

# Concordia Theological Monthly

---

Volume 9

Article 80

---

11-1-1938

## Miscellanea

J. T. Mueller

*Concordia Seminary, St. Louis*

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



Part of the [Practical Theology Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Mueller, J. T. (1938) "Miscellanea," *Concordia Theological Monthly*: Vol. 9 , Article 80.

Available at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm/vol9/iss1/80>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Print Publications at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Concordia Theological Monthly by an authorized editor of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact [seitzw@csl.edu](mailto:seitzw@csl.edu).

---

**Miscellanea**

---

**Science and Christian Education**

This was the subject upon which Dr. Arthur H. Compton, professor of physics at the University of Chicago, spoke at the closing session of the International Convention of Christian Education held here in Columbus last week. Dr. Compton is a scientist of the first water, winner of the 1927 Nobel prize in science and renowned for his work in connection with the cosmic ray. The burden of his message before this international gathering of religious educators was that science has given new powers to man, but that Christianity is the key to the proper use of these enlarged powers. It was extremely heartening to hear this eminent scientist develop this proposition. To be sure, he spoke as a scientist, not as a theologian. He tried to give us the viewpoint of a man of science, telling us that scientists regard science as the basis of civilization and the primary factor in stimulating its growth. He traced the rapid, far-reaching advances that have been made, for example, in the field of physics — in heat, light, and electricity — in the last fifty years and stated that these advances have powerfully influenced our intellectual, economic, and social life and contributed much to human welfare. But then the learned scientist from Chicago at once admitted that the key to the future of man lies not only in the increased knowledge and increased strength which science has put at our disposal but *in the use which man makes of that knowledge and strength*. The new powers which science has given to man may be, and have been, abused by cruel men and by selfish, short-sighted nations, averred Dr. Compton. And in this indictment he included not only Germany and Russia but our own country as well, for he admitted a rather universal tendency on the part of mankind to divide into antagonistic groups, in which men become terribly destructive. Science, in other words, has demonstrated the tremendous need of cooperation and has helped to show the rich rewards which cooperation, consideration of one another, brings; but the real key to effecting this cooperation, this brotherly love, is Christian education. The eminent physicist made an eloquent plea for that which Paul prays for in his letter to the Philippians: "It is my prayer that your love may be more and more rich in knowledge and all manner of insight" (Phil. 1:9, Moffatt's translation). He insisted that love alone isn't enough; it must be enriched by increasing knowledge and insight. But knowledge alone isn't enough either; it must be motivated by Christian love. Hence science, which has brought about a technological society and demonstrated the mutual dependence of the members of such a society upon each other, shows how absolutely indispensable Christian education is if our increased knowledge and strength is to benefit rather than hurt society.

Remember once again, these words came not from a theological professor or a minister or a Sunday-school superintendent but from a world-renowned scientist. Perhaps, had he told us more fully what

he understands by Christian education, what the content of such education is, we would not have seen eye to eye with him. But his telling argument for the need of Christian education stands nevertheless. In fact, if we Lutherans have the precise message — the life-giving, power-bestowing Gospel of Jesus Christ in all its saving fulness — that our world needs to save it from chaos despite its advance in scientific knowledge and technique, it becomes us to be particularly zealous in giving this message to our children and college youth, to our fathers and mothers, that they in turn may be used in helping others to see and follow the light. — *Lutheran Standard*.

### The Body of Christ in the Holy Supper

The question has been raised: "Which is the form in which we receive the body of Christ and His blood in Holy Communion? Is it the natural body of the Son of God, as it hung on the Cross, or is it the glorified form in which we receive it?"

The question concerns the peculiar mode of Christ's presence in the Lord's Supper. In it neither the real presence nor the oral manducation is being denied. It has been said: "Since Christ is now glorified, He can give us no other than His glorified body today." Such reasoning in matters of doctrine is out of place; for not any logical deduction from an unwritten premise, but Scripture, in its clear declaration, is our *principium cognoscendi*, or our norm of faith. The syllogism in this case reads: 1. Christ is now glorified. 2. He cannot be present in any other way than in His glorified body. 3. Therefore in the Holy Supper we receive His glorified body. Evidently the minor premise is not stated in Scripture. It must be noted that the Scriptures carefully determine the body given us in the Holy Supper when in the words of institution it specifies "the body given for you," "the blood shed for you."

Dr. Pieper, in his *Christliche Dogmatik* (III, 415), writes very properly: "Also with regard to the *materia coelestis* it is necessary for us to adhere to the words of institution and to repudiate all substitutes invented by men." Among the substitutes put in place of Christ's true body given for us and His true blood shed for us he mentions also the "glorified body of Christ" or the "glorified corporeity" of Christ or the "glorified Christ," etc. "Calvin," he says, "holds that the powers of the glorified body of Christ infuse themselves into the believing soul, while modern theologians speak of the pneumatico-physical efficacy of the Lord's Supper, for the reason that in this Sacrament the glorified body of Christ is said to be received. But the words of institution do not say anything of a glorified body, and neither the essence of the Holy Supper (the real presence) nor its salutary effect (remission of sins) should be based upon the glorification of the body of Christ. The fact that Christ's body was not yet glorified at the first Holy Communion did not prevent the real presence of the body and blood; just so also the fact that Christ's body is now glorified does not promote (*foerdert nicht*) the real presence that occurs till the end of time whenever the Holy Supper is being celebrated in the Christian Church. The real presence has its fully adequate *rationale* in the words of institution:

'This is My body; this is My blood.' It is only when the Reformed object that a human body cannot be present at several places at the same time that we emphasize the fact that Christ's body is not merely a truly human body but also the body of the *Son of God*, to which Scripture expressly ascribes divine attributes, including also *omnipresence*, just because of the *personal union*. Very rightly Dr. Walther declares: 'The presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Holy Supper must not be based upon the glorified state of Christ's body. The glorification imparts to Christ's body only spiritual, not divine properties. We believe that Christ's body is present and received in the Holy Supper 1. because of Christ's promise; 2. because Christ's body is the body of God's Son.' To this Dr. Walther adds the warning: 'Divines, such as Sartorius and others, who in general have written much that is excellent, use the glorified state of Christ's body as a support (*Stuetze*) of His presence in the Holy Supper. But that is a false prop, and false props are just as dangerous as are open contradictions. It is incorrect to say that Christ can now give us His body in the Holy Supper because He is glorified. In this erroneous argumentation there is implied that Christ could not give us His body as long as this was not yet glorified, and this would abrogate the first celebration of the Holy Supper.' Even if now the communicants receive also the glorified body because the glorified body is identical with the non-glorified, nevertheless, according to the words of institution, the body concerns us not inasmuch as it is glorified, but inasmuch as it was given for us into death for our reconciliation (*als der zu unserer Versoehnung dahingegebene*), τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον, that is to say, as the *pledge and means of the remission of sins*." This fine presentation, we are sure, dispels whatever doubts may exist in the minds of some regarding the peculiar mode of Christ's presence in the Holy Supper.

In two extensive footnotes Dr. Pieper quotes Kromayer as urging against the Calvinists that even a spiritual body is *eo ipso* not yet omnipresent. In fact, Christ has His majestic body (His omnipresent body) not from His glorification but from the personal union with the Logos and the session at the right hand of God. So also Burger (*RE<sup>2</sup> I, 37*) says that the possibility of the omnipresence rests not upon the glorification of Christ but upon the personal union and the mutual communication and permeation of the divine and human natures in the unity of His person. Both quotations shed valuable light upon the issue. We maintain that Christ is truly present in the Lord's Supper because of His express promise to that effect in the words of institution. We maintain that it is the *true body* of Christ that is present because He describes the body as that *given into death*. We defend the possibility of the real presence (omnipresence) by the personal union, which embraces the communion of natures and the communication of attributes, in particular the *genus maiestaticum*. J. THEODORE MUELLER