

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Bachelor of Divinity

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

4-15-1927

A Presentation and Critique of the Roman, Reformed, and Lutheran Doctrine if the Lord's Supper-

Clarence Peters

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

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



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

Recommended Citation

Peters, Clarence, "A Presentation and Critique of the Roman, Reformed, and Lutheran Doctrine if the Lord's Supper-" (1927). *Bachelor of Divinity*. 685.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv/685>

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 Bachelor of Divinity by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

A Presentation and Critique of the Roman, Reformed, and Lutheran
Doctrine of the Lord's Supper.

A thesis

presented to the faculty of

Concordia Seminary,

St. Louis, Missouri,

by

Clarence Peters

in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

of

Bachelor of Divinity.

St. Louis, Missouri,
April 15, 1927.

Presentation and Critique of the Roman, Reformed, and Lutheran
Doctrine of the Lord's Supper.

In his first epistle to Timothy Paul writes: "Now the Spirit speaketh expressly that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy." The Holy Spirit who transmits the divine revelation, was especially active in the early days of the Christian Church. In this case the Spirit had expressly declared that there would be a falling away from the truth in times to come. Men would actually apostatize from the faith, would teach and preach in direct opposition to the sound doctrine of the Gospel. How extensively this has been fulfilled is seen in the great number of denominations and sects which have left the purity of Christ's teaching to spread their errors devised by man, which errors the apostle calls teachings of demons, -- the evil spirits themselves being the originators of their false ideas, of their perversions of the truth. The insidiousness of these false doctrines consists in this that they often bear the appearance of godliness. And certainly there is no doubt that this is applicable to the papal and Reformed doctrine of the communion. Indeed these systems could not be better characterized than by saying that they are systems "speaking lies." The entire scheme of these two doctrines attempts to palm falsehood upon the world in the place of the simple teaching of the New Testament. This latter doctrine the Lutheran Church teaches, and especially is this true of the doctrine of the Lords' Supper.

The present doctrine of the Lord's Supper, as the Roman Church teaches it, is a rather late development. In 844 the French monk Paschavius Radbertus published a work wherein the change of bread and wine into the flesh and blood of Christ was vigorously defended. The term, "transubstantiation", by which this doctrine is now generally known, seems to have been first used by Hildebert of Tours about 1079. His "encouraging" example was soon followed by other theologians, as Stephen of Autun, 1139, Gaufred, 1188, and Peter of Blois, 1200, whereupon several ecumenical councils also adopted this significant expression, as the Fourth Lateran Council, 1215, where this unscriptural doctrine was made the doctrine of the Catholic Church, and the Council of Lyons, 1274, in the profession of faith of the Greek Emperor, Michael Paleologus. The Council of Trent not only accepted as an inheritance of faith that which was contained in the idea, but authoritatively confirmed "the aptitude of the term" to express most strikingly the doctrinal concept developed by the church.

The Roman doctrine of transubstantiation, which Catholics assert is based on revelation, is in short this: Christ becomes present through conversion of the whole substance of bread into the substance of the body of Christ, and the whole substance of the wine into that of the blood of Christ, while only the outward form of the bread and wine remain.

The Council of Trent says: "And because that Christ, our Redeemer, declared that which He offered under the species of bread to be truly his own body, therefore has it ever been a

firm belief in the Church of God, and this holy Synod doth now declare it anew, that, by the consecration of the bread and of the wine, a conversion is made 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; which conversion is, by the holy Catholic Church, suitably and properly called Transubstantiation."

W. Wilmers, a priest of the Society of Jesus, in his "Lehrbuch der Religion", a work recognized by Catholic authorities as authentic, presents the doctrine of transubstantiation somewhat as follows: "According to the words of Holy Writ it cannot be understood of the body and blood of Christ, that they are present in, with, or under the bread and wine. With the words, 'This is my body -- this is my blood,' Christ claims no more and no less than this: That which he held in his hands, was his body and blood, because with the word 'this' Christ undoubtedly had reference to that, which he was giving to his disciples, and in no other way could the disciples understand his words. Had there remained only bread, he would have said: This (actual) bread is my body, which manifestly would have been an untruth. Christ's words also would have been at variance with the truth, if the body of Christ had been present in, with, or under the bread. For surely no one would point to a stone and dare to say: This is God. And yet God in his infinity is present in the stone just as well, as according to Luther's view, the body of Christ is to be present in the bread.

Learned men have therefore quite rightly pointed to the great danger of idolatry, to which the believers would be exposed, if aside from the body of Christ, bread also were present.

Then also it does not seem proper that earthly food should be eaten together with the heavenly.

Useless would be the objection, that Christ, if both bread and body were present, had said only of the latter: "This is my body". For would not the apostles necessarily have understood these words as referring to the bread, just as we, if a stone, is shown to us, and the words spoken: 'This is God,' understand the word 'this' to mean the stone? For if two substances are present under the same form, we naturally will understand reference to one of these as meaning the one which has the outward form by nature. Consequently, the word 'this' will be taken as referring to bread, if both, bread and body of Christ are present. The accidents or forms designate the substance which is hidden under them. They will, therefore, first of all, designate the substance to which they belong. But they belong to that substance, in which they are inherent, and which are evident to our senses. Consequently they designate bread as long as bread is present; therefore, if both bread and the body of Christ were present, the disciples necessarily must have understood this: This bread is my body, and thus Christ would have uttered an untruth."

This argument is indeed typical of a member of the Society of Jesus, and he might well be termed an "advocatus diaboli" in the fullest sense of the term. But it seems as though he might have proved himself a "worthier" member of his society, if he had placed the paragraph, in which he states, that in "This is God", when pointing to a stone "this" refers to stone at least a few pages later, for it is a glaring contradiction to that, which immediately precedes. He claims first

that in the words of institution, "This is my body", "this" refers to the body of Christ, which is not visible, but that, if one took a stone in the hand, as before the bread, and would make the statement, "This is God", then "this" would refer to the stone, which is, in this case the visible element. But God did not say about a rock: This is my body, but he did say in communion when giving his disciples bread: This (what I am giving you) is my body. His argument that there is the danger of idolatry rests on a false premise, because God did not command to adore the wafer, which is an earthly element, but he rather comanded that he alone is to be worshiped. Hence there is no danger at all.

Then also the disciple of the 'Holy' Father at Rome ^{seems to forget,} when he accuses Christ of an untruth, if he had meant that the actual bread given were his body, that Christ, being himself the almighty God, could institute the Holy Sacrament in whatever manner he chose, and could give it whatever meaning he wished to attch ^a to it. It surely is not for Wilmers to say, what Christ ought to have said and meant, but to arrive at the truth the words of Holy Writ must be accepted as they read. This whole question is really unnecessary, yes, out of place. Christ said, "This is my body", and thus we accept his words.

Wilmers now continues: "It is also contrary to Scripture to say that bread and wine were united with his person, as the Word assumed the human nature. -- Even though such a union had taken place, bread and wine would essentially have remained bread and wine, just as the human nature, although assumed by Christ, nevertheless remained a human nature. --

Then also according to the words of promise Christ gave his disciples that body which hung on the cross and that blood which was shed there. "The bread that I will give is my flesh which I will give for the life of the world." John 6,51. This is not meant of bread and wine; not bread did he give on the cross, nor did he shed wine. Consequently the body and blood of Christ are present through transubstantiation of the substance of the bread and wine into that of the body and blood of Christ. This necessarily follows out of that which was said. If the presence of Christ cannot be explained through the consubstantiation of the Lutherans, nor through impanation, therefore transubstantiation must be accepted. The words of Christ: "This is my body, this is my blood" became effective. That is shown by John 6,51: "The bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world", If now Christ effected through his word that the bread which he held in his hand, became his body, he must have converted it into his body. In other words, If Christ had said: I effect that this become my body, then transubstantiation would be expressed. But now his words " 'This is my body' " are according to their sense the same."

In answer to this we would quote 1 Cor.10,16, which refers to that particular presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist. In the strong form of a rhetorical question, which amounts to a strong affirmation, Paul calls the "cup of blessing " "the communion of the blood" and "the bread which we break" "the communion of the body of Christ." There exists a union between the materia terrena and the materia coelestis, in consequence of which, as Baier puts it, "the body of Christ is verily and truly distributed with the bread and his blood with the wine."

This union, as Wilmers quite rightly states, is not the personal union. But this union is known as the sacramental union which admits of each element remaining what it is and yet entering into a union with the other, and that, a true and real union, so that communicants receive by one and the same act the united element. This union is without a parallel elsewhere, occurring only in the Sacrament, and is, therefore, called sacramental union.

To use John 6, as Wilmers does, as a proof that bread and wine are not received by the communicants, really proves only that this doctrine is not based on Scripture but on man himself. According to text and context it is impossible to understand the sixth chapter of John as referring to the Lord's Supper. All the communion apparatus, which Matthew, Mark, Luke, and St. Paul do not fail to describe, are absent. Christ does not take bread, give thanks, break it, and give it to the people, saying, Take eat, this is my body, nor is a cup mentioned. But that Christ speaks John 6 of the eating of his body and drinking of his blood, is explained through the context. Christ had just fed the five thousand with the five barley loaves and the two fishes. Now the Jews seek earthly bread with him. Christ now warns them that they must seek that bread which leads to eternal life. He himself is that bread. They must have faith in him. Faith in him he now presents to them by the symbol of eating and drinking. Finally Christ asserts that no one can come to life who does not eat his flesh and drink his blood. "This", that is, his vicarious satisfaction, "is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that man may eat thereof and not die." Luther said: "Not a single letter in this chapter refers to the Lord's Supper."

In order to justify their withdrawal of the cup from the

PRITZLAFF MEMORIAL LIBRARY
CONCORDIA SEMINARY
ST. LOUIS, MO.

lay-communicants, the Papists teach that the entire Christ is received by the guests. The Council of Trent said in regard to this: "If anyone denieth, that in the venerable sacrament of the Eucharist the whole Christ is contained under each species and under every part of each species when separated, let him be anathema."

This view necessitates that also the divinity of Christ be included in the heavenly elements; for Christ certainly is not entire without his divinity. The words of institution name only the body and the blood as the heavenly element. Everything else is mere speculation, designed to make the ignorant laymen believe they lose nothing, if they receive communion only under one kind. The transubstantiation of the Papists is then really not a transubstantiation, that is, a change or metamorphosis, conversion of one substance into another, but it is an annihilation. For according to their doctrine not a particle of the bread and blood remains.

To express the idea that the blood of Christ must be received also with the bread, because that is the body of Christ, and the body of Christ cannot be without the blood, the Papists have coined the word "concomitance", because the blood is said to accompany the body. Luther has exquisitely satirized this Romish concomitance. He says: "The finest piece in the Bishop's (of Meissen) proclamation is, that the parsons are to teach the laymen, that in communion in one kind, there is present the entire Jesus Christ, the Son of God, God and man, also His body and blood, and is eaten and drunk by the lay-communicants. -- This view is established by concomitance, (which means about the following): Since the body of Christ is not without blood, it follows, that his blood is not without his soul; from this it follows that his divinity is not without the Father and the Holy Ghost; from this it follows,

that in the sacrament, even when administered in one kind, there is the soul of Christ, and the Holy Trinity, eaten and drunk with the body and blood of Christ; from this it follows that in every mass the mass-priest offers up twice and sells the Holy Trinity; now since the Deity is not without the creatures, it follows from the foregoing premises, that heaven and earth are also present in the sacrament; from this it follows that the devil and hell are also in the sacrament; from this it follows that any person receiving communion also in one kind, devours the Bishop of Meissen with his mandate and proclamation; from this it follows that every priest at Meissen in each mass eats and drinks his bishop twice; from this it follows that the Bishop of Meissen must have a larger body than heaven and earth. And who could enumerate what all does follow! But ultimately this also follows that all such drawers of inferences are asses, fools, blind, insane, mad, raving, etc; this inference is certain." In the Lord's Supper Christ gives something which is the object of the eating and drinking with the mouth, that is, not the entire Christ, but Christ's body and blood, as the words of institution read: "Take, eat, this is my body; drink ye all of it, this is my blood." We receive, therefore, with the mouth no more and no less than the body with the bread, and the blood with the wine.

To bring out the Roman doctrine Christ and his Apostle Paul certainly would have needed a vast amount of "exegesis." Already the word "bread" would have demanded it. It would have been necessary for Christ to say something like this: Of course, I take the bread, as you see, consecrate it and give it to you to eat. Also my evangelists and apostles will later term the bread as present in the Supper. But you must not take my words and theirs as they read. Don't think, therefore, that actual and substantial

bread is present in the Sacrament. Only the outward appearance of bread is there. The whole substance of the bread has been changed into my body." It is a poor argument to say: This is my body, is what Christ says, and, therefore, the substance of the bread has been converted into the substance of the body of Christ. For in the same way we might argue: Peter says to Christ: Thou art the Son of the living God; therefore the substance of the Son of man has been changed into the substance of the Son of God. In both statements two things, or substances, or natures are named. The person of Christ consists of two natures, hence it can be truly said: Christ is the Son of God. Likewise in the statement: This is my body, there are two substances named: one the earthly bread, the other, the heavenly, the body of Christ; and these are sacramentally united. It is not necessary at all to resort to the transubstantiation theory of the Papists in order to understand and explain this statement. For the bread is bread and remains bread; the body of Christ is and remains the body of Christ, without any change or transubstantiation. It is a very familiar mode of speech, not only in Scripture, but in all human language to name one substance, usually the one that is not visible, when handing a person something that is two substances united or combined. A wine merchant shows a customer several barrels and says: This is Rhine wine. This use is the so-called locutio exhibitiva, in which the particular "this" refers to the complex thing. Incidentally it may be noted that the Roman doctrine of transubstantiation is self-contradictory. If the body of Christ in the Eucharist is produced by the consecration of the priest from out of the bread, that body cannot be the body of Christ, which was conceived by the Holy Ghost and born of the Virgin Mary. And thus they must believe that

Christ has two bodies, one produced from the body of his mother, the other produced out of dough by the consecration of the priest.

Scripture is very clear in speaking of the Lord's Supper. 1 Cor. 11, 27, 28 Paul says: "Whosoever shall eat this bread and drink this cup of the Lord -- and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup." Here Paul speaks to communicants about the consecrated elements, and expressly calls them still bread and wine. This shows that the earthly elements do not change their qualities by consecration. In 1 Cor. 10, 16 Paul calls the consecrated wine the communion of the blood of Christ, and the bread the communion of the body of Christ. This text establishes the doctrine of the sacramental union, which requires the presence of both elements. A thing cannot be united, or have communion with another, if it doesn't exist at all. Quenstedt writes: "Koinonia est inter duo unita existentia." The Roman doctrine, that only body and blood of Christ are present in the Sacrament, is therefore really, as Luther terms it, "sophistical subtlety -- a dream of monks."

The Roman Church regards it as a damnable error to mention the forgiveness of sins as the chief result, or benefit of partaking of the holy Lord's Supper. The Romanists teach that its participation works deliverance from daily sins, preservation from mortal sins and forgiveness of minor sins. The Catechismus Romanus says: "Through the Lord's Supper lesser sins are forgiven." The Council of Trent says: "If any one saith, that the principal fruit of the most holy Eucharist is the remission of sins, or that other effects do not result therefrom, let him be anathema." To remove the forgiveness of sins from the Holy Eucharist can be very well understood from the Roman standpoint, because the rule of the pope depends on the uncertainty of the forgiveness of

sins, the monstrum incertitudinis, as Luther says. The Catholic regards grace as a power infused into man, by means of which he is enabled to do that which is good. Thus then the Lord's Supper is to preserve from mortal sins.

Against this erroneous doctrine of the Romanists Scripture speaks very plainly. Matt. 26,28 reads: "For this is my blood of the new testament which is shed for many for the remission of sins." The chief object of the Lord's Supper is to appropriate to us the work of Christ, above all, the forgiveness of sins. Thus it must bring to us the greatest of all gifts, the forgiveness of our sins, and that in such a way, that we are especially assured of forgiveness when we partake of this holy Sacrament. Luther says of this: "Welches auch das Noetigste darin ist, dasz man wisse, was wir da suchen und holen sollen." We must also bear in mind the earnest warning of the Apostle for self-examination before partaking of the Lord's Supper, 1 Cor. 11,28, the result of which will always be the knowledge of sins. And in the very next verse the Apostle says: "For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself." Logically it follows from this, that whosoever eateth and drinketh worthily, does so for the forgiveness of his sins, to everlasting life.

It is, therefore, quite clear that the Roman doctrine of the Holy Eucharist is anti-Scriptural, and all those who with Rome substitute an infused grace fall under this judgment: "Christ is become of no effect to you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace."

that Christ
contained invisibly under the bread? The Heidelberg Catechism,
rather confession of all later Reformed confessions says of the

The whole army of the Reformed teachers from Zwingli to "Billy" Sunday teaches that only the bread and wine are present in the Eucharist, or, in other words, that bread and wine are symbols of the absent body of Christ.

Zwingli, the father of Reformed rationalism, says in his preface to "A Short Christian Catechism to the Clergy:" "The Lord's Supper is nothing more than the feast of the soul, and Christ instituted it as a remembrance of himself. When man trusts in the suffering and redemption of Christ, he shall be saved. Of this he has left us a sure and visible sign in the emblem of his body and blood, and entreats us to eat and to drink both in remembrance of him." In his Reckoning of the Faith this is his standpoint: "Eightly. I believe that in the Holy Eucharist, i.e., the supper of thanksgiving, the true body of Christ is present by contemplation of faith, i.e., that they who thank the Lord for the kindness conferred on us in His Son, acknowledge that He assumed true flesh, in it truly suffered, truly washed away our sins in His own blood; and thus everything done by Christ becomes present to them by the contemplation of faith. But that the body of Christ in essence and really -- i.e., the natural body itself -- is either present in the Supper or masticated with our mouth or teeth, as the papists and some who long for the fleshpots of Egypt assert, we not only deny, but firmly maintain is an error opposed to God's Word." (Reckoning of Faith was presented at Augsburg, 1530). Calvin says in his "Institutes": "How, then, could they (the disciples) have been so ready to believe what is repugnant to all reason, viz., that Christ was seated at table under their eye, and yet was contained invisibly under the bread?" The Heidelberg Catechism, the mother confession of all later Reformed confessions says of the

Eucharist: "The Lord's Supper is a distributing and receiving of bread and wine commanded of Christ unto the faithful, that by these signs he might testify that he has delivered and yielded his body unto death, and has shed his blood for them, and does give them these things to eat and drink, that they might be unto them the meat and drink of eternal life, and that thereby also he might testify that he would dwell in them, nourish, and quicken them forever." Again: "To eat is to believe, to receive remission of sin by faith, to be united to Christ, to be made partakers of the life of Christ." Again: "The literal sense, if it be properly taken, can be no other wise understood than thus: The substance of this bread is the substance of my body. But so to understand it is an undoubted absurdity." The Book of Common Prayer says in "a catechism -- to be learned -- before confirmation": "Why was the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper ordained? Ans.: For the continued remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of Christ, and of the benefits which we receive thereby. What is the inward part, or thing signified? Ans.: The body and blood of Christ, which are spiritually taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper." In the Episcopal Articles of Religion the first part speaks of "partaking of the body and blood of Christ", but concludes by stating that "the body of Christ is given, taken and eaten in the Supper, only after ~~after~~ an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the means whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is faith." The Presbyterians say: "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 there not corporally or carnally in, with, or under the bread and wine; yet as really, but spiritually, present to the faith of
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." (West. Conf.) Shedd has this: "The presence of Christ is not in the bread or wine, but in the soul of the participant. 'Christ', says the Westminster Confession, is 'present to the faith of believers,' and faith is mental and spiritual." Again: "In the sacrament of the supper, the bread and wine are both symbols, and memorials of Christ's body." Strong says: "The Lord's Supper sets forth, in general, the death of Christ, as the sustaining power of the believer's life."

The Reformed doctrine, that Christ's body and blood are not really present, but are present in a symbolical way only, is refuted through this statement of Scripture that the body and blood of Christ, which he gave his disciples, are present not only for the faith, but also for the mouth of the communicants. Christ designates his body Luke 22,9 as "my body which is given for you," and the blood which he gave them in the Holy Supper to drink with the mouth as "my blood which is shed for many." (Matt. 26, 28) We know, however, that not images of the body and blood of Christ, but his true body and blood were given and shed for us. When Christ described his body with the words "this is my body which is given for you" and his blood "this is my blood which is shed for many" he commanded his disciples to "take, eat, drink" just that very body and blood. When the Reformed maintain that the body and blood are not present for the mouth, but only for the faith, they rob the "eat" and "drink" of the object which Christ gave to them. Chemnitz has said: "When Christ says, 'Eat, drink', he prescribes the way and manner in which we are to take that which is present in the Holy Supper, and distributed, namely, with the mouth." (Dre sumamus) That such a taking of the words of eating and

drinking is meant, no one can deny, unless at the same time he intends to put an end to and overthrow the whole outward act of the Supper. But of that which is present in the Sacrament, which is distributed, which those eating receive with the mouth, he says expressly, 'This is my body, which is given for you; this is my blood which is shed for you for the remission of sins.' We also have in the Lord's Supper a plain exhortation to come to faith or for spiritual eating. But this exhortation goes hand in hand with the eating with the mouth and is based on it. This exhortation is contained in the phrase, in which Christ describes the body which he is giving his disciples, "which is given for you." In partaking of the body with the mouth the disciples are to believe that through this body of Christ which was given for them, they have perfect reconciliation with God, or the forgiveness of sins.

Although the Reformed are unanimous in denying that the body and blood of Christ are present in the Sacrament, and, therefore, permit the bread and wine only as symbols of the "absent" body and blood of Christ, yet they do not agree in what part of the sentence "This is my body" the trope is to be found. Carlstadt found it in "touto", Zwingli in "estin", Oecolampad and Calvin in "to soma mou."

Carlstadt held that Christ with the word "this" did not point to the bread but to his body, which was sitting at the table. Luther says: "Carlstadt really says: 'This is my body' ought to read: Here sits my body. And the text ought to read: He took the bread and when he had given thanks, he brake it and gave it to his disciples and said: Here sits my body which is given for you." Of course, such arbitrary explanation, as Carlstadt gives, can find no room with us. The words of Christ are too plain.

Zwingli opposes Carlstadt and advances a different theory. He maintains that the copulative "is", estin, must be understood in the sense of "signifies," -- this bread signifies my body. To prove this view he advances such passages as John 10,9, where Jesus says: "I am the door;" John 15,5: "I am the vine, ye are the branches;" 1 Cor.10,4: "For they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them: and that Rock was Christ." It is true, there are figurative expressions here, but not in the copula, but in the predicate nouns, door, vine, Rock. Christ is the door, but not such a door, as would lead into a house, but a spiritual door, which leads into the kingdom of glory, as Christ immediately adds: "By me, if any man enter in, he shall be saved." The copula "is" also retains its original meaning in the parables of Christ, where he uses pictures from earthly things to designate spiritual things, as Luke 8,11: "The seed is the word of God." The meaning here is not: The seed signifies the word of God, but that which the seed pictures, is the word of God. Dr. Walther says: "Whenever Scripture says, that something is, we can safely depend on it." Dr. Krauth has this: "Language itself would commit suicide, if it could tolerate the idea that the substantive verb shall express not substance but symbol." Zwingli's zeal in forwarding this interpretation is much greater than the quality of his logic. Luther calls Zwingli's view pure fiction. The very passages which are advanced by the Reformed to prove their point here, prove just the opposite. (Pieper)

The view of Oecolampad and Calvin, that the trope is to be found in the predicate noun "body," according to which "body" is to mean "sign of the body," is just as arbitrary as Zwingli's view. Christ did not say, Take, eat, this is a sign of my body,

but "This is my body." All four of the holy writers give us this account: "This is my body". Not a single one speaks of a sign of my body. Luther says: "Since all the writers unanimously say: 'This is my body,' we can truly say, that no figurative speech is to be found there." Lutheran teachers have always held to this principle: Every word is to be taken in its original meaning until the context forces, to accept a figurative sense.

There have also been these advocates of the Reformed doctrine of the Lord's Supper as Keckermann, who did not take the separate words figuratively, who, therefore, do not take "is", nor "body" as figurative, but conceive of the entire sentence as figurative. But this is deceiving, because Keckermann speaks of a unio significationis, which is to exist between the bread and the body of Christ. In reality he then either takes "is" for "signifies," or "body" for "sign of body." We might in this connection ask the Reformed a disconcerting question: Why stop half way? Why not take the whole act of the Holy Supper in a figurative sense? Luther remarked: "Why are not the other words taken figuratively and why is the trope only in "is" or "body?" Where is there a rule, that teaches us, which words must be taken figuratively, and which not? I might say then: 'Take' means hear, 'eat' means believe, 'this do' means think in your heart." Krauth makes the following statement: "The word TAKE these interpreters(Reformed) have usually taken literally, though why an imaginary body or the symbol of a body might not be taken mentally, they cannot say. -- The word EAT they have interpreted literally, though why the eating ought not to be done symbolically, or mentally to correspond with the symbolical or mental character of the body they cannot say. Certainly there are plenty of instances of a figurative

use of the word "eat", while there are none of such a use of the word "is'."

The Reformed maintain that the words of institution must be explained according to John 6. Thus Hodge cites John 6 in explanation of 1 Cor.10,16, and his following ^{also} "prooftexts" do not treat of the Lord's Supper, but of the unio mystica of the faithful with Christ. Against the use of John 6 in this connection we might cite four reasons: 1) It is true, Christ speaks metaphorically of the eating of his flesh(not body), and of the drinking of his blood. But it was not until a year later, that he instituted that rite of which he said: "Do this in remembrance of me." And the record of institution states plainly that it was "the same night in which he was betrayed." The Reformed, when they appeal to John 6 as the sedes doctrinae of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, must grant in order to hold their own ground, that the Lord's Supper was in existence before it was instituted. 2) When the three Evangelists and Paul present the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, they speak of an eating and drinking of the body and blood of Christ, which may bring damnation, namely to an unworthy communicant. 1 Cor.11,29. Such a possibility is not even remotely considered in John 6; on the contrary we are told in vv. 54.56 that the eating of his flesh and the drinking of his blood of which the Lord speaks is always salutary, it is always to the end of obtaining eternal life. The Reformed must grant then, in order to hold their ground, that no person can commune unworthily. 3) In John 6 the Lord Jesus speaks of an eating and drinking that is absolutely necessary for salvation: "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood ye have no life in you." v.53. But of the eating and drinking in the Lord's Supper Paul says, 1 Cor.11, 25: "Let a man examine himself and so let him eat." Hence, persons

who are not capable of self-examination are not admitted to the
 and the Reformed
 Lord's Supper, are forced to believe, if they will be true to their
 own arguments, that all Christians who have not communed will be
 damned. 4) In John 6 Christ speaks of his flesh and blood, but
 names no external elements by means of which that is to be taken,
 while the elements are named and exhibited in the words of insti -
 tution. The Reformed, who appeal to John 6 as the sedes doctrinae
 for the doctrine of the sacrament must do one of two things: either
 they must eat the flesh of Christ and drink his blood without any
 external means, or they must admit that the words "Eating and
 drinking," likewise the words "flesh and blood" in this text can-
 not be taken literally, but must be understood figuratively,
 for believing in the atoning sacrifice of Christ, and on the
 feasting on his merits by the mouth of faith.

If one wishes to accept the Reformed doctrine of the Holy
 Supper a vast amount of "exegesis" is demanded, just as with the
 Catholics..In that case Christ might have illustrated his words
 somewhat as follows: My words: "Take, eat, this is my body" de-
 mand an eating with the mouth. Do not, however, imagine that my
 body is here on earth in this Supper to be eaten with the mouth.
 As far as heaven is from earth, so far is my body from the Lord's
 Supper, and from your mouth. What I really mean is this, that you
 are to raise yourself to heaven with the mouth of faith, there to
 eat my body spiritually. The words "Given for you" indeed seem
 to mean that you are not receiving a symbol or image of my body,
 but the body itself. But you must interpret my words according to
 the following axiom, that my body cannot have a visible or local
 presence. Because you cannot see or feel my body in the Sacrament
 you must accept "my body" to mean a "symbol of my body!" Had the

apostle Paul intended to give his readers a Reformed idea of Holy Communion, a peculiar commentary would have resulted. He would have "explained" his words something like this: Of course, I say that the chalice is the koinonia of Christ's blood and the bread the koinonia of Christ's body. If you take the words as they read you might indeed think that in Communion the body and blood of Christ are present with the bread and wine, and all that partake of this meal, receive the body and blood of Christ. This communion of the bread with the body of Christ and the wine with the blood is also shown by these words: "Wherefore whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord." 1 Cor. 11, 27. But in order to get the proper understanding of my words, you will have to harbor many thoughts outside the literal meaning of these words, as, for example, Zwingli has said: "The flesh profiteth nothing." Why should we believe that the body and blood of Christ are present in the Holy Sacrament, "since the believers receive elsewhere by faith all they receive at the Lord's table; and since we Christians receive nothing above or beyond that which was received by the saints under the Old Testament, before the glorified body of Christ had any existence?" (Hodge) Then it would also be derogatory to the honor of Christ, if he were "to attach his body to the bread," and would be forced to leave heaven. His disciples would also have been greatly terrified, had they not at once explained "body" with "symbol of body." Of course, the general rule, that Christ's body can have only a local presence must be born in mind. On the basis of these thoughts you will understand my words, which speak of the "presence" of Christ's body, to mean an "absence" of it. That the Reformed doctrine is grounded in this "exegesis"

is shown clearly by various Reformed writers, Zwingli, Calvin, Hodge, and others.

Of course, it is quite evident that the Reformed interpretation of the Holy Eucharist is not founded on Scriptural grounds, but is based on human reason. This is clearly shown by Calvin, when he said: "How, then, could they (the disciples) have been so ready to believe what is repugnant to all reason, viz., that Christ was seated at the table under their eye, and yet was contained invisibly under the bread?" Dr. Pieper says: "Die reformierte Exegese der Abendmahlsworte findet keinen Platz, wo ihr Fusz ruhen kann." Their doctrine is based on the rationalistic axiom, that Christ, according to his human nature has only a local presence. The Christ which the Reformed drag into the Lord's Supper is no Christ at all, because they leave out one very respectable portion of the God-man, namely, his divinity. Because the Reformed openly assert, that they do not intend to celebrate the Lord's Supper with the real presence of the Lord, but call such a Supper an abomination, it is evident that they do not celebrate that communion, which Christ gave to his church. By upholding this teaching, the Reformed sever all connections with Christ's words of institution. They have, therefore, no command of God for such a Communion, because a Communion, in which bread and wine are received as a symbol of the absent body and blood of Christ, our Lord and Master has not instituted. We must conclude, therefore, as Dr. Pieper expresses it: "Since the Reformed communion is an act outside of the words of institution, they have no communion."

As the Reformed Churches deny the real presence, so they also deny the real benefit thereof. Carlstadt said: "It is a shame that our Christians seek forgiveness of sins in the Sacrament."

Zwingli held that the Holy Supper was to be celebrated as a commemoration of the death of Christ, but one should not think, that forgiveness of sins is to be found there. Calvin teaches the same. The Consensus Tigurinus warns against the thought "that the visible sign, when it is offered, in the same moment brings the grace of God." To the Reformed, communion seasons are merely memorial seasons, on which the believers review the death of the Redeemer. That is all. The Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and Baptists unite in confessing that "The Lord Jesus instituted the Sacrament of his body and blood -- for the perpetual remembrance of the sacrifice of himself in his death." (Westminster Confession) The Methodists speak ambiguously in their Articles of Religion of the Lord's Supper, but they are unmistakably Reformed in practice and public teaching.

According to the Reformed doctrine there is no forgiveness of sins in Holy Communion, yes, they even admonish, not to regard the Holy Supper as offering forgiveness of sins. This is, of course, in accord with their doctrine, because they teach that the grace of God is not for all men, but for the elect only, but according to their doctrine not even for the elect is forgiveness of sins in the Supper, and therefore, they say, to use the words of Hodge: "Efficacious grace works immediately." Hence, no means of grace is needed, and, then, of course, no communion. The character of the means of grace always presupposes, that Christ has obtained grace for all men and that the Holy Ghost works, not without the means of grace, nor beside them, but through them. Even though the Reformed were to accept the Scriptural doctrine of the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in, with, and under the bread and wine in the Sacrament, yet it would be of no value, as long as they deny universal grace, and the working of the Holy Ghost

through the means of grace. Of course, the Reformed speak of a spiritual partaking of the body and blood of Christ, but they make such a partaking impossible by denying that the body of Christ was given for all men. This is also done when the Reformed speak of a hidden, immediate effect of the Spirit. In the first place "faith" through which this spiritual partaking is brought about has no hidden effects of the Holy Spirit in the heart of man as object. The object of faith, is Dei favor propter Christum. Then we must bear in mind, that there are no hidden immediate effects of the Holy Spirit, as the Reformed teach. This is only man-made. This "faith" also is a fabrication of man. Nor have the Reformed a right to speak of a memorial feast of the death of Christ. Only those, who believe that Christ died for all mankind have such a feast. The Reformed have no right to this expression, to which they all agree, that bread and wine in the Lord's Supper are merely symbols of the body and blood of Christ. The symbol can reach no further than that which is symbolized. If the body and blood are not given and shed for all, then bread and wine cannot be symbols of the body and blood of Christ to all participants of the Lord's Supper. It is evident that the Reformed doctrine breaks down if we view their presentation of the essence in the light of Holy Writ. Also their view of the benefit of the Supper cannot stand when confronted with the clear teaching of the Word. Our precious Bible is very clear here, and it shatters the Reformed doctrine, because this is based only on human reason, Luke 22,19.20 we read: "And he took bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, and gave unto them, saying, This is my body which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me. Likewise also the cup after the supper, saying, This cup is the new testament in my

blood, which is shed for you." Matt.26,26-28 states: "And as they were eating Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." When Christ bids his disciples to partake of communion, it is with the intent that they are to obtain there forgiveness of sins, as he clearly states. All who deny this, do not teach according to Christ's institution, but according to the invention of men, and they should heed the words of Paul: "For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body."

.....

The doctrine of the Lutheran Church is that the bread and wine, as well as the body and blood of Christ are present in the Sacrament, or in other words, that in the Sacrament with the bread the body of Christ and with the wine the blood of Christ are received, in a union which is found only in the Sacrament, and which, to distinguish it from the unio personalis which exists between the Father and man in the person of Christ, and the unio mystica, which exists between Christ and the believers, is called unio sacramentalis, sacramental union. This is clearly set forth in Luther's Small Catechism. On the question: "What is the Sacrament/of the Altar?" we find this 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." Matt.26,26-28 we read: "And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed it and brake it, and gave it to them, and

said, Take, eat; this is my body. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." This account is also found in Mark 14,22-24; Luke 22,19.20; 1 Cor.11,23-25. The Augsburg Confession says:

"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." In the Formula of Concord we find this: "We believe, teach, and confess that in the Holy Supper the body and blood of Christ are truly and essentially present, and are truly distributed and received with the bread and wine. We believe, teach, and confess that the words of the testament of Christ are not to be understood otherwise than as they read, according to the letter, so that the bread does not signify the absent body of Christ, but that on account of the sacramental union, they (the bread and wine) are truly the body and blood of Christ."

This doctrine of the Holy Supper is in accordance with the Word of God, because it lets the words which point to the presence of the bread, and which mention the body of Christ as present in the Supper, stand as they read without adding thereto, or detracting therefrom. It does not teach with the Romish Church that the bread is only a "show bread", nor does it hold with the Reformed sects that "body" is only a symbol of the body of Christ. It lets the true bread as well as the true body be present in the Sacrament because the words of institution clearly demand it.

The words of Christ "This is my body" have caused much dispute. All learned and also unlearned will admit that these words are easily understood. This is clearly seen from the fact that Christ offers no commentary of these words at the institution. If there were a special difficulty in his words, or even a pos-

sibility of misunderstanding them, Christ would surely have offered the necessary exegesis. Since nothing whatsoever is offered by Christ in this respect, it is certain that the words: "Take, eat; this is my body, which is given for you" are a phrase, which can without commentary be understood at the mere reading or hearing. Christ uses a mode of expression that is common in every day life, when something is handed to another. The term for this act is locutio exhibitiva, in which the particular is used for the complex, as was already noted when presenting the Roman teaching. This expression is common in every day usage as well as in Scripture. When handing someone water in a glass, we do not say: 1) Here is a glass; 2) here is water, but we merely name that which is contained in the glass. Just so also Christ speaks when in the words of institution he does not in the predicate name the bread, which the disciples saw, but the body, which they did not see, and to which he wanted to direct their attention.

The apostle Paul refers to this particular presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist, proving the Lutheran doctrine in strict accord with Scripture, 1 Cor. 10, 16: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" Not only does Paul give us an account of the words of institution, as Matthew, Mark, and Luke, but he gives us more. He calls the bread bread. Hence it is really present in the Eucharist. There is no transubstantiation. The body is named, so the "symbol" of the Reformed falls. The body is present. Then Paul also speaks of a "communion." We know, of course, that it takes at least two things to make a communion. This is in perfect harmony with the Lutheran doctrine that both bread and body, and wine and blood are present in the Holy Sacrament. Paul censures

the Corinthians for their carelessness with the Holy Sacrament and admonishes them to greater earnestness, and thereupon he plainly states that the words "body of Christ" and "blood of Christ" are to be understood in the first and real meaning. For he calls the cup of blessing not symbol, or image, but the communion of the blood of Christ, and the bread which we break, not a symbol or image, but the communion of the body of Christ, and says in the following chapter, 1 Cor. 11, 28. 29: "But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup. For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body." Although the term "sacramental union" is not found in Scripture, as some Reformed have thrown up to the Lutherans, yet this passage in Corinthians just quoted teaches it so clearly that, that the verse can scarcely be misunderstood. Dr. Pieper says: "Der Ausdruck unio sacramentalis wird uns hier geradezu in den Mund gelegt. Daher weichen wir Lutheraner mit dem Ausdruck nicht von der Schrift ab, sondern beweisen, dass wir in der Schrift sitzen, und beide Papisten und Reformierte daneben." This communion can mean nothing else, than this, that he who partakes of the bread receives in it also the body of Christ. This union, as a result of which the body of Christ is received with the bread and the blood with the wine, the Lutherans have termed "sacramental union."

The Reformed charge the Lutherans with having themselves departed from the literal meaning or from the very words of institution, because they have adopted the formula "in, with, and under." Also Hodge says: "That makes the language figurative, and the literal interpretation, the main, if not the only prop of the Lutheran doctrine, is given up." Kromayer explained that

this phrase does not mean to make clear what is incomprehensible, but that the phrase merely imitates the language of Scripture in regard to another mystery, for we read 2 Cor. 5, 19: "God was in Christ" and Acts 10, 38: "God was with Christ." As regards the "under" which Luther uses in his Small Catechism, that is not to signify that the body of Christ is somehow concealed below the bread, but to express the great mystery of the sacramental union. (Dau)
 Hodge borrowed his assertion from Calvin and others without examining the truth of it.

Various false names have been coined for the Lutheran doctrine by its adversaries, such as consubstantiation, impanation. These terms are given in many encyclopedias as expressions of the Lutheran teaching of the Eucharist. As to consubstantiation, that is, that the body and bread form one substance, many Reformed claim this of the Lutheran doctrine. But those, who apply that term "consubstantiation" to the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper misrepresent our position. We do not teach that the bread and body of Christ, or the wine and blood form one substance, but that in, with, and under the bread we receive, not in a natural, but supernatural (sacramental) manner the true body of Christ, and with the wine his true blood. This is the plain doctrine of Scripture as already shown before. This is, of course, too deep for human reason to fathom. As regards the term "consubstantiation" itself, Dr. Dau quotes Kromayer, who says that we might accept that term, but since the Calvinists will have it to signify the local inclusion of the body in the bread, impanation, we rightly abstain from the use of the term. Nor is it true when the Reformed say that the Lutherans really teach transubstantiation. Hodge expresses this: "If the words of Christ are to be taken literally

they teach the doctrine of transubstantiation." That this bears no weight can clearly be seen from other places of Scripture where the locutio exhibitiva is used. Matt. 16, 16 Peter says: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," and the angel said to Mary Luke 1, 35: "That holy thing which shall be born of thee, shall be called the Son of God." Just as the son of man and the son of Mary is the Son of God, not through transubstantiation of the son of man into the Son of God, nor through an image of the son of God by the son of man, but through an union -- here through the personal union -- so in the Holy Supper the bread which is distributed is the body of Christ, not through transubstantiation of the bread into the body of Christ, nor through a symbol of the body of Christ through the bread, but through the communion of the bread with the body, through the sacramental union.

Since the Lutheran doctrine is in strict accord with Holy Scripture, since it leaves the true bread and the true body, the true wine and the true blood in the Sacrament just as the words of institution teach, it is evident that the Lutheran Sacrament is the true Scriptural Sacrament.

The Lutheran doctrine concerning the benefit of the Lord's Supper is clearly expressed in the words of Luther's Small Catechism. On the question: "What is the benefit of such eating and drinking?" the answer is: "That is shown us by these words, 'Given and shed for you for the remission of sins'; namely, that in the Sacrament forgiveness of sins, life, and salvation are given us through these words. For where there is forgiveness of sins, there is also life and salvation." The Formula of Concord says: "Since -- Jesus Christ -- in the ordaining and institution of the Holy Supper spake these words concerning the

bread which he blessed and gave: "Take, eat, this is my body, which is given for you" and concerning the cup or wine: "This is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins," we are certainly in duty bound -- to receive the words as they read." When Christ added the words "shed for many for the forgiveness of sins," he wanted to give to his disciples and all later communicants the assurance that through his atoning death they have a gracious God, forgiveness of sins. Also in the words: "This cup is the new testament in my blood" the *finis cuius* of the Lord's Supper is directly named, since "the new testament" according to the interpretation of Holy Writ means nothing else than forgiveness of sins. We, therefore, hold that the Holy Supper gives forgiveness of sins, and that the same as the Gospel and Baptism. But there is this in the Lord's Supper, which is not found in the other means of grace, that the forgiveness of sins is sealed for us, through the distribution of his body, given for us into death, and his blood, shed for us for the forgiveness of sins.

All other benefits derived from the Lord's Supper are not coordinate with forgiveness of sins, but are subordinate to it. Such benefits are: Strengthening of our faith, communion with Christ, communion with the Church, the furtherance in holiness of life, arousing love toward God and neighbor, increase of patience and eternal life. All these effects result not only partly but wholly from this that in the Holy Eucharist forgiveness of sins is given. The Christian faith is according to its essence faith in the atoning sacrifice of Christ. Therefore, the Christian faith can be strengthened only in this manner, that its object, through which it comes into existence and exists, that is

the promise of the forgiveness of sins, is constantly brought before him. Nor is there any other communion with Christ than this one which is brought about through faith in the forgiveness of sins, earned by Christ. There is no other communion with the Church, than the one which through faith in the Gospel of the forgiveness of sins for Christ's sake has been brought about and is thus sustained. No other means is to be found to bring about holiness of life than faith in the grace of God, according to which God forgives us our sins on account of the satisfactio vicaria of Christ. Thus Paul also regards his hope of salvation and his patience to endure under the cross, solely as the result of justification, that is the forgiveness of sins on account of the atoning work of Christ, his by faith. "Therefore being justified by faith we have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ." Because the forgiveness of sins is sealed to us in the Eucharist, and so is offered to us in a special comforting manner, therefore also the spiritual benefits named before are made our own in a special measure. All those, therefore, who with the Romans, Reformed, and others do not place the Lord's Supper primo loco as a means for the forgiveness of sins, deny also these other results and benefits, and thus draw a wall between themselves and the grace of God in Christ Jesus.

Page 19 - Hodge, Syst. Theol. III, 622. (74, 1863)

Page 21 - Hodge, Syst. Theol. III, 647.

Page 22 - Calvin, Inst. IV, C. XXVII, §23.

Page 23 - Pieper, Notes from class.

Page 24 - Carletadt, Luther, XI, 94.

Page 25 - Zwingli, Opp. III, 256. Cited Pieper, Chr. Dogm. III, 432, f. 134.

Page 26 - Consensus Tigurinus, Pieper, p. 150. Cited Pieper, III, 432, Note 1340.

References to quotations in this thesis.

- Page 2 -- Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent, Sess.XIII,c.IV.
- Page 3 -- W.Wilmers, Lehrbuch der Religion, Fifth Ed. 1895, IV.p455.
- Page 5 -- W.Wilmers, Lehrbuch der Religion, IV.p.456f.
- Page 8 -- Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent. Sess.XIII,can.III^{///}
- Page 11 - Quenstedt, Cited Dau, Doctrinal Theol. II.p.69.
- Page 11 - Luther, XIX.1320. St.L.Ed.
- Page 11 - Catechismus Romanus, II,4. Quest.50.
- Page 11 - Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent. Sess.XIII.can.5.^{5.}
- Page 12 - Luther, Cat.Maj.M.502,20ff.
- Page 13 - Zwingli, Quoted Monson, The Difference,p.101-102.
- Page 13 - Calvin, Inst.IV.C.XVII.#23.
- Page 13 - Heidelberg Cat.by Ursinus and Olevianus, quest.75-77.
quoted Monson,The Difference,p.102-103.
- Page 14.- Book of Common Prayer(Episcopal) p.228. Quoted Monson,
The Difference.
- Page 14 - Articles of Religion(Epis) Art.XXVIII. Quoted Monson,
The Difference.
- Page 14 - Westminster Confession, Art.XXIX,7.
- Page 15 - Shedd, Dogm.Theol. II,p.565.(Sec. Ed.1889)
- Page 15 - Strong, Syst. Theol. p.400.(Fifth Ed.1896.)
- Page 16 - Luther, St.L.Ed.XX,1771f.
- Page 17 - Pieper, Chr.Dogm. III,384,Note 1260.
- Page 17 - Krauth, Conserv. Ref.p.619.
- Page 18 - Krauth, Cons. Ref., p.608f.
- Page 19 - Hodge, Syst. Theol. III.622.(Ed.1883)
- Page 21 - Hodge, Syst. Theol.III,647.
- Page 22 - Calvin, Inst.IV.C.XXVII,#23.
- Page 22 - Pieper, Notes from class.
- Page 22 - Carlstadt, Luther,XX,94.
- Page 22 - Zwingli,Opp.III,258. Cited Pieper,Chr.Dogm.III,438,N.1389.^{,ss?}
- Page 22 - Consensus Tigurinus, Niemeyer,p.195.Cited Pieper,III,
438,Note 1390.

- Page 22 -- West.Conf.XXIX,1.
- Page 23 -- Hodge, Syst.Theol.II,p.684.
- Page 25 -- Luther's Sm.Cat., Schwan,p.25.
- Page 26 -- Aug.Conf. ArtX,Trigl.p.809f.
- Page 26 -- Form. of C. Epit.VII,6.7, Trigl.p.47.
- Page 28,-- Pieper, Classnotes.
- Page 28 --, Syst. Theol.III,662. Ed.1883, Hodge, Syst.Theol.
- Page 28 -- Kromayer, Cited Dau, Doct. Theol.II,p.73.
- Page 29 -- Kromayer, Cited Dau, Doct. Theol,II,p.73.
- Page 29 -- Hodge, Syst, Theol. III.662. Note 1.(Ed.1883)
- Page 30 -- Luther, Sm.Cat.VI,5.6. Trigl.p.557.
- Page 30 -- Form. of C. Decl.VII,44.45. Trig.p.987.

.....

Bibliography used for this thesis:

- Catholic Encyclopedia.
- W.Wilmers, Lehrbuch der Religion, Fifth Ed. Münster 1895.
Aschendorfschen Buchhandlung.
- Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent.

- Hodge, Systematic Theology, Ed.1883.
- Strong, Systematic Theology, Fifth Ed.1896.
- Shedd, Doctrinal Theology, Second Ed.1889.
- Calvin, Institutes.
- Heidelberg Catechism, Text of Tercentenary Edition.
- Westminster Confession.

- Bible.
- Luther, St. Louis, Edition.
- Pieper, Christliche Dogmatik.
- Dau, Doctrinal Theology.

Bibliography, Continued.

Triglotta.

Walther, Pastorale, Fuenft~~e~~ Auflage, 1906.

Mueller, My Church and Others.

Monson, The Difference.

Krauth, Conservative Reformation.

Kretzmann, Popular Commentary.

Guenther, Populaere Symbolik.