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Modern Dogma and Liturgical Renewal

Patrick Keifert
Luther Northwestern Theological Seminary, St. Paul, Minnesota

A modern dogma, a set of unquestioned assumptions, makes public conversation regarding worship difficult. This modern dogma, which passes for common sense, relegates all matters religious, especially worship, to private matters of sentiment and taste. Since the contemporary American common sense holds that worship is made up of private values which are not subject to public and rational conversation, we can, at best, share only our irrational values and feelings about it. The result is dreadful. We cannot engage in thoughtful and soulful arguments which change one another's minds regarding these topics. If we cannot intelligently discuss worship in civil society, we cannot respond adequately to new and diverse situations.

This modern dogma affects liturgical renewal. Its acceptance by most Americans leads them to reject ritual as, at best, a curiosity and, at worst, superstition. As a result, much modern American worship is directed to the mind only, either the intellect or the heart, and omits the body. The modern dogma affects liturgical renewers as well. Those liturgical renewers who value ritual and have tried to restore it to contemporary worship have in several cases fallen prey to the same "common sense" which they believe they are fighting. This article briefly describes this modern dogma and its affect on contemporary liturgical renewal.

I. Worship and the Modern Dogma

The distinction between what is and what ought to be, between fact and value, is at the heart of the modern dogma. One of its most prominent proponents, Karl Popper, summarizes the view this way:

It is impossible to derive a sentence stating a norm or a decision from a sentence stating a fact; this is only another way of saying that it is impossible to derive norms or decisions or proposals from facts.

Reality, according to this commonly held view, is divided unequally between facts and values; a very small number of indubitable facts and a very large number of values constitute reality.

1 Much of the material which follows depends heavily upon the work of Wayne C. Booth, especially his delightfully insightful book, Modern Dogma and the Rhetoric of Assent (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974).
2 What follows in this essay is intended to clarify the nature of this challenge. It is a part of a much larger project which seeks to engender a critical conversation designed to nurture a kind of public worship which meets this challenge.
3 Karl Popper, The Open Society and Its Enemies (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1947), 53; Interestingly enough, one of Karl Popper's students, William Warren Bartley III, has completed Popper's argument regarding the developments in theology as this modern dogma has gained acceptance. See his The Retreat to Commitment (London: Open Court, 1984), esp. 35-62.
This modern dogma fosters a debate between a scientismic view and an irrationalist view. The scientismic group favors the factual and portrays the world along the lines of the following two column chart:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientismic</th>
<th>Irrationalist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>BAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>known facts</td>
<td>asserted values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>objectivity</td>
<td>subjectivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reason</td>
<td>faith, prejudice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>science</td>
<td>opinion, rationalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proof</td>
<td>assertion, emotion,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neutral universe</td>
<td>rhetoric, propaganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>empiricism</td>
<td>idealism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The irrationalist, the person who accepts the fact-value split, makes the same distinctions but from the opposite normative point of view favoring values:

Anyone familiar with this debate can continue these lists indefinitely.

One's religious experience and the expression of it, according to this schema, remain for the most part private and a matter of sentiment, nostalgia, or ignorance. Ignorance regarding one's own religious experience and reticence to discuss it in public are the order of the day. There is a high inverse proportion between a person's formal education and their ignorance regarding religious experience and expression.

Nowhere is this more evident than in the area of liturgy. Many Christian ministers, and even more so, parishioners, are woefully ignorant regarding the liturgy. They have modest theological, much less anthropological, sociological, and psychological, understanding of it.

Liturgy, of all the theological disciplines, is placed squarely within the value category according to the modern dogma. Liturgical concerns are just matters of taste, not really important or central to human experience or divine reality, according to the dominant wisdom on liturgy. “To each her own, since liturgy is not subject to public conversation.” Or from the irrationalist flip side of the modernist debate comes a romantic assertion about the divine mystery or a nostalgic repristination of the 4th or the 16th centuries. This is hardly a helpful contribution and too much of liturgical scholarship has taken this route. The teaching of worship, especial-
The challenge to go public requires a major change

ly in most Protestant seminaries, is lodged in the practical department where it runs the risk of reduction to practical techniques. The challenge to go public requires a major change in liturgical scholarship, the teaching and practice of worship.

Liturgical Renewal and the Modern Dogma

Liturgical renewal in this century reflected this modern dogma far more than is generally appreciated. Where the scientism group rejected tradition, ritual, sacred space and time, the liturgical renewers reveled in these same things, only differing on the appropriate century upon which to model their renewal. When the liturgical renewers entered into public argument (the "factual" side), they did so dressed primarily as historians. Since their facts were historical, contemporary use fell on the side of values and taste. The critical portion of their work, then, focused more on the accuracy of their historical work than on the contemporary context within which liturgical renewal needed to take place.

Making the historical into the primary critical moment hampered local ownership of liturgical renewal and caused more conflict within the church membership than was necessary or helpful. While the retrieval of our liturgical heritage was necessary following the Enlightenment, many of the renewers did not adequately distinguish between tradition, "the living faith of the dead," and traditionalism, the "dead faith of the living." Traditionalism obscured the critical force of the gospel to which Jesus calls us and which he embodies. The life, creativity, and sense of local indigenous worship were discouraged.

Four sections follow, three exposit my contention and the fourth summarizes and makes a proposal. I first sketch the three major liturgical renewal currents in twentieth century Lutheranism. Then, second, I describe the effect of the modern dogma upon these currents. Third, I note the surface eddies resulting from these currents and the hidden undercurrent of the modern dogma and give an example of its effect upon one area of contemporary church life.

I. Three Currents in Liturgical Renewal

I have already stated the major undercurrent I wish to trace in twentieth century liturgical renewal, namely the American modern dogma. My colleague, Henry E. Horn, has described three surface currents5 which I am suggesting are

---

4 This is a favorite saying of Jaroslav Pelikan, most recently published in The Vindication of Tradition (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984), 65.
5 My debt to Henry Horn, not only in this article, is insufficiently addressed by a footnote. If the truth were known, he would be a co-author; he, however, has better sense than to put these comments into print.
profoundly directed by this major undercurrent. For easy identification of these currents, imagine that the twentieth century liturgical renewal is a large body of water and, further, that we put some dye into the water to trace its currents.

The first current is marked by red dye; it is red because it is the most influential force in the *Service Book and Hymnal*. The second current is marked by green dye because it is the current most affecting the *Lutheran Book of Worship*. The third current is yellow: it is the folk worship revival of the sixties which died quietly, more or less, in the early seventies, but which in very important ways represents a very strong counter-cultural liturgical renewal. It, also, reveals the more obvious influences of the modern dogma’s effect on liturgical renewal.

Liturgical renewal, which began in Europe, faced a great challenge in restoring physical rituals to American Lutheran worship practice. There was not an organic tradition readily available to the mid-nineteenth century restorers. In order to restore physical ritual, to integrate mind and body, they chose to retrieve the most available heritage which happened to be based upon late medieval worship. The subsequent liturgical renewals in this century also retrieved a previous liturgical practice which was not organically continuous with the contemporary experience. In an overly simplified way, one might think of all three movements, Red, Green, and Yellow as attempts at romantic retrieval.

The argument for the retrieved worship pattern usually took on a romantic tone. As one liturgical scholar put it at the beginning of a session introducing the *Lutheran Book of Worship*, “One must choose one’s century. It is time Lutherans stopped making the sixteenth century their norm and chose the fourth! That is what the LBW does.”

The Red Current

Henry Horn speaks of “the throes of a liturgical movement,” often called “the Philadelphia Movement,” in full swing during his seminary days in the 1930s. This movement, under the leadership of Luther D. Reed, is the Red Current.

This first liturgical renewal current of the twentieth century grew out of the revived historical consciousness in nineteenth century Europe. During the 1840s, in England with the Oxford and Cambridge Movements and in Germany under Wilhelm Loehe, this renewed historical vision fastened on the late middle ages as a sort of ideal time for Christianity. The church then was integrated

---

6 I use LCA and ALC service books for several reasons. Most of my audience is familiar with these. LC—MS Lutherans will recognize in the Red Current most of the characteristics of *The Lutheran Hymnal*, a product of this same liturgical current.

During these times holy space was emphasized.

with culture; this was the time of Christendom. Those in the movement turned toward a recovery of Gothic church buildings. Authorities were set up who would answer questions about vestments, ecclesiastical arts, paraments, and architectural details taken from Gothic plans. During this time holy space was emphasized.

A major force toward Lutheran liturgical recovery was the king of Prussia, Friedrich Wilhelm III, who produced a liturgy for his newly united church. Although the king's liturgy was affected by Restorationism, its major effect for our purposes was the reawakening in Lutheranism that it provoked. Most significant for Americans is the Agenda fur christliche Gemeinden des lutherischen Bekenntnisses by Wilhelm Loehe, published in Noerdlingen (Bavaria) in 1844 primarily for the benefit of Lutheran missions in the Frankenmuth area of Michigan. An English translation, Liturgy for Christian Congregations of the Lutheran Faith appeared in 1902.

Along with Loehe's revival of liturgy came the romantic retrieval of Lutheran Confessionalism under the leadership of Claus Harms (1778-1855). Some of the Lutheran Confessionalists, who opposed the king's church union, would leave for America to escape his power and bring with them the seeds of liturgical reform. Among these are the immigrant groups which founded the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod and the Buffalo Synod.

Along with these recent immigrants, following the Civil War in America, the Southern church of the more established East coast Lutherans began seeking a liturgical renewal through a restorationist policy. Without rehearsing further detail, these forces eventually produced the Common Service of 1888 which became standard by 1917 with the Common Service Book with Hymnal of the ULCA and the English Synod/Evangelical Lutheran Hymn-Book, 1912. This version of the Common Service was slightly revised and issued as The Lutheran Hymnal, 1941.


11 Moving Frontiers, 90-141.

12 Reed, 183f; Muenich, "Restorationism," 15.
The Service Book and Hymnal is also the product of this liturgical renewal. In the words of George Muenich, "(It) does not represent a radical departure from the Common Service, but neither is it simply another, or more refined, restoration liturgy." In fact, in certain places one can begin to see the effects of the second great liturgical renewal movement of the twentieth century, the Green Current. Many of these influences move beyond the Restorationism of either German Lutheranism or medieval liturgy on the eve of the Reformation.

What follows is a simplified description of the Red Current's basic characteristics.

1. The rubrics or general directions were all important. The object was one standard liturgy which was protected by rubrics saying when one shall or may act in certain ways. The shalls protect the integrity of the liturgy; the mays allow for some freedom and experimentation. But many clergy were always confused and stuck to the shalls.

2. There was always clerical leadership in this movement. The laity had only responsive parts in liturgy.

3. The emphasis was on sacred space.

4. Since late medieval worship had a strong individualistic bent, this same individualistic bent fit into the modern period's focus upon the individual. The result for corporate worship was the gathering of individuals who more or less worshiped individually in a public setting.

5. Finally, the general assumption underlying worship in the Red Movement was that worship took place within the idea of Christendom. It was assumed that worship was public; that it was aimed at the whole community rather than the faithful alone.

The Green Current

The Green Current, the second great liturgical renewal movement in the twentieth century, also has its roots in nineteenth century scholarship. However, some basic changes in the world of theology and liturgical thought following the First World War brought the Green Current about; these changes, which I describe as four factors, intensified in the 1930s and 1940s.

The first was the breakthrough in biblical studies. Since the turn of the century, biblical studies have been more and more ecumenical. Especially following Pius XII's encyclical, "Divino Afflante Spiritu," in 1943, the efforts of Catholic biblical scholarship have increased and joined arms with Protestant and, to some extent, Orthodox scholarship.

---

The churches tried to bring their traditions together.

The result of this ecumenical biblical scholarship on liturgical renewal is multifaceted. First, it puts scholars from traditionally anti-liturgical churches in contact with contemporary Catholicism. This eroded many unfounded prejudices previously held by them. Much of the historical retrieval led to a growing appreciation of Christian liturgy as the Christianization of Israel's worship.

Ecumenical work brought traffic from the Far East which affected liturgical renewal as well. Take for example, the ecumenical work of Protestants in South India. Here many denominations, separated by European history, were portraying their separation before Asian converts who did not care about European denominational divisions in their Asian setting. The churches tried to bring their traditions together through a new approach to liturgy, namely, by choosing the early church eucharist as a model. The liturgy of the Church of South India is the result. It was influential in the Green Current among Protestants.

The place of patristic studies in ecumenical liturgical renewal cannot be ignored. Perhaps most significant in this development is the work of Gregory Dix. In his book, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, he set the tone for how liturgists would use patristic scholarship. One passage, in particular, reveals the rather romantic turn this use of patristic scholarship took. He describes the early fourth century liturgy in terms of a Victorian gathering in a wealthy middle-class home. Although he explicitly tries to avoid romanticizing this time period, the tone of this passage is patently romantic. Dix’s tone, as much as anything else in this book, shaped the liturgical renewal of the Green Current.

A third factor in the Green Current is the worker-priest movement. Between and following the two world wars, the Catholic Church of France realized that it had missed contact with the working class. A number of younger priests offered to give themselves, at subsistence pay, to live among the workers, say mass at their factories, and carry on a mission to them where they lived and worked. Thus started about ten years of heroic work. However, it did not go as planned: the workers could not make the cultural jump that the mass demanded, and, as a result, they did not attend. Instead, the priests through their concern for the worker’s lives, made common cause with their grievances and became the vocal proponents of their cause, joining the Communists in their protest. This embarrassed the established church, and the work was terminated. But this effort of work and worship had a profound effect.

---

17 Dix, *Shape*, 142.
on congregations nearby, and social action was tied to a renewal of eucharistic action.\(^{18}\)

Finally, a momentous change had come upon the consciousness of European Christians and on their mission outposts around the world. The nineteenth century produced missionary enthusiasm which counted the whole world as territory for the expansion of the Christian Church. It stirred up so much enthusiasm that a journal was renamed at the turn of the twentieth century predicting *The Christian Century*. Two world wars and the accompanying disillusionment with Western culture, together with the completely unexpected reappearance of world religions in force, brought discontinuity to the idea of a Christendom, a melding of Christ and culture. In place of the Christian century, a very different world evolved, one in which Christians were in the minority and probably would always be so.

The idea of Christians as a permanent minority and the loss of missionary zeal profoundly affected the conception of Christian worship. The emphasis moved from the melding of Christ and culture to significant discontinuity between them. Sunday morning, no longer Christendom at worship, became a small, highly intentional community of the faithful, the people of God. The liturgy became less a public act and more a peculiar act of this small but faithful few. This is, for the purposes of exposition, overdrawing the distinction.

However, the contrast is clearly present between SBH and LBW.

The result of these four factors (biblical studies, ecumenical work, worker-priest movement, and minority consciousness) on the liturgical practice of the church is the Green Current. In the U.S.A., this current built up in the fifties, just when the Red book was coming out, but was too late for major inclusion. A few additions to the Red book, the Deacon's Litany and Eucharistic Prayer, indicate the growing effect of the Green Current. Immediately after the Red book was out, the Commission on Liturgy and the Hymnal (ALC and LCA) invited the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod to join in new work on the liturgy, in order to harness for Lutherans all the experiences taking place around us. When the InterLutheran Commission came together, the model of worship had already changed to that of the early church; the Green Current had arrived.

To keep our discussion parallel, allow me to make some simple characterizations of the Green Current:

1. The Green movement refocuses concern upon the image of the church as the people of God.

---

Holy people replace sacred space.

2. The movement emphasizes a self-consciousness of one's called, baptized state as bringing one into this people.

3. The activity of the laity in worship in leadership and actions is greatly increased, even emphasized.

4. There is, then, a more corporate conception about worship. Worship is thought of as what the people of God do in God's presence.

5. Holy people replace sacred space.

6. Non-verbal, symbolic language comes in with gestures, visible signs, etc.

The Yellow Current

This movement affected Lutheranism primarily through its youth departments, Walther League, Luther League, etc; it also showed itself in campus ministry. Songs were produced with secular tunes popular with youth, which could be used in place of liturgical chants, not so much to replace them but to give a bored younger generation some incentive to join worship.

It worked for some of us. As a teenager in the late sixties, I was attracted to the liturgical renewal which was at the center of both Catholic and some Protestant youth groups in my hometown. It was only natural that when I attended Valparaiso University, I would become active in the experimental liturgies common on that campus in the late sixties and early seventies.

I mentioned the local Catholic parish in passing but the youth liturgical renewal was timed perfectly for the results of the Second Vatican Council. During this time, Catholic parishes were moving from the Latin Mass to a more dialogical and congregationally oriented vernacular service. And at least in several parishes I know, the youth liturgical renewal became its own ecumenical bridge in many Catholic parishes. The Catholics during this time provided what Henry Horn calls, “a folk mass avalanche.” For me, it was more like riding the crest of a wave.

What I could not see then, but what is clear to me now, is that the youth movement was really a new pietism. It majored in small group psychology and methods. The guitar, an intimate, small group instrument, became all pervasive. When amplified with a leader at the mike it imposed a new dictatorship of liturgical action. Small group singing accompanied the guitar. The texts identified with the oppressed as over against the establishment. The movement was certainly opposed to the Red Current which had bored its young worshipers to death. Its relationship with the Green Current is more complicated, for both are basically small group movements in recovering the early church; and it is no accident that campus ministries were the sites of experimentation by both the folk advocates and the experimenters with Inter-Lutheran material.

For better or worse, the youth
The liturgical movement has been swallowed up by time. Nothing passes faster than nostalgia, especially when it is nostalgia for a time and place which the nostalgic never experienced and which, in the eye of the critical historian, probably never existed.

It was more like a child's ideal of the people of God than a ritual practice which can sustain the public worship of the church. The youth liturgical renewal, for all its strength, only intensified the privatization and sentimentalization of public worship. That brings us back to the main thesis. The liturgical renewal movements of the twentieth century have been drawn along, without our noticing it, by the strong undercurrent of the modern dogma: the fact/value split. Each of the three currents, Red, Green, and Yellow, illustrate the effect of the modern dogma on liturgical renewal.

II. The Modern Dogma as Undercurrent

What characterizes all of these liturgical currents is an attempt to retrieve an earlier moment in the life of the church. They differ, of course, in the century they choose and the way they construe the basic ingredients of public worship. Their basic commonality will be explored in this section before turning to the eddies which their differences create.

The liturgical renewers have tried to put into our congregations the traditions of various centuries but have not attended adequately to the new context. They rediscovered tradition but did not recover it. Instead of discovering a new experience, related to the first, but more appropriate for their present situation, they have handed the contemporary church a series of choices with little theological, anthropological, and sociopsychological criteria for evaluating those choices. Recovery is hampered.

The primary method of retrieval was through romantic historical methods. These historical methods understood the process of retrieval primarily as the retrieval of the genius and experience of the original text and situation. Critical scholarship focuses on the analysis of past biblical and liturgical texts, rather than the constructive moment in the present. The major gap to be conquered, according to this method, is the gap between history and dogma. History, in this model was the lived experience of the faithful; and, since most of the liturgical reformers had a strong irrationalist bent to them, they preferred this to what they perceived to be rationalistic dogma. The much used Latin tag, *lex orandi, lex
Where is the focus of attention to God's presence?

credendi (literally, law of praying, law of believing), became the battle cry for this romantic retrieval.20

III. Eddies and the Parish

Even the surface eddies which result from the meeting of these three currents illustrate the effect of the modern dogma on liturgical renewal. The most evident of these eddies result from the meeting of the Red and Green Currents. Those eddies show themselves in problems of orientation immediately: where is the focus of attention to God's presence, toward the East, or among God's people? Secondly, from this, what attitudes should we adopt in gathering in his presence: awe and mystery or the meeting of the people of God in his presence? Third, what is the relation between a predominantly verbal approach to worship and one of actions and non-verbal expressions? Fourth, whereas we had been used to leadership by the clergy, do we now have more lay leadership than we are ready for, at least in many cases?

The majority of parishes are caught "betwixt and between" the Red and Green Currents. The Red Current with its retrieval of late medieval worship focuses the presence of God spatially to the East, the altar and, because of their location, the clergy. Congregations worshipping in buildings designed for this construal of the presence of God are confused when they try to follow the rubrics (a habit fostered by the Red Current) of the Green Current. Since the Green Current attempts to retrieve the ideal of the fourth century with its focus on the people of God as a small, but highly intentional group gathered in a home, the style of the congregation must change substantially to follow those rubrics. Confusion and conflict are a common result.

The "initiation crisis" is an excellent example of the conflict between the Red and Green Currents and how the liturgical renewal currents have only exacerbated this crisis. By "initiation crisis" I mean major critical questions regarding Christian initiation. "Questions are being asked, and answers given, about the right age for confirmation, about how best to catechize parents of infants brought for baptism, about whether infant baptism itself is a good thing, about first confession for children baptized as infants, and so on."21

For Lutherans, the role of the rite of confirmation in relationship to Baptism and Holy Communion has become a

20Geoffrey Wainwright, Doxology (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980), 218, notes that "from a grammatical point of view it is equally possible to reverse subject and predicate" leaving, in my opinion, a happy ambiguity which is seldom noted.

neuralgic point in this initiation crisis. The Green and Red Currents have two different responses to this point. Under the Red Current, confirmation was attached to First Communion, and functioned primarily as a rite of passage from childhood to adulthood. For example, in my grandmother's generation, confirmation came at the end of eighth grade; so did formal education, if one had stayed in school that long. When she and her siblings were confirmed they were young adults both in the eyes of the Church and the general culture around their place of worship. Aside from certain areas of the country, this easy melding of Christ and culture, the rite of confirmation and the rite of passage to adulthood, no longer coincide; significant discontinuity exists between Christ and culture.

The Green Current focuses on a small, highly intentional community, and places higher stricutures on initiation. Baptism becomes far more important under its influence. Confirmation, then, becomes attached primarily to baptism, not Holy Communion. Confirmation, we are told by patristic scholars, was the affirmation of this baptism by the bishop through an act of chrismation. Subsequent history, while noted, is rejected by the Green Current liturgical reformers. Instead, the early church is chosen as the model for facing the challenge surrounding confirmation and baptism. The way it was in the fourth century is clearly superior to the "disintegration of confirmation" in the medieval and reformed period. Out goes the tie between confirmation and Holy Communion. First communion is moved to a younger age, in some cases, as early as infancy on the grounds that it was done that way in the fourth century.

Both liturgical renewal movements fail to attend the significant discontinuity with the previous communal faith experience in America. Neither take seriously enough new ingredients dictated by the contemporary context in their proposals. For example, neither re-evaluate their entire proposal in light of the prolonged adolescence in contemporary America or contemporary rites of passage. Here the Green Current's choice of the fourth century simply does not address part of the contemporary crisis. New rituals need to be found which more carefully integrate Christian rites of passage with the experience of the people. Something besides the "disintegration" of the ideal, namely the fourth century, might be learned in the history of confirmation in the West. New questions and a different model of liturgical scholarship and renewal are needed to face the initiation crisis.

22 Frank W. Klos, Confirmation and First Communion (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1968).
Summary and Proposal

The three major liturgical renewal currents (Red, Green, and Yellow) have been unconsciously affected by the undercurrent of the modern dogma. These movements, in their reaction to the scientism/rationalist view of ritual and tradition, reveled in them. Liturgical scholars of the first two movements, the only two which are taken as the subject of most serious liturgical scholarship, focused their critical energies on the historical retrieval of the intentions and experience of the original congregation. The choice of century and the place of contemporary practice and application were relegated to secondary status in the public conversation. Remember the advice of our liturgical scholar, "One must simply choose one's century." A critical use of theological principles is rare. A full blown examination of contemporary anthropological ritual study, or socio-psychological and cultural studies, is becoming more common but usually poorly integrated with theological and historical studies. In short, the main battle line in both academically based liturgical movements in this century is on an axis between history and dogma (lex orandi, lex credendi) with no small amount of animosity against dogma and critical theology.

However, if historical analysis is the only critical moment, the temptation is to impose upon the contemporary church a romanticized historical description of a past liturgical practice. The phrase lex orandi, lex credendi can easily fall prey to this pattern. In principle, Prosper of Aquitaine's formulation of this principle in the axiom that "the rule of prayer should lay down the rule of faith" is a necessary but not sufficient moment in liturgical renewal. Liturgical scholarship and its use in liturgical renewal is appropriately interested in history, especially the history of prayer. The evocation of the principle lex orandi, lex credendi requires a more complex relationship between liturgy and theology than is often the case among the liturgical renewers. To say that the principle is necessary but not sufficient is not to continue what has been basically a fruitless struggle between history and dogma, liturgy and theology, which has been perpetuated by parts of liturgical and theological scholarship.

In contrast to this either/or logic of history vs. dogma, systematic theology vs. historical theology, I want to emphasize a dialectical relationship between them. Furthermore, my overall impression agrees with Johannes-Baptist Metz' observation that "the fundamental hermeneutical problem of theology is not the problem of how systematic theology stands in relation to historical theology, how dogma stands in relation to historical theology, but rather the relationships between the history of the church and the contemporary church." The evocation of the principle lex orandi, lex credendi requires a more complex relationship between liturgy and theology than is often the case among the liturgical renewers. To say that the principle is necessary but not sufficient is not to continue what has been basically a fruitless struggle between history and dogma, liturgy and theology, which has been perpetuated by parts of liturgical and theological scholarship.

---

26Adolf von Harnack's opinion regarding liturgy in the history of Christianity is too severe. He argued that "another instance of the exceptional nature of Christianity" was that "for a considerable period it possessed no ritual at all" and that therefore "the history of dogma during the first three centuries is not reflected in the liturgy"; cf. History of Dogma, vol. 1., trans. Neil Buchana (Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1901), 33; for further discussion with a very different opinion see J. Pelikan, Historical Theology: Continuity and Change in Christian Doctrine, (New York: Corpus Instrumentorum, 1971), 88.
to history, but what is the relation between theory and practice." In general, the liturgical renewal movements of this century have not attended to the dialectic of theory and practice.

In parishes all three liturgical renewal options keep worship basically in the category of taste and sentiment, both of which are thought to be irrational and private. New liturgies are handed down from above, from people who have done their homework and are said to have good taste. It is no matter that the taste is formed out of a romantic notion of some supposed golden age of the church and that no theological argument has been made for this liturgy. Never mind that it is severely discontinuous with the experience of the people, both in the pews and outside them.

If my analysis regarding the effect of the modern dogma on these liturgical movements is at all accurate, two major changes need to be made. First, a more critical dialogue between history and dogma, along with contemporary critical theology, needs to take place. Second, a major effort of liturgical scholarship should be placed upon the axis and dialectic occurring between theory and practice. Such a refocusing of energy would take into account in an integrated manner the particular context of the worshiping community and would see critical theology, dogma, anthropology, and sociology as ancillary disciplines to liturgical scholarship.

On the parish level, this same shift of emphasis would lead to the development of local theology and worship which, while remaining faithful to the tradition, would feel far less obliged to some universal ideal of the liturgy handed down from some committee. This would commit parish clergy to a major overhaul of the place of ritual competence and theological critique in the education and practice of ministry. Liturgical renewal in this century has been more influenced by the modern dogma than is normally realized and more than is healthy for the life of the church.

