ...the Lutheran liturgy distinguishes Lutheran worship from the worship of other churches to such an extent that the houses of worship of the latter look like lecture halls in which the hearers are merely addressed or instructed, while our churches are in truth houses of prayer in which Christians serve the great God publicly before the world. (Walther EC, I:194)

Similar concerns and warnings were expressed and issued from among the Norwegian Lutherans in America, in 1916, specifically in regard to the kind of hymns that young people should be taught, and that should be sung by all Lutherans in the Lutheran Church:

The songs of Lutheran children and youth should be essentially from Lutheran sources. The Lutheran Church is especially rich in songs and hymns of sound doctrine, high poetical value and fitting musical setting. They express the teachings and spirit of the Lutheran Church and help one to feel at home in this Church. Of course, there are songs of high merit and sound Biblical doctrine written by Christians in other denominations also, and some of these could and should find a place in a Lutheran song treasury. But the bulk of the songs in a Lutheran song book should be drawn from Lutheran sources. We should teach our children to remain in the Lutheran Church instead of to sing themselves into some Reformed sect. (LHJ)

Another area where the principles of Christian freedom and *adiaphora*, and the need to make a clear confession, can be applied, is in how a church body or congregation is named or described. This also can be considered on the basis of an illustrative example from history.

A Lutheran movement emerged and took root in Antwerp, in what is now Belgium, in the middle part of the sixteenth century. Anabaptists and Calvinists were also present in this officially Roman Catholic city. The Roman Catholic authorities and population did not, however, make any distinctions among these dissenting groups. They were all referred to, disdainfully, as “Lutherans.” In this context, those who were *actually* Lutheran did not use the term “Lutheran” to describe themselves. They wanted to distinguish themselves not only from the Romanists but also from the Reformed and the sectarians. So in Antwerp, in the sixteenth century, the Lutherans referred to themselves as “Martinists.”

A limited tolerance, and permission to organize congregations and conduct public worship, were granted to the Martinists and the Reformed of Antwerp in 1566. The Martinists then set themselves apart from the other groups also in how they held their services:

When the Martinists began public worship, their Calvinist neighbors...were offended... that there were services on Saints’ days. ... Although the Calvinists had not yet got around to serving Holy Communion, they were displeased that the Martinists scheduled it every Sunday. They did not like it that the “vleescheters” (flesh-eaters) and “bloetdrinkers” (blood-drinkers), as they called the Lutherans, knelt to receive it. (Olson, 103)

After a while the Lutheran Church as a whole – across Europe – settled on the name “Evangelical Church” to identify itself in the larger world of Christendom. Yet sometimes

that “Evangelical” name was hijacked by Anabaptist sectarians. The Formula of Concord observed that such

factions and sects...insinuated themselves...into those places...where the pure Word of the holy Gospel was allowed neither room nor scope, where the true teachers and confessors of the Gospel were being persecuted, where the profound darkness of the papacy still reigned, and where the poor, simple people, who were forced into contact with the open idolatry and false beliefs of the papacy, unfortunately accepted in their innocence what called itself evangelical and was not papistic.

The Concordists therefore stated that “We have not been able to refrain from witnessing publicly before all Christendom that we have no part or share in their errors” (SD XII:7-8, Tappert). At the same time, the Concordists still described their own Formula of Concord – together with the other Lutheran Confessions which the Formula endorsed – as a “universally accepted, certain, and common form of doctrine which all our Evangelical churches subscribe” (SD R&N:10, Tappert). They did not abandon a good term, just because a few fringe elements were misusing it.

But when the Reformed – on a much larger scale – began referring to themselves *also* as the “Evangelical Church,” the Lutherans did then modify their way of describing their own churches, so as to distance themselves from Calvinism. Most adopted the term “Evangelical-Lutheran Church,” which was then sometimes shortened to “Lutheran Church.” Others, especially in eastern Europe, adopted the name “Evangelical Church of the Augsburg Confession.” But in all these cases, with whichever option was chosen, the Lutherans wanted to make sure that their churches would not be confused with false-teaching churches. When “Evangelical Church,” without qualifiers, had come to be seen by many as a term for a Calvinist church, or for a church that did not consider the differences between Lutheranism and Calvinism to be significant and divisive, then the orthodox Lutherans stopped using that term. And they never went back to it, especially when “Evangelical Church” became the official name of the church of the Prussian Union in the nineteenth century.

Also in the nineteenth century, in the United States, the more consistently Confessional Lutheran church bodies did not want to be confused with the General Synod type of “American Lutheranism” that had been advocated by Samuel Simon Schmucker and others. Writers from the more conservative midwest-based synods sometimes spoke critically of “the *so-called* Evangelical Lutheran General Synod.” But those conservative Lutherans did not abandon the names “Evangelical-Lutheran Church” or “Lutheran Church” for themselves and for their congregations, just because those names had come to be associated with some very un-Lutheran teachings and practices in General Synod circles. They did explain what real Lutheranism is, however, and through those explanations they clearly distanced themselves from the General Synod.

Does this history speak to the circumstances in which Confessional Lutherans find themselves in twenty-first century America? Indeed it does! It is true now, as it was true in the past, that Lutheran churches should employ recognizably Lutheran rites and ceremonies in their worship, and should not imitate the rites and ceremonies of the sectarian churches that surround them. For the sake of fraternal love and harmony, for the sake of a clear confession of the whole truth of God, and for the sake of instilling the faith of the church into the minds and hearts of worshipers, congregations of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod in particular should follow the counsel of Chapter I of the ELS bylaws whenever it is possible to do so:

In order to preserve unity in liturgical forms and ceremonies, the synod recommends to its congregations that they use the Order of Worship based on the Danish-Norwegian liturgy of 1685 and agenda of 1688, or the Common Order of Worship [the Common Service], as each congregation may decide.

It is also true now, as it was true in the past, that in a Lutheran worship service the singing of hymns with a Lutheran origin – which more clearly teach Biblical doctrine, and which more fully reflect and exude a Christ-centered piety oriented toward the means of grace – should predominate over the singing of weaker hymns with a different origin. Again, for the sake of fraternal love and harmony, for the sake of a clear confession of the whole truth of God, and for the sake of instilling the faith of the church into the minds and hearts of worshipers, congregations of the ELS should make regular use of the sound and suitable hymns that are available in the pages of the synod’s approved hymnal, the *Evangelical Lutheran Hymnary*, whenever it is possible to do so. Songs from sectarian sources that are designed to manipulate the will and the emotions, to implement the Arminian doctrine of conversion and faith, and to create a false sensation of closeness to God through the music of the song (rather than to teach the faith through the words of the song), are especially to be avoided by Lutherans of *all* synods.

And it is true now, just as it was true in the past, that a Lutheran church should identify itself publicly *as a Lutheran church*, and should not imitate the familiar naming patterns of non-denominational Evangelical Protestantism. How could a church that employs such a tactic avoid the accusation that it is acting in a dishonest and deceptive manner in the way it represents itself to its community? It is understandable if a conservative Lutheran church would want to distance itself from the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and from the liberal doctrinal and moral errors of the ELCA, in a region where the ELCA has a significant presence – so that the term “Lutheran” is associated with the ELCA in the minds of many in that region. But a conservative Lutheran church must not then make itself appear to be cozying up to the *sectarian* churches that also dot the religious landscape of the country, and to the *enthusiast* and *rationalist* errors of *those* churches.

Embracing the terms “Martinist Church” or “Church of the Augsburg Confession” as substitutes for “Lutheran Church” would likely be too confusing or too cumbersome in our day. But instead of simply dropping the word “Lutheran” from the church’s name, a clarifying phrase can be added. On signs and in digital and print media, below the name of the church, the phrase “a Confessional Lutheran congregation” can be inserted. Or the example of an Arizona congregation of the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod – named *Trinity Orthodox Lutheran Church* – can be followed. That congregation is not known *only* as *Trinity Lutheran Church*, but it is also not known as “Trinity Christian Fellowship” or as “Trinity Evangelical Ministries!”

Visitors or prospects who are unfamiliar with Lutheranism, or with Christianity in general, will certainly need to have the meaning of terms like “Confessional” and “orthodox” explained to them. The purpose and benefits of worshiping according to a liturgical order of service, and the purpose and benefits of singing dignified hymns with substantial doctrinal content, will likewise need to be explained to them. Such conversations would actually be good opportunities for teaching and building relationships. And such conversations would not be as challenging as would be the need, eventually, to explain to visitors or prospects the reasons why a church that they had been led to believe was a baptistic Evangelical church, is really a Lutheran church in disguise; and the reasons why they should not feel that they had been lured into that church through a duplicitous bait-and-switch scheme.

Also, if conservative members of an ELCA congregation leave their church because of its apostasy, we would hope that they would then look for a conservative Lutheran alternative in their community. They would already know by their experience that there are liberals who call themselves “Lutheran” even though they no longer are. But they would not expect those who *are* still Lutheran to stop identifying themselves as such, and thereby to make themselves hard to find for people who are searching for a genuine Lutheran church.

The instruction and warnings of Paul E. Kretzmann need to be taken to heart, as he explains what kinds of things are matters of *adiaphora*, and what kinds of things are not:

Divine worship in the Christian Church is not an *adiaphoron*. The Lord expressly commands that His Word be heard, John 8, 47. He has only severe censure for those who forsake the Christian assemblies, Hebrews 10, 25. He expressly enjoins public prayer, 1 Timothy 2, 1. 2. 8. He graciously promises His divine presence at such assemblies, Matthew 18, 20. He records with approval the public services of the early Christians, Acts 2, 42-47. But though He has prescribed the *general* content of public worship, though He is present in the sacramental acts of divine service, declaring and appropriating to the believers the means of grace, and though He graciously receives the sacrificial acts of the assembled congregation, in confession and prayer and offerings, He has not commanded a definite form or order of divine service. It is a matter of Christian liberty whether a congregation wishes one or many prayers, one or several hymns, one or two sermons or homilies, whether the chief assembly be held in the morning or in the evening, whether the service be held on Sunday or on a ferial day.

To argue from these facts, however, that it is a matter of complete indifference as to how the form of Christian worship is constituted would be bringing liberty dangerously near to license. The Lord says: "Let all things be done decently and in order," 1 Cor. 14, 40; and again: "Let all things be done for edification," v. 26. It cannot really be a matter of indifference to a Christian congregation when the order of service used in her midst shows so much similarity to a heterodox order as to confuse visitors. One may hardly argue that such *adiaphora* do not matter one way or the other... And a Lutheran congregation cannot justly divorce herself, not only not from the doctrinal, but also not from the historical side of its Church. (Kretzmann, 395-96)

The instruction and encouragement of John Schaller likewise need to be taken to heart, as he speaks specifically to the unique challenges and opportunities of Lutheran home missions:

The first care, then, of...pastors and laymen alike, ought ever to be that they steadfastly adhere to the biblical doctrine in all its parts. Lutheran hymns, Lutheran liturgies, Lutheran prayers, above all Lutheran sermons ought to be heard wherever our missionary work is carried on. True Lutheranism need not fear any criticism. It has stood the test of centuries, and no modern weapon of offence will subvert it. It is an impregnable fortress. Be not afraid, then, to show its beauties to all who come to hear. They expect to be treated to something new in our churches, and they ought not to be disappointed.

To follow the example set by sectarian clergymen, to sermonize on anything else rather than upon questions of doctrine, or to fill the hearers' ears with weak generalizations and pasture them on fine, poetic language alone, would be worse than folly. To make a good impression, to effect some real, living good, solid meat must be offered, which alone can satisfy the soul's desires. Emphasize doctrine, if you would accomplish your aim. Else why should we expend money and labor, only to do what others may do as well? ... Having laid a good foundation, we may hope to build up congregations [that are] really Lutheran. Having sown good, living seed, we may look forward to a rich harvest. (Schaller, 58)

David Jay Webber

April 2, 2025

(slightly revised October 22, 2025)

This essay was delivered at the Evangelical Lutheran Synod Circuit Visitors Conference in Eagan, Minnesota, on September 11, 2025.

CITED SOURCES

- Belgum: Gerhard Lee Belgum, *The Old Norwegian Synod in America* (1957).
- ESV: *The Holy Bible, English Standard Version*, copyright 2001 by Crossway Bibles (a division of Good News Publishers).
- Guenther: Martin Guenther, book review of *Church Liturgy for Evangelical Lutheran Congregations of the Unaltered Augsburg Confession*, *The St. Louis Theological Monthly* 1: 4 (August 1881).
- Kolb/Wengert: *The Book of Concord: The Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*, edited by Robert Kolb and Timothy J. Wengert (Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 2000).
- Kretzmann: Paul E. Kretzmann, *Christian Art in the Place and in the Form of Lutheran Worship* (Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1921).
- LHJ: *Lutheran Hymnary, Junior* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1916).
- Olson: Oliver K. Olson, "The Rise and Fall of the Antwerp Martinists," *Lutheran Quarterly* I:1 (new series) (Spring 1987).
- Schaller: John Schaller, "Danger Ahead!" , *Lutheran Witness* 10:8 (September 21, 1891).
- Severinsen: Peder Severinsen, *The Proper Communion Vestments* (trans. by J. Madsen) (1924).
- Spaeth: Adolph Spaeth, *Charles Porterfield Krauth*, 2 vols. (New York: The Christian Literature Company, 1898-1909).
- Tappert: *The Book of Concord: The Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*, edited by Theodore G. Tappert (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1959).
- Walther DOLLR: Carl Ferdinand Wilhelm Walther, "Does Old Lutheranism Lead to Rome?," *Missouri Synod in Formation: Essays of the Founding Fathers (1844-'47)* (trans. by Joel R. Baseley) (Dearborn, Michigan: Mark V Publications, 2012).
- Walther EC: Carl Ferdinand Wilhelm Walther, *Essays for the Church*, 2 vols. (Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1992).
- Walther L: Carl Ferdinand Wilhelm Walther, "Ob denn die Wechselgesaenge in unserem Evangelisch-Lutherischen Gottesdienste wirklich roemisch-katolisch seien?" ["Is the Chanting in the Evangelical Lutheran Church Really Roman Catholic?"], *Der Lutheraner* 9: 24 (July 19, 1853).