

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

'Verba Testamenti'

versus Canon: the radical nature of Luther's liturgical reform

ROBIN A. LEAVER

In liturgical matters Luther is frequently referred to as an inept, inconsistent and conservative Reformer who was conditioned more by late medieval thought than by primitive Christianity. The criticism centres on his wholesale rejection of the Canon of the mass, the Eucharistic Prayer. For example, in his *Formula Missae* of 1523 he writes: 'From here on [i.e., from the offertory] almost everything smacks and savours of sacrifice. And the words of life and salvation [i.e., the Words of Institution] are imbedded in the midst of it all, just as the ark of the Lord once stood in the idol's temple next to Dagon. . . . Let us, therefore, repudiate everything that smacks of sacrifice, together with the entire Canon and retain only that which is pure and holy.'¹ And Luther consistently works this out in both the *Formula Missae* and the *Deutsche Messe* of 1525/26: the *Verba Testamenti*, the Words of Institution, are given an isolated prominence with neither anamnesis nor epiclesis. The Preface is retained, although kept distinct from the *Verba* by an appropriate pause,² and the Sanctus is to be sung during the distribution.³ Hans-Christoph Schmidt-Lauber characterizes this as a 'false development' derived from Luther's theology of consecration, which has its roots in medieval thinking.⁴ Frank C. Senn comes to a similar conclusion: 'The truncating of the Canon, therefore, is the most serious defect of Luther's eucharistic revision. . . . Whatever defects we may find in Luther's liturgical work, they were primarily medieval defects.'⁵ W. D. Maxwell describes Luther's treatment of the Canon as 'negative, illogical, and subversive',⁶ and Gregory Dix dismisses the German Reformer as being unconcerned with liturgical origins, and content only to solve contemporary problems of worship in Wittenberg.⁷ All these scholars—and there are others as well—make their judgement with the wisdom of hindsight, and it is both unfair and unhistorical to do so without investigating Luther's own motives for his liturgical reforms.

If one approaches these reforms of his from the point of view of comparative liturgiology, then only one conclusion can be drawn, and that is that Luther *was* inept, inconsistent and conservative. However, in a recently published, valuable and timely study, Bryan Spinks has looked again at Luther's liturgical reforms and the criticisms of them from the comparative liturgiology standpoint.⁸ He demonstrates that

much of this criticism levelled at Luther owes its origin to Yngve Brilioth's *Eucharistic Faith and Practice: Evangelical and Catholic*, which was issued in A. G. Hebert's translation in 1930. As Spinks makes clear, Brilioth came to his conclusions from questionable premises.⁹ Nevertheless, other scholars have accepted Brilioth's conclusions—that Luther's work was conservative, unclear and without any constructive thought—but without examining Brilioth's premises. 'It is clear—from phraseology, footnotes, and bibliography—that Brilioth has passed on certain conclusions about Luther's work. . . . Simply to repeat his views without reference to his criteria, and to present them as established conclusions of liturgical scholarship, is highly misleading.'¹⁰

To understand Luther's liturgical reforms, it is necessary to evaluate them from the standpoint of his own liturgical thinking and his reforming work in general. It is this contemporary, theological context, which has been neglected by many scholars, that Spinks reviews. His conclusions are quite different from the widely-held Brilioth-inspired position, and reinforce another but more authentic understanding of Luther's liturgical reforms.¹¹

Luther may not have been the systematic theologian that Calvin was, but that is not to suggest that his theological thinking was a disjointed collection of half-formed ideas and opinions. Certainly Luther wrote a great deal about many disparate things, but there is an incredible unity in the diversity of his theological thought. The touchstone of this unity is his understanding of the doctrine of justification by faith alone. For Luther, the heart of the gospel is at the heart of every question of theology and every practical concern. As I have written elsewhere: 'It was not that Luther was first upset by abuses in the church and as he began to tackle them discovered the gospel. No. At the beginning it was the personal problem expressed in the biblical question, "What must I do to be saved?"', and not until Luther received the biblical answer, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ",¹² did he go on to tackle church problems.'¹³ As with other questions, Luther's starting-point for the question of liturgical reform was the doctrine of justification.¹⁴ At the beginning of 1530, Luther wrote to the pastors in Lübeck advising them on how they should reform the church life of the city:

We . . . both beg and urge you most earnestly not to deal first with changes in the ritual, which changes are dangerous, but to deal with them later. You should deal first with the centre of our teaching and fix in the people's minds what they must know about our justification: that is, that it is an extrinsic righteousness—indeed it is Christ's—given to us through faith which comes by grace to those who are first terrified by the law and who, struck by the consciousness of their sins, ardently seek redemption. . . . Adequate reform of ungodly rites will come of itself, however, as soon as the fundamentals of our teaching, having been successfully communicated, have taken root in devout hearts. These devout people will at once

recognize what a great abomination and blasphemy that papistic idol is, namely, the mass and the other abuses of the sacrament, so that it is not necessary to fish in front of the net, that is, first to tear down the ritual before the righteousness of faith is understood.¹⁵

It was not innate conservatism but theological radicalism which lay behind Luther's approach to liturgical reform. This was neither understood by W. D. Maxwell, who thought that Luther's 'Protestant thunder' had been neutralized by his retention, in the *Formula Missae*, of the Latin language, most of the ceremonial, lights, incense, and vestments;¹⁶ nor by Carlstadt, whose attempts at liturgical reform in Wittenberg were reversed by Luther in 1522.¹⁷ Both failed to appreciate that for Luther the prior requirement for liturgical reform was the preaching and teaching of the doctrine of justification, and until that had been adequately done, few changes in the ritual and ceremony should be made. However, the situation should be tolerated only until the preaching of the gospel has revealed the 'abominations', which can then be completely removed.¹⁸ It is clear that the 'abominations' Luther refers to are those of the Canon of the mass which speak in the language of sacrifice.¹⁹

Here is revealed Luther's theological and antithetical understanding of the mass. Whereas the Roman Church spoke of the mass in terms of *sacrificium, opus bonum, meritum*—supremely expressed in the Eucharistic Canon—Luther spoke in terms of *beneficium, testamentum, donum*, which are clearly presented in the proclamation of *Verba Testamenti* alone.²⁰ And this difference was no mere semantic illusion but a theological reality. The movement of the mass in traditional thinking was from man, who brings a gift to God, but for Luther the movement is entirely the other way: God's gift is brought to man. In his *Admonition Concerning the Sacrament* (1530), Luther wrote:

The art of doing this is set forth briefly and surely in these words: 'Do this in remembrance of me.' Learn to remember him... by preaching, praising, honouring, listening, and giving thanks for grace revealed in Christ. If you do that... you have given nothing to God, nor are you able to, but that you have and receive each and everything from him, particularly eternal life and infinite righteousness of Christ... For this is the true God who gives and does not receive, who helps and does not let himself be helped... in short, he does and gives everything, and he has the need of no one; he does all things freely out of pure grace without merit, for the unworthy and undeserving, yes, for the damned and lost. This kind of remembrance, confession and glory he desires to have.²¹

For Luther, therefore, at any celebration of the mass, the work of God in Christ must be given prominence in proclamation and action. The proclamation is given in the Lord's own Words of Institution, with the repeated 'for you'; the action is in the distribution of bread and

Churchman

wine to the whole congregation, which is the demonstration of the 'for you' proclamation. This 'for you' aspect lies at the heart of Luther's understanding of the doctrine of justification, and therefore is also at the centre of his thinking about the Lord's Supper:

These words, OUR, US, FOR US, must be written in letters of gold. He who does not believe this is not a Christian.²²

Therefore read these words 'me' and 'for me' with great emphasis, and accustom yourself to accepting this 'me' with a sure faith and applying it to yourself. . . . Christ did not love only Peter and Paul and give himself for them, but the same grace belongs and comes to us as to them; therefore we are included in this 'me'.²³

It is for this reason that the *Verba Testamenti* are for Luther the essence of the Lord's Supper. In his *Treatise on Good Works* (1520), he writes:

It is necessary that we attend with our hearts also; and we do attend when we exercise faith in our hearts. Here we must listen to the words of Christ when he institutes the mass and says, 'Take, eat; this is my body, which is given for you.' In like manner he says over the cup, 'Take it and all of you drink of it: this is a new everlasting testament in my blood, which is shed for you and for many for the remission of sins. Do this as oft as you do it, in remembrance of me.'²⁴ In these words Christ has made a memorial or anniversary. . . . To it he has added a wonderful, rich, great testament in which are bequeathed and distributed not interest, money, or temporal possessions, but the forgiveness of sins, grace and mercy unto eternal life. . . . He died with the intent that this testament become permanent and irrevocable.²⁵

But here Luther is not conservatively hanging on to the remnant of the medieval understanding of consecration, but radically exposing the doctrine of justification as it is expressed in the Saviour's own words. He would answer those who would charge him of not being primitive enough in his liturgical thinking by saying that the tradition of Jesus is more primitive than the tradition of Hippolytus, or whoever:

When Christ himself first instituted this sacrament and held the first mass, there was no tonsure, no chasuble, no singing, no pageantry, but only thanksgiving to God and the use of the sacrament. According to this same simplicity the apostles and all Christians for a long time held mass, until there arose the various forms and additions, by which the Romans held mass one way, the Greeks another. And now it has finally come to this: the chief thing in the mass has been forgotten [i.e. the *Verba Testamenti*], and nothing is remembered except the additions of men! Now 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.²⁶

Thus anything which would undermine, obscure and nullify these *Verba* is to be removed, and in practice that meant virtually the whole of the Canon apart from the essential *Verba Testamenti*. Luther's understanding of these Words of Institution is that they are not words to be uttered in prayer to God, but rather words to be spoken to the attending congregation.²⁷ They are therefore no longer to be kept inaudible by whispering priests, but spoken loud and clear so that all should hear,²⁸ and in the vernacular so that all should understand.²⁹ Indeed, Luther went further and expressed his view, in the *Formula Missae*, that the *Verba Testamenti* should be *sung*.³⁰ A few years later he provided the necessary chant for these words in his *Deutsche Messe*.³¹ And, as Luther viewed the *Verba Testamenti* as proclamation from God rather than prayer to God, he favoured the so-called westward position with the priest facing the people.³²

The consequences of Luther's theological understanding of the essential proclamatory nature of the *Verba Testamenti* are that the liturgies of the church which took his name, and its eucharistic theology, were based primarily on biblical rather than liturgical sources. Of course, Luther and those who followed him did not overturn liturgical practices which in their view did not undermine this proclamation of the gospel. But the reasons were in the first place theological, and only in the second place liturgical.

The classic Lutheran theologians followed Luther both in letter and spirit. Martin Chemnitz, in his *magnum opus*, *Examen Concilii Tridentini* (1565–73), speaks thus: 'When Christ was about to die, he instituted the administration and use of the Lord's Supper in the form of a testament. Now it is a great crime to add anything even to a human testament when it has been ratified and confirmed. It is manifest, therefore, what the papalist mass is, which adds to the testament of the Son of God something which is not contained in it, is not instituted, is not prescribed.'³³ David Chytraeus, a colleague of Chemnitz, has a similar thrust in the *prolegomena* to his commentary on Leviticus (1569):

The mass, or Lord's Supper, is Christ's testament, that is, a promise of the remission of sins which was sealed by Christ's death; and it is at the same time the distribution and partaking of the body and blood. That it is not a sacrifice in which we offer Christ's body and blood to God is plainly demonstrated by the Words of Institution, where almost every letter contradicts the fundamental idea of such a sacrifice. Christ broke the bread and gave it to his disciples, saying: 'Take...'; but to receive something from another is not to offer and sacrifice it to the one who is giving. ... Then Christ says: 'This is my body, which is given for you. This is my blood which is shed for you for the remission of sins.' It is evident that these words are words of promise by which God offers and imparts his benefits to us. ... Now a promise (by which God confers his benefits upon us) is utterly in conflict with a sacrifice (in which we ourselves offer something of our own to God). ... From these *Verba* handed down

Churchman

by Christ we conclude most unmistakably that in the mass, or Lord's Supper, Christ's body and blood are not offered to God either as a propitiatory sacrifice or as a eucharistic sacrifice but are given and presented by God through a minister and are only taken and received by us.³⁴

But it was not only Lutheran theology but also Lutheran practice to centre the Lord's Supper in the *Verba Testamenti*. Virtually all the sixteenth-century Lutheran liturgies replace the Canon by the Words of Institution.³⁵ There are but two exceptions out of the many church orders of the period which have anything like a Eucharistic Prayer: the liturgy for Pfalz-Neuberg (1543) and the Swedish order of 1576³⁶—but both are untypical in Lutheran tradition.³⁷ Luther's understanding of the *Verba Testamenti*, as proclamation to the people of God, is also reflected in the Reformed liturgies of, for example, Zwingli and Bucer.³⁸

It is only in fairly recent times that a Eucharistic Prayer has been introduced into Lutheran liturgies. One cannot help but observe that at the same time as there has been this growing interest in a Eucharistic Prayer within Lutheranism, there has been a corresponding decline in the understanding of the doctrine of justification as the central and controlling principle in theological matters. It is therefore not surprising to find that Luther is misunderstood and reinterpreted. Thus, for example, the American *Lutheran Book of Worship* gives in parallel columns the alternatives of a Eucharistic Prayer and the Words of Institution.³⁹ There is a theological inconsistency here, which has not gone unnoticed,⁴⁰ in that, on the one hand there is a prayer addressed to God, in accordance to accepted liturgical tradition; and, on the other hand there is a proclamation from God, which follows the theology and practice of Luther. It may well be a widely-held contemporary view that the essence of the Lord's Supper is to be found in a Eucharistic Prayer, but to charge Luther with inconsistency simply because he took a different point of view is neither objective nor fair. Luther was totally consistent in applying the doctrine of justification as the controlling principle to liturgical as well as to all other theological and practical questions.⁴¹ In the Lord's Supper is the offer of forgiveness and grace, and this proclamation of the gospel is enshrined in the *Verba Testamenti*, which are not to be obscured by the addition of man-made traditions, nor confused by making them into a God-directed prayer. Thus, as Spinks rightly concludes, 'words such as "conservative", "pruning-knife" or "hatchet-job", are completely inadequate, and even misleading. Far from being a conservative and unimaginative liturgiologist, Luther was in fact giving radical liturgical expression to justification by faith, and deserves to be regarded as a serious Reformation liturgist.'⁴²

THE REVD ROBIN A. LEAVER is Associate Librarian of Latimer House and Minister of Cogges, Witney, Oxon.

NOTES

- 1 *Luther's Works*, 54 vols (Fortress Press and Concordia, Philadelphia and St Louis 1955- [hereafter cited as *LW*]), 53, p.26.
- 2 *ibid.*, p.28.
- 3 *ibid.*, pp.28 and 81f.
- 4 H.-C. Schmidt-Lauber, *Die Eucharistie als Entfaltung der Verba Testamenti* (Kassel 1957), pp.102ff. and 144ff.
- 5 F. C. Senn, 'Martin Luther's Revision of the Eucharistic Canon in the *Formula Missae* of 1523', *Concordia Theological Monthly*, 44, 1973, p.118. 'It would seem, therefore, that the Lutherans discarded what was most primitive in the eucharistic tradition, namely, the act of thanksgiving, and retained what was secondary' (*ibid.*, p.109; but cf. n.26 below).
- 6 W. D. Maxwell, *An Outline of Christian Worship: Its Development and Forms* (OUP, London 1936), p.77. Maxwell adds: 'By an indefensible innovation he attaches the Words of Institution to the Preface.' But Luther did not so much 'attach' as 'detach' the *Verba* from the Preface; see n.2 above.
- 7 G. Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy* (Dacre Press, London 1945), pp.629ff.
- 8 B. Spinks, *Luther's Liturgical Criteria and his Reform of the Canon of the Mass*, Grove Liturgical Study 30 (Grove Books, Bramcote 1982).
- 9 *ibid.*, pp.11-14.
- 10 *ibid.*, p.14.
- 11 As well as Spinks, *op. cit.*, and the literature cited there (especially V. Vajda, *Die Theologie des Gottesdienst bei Luther* [Göttingen 1954], and its English translation, by U. S. Leupold, *Luther on Worship: An Introduction* [Fortress Press, Philadelphia 1958], which is unfortunately abridged), see also A. Allwohn, *Gottesdienst und Rechtfertigungsglaube: Luthers Grundlegung evangelischer Liturgik bis zum Jahre 1523* (Göttingen 1926); T. Knolle, 'Luthers Deutsche Messe und die Rechtfertigungslehre', *Luther Jahrbuch*, 1928, pp.170-203; and the summary, largely based on Vajda, in G. Hahn, *Evangelium als literarische Anweisung: Zu Luthers Stellung in der Gerschichte des deutschen kirchlichen Liedes* (München 1981), pp.49-60.
- 12 See Acts 16:30-31.
- 13 R. A. Leaver, *Luther on Justification* (Concordia, St Louis 1975), p.13.
- 14 'The first and chief article is this, that Jesus Christ, our God and Lord, "was put to death for our trespasses and raised again for our justification" (Rom. 4:25). . . . Nothing in this article can be given up or compromised. . . . On this article rests all that we teach and practice against the pope, the devil and the world. Therefore we must be quite certain and have no doubts about it. Otherwise all is lost, and the pope, the devil, and all our adversaries will gain the victory. The mass in the papacy must be regarded as the greatest and most horrible abomination because it runs into direct and violent conflict with this fundamental article. . . . The mass is and can be nothing else than a human work, even a work of scoundrels (as the Canon and all the books on the subject declare), for by means of the mass men try to reconcile themselves and others to God and obtain and merit grace and the forgiveness of sins. . . . Therefore it [i.e., the Canon] should be condemned and must be abolished because it is a direct contradiction to the fundamental article [i.e., of justification], which asserts that it is not the celebrant of a mass and what he does but the Lamb of God and the Son of God who takes away our sin' (*Schmalcald Articles* [1537], *The Book of Concord*, translated and edited by T. G. Tappert [Fortress Press, Philadelphia 1959], pp.292f. and 293f.).
- 15 *LW*, 49, p.263.
- 16 Maxwell, *loc. cit.*
- 17 Luther returned from Wartburg to bring order out of the chaos created by Carlstadt's iconoclastic reforms; he preached eight pastoral sermons in the course of a week. In one he said: 'The mass is an evil thing, and God is displeased with it, because it is performed as if it were a sacrifice and work of merit. Therefore it must be abolished. . . . and only the ordinary evangelical mass be retained. . . . It should be preached and taught

Churchman

with tongue and pen that to hold mass in such a manner is sinful, and yet no one should be dragged away from it by the hair; for it should be left to God, and his Word should be allowed to work alone, without our work and interference. Why? Because it is not in my power or hand to fashion the hearts of men. . . . I can get no further than their ears; their hearts I cannot reach. And since I cannot pour faith into their hearts, I cannot, nor should I, force anyone to have faith. That is God's work alone, who causes faith to live in the heart. . . . We should preach the Word, but the results must be left solely to God's good pleasure' (LW, 51, pp.75f.).

- 18 *Formula Missae* (1523), LW, 53, p.22. This was not only theory but also Luther's practice; he had preached the gospel for years in Wittenberg before introducing this Reformed liturgy.
- 19 Luther had been consistently speaking against the sacrifice of the mass in such writings as *A Treatise on the New Testament, that is, the Holy Mass* (1520), LW, 35, pp.79–111; *The Babylonian Captivity of the Church* (1520), LW, 36, pp.11–126; and *The Misuse of the Mass* (1521), *ibid.*, pp.162–98.
- 20 On *Beneficium* and *Sacrificium*, see Vajda, ET, pp.27–63.
- 21 LW, 38, p.107.
- 22 *Lectures on Isaiah* (1527–30), LW, 17, p.221.
- 23 *Lectures on Galatians* (1535), LW, 26, p.179; see *Theses Concerning Faith and Law* (1535), LW, 34, p.110; and also n.28 below. For this 'for you' aspect in Lutheran worship, see P. Brunner, *Worship in the Name of Jesus*, translated by M. H. Bertram (Concordia, St Louis 1968), pp.91, 165 and *passim*.
- 24 cf. Matt. 26:26–28; Luke 22:17–19; 1 Cor. 11:23–24.
- 25 LW, 44, pp.55f.
- 26 *A Treatise on the New Testament, that is, the Holy Mass* (1520), LW, 35, p.81.
- 27 The recitation of these words is not focused on the elements of bread and wine so much as on the people who are to receive them. 'The words of the Supper: "He said, "Take, eat; do this"', etc., are directed not to the elements but to those who are about to commune' (M. Chemnitz, *Examination of the Council of Trent, Part II*, translated by F. Kramer [Concordia, St Louis 1978], p.311); cp. Peter Martyr: 'the words of the Supper pertain rather to men than either to bread or to wine' (quoted in J. C. McLelland, *The Visible Words of God: An Exposition of the Sacramental Theology of Peter Martyr Vermigli AD 1500-1562* [Oliver and Boyd, Edinburgh 1957], p.30).
- 28 See *The Abomination of the Secret Mass* (1525), LW, 36, pp.311–28. 'In the first place, let us pay no heed to . . . those foolish people [who] have invented and persuaded the whole world to believe . . . that the words of consecration have been kept secret and their use and knowledge entrusted to no one but the priests. . . . These words, after all, should fittingly have been common knowledge to all people, because faith, consolation and salvation of all people is contained in them' (*The Misuse of the Mass* [1521], *ibid.*, p.164). 'The whole power of the mass consists of the words of Christ, in which he testifies that forgiveness of sins is bestowed on all those who believe that his body is given and his blood poured out for them. This is why nothing is more important for those who go to hear mass than to ponder these words diligently and in full faith. Unless they do this, all else they do is vain' (*The Babylonian Captivity of the Church* [1520], *ibid.*, p.43).

Luther therefore urged that the *Verba Testamenti* should be memorized by all church people and so included them in his Catechisms of 1529: 'What is the Sacrament of the Altar? Answer: Instituted by Christ himself. . . . Where is this written? Answer: The holy evangelists Matthew, Mark, Luke, and also St Paul, write thus: "Our Lord Jesus Christ, on the night when he was betrayed, took bread" . . . What is the benefit of such eating and drinking? Answer: We are told in the words "for you" and "for the forgiveness of sins". By these words the forgiveness of sins, life, and salvation are given to us in the sacrament, for where there is forgiveness of sins, there are also life and salvation' (*Small Catechism, The Book of Concord*, pp.351f.). In the *Large Catechism* Luther states that what the second sacrament is, what its benefits are, and who is to receive it, 'are established from the words by which Christ instituted it. So everyone

- who wishes to be a Christian and go to the sacrament should be familiar with them. For we do not intend to admit to the sacrament and administer it to those who do not know what they seek or why they come. The words are these . . . ' (ibid., p.447).
- 29 'The priest utters these words [i.e. the *Verba Testamenti*] during mass—would to God that he would shout them loudly so that all could hear them clearly, and, moreover, in the German language' (*Sermon on the Worthy Reception of the Sacrament* [1521], *LW*, 42, p.173).
- 30 'I wish these words of Christ—with a brief pause after the Preface—to be recited in the same tone as the Lord's Prayer is chanted elsewhere' (*LW*, 53, p.28).
- 31 ibid., pp.80–1.
- 32 *Deutsche Messe*, ibid., p.69. Luther never put this into practice.
- 33 Chemnitz, op. cit., p.494; see also M. Chemnitz, *The Lord's Supper* (1570), translated by J. A. O. Preus (Concordia, St Louis 1979), pp.25ff. and *passim*.
- 34 *Chytraeus on Sacrifice: A Reformation Treatise in Biblical Theology*, translated by J. W. Montgomery (Concordia, St Louis 1962), pp.122f. Before these words the reader is directed to 'those richer treatises of Luther: *On the Abrogation of Private Mass* and *The Babylonian Captivity*.'
- 35 L. Fendt, *Der lutherische Gottesdienst des 16. Jahrhunderts* (München 1923), p.94.
- 36 See L. D. Reed, *The Lutheran Liturgy* (Fortress Press, Philadelphia, 1959²), pp.754ff. The Pfaltz-Neuburg church order was largely the work of Osiander and may well have exerted some influence on Cranmer and the 1549 Prayer Book; see J. Dowden, *Further Studies in the Prayer Book* (London 1908), pp.66ff. However, it should be noted that it is not a Reformed Canon as such but rather an independent epiclesis to be said before the *Verba Testamenti*; see A. L. Richter, *Die evangelischen Kirchenordnungen des sechzehnten Jahrhunderts*, Vol. 2 (Weimar 1846), p.28.
- 37 It is significant that Brilioth's critique of Luther was made from a Swedish perspective; so also F. C. Senn (n.5 above), see his 'Liturgia Svecanae Ecclesiae: An attempt at Eucharistic Restoration during the Swedish Reformation', *Studia Liturgica*, 14, 1980/1981, pp.20–36.
- 38 See B. Thompson, *Liturgies of the Western Church* (Collins, Cleveland and New York 1962), pp.154, 177. The influence of Luther is also to be found in the early development of the English Prayer Book. The 1549 Eucharistic Prayer, which was a reduced and reformed version of the Sarum Canon, was in three parts, with the *Verba Testamenti* imbedded within the middle section. The outer sections were deleted from the 1552 Prayer Book, leaving the Words of Institution almost on their own. An interim position is discovered in Marbeck's *booke of Common praier noted* (1550), which introduced an 'Amen' after the first section, and a suitable space before the third section, which serves to highlight the Words of Institution. Marbeck also followed Luther, and the German church orders derived from Luther, by indicating that the Reformed Canon should be sung, albeit in a monotone rather than in a melodic form such as Luther prescribed; see R. A. Leaver, *Marbeck's booke of Common praier noted*, Courtenay Facsimile 3 (Marcham Manor Press, Appleford 1982), pp.70f. Luther, of course, would not have been entirely happy with the 1552 Prayer Book, since the *Verba Testamenti* are set within the context of prayer to God, rather than being presented as God's proclamation of forgiveness and grace in Christ to his believing people.
- 39 *Lutheran Book of Worship* (Augsburg Publishing House, Minneapolis 1978), pp.69f.
- 40 See, for example, P. Rorem, 'Luther's Objection to a Eucharistic Prayer', *The Cresset*, 38, 1978, pp.12–16.
- 41 For example, for a recent discussion of how Luther understood the doctrine of the church from the standpoint of the doctrine of justification, see P. D. L. Avis, *The Church in the Theology of the Reformers* (Marshall Morgan and Scott, London 1981), pp.1–25.
- 42 Spinks, op. cit., p.37.