

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Master of Divinity Thesis

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

5-18-1978

Contemporary Doctrines of the Lord's Supper Believed, Taught and Confessed By Selected Religious Bodies of the United States of America, With Special Emphasis Upon the Doctrines of the Real Presence and the Consecration

David Last

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir_lastd@csl.edu

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



Part of the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Last, David, "Contemporary Doctrines of the Lord's Supper Believed, Taught and Confessed By Selected Religious Bodies of the United States of America, With Special Emphasis Upon the Doctrines of the Real Presence and the Consecration" (1978). *Master of Divinity Thesis*. 160.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/mdiv/160>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master of Divinity Thesis by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

Contemporary Doctrines of the Lord's Supper Believed, Taught
and Confessed By Selected Religious Bodies of the United
States of America, With Special Emphasis Upon the
Doctrines of the Real Presence and the Consecration.

by
David Last

Submitted to
Dr. Daniel C. Overduin
Concordia Seminary
May 18, 1978

*This paper was properly marked. However this
is an unmarked copy.*

D. D. Ch. Weidman

#2878
Research Paper

178
L223



Preface

This paper is dedicated to my dear friend, Mr. Timothy A. Ziebell, who possessed the theological insight, courage and integrity to leave the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod and its seminary on account of their Crypto-Calvinism and thereby forced his friends to confront the issues of the Real Presence and the consecration as they are presented in the Symbols of our beloved Evangelical Lutheran Church, which in all verity is the true, visible church of God on earth.

SENIOR HONORARY COLLEGE
256 COTTON FIBER

CONCORDIA SEMINARY LIBRARY
ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI

Table of Contents

Contemporary Doctrines of the Lord's Supper Believed, Taught
and Confessed By Selected Religious Bodies of the United
States of America, With Special Emphasis Upon the
Doctrines of the Real Presence and the Consecration.

- I. The Roman Position
- II. The Episcopal Church
- III. The Reformed Church
- IV. The Lutheran Church - Prior to the Twentieth Century
- V. American Lutheranism in the Twentieth Century
- VI. Confessional Lutheran Influences Upon American Lutheranism
- VII. Conclusion

Contemporary Doctrines of the Lord's Supper Believed, Taught
and Confessed By Selected Religious Bodies of the United
States of America, With Special Emphasis Upon the
Doctrines of the Real Presence and the Consecration.

Part I

The Roman Position

As the Reformation of the Christian Church marched on, it seemed for a time that the greater part of Europe might become Protestant. Then came the Counter-Reformation through which the Roman Church undertook to undo the results of the Protestant Reformation. The Jesuits, or the Society of Jesus, founded by Ignatius Loyola in 1534, played an important role in it. The Counter Reformation was intended to retain the rites and doctrines as they existed within historical Romanism, to do away as much as possible with the wicked and immoral life of the clergy, and to bring the Protestants back into the Roman Church by force if necessary. It is within that context that the events of the Inquisition, the St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre, the Spanish Armada, and the Thirty Years War must be understood.

The first Roman parish in what is presently the United States was established at St. Augustine, Florida, in A.D. 1565. Lord Baltimore (George Calvert) founded his colony in Maryland in 1633. This was the first colony to guarantee religious liberty. At the end of the Revolutionary War, there were twenty thousand Roman Catholics in the United States, sixteen thousand of them in Maryland. Under Bishop John Carroll, Romanism expanded to 150,000 in thirty years. Immi-

gration added to the number of souls. In 1893, what had previously been regarded as a mission territory received an apostolic delegation from the Vatican. There are presently forty-nine million Roman Catholics in the United States.

Their church's doctrine concerning the Sacrament of the Altar had been formulated many years before, starting with the Fourth Lateran Council in A.D. 1215:

Canon I. There is one universal church of believers outside of which there is no salvation at all for any. In this church the priest and sacrifice is the same Jesus Christ Himself, whose body and blood are truly contained in the sacrament of the altar under the figures of bread and wine, the bread having been transubstantiated into His body and the wine into His blood by divine power, so that, to accomplish the mystery¹ of our union, we may receive of Him what He has received of us.

The Council of Trent, which met at intervals between 1545 and 1563, set forth the official Confessions of Romanism. The Thirteenth Session, chapter one, speaks of the Real Presence of the Lord Jesus Christ in the most holy Sacrament of the Eucharist:

First of all, the holy council teaches and openly and plainly professes that after the consecration of bread and wine, our Lord Jesus Christ, true God and true man, is truly, really and substantially contained in the august sacrament of the Holy Eucharist under the appearance of those sensible things.²

In 1551, the Council of Trent adopted chapter II, which speaks of the reason for the institution of the most holy Sacrament.

Therefore, our Saviour, when about to depart from this world to the Father, instituted this sacrament, in which He poured forth, as it were, the riches of His divine love towards men, making a remembrance of his wonderful works, and commanded us in the participation of it to reverence His memory³ and to show forth his death until he comes to judge the world.

Again in 1551, the Council adopted chapter III, which deals with the excellence of the most holy Eucharist over the other Sacraments:

The most Holy Eucharist has indeed this in common with the other sacraments, that it is a symbol of a sacred thing and a visible form of an invisible grace; but there is found in it this excellent and peculiar characteristic, that the other sacraments then first have the power of sanctifying when one uses them, while in

the Eucharist there is the Author Himself of sanctity before it is used. ...it is very true that as much is contained under either form as under both. For Christ is whole and entire under the form of bread and under any part of that form; likewise the whole Christ is present under the form of wine and under all its parts.⁴

Chapter IV speaks of transubstantiation:

But since Christ our Redeemer declared that to be truly His own body which He offered under the form of bread, it has, therefore, always been a firm belief in the Church of God, and this holy council now declares it anew, that by the consecration of the bread and wine a change is brought about of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the body of Christ our Lord, and of the whole substance of the wine into the substance of His blood. This change the holy Catholic Church properly and appropriately calls transubstantiation.⁵

Again in 1551, chapter V, concerning the worship and veneration to be shown to this most holy Sacrament, was adopted:

There is, therefore, no room for doubt that all the faithful of Christ, may, in accordance with a custom always received in the Catholic Church, give to this most holy Sacrament in veneration the worship of latria, which is due to the true God. ...The holy council declares, moreover, that the custom that this sublime and venerable sacrament be celebrated with special veneration and solemnity every year on a fixed festival day, and that it be borne reverently and with honor in processions through the streets and public places, was very piously and religiously introduced into the Church of God.

Chapter VI of 1551 speaks of the reservation of the Sacrament of the holy Eucharist and taking it to the sick: "The custom of reserving the Holy Eucharist in a sacred place is so ancient that even the period of the Nicene Council recognized that usage."⁷ Chapter VII of 1551 is concerned with the preparation to be employed that one may receive the sacred Eucharist worthily:

It ~~X~~ is unbecoming for anyone to approach any of the sacred functions except in a spirit of piety, assuredly, the more the holiness and divinity of this heavenly sacrament are understood by a Christian, the more diligently ought he to give heed lest he receive it without great reverence and holiness, especially when we read those terrifying words of the Apostle: He that eateth and drinketh unworthily eateth and drinketh judgment to himself, not discerning the body of the Lord.

Again in 1551, chapter VIII, concerning the use of this admirable Sacrament, was formulated:

As to the use of this holy sacrament, our Fathers have rightly and wisely distinguished three ways of receiving it. They have taught that some receive it sacramentally only, as sinners; others spiritually only, namely, those who eating in desire the heavenly bread set before them, are by a lively faith which worketh by charity made sensible of its fruit and usefulness; while the third class receives it both sacramentally and spiritually, and these are they who so prove and prepare themselves beforehand that they approach this divine table clothed with the wedding garment.

Also in 1551, the Council formulated, adopted and promulgated a series of anathemas. These are summarized as follows:

1. Anathematizes those who deny the presence of the whole Christ.
2. Anathematizes those who do not believe in transubstantiation.
3. Anathematizes those who do not believe that the whole Christ is contained under each form.
4. Anathematizes those who believe that the Real Presence is confined to the usus.
5. Anathematizes those who believe that the principle fruit of the Eucharist is the remission of sins.
6. Anathematizes those who degrade or object to the Adoration and Procession of the Sacrament.
7. Anathematizes those who object to the Reservation of the Sacrament.
8. Anathematizes those who hold to only a spiritual presence of Christ.
9. Anathematizes those who do not commune at least once a year at Easter.
10. Anathematizes those who object to the priest communing himself.
11. Anathematizes those who maintain that faith alone is sufficient preparation for reception of the sacrament. Sac-

ramental confession must be made beforehand.¹⁰

In A.D. 1562, the twenty-second session of the Council of Trent met. While discussing the doctrine concerning the Sacrifice of the Mass, they adopted chapter I, which deals with the institution of the most holy Sacrifice of the Mass:

Since under the former Testament, according to the testimony of the Apostle Paul, there was no perfection because of the weakness of the Levitical priesthood, there was need, God the Father of mercies so ordaining, that another priest should rise according to the order of Melchisedec, our Lord Jesus Christ, who might perfect and lead to perfection as many as were to be sanctified. ... (He) offered up to God the Father His own body and blood under the form of bread and wine. ... He instituted a new Passover, namely, Himself, to be immolated under visible signs by the Church through the priests in memory of His own passage from this world to the Father. ... And this is indeed that clean oblation which cannot be defiled by any unworthiness or malice on the part of those who offer it...

Chapter II, maintaining that the Sacrifice of the Mass is propitiatory both for the living and the dead, states:

And inasmuch as in this divine sacrifice which is celebrated in the mass is contained and immolated in an unbloody manner the same Christ who once offered Himself in a bloody manner on the altar of the cross, the holy council teaches that this is truly propitiatory and has this effect, that if we, contrite and penitent, with sincere heart and upright faith, with fear and reverence, draw nigh to God, we obtain mercy and find grace in seasonable aid.¹²

The Creed of the Council of Trent was composed in 1564 by Pope Pius IV. Leith notes: "This creed is still in force and is a creedal test to which, upon demand, every faithful Catholic must subscribe."¹³ In part of this creed, a faithful Romanist, including those in the United States, vows:

I likewise profess that in the Mass a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice is offered to God on behalf of the living and the dead, and that the body and blood together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ is truly, really, and substantially present in the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist, and that there is a change of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into blood; and this change the Catholic Church calls transubstantiation. I also profess that the whole and entire Christ and a true sacrament is received under each separate species.¹⁴

The Second Vatican Council, meeting in session from 1963 to 1965, added a new twist: Communion in both kinds for the first time since 1414 (at least, as far as the laity was concerned).

The dogmatic principles which were laid down by the Council of Trent remaining intact, communion under both kinds may be granted when the bishops think fit, not only to clerics and religious, but also to the laity, in cases to be determined by the Apostolic See, as, for instance, to the newly ordained in the Mass of their sacred ordination, to the newly professed in the Mass of their religious profession, and to the newly baptized in a Mass following their baptism.

Traditionally, the Sacrament of the Eucharist, according to the Roman conception, has as its signs the appearances of the bread and wine which were transubstantiated via the words of consecration into Christ's body and blood. The Sacrament provided a unitive grace, that is, a union with Christ, Who is the bread of life. The Eucharist conveyed power to avoid sin and to perform good works. It blotted out venial sins and preserved from mortal sin. It gave the body a moral right to the future resurrection. The Sacrament was instituted by Christ as the Last Supper, and could be administered only by the bishops and priests. As a sacrament, grace was given to the communicants. It was not necessary to commune in both kinds (although Vatican II allowed for the possibility). The doctrine of concomitance was held to firmly. As a Sacrifice, it was always essential that both kinds be used. The Sacrifice of the Mass was an unbloody Sacrifice, which involved no pain for Christ. This Sacrifice benefited all members of the Church Militant and of the Church Triumphant, but especially the priest saying the Mass and the person for whom the Sacrifice was offered were benefited.

But what is the present day position of Roman Catholics regarding the Mass? What are Rome's teachings regarding the Real Presence of Christ's true body and blood in the Sacrament of the Lord's

Supper? What is the current definition of transubstantiation? While many Romanists and papists still walk in the path of the traditions of the Roman Church, the thunderings and rumblings to the left become increasingly clear and resonant. The views of theologians like E. Schillebeeckx are becoming increasingly prevalent, and, although Schillebeeckx is from Holland, his works are published in English here in America, with the result that his views filter down to the priests, deacons, and eventually, even the laity.

There is a new climate of interpretation within Romanism today. Schillebeeckx believes that we can never find the word of God anywhere

in its pure state. ...It is only after the passage of time has produced a different climate of thought that meaningful questions can be raised concerning the "wording" of the dogmatic definitions of the past; in other words, that the process of finding new interpretations faithful to these definitions can begin.

This so-called "modern" theological activity began soon after World War II, even before Vatican II.

The debate between the defenders of the "physical" and the ontological interpretations flared up again, especially in Italy, between 1949 and 1960, but in fact a different question was already preoccupying most theologians - that of the relationship between the metaphysical approach and the sacramentality of the Eucharist. The tendency to approach the Eucharist, not ontologically and via the philosophy of nature, but anthropologically became increasingly prevalent at this time.

The new area of theological activity was known as phenomenology:

Because the renewed new-scholastic study of transubstantiation came to nothing, an attempt has been made during the last ten years especially - under the influence of the rediscovery of the real sphere in which the sacraments operate - to approach the eucharistic presence in an entirely new, phenomenological way.

Schillebeeckx provides the history of modern Eucharistic Romanism:

The first theologian to rise above both the physical and the purely ontological interpretations and to situate the reality of the eucharistic presence in the sacramental presence was, without any doubt, J. de Baciocchi. He accepted an ontological

depth in transubstantiation, but placed this on the sacramental level. He did in fact use the terms transfunctionalisation, transfinalisation, and transsignification. ...1950...was the year in which the encyclical Humani Generis appeared, which denounced the opinion of certain theologians who maintained that transubstantiation was based on an outdated philosophical concept of substance and therefore had to be corrected in such a way that the real presence of Christ was reduced to a kind of symbolism, in which the consecrated hosts were simply efficacious signs of the spiritual presence of Christ and¹⁹ of his intimate union with his mystical body and its members.

It should be noted that Schillebeeckx maintains that he knows of no purely symbolical interpretation.²⁰ To continue this history, a symposium on the Eucharist was conducted at Passau in Germany on October 7-10, 1959. J. Möller in the Netherlands put forward an existential and phenomenological interpretation, as did Charles Davis in England. In the Netherlands, P. Schoonenberg and L. Smits did the same.²¹

Schillebeeckx and his contemporaries begin by explaining the Council of Trent's use of the word "transubstantiation:"

...the term "transubstantiation" was, for the Council of Trent, a political banner of the orthodox faith, very suitably proclaiming, in the sixteenth-century situation, the difference between the Reformers' and the Catholic view of the Eucharist. As such, the word itself explained nothing. It was simply intended as a kind of distinguishing mark by which the Christian could make his own²² position in the doctrine of the Eucharist immediately clear.

The next step is to note the influence of Aristotelian philosophy at Trent:

Although there were individual differences, the Aristotelian doctrine of substance and accidents formed the framework within which all the fathers of the Council of Trent thought. ... the whole Aristotelian doctrine of substance and accidents was the framework of thought²³ within which the fathers of the Council reflected about faith.

The final step consists of the demythologizing of the Council of Trent:

...it is perfectly clear that a demythologisation of this kind of the Aristotelian element in the Tridentine dogma is still completely faithful to the Catholic belief in the real presence

of Christ in the Eucharist. ...canon 2 of the Council of Trent does suggest a reality of our faith which need not of itself be interpreted in the Aristotelian sense.²⁴

Schillebeeckx provides an historical definition of the term "substance."

The prescientific meaning of the word was reality, as opposed to appearance or something abstract (an ens rationis). ...In the Christian literature of the first centuries, substance therefore always indicated reality. ...An Aristotelian influence already made itself felt in the patristic period, with the result that a twofold (scientific) concept of substance became current in a theological context - the substantia prima or the concrete reality, the reality that is firm in its being, the existing reality, and the substantia secunda or an abstract formalisation of this concrete reality (the so-called essentia or quidditas abstracta).²⁵

After laying this foundation and doing all the groundwork, he reaches this conclusion:

The dogma was thought out and expressed in "Aristotelian" categories, but the strictly Aristotelian content of these categories was not included in what the dogma intended to say. Christ's real presence in the Eucharist²⁶ is therefore not tied to Aristotelian categories of thought.

There is an uneasiness about the concept of transubstantiation within Romanism today, both abroad and here in the United States, because of increasing ecumenical contacts with Protestant thought. And although Schillebeeckx has been quoted at length in this part of this paper, it ought not be assumed that his is a lone voice crying in the wilderness. There is a new school of theological thought within Romanism, and E. Schillebeeckx is only a part of it. The clarion call becomes increasingly clear and loud: the dogmatic datum must be reinterpreted.²⁷ Tradition must bow to the new climate of interpretation in all questions, according to this new school. Even the use of bread and wine is questioned:

According to historians of biology, the bread that Jesus used in his daily life had little to do with the wheaten bread that we have come to use in the West since the sixteenth century and, biologically, wine is nothing more or less than currant juice (according to my colleague, the botanist, Dr. H.F. Linskens). For this reason alone, theologians ought to be more discreet

about the "matter" of the Eucharist which is now firmly established in clearly defined principles. Is the use of bread and wine of dogmatic significance for the concrete celebration of the Eucharist simply because Christ used bread and wine?²⁸

What is modern Rome's dogma of the Real Presence? Schillebeeckx maintains:

The practice of returning to biblical and liturgical sources led to the official recognition, in the Constitutum on the Liturgy (c. 1, m.7) and the encyclical Mysterium Fidei, of the manifold intensity of the one real presence of Christ. Christ - and indeed, not only his activity or his power, but the person of Christ himself, since a presence is always personal - is really present in the service of the Word and in the liturgical assembly of the faithful. He is also really present in anyone who is in a state of grace. He is really present in the sacraments, and ... finally, he is also really present in the Eucharist.²⁹

The similarity between the present Roman conception of the Sacrament and contemporary Reformed theology must be examined.

End Notes

- ¹ John H. Leith, ed., Creeeds of The Churches. A Reader in Christian Doctrine from the Bible to the Present (Atlanta, Georgia: John Knox Press, 1977), p. 58.
- ² Leith, op. cit., p. 429.
- ³ Leith, op. cit., p. 430.
- ⁴ Leith, op. cit., p. 431.
- ⁵ Leith, op. cit., p. 432.
- ⁶ Leith, op. cit., p. 432.
- ⁷ Leith, op. cit., p. 433.
- ⁸ Ibid.
- ⁹ Leith, op. cit., p. 434.
- ¹⁰ Leith, op. cit., pp. 435-437.
- ¹¹ Leith, op. cit., pp. 437-438.
- ¹² Leith, op. cit., p. 439.
- ¹³ Leith, op. cit., p. 439.
- ¹⁴ Leith, op. cit., pp. 440-441.
- ¹⁵ Walter M. Abbott, S.J., gen. ed., The Documents of Vatican II. All Sixteen Official Texts Promulgated By The Ecumenical Council. 1963-1965. Translated From The Latin (New York, New York: America Press, 1966), p. 156.
- ¹⁶ E. Schillebeeckx, O.P., The Eucharist (New York, New York: Sheed And Ward, 1967), pp. 25-26.
- ¹⁷ Schillebeeckx, op. cit., pp. 96-97.
- ¹⁸ Schillebeeckx, op. cit., p. 101.
- ¹⁹ Schillebeeckx, op. cit., pp. 108-110.
- ²⁰ Ibid.
- ²¹ Schillebeeckx, op. cit., pp. 112-117.
- ²² Schillebeeckx, op. cit., p. 41.
- ²³ Schillebeeckx, op. cit., pp. 56 & 58.
- ²⁴ Schillebeeckx, op. cit., pp. 64 & 70.
- ²⁵ Schillebeeckx, op. cit., p. 72.

²⁶Schillebeeckx, op. cit., p. 102.

²⁷Schillebeeckx, op. cit., p. 103.

²⁸Schillebeeckx, op. cit., p. 135.

²⁹Schillebeeckx, op. cit., p. 103.

Part II

The Episcopal Church

Dr. C.F.W. Walther once noted that the Baptists, the Methodists, the Evangelical Alliance, the Presbyterians and the Episcopal Church were all branches of the great tree of the Reformed Church.¹ While this was true in Walther's day, it no longer can be assumed. The Protestant Episcopal Church is held together more by loyalty than by doctrine. Its ethic is Calvinistic, its liturgy is Lutheran, its sacraments are Roman, all bound together in the Book of Common Prayer.

When the Revolutionary War ended, the name of the Anglican Church in the colonies was changed to the Protestant Episcopal Church of North America. The Book of Common Prayer was revised in 1789. Recognition was granted by the British bishops. The Church was influenced by the Oxford Movement in the nineteenth century, by the moderate social gospel movement in the twentieth, and also by the ecumenical movement.

There are three theological parties in the Church, none of which are mutually exclusive. The Low Church or Evangelical Party emphasizes gospel preaching rather than sacraments and ecclesiastical rites. The High Church or Anglo-Catholic Party holds that the certainty of salvation is dependent upon submission to the episcopacy and the use of the church offices. Some seek reunion with Rome. The Broad Church Party is represented in both the High and the Low Church Parties. It minimizes the importance of doctrinal

differences by minimizing doctrine, by not spelling things out. Lex orandi, lex credendi (the law of prayer is the law of believing), hence, any change in the Book of Common Prayer, which is the ritual of worship, is indicative of a change in the doctrine of this Church. It is currently being revised.

The material principle of the Episcopal Church is latitudinarianism. The result is that there is no agreement on the significance of the sacraments. This Church affirms the Real Presence, but denies the manducatio indignorum. Some theologians speak of seven sacraments.

The historical doctrine of the Lord's Supper is contained in the Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion of 1563, revised for the Church in the United States in 1801. It should be noted that these Articles currently possess no binding character; they are merely of historical significance. Article XXVIII speaks of the Lord's Supper:

The Supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another; but rather it is a Sacrament of our Redemption by Christ's death: insomuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith, receive the same, the Bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of Christ; and likewise the Cup of Blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ. Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of Bread and Wine) in the Supper of the Lord, cannot be proved by Holy Writ; but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions. The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper, is Faith. The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped.

Article XXIX is entitled:

Of the Wicked, which eat not the Body of Christ in the use of the Lord's Supper.

The Wicked, and such as be void of a lively faith, although they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth (as Saint Augustine saith) the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ; yet in no wise are they partakers of Christ: but rather, to their condemnation, do eat and drink the sign or Sacrament of so great a thing.³

Article XXVI correctly maintains that the one oblation of Christ was finished upon the Cross:

The Offering of Christ once made is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction, for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin, but that alone. Wherefore the sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said, that the Priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits.⁵

As noted above, these Articles of Religion are not binding on Episcopalians (except in the new Anglican Orthodox Church). Dr. Hermann Sasse has noted:

Every candidate on taking Holy Orders has to sign the 39 Articles. This, however, does not imply an acceptance of their doctrinal contents. When the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Fisher, was asked by an English newspaper to write a contribution to a series of articles by leading churchmen on the belief of their respective churches, he stated that

the principle beliefs of the Church of England are expressed in its Book of Common Prayer and are summarized in the Apostles' Creed.

Not one word did he say about the "Articles of Religion," which are not a part of the Prayer Book, though they are printed among the appendices. The clergy of the Church of England are free to teach either the clearly-Reformed doctrine on the Lord's Supper contained in Article 28, or transubstantiation (as Anglo-Catholics do) or consubstantiation (as Pussey did), or even a Zwinglian view. If in a discussion with Anglicans we draw their attention to the "Black Rubric" in the Book of Common Prayer, and in the "Alternative Form" of 1928, some would strongly maintain the binding character of its doctrinal content, while others would minimize it.⁶

While Sasse is speaking of the Church of England, it is also true of the Episcopal Church, which is a part of the world-wide Anglican communion.

The result of such latitudinarianism is that widely divergent views are believed, taught, confessed and published, such as those of the Anglo-Catholic Party by the Reverend Archibald Campbell Knowles, D.D. in 1908. He gave the following definition of the Holy Communion:

Holy Communion, well called the Blessed Sacrament, is the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, and the Memorial of the Sacrifice of the Cross. Under the forms of Bread and Wine we receive Our Lord Really and Objectively Present but after a Spiritual, Mys-

tical and Supernatural manner. By this Offering we commemorate and show forth the "One, Full, Perfect, and Sufficient Sacrifice, Oblation and Satisfaction for the sins of the whole world," made by Our Lord on the Cross. The Sacrifice of the Altar is one with the Sacrifice on the Cross, Christ being the Priest and Victim on Calvary and in the Eucharist. It is the only true Sacrifice, one that honours God as God, one that satisfies the holiest aspirations of the soul. In it we plead Our Lord's Death and Passion; worship and adore Him Supernaturally Present, and receive Christ unto Everlasting Life. In the Holy Communion, or Eucharistic Sacrifice, it is Christ Who offers, consecrates, and gives His Body and Blood unto Everlasting Life, through His Priest on earth presenting the same Sacrifice which in Heaven He offers or pleads in Glory before the Throne of God. ...The Holy Eucharist being a Sacrifice as well as a Sacrament is offered both for the Living and the Dead. To pray that the departed may "rest in peace," that "light perpetual may shine upon them," and that they may soon have their perfect consummation and bliss, is a custom ancient and Scriptural. To remember them in the Sacrifice of the Altar seems the most fitting way to fulfill this duty.

Knowles considered the Blessed Sacrament to be the gift, a holy Mystery which sets forth the four great parts in the work of redemption: the Incarnation, the Crucifixion, the Resurrection and the Ascension. It is also a Sacrifice in which we plead the death of Christ.⁸ The Blessed Sacrament is the test of our religious life; a test of our faith, our love, our obedience. Through this Sacrament we receive the remission of sin, an increase of grace, the illumination of the mind, the purification of desire, the strengthening of our will, union with God, and a pledge of everlasting life.⁹

Dr. Knowles encouraged adoration and maintained that one ought to genuflect to the Christ really and supernaturally present after the consecration under the outward forms, for, as St. Augustine said, "No one eats this flesh unless he first adores."¹⁰ Knowles extolled the example of fasting communion, labelling it an ancient and hallowed practice. The motive was to be love and adoration for our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament and a desire to offer Christ the "sacrifice of oneself in making Christ the first gift received." The Old Testament sacrifices were antitypes of which the Holy Eucharist is the memorial.

The sacrifice is identical with that of Calvary. It is of the same nature but of a different mode. In this holy sacrifice, we offer up Christ, praise, prayer for the living and the dead, and ourselves, according to Dr. Knowles. In his catechism for confirmation, Dr. Knowles provides the following instruction:

What is the Holy Communion? The Holy Communion is the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ and the Memorial of His Sacrifice on the Cross. Why is the Holy Communion a Sacrament? The Holy Communion is a Sacrament because under the forms of Bread and Wine, Our Lord gives His Body and Blood unto Everlasting Life. Why is the Holy Communion a Sacrifice? The Holy Communion is a Sacrifice because it is the Memorial of Our Lord's Death on the Cross where He was Priest and Victim and shed His Blood for us, which offering He presents in the Sacrifice of the Altar. Who instituted the Holy Communion? Our Lord instituted the Holy Communion when taking Bread and Wine, He consecrated them and gave them to His disciples saying: "This is My Body ... This is My Blood... Do this in remembrance of Me." Did not Our Lord give power and commandment to the Apostles to consecrate Bread and Wine to be His Body and Blood and to offer this Holy Sacrifice? Yes: Our Lord gave power and commandment to the Apostles to consecrate Bread and Wine to be His Body and Blood and to offer this Holy Sacrifice, which same power and commandment is given to priests today. What are the outward, visible signs in the Holy Communion? The outward, visible signs in the Holy Communion are Bread and Wine. What are the inward, spiritual Gifts in the Holy Communion? The inward, spiritual Gifts in the Holy Communion are the Body and Blood of Christ, Really and Objectively Present after a Spiritual, Mystical and Supernatural manner. What is the benefit of receiving the Holy Communion? The benefit of receiving the Holy Communion is the strengthening and refreshing of our souls by the Body and Blood of Christ, the Increase of Grace, the Pledge of Everlasting Life, and Union with God in Christ. When do the Bread and Wine become Our Lord's Body and Blood? The Bread and Wine become Our Lord's Body and Blood when the Priest says Our Lord's Words of Consecration. Do we receive Our Lord Whole and Entire both under the form of Bread and under the form of Wine? Yes: we receive Our Lord Whole and Entire both under the form of Bread and under the form of Wine. Why is Our Lord to be worshipped and adored in the Blessed Sacrament of the Altar? Our Lord is to be worshipped and adored in the Blessed Sacrament of the Altar because He is Our God and Saviour. What is the Holy Communion also called? The Holy Communion is also called "The Holy Eucharist," "The Holy Mysteries," "The Sacrifice of the Altar," "The Blessed Sacrament," and "The Mass."

The Episcopal Church also is experiencing the results of the "new climate of interpretation," as Rome has. This influence can be seen in an author by the name of Sheldon Flory who describes Eucharistic fellowship:

...in the eucharistic gathering of the Church, life itself, private, corporate, public, in all its brokenness, all its guilts and anxieties, its strife, its sins, its joys and sorrows, sickness and health, its work and loves and leisure can be gathered up and offered through the life tokens of the bread and wine and money we wring from the earth by the sweat of our faces. As Saint Augustine said, "There you are on the altar; there you are in the cup." In the eucharistic sharing of the gathered fellowship, life itself is received back again blessed, revived, and empowered, as bread and wine, common food made holy, are received back again full of the risen life of Christ as His Body and Blood. ¹³

What is the sacramental life of the Church for Flory?

...if I were asked to say in one sentence what the sacramental life of the Church is, I think I should reply that to live the sacramental life is, to be in touch with the meaning and divine purpose of history. ¹⁴

Flory also speaks about the Sacrificial and Memorial aspects of the Sacrament:

Again there is the memorial element. And again it is more than just remembering something in the past; for again the event is brought forward in time, or rather made present, or re-presented. It is re-presented in two directions: to us, and to God. And notice that the event here made present is the significant, the crucial event of history: the quadruple event of Christ's passion, death, resurrection, and ascension. This event is re-presented before God as the sacrifice of Christ for the life of the world - the one true sacrifice which ends and fulfills all sacrifices, for it accomplishes what no mere human sacrifice can: the pleasure of God, and thus the remission of sins and the undoing of death. This is the sacrifice Christ pleads eternally before the Father on our behalf, as we in our sinful, unworthiness cannot plead even at our altars, except in Him. ¹⁵

But when he reaches the point of explaining what a communicant receives, he lists only: 1) a new life (which includes renewed love and charity, renewed grace to sin no more, and renewed strength to go forth and do God's work) and 2) a new birth.

To counteract and combat such a new interpretation of the Sacrament, parish priests and theologians such as the Reverend James P. De Wolfe, Jr., the Rector of All Saints Episcopal Church in Fort Worth, Texas, have prepared books and tracts of sacramental devotions. Father De Wolfe provides a suggested preparatory prayer which reveals his faithfulness to traditional Anglo-Catholicism:

O great and good God, I have (will) come into your presence to share in offering to you the great Sacrifice of your Blessed Son, our Saviour, Jesus Christ (and to receive the Holy Sacrament of the Body and Blood of the same Jesus Christ) in remembrance of his life, death, and Passion, and in thanksgiving for all your blessings bestowed upon your whole Church and on me a most unworthy sinner. I desire to offer (and to receive) with all the love and contrition of which I am capable, in conformity with those sacred intentions wherewith our Saviour instituted and our holy Mother the Church ever offers it. I wish, then, to offer (and to receive) it: 1) For your greater glory. 2) For the continual remembrance of the Sacrifice of Christ. 3) To give you thanks for all the blessings you have bestowed, especially ... 4) To ask your help in any matter I have in hand, especially... 5) To ask you to bless all my friends and relatives, especially ... 6) For the dead, especially...¹⁶

Father De Wolfe notes that, during the Offertory, a spotless host is offered to God for one's countless sins, for all those who are present and for all the faithful. The cup of salvation is offered to God as a sweet-smelling savor for salvation. This oblation is offered to God in memory of the passion, resurrection and ascension of Christ, in honor of the blessed Mary ever-virgin, all the saints, to all their honor and to our salvation.¹⁷ De Wolfe also considers the Eucharist to be a Sacrifice of Christ:

Behold, O Eternal Father, the Salutary Sacrifice of the Eucharist is done. May it be acceptable to you, inasmuch as in it your Son, in whom you are ever well pleased, is set forth before you. May he now, I beseech you, perform the office of a Mediator and Advocate, where he sits at your right hand, and makes intercession for us. ... This one thing I ask, O Lord, let this Sacrifice be well pleasing to you, to the glory of your Name; and may it be profitable to the salvation of all your faithful servants. Amen.¹⁸

There are three million people in the Episcopal Church. Because their doctrine and practice is currently so similar to that of Romanism, rather than Reformed, those portions of Holy Scripture and the Lutheran Confessions finding fault with papistical doctrine apply equally to this church.

End Notes

- ¹ C.F.W. Walther, The Proper Distinction Between Law And Gospel. Thirty-Nine Evening Lectures. Reproduced from the German edition of 1897 by W.H.T. Dau (St. Louis, Missouri: Concordia Publishing House, n.d.) p.127.
- ² no author, The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments and Other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church According To The Use Of The Protestant Episcopal Church In The United States of America Together with The Psalter or Psalms of David ("Articles of Religion As established by the Bishops, the Clergy, and the Laity of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, in Convention, on the twelfth day of September, in the Year of our Lord 1801") (New York, New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1944), p. 608.
- ³ Book of Common Prayer, etc., op.cit., p. 609.
- ⁴ Ibid.
- ⁵ Ibid.
- ⁶ Hermann Sasse, This Is My Body. Luther's Contention for the Real Presence in the Sacrament of the Alter (Adelaide, South Australia: Lutheran Publishing House, 1976), pp. 282-283.
- ⁷ Rev. Archibald Campbell Knowles, D.D., The Practice of Religion. A Short Manual Of Instructions And Devotions Illustrated (New York, New York: Morehouse-Gorham Co., 1945), p.26.
- ⁸ Knowles, op. cit., p. 37.
- ⁹ Knowles, op. cit., p. 38.
- ¹⁰ Knowles, op. cit., pp. 38-39.
- ¹¹ Knowles, op. cit., p. 39.
- ¹² Knowles, op. cit., pp. 76-78.
- ¹³ Sheldon Flory, The Sacramental Life and its implications (Cincinnati, Ohio: Forward Movement Publications, 1964), p.9.
- ¹⁴ Flory, op. cit., p. 10.
- ¹⁵ Flory, op. cit., p. 11.
- ¹⁶ The Rev. James P De Wolfe, Jr. Rector (ed), Devotions Before, During And After The Holy Eucharist (Fort Worth, Texas: All Saints Episcopal Church, ca. 1975), p. 1.
- ¹⁷ De Wolfe, op. cit., p. 3.
- ¹⁸ De Wolfe, op. cit., p. 6.

Part III

The Reformed Church

The word "Reformed" has both a wide and a narrow sense. The wide sense has a different connotation in Europe than it has in the United States. In Europe, it denotes the Zwinglian and Calvinistic bodies of central Europe. In the United States, it includes also the Arminian bodies. In the narrow sense, there are a few specific denominations which include "Reformed" in their official name.

Hence, Part III of this paper speaks of both Calvinism and Arminianism. Representatives of Calvinism are The Reformed Church in America, the Christian Reformed Church, Presbyterian bodies, Particular Baptists, and historic Congregationalism (now part of the United Church of Christ). Descendants of Arminianism are the General Baptists, Methodist churches and their relatives such as The Salvation Army, American Rescue Workers, Volunteers of America, Holiness bodies (both Perfectionist and the Pentecostal wings), Evangelistic Associations and the Inner Light Groups.

For the Reformed, sacraments are not means of grace in the Lutheran sense. One of the fathers of Reformed theology, Ulrich Zwingli, maintained that the bread and wine merely represent the Lord's Body and Blood in the Sacrament. He attempted to follow the philosophical principle that the finite cannot contain the infinite. Finitum non est capax infiniti. He employed the alloeosis as a figure of speech to designate the human nature of Christ instead of the person of Christ. Zwingli declared in 1526 that the truth of his

opinion on the Sacrament had been revealed to him in a dream, although he had already adopted Cornelius Hoen's doctrine of the Sacrament in 1524. Hoen, a Dutch theologian, maintained that the word "is" in the Words of Institution means "signifies."

It is John Calvin's theology which influences much of the twentieth century. Zwingli died in a war which he instigated against the mountain cantons of Switzerland which were Roman. In 1549, John Calvin's Consensus Tigurinus brought unity between Calvinism and Zwinglianism, but Calvin's views were predominant. For Calvin, the sacraments are the "visible word." They are essentially and merely symbolic interpretations. They are outward signs that the Holy Spirit has already worked faith. Hence, the Real Presence is a spiritual union between the believing communicant on earth with the ascended Christ in heaven. The sacramental union, in the Lutheran sense, was rejected by Calvin.

Already by 1528, in The Ten Conclusions of Berne, written by Berthold Haller and Francis Kolb, and revised by Zwingli, the Reformed interpretation of the Lord's Supper was taught in their first real Confession:

4. It cannot be shown from Holy Scripture that the body and blood of Christ are substantially and corporeally received in the bread of the Eucharist. 5. The mass, as it is now celebrated, in which Christ is offered to God the Father for the sins of the living and the dead is contrary to Scripture, a blasphemy against the most holy sacrifice, passion, and death of Christ and on account of its abuse, an abomination to God.

The Heidelberg Catechism was written in 1563 by Ursinus and Olevianus for use in the German Palatinate in order to join Lutheran and Reformed theology. Question forty-seven excludes the human nature of the exalted Christ from His presence here on earth in general.²

Question seventy-eight discusses the Real Presence:

Do, then, the bread and wine become the real body and blood of

Christ? Answer: No; but as the water in Baptism is not changed into the blood of Christ, nor becomes the washing away of sins itself, being only the divine token and assurance thereof, so also in the Lord's Supper the sacred bread does not become the body of Christ itself, though agreeably to the nature and usage of sacraments it is called the body of Christ.

Question seventy-nine discusses why the Reformed do not believe in the Real Presence and what the communicant actually receives:

Why, then, doth Christ call the bread his body and the cup his blood, or the New Testament in his blood; and St. Paul, the communion of the body and blood of Christ? Answer - Christ speaks thus not without great cause: namely, not only to teach us thereby that like as bread and wine sustain this temporal life, so also his crucified body and shed blood are the true meat and drink of our souls unto life eternal; but much more, by this visible sign and pledge to assure us that we are really partakers of his true body and blood, through the working of the Holy Ghost, as we receive by the mouth of the body these holy tokens in remembrance of him; and that all his sufferings and obedience are as certainly our own as if we had ourselves suffered and done all in our own persons.⁴

In 1566, Bullinger wrote the Second Helvetic Confession. This is the most universal Reformed Confession. Chapter XIX speaks concerning the sacraments of the Church of Christ, specifically dealing with the consecration of the sacraments. It should be noted in this place that the Reformed constantly have maintained that consecration is a setting aside of earthly elements for a heavenly, sacred use. The Lutheran Confessions do not consider this a proper definition of consecration. For Lutherans, consecration equals the Words of Institution, the powerful Word of God (die Machtworte) which effects the Real Presence. It is unfortunate that this Reformed definition of consecration has carried over into Lutheranism. But to return to the subject at hand, chapter XIX declares:

(The Consecration of Sacraments)... To sanctify or consecrate a thing is to dedicate it unto God, and unto holy uses; that is, to take it from the common and ordinary use, and to appoint it to some holy use. ...in the Lord's Supper, the outward sign is bread and wine, taken from things commonly used for meat and drink, but the thing signified is the body of Christ which was given, and his blood which was shed for us, or the communion of the body and blood of the Lord.⁵

Article XXI speaks concerning the holy Supper of the Lord:

(Sacramental Eating Of The Lord) (3) Besides that former spiritual eating, there is a sacramental eating of the body of the Lord; whereby the believers not only is partaker, spiritually and internally, of the true body and blood of the Lord, but also, by coming to the Table of the Lord, does outwardly receive the visible sacrament of the body and blood of the Lord ... For he (the believer) goes on in continual communication of the body and blood of the Lord, and his faith is daily more and more kindled, more strengthened and refreshed, by the spiritual nourishment ... (Presence of Christ In Supper) We do not, therefore, so join the body of the Lord and his blood with the bread and wine, as though we thought that the bread is the body of Christ, more than after a sacramental manner; or that the body of Christ does lie hid corporeally under the bread, so that it ought to be worshipped under the form of bread; or yet that whosoever he be who receives the sign, receives also the thing itself. The body of Christ is in the heavens, at the right hand of his Father; and therefore our hearts are to be lifted up on high, and not to be fixed on the bread, neither is the Lord to be worshipped in the bread... Christ, the Sun of Righteousness, though in body he be absent from us in the heavens, yet is present among us, not corporeally, but spiritually.⁶

In 1646-1647, the Westminster Confession was written and promulgated. This Confession has historically been the Confession of Presbyterians and Congregationalists. Chapter XXVII states: "Of The Sacraments ... III. The grace which is exhibited in or by the sacraments, rightly used, is not conferred by any power in them ..." Chapter XXIX, which is concerned with the Lord's Supper, lists eight points:

- 1) The Sacrament is for a perpetual remembrance of Christ's Sacrifice;
- 2) it is merely a commemoration of His one offering;
- 3) it is to be administered by the ministers;
- 4) is a condemnation of Roman errors;
- 5)

The outward elements in this sacrament, duly set apart to the uses ordained by Christ, have such relation to him crucified, as that truly, yet sacramentally only, they are sometimes called by the name of the things they represent, to wit, the body and blood of Christ: albeit, in substance and nature, they still remain truly, and only, bread and wine, as they were before;⁸

- 6) condemns transubstantiation;
- 7)

Worthy receivers, outwardly partaking of the visible elements in this sacrament, do then also inwardly by faith, really and indeed, yet not carnally and corporally, but spiritually, receive and feed upon Christ crucified, and all benefits of his death: the body and blood of Christ being then not corporally or carnally in, with,

or under the bread and wine; yet as really, but spiritually, present to the faith of believers in that ordinance, as the elements themselves are, to their outward senses;⁹

and 8) denies that ignorant and unworthy partakers receive the body blood or benefits of Christ.

One problem arises: Reformed Confessions are not theological norms; rather, they are theological orientations. It is not the letter, but the spirit of the Confessions which binds. Hermann Sasse notes:

If a Lutheran took issue with a Swiss theologian on the matter of the Sacrament, he would soon find that for the churches of Switzerland neither the Confessio Helvetica Prior or Posterior, nor the Catechism of Geneva, nor the Consensus Tigurinus has any binding force comparable to that of the Augsburg Confession in the Lutheran churches. They are regarded as historical documents only, which may be used or disregarded by the individual pastor and his congregation, the confessional obligation of the ministers being limited to the faithful interpretation of Holy Writ according to their best understanding. The same is true of almost all Reformed churches. It may seem, then, that the old adversaries of the Lutheran doctrine in Reformed Protestantism have completely disappeared. If we discuss the Sacrament with Reformed theologians we no longer have to deal with strict followers of Zwingli or even of Calvin.¹⁰

However, there is one article of faith in which almost all Reformed theologians possess complete equanimity: the Real Absence of Our Lord Christ's Body and Blood in His Blessed Sacrament. In 1967, the United Presbyterian Church in the United States of America adopted a new Confession which is classical Zwinglianism:

Art. 4. "The Lord's Supper" : The Lord's Supper is a celebration of the reconciliation of men with God and with one another, in which they joyfully eat and drink together at the table of their Saviour. Jesus Christ gave his church this remembrance of his dying for sinful men so that by participating in it they have communion with him and with all who shall be gathered to him. Partaking in him as they eat the bread and drink the wine in accordance with Christ's appointment, they receive from the risen and living Lord the benefits of his death and resurrection. They rejoice in the foretaste of the kingdom which he will bring to consummation at his promised coming, and go out from the Lord's Table with courage and hope for the service to which he has called them."

There are four million Presbyterians in the United States.

It is undoubtedly true that Baptist belief is an expression

of American Christian religion. The first Baptist congregation to be founded in what is presently the United States was either in Providence, Rhode Island in 1639 or in Newport, Rhode Island in 1638 or 1641, depending upon which system of dating one follows. The professed material principle of Baptists is the absolute lordship of Jesus Christ and the greatest possible liberty consistent with that lordship, and they emphasize the complete sovereignty and full competency of the individual soul in religious matters.

In 1833, their New Hampshire Confession was written. Article XIV, which speaks of baptism and the Lord's Supper, states:

(We believe) That Christian Baptism is the immersion of a believer in water, in the name of the Father (and) Son, and Spirit, to show forth in a solemn and beautiful emblem, our faith in a crucified, buried, and risen Saviour, with its purifying power; that it is prerequisite to the privileges of a church relation; and to the Lord's Supper, in which the members of the church, by the (sacred) use of bread and wine, are to commemorate together the dying love of Christ; preceded always by solemn self-examination. ¹²

The Abstract of Principles of 1859 was adopted by Southern Baptist Seminary in Louisville, Kentucky in 1859 and by Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary in 1950. It says virtually the same thing. ¹³ A Statement of Baptist Faith And Message of the Southern Baptist Convention of 1925 is also quite similar. ¹⁴

What is the purpose of the Lord's Supper for the Baptists?

The Lord's Supper is a symbolic act of obedience whereby members of the church, through partaking of the bread and the fruit of the vine memorialize the death of the Redeemer and anticipate His second coming.

Baptists are not convinced that wine is to be employed in the celebration of this memorial feast; rather, they advocate the use of pure grape juice:

The elements used in the Supper were unleavened bread and "the fruit of the vine." The word "wine" is not used. Some interpret "fruit of the vine" as wine. However, as the bread was unleavened, free of bacteria, was the cup also not grape juice? Wine is the product of the juice plus fermentation caused by bacteria. Since both elements represented the pure body and

blood of Jesus, there is reason to ponder. The writer sees "fruit₁₆ of the vine" as pure grape juice untainted by fermentation.

Baptists then, like all Reformed churches, confess their belief in the Real Absence of Christ's Body and Blood in this Memorial Feast:

When Jesus said, "This is my body" and "This is by blood" (Matt. 26:26,28), he no more meant that they actually became such than by saying, "I am the door" (John 10:9), he meant that he was a hole in a wall or a piece of wood. In all cases he spoke symbolically. So the elements are merely symbols of his body and blood. Like the meaning in baptism, the elements portray that which Jesus did for man's salvation. Both are visual aids whereby the believer portrays the basis and experience of his saving relationship with Jesus Christ.

There are 27, 500, 000 Baptists in the United States.

The Twenty-Five Articles of Religion were written by John Wesley for American Methodists in 1784 and adopted by a Methodist Conference in Baltimore in that same year. Article XVIII, concerning the Lord's Supper, states:

The body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper only after a heavenly and spiritual manner. And the means whereby the₁₈ body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is faith.

There are fourteen million Methodists in the United States.

Obviously, the Reformed doctrine of the Lord's Supper, like Rome's and that of the Episcopal Church, is a false doctrine. The proof of that statement will be found in the next parts of this paper. However, while Roman Catholics and Episcopalians maintain their belief in the Real Presence (to a certain extent, and in an erroneous fashion), the Reformed err, not only as to the benefits, but they unabashedly err even in the essence of the Sacrament. It is doubtful that the Sacrament exists in the Reformed churches.

End Notes

- ¹ John H. Leith, ed., Creeds Of The Churches. A Reader in Christian Doctrine from the Bible to the Present (Atlanta, Georgia: John Knox Press, 1977), p. 130.
- ² Werner Elert, Contemporary Theology Series. The Lord's Supper Today (St. Louis, Missouri: Concordia Publishing House, 1973), p. 36.
- ³ Jean A. Vos, ed., The Heidelberg Catechism (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Reformed Publications, n.d.), p. 43.
- ⁴ Vos, op. cit., p. 43.
- ⁵ Leith, op. cit., p. 164.
- ⁶ Leith, op. cit., p. 173
- ⁷ Leith, op. cit., p. 223.
- ⁸ Leith, op. cit., p. 225.
- ⁹ Ibid.
- ¹⁰ Hermann Sasse, This Is My Body. Luther's Contention for the Real Presence in the Sacrament of the Altar (Adelaide, South Australia: Lutheran Publishing House, 1976), p.282.
- ¹¹ Sasse, op. cit., p. 348.
- ¹² Leith, op. cit., p. 338.
- ¹³ Leith, op. cit., p. 339.
- ¹⁴ Leith, op. cit., p. 343.
- ¹⁵ Herschel H. Hobbs, The Baptist Faith And Message (Text for course 3302 of the subject are Baptist Doctrine in the Church Study Course) (Nashville, Tennessee: Connention Press, 1971), p. 83.
- ¹⁶ Hobbs, op. cit., p. 88.
- ¹⁷ Ibid.
- ¹⁸ Leith, op. cit., p. 358.

Part IV

The Lutheran Church - Prior to the Twentieth Century

The Lutheran Church possesses a norm in theology which is normed by Holy Scripture: the Lutheran Confessions, as they are contained in the Book of Concord of 1580. Every candidate for the public ministry at the time of his ordination, every pastor at the time of his installation, every called teacher takes an oath and makes a quia subscription to these Confessions. Therefore, the first section of Part IV examines pertinent sections of these Confessions which speak concerning the doctrines of the Real Presence and the consecration.

In A.D. 1529, Dr. Martin Luther wrote in the Small Catechism (VI;1-2):

The Sacrament Of The Altar, as the Head of a Family Should Teach It in a Simple Way to His Household. What is the Sacrament of the Altar? - Answer. It is the true body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, under the bread and wine, for us Christians to eat and to drink, instituted by Christ Himself.

In the same year (1529), Dr. Luther explained the Real Presence with greater detail in his Large Catechism (V;8,9,12,14,28):

...Now, what is the Sacrament of the Altar? Answer: It is the true body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, in and under the bread and wine which we Christians are commanded by the Word of Christ to eat and to drink. And as we have said of Baptism that it is not simple water, so here also we say the Sacrament is bread and wine, but not mere bread and wine, such as are ordinarily served at the table, but bread and wine comprehended in, and connected with, the Word of God. ...With this Word you can strengthen your conscience and say: If a hundred thousand devils, together with all fanatics, should rush forward, crying, How can bread and wine be the body and blood of Christ? etc., I know

that all spirits and scholars together are not as wise as is the Divine Majesty in His little finger. Now here stands the Word of Christ. ...It is true, indeed, that if you take away the Word or regard it without the words, you have nothing but mere bread and wine. But if the words remain with them, as they shall and must, then, in virtue of the same, it is truly the body and blood of Christ. For as the lips of Christ say and speak, so it is, as He can never lie or deceive. ...But here our wise spirits contort themselves with their great art and wisdom, crying out and hawling: How can bread and wine forgive sins or strengthen faith? Although they hear and know that we do not say this of bread and wine, because in itself bread is bread, but of such bread and wine as is the body and blood of Christ, and has the words attached to it. That, we say, is verily the treasure, and nothing else, through which such forgiveness is obtained.

In 1530, Philip Melanchthon wrote in the Unaltered Augsburg Confession (X;1-2):

Of the Supper of the Lord they teach that the Body and Blood of Christ are truly present, and are distributed to those who eat in the Supper of the Lord; and they reject those that teach otherwise.

One year later, in 1531, Melanchthon explained that statement in the Apology (X;54 & 57):

Article X: Of the Holy Supper. The Tenth Article has been approved, in which we confess that we believe, that in the Lord's Supper the body and blood of Christ are truly and substantially present, and are truly tendered, with those things which are seen, bread and wine, to those who receive the Sacrament. This belief we constantly defend, as the subject has been carefully examined and considered. For since Paul says, I Cor. 10,16, that the bread is the communion of the Lord's body, etc., it would follow, if the Lord's body were not truly present, that the bread is not a communion of the body, but only of the spirit of Christ. ... We have cited these testimonies, not to undertake a discussion here concerning this subject, for His Imperial Majesty does not disapprove of this article, but in order that all who may read them may the more clearly perceive that we defend the doctrine received in the entire Church, that in the Lord's Supper the body and blood of Christ are truly and substantially present, and are truly tendered with those things which are seen, bread and wine. And we speak of the presence of the living Christ (living body); for we know that death hath no more dominion over Him, Rom. 6,9.⁴

In 1537, Dr. Luther again wrote about the Sacrament of the Altar in the Smalcald Articles (III, VI,1 & 5):

Of the Sacrament of the Altar we hold that bread and wine in the Supper are the true body and blood of Christ, and are given and received not only by the godly, but also by wicked Christians. ... As regards transubstantiation, we care nothing about the soph-

istical subtlety by which they teach that bread and wine leave or lose their own natural substance, and that there remain only the appearance and color of bread, and not true bread. For it is in perfect agreement with Holy Scriptures that there is, and remains, bread, as Paul himself calls it, I Cor. 10,16: The bread which we break. And I Cor. 11,28: Let him so eat of that bread.

In 1577, the Solid Declaration of the Formula of Concord stated (SD, VII; 33,35,48-39,54,108,111,123):

Dr. Luther, who, above others, certainly understood the true and proper meaning of the Augsburg Confession, and who constantly remained steadfast thereto till his end, and defended it, shortly before his death repeated his faith concerning this article with great zeal in his last Confession where he writes thus: I rate as concoction, namely, as Sacramentarians and fanatics, which they also are, all who will not believe that the Lord's bread in the Supper in His natural body, which the godless or Judas received with the mouth, as well as did St. Peter and all (other) saints; he who will not believe this (I say) should let me alone, and hope for no fellowship with me; this is not going to be altered (thus my opinion stands, which I am not going to change). Tom. 2, Wittenb. German, fol. 252. ...For the reason why, in addition to the expressions of Christ and St. Paul (the bread in the Supper is the body of Christ or the communion of the body of Christ), also the forms: under the bread, with the bread, in the bread (the body of Christ is present and offered), are employed, is that by means of them the papistical transubstantiation may be rejected and the sacramental union of the unchanged essence of the bread and of the body of Christ indicated. ...Now, all the circumstances of the institution of the Holy Supper testify that these words of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, which in themselves are simple, plain, clear, firm and indubitable, cannot and must not be understood otherwise than in their usual, proper, and common signification. For since Christ gives this command (concerning eating His body, etc.) at the table and at supper, there is indeed no doubt that He speaks of real, natural bread and of natural wine, also of oral eating and drinking, so that there can be no metaphor, that is, a change of meaning, in the word bread, as though the body of Christ were a spiritual bread or a spiritual food of souls. Likewise, also Christ Himself takes care that there be no metonymy either, that is, that in the same manner there be no change of meaning in the word body, and that He does not speak concerning a sign of His body, or concerning an emblem (a symbol) or figurative body, or concerning the virtue of His body and the benefits which He has earned by the sacrifice of His body (for us), but of His true, essential body, which He delivered into death for us on the tree (altar) of the cross for the remission of sins. ...From this we clearly learn that not only the cup which Christ blessed at the first Supper, and not only the bread which Christ broke and distributed, but also that which we break and bless, is the communion of the body and blood of Christ, so that all who eat this bread and drink of this cup truly receive, and are partakers of, the true body blood of Christ. ...we reject and condemn ...1. The papistic

transubstantiation, when it is taught that the consecrated or blessed bread and wine in the Holy Supper lose entirely their substance and essence, and are changed into the substance of the body and blood of Christ in such a way that only the mere form of bread and wine is left, or accidentia sive subiecto (the accidents without the object); under which form of the bread, which nevertheless is bread no longer, but according to their assertion has lost its natural essence, the body of Christ is present even apart from the administration of the Holy Supper, when the bread is enclosed in the pyx or is carried about for display and adoration. For nothing can be a sacrament without God's command and the appointed use for which it is instituted in God's Word, as was shown above. ...However, since we have undertaken in this document to present especially only our own confession and explanation concerning the true presence of the body and blood of Christ against the Sacramentarians, some of whom shamelessly insinuate themselves into our churches under the name of the Augsburg Confession, we will also state and enumerate here especially the errors of the Sacramentarians, in order to warn our hearers to guard against and look out for them. ...¹² We reject also the teaching that unbelieving and impenitent, wicked Christians, who only bear the name of Christ, but do not have the right, true, living, and saving faith, receive in the Supper not the body and blood of Christ, but only bread and wine. And since there are only two kinds of guests found at this heavenly meal, the worthy and the unworthy, we reject also the distinction made among the unworthy (made by some who assert) that the godless Epicureans and scoffers of God's Word, who are in the external fellowship of the Church, when using the Holy Supper, do not receive the body and blood of Christ for condemnation, but only bread and wine.⁶

The Confessions of our beloved Evangelical Lutheran Church do not cease speaking at this point. They continue by speaking about the cause of the Real Presence: the consecration. Note once again, as was done in Part III of this paper, that the Lutheran Confessions do not consider consecration to be the setting aside of earthly elements for sacred use, as the Reformed churches and theologians do. The Confessions of our Church equate consecration with the Verba, the words of institution, the powerful Word of God (what the Germans call die Machtworte). This point is central to the understanding of what follows in this paper.

Dr. Luther spoke about the consecration in 1529 in his Large Catechism (V; 10, 18):

It is the Word (I say) which makes and distinguishes this Sacrament; so that it is not mere bread and wine, but is, and is called, the body and blood of Christ. For it is said: Accedat verbum ad elementum, et fit sacramentum. If the Word be joined to the to the element, it becomes a Sacrament. This saying of

St. Augustine is so properly and so well put that he has scarcely said anything better. The Word must make a Sacrament of the element, else it remains a mere element. ...That is as much as to say, No matter whether you are worthy or unworthy, you have here His body and blood by virtue of these words which are added to the bread and wine. Only note and remember this well; for upon these words rest all our foundation, protection, and defense against all errors and deception that have ever come or may yet come.

The Epitome of the Formula of Concord of 1577 states (VII;8 & 35):

Of The Lord's Supper...AFFIRMATIVA. Confession of the Pure Doctrine concerning the Holy Supper against the Sacramentarians. ...3. Now, as to the consecration, we believe, teach, and confess that no work of man or recitation of the minister (of the church) produces this presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Holy Supper, but that this is to be ascribed only and alone to the almighty power of our Lord Jesus Christ. ...NEGATIVA. Contrary, Condemned Doctrines of the Sacramentarians. ...14. That not the omnipotent words of Christ's testament, but faith, produces and makes (is the cause of) the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Holy Supper.

Therefore, faith has nothing at all to do with the Real Presence, for also the ungodly receive our Lord Christ's true and substantial body and blood. Faith is necessary to receive the benefits of the Real Presence. However, to teach that faith is necessary for the Real Presence to be effected is rejected as Reformed and labelled as a false doctrine known as receptionism. The Solid Declaration of the Formula of Concord of 1577 also speaks concerning this issue and doctrine of the consecration (SD, VII; 73-77,79-82,86-87,89):

Since a misunderstanding and dissension among some teachers of the Augsburg Confession also has occurred concerning consecration and the common rule, that nothing is a sacrament without the appointed use (or divinely instituted act), we have made a fraternal and unanimous declaration to one another also concerning this matter to the following purport, namely, that not the word or work of any man produces the true presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Supper, whether it be the merit of recitation of the minister, or the eating and drinking or faith of the communicants; but all this should be ascribed alone to the power of Almighty God and the Word, institution, and ordination of our Lord Jesus Christ. For the true and almighty words of Jesus Christ which He spake at the first institution were efficacious not only at the first Supper, but they endure, are valid, operate, and are still efficacious (their force, power, and efficacy endure and avail even to the present). So that in all places where the Supper is celebrated according to the

institution of Christ and His words are used, the body and blood of Christ are truly present, distributed, and received, because of the power and efficacy of the words which Christ spake at the first Supper. For where His institution is observed and His words are spoken over the bread and cup (wine), and the consecrated bread and cup (wine) are distributed, Christ Himself, through the spoken words, is still efficacious by virtue of the first institution, through His word, which He wishes to be there repeated. As Chrysostom says (in Serm. de Pass.) in his Sermon concerning the Passion: Christ Himself prepares this table and blesses it; for no man makes the bread and wine set before us the body and blood of Christ, but Christ Himself, who was crucified for us. The words are spoken by the mouth of the priest, but by God's power and grace, by the word, where He speaks: "This is My body," the elements presented are consecrated in the Supper. And just as the declaration, Gen. 1,28: "Be fruitful, and multiply, and replentish the earth," was spoken only once, but is ever efficacious in nature, so that it is fruitful and multiplies, so also this declaration ("This is My body; this is My blood") was spoken once, but even to this day and to His advent it is efficacious, and works so that in the Supper of the Church His true body and blood are present. Luther also (writes concerning this very subject in the same manner), Tom. VI, Jena, Fol. 99: This His command and institution have this power and effect that we administer and receive not mere bread and wine, but His body and blood, as His words declare: "This is My body," etc.; "This is My blood," etc., so that it is not our work or speaking, but the command and ordination of Christ that makes the bread the body, and the wine the blood, from the beginning of the first Supper even to the end of the world, and that through our service and office they are daily distributed. ...Now, in the administration of the Holy Supper the words of institution are to be publicly spoken or sung before the congregation distinctly and clearly, and should in no way be omitted (and this for very many and the most important reasons. First,) in order that obedience may be rendered to the command of Christ: This do (that therefore should not be omitted which Christ Himself did in the Holy Supper), and (secondly) that the faith of the hearers concerning the nature and fruit of this Sacrament (concerning the presence of the body and blood of Christ, concerning the forgiveness of sins, and and all benefits which have been purchased by the death and shedding of the blood of Christ, and are bestowed upon us in Christ's testament) may be excited, strengthened, and confirmed by Christ's Word, and (besides) that the elements of bread and wine may be consecrated or blessed for this holy use, in order that the body and blood of Christ may therewith be administered to us to be eaten and to be drunk, as Paul declares (I Cor. 10, 16): The cup of blessing which we bless, which indeed occurs in no other way than through the repetition and recitation of the words of institution. ...If the institution of Christ be not observed as He appointed it, there is no sacrament. This is by no means to be rejected, but can and should be urged and maintained with profit in the Church of God. And the use or action here does not mean chiefly faith, neither the oral participation only, but the entire external, visible action of the Lord's Supper instituted by Christ, (to this indeed is required) the consecration, or words of institution, the distribution and reception, or oral partaking (manducation) of the consecrated bread and

wine, (likewise the partaking) of the body and blood of Christ. And apart from this use, when in the papistic mass the bread is not distributed, but offered up or enclosed, borne about, and exhibited for adoration, it is to be regarded as no sacrament; just as the water of baptism, when used to consecrate bells or to cure leprosy, or otherwise exhibited for worship, is no sacrament or baptism. ...Now, it is not our faith that makes the Sacrament, but only the true word and institution of our almighty God and Savior Jesus Christ, which always is and remains efficacious in the Christian Church.

One would assume that with such a cloud of witnesses going on before us, our Lutheran Church would have clung tenaciously to this doctrine as the very word of our Lord Christ, which in verity it is. Unfortunately, such is not the case. Infrequent communion became the rule in the United States, rather than the exception. This was due primarily to a severe shortage of trained pastors who were rightly called and it was due to frontier conditions. One of the rubrics in the Liturgy of 1748 for the Pennsylvania Ministerium stated:

Ordinarily, whenever circumstances admit of it, the Supper of the Lord shall be administered on Christmas, on Easter, and on Pentecost. It may also be administered at other times, as the necessities of the congregation may demand.¹⁰

By 1845, some of the men in Ohio who later assist in the organization of the Missouri Synod with the Saxons in Missouri and the Franconians in Michigan condemned the General Synod.

The abolition of the present unionistic formula of dispensing Holy Communion: "Christ says" and so forth, as requested by some of the undersigned, was rejected; and on the contrary the use of the agenda introduced in 1842, which is in all of its absolution formulas unchurchly and Calvinistic and at the ordination does not pledge (the ordinand) on the confessions of the Lutheran Church was recommended to the members of the Synod as obligatory.

Disputes over the Real Presence in this country became readily apparent when the position of Dr. S.S. Schmucker of the General Synod, who was the head of Gettysburg Seminary, was examined closely. Already in 1838,

he helped to send a circular letter to Germany disparaging the Lutheran view of the Lord's Supper and indicating points of sim-

ilarity between the General Synod and the Prussian Union.¹²

In 1855, the whole dispute came to a head.

...a small pamphlet called the "Definite Synodical Platform" appeared anonymously in September, 1855, and was sent to many of the pastors. It was a revision of the Augsburg Confession, and the synods were urged to adopt it as their confessional basis. It found a number of "errors" in the Augsburg Confession, and these it specified as follows: the approval of the mass, private confession and absolution, denial of the divine obligation of the Sabbath, baptismal regeneration, and the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the Lord's Supper.¹³

Dr. Schmucker afterwards acknowledged his authorship of the document.¹⁴

Article X of Dr. Schmucker's Definite Synodical Platform speaks concerning the Lord's Supper:

In regard to the Lord's Supper they teach that Christ is present with the communicants in the Lord's Supper, under the emblems of Bread and wine.¹⁵

John Calvin could not have expressed the Real Absence in more appropriate terms. Schmucker openly disagreed with the Tenth Article of the Augsburg Confession.

He rejected the view of the Lord's Supper set forth in Article X, declaring that "there is no presence of the glorified nature of the Saviour," and that "the bread and wine are merely symbolic representations of the Saviour's absent body by which we are reminded of his sufferings."¹⁶

Schmucker expressed himself less polemically here than, for example, in his The American Lutheran Church (Springfield, Ohio, 1851).¹⁷

August Hoyer of the Missouri Synod responded to the Definite Synodical Platform in June, 1856, in Lehre und Wehre:

With deep sorrow and anxious misgivings, we declare: that theology - which expresses itself in such mishandling of the doctrines of Holy Communion and of Confession and Absolution or the Office of the Ministry - is not merely the theology of the three articles here adduced in the Observer, but the same which is continually praised by the Lutheran Observer as the genuine theology of the American Lutheran Church...brought forth by professors and doctors of theology with appeal to scholarly Germans whose rationalistic bent and thinking are not recognized here... (It interprets) Scripture not with Scripture but with common sense, thereby depriving itself of the sole means by which it could attain to a recognition of its own defects and to a blessed reformation of itself. Yet unnoticed - so much the more irresistible because

of their hiddenness - two tyrants divide between themselves the lordship over these United States, both derived from a common mother, namely disdain of Word and Sacrament - two tyrants, more terrible than Antiochus Epiphanes and Herod: rationalism and Roman Catholicism. Is it now their very hour?¹⁸

During the second half of the nineteenth century, communicants were still expected to announce their intention to commune in person to the pastor a few days or weeks in advance in order to provide opportunity for a conference on the spiritual condition of the communicant. Such private confession was practiced faithfully in the Missouri Synod of 1855:

The Synod deemed therefore that aside from special circumstances, inquiry at private confession or at the announcement for Holy Communion is the proper and chief means by which the pastor should obtain a knowledge of the spiritual condition of the individuals; not only because at that time he can generally talk with a person alone and unhindered but also because those who come to announce are more inclined to explore their spiritual condition more precisely, and the impending confession and Communion presents a special opportunity for self-examination.¹⁹

Wilhelm Loehe, who was responsible for so many of the Lutheran missions in the United States and for the foundation of the "practical" seminary in Fort Wayne, Indiana, was often considered guilty of harboring Romanizing views concerning the Sacrament of the Altar.

In his eyes confirmation, absolution, Lord's Supper, ordination, and other acts became the essence of the Christian life. "For me Lutheranism used to be identical with a commitment to the confessions from A to Z," he wrote in 1865, "but now the whole of Lutheranism is comprised in the sacrament of the altar ... In the words "sacramental Lutheranism" my development is expressed."²⁰

Matthias Loy of the Ohio Synod at its seminary in Columbus, who later would become embroiled in the Predestinarian Controversy by allying with Stelhorn and Allwardt, at this time was an admirer of Dr. C.F.W. Walther and the Missouri Synod. In the area of the sacraments, Loy was a faithful Lutheran. He wrote an essay entitled "The Lutheran Cultus" in 1853 and attacked the Reformed conception of the blessed Sacrament, at the same time championing the Biblical, Lutheran doctrine of the Real Presence:

They (the Reforméd) do not believe in the real, active presence of the Saviour in his church. They do not assemble to receive from the Lord so much as to bring to him their offerings. Their cultus is altogether sacrificial. Even the Lord's Supper and baptism are memorials. Whatever they have in the house of the Lord they are expected to bring with them. The whole cultus therefore partakes rather of a stirring or awakening than of a quiet, solemn, soothing character. The sermon is more excited and exciting. So are also the prayers, and for this reason they are mostly extemporany. Thus with all their endeavors to do away with all art and pomp as influencing the imagination and suit everything to the naked understanding, they fall again into the Romish error of trusting to natural enthusiasm, and this unquestionably from the unsacramental separation of the Holy Spirit from, his chosen means of operation upon men's souls. This depreciation of the sacramental exerted its influence also in preventing a proper development of the sacrificial. They received little and therefore had little to give. Hence the sermon in time became not only the center but also the sum of their cultus.²¹

Loy also pushed for more frequent Communions:

Without either Word or sacrament there can be no public worship in the Lutheran sense; without the communion there can be no complete worship. The spirit of our church requires weekly communion.²²

General Charles, Porterfield Krauth was the theologian of the General Council, which consisted of the more orthodox member synods of the old General Synod. In his magnum opus, The Conservative Reformation, he wrote:

X The Sacramental Presence is the necessary sequel, the crowning glory of the Incarnation and Atonement. ...All theology without exception has had views of the atonement which were lower or higher, as its views of the Lord's Supper were low or high. Men have talked and written as if the doctrine of our Church, on this point, were a stupid blunder, forced upon it by the self-will and obstinacy of one man. The truth is, that his doctrine, clearly revealed in the New Testament, clearly confessed by the early Church, lies at the very heart of the Evangelical system - Christ is the center of the system, and in the Supper is the center of Christ's revelation of Himself. The glory and mystery of the Incarnation combine there as they combine nowhere else. Communion with Christ is that by which we live, and the Supper is "the Communion." Had Luther abandoned this vital doctrine, the Evangelical Protestant Church would have abandoned him. He did not make this doctrine - next in its immeasurable importance to that of justification by faith, with which it indissolubly coheres - the doctrine made him. The doctrine of the Lord's Supper is the most vital and practical in the whole range of the profoundest Christian life - the doctrine which, beyond all others, conditions and vitalises that life, for in it the character of faith is determined, invigorated, and purified as it is nowhere else. It

is not only a fundamental doctrine, but is among the most fundamental of the fundamentals. We know what we have written. We know that to take our Saviour at His Word here, to receive the teachings of the New Testament in their obvious intent, is to incur with the current religionism a reproach little less bitter than if we had taken up arms against the holiest truths of our faith. We are willing to endure it. ...The Lutheran Church has suffered more for her adherence to this doctrine than from all her suffering. To her it is a very small thing that she should be judged of man's judgement...²³

Krauth was also the man responsible for the Galesburg Rule. Krauth wrote it, and it was then adopted in convention by the General Council at Akron, Ohio in 1872 and at Galesburg, Illinois in 1875.

1. The rule is: Lutheran pulpits are for Lutheran ministers only. Lutheran altars are for Lutheran communicants only.
2. The exceptions to the rule belong to the sphere of privilege, not of right.
3. The determination of the exceptions is to be made in consonance with these principles by the conscientious judgement of pastors as the cases arise.²⁴

To explain this Galesburg Rule, Krauth wrote an essay entitled "The Relations of the Lutheran Church to the Denominations Around Us" in 1877, which stated:

A Zwinglian may admit that a Lutheran is not in fundamental error; a Lutheran cannot admit it in regard to a Zwinglian. To claim that what is really bread and wine is Christ's body and blood may be a great absurdity - but it is the result of too absolute a trust in his word; it is the superstition of faith. But to say that what he really tells us is body and blood is but bread and wine implies lack of trust in his word - it is the superstition of unbelief. However, the astonishing thing is that those who reproach us for treating the doctrine of the Lord's Supper as fundamental do themselves treat it in the same way. They treat it as fundamental by making it a part of their confession, and in every one of its aspects in which our confession considers it. It is in the Thirty-Nine Articles, the Westminster Confession, and every other great Protestant confession, carefully stated and guarded not only against Rome but against our church. That is an official admission and claim that the doctrine is clearly revealed, that they hold it in its purity, that we are wrong in it, and that a clear confession on the very points in which they are right and we are wrong is needful. Their own confessions witness against them when they say that the Lutheran Church should not make its doctrine of the Lord's Supper a term of teaching and communion.²⁵

The problem with the Galesburg Rule was that it was just that: a rule; a rule which was never used in disciplining. Like any resolution adopted by any convention of any synod, unless it is actually

practiced and followed through, it is simply a gesture. The rule itself permits "exceptions", rather than treating them as cases of casuistry (if such had been the case, the "exceptions" would not have been built into the rule).

The theologian of the Missouri Synod, of course, was Dr. C.F.W. Walther, who was a pastor and a teacher of dogmatics, president of Concordia Seminary in St. Louis, editor of Lehre and Wehre, and sometimes president of the Synod. On one Maundy Thursday Walther preached about the Sacrament of the Altar as the crown of all the means of grace:

Woe to us, therefore, if we want to yield and give in here! Thereby we would be surrendering nothing less than the Holy of Holies of the Christian Church, the Ark of the Covenant and the Mercy Seat of the New Covenant.... It is true, my beloved, in the Holy Supper there is given to us no other grace than that which is given to us already in Baptism, in the preaching of the Gospel, and in the comforting Absolution ... Accordingly it might well seem as if every person is thereby sufficiently supplied with the treasure of the forgiveness of sins and that it therefore matters little, if the Holy Supper with its forgiveness of sins is mutilated or taken from him entirely. But this is by no means so. Rather, the Holy Supper is the real crown of all the means of grace which Christ has given to His dear Christendom ... O, who can express what a glorious, comforting, heavenly sweet Meal the Holy Supper is? Here the forgiveness of sins is not only preached, proclaimed, promised, assured and sealed to us, as in the other means of grace, but here Christ at the same time gives His Body and His Blood to His Christians, as the guarantee of it ... No, a more precious, incontrovertible divine guarantee there cannot be ... Let us not be ashamed of this doctrine, but joyfully confess it, and publicly praise it as the most precious treasure entrusted to us. (Maundy Thursday sermon on I Cor. 11:23-32, in Amerikanisch - Lutherische Evangelien Postille, p. 147).²⁶

Walther told his students at Concordia Seminary that the Sacrament of the Altar is a heavenly feast on earth:

According to the Holy Scriptures the Lord's Supper is not an earthly feast, but a heavenly feast on earth, in which not only bread and wine, or only the body and blood of Christ are given us, but together with these forgiveness of sins, life, and salvation is given and sealed to us. For, distributing the bread which He had blessed, Christ said: "This is My Body which is given for you;... this do in remembrance of Me." By the words "for you" He invited the disciples to ponder the fact that they were now receiving and eating that body by the bitter death of which on the cross the entire world would be redeemed. He meant to remind them that they ought to break forth with joy and gladness because the ransom that was to be paid for the sins of the whole world was, so to speak, put in their mouths. Offering the

disciples the cup which He had blessed, Christ said: "This is the cup, the new testament in My blood, which is shed for you." Why did He add the words "shed for you"? He meant to say: "When receiving the blood of redemption in this Holy Supper, you receive at the same time what has been acquired on the cross by means of this sacrifice."²⁷

Walther believed and taught that every communicant should shout with joy when he goes home from church after communing, because Christ emphasizes the words "for the remission of sins."²⁸ Walther was also quite adamant in maintaining that the Lord's Supper is not a work performed by a Christian or that it produces blessings ex opere operato.

True, many Lutherans determine by the almanac whether it is time for them to go to Communion again, because they imagine that going to Communion is a work which a Christian must perform and which he cannot afford to neglect. Thus they approach the altar and eat and drink death and damnation to themselves. What is to urge a person to go to Communion is the promise of grace which God has attached to the visible signs in the Sacrament. If a person approaches the altar with faith in the promise, he will leave the Table of the Lord with a blessing in his heart. It is a pity that many think and say: "I have been brought up to consider it my duty to go to Communion. If I perform this duty, then I am sure of my salvation."²⁹

The orthodox Lutheran theologians during the nineteenth century fought for the doctrine of the Real Presence with all the strength and intelligence which God supplied them. However, in that strife, to a large extent they neglected one thing: the consecration. It remained for the twentieth century to raise that issue.

End Notes

- ¹ F. Bente, ed., Trigolt Concordia. The Symbolical Books of the Ev. Lutheran Church. German - Latin - English. Published as a Memorial of the Quadricentenary Jubilee of the Reformation anno Domini 1917 by resolution of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States. (St. Louis, Missouri: Concordia Publishing House, 1921), p. 555.
- ² Triglot, op. cit., pp. 753-759.
- ³ Triglot, op. cit., p. 47.
- ⁴ Triglot, op. cit., p. 247.
- ⁵ Triglot, op. cit., p. 493.
- ⁶ Triglot, op. cit., pp. 971-1015.
- ⁷ Triglot, op. cit., p. 755.
- ⁸ Triglot, op. cit., pp. 807-815.
- ⁹ Triglot, op. cit., pp. 999-1003.
- ¹⁰ Carl S. Meyer, Moving Frontiers. Readings In The History Of The Lutheran Church - Missouri Synod (St. Louis, Missouri: Concordia Publishing House, 1964), p. 11
- ¹¹ Meyer, op. cit., p. 144.
- ¹² Abdel Ross Wentz, A Basic History of Lutheranism In America (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Fortress Press, 1964), p. 133.
- ¹³ Wentz, op. cit. p. 136.
- ¹⁴ Ibid.
- ¹⁵ F. Clifford Nelson, ed., The Lutherans in North America (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Fortress Press, 1975), p. 223.
- ¹⁶ Theodore G. Tappert, ed., Lutheran Confessional Theology in America 1840-1880 (New York, New York: Oxford University Press, 1972), p.24.
- ¹⁷ Ibid.
- ¹⁸ Nelson, op. cit., pp. 225-226.
- ¹⁹ Nelson, op. cit., p. 246.
- ²⁰ Tappert, op. cit., p. 13.
- ²¹ Tappert, op. cit., p. 308.

End Notes

- ²³ Kurt Marquart, "The Meaningful Use of the Means of Grace as the Source of Spiritual Life." A Christian Handbook On Vital Issues Herman Otten, ed. (1973), p. 89.
- ²⁴ Tappert, op. cit., p. 101.
- ²⁵ Tappert. op. cit., p. 124.
- ²⁶ Marquart. op. cit., p. 89.
- ²⁷ Dr. C.F.W. Walther, The Proper Distinction Between Law And Gospel. Thirty-Nine Evening Lectures. Reproduced from the German edition of 1897 by W.H.T. Dau (St. Louis, Missouri: Concordia Publishing House, n.d.), p. 152.
- ²⁸ Walther, op. cit., p. 376.
- ²⁹ Walther, op. cit., p. 354.

Part V

American Lutheranism In The Twentieth Century

In 1910, A.L. Gæbner provided what many orthodox American Lutheran considered the definitive statement on the Sacrament of the Altar:

The sacrament of the Lord's Table, or the Lord's Supper, or the Eucharist, is the divinely instituted act of consecrating, by the word of institution, the divinely prescribed visible elements, bread and wine, of distributing to the communicants the consecrated elements, and of orally eating and drinking in, with, and under the consecrated bread and wine the true body and blood of Christ, who, being present in such act, earnestly offers to all communicants forgiveness of sins, and efficaciously operates toward the acceptance of such gift, and toward renewed assurance of its possession, and the effects of such assurance.

It remained for Dr. Franz Pieper to develop that statement.

Dr. Pieper was the successor of Dr. Walther in the Missouri Synod. He served as teacher of dogmatics and president of Concordia Seminary, and also served as the president of the Synod for several years. In his three volumes of dogmatics, published in 1924 and translated into English in 1953, he clashed with both liberalism and neo-orthodoxy. In his locus on the Lord's Supper, he notes that this sacrament has a divine institution and offers a personal pledge of the remission of sins, in addition to noting the three traditional beliefs: 1) transubstantiation; 2) representation (i.e. bread and wine are symbols of Christ's body and blood); and 3) the unio sacramentalis (i.e. the bread and wine and Christ's body and blood are present).² Pieper speaks about the locutio exhibitiva (a form of speech employed by all people in passing objects to one another):

This locutio exhibitiva is in general use both in our daily intercourse and in Holy Scripture. Properly our Lutheran theologians remind us that in tendering food or drink in a vessel we do not mention both the vessel and the food or drink, but only the contents of the vessel.³

Dr. Pieper expends a great deal of effort and space in detailing the controversy between Luther and the Enthusiasts over the doctrine of the Real Presence. Carlsadt made the "this" (touto) point to Christ's body, as though Christ said that here his body was seated. Thus Zwingli maintained that "is" stands for "signifies," whereas Calvin and Oecolampadius took the noun "body" in a figurative sense, a signum corporis.⁴ Pieper then shows the fallacies of this enthusiasm:

"Where the little verb "is" is used in speaking, there the true nature of the thing is certainly spoken of, and not what it may symbolize." In other words, where the verb "is" is employed, men are always speaking of what the thing really is and not what it is a figure of. The human tongue would cease to be a medium for the exchange of thoughts if "is" were not to mean "is," but something else. "Language itself would commit suicide if it could tolerate the idea that the substantive verb shall express not substance, but symbol" (Krauth, Conserv. Reformation, p. 619). ...When it is said: Christ is the Door, the Vine, the Rock, etc., there is in these sentences, of course, a figurative expression (Tropus). However, it is not the copula "is;" but in the predicate noun "Door," "Vine," "Rock." Christ does not signify the door, but really is the Door. Of course, not an ordinary door leading from a St. Louis street into a home on that street, but a spiritual Door, namely the Door by which men enter into the Kingdom of God. As Christ Himself immediately explains His words: "I am the Door: by Me, if any man enter in, he shall be saved." The word "door," as Luther expresses it, has become a "new word." Meanwhile, however, the copula "is" retains its first and only meaning: it expresses the essence, what Christ actually is, the spiritual Door into the Kingdom of God. The same thing holds true of the other examples adduced. Christ does not signify a vine, but is the spiritual Vine, on which the spiritual branches, the Christians, grow by faith. Again Christ did not typify the rock, but really was the spiritual Rock (πνευματικὴ πέτρα) that accompanied Israel through the desert. Also when we are dealing with pictures "is" remains is. True, we say pointing to a picture of Peter: "That is Peter." But our words do not mean: This picture signifies Peter; they rather mean: The object portrayed is Peter, or, This is a painting or portrait of Peter.⁵

In this way Pieper demolishes the arguments of the Reformed groups (such as the Baptists raised in Part III of this paper), as Luther had done previously. Pieper also reiterates the hermeneutical rule for

all discussion concerning the Real Presence:

Every word must be taken in its first, that is, its proper meaning, until circumstances contained in the context or an express declaration of the writer compel one to substitute the figurative or symbolic meaning for the natural.⁶

Pieper continues his discussion by maintaining that John 6 does not speak concerning the Sacrament (the reader should note that Werner Elert and many others disagree with this statement of Pieper):

Text and context make it utterly impossible to refer John 6 to the Lord's Supper. The entire apparatus of the Lord's Supper, so faithfully described by all four writers, Matthew, Mark, Luke, and Paul, in their report on the Sacrament, is here missing. In John 6 Christ does not take bread, give thanks, break it and give it to the people, and say: "Take, eat; this is My body, which is given for you." Just as little does John 6 mention a cup which Christ takes, gives thanks over, gives to the people, and says: "Drink ye all of it; this is My blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins."⁷

Pieper believes that John 6 treats of a spiritual eating which is further served in a special manner by the Lord's Supper.⁸ No one has yet successfully answered Dr. Pieper's arguments on this point. His elucidation of the false exegesis of the other traditions is impeccable. Pieper notes that the Roman doctrine stems, not from a bad interpretation, but from a false and faulty exegesis; so also the Reformed doctrine of the Lord's Supper demands a great amount of such faulty exegesis.⁹ However, the Lutheran doctrine rests on the bare words of institution and employs no faulty exegesis.¹⁰ Therefore, Pieper maintains:

Both opponents basically form a united front against Luther and the Lutheran Church in their teaching of the Lord's Supper, in spite of the difference in their conclusions, inasmuch as neither will accept the plain meaning of the statements of Scripture on the Lord's Supper.¹¹

Pieper also noted that Charles Porterfield Krauth agreed with this analysis.

Concerning the variations in the wording of the four records, Dr. Pieper illustrates that all four accounts bring out the essence of the Lord's Supper.¹² The new covenant for Pieper consists of the re-

mission of sins.¹³ The Holy Supper itself consists of earthly elements (terrena) and heavenly (coelestis). Concerning the terrena, Pieper states:

As we do not venture to substitute some other fluid for water in Baptism, so neither in the Lord's Supper do we dare to substitute aught for bread and wine. If something else is substituted, doubts must necessarily arise whether our celebration is the Supper instituted by Christ. And as the application of the water is a part of Baptism, so also the giving and receiving of the bread and wine are a part of the Lord's Supper. Where the elements are not distributed and consumed, as in the case of the Papistic Mass and the Corpus Christi festival, there is no Lord's Supper and no body of Christ, but solely abomination and fraud.¹⁴

Nor does Pieper understand the "whole Christ" to be present in the Sacrament. The four writers do not indicate such to be the case.

...we must maintain: The whole Christ is present, of course, as in the universe, so in particular in the Church and in all rites of the Church, hence also in the Lord's Supper. But in His Sacrament Christ gives something to be eaten and drunk with the mouth, and that is not the whole Christ, but Christ's body and blood, as the words of institution read: "Take, eat, this is My body," etc.¹⁵

The communicant receives neither the "benefits of Christ," for they are not given and shed for the remission of sins; nor the Holy Ghost and His activity, which were not given into death or shed for the remission of sins; nor spiritual fellowship with Christ or union with the Christian Church which likewise are fruits of faith, not given and shed for the remission of sins.¹⁶ The Real Presence, Pieper says, is not based on the glorification of the body of Christ, but occurs only because of the promise of Christ.¹⁷ Only in the blessed Sacrament of the Altar does the unio sacramentalis occur, where Christ's body is received with the bread, and with the wine the communicant receives His blood.¹⁸ These elements are received and eaten with the mouth, manducatio oralis.¹⁹ The bread and wine are eaten in a natural manner, and our Lord Christ's body and blood are received in a supernatural manner.²⁰

What effects the Sacrament? Dr. Pieper correctly maintains:

The Sacrament, instituted by Christ, comes into being not by the state of the administrant, nor, by the faith of the communicants,

but by the institution of Christ, which to the end of time exerts its power wherever the Lord's Supper is administered according to the institution of Christ.²¹

For this reason, the Romanists and the Reformed do not have the Sacrament instituted by Christ, for their rite lacks that institution.²²

It is only when Pieper begins his discussion of the consecration that fault can be found. He defines consecration:

Consecration is correctly defined as the act whereby bread and wine are detached from their ordinary use and appointed to the use in the Lord's Supper, that is, are set apart to this end, that with the bread, according to Christ's promise the body of Christ and with the wine, according to Christ's promise, the blood of Christ be received.²³

Pieper does not equate consecration with the Words of Institution, the powerful Word of God, die Machtworte, as the Formula of Concord does, and that is unfortunate. He affirms the manducatio indignorum as the test question for belief in the Real Presence,²⁴ but his position on the consecration becomes quite evident in his discussion of Johann Saliger:

It should be added that the Formula of Concord very definitely rejects the opinion that the consecration by itself, or the mere recitation of the words of institution, makes the Sacrament or brings about the unio sacramentalis. Johann Saliger, pastor at Luebeck and Rostock, had tenaciously defended the opinion that the unio sacramentalis occurred already ante usum; hence before the distribution and reception. (On Saliger see Walther, Pastorale, p. 175, note.) In vain did a commission seek to convince Saliger; he even carried the controversy into the pulpit. A fuller report on the trouble with Saliger is offered in Frank, III, 146 ff. (foot-note 117))²⁵

Dr. Pieper cites Dr. Walther who cited Hunnius' argument concerning the Sacrament previously consecrated followed by a fire. Every sensible person in that case, according to Pieper, would negate the sacramental union. The query must be raised, however: What does sensibility have to do with the sacramental union? Have we become rationalists? Obviously, the Sacrament is for eating and drinking. Nevertheless, the Formula of Concord states (VII;75-77):

...der Leib und Blut Christi, wahrhaftig gegenwärtig, ausgeteilt und empfangen wird...

...corpus et sanguis Christi vere praesentia, distribuuntur et sumuntur...

...the body and blood of Christ are truly present, distributed, and received, because of the power and efficacy of the words which Christ spake at the first Supper. For where His institution is observed and His words are spoken over the bread and cup (wine), and the consecrated bread and cup (wine) are distributed, Christ Himself, through the spoken words, is still efficacious by virtue of the first institution, through His word, which He wishes to be there repeated...

...Die Worte werden durch des Priesters Mund gesprochen, aber durch Gottes Kraft und Gnade, durch das Wort, da er spricht: „Das ist mein Leib“, werden die vorgestalteten (vorgestellten) Elemente im Abendmahl gesegnet...

...Sacerdotis ore verba proferuntur, et Dei virtute consecrantur et gratia. Hoc est, ait: „Corpus meum“; hoc verbo proposita elementa in Coena consecrantur...

...The words are spoken by the mouth of the priest, but by God's power and grace, by the word, where He speaks, "This is My body," the elements presented are consecrated in the Supper...

Pieper continues the discussion by explaining that the purpose of the Lord's Supper is to grant the remission of sins.²⁷ Faith in the Real Presence is the indispensable prerequisite for salutary use of the Supper, but does not necessarily guarantee a salutary use; faith which believes that the remission of sins is imparted in this Supper makes its use salutary.²⁸ Pieper also points out that Rome anathematizes this doctrine, and the Reformed also reject it. The Sacrament's subordinate effects according to Pieper, are 1) the strengthening of faith; 2) communion with Christ; 3) communion with the spiritual body of Christ which is the Church; 4) furtherance in sanctification; 5) the kindling of love of God and neighbor. and 6) growth in patience and the hope of eternal life.²⁹

Dr. Pieper correctly maintains that the Sacrament was not and is not intended for all people, but for Christians.³⁰ It is not intended even for all Christians, but for 1) such as have been baptized; 2) such as are able to examine themselves; 3) only such as believe the words of institution; and 4) such as must ~~not~~ first remove a public offense.³¹ Those barred or excluded from, the Lord's Table are 1) those

living in the sin of implacability and 2) members of heterodox churches.³²
 The practice of open communion is contrary both to love for God and
 to love for one's neighbor.

Accordingly, if a Christian congregation is to prove itself conscientious in the administration of the Lord's Supper, it must have the custom of registration for Communion (announcing one's intention to partake to the pastor). Obviously, only through such registration can the pastor limit Communion attendance to those eligible for the Lord's Supper.³³

Dr. Pieper then concludes his discussion by noting that the Sacrament of the Altar is a divine ordinance which must be observed by the Church until Judgement Day.³⁴ It is not an adiaphoron; rather, the Lord's Supper is a necessity.

Dr. Pieper's influence among orthodox American Lutherans remains strong, as well it should. His three volume set of Christian Dogmatics is an excellent portrayal of the orthodox Lutheranism. Nevertheless, in the locus of the blessed Sacrament, his discussion of the consecration is weak and sub-Lutheran. While he does not deny the words of the Formula of Concord, he appears to have evaded the issue. Unfortunately, many conservative Lutheran synods and theologians have regressed several steps beyond the position of Dr. Pieper.

Perhaps this is the reason why, as Dr. Raymond Surburg observes, " ... only 28% "of American Lutherans ""strongly agree" that "in the Holy Communion we are given the true Body and Blood of Jesus Christ for the forgiveness of sins.""³⁵

Dr. Edward W.A. Koehler was a member of the faculty of Concordia Teachers College in River Forest, Illinois from 1909-1951. In 1939, his Summary of Christian Doctrine was published. It can still be found in the libraries of Missouri Synod faithful, and it is still used as a text book for doctrine courses in many Lutheran high schools and colleges. Dr. Pieper has influenced the theologians of the Church, so Koehler has influenced its laity.

Dr. Koehler also speaks about the Lord's Supper, noting that it is a permanent institution to be observed in the Church unto the end of time. The visible elements are bread and wine. The heavenly elements are the true body and blood of Christ. He rejects transubstantiation and representation. The "whole Christ" is not received, only His body and Blood. Rome and the Reformed do not possess the Sacrament. The sacramental union consists of the wine and bread united with Christ's blood and body. This union is supernatural and peculiar only to this Sacrament. Consubstantiation is rejected by Koehler. He maintains that the sacramental union is effected by the power of God's Word and Christ's institution. Its validity is not affected by the faith or the impiety of either the minister or the communicant. Koehler believes that the sacramental action consists of taking, eating and drinking (thus ignoring the fact that the Thorough Declaration of the Formula of Concord also includes consecration as part of the sacramental action, FC,SD,VII,86). Koehler also rightfully rejects intinction because Christ said "Take, eat," and "Take, drink." He also rejects the adoration of the host and the sacrifice of the papistical mass which belittles the sacrifice of Christ. The Sacrament, he notes, was given to the Christian disciples, hence close communion is proper. One receives the forgiveness of sins, life and salvation from the body and blood of Christ. "given and shed for you for the remission of sins," hence the Sacrament is a Means of Grace. This promise is useless unless it be received by faith. Koehler also rejects the Roman doctrine of ex opere operato. He also notes that at whose altar one worships, his religion is confessed, hence altar fellowship and close communion are Biblical precepts and practices. Finally, Koehler notes the need for frequent attendance at the Lord's Supper due to Christ's command and invitation, and on account of the promised blessings of the Supper's reception and the trouble which lies heavy upon human beings.³⁶ Dr.

Koehler maintains that John 6:53-56 does not treat of the Sacrament of the Altar:

John 6:53-56 does not treat of the Lord's Supper, because the Lord's Supper was not yet instituted. It teaches that by faith one must receive the merits of Christ, which He procured by giving His body and by shedding His blood, and that all those who so eat His flesh and drink His blood have eternal life. But not all who eat and drink the body and blood of Christ in the Sacrament shall have life. (I Cor. 11:27-29). Besides, the expression "My flesh is meat" is by no means the same as "the bread is My body."³⁷

Basically, Koehler's treatment of the doctrine of the Lord's Supper is adequate. However, when it comes to the consecration, Dr. Koehler teaches a form of receptionism:

The sacramental union, therefore, is not effected by the pastor's consecration of the bread and wine, but it obtains only in the bread and wine we eat and drink, and while we eat and drink them. We have no Biblical ground to assume that the bread is the body of Christ before we eat it, and that it continues to be the body of Christ after we have eaten it.³⁸

When one compares Koehler's words with those of the Formula of Concord, it is obvious that there is a disagreement. Unfortunately, Koehler has influenced laymen and teachers so much since 1939 that the majority of Lutherans believe Koehler's teaching to be the doctrine of the orthodox Lutheran Church. Koehler also speaks about the word of Institution:

The words Christ used when He gave thanks over the bread and the cup are not recorded, but they, no doubt, referred to what He was about to do. Also Paul speaks of "the cup of blessing which we bless" (I Cor. 10:16). Thus we likewise bless, consecrate the bread and wine. And as these elements are to be used in the Supper which Christ instituted, it is self-evident that we should use those words by which He instituted this Supper and commanded us to celebrate it. However, these words do not work like a magic formula, whereby the body and blood are instantly and automatically joined with the bread and wine, for Christ did not say that the bread which He blessed was His body, but the bread which He gave to His disciples, and which they ate ... By such consecration we merely indicate that we are about to celebrate that Supper which Christ instituted with these words, and thereby we set aside this bread and wine for the sacred use that it should be the carrier of the body and blood of Christ.³⁹

Although Dr. Koehler believes, teaches and confesses the doctrine of the Real Presence of our Lord Christ's body and blood, he employs

the Reformed definition of consecration, and he ignores the words of the Thorough Declaration, VII;54, which state:

not only the bread which Christ broke and distributed, but also that which we break and bless, is the communion of the body and blood of Christ, so that all who eat this bread and drink of this cup truly receive, and are partakers of, the true body and blood of Christ.⁴⁰

In 1967, the Commission on Doctrinal Matters of the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod (WELS) produced a statement of faith entitled "This We Believe." Article VI is concerned with the Means of Grace:

...4. We believe that all who partake of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper receive the true body and blood of Christ "in, with, and under" the bread and wine. This is true because, when the Lord instituted this Sacrament, He said: "This is my body which is given for you...This cup is the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you."(Luke 22:19,20). As we partake of His body and blood, given and shed for us, we by faith receive the comfort and assurance that our sins are indeed forgiven and that we are truly His own. ...

7. We reject all teachings that see in the Sacrament of the Altar nothing more than signs and symbols for faith, thereby denying that Christ's true body and blood are received in the Lord's Supper.

8. We reject the claim that unbelievers and hypocrites do not receive the true body and blood of Jesus in the Sacrament, as well as the view that to eat the body of Christ in the Sacrament is nothing else than to receive Christ spiritually by faith. We reject the view that the body and blood of Christ are present in the Sacrament through the act of consecration as such, apart from the reception of the elements.

9. We reject the teaching that the real presence of Jesus' body blood in the Sacrament means merely that the person of Christ⁴¹ is present in His Supper even as He is present in the Gospel.

The statement is a fine expression of Lutheran doctrine, except for point number eight, which ignores the Large Catechism, (V;10,18):

It is the Word (I say) which makes and distinguishes this Sacrament; so that it is not mere bread and wine, but is, and is called, the body and blood of Christ. ...That is as much as to say, No matter whether you are worthy or unworthy, you have here His body and blood by virtue of these words which are added to the bread and wine. Only note and remember this well; for upon these words rest all our foundation, protection, and defense against all errors and deception that have ever come or may yet come.⁴²

Dr. Luther stressed the Word of God, the Words of Institution, which

effected the Real Presence. The Wisconsin Synod looks to the reception. At the worst, this is Crypto-Calvinism. At best, it is Melancthonian receptionism.

In 1974, professors Schuetze and Habeck of Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary of the Wisconsin Synod published their text book for pastoral theology. When they speak about the consecration, the Reformed influence is evident:

Essentially, the consecration consists in speaking the words of institution over the visible elements. Its purpose is, first of all, to show that it is the pastor's intention to carry out Jesus' institution and to set the visible elements apart for use in the sacrament. It furthermore serves as a prayer that the Lord may do what He has promised, as a confession that the body and blood of Christ are present in the sacrament, and as an invitation to the communicants to appropriate Jesus' promise by faith.⁴³

Note that these "conservative" Lutheran seminary professors do not maintain, as the Lutheran Confessions do, that the Verba of the words of institution, die Machtworte, consecrate and effect the Real Presence! They teach receptionism. Schuetze and Habeck speak also concerning the Real Presence during the distribution:

The distribution of the wine also calls for considerable care lest some of it spill on a communicant's clothes or on the floor.. While unconsumed portions of the bread and wine are not the body and blood of Christ, their falling to the floor can disturb the devotion of the communicants and may give the impression that the pastor is careless about the sacrament.⁴⁴

According to Schuetze and Habeck, then, it is not the Verba which effect the Real Presence, but the reception, for if the elements are not received, there is no Real Presence. This is receptionism. This is Crypto-Calvinism. For, as Epitome VII;8 & 35 state:

Now, as to the consecration, we believe, teach and confess that no work of man or recitation of the minister (of the church) produces this presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Holy Supper, but that this is to be ascribed only and alone to the almighty power of our Lord Jesus Christ. ...we unanimously reject and condemn all the following erroneous articles...That not the omnipotent words of Christ's testament, but faith, produces and makes (is the cause of) the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Holy Supper.⁴⁵

And what should be done with the consecrated elements after the communion, according to Schuetze and Habeck?

The premise must stand that apart from the sacrament the elements are only bread and wine. Whatever consecrated elements are not used in the sacrament cannot be considered the Lord's body and blood unless one holds to the Roman doctrine of the transubstantiation. There is no scriptural reason why they may not be saved for another communion, at which time they will, of course, again be consecrated.⁴⁶

Granted, of course, that the Sacrament is for eating and drinking and is not to be hoisted about on a pole as Rome does on Corpus Christi Day; nevertheless, that is not identical to, nor remotely familiar to WELS' premise which "must stand." To dismiss the previous statement as a Romanizing tendency and to ignore the Lutheran Confessions shows a severe lack of theological insight and/or Reformed tendencies.

As Dr. Lowell Green has pointed out,

One of the greatest perils is that American Lutherans will fall into the pit of subordinating the Lord's Supper by placing it under some general category which robs it of its uniqueness. A common mistake is to follow Karl Barth and others who call the Eucharist merely another form of the "Word of God. This approach was much used by the Lutheran and Reformed essayists who contributed to the paperback volume, Marburg Revisited. It has the dubious merit of suppressing the elements that are most distinctive in the Lutheran Confessions and thereby offensive to the Reformed partners, but it does this at the expense of the uniqueness of the Sacrament.⁴⁷

Unfortunately, American Lutheranism, both conservative, moderate and liberal, finds itself in that great pit. However, as confessional Lutheranism, like a sleeping giant, begins to wake up and flex its muscles, there is hope for the visible Church of God on earth.

End Notes

- ¹ A.L. Graebner, Outlines of Doctrinal Theology (St. Louis, Missouri: Concordia Publishing House, 1910), p. 167.
- ² Francis Pieper, D.D., Christian Dogmatics, Volume III (St. Louis, Missouri: Concordia Publishing House, 1953), pp. 290-295.
- ³ Pieper, op. cit., p. 299.
- ⁴ Pieper, op. cit., pp. 303-304.
- ⁵ Pieper, op. cit., pp. 305-306.
- ⁶ Pieper, op. cit., p. 317.
- ⁷ Pieper, op. cit., p. 329.
- ⁸ Pieper, op. cit., p. 331.
- ⁹ Pieper, op. cit., pp. 337-339.
- ¹⁰ Pieper, op. cit., p. 341.
- ¹¹ Pieper, op. cit., p. 343.
- ¹² Pieper, op. cit., p. 350.
- ¹³ Pieper, op. cit., p. 351.
- ¹⁴ Pieper, op. cit., p. 354.
- ¹⁵ Pieper, op. cit., p. 356.
- ¹⁶ Pieper, op. cit., p. 358.
- ¹⁷ Pieper, op. cit., p. 360.
- ¹⁸ Pieper, op. cit., p. 361.
- ¹⁹ Ibid.
- ²⁰ Ibid.
- ²¹ Pieper, op. cit., p. 365.
- ²² Pieper, op. cit., p. 370.
- ²³ Pieper, op. cit., p. 366.
- ²⁴ Pieper, op. cit., p. 370.
- ²⁵ Pieper, op. cit., p. 372.
- ²⁶ F. Bente, ed., Triglot Concordia. The Symbolical Books of the Ev. Lutheran Church, German - Latin - English, Published as a Memorial of the Quadricentenary Jubilee of the Reformation anno Domini

End Notes

- 1917 by resolution of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States (St. Louis, Missouri: Concordia Publishing House, 1921), p. 999.
- ²⁷ Pieper, op. cit., p. 373.
- ²⁸ Ibid.
- ²⁹ Pieper, op. cit., pp. 379ff.
- ³⁰ Pieper, op. cit., p. 381.
- ³¹ Pieper, op. cit., pp. 383ff.
- ³² Ibid.
- ³³ Pieper, op. cit., p. 385.
- ³⁴ Pieper, op. cit., p. 391.
- ³⁵ Dr. Raymond Surburg, "Millions Of Lutherans Are As Bad Off As the Heathen," A Christian Handbook On Vital Issues Herman Otten, ed. (1973), p. 77.
- ³⁶ Edward V.A. Koehler, D.D., A Summary of Christian Doctrine, A Popular Presentation of the Teachings of the Bible (St. Louis, Missouri: Concordia Publishing House, 1971), pp. 212-235. The entire paragraph is a condensation of Koehler's chapter entitled "The Sacrament of the Altar."
- ³⁷ Koehler, op. cit., p. 216.
- ³⁸ Koehler, op. cit., p. 219.
- ³⁹ Koehler, op. cit., p. 221.
- ⁴⁰ Triglot, op. cit., p. 991.
- ⁴¹ Commission on Doctrinal Matters, Wisconsin Ev. Lutheran Synod, This We Believe. A Statement of Belief of the Wisconsin Ev. Lutheran Synod (Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Northwestern Publishing House, 1967), pp. 15-17.
- ⁴² Triglot, op. cit., pp. 755-757.
- ⁴³ Armin W. Schuetze & Irwin J. Habeck, The Shepherd under Christ. A Textbook for Pastoral Theology (Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Northwestern Publishing House, 1974), p. 91.
- ⁴⁴ Schuetze & Habeck, op. cit., p. 93.
- ⁴⁵ Triglot, op. cit., pp. 811-815.
- ⁴⁶ Schuetze & Habeck, op. cit., p. 95.

End Notes

- ⁴⁷ Prof. Lowell Green, D. Theol., "Faithful Confessional Life In The Church...Confessional Ecumenism II - A Case Study in Communion Practice," Evangelical Directions For The Lutheran Church Erich Kiehl & Waldo J. Werning, ed. (1970), p. 94.

Part VI

Confessional Lutheran Influences upon American Lutherans

Holsten Fagerberg is a German Lutheran scholar whose text book, entitled A New Look At The Lutheran Confessions (1529-1537), is highly recommended in various bibliographies and courses of study. Most seminarians have this volume in their library; therefore his theology and thought will influence future Lutheran pastors in the United States, especially those of the Missouri Synod (whose publishing house has made the volume available).

Fagerberg notes that the blessed Sacrament of the Altar is God's work, not man's work:

If the Lord's Supper is made dependent on man's faith and worthiness, one would look upon the Sacrament as something we do and not as God's work of salvation.¹

When he speaks concerning the consecration, Fagerberg teaches what the Lutheran Confessions teach:

Luther's thinking here was centered upon God's active Word of consecration, whereby bread and wine become something other than ordinary bread and wine. In LC the words of institution are first of all divine command, not promise. Through these words Christ has bound His presence to the Lord's Supper; through the words of institution the whole Christ is present "in and under the bread and wine" (LC V 8). The reason why the words of institution ought to be thought of first and foremost as words of consecration is found in Luther's idea that the Word must make the elements into a sacrament; if this is not done, they are simply elements and nothing else.²

Fagerberg again correctly maintains, because the Confessions maintain likewise, that the words of institution are Machtworte:

Since Jesus has commanded that the words of institution be repeated, they still have the creative power they possessed from the beginning - and Christ's body and blood are truly present in the Lord's Supper. The minister who reads these words is only an instrument for Christ; he acts on Christ's orders and in His stead. He represents Christ in his function, but not in his person. He has no independent authority, but when he speaks the words of institution, he does so at Christ's command. The effective, consecrating power rests with Christ and

in His Word, which the minister repeats and makes actual. The body of Christ is present in the Lord's Supper "by virtue not of our speaking but of his command, bidding, and action." He "connects his command with our speaking." Luther reminds us that water burst forth from the rock (according to Num. 20:8-14) when Moses struck his staff against it, as God commanded him to do. This and other similar examples from the Old and New Testaments reveal to us that God expresses His will through His Word, even when it is spoken through human instruments, provided that this is done by God's express command. Even though God must make use of human hands and earthly things such as bread and wine, it is He who acts. God is everything and man is nothing when it comes to carrying out His institutions and commands. Therefore the Lord's Supper is altogether God's work.⁵

Fagerberg, as the Lutheran Confessions do, equates the consecration with the Verba of the institution:

One can make good sense out of Luther's short statements in LC only if the words of institution are interpreted as words of consecration. ...We have the right to speak of a sacrament here "by virtue of these words" (LC V 18)...The Word is the command which consecrates the elements and makes them into Christ's body and blood, for "what the words say, that it will be," was die Wort lauten, das wirds sein.⁴

What then effects the Real Presence? "When the words of institution are read, the presence of Christ's body is effected, inasmuch as He in His Word has proclaimed this to be His will."⁵ As noted above, Fagerberg does not believe that the Lord's Supper is mere promise.

The promise stems from the Real Presence:

In modern Protestant theology there is a clearly discernible tendency to emphasize one-sidedly the functional aspect of the Lord's Supper. ...it is misleading to look at the Lord's Supper only from the functional viewpoint of the forgiveness of sins...The Word of promise therefore includes no assurance of the real presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper, but on the basis of the presence of Christ's body and blood the Lord's Supper promises us forgiveness.⁶

There is a certain degree of dissonance between the Lutheran Confessions and theologians of conservatism. A conservative Lutheran is not necessarily an orthodox Lutheran. This is a lesson which the Missouri Synod has yet to learn. Fagerberg's treatment of the Lord's Supper is orthodox. One can only hope that he will influence the sacramental theology of American Lutheranism more than Pieper and Koeh-

ler, lest the sound of the trumpet become as muddled as the one the Wisconsin Synod blows.

Werner Elert is another German Lutheran theologian who exerts a great influence upon American Lutherans. He is considered a confessional Lutheran. Elert correctly maintains that man's part in sacramental acts is incidental:

What is man's part in sacramental acts? In them man plays the same receptive role as in the proclamation of the Word. It follows from this that when the sacraments are understood as acts whereby man confesses his faith, this has to be considered incidental; it cannot have constitutive meaning for the sacraments.

What is Holy Communion for Elert?

In Holy Communion the disciples receive the blood of the new covenant. It becomes evident here that Holy Communion really enters the vacuum which occurs with the solemn termination of the old order through Jesus' last Passover meal. And that applies not only to the first celebration of the Sacrament, which bore an anticipatory character since Christ's sacrifice was first carried out on the following day. No, it applies to every celebration of Holy Communion. Theodore Zahn says correctly, "The church's celebration of Holy Communion is not a celebration commemorating its institution, but a celebration of the entire Christ-wrought redemption of His church as typified in the Jewish Passover."

What does Holy Communion require, according to Elert?

As an act of reception Holy Communion requires a readiness on the part of the communicants to receive something from the Donor. The Donor must be known to the recipients. It was for good reason that the ancient church withheld the Sacrament from the view of all outsiders. After all, of what concern is to outsiders what only Christ's disciples may receive? The proper attitude for receiving also demands that we are open to the Donor's invitation.

Elert asks the all-important question when he asks, why doubt the Real Presence?

...when He accompanies this gift with the words, "This is My Body" and "This is My Blood," it is in fact His body and blood. How can anyone who in faith hears His invitation, knowing that only as a believer he can and will receive the benefits of Christ's gifts - how can he conceive the idea that this is not Christ's body and blood? How can there be "a distress" about Holy Communion, as some people say today, if it is received with this attitude of faith? Of the early church we read that Christians "broke bread." In view of the following liturgical note, this is undoubtedly a reference to Holy Communion. And they broke bread "with gladness and singleness of heart" (Acts 2:46 KJV). How

can this gladness, which our Holy Communion liturgy also aims to express, become "distress"? And above all, how can anyone hold Luther's doctrine of Holy Communion responsible for that, considering that his whole struggle was directed against no other opponent than doubt regarding Christ's own words? And how can there be doubt about words which, among all those transmitted of Christ, have the very oldest testimony in their favor, and without which Holy Communion would be an empty ceremony?¹⁰

Elert maintains that today's Crypto - Calvinists are typified by singleness (Einfachheit)' which is the opposite of doubleness (Zwiefalt, which comes from Zweifel, or doubt).¹¹ These Crypto - Calvinists agree that Calvin expressed what Luther meant. They feel the objective difference between Luther and Zwingli or Calvin, but they suppose that they can dissolve that difference by dialectics.¹² Elert then points out that singleness and doubleness can never, never be reconciled, and that Luther must be and is our exemplar.¹³ The Lord's Supper does not consist of mere table fellowship, as Crypto - Calvinists suppose:

Neither table fellowship as such nor the benediction can afford participation in Christ's body and blood; only the eating and drinking do that. ...a physical oneness of the communicants is effected through the eaten bread, that is through each communicant's reception of a part of the broken bread. But since it is the liturgically broken bread and liturgically blessed cup which are received here, thus also this physical oneness is a common physical sharing in the body and blood of Christ.¹⁴

Elert observes that the reception consists of the oral eating and drinking of Christ's body and blood, the manducatio oralis; and therefore the eating of the unworthy, or the manducatio indignorum, is an unworthy reception of the body and blood of the Lord.¹⁵ Elert believes that Calvinism can be traced back to St. Augustine:

To the present day Augustine is the author of all the types of "doubleness" with regard to the doctrine of Holy Communion in the West. Within the framework of the doctrine of Holy Communion he went ahead with the impossible thesis that Christ's body is localized in heaven and is thus spatially restricted. And from this he logically deduced that this body could not be present in the Sacrament. Thereby he simultaneously became the author of all attempts to assign to Christ's words on Holy Communion a meaning which is different from what they really express.¹⁶

Elert considers Zwingli to be St. Augustine's most faithful disciple; and that Augustinian theology bore its fruit above all others in Calvin.¹⁷

Elert maintains that the confrontation between Luther and Zwingli was a classic example of the clash between two separate theologies:

It is folly to say that the disagreement in the doctrine of Holy Communion, which came into the open then and endures to the present day, involves nothing more than insignificant theses. Two theologies - two types of belief in God - confronted each other at Marburg. There can be no compromise between the two. This situation was not altered by Calvin, nor can it be made obsolete by any "new exegetical situation."¹⁸

He rightfully believes that Marburg was a clash between two different Christologies:

If in the Sacrament at hand He gives us His body, we must not seek Him in distant places. That is our conception of the real presence. The gulf which separates Christologies also separates the doctrines of Holy Communion. The doctrine of Holy Communion is the test for the genuineness of our belief in the incarnation.¹⁹

It is unfortunate that Elert muddies the waters by insisting that Acts 2:46 and John 6 are references to Holy Communion.²⁰ He also maintains that the consecration is only a promise:

Along with the eating and drinking, bread and wine too do not have the function of magical means here. They obtain their place in Holy Communion by the act of institution and by Christ's words of distribution associated with this act. The recitation of these words as the celebration of the Sacrament is repeated does not have the significance of a magic formula, as though it had a magical effect on the bread and wine. The words merely repeat the promise of Christ, just as other promises are repeated in a sermon.

Note that Elert says the same as Pieper, Koehler, and the Wisconsin Synod. However; as noted above, the Confessions of our Church do not speak this way. The Words of Institution are not chiefly or merely words of promise, but Machtworte which effect the Real Presence. If, as Elert maintains, the words "merely repeat the promise of Christ", then what effects the Real Presence? If the answer is faith or the

reception, it is a Reformed, sub-Lutheran answer. Werner Elert does not pass the test of confessional loyalty which is required in a quia subscription to the Lutheran Symbols.

Hermann Sasse's magnum opus on the Sacrament, This Is My Body, is well known to students of Lutheran theology. Sasse's orthodoxy has been tested from the time he was ordained. He pinpoints the reason for the continuing controversy over the Real Presence:

...in order to understand that the condemnation of soul-destroying error is more than the rejection of opinions that we do not like, we need only ask what would have become of the Gospel in the world if the apostles and the church after them had been less orthodox and more tolerant, if they had shown more of what the world calls "love" and "toleration." Just as the distinction between true and false prophets or true and false apostles belongs of necessity to the history of God's revelation, so the fight against heresy and serious doctrinal controversy belongs to the very nature of the Church of him who called himself the truth. If this is true of the entire history of the church, how could one expect the church of the Reformation to be an exception to this rule? On the contrary, if in an age of religious decay in the Christian world the question should be raised again as to what the Gospel really is, how could this question find an answer without incurring the most earnest controversies? And how could it be avoided that these controversies centred in the Lord's Supper, which always has been a centre of discussion, because doctrine and liturgy, as well as the life and faith of the church, meet in this Sacrament as nowhere else?

The controversies over the Lord's Supper are intimately connected with controversies over the very Gospel itself.

Sasse goes right to the heart of the matter when he speaks about the consecration:

What, then, is consecration, according to Luther? Zwingli was not entirely mistaken when he saw a certain relationship between the Lutheran and the Roman doctrine on consecration. The question is only whether the Roman church, whatever her errors concerning this Sacrament may be, specifically in this case retained a truth without which there would be no sacrament at all. It is noteworthy, and should be kept in mind by every critic of the Roman understanding of the Sacrament that this church also regards the words of Christ as the forma, which makes the materia (the outward element) a sacrament. The Western church has never forgotten what Augustine taught about the Word as causing the element to become a sacrament. The Roman church has never been guilty of the heresy of modern Protestants who want to rediscover the Sacrament by finding a mysterious quality in the natural things,

water, bread, and wine. No Catholic theologian would disagree with Luther's words: The words are the first thing;² for without the Word the cup and the bread would be nothing.³

When does consecration occur?

Luther's understanding of the consecration raises a question which had already appeared on the horizon during the Great Controversy with Zwingli, though it did not become an issue of controversy among the Lutherans themselves until later. We have seen that Luther can express the fact that the Words of Institution effect the Real Presence by stating that the bread becomes Christ's body, or that the words cause the bread to become the body. Luther here follows the view held by the Catholic church of the West that the Words of Institution are the words of consecration and nothing else, not an epiclesis after the Greek manner, nor another prayer. Does this imply the acceptance of the theory of the duration of the Real Presence which we found in earlier theology, Eastern and Western? When does the Real Presence begin? When does it end? It seems that Luther would share the Roman view about the "moment of consecration" if he regards the Words of Institution as effecting the Real Presence. Actually, however, he never established a theory about this. The same is true of the question as to the precise moment when the body and blood of Christ cease to be present. It is not lack of clarity that causes him to refrain from answering such questions, but rather the fact that they cannot be answered from the Word of God. If Luther repeatedly confessed his ignorance as to the how of the Real Presence and its beginnings, he could have used the words of Innocent III: "He knows who knows all things."²⁴

Sasse notes that Luther never specified an effecting of the Real Presence under any particular syllable of the Words of Institution. But he also notes that Luther looked to the Verba. Luther, according to Sasse, did not limit the Real Presence to the reception which so many American Lutherans succumb to.

In a similar way, Luther and the early Lutheran church avoided forming any theory about the "moment" when the Real Presence begins, and the "moment" when it ceases. Some later orthodox theologians advanced the theory that Christ's body and blood are present only at the "moment" when they are being received. This is frequently regarded as the genuinely - Lutheran doctrine both within and without the Lutheran church. Actually, this view is only another attempt to determine a time that only "he knows who knows all things." As far as Luther himself is concerned, there cannot be the slightest doubt that he ever limited the Real Presence to the instant of distribution and reception. He never abandoned the view that by the words of consecration bread and wine "become" the body and blood of Christ. Otherwise, neither the elevation, which was in use at Wittenberg up to 1542, nor the adoration of Christ, who is present in the elements, could have been justified. He always regarded it as Zwinglianism to neglect the difference between a consecrated and an unconse-

crated host, and it has always been the custom of the Lutheran church to consecrate the new supply of bread or wine (or both) if more is needed than originally was provided for. The rule that Luther followed, like Melancthon and the Lutheran Confessions, was that there is no sacrament, and, consequently, no presence of the body and blood of Christ, "apart from the use instituted by Christ" or "apart from the action divinely instituted. Since the word usus is explained by actio, it cannot mean the same as sumptio. If it has sometimes been understood in this way, it must be said that neither Luther nor the Formula of Concord (which definitely stated what the Lutheran church teaches concerning this problem) identified the sumptio²⁵ (eating and drinking) with the use or action of the Sacrament.

In a footnote, Sasse adds more convincing proof to his previous statement:

Luther demanded the dismissal of a pastor who had given to a communicant an unconsecrated host instead of a consecrated one, which had been dropped. This unfortunate man was imprisoned. Luther does not approve of such punishment, but he thinks him to be unfit for the Lutheran ministry: "He should go to his Zwinglians" (Letter of Jan. 11, 1546; WA BR 11, no. 4186). In 1543 Luther and Bugenhagen (WA BR 10, no. 3888) gave their opinion in a controversy about the question whether consecrated hosts could be preserved together with unconsecrated ones for another consecration. Luther criticizes this. Nothing of the consecrated elements should be saved, but must be consumed. In this connection he gives a clear definition of the sacramental "time" or "action": sic ergo definiemus tempus vel actionem sacramentalem ut incipiat ab initio orationis dominicae duret, donec omnes communicaverint, calicem ebiberint, particulas comederint, populus dismissus et ab altari discessum sit. (WA BR 10, no. 3894, lines 27ff). In the Table Talk of 1540 Luther goes so far as to allow the blessed Sacrament to be carried to another altar (in the same church) or even, as was still customary in some churches, to be brought to the sick in their home (WA TR 5, no. 5314), provided this could be regarded as a part of the "action". This was tolerated as an exception. However, a reservation of the Sacrament was not allowed. The remnants of the elements should be either consumed or burned.²⁶

Sasse has conducted an intensive historical and dogmatical study, and he speaks as a committed orthodox Lutheran theologian. As such, he disagrees with Franz Pieper's assessment of the Johann Saliger case:

Joh. Saliger, first in Lübeck, later in Rostock, was accused of having taught that the Real Presence begins with the consecration (ante usum here to be understood as meaning ante sumptionem) and lasts even if no distribution takes place, or if the distribution should follow some days or weeks later. The rejection of this error is not to be understood as if the Real Presence takes

place only at the moment of the sumptio when the blessed bread and wine are touched by the mouth of the communicant, as the decision of the controversy expressly states. Chytraeus, the author of the decision (which later was partly incorporated in the Formula of Concord, Sol. Decl. VII, 83-85), refers expressly to the saying of Luther that "We do not prescribe to God anytime or moment," see J. Wiggers, Zeitschrift fuer historische Theologie (1848), 639 ff; H. Grass, Die Abendmahlslehre bei Luther und Calvin (1940), 111f. The error of Saliger was not the view that the Real Presence cannot be limited to the moment of the eating and drinking - in this respect he had Luther on his side - but the "papistic" way in which he expressed himself and his belief that the presence could last beyond the time of the celebration.

Sasse understands the importance of the doctrine of the Real Presence for the reception of God's grace:

We need the Sacrament because it is an external sign which affirms the word of the divine promise. No Lutheran would deny the truth contained in this statement. But it is not the whole truth. The Sacrament is a sign, but at the same time it is more. It conveys to us God's grace. That is what Luther had learned in his fight against the "sacramentarians": only in the Real Presence of the true body and blood of Christ do we have that assurance which the Lord's Supper gives us. Luther himself never doubted this Presence. It was the silent presupposition of everything which he had said in his early writings on the Sacrament as a sign and seal attached to Christ's promise. He had seen then where the figurative understanding of the sacramental words was bound to lead. If "This is my body," "This is my blood" were understood figuratively then there would be no assurance that "given for you." "shed for you" were to be taken literally. Then the proprium of this Sacrament would be lost, the eating and drinking of what Christ had sacrificed for us, and with it the Real Presence of the whole Christ, according to his divinity and humanity, in his church on earth, here and now, as an anticipation of our eternal union with him.²⁸

Sasse finds this attitude sadly lacking in American Lutherans:

Deeply saddened, though not surprised, by the development of the Lutheran churches of the Old World, we turn to America to experience our deepest disappointment. If we ask the great Lutheran churches of America: "What is the Sacrament of the Altar?" we hear confused voices which are tantamount to the answer: We do not know exactly what it is, except that it is not quite what Luther believed and what our fathers have confessed it to be. We can no longer express the mystery of this Sacrament in the simple words of the Catechism: "It is the true body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ..." We have seen light, for we revisited Marburg."²⁹

Sasse has little praise to offer for the result of the Reformed - Lutheran dialogue which produced the book entitled Marburg Revisited:

Marburg Revisited with its papers and recommendations is now before the Lutheran churches in America. No church has so far committed itself to it, but only to its study. It will be put into the hands of all students of theology in the Lutheran and Reformed churches. It will be discussed on all levels of the churches. It will have far-reaching effects. As these discussions will coincide with the discussions which are now going on on a world-wide scale between Lutherans and Reformed, discussions in which the Lutheran churches in Europe have already surrendered the Lutheran doctrine of the Confessions, our brethren in America are facing a tremendous responsibility. It seems that the Lutheran World Federation and the Reformed World Alliance are - as far as their ecclesiastical and theological leadership is concerned - determined to carry out the great union in the spirit of modern ecumenism. So the hour of confession has come for the Lutherans in America - the hour of confession, and not of mere discussion.³⁰

These words of this eminent sacramental theologian of the Lutheran Church should cause all Lutherans in America to stop and reflect. Sasse is correct. His words apply especially to the Lutheran Church - Missouri Synod. Now is the hour of confession - a time to re-examine our norming Scriptures and the normed Confessions of our Church, and to proclaim their doctrine boldly.

There is one other theologian who needs to be examined, since he is beginning to exert an influence within American Lutheranism. This theologian is from Sweden. He is not a popular theologian in most conservative Lutheran circles. The Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod considers him a Romanist (as is revealed in the unpublished, private correspondence between him and Dr. Siegbert Becker of Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary, formerly of the LC-MS at Concordia River Forest). This Swedish theologian, although shunned by the WELS supported conservative Lutherans in Sweden, has been a guest lecturer of Concordia Theological Seminary in Fort Wayne, Indiana and his influence is growing. His name is Tom Hardt.

In a lecture entitled "On The Babylonian Captivities of the Sacrament of the Altar," Hardt calls upon American Lutheranism:

If the orthodox Lutheran church lives in the midst of such struggles, she must also face as inevitable that she herself will be

exposed to similar temptations. It is my firm conviction that also the post-reformation theology within the Lutheran church at an early stage made unconscious changes with the truth of our confessions about the sacrament of the altar. New babylonian captivities were prepared, as philosophical frames were made part of the biblical definitions. Although, of course, the sacrament as a means of grace was kept pure, deviations on other parts were at work. In view of this fact it is important to stress that it belongs to the glory of the theology of the American synodical Conference that it, during the time of repristination theology in the 19th century, always insisted on its right to examine also the theology of the 17th century. We know that thereby the orthodox church escaped, e.g. heresies like the e praevisa fide. The church was thus purged of old philippistic leaven that had accompanied it for a long time. The same kind of purgation must now take place concerning the sacrament of the altar. I will try to explain what I aim at.³¹

Dr. Hardt, as Luther and the Lutheran Confessions do, looks to the power of consecration:

It is to Luther a selfevident thing that this miracle takes place "as soon as Christ says: This is my body." The consecration is an undisputed fact, as long as we deal with the proper institution of Christ and not e.g. with its perversion in the Roman private mass, where no consecration at all takes place, as there is no divine authorization of this selfchosen worship of God. But within the real Christian sacrament it is not to be denied that the true body and blood of Jesus Christ are really and indeed present upon the altar after the consecration (leaving to God, however, under which syllable the miracle takes place). It is the true sacrament that is lifted up and adored in the elevation.³²

Like Sasse, Hardt disagrees with Pieper and Walther in their assessment of the Saliger case:

... Luther does not hesitate to make use of the accusation "Zwinglianism," when he is confronted with the thought that the sacrament would be limited to the moment of eating or at least cease to be a sacrament as soon as all communicants have received holy communion. Certainly Luther rejected the idea that we would be entitled to take the sacrament from the altar to a tabernacle, but he also rejected the Protestant counterpart of that perversion, viz. to take the sacrament from the altar (and) to mix it with unconsecrated elements. That would imply denial of the consecration, and as the only real presence that we know is effected by the consecration, real presence is also threatened. The only solution left is that if something remains after communion, the celebrating clergyman or someone else must reverently consume it as a sacrament - not merely for the sake of decency or as bread and wine. This view was maintained by Luther not as a private opinion but a doctrine, and he was followed on this point by the Gnesiolutherans in the next generation. As a matter of fact, a great dispute (a)rose on this question and called

forth several books dealing with the problem. For some reason those books are today completely forgotten. Only the so-called Saliger case in the town of Rostock has been saved from oblivion, but although recently a minor monograph has been dedicated to that struggle, no one has come to realize that it was merely a minor case within a great theological war that was carried on for a very long time between philippists and Gnesiolutherans. It should, by the way, remind us about how very limited our knowledge of church history is. The reason behind this forgetfulness - which we might term damnation memoriae, the penalty of oblivion to which heretics were sentenced in the ancient church - is that the following centuries could not even imagine that such struggles were possible in the Lutheran church among seriousminded theologians. Another definition of "Lutheran" had gained foothold with³³ in Lutheranism: Melanchthonianism or philippism was marching on.

Hardt also refers to the battle over the Adoration which occurred during that period of church history:

Naturally also the adoration of the sacrament came under fire. It was defended with all power by the followers of Luther. Among its numerous adherents we can count Joachim Westphal, who started the war against Calvin, where objections against the real presence dealt very much with the adoration - Andreas Poach, Johann Hachenburg, Andreas Musculus, coauthor of the Formula of Concord as also Christopher Corneius - Musculus presided when Corneius disputed for a doctor's degree on the adoration - Johann Agricola, Jacob Rungius of Pomerania, Archbishop Laurentius Petri of Upsala, Benedict Morgenstern of Prussia, Johannes Wigand, bishop of Pomesania, Nicolaus Selnecker and Martin Chemnitz, the orthodox clergy of Mansfeld and Wismar, just to mention a few theologians. More than by anyone of those people the adoration of the sacrament of the altar was defended by the socially most prominent theologians of the Reformation time, Luther's very close friend: Prince George III of Anhalt, bishop of Merseburg, dean of Magdeburg. In his writings the Lutheran belief in the sacrament takes the shape of a hymn to the glory of the eucharistic Christ. George was frequently quoted by the fathers of the Formula Concordiae, and from the quotations in the "Histori dess Sacramentsstreits", written by Chemnitz, Selnecker and Timotheus Kirchner, we can quote: "We wish to have nothing to do with such people who... regard it as idolatry to adore the most blessed sacrament, yea, Christ in the sacrament". "Also although our dear Lord Jesus Christ did not institute his holy supper to be looked upon or adored, still it is not to prohibit, not less to regard as idolatrous but rather as very meet and right that -- one should be there with all devotion and reverence and that one should adore Our Lord Jesus Christ, true God and Man, who -- is present in this most blessed Sacrament." Against Calvin and Melanchthon, Joachim Westphal enumerates the different usages that accompany the Gnesiolutheran "adoratio Sacramenti vel Eucharistiae": the use of a sacring bell, elevation, genuflections, to raise one's hands towards the eucharistic Christ, beat one's chest, etc. The answer of Melanchthonianism was immediate: the Lutherans are as bad as pagans.³⁴

Hardt concludes his lecture, as a good theologian does, with a series of theses and antitheses:

Thesis I: The sacrament of the altar is entirely dependent upon the creative, divine word of Jesus Christ in the night he was betrayed. That word was no less effective than the creative word of Genesis 1: "For he spake, and it was done", Ps. 33.9...

Thesis IV: Although Christ during his time on earth was here to serve and not to be served, he did not refuse to receive adoration, Matt. 3:11, John 20:28. Although the sacrament also has as its main task to give the remission of sins, it can as being the body and blood of God-man rightly receive adoration by all Christians. No one can deprive the church of that liberty, Gal. 5:1. Such an adoration has always been given to the body and blood of Christ, not to the elements or the vessels containing them or the place where they are, as the opponents of the eucharistic adoration sometimes falsely claim. ...

Thesis V: The sacramental gifts are by divine command not to be taken from the sacred meal, in which they are to be received by the communicants: "Take, eat", "Drink ye all of it", Matt. 26:26,27. Those words demand that whenever something remains of the consecrated elements (reliquiae sacramenti) it shall necessarily be consumed reverently and as a sacrament as a last part of the celebration of the sacrament. ...

Thesis VII: We reject the idea that "it is enough" to be certain that the eating and drinking give us the body and blood of Jesus Christ. The blessed effects of a communion in faith, however important, cannot regulate what the church must teach on the sacrament. True faith does not limit itself to what is useful for the edification of our faith in the remission of sins but demands eagerly to believe God in all his words and all his deeds. ...

Thesis VIII: We reject the idea that the sacrament of the altar could sufficiently be described as a promise of Christ to give us his body and blood, when we eat and drink in the sacrament. Such wordings are acceptable only as second hand descriptions of the sacrament. The sacrament builds upon the word of Christ that the elements are his body and blood and we effect the sacrament by making bread and wine the body and blood of Christ through the consecratory words of Christ. Our eating and drinking follow thereupon in obedience to the institution of Christ. Also the expression "in, with and under" bread and wine must admit the priority of the biblical sentence "This is my body", "the bread is the body."

It appears that, upon examination of the writings of Luther and the Lutheran Confessions, Dr. Hardt's theses, especially thesis VII, must stand. When contrasted with popular opinion, the theses fall. However, the Church's doctrine is not formulated or approved by majority vote.

In 1977, Dr. Hardt wrote a small book entitled: On The Sacra-

ment Of The Altar. A Book on the Lutheran Doctrine of the Lord's Supper. As of this moment, it is an unpublished manuscript, translated into English by Mr. Edward L. Rye and Mr. Timothy A. Ziebell (through whom a copy of this manuscript was provided). The book is dedicated to Dr. Hardt's dear friend, Dr. Hermann Sasse, who rejoiced to see the day it would be published, only to be taken by our Lord to the Church Triumphant. In this book, Dr. Hardt elucidates and elaborates.

Hardt explains that, by "adoration," he means an adoration of God's body and blood:

If it is not a question of God's body and blood -- belonging to Him not as clothes but as parts of His eternal person -- both Holy Communion and a book like this one, which is devoted to the fact of the Real Presence, become incomprehensible and obnoxious. The rejoicing kindled before the body and blood of Christ in the sacrament is possible only if the persons who adore know that they are standing in front of the Power which created them, which they cannot refuse to worship without denying the sense of all human existence.³⁶

Hardt correctly maintains that the "whole Christ" is not present in the Holy Supper:

Nowadays the wording "the whole Christ" usually occurs in a frame entirely different from that of medieval scholasticism. The formula "the whole Christ" has a great attraction for modern theology, which would like to dispense with the Real Presence. "The whole Christ" is the presence of grace in the Word, given to faith, and the presence which is true of every service: "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." Since the words of institution are a part of the preaching of the Word and are not merely consecrating, and since the distribution is often accompanied by so-called words of distribution, it is always possible to let the Word's conveyance of the general presence treacherously replace the sacramental presence constituted by the fact that the bread and wine are the body and blood of Christ. Already in Melanchthon's interpretation of the words of institution, Bible words about the general presence started getting mixed in, and the "whole Christ" was formulated as a rejection of the Lutheran wording, "the body and blood of Christ." This tradition, which lays claim to the exclusive title of satisfying the needs of piety for a personal meeting with God, was handed down by Melanchthon's followers, the old and new Philippists within the Pietistic, Liberal tradition. For this reason it is not unimportant to decline all turgid, pious talk about "Christ" and to bring all discussions about the Sacrament back to Jesus' words, "This is my body."³⁷

After laying this groundwork upon the foundation of the Real Presence,

Dr. Hardt continues to build with the Adoration:

That Luther himself practiced, taught and defended the adoration of the Sacrament is a fact that is almost unanimously confirmed by research scholars; albeit the fact is often regretted. What is not known is the fact that Lutheranism fought out a controversy over this question up until the time when the Lutheran confessional writings were finally completed, and that the feast of the victory of genuine Lutheranism over Philippism was celebrated in one of the German principalities with prayers for the preservation of the doctrine of justification and the doctrine of the adoration of the Sacrament. "One of the co-authors of the Formula of Concord took his doctorate with a disputation on, i.e., the adoration of the Sacrament, and this disputation took place in the presence of another one of the co-authors of the Book of Concord."³⁸

Dr. Hardt maintains that the adoration is an adiaphoron:

This adoration of the Sacrament is designated by Luther as an adiaphoron that can be practiced but need not be. This does not mean that Luther would in any sense allow anyone to proclaim openly that the adoration is inadmissible. "He, who believes what one ought to believe, as has been proven here, can indeed not deny the body and blood of Christ his veneration without committing a sin." However, since the time has not yet come when the Christian's only task will be to worship God, what is of immediate importance is that adoration occur "when there is time and opportunity." The apostles, eg., remained seated at the first celebration of the Lord's Supper, "forgetting both the adoration and the reverence."³⁹

Hardt delineates four kinds of adorers, as Dr. Luther does (WA 11, 449):

The first group acts as the apostles did at the first celebration and stick to faith in the forgiveness of sins in accordance with the words of institution, omitting the adoration: "These are the safest and the best." The second group consists of those who "exercised in this faith arrive at their deed and adore Christ spiritually in the Sacrament, i.e., in the depths of their hearts they bow before Him and acknowledge Him as their Lord who works everything in them and outwardly they bend and bow and fall on their knees with their bodies in order to prove their inward adoration." The third group consists of those who adore without any outward gestures. ⁴⁰The fourth group adores with gestures only and that is hypocrisy.

Finally, in connection with the Adoration, Hardt quotes Luther (BR 10):

Luther himself writes: "And if the time perhaps comes someday which gives reason to elevate (the Sacrament), it is free and without peril to elevate again." "If it comes to the point that the elevation become necessary again in order to avoid heresy or other things, we shall establish it again."⁴¹

Hardt also has a great deal to contribute to the discussion

concerning the consecration. His starting point is the little word "tuto."

The current discussion about the content of the Lord's Supper has usually centered on the word is in "This is my body." The Lutheran IS -- in Latin, EST -- has thus become an established concept. Nowadays we hardly even encounter any debate concerning this THIS, despite the fact that this very point is where we find one of Luther's most important contributions to the right understanding of the Sacrament. In fact, it would be entirely appropriate to speak of "the Lutheran THIS." ...Luther lets the text speak, and according to the text Jesus took visible bread in His hands and let the word THIS refer to that very bread: "(I stick simply to His words and firmly believe that Christ's body is not only in the bread but that "the bread is the body of Christ"" (Italics mine). In a decisive point this surpasses scholastic theology. It is no longer a matter of tying a presence of Christ to the host in one way or another, or of expressing a presence of one thing in another. Instead, Luther says that the earthly bread in the hands of Jesus and in the hands of the celebrant is the body of Christ; and he cites a parallel that was shocking in his day: "This man is God." Just as the man Jesus is God, "the bread is the body of Christ."⁴²

Hardt considers the consecration to be a necessity and of the utmost importance:

It can also be said that in our day the real controversy concerning the Real Presence stands precisely at this point. It is only the consecration that ties the body and blood of Christ to bread and wine; it is the consecration that makes the bread and wine the body and blood of Christ. Without a clear teaching on the consecration it is, indeed, still possible to say that the communicants receive the body and blood of Christ and that the heavenly gift is present. But the essential thing will be missing: the fact that Christ has made bread and wine His holy body and His holy blood and commanded us to eat it. A presence alongside bread and wine need not differ from the general presence of Christ in His two natures (which includes His body and blood); this general presence is promised for every service and is constantly being received by faith. Only the consecration ties the presence to the elements and creates the Real Presence in its specific sense. Only the conscious bypassing of the stumbling-block of the consecration has made it possible to create the modern union documents which wish to reconcile the Presence and the absence of the body of Christ and which pretend to represent a higher unity between Lutheranism and the denial of the Sacrament.⁴³

Hardt, like Sasse, the Lutheran Confessions and Luther, considers the consecration to be the test of loyalty to the doctrine of the Real Presence:

The Biblical Sacrament of the Altar stands and falls with the con-

secration. It is therefore entirely natural that Luther on an occasion when a priest distributed an unconsecrated host at mass expressed his condemnation: "Let him go to his Zwinglians." This blasphemous procedure of "daring to consider consecrated and unconsecrated hosts to be the same thing" of course resulted in extensive church discipline proceedings. Only after it was revealed that the erring country priest had acted in confusion was the threat of expatriation turned into a milder sentence of a short term in prison. That is how great the zeal of the Reformation times was for the consecration which Jesus Christ entrusted to Christians to use and to defend. Of course Luther also reckons with the necessity of using a new consecration (Nachkonsekration) if the consecrated elements must be taken in to the altar. It is by the retention of such things which outsiders must deem "trivialities" that loyalty to Christian revelation is tested and proved.⁴⁴

It is only at this point that Dr. Hardt begins to present and explain the practical ramifications of this doctrine. The first issue is that of mixing consecrated and unconsecrated elements:

The reality which springs forth from God's creative words cannot lightly be made to cease merely because the communicants have completed their communion. In two extensive letters to Simon Wolferinus, Luther attacks that man's teaching and practice according to which the presence ceased with the communion itself, for which reason the priest could without reproach mix consecrated and unconsecrated elements after mass. This error cast unhappy shadows over Luther's old age, and Wolferinus is to be considered equivalent to a Zwinglian. Of course Luther does not wish to claim here that the bread carried around in the Roman sacramental procession or the bread reserved in the sacramental tabernacle was a valid Sacrament, the true body of Christ. Such things are outside the institution of Christ, which speaks of a meal. Within this meal, which is the mass, the Sacrament is, however, a sacrament with all the consequences of this fact. The meal of Christ lasts "until all have received the Sacrament, drunk of the chalice and eaten up the pieces of bread." What remains after the end of the communion is therefore consecrated by Christ to be His holy body and blood, is to be received carefully and with reverence by the priest or another person as Sacrament. For Luther it is thus a dogmatic demand that in the mass everything that has been consecrated is to be consumed. This abolished both the possibility of the Roman abuse of carrying the host from the altar as a Sacrament and the possibility of the Protestant abuse of treating the remaining elements as mere bread and wine. These two letters of Luther's were quoted diligently by the following generation of Gnesio-Lutherans. Evidently the Lutheran Confessions, too, refer to these letters in the discussion about the extension of the Sacrament in time, although the fact that the reference to the page number was omitted hence made this reference somewhat unclear.⁴⁵

If Hardt is correct in his argumentation up to this point (and it would appear to be rather difficult to prove him wrong with Scrip-

ture or the Lutheran Confessions), then over-consecration is almost unforgivable.

To consecrate such a large quantity of wine that it cannot reasonably be consumed is a sign of grave disorderliness and unwillingness to go to the trouble of finding out the number of communicants, which for Luther is an almost necessary prerequisite for the celebration of the mass, motivated already by the general church discipline practiced in connection with communion. Letting the elements remain undistributed the way Wolferinus did passes the borders of what is merely disorderly and is given a worse appellation; "I believe that you are operating with Zwingli's insanities."⁴⁶

Hardt also has spoken concerning the spilling of consecrated elements:

If, within the mass commanded by Christ, the chalice is accidentally spilled, this misfortune has happened to the true blood of Christ; Luther speaks of how such an accident, which is not necessarily due to any sin, is followed by great "fear and trembling" in the good Christian. We are also informed as to how Luther actually acted. Such an accident occurred at the distribution of communion in the town church at Wittenberg in the year 1542, when Luther and the officiating pastor and the deacon, with the greatest reverence and in deep excitement, attempted to consume the poured-out blood of Christ from the floor of the sanctuary. The witness writes: "This accident touched Doctor Martin's heart so profoundly that he sighed about it and said: "Oh God, help." His eyes were also full of tears." After mass Luther, following medieval precedent, had a chair, on which the Sacrament had been spilled, planed off the wood shavings burned together with the pieces of cloth that had likewise been involved. This story is told also by the leading theologians of the Formula of Concord, who express their approval. They were capable of taking cognizance of and highly valuating the same fact which Hermann Sasse has worded in our day: "Perhaps no Catholic ever had such reverence for the miracle of the Real Presence as Luther did. No one could think more highly of the consecration; no one could treat the consecrated elements more reverently."⁴⁷

Dr. Hardt sees the whole present controversy, especially that sort of controversy between himself and the Wisconsin Synod, as a battle between Philippism and Lutheranism:

For the Lutherans, Christ had made the bread His body through the consecration and commands us to eat it; for the Philippists, Christ had promised to give His body if one ate the bread. Not without reason; the latter drew from this premise the conclusion that the Sacrament was an act, not a thing, and that if the bread were not eaten, Christ would have no reason to fulfill His promise for a communicant who is not there. In this case the words of Jesus do not have any direct connection with the bread, the only role of which is to render possible the promise's being fulfilled for the communicant.⁴⁸

It appears that Fagerberg, Sasse and Hardt have hit the nail directly on its head.

End Notes

- ¹ Holsten Fagerberg, translated by Gene J. Lund, A New Look At The Lutheran Confessions (1529-1537) (St. Louis, Missouri: Concordia Publishing House, 1972), p. 185.
- ² Fagerberg, op. cit., pp. 186-187.
- ³ Fagerberg, op. cit., p. 189.
- ⁴ Fagerberg, op. cit., p. 190.
- ⁵ Fagerberg, op. cit., p. 195.
- ⁶ Fagerberg, op. cit., p. 196.
- ⁷ Werner Elert, Contemporary Theology Series. The Lord's Supper Today (St. Louis, Missouri: Concordia Publishing House, 1973), p. 10.
- ⁸ Elert, op. cit., p. 20.
- ⁹ Elert, op. cit., p. 21.
- ¹⁰ Ibid.
- ¹¹ Elert, op. cit., p. 22.
- ¹² Ibid.
- ¹³ Ibid.
- ¹⁴ Elert, op. cit., p. 24.
- ¹⁵ Elert, op. cit., pp. 25-26.
- ¹⁶ Elert, op. cit., p. 35.
- ¹⁷ Ibid.
- ¹⁸ Elert, op. cit., p. 37.
- ¹⁹ Ibid.
- ²⁰ Elert, op. cit., pp. 29-30.
- ²¹ Elert, op. cit., p. 42.
- ²² Hermann Sasse, This Is My Body. Luther's Contention for the Real Presence in the Sacrament of the Altar (Adelaide, South Australia: Lutheran Publishing House, 1976), p. 109.
- ²³ Sasse, op. cit., p. 134.
- ²⁴ Sasse, op. cit., pp. 137-138.

- ²⁵Sasse, op. cit., pp. 139-140.
- ²⁶Ibid.
- ²⁷Ibid.
- ²⁸Sasse, op. cit., p. 267.
- ²⁹Sassee, op. cit., pp. 340-341.
- ³⁰Sasse, op. cit., p. 345.
- ³¹Dr. Tom G.A. Hardt, On The Babylonian Captivities of the Sacrament of the Altar (no city or publisher noted, no date), p. 2.
- ³²Hardt, op. cit., p. 4.
- ³³Ibid.
- ³⁴Hardt, op. cit., pp. 6-7.
- ³⁵Hardt, op. cit., p. 3.
- ³⁶Dr. Tom G.A. Hardt, On the Sacrament Of The Altar. A Book on the Lutheran Doctrine of the Lord's Supper (Unpublished manuscript, 1977), pp. 26-27.
- ³⁷Hardt, On The Sacrament. op. cit., p. 61.
- ³⁸Hardt, On The Sacrament. op. cit., p. 63.
- ³⁹Hardt, On The Sacrament. op. cit., p. 64.
- ⁴⁰Hardt, On The Sacrament. op. cit., p. 65.
- ⁴¹Hardt, On The Sacrament. op. cit., pp. 68-69.
- ⁴²Hardt, On The Sacrament. op. cit., p. 37.
- ⁴³Hardt, On The Sacrament. op. cit., pp. 47-48.
- ⁴⁴Hardt, On The Sacrament. op. cit., pp. 54-55.
- ⁴⁵Hardt, On The Sacrament. op. cit., pp. 69-70.
- ⁴⁶Hardt, On The Sacrament. op. cit., pp. 71-72.
- ⁴⁷Hardt, On The Sacrament. op. cit., p. 72.
- ⁴⁸Hardt, On The Sacrament. op. cit., p. 75.

Part VII

Conclusion

B.W. Teigen is a professor at the Evangelical Lutheran Synod's seminary in Mankato, Minnesota. Although ELS is in church fellowship with the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod, her historical ties prior to the break-up of the old Synodical Conference have been to the Lutheran Church - Missouri Synod.

Teigen has, among others, picked up the Confessional emphases of theologians like Sasse and Hardt. He also maintains that Johann Saliger was not an extremist:

It is the consensus of these men (Sasse and Hardt) that Saliger was not guilty of false doctrine, but rather that as a Gnesio-Lutheran, he was upholding Luther's doctrine of the Lord's Supper and what is confessed in Article VII of the Formula of Concord is nothing else but what Saliger was contending for.

Teigen also finds fault with the Lutheran theologians in America who have gone before him in their loci on consecration:

With regard to the time or "the moment" when the Real Presence begins and the moment it ceases, Luther believed that it began with the words of consecration and ended when the communion service was over. This is what the Solid Declaration is saying (73-90), and it was certainly the understanding of the Augsburg Confession... It would appear to me that F.E. Mayer does not quite represent the Lutheran Confessions when he says that: "The Lutheran Confessions refrain from entering on the precise moment when the sacramental union begins and ends."

Teigen notes that there is a difference between the Lutheran Confessions and the Lutheran dogmaticians on the consecration:

Apparently something strange happened to the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper, especially with regard to the consecration, on its way to being formulated by the seventeenth century dogmaticians.³

His attitude towards Dr. Hardt is an example for all American Lutherans:

I would suggest that one should be extremely cautious that he does not immediately reject out of hand what he has to say and slough it all off by crying "Romanizing views."⁴

Obviously, even Lutherans have held (and will continue to hold) false positions concerning the Lord's Supper, the Real Presence, and consecration.

Because of the fact that the Lord's Supper is "by mystery surrounded," the temptation to stray from the Scriptural doctrine is unusually strong, as is evidenced by the false positions that have arisen over the course of the centuries.

It is, therefore, necessary that we

be driven back to this Lutheran doctrine that the Word of God is a creative Word and the only channel of the Holy Spirit, in view of the tremendous tidal wave of Reformed Enthusiasm that is sweeping over us in the Evangelistic youth movements and the Charismatic movement which downgrade the power of the Word, no matter whether it is read, preached, or administered as the Visible Word of our gracious God. Has there been a tendency for us to overlook this in Baptism, Absolution (especially individual and private), and in the Lord's Supper, so that our people are not aware of this precious truth but rather look upon the Scripture as only a means of defining correct doctrine?⁶

This paper has attempted to present the doctrines of the Real Presence and the consecration in various religious bodies on these United States; especially among Lutherans. It has hopefully raised some eyebrows, driven us back to Scripture and the Confessions, and caused us to think through our position once again. It has presented the understanding of the Sacrament and the Real Presence for Luther and for the Confessions of our beloved Evangelical Lutheran Church.

Now a question needs to be asked by all Lutherans:

Can and will the church that calls itself Lutheran retain it - or, where it has been lost, try to regain it? This would be impossible if the doctrine of the Real Presence were only a human theory that has appeared time and again in various forms in the history of the church, perhaps in an especially-impressive form in the Lutheran Reformation. No human authority, no respect for a great Christian and doctor of the church, would be sufficient reason for accepting the Lutheran doctrine on the Sacrament. The

only reason could be its strictly scriptural character. On the other hand, no objection that might be raised by our human reason against a doctrine of Scripture could justify its rejection. It is true, the doctrine of the Real Presence, of our eating and drinking the true body and blood of Christ, is still more than any other doctrine of the church "unto the Jews a stumblingblock and unto the Greeks foolishness." Luther was right when he maintained that Christ, though hidden (occultus) in all places where he reveals himself, is most hidden (occultissimus) in this Sacrament. And yet, thus far, no one has been able to remove the Real Presence from the New Testament. We have tried on the preceding pages to show how deeply it is rooted in the Scriptures. All the great facts and thoughts connected with the Lord's Supper, such as remembrance, remission of sins, sanctorum communio, "Come, Lord Jesus!", presuppose this Presence. The words of Institution and Paul's commentary teach it clearly. Either Jesus meant what he said at the Last Supper, or he left to his disciples and to the church of all ages a puzzle which no one has ever been able, or ever will be able, to solve. Either we accept Paul's commentary or we reject it, and with it the authority of the New Testament. The acceptance or rejection of the Real Presence means, as Luther clearly saw, the acceptance or rejection of God's Word. Just as the church stands or falls with the Gospel, so she stands or falls with the Sacrament of the Altar. For the Sacrament is the Gospel. This is the conviction, not only of Luther, but of the New Testament. "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come!"

May we Lutherans use the Lord's Supper willingly and without constraint, every Lord's Day, but after having been first instructed, examined as to whether we know and understand anything of the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, the Ten Commandments, and Absolution! May our people and our children sing and learn and become familiar with passages of Scripture! May our trust in the consecration and Real Presence never waver! May we defend this precious doctrine till the end of time. In Nomine Jesu.

SOLI DEO GLORIA!

D.A.A. Last

End Notes

¹ B.W. Teigen, "The Real Presence in the Book of Concord," Concordia Theological Quarterly, Volume 41, Number 2, p. 49.

² Teigen, op. cit., p. 53.

³ Teigen, op. cit., p. 54.

⁴ Teigen, op. cit., p. 55.

⁵ Teigen, op. cit., p. 41.

⁶ Teigen, op. cit., pp. 55-56.

⁷ Hermann Sasse, This Is My Body. Luther's Contention for the Real Presence in the Sacrament of the Altar (Adelaide, South Australia: Lutheran Publishing House, 1976), p. 329.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abbott, Walther M., S.J. The Documents of Vatican II. All Sixteen Official Texts Promulgated By The Ecumenical Council 1963-1965. Translated From The Latin. New York, New York: America Press, 1966.
- Allbeck, Williard Dow. Studies in the Lutheran Confessions. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Forstree Press, 1968.
- Bente, F. (editor). Triglot Concordia. The Symbolical Books of the Ev. Lutheran Church, German - Latin - English, Published as a Memorial of the Quadricentenary Jubilee of the Reformation anno Domini 1917 by resolution of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States. St. Louis, Missouri: Concordia Publishing House, 1921.
- Bente, F. (Historical Introductions to the Symbolical Books of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. XVIII. The Crypto - Calvinistic Controversy.) Triglot Concordia. The Symbolical Books of the Ev. Lutheran Church, German - Latin - English, Published as a Memorial of the Quadricentenary Jubilee of the Reformation anno Domini 1917 by resolution of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States. St. Louis, Missouri: Concordia Publishing House, 1921.
- No Author. The Book Of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments and Other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church According To The Use Of The Protestant Episcopal Church In The United States Of America Together with The Psalter or Psalms of David. Articles of Religion As established by the Bishops, the Clergy, and the Laity of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America in Convention, on the twelfth day of September, in the Year of our Lord 1801. New York, New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1944.
- Bouyer, Louis, Minister of the oratory. The Liturgy Revived. A Doctrinal Commentary Of The Conciliar Constitution On The Liturgy. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1964
- Commission on Doctrinal Matters, Wisconsin Ev. Lutheran Synod. This We Believe. A Statement of Belief of the Wisconsin Ev. Lutheran Synod. Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Northwestern Publishing House, 1967.
- De Wolfe, James P. Jr. Rector (editor). Devotions Before, During And After The Holy Eucharist. Fort Worth, Texas: All Saints Episcopal Church, no date given.
- Flert, Werner. Contemporary Theology Series The Lord's Supper Today. St. Louis, Missouri: Concordia Publishing House, 1973.
- Flert, Werner, Translated by Walter A. Hansen. The Structure of Lutheranism. The Theology and Philosophy of Life of Lutheranism Especially in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. St. Louis, Missouri: Concordia Publishing House, 1962.

- Fagerberg, Holsten, Translated by Gene J. Lund. A New Look At The Lutheran Confessions (1529-1537). St. Louis, Missouri: Concordia Publishing House, 1972.
- Flory, Sheldon. The Sacramental Life and its implications. Cincinnati, Ohio: Forward Movement Publications, 1964.
- Fremantle, Anne. The Papal Encyclicals In Their Historical Context. New York, New York: New American Library of World Literature, 1956.
- Graebner, A.L. Outlines of Doctrinal Theology. St. Louis, Missouri: Concordia Publishing House, 1910.
- Hardt, G.A., Th.D. On The Babylonian Captivities of the Sacrament of the Altar. Unpublished Manuscript, no date given.
- Hardt, G.A., Th.D. On The Sacrament Of The Altar. A Book on the Lutheran Doctrine of the Lord's Supper. Unpublished Manuscript, 1977.
- Hobbs, Herschel H. The Baptist Faith And Message. Text for course 3302 of the subject area Baptist Doctrine in the Church Study Course. Nashville, Tennessee: Convention Press, 1971.
- Kauffeld, Eugene P. (editor). God The Holy Spirit Acts. A Series of Five Essays on the Holy Spirit. "God The Holy Spirit Acts Through The Lord's Supper." Martin W. Lutz, Professor, Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary, Mequon, Wisconsin. pp. 115-202. Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Northwestern Publishing House, 1972.
- Kiehl, Erich and Werning, Waldo J. (editors) Evangelical Directions For The Lutheran Church. "Faithful Confessional Life In The Church ... 11. Confessional Ecumenism II - A Case Study in Communion Practice - Prof. Lowell Green, D. Theol." pp. 92-99. Chicago, Illinois: No publisher, 1970.
- Knowles, Archibald Campbell, Minister D.D., The Practice of Religion. A Short Manual Of Instructions And Devotions Illustrated. New York, New York: Morehouse - Gorham Co., 1945.
- Keohler, Edward W.A., D.D. A Summary of Christian Doctrine. A Popular Presentaion of the Teachings of the Bible. St. Louis, Missouri: Concordia Publishing House, 1971.
- Leith, John H. (editor). Creeds Of The Churches. A Reader in Christian Doctrine from the Bible to the Present. Atlanta, Georgia: John Knox Press, 1977.
- Mead, Frank S. Handbook Of Denominations In The United States. Nashville, Tennessee: Abingdon Press, 1975.
- Meyer Carl S. Moving Frontiers. Readings In The History Of The Lutheran Church - Missouri Synod. St. Louis, Missouri: Concordia Publishing House, 1964.
- Nelson, Clifford E. The Lutherans in North America. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Fortress Press, 1975.

- Otten, Herman (editor). A Christian Handbook On Vital Issues.
Christian New, 1963, 1973. New Haven Missouri: Leader Publishing
Co., 1973.
- Pieper, Francis , D.D. Christian Dogmatics, Volume III. St. Louis,
Missouri: Concordia Publishing House, 1953.
- Preus, Robert D. The Theology of Post - Reformation Lutheranism.
A Study of Theological Prolegomena. St. Louis, Missouri: Con-
cordia Publishing House, 1970.
- Preus, Robert D. The Theology of Post - Reformation Lutheranism.
God and His Creation, II. St. Louis, Missouri: Concordia
Publishing House, 1972.
- Sasse, Hermann. This Is My Body. Luther's Contention for the Real
Presence in the Sacrament of the Altar. Adelaide, South Au-
stralia; Lutheran Publishing House, 1976.
- Schillebeeckx, E. , O.P. The Eucharist. New York: Sheed and Ward,
1967.
- Schlink, Edmund, Translated by Paul F. Koehneke and Herbert J.A.
Bouman. Theology of the Lutheran Confessions, Philadelphia,
Pennsylvania: Fortress Press, 1961.
- Schuetze, Armin W. and Habeck, Irwin J. The Shepherd under Christ
A Textbook for Pastoral Theology. Milwaukee, Wisconsin: North-
western Publishing House, 1974.
- Tappert, Theodore G. Lutheran Confessional Theology in America
1840-1880. New York, New York: Oxford University Press, 1972.
- Vos, Jean A. (editor). The Heidelberg Catechism. Grand Rapids,
Michigan: Reformed Publications, no date given.
- Walther , C.F.W. The Proper Distinction Between Law And Gospel.
Thirt-Nine Evening Lectures. Reproduced from the German edition
of 1897 by W.H.T. Dau. St. Louis, Missouri: Concordia Publish-
ing House, no date given.
- Wentz, Abdel Ross. A Basic History of Lutheranism In America
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Fortress Press, 1964.

Periodicals

- Klug, Eugene F. "Lutheran-Reformed Dialogues Concluded" The Spring-
fielder, Volume XXXIX, Number 1, pp. 57-62. June, 1975.
- Teigen, B.W. "The Real Presence in the Book of Concord" Concordia
Theological Quarterly, Volume 41, Number 2, pp. 41-57.
April, 1977.