

*The Lord's Supper
in the Theology
of Martin Chemnitz*

•
Bjarne Wollan Teigen



MARTIN CHEMNITZ 1522-1586

LINKS IN THE ELECTRONIC VERSION

Table of Contents

All chapters are linked. To return to the Table of Contents, click on the Chapter title. Forward page numbers (i–xiv) are also linked to the Table of Contents.

Notes

All note reference numbers are linked to their notes. To return to the text page, click the “back” button.

Index

All index entries are linked to their corresponding paragraphs or notes. To return to index, click the “back” button.

*The Lord's Supper
in the Theology
of Martin Chemnitz*

Bjarne Wollan Teigen

Trinity Lutheran Press
Box Z
Brewster, Mass. 02631

1986

Published by

Trinity Lutheran Press
Box Z, Brewster, MA 02631

Originally distributed by

Confessional Lutheran Research Book Center
409 S.E. Wiimers
Des Moines, IA 50315

Quotations from the English translations of the works of Martin Chemnitz, copyright by
Concordia Publishing House.

Used by permission.

Quotations from *The Book of Concord*, copyright by Fortress Press.

Used by permission.

Quotations from *Luther's Works*, copyrighted by Concordia Publishing House and Fortress
Press. Used by permission.

© 1986 by Bjarne Wollan Teigen 924 Plum Mankato. MN 56001

Library of Congress Catalog Card No. 86-50117

ISBN 0-9616252-0-1

Printed by Graphic Publishing Co., Inc., Lake Mills, Iowa

Electronic version published by Erling Teigen and Patricia Ludwig

For Elna

Contents

Forewords to Electronic Edition	ix
The Lord's Supper in the Theology of Martin Chemnitz by Dr. Noman Nagel	x
Author's Foreword	xiii
I. Introduction	I
II. Sacrament and Sacramental Action	9
III. The Biblical Foundation for the Lord's Supper and Principles of Interpretation Necessary for its Correct Understanding	17
IV. The Sacramental Union and its Christological Basis	28
V. The Consecration and its Effects	76
VI. The Effects of the Sacramental Eating and Drinking	164
VII. Summary and Conclusions	185
Index	215

FOREWORD

TO THE ELECTRONIC EDITION

For some time my siblings and I, along with Cousin Erling, had talked with Dad about reprinting his book. He thought it was a good idea and wanted to make it available to as many people as possible, at a low price.

Shortly before his death we suggested republishing it on the internet; he was able to conceptualize the process and understood that by this means his book might reach scholars worldwide at low cost. When he gave his consent we began the process of having *The Lord's Supper in the Theology of Martin Chemnitz* republished, electronically.

The cost of the project could be kept low only because of LOGIA's generous offer to place the book on its website (www.logia.org) where it may be downloaded at no cost.

Scanning the book, arranging the proper electronic format and putting it on-line proved to be a complicated and time-consuming process, a process which had to be performed by a human hand and brain. That brings me to the purpose of this foreword to thank one of those behind-the-scenes people.

Many people made direct and indirect contributions to the reprint; we recognize that, but feel one person, someone who contributed both to the first printing and reprint, needs to be thanked publicly.

At first publication a group of people provided funds, and Trinity Lutheran Church of Brewster, Massachusetts, served as publisher. After publication, my brother Norman Teigen and his wife Judy set up a distribution center at their home in Des Moines, Iowa, shipping copies to book stores, libraries and hundreds of individuals.

When it came time for the reprint Norman accomplished the daunting task of proofreading the electronically-scanned document in its entirety, comparing the scanned text letter by letter and word for word to the original document. Electromechanical devices such as a scanner make many mistakes; without Norman's diligence the reprint could not have been accomplished.

THANK YOU, NORMAN

To God alone the Glory

September, 2005
Lower Hay Lake, Minnesota

Colonel David H. Teigen

The Lord's Supper in the Theology of Martin Chemnitz

Dr. Norman Nagel

"Lutheran theology is sacramental theology." With this profound observation Bjarne Teigen points to what is at the heart of Chemnitz's theology, and at the same time indicates a lamentable atrophy in a good deal of contemporary Lutheran theology. Bjarne Teigen would give us again the vitalizing resources there for us in Chemnitz's theology, and therein most vividly in *The Lord's Supper in the Theology of Martin Chemnitz*.

One has to always say specifically Bjarne Teigen because there are a number of Teigens to whom we are indebted for their weighty and robust contributions in the service of theology and the proclamation of the Gospel. They are each of them more by the faith confessed and lived back and forth between them as a family. Martin and Mathilda Teigen reared this remarkable family: Erling, Bjarne, Torald, Gudrun, Ingolf, Rolf, and Leif. To tell of them all we might never get to Chemnitz. There was an Erling Secundus, son of Torald, whose faithful and fruitful years as a pastor and a professor came to further harvest in the astonishingly successful *LOGIA* which he came to edit, thus fostering a further generation of pastors eager to share and serve in the confession of theology alive in the Lutheran Confessional tradition. Norman, nephew of Erling Primus, and also son of Bjarne (this family does have something of a Norse saga about it, both heroic and tragic), has undertaken the task of making his father's book again available now in a contemporary format.

The Lord's Supper in the Theology of Martin Chemnitz was published in 1986. Its Foreword speaks of having for years "been immersed in the writings of a theologian with such love of the Gospel of justification by faith alone without the deeds of the Law." Those writings were receding from church and seminary fruitfulness as competence in Latin and German declined. From the last generation in which seminarians still had this competence came the translations: *The Two Natures of Christ*, *The Lord's Supper*, and most of the *Loci* by Preus Secundus; *Examination of the Council of Trent* by Kramer; *Ministry, Word and Sacraments* by Poellot. Help was needed to digest all this wealth of Chemnitz now available in English. In the *Doctrine of the Lord's Supper* that help was given by Bjarne Teigen, a scholar eminently equipped for the task with his deep learning and exact scholarship.

Why the Doctrine of the Lord's Supper and not some other doctrine? First of all because it was there, deep in the confession and life of the family, and that family active in the tradition of Norwegian Lutherans that grew into the Evangelical Lutheran Synod. Living through that history drew them to the centrality of the Lord's Supper. There the Lord's giving his body to be eaten and his blood to be drunk for the forgiveness of their sins was the place from which to confess our Lord's communion. What is confessed at the Lord's altar is then confessed into its fellowship. As from the first, altar fellowship is church fellowship. Not the other way round as if some church arrangements could give warrant for confidence in the Lord's giving into our mouths his body to be eaten and his blood to be drunk for the forgiveness of sins at his altar.

The Evangelical Lutheran Synod was confronted with critical questions of church fellowship in its own history, and was also faced with them in the challenge of what is the faithful way to be ecumenical when "ecumenical" is promoted with so much ambiguity.

The Norwegian Lutheran tradition both in the homeland and in America offered some differing and alternative responses. In the homeland of the Reformation the formation of the Evangelical Church in Germany (EKiD) brought all Protestants together in culmination of the Prussian Union. The Lutheran confession of the Lord's Supper became one option along with others in this Church. Weakened doctrine of the Lord's Supper gave weakened church fellowship. What is the worth of church fellowship if it is not the gift of altar fellowship? Theological cover was furnished by the Arnoldshain Theses in 1957 and the Leuenberg Theses in 1973. Similar developments followed in the United States.

Meanwhile in Mankato, in the backwoods of Minnesota, there were Lutheran scholars who recognized that resources for perplexed Lutherans were already available there unused in their heritage. Torald, son of Martin, was assigned the *Large Confession* of Martinus Primus. Bjarne, son of Martin, inherited this task. Sasse weighed in with his *This Is My Body*. Are we again at Marburg? Is that the Luther to heed, and not the early Augustinian Luther so promoted in the Hollian Luther renaissance? For his faithfulness to Luther, Martin Chemnitz was dubbed Martinus Secundus. What better way of testing out your Luther than by way of Chemnitz? And what better way of testing that approach than by doing it the other way round? Bjarne Teigen says, "One must read Chemnitz together with Luther."

In the sixteenth century there were already such problems, problems of slippage, and already such answers as might be achieved by a seemingly little adjustment and spinning. The Formula of Concord gave clear and resounding affirmation to the Ecumenical Creeds, to the Augsburg Confession, its

Apology, the Small and Large Catechisms, the Smalcald Articles and the Tractate, and with a flood of patristic evidence to show that here was no new doctrine, but a “we believe, teach and confess” to the faith once delivered to the one, holy, catholic, and apostolic church, which the Lord creates and sustains by the gifts he gives through his Means of Grace.

The Book of Concord’s confession of the Lord’s Law and Gospel is so destructive of the world’s religions that it is ever under attack both blatant and subtle, with the latter ever the more sinister. Does it have to be so clear and blunt? Is that what the Lord really said? No chance for any synergism?

Bluntness as proof of faithfulness was not the way of Chemnitz. Bjarne Teigen remarks “his faculty for presenting with objectivity not only the content of Sacred Scriptures but also the views of theologians, friendly and otherwise” and eager to recognize “a number of things not in controversy. These I willingly concede” (ix).

The Formula first confesses the Lord’s Supper, and then the Lord whom the Lord’s Supper confesses, Articles 7 and 8: a sacramental Christology. Of what use is a salvation achieved for us, if it is not delivered to us? The salvation, achieved by the vicarious atoning sacrifice of his body and blood, is given us as the Lord gives into our mouths his body and blood to eat and to drink, as he says. There is no other Savior. “Lutheran theology is sacramental theology.”

On then to Chemnitz: “There and back again.”

Note concerning electronic publication: This electronic edition of *The Lord’s Supper in the Theology of Martin Chemnitz* is not a photographic reproduction of the print edition. The text has been scanned, manipulated and reformatted. While the pagination differs from that in the print edition, the paragraph numbering is identical to the original. The entries in the index are linked to their paragraphs. The print edition had all endnotes at the end of the last chapter. This edition has moved the notes for each chapter to the end of that chapter. The index is reproduced from the print edition. We have retained the method of the original index of making references to the text by paragraph number. Since the paragraph numbers in the edition are identical the original index is accurate. Citations based on the original text will be identical to citations to this text.

This electronic reproduction is made available for the use of individuals and may be reproduced for private use. Any re-publication of the text, for profit or otherwise is prohibited.

Erling T. Teigen

AUTHOR'S FOREWORD

In submitting to the public a study of Martin Chemnitz's doctrine of the Lord's Supper, I am keenly aware that I have been immersed in the writings of a theologian with such love of the Gospel of justification by faith alone without the deeds of the Law, that he has rightly been called the "Second Martin" of the Lutheran Reformation. He is a true disciple of Martin Luther. Besides his humble obedience to the Word of the Lord, what is most striking to a student of his works is an awareness of the brilliant mind with which the Lord had endowed him. Coupled with this is his faculty for presenting with objectivity not only the content of the Sacred Scriptures but also the views of theologians, friendly and otherwise. It is not often that one can find a scholar who is so adamantly opposed to the fundamental core of Roman Catholic doctrine, but who can at the same time, for example, calmly write on such an explosive issue as the adoration of the Sacrament this even-tenored judgment that here "a number of things are not in controversy. These I willingly concede" (Ex. 2, 227). As an expositor of the Word of God, a systematic theologian and polemicist, he can well serve as an ideal model for succeeding generations. On the eve of the 400th anniversary of his death (1586), it is my hope that this monograph will encourage others to take the opportunity to explore the theology of Martin Chemnitz.

In bringing this work to the point of publication, I must confess that my debts are many and beyond my ability to recall all of them. Every English student of Reformation theology is deeply indebted to Dr. J. A. O. Preus, Prof. Fred Kramer, and Pastor Luther Poellot for excellent translations of five significant works of Chemnitz; and to Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Missouri, for publishing these volumes. English-speaking students are also grateful for the combined efforts of Concordia Publishing House and Fortress Press, Philadelphia, for providing fifty-five volumes of Luther in English, in which are included his chief writings on the Sacraments. One must read Chemnitz together with Luther.

I have received many constructive suggestions from those who read the preliminary drafts of these chapters. Their reactions have led me to review my summaries and conclusions. It goes without saying that I take the responsibility for all the views here expressed, and the publishers are in no

way responsible for the theological content of this work. I do, however, confess myself subject to the Holy Scriptures and their exposition as given in the Lutheran *Book of Concord*.

Since theological works from the nature of the case do not attract a wide-reading audience and the publishing of books is a costly project, I acknowledge with deep gratitude the generous gifts of all those who made possible the publication of the book.

For this work which I have just completed, and for all my public life as pastor, college instructor, and president, I owe much to the patience and understanding of my wife and family. Their personal interest in the varied work which has occupied my mind for many years, has been most supportive to me. For their assistance, encouragement, and patience only my debt exceeds my gratitude.

For the tedious work of reading my hand scribbled notes, listening to my dictation, and typing and retyping this material so that it would be presentable to others, my thanks to Mrs. Orla Petersen for help painstakingly and excellently accomplished.

And lastly, I would be remiss in not publicly acknowledging my gratitude to the publisher for venturing to undertake publishing a work on Martin Chemnitz, a sixteenth century Reformer: Trinity Lutheran Press, Brewster, Mass.

On the eve of the 400th anniversary of the death of Martin Chemnitz, my prayer is that the publication of this volume will lead to a renewed appreciation of the glorious gift of grace our Savior bequeathed to us in His last will and testament, His body and blood. There is also gratitude to our Lord for the work of the Lutheran Reformers in restoring this doctrine to its pristine worth. We can do well to remember Martin Luther's succinct summary, "This Sacrament is the Gospel" (LW 36, 289), and Martin Chemnitz's moving testimony, "The more we love it, the more diligently we will defend it and the more tenaciously we will retain the proper, simple, and natural meaning of the words of Christ's last will and testament so that these sweet consolations are not snatched away from us" (LS 194).

SOLI DEO GLORIA

Reformation Day, 1985
Mankato, Minnesota

Bjarne Wollan Teigen

CHAPTER I

Introduction

- 1 Present-day theology among Lutherans demonstrates a great concern with respect to Luther's theology of the Lord's Supper. Admittedly, there have been different evaluations of what his doctrine actually was, resulting in differences as to what is the Lutheran doctrine.¹ Closely related to Luther's position on the Sacrament of the Altar is the question of what is the doctrine enunciated in the *Book of Concord*. Ultimately this comes down to the doctrine confessed in the Formula of Concord, Article VII. The question arises as to whether there is an internal consistency to the doctrine confessed, beginning with Luther's Catechisms through the Augsburg Confession, the Apology, the Smalcald Articles, and the Formula of Concord, both the Epitome and the Solid Declaration. For a Lutheran who confesses that the *norma normans* of all doctrine is the sacred Scriptures inspired by God, and that the Confessions are *norma normata*, he is faced with the overwhelming question whether, after comparing the original source and the derived source, he will honestly give a *quia* or a *quatenus* subscription to the Book of Concord.
- 2 It may well be that modern Lutherans have not agonized over this problem as much as their allegiance to the Lutheran Confessions and the present state of Christian doctrine of the Lord's Supper warrant. It would not be too difficult to demonstrate that today in current literature and orders of worship Lutherans are quite far apart in their understanding and application of the Lutheran doctrine of the Sacrament of the Altar.
- 3 The Formula of Concord had several antecedents before it resulted in its final form. Furthermore, as any standard commentary will reveal, several authors were involved in its formulation. One fact emerges, however, that all confess that they wanted to reproduce Luther's

doctrine, especially with regard to this sacrament, since they were convinced that he had taught what the divine revelation had given to the church and commanded that it observe to the end of time.

4 Another fact on which there seems to be general agreement is that Martin Chemnitz (1522–1586) is the chief author of the Formula. E. F. Klug is not far wrong in representing the general consensus of scholars regarding the chief precursor of the Formula, namely the Saxon-Swabian Confession, by stating that “much of it by this point was Chemnitz’s contribution.”²

5 In view of this, it should be of some benefit to examine more closely the writings of Chemnitz in order to ascertain in detail his doctrine of the Lord’s Supper. Since there seems to be no such study available to English readers, the purpose of this monograph is to make at least a beginning in such a systematic review, with the hope that others will be induced to proceed further in the study of the works of this great Lutheran theologian. All Lutherans will be grateful to President Emeritus J. A. O. Preus, Professor Fred Kramer, and Pastor Luther Poellot for making several hundred pages of Chemnitz available in the English language (see the preceding bibliography for details).

6 But Chemnitz also collaborated with several other theologians to shed light on the gigantic struggle that took place after Luther’s death to preserve the Lutheran doctrine of the Sacrament of the Altar and to keep the Lutheran Church of the 1570s from becoming Reformed or Sacramentarian in this respect. It would be difficult to determine precisely the role played by Chemnitz in these collaborative writings. But it is safe to say that it was an important one. In these works one sees many parallels to what Chemnitz himself has written as an individual.

7 It is impossible to grasp the wide range and depth of study which Chemnitz devoted to the Lord’s Supper by consulting only his *Loci*. This is simply because this work does not carry the detailed analysis which the *Lord’s Supper* and the *Examination II* do. In fact, Chemnitz states after the introductory paragraphs of this *Locus*, that he will not at this place repeat the entire doctrine of the Supper since other explications are available, including antitheses against the Romanists (LT 165). He seems to be referring to his massive work of 1570. *The Lord’s Supper* and to his *Examination of Trent* (1565–1573). After he has briefly summarized the main points in the *Loci* he de-

votes the largest part of the presentation to a lengthy letter he wrote to Timotheus Kirchner (1532–1587) refuting the last defense of Beza for the Sacramentarian position (LT 168–198). This letter treats mainly of Christology, refuting the objections of the Reformed to the Lutheran position that in the personal union Christ’s divine attributes are communicated to His human nature. Since Beza must have considered Acts 3:21 as his trump card which would defeat the Lutheran doctrine of the Real Presence of the body and blood in the sacrament, Chemnitz analyzes the passage in considerable detail.

8 In *The Lord’s Supper (Fundamenta, etc.)* Chemnitz makes an exhaustive analysis of the Words of Institution and the arguments of the adversaries, chiefly the Sacramentarians, against accepting the Verba as simple and clear. He notes in the dedicatory epistle to the princes of Brunswick and Luneburg, that this book is a more detailed development of a book he had published eight years previous (*Repetitio Sanae Doctrinae, etc.*). In 1561 he gathered the main points under dispute in the controversy and “explained them in a simple and unaffected way, irenically and without acrimony, on the basis of the true, sure, and clear foundation of Scripture” (LS 20). Since this work had been well received Chemnitz is hopeful that this new expanded version will also contribute to the acceptance of the Verba in their “simple, proper, and natural meaning.” He has no desire to bring in anything new but is “simply trying to retain the old fundamental and simple teaching and to repeat it out of Luther’s writings” (LS 21). A perusal of its 269 pages will demonstrate Chemnitz to be an objective and irenic theologian, and also a most astute analyst.

9 The *Examination of the Council of Trent, Part II* examines almost exclusively the fundamental differences between the sacramental systems of the Roman Catholics and the Lutherans. Here Chemnitz does not treat at any length the fact that the bread and wine are the true body and blood of Christ as he was forced to do with the Sacramentarians. As a matter of fact, he twice refers the reader to his *The Lord’s Supper* for more details. He has found no evidence, he asserts, that the “simple, proper, usual, and genuine meaning of the words, ‘This is my body,’ should be abandoned.” He has shown this more “fully . . . in a special booklet” (Ex 2, 223). He is certain that “that which is offered to us in the Lord’s Supper, which our mouth receives, the Son of God declares, ‘This is my body, this is my blood.’”

He does not discuss this point in any greater detail with the Papalists because, as he says, “I have in a small book explained the grounds for this conviction more fully, I shall add nothing here” (Ex 2, 327).

10 What is significant about the analysis of Chemnitz of the Sacrament of the Eucharist in the *Examination* is the precise line he draws between the Lutherans and the Romanists. He does not think it is necessary that in debating with them the “whole treatment of the controversy [i.e., the Real Presence] should be repeated here. . . . I am one in confession with those churches which differ from the Sacramentarians” (Ex 2, 223). Yet he devotes about twenty pages to the rejection of transubstantiation. Both he and the Romanists agree that the bread and cup become sacramental by a certain consecration (Ex 2, 225), but he disagrees with them when they “patch human traditions into the Word of God” as in the Canon of the Mass (Ex 2, 230). And when he comes to examine “the cult and veneration to be shown this most holy sacrament, “he is willing to say that” a number of things are not in controversy; these I willingly concede” (Ex 2, 277). And yet there are several points on which he must disagree with them (Ex 2, 279). The common-sense clear writing of Chemnitz is a healthy antidote against the excesses of some simplistic high-church liturgically minded as well as against the excesses of the anti-liturgically minded.

11 *The Two Natures in Christ* was first published in 1578, after the Formula of Concord had been completed and while the “Preface to the Book of Concord” for the 1580 publication of the entire Book of Concord was in the making. Since *Two Natures* was expanded from a much smaller book with the same title published in 1570, the massive research material which Chemnitz had gathered and digested was available for the Lutheran theologians to use. This work makes an important contribution to the proper understanding of the Sacrament of the Altar. But from the outset it must be understood that neither Luther nor Chemnitz suggests that the debate over the Lord’s Supper can be resolved by means of the Christological truths. Luther writes in the *Great Confession* (1528) that he had in the previous year (*That These Words Still Stand Fast*) demonstrated that it was not contrary to Scripture nor to the Articles of Faith for Christ’s body to be at the same time in heaven and in the Supper (LW 37, 55, 64), but he had done this only “to show at least one way how God

could bring it about that Christ is in heaven and His body in the Supper at the same time, and that He reserved to His divine wisdom and power many more ways to accomplish the same result, because we do not know the limit or measure of His power” (LW 37, 207). Luther’s doctrine of the Real Presence is taken from “the clear, distinct Scripture which reads, ‘Take, eat; this is my body,’ and we are not under obligation nor will we be pressed to cite Scripture beyond this text — though we could do so abundantly” (LW 37, 33).

12 Similarly, when Chemnitz comes to discuss Christ’s presence in the church according to both natures, he asserts that “we are not arguing from the absolute omnipotence of the Son of God, but at this discussion about Christ we must always add the fact that He wills, is able, does, or is” (TNC 426). So, with regard to the Real Presence, Chemnitz confesses, “We have . . . an express word and a specific promise instituted in a particular and definite way, ordained as part of His will and testament by the Son of God Himself on the night in which He was betrayed, a promise which Christ ratified also after His ascension by sitting at the right hand of the Majesty in His glory in heaven, a promise which was repeated to Paul, a promise that He wills to be present with His body and blood in the observance of His Supper as it is celebrated in the gathering of the church here on earth in accord with His institution” (TNC 432).

13 With respect to Chemnitz’s *Ministry, Word, and Sacraments, an Enchiridion*, the noteworthy thing about this is that the author originally composed it as “an examination for the use of the less well-trained pastors” at the beginning of the Reformation of the churches in the Duchy of Brunswick (MWS 13). The work was to be used in periodic examinations of pastors by the superintendents. It is set up in the form of questions and answers. Of the four parts of the book Part I, containing ten pages, treats of the call of the ministers of the Word and Sacraments. Part II, by far the most extensive section (117 pages), contains detailed questions on the Word and the Sacraments. Under the rubric of “The Word of God” one finds a short dogmatics treating Scripture, the Law, Sin, Contrition, Free Will, the Gospel, Justification, Faith, Predestination, and the New Obedience. Under the “Sacraments” there are questions and answers on Baptism, Absolution, and the Lord’s Supper, with the latter receiving the most consideration (12 pages). Chemnitz gives all the topics a solid dogmatic

base, but he orients the material towards its proper application by the parish pastor to his flock.

- 14 Of the works which Chemnitz co-authored three, besides the Formula of Concord, need special consideration when one undertakes to investigate Chemnitz's doctrine of the Lord's Supper. "The Catalog of Testimonies," composed by Andreae and Chemnitz, was added as an "Appendix" to the Formula of Concord and is found in the 1580 edition of the *Book of Concord*. It treats chiefly of Christology, but it also reveals the thought of the authors with respect to implications of the sacramental union.
- 15 When the Formula appeared in the *Book of Concord* in 1580, it was severely attacked by the Reformed theologians in 1581 in a book with the title, *Neostadiensium Admonitio*, etc. Its authors were a Reformed group at Neustadt, and their purpose was to attempt to refute the Formula of Concord, the Augsburg Confession, and Martin Luther, especially with respect to Christology, the Lord's Supper, and Predestination. In 1583 the Elector August commissioned Chemnitz, Kirchner, and Selnecker (1528–1592) to write a defense of the *Book of Concord*. It is today generally known as the *Apology to the Formula of Concord* and also as the "Erfurt Book." Because it is the first formal defense and explication of the doctrines of the Formula its importance will be readily acknowledged. In contrast to some of Chemnitz's works, which are quite irenic in tone, the *Apology to the Formula* is rather acerbic in its comments.
- 16 Approximately at the same time these three theologians felt it necessary and helpful to compile a source book on the history of the sacramental controversy. The 736 pages of *Histori des Sacramentstreit* constitute a remarkable collection culled from original sources, giving virtually a blow-by-blow account of how among the Evangelicals the controversy over the Lord's Supper began in the early 1520s and continued through the years until finally settled in the Formula of Concord. These three scholars went to the original sources to explain how the controversy developed from year to year, beginning with 1521. They ended their historical account with the year 1561. It is obvious that their chief aim is to demonstrate that Sacramentarians of all stripes have twisted the words of Luther and misrepresented his doctrine even to the point of asserting that at the end of his life he had retracted his former teaching. Early in the book (HS 15) the authors

do point out that Luther acknowledged that some of the things he wrote before 1521 and which he had expounded in the papacy were wrong. But after a thorough study of the Scriptures relating to the Lord's Supper, Luther never changed his conclusions with regard to this sacrament. Judging from the copious quotations from Luther's works of 1527 and 1528, and also of Bugenhagen's of those years, one is drawn to the conclusion that Chemnitz, Kirchner and Selnecker regard these years as pivotal for establishing the Lutheran doctrine. This is corroborated by the frequent Luther references that were inserted in the Formula of Concord (Ep VII, 10, 17, 18; SD VII, 5, 28, 33, 34, 40, 41, 77, 78, 87, 91, 93–103; SD VIII, 17, 38, 44, 81–86).

- 17 The *Histori* ends with a detailed essay written by Joachim Morlin (1514–1571). The essay, written in 1565, demonstrates how the true Lutherans had always understood the Augsburg Confession in the terms of Luther's exposition and not that of the Sacramentarians. He ends his essay with a touching description of how Luther in his last days was determined to remain firm in the doctrine of the Sacrament of the Altar and do all that he could to see to it that this doctrine was perpetuated at the University of Wittenberg. The final words of the essay are those of Luther in his last brief confession concerning the Holy Sacrament (1544), "Since my death is now imminent, I want to take this testimony and this honor along with me before my dear Lord and Savior Jesus Christ's judgment seat, that I have earnestly condemned and rejected the fanatics and enemies of the sacrament — Carlstadt, Zwingli, Oecolampadius, Stenckefeld, and their disciples at Zurich and wherever they are according to His command, Titus 3 [10–11]: 'As for a man who is factious, after admonishing him once or twice, have nothing more to do with him, knowing that such a person is perverted and sinful; he is self-condemned.' They have been admonished often enough and also earnestly enough by me and others; the books are extant. In addition we continue to preach against their blasphemous and deceitful heresy daily, as they know full well." (LW 38, 287 f.).

Notes 1–2, Chapter I

1. Some recent books which have examined Luther's theology of the Lord's Supper:
Sasse, Hermann, ed. *Vom Sakrament des Altars, Lutherische Beitruge zur Frage des Heiligen Abendmahls*, Leipzig: 1941.
Vajta, Vilmos, *Luther on Worship*, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1958.
Sasse, Hermann, *This is My Body, Luther's Contention for the Real Presence in the Sacrament of the Altar*, Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1959. A revised Australian edition was published by the Lutheran Publishing House, Adelaide, S.A., Australia, 1977.
Empie, Paul E and James McCord, editors, *Marburg Revisited, A re-examination of Lutheran and Reformed Traditions*, Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1966.
Schone, Jobst, *Um Christi Sakramentale Gegenwart, Der Saligersche Abendmahlsstreit 1568–1569*, Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1966.
Hardt, Tom G. A., *Venerabilis et Adorabilis Eucharistia, En Studie i den Lutherska Nattvards-Iaran under 1500 Talet*, Upsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, *Studia Doctrinae Christianae Upsaliensis*, #9, 1971.
2. Klug, E. F., Th.D., *From Luther to Chemnitz*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971, p.135.

CHAPTER II

Sacrament and Sacramental Action

- 18 Lutheran theology is sacramental theology. Here it is to be sharply distinguished from Reformed theology. Roman Catholic theology can also be called “sacramental.” But despite a superficial resemblance in this respect, the gulf between Lutheran and Roman theology is here unbridgeable.
- 19 In view of this and the fact that both Roman, Reformed, and Lutheran writings make use not only of the term “sacrament” but also a related term “sacramental action,” it would seem most profitable to begin with an investigation of Chemnitz’s understanding of these terms.
- 20 With respect to the term “sacrament,” Chemnitz from the outset acknowledges that the Lutheran theologians have publicly professed in the Apology [AP XII, 12] that they do not “greatly wrangle about the term” (Ex 2, 21), or the number of sacraments since it is not found in the Scriptures. In general he seems to be satisfied with employing the definition of Melancthon, “It is a divinely instituted rite added to the promise given in the Gospel, so that it becomes a testimony and pledge of the promise of grace that is set forth and applied” (MWS 109).
- 21 But it is quite evident that Chemnitz would not want this definition to be some kind of Procrustean bed designed to stretch or cut down the Biblical material to secure, at any cost, uniformity with an inadequate definition. He quickly adds that while absolution does not have an outward element, it nevertheless could be called a sacrament because “the universal promise of the Gospel is applied and sealed individually to each believer” (MWS 110). Hence what in real-

ity must be preserved “are those rites which have an explicit command of God in Scripture, and added to them the clear promise of grace which is peculiar to the New Testament.” They are to be “carefully distinguished from other matters which indeed have the command of God but do not have specific and sure divinely instituted rites.” Also to be distinguished from the concept of a sacrament are those things which may have a promise, “but not the promise that through them the gratuitous reconciliation is bestowed and sealed” (Ex 2, 22).

22 With these restrictions several things are eliminated for consideration as sacraments. There is no divine command to follow the example of the Apostles to lay hands on the sick to heal them (Mark 16:18), nor to confer the Holy Spirit on believers “under the outward and visible form of such gifts as tongues and prophecy” (Acts 19:6) (MWS 110).

23 Further, Chemnitz will not count the seven sacraments within the Papistic Church, because most of them lack the essential parts that properly belong to the essence of a sacrament. He rejected Canon I of Article I of Session VII of Trent, because the Papalists cannot prove from Scripture or “the entire true and pure antiquity” that there are not “more or fewer than seven sacraments.” Besides, “the true peculiarity of a sacrament according to Scripture can in no way fairly fit all these seven” (Ex 2, 23).

24 After a careful examination of the Roman claims and also of the terms *sacramentum* and *mysterion* (Ex 2, 23–38), Chemnitz agrees that we reject their definitions, and they “with the same freedom also do not accept our recent narrower definitions.” Having arrived at this impasse, he asks the question, “How and on what grounds will we demonstrate which are truly and properly sacraments of the New Testament?” Both agree that Baptism and the Eucharist “are truly and properly . . . sacraments of the New Testament” (Ex 2, 38).

25 Chemnitz then proceeds to delineate eight points with regard to Baptism and the Lord's Supper which demonstrate that they are truly sacraments of the New Testament. He insists that these eight are “true, manifest, certain, and immovable”:

1. “That it have some external, material or corporeal and visible element or sign, which is handled, offered, and employed in an external rite;
2. “That this element or sign and its fixed rite have an explicit divine command or divine institution;

3. "That it be instituted or commanded in the New Testament;
4. "That it be instituted, not for a time only, but to the end of the world as it is written of Baptism, and until the Son of God returns to judgment, as St. Paul says of the Eucharist. These things are required for the element or sign of the New Testament;
5. "There is required for a sacrament a divine promise concerning the grace, effect, or fruit of the sacrament;
6. "This promise must not simply, nakedly, and in itself have a testimony in the Word of God, but it is necessary that it be joined to the sign of the sacrament by divine ordination, and so be clothed with it;
7. "This promise must not pertain to any and all gifts of God, spiritual or temporal, but it must be the promise of grace, or of justification, that is, of the gratuitous reconciliation, of the remission of sins, and, in sum, of the entire benefit of redemption;
8. "And this promise in the sacraments is not merely either signified or announced in general, but by the power of God it is offered, displayed, applied, and sealed also to the individuals who use the Sacraments in faith." (Ex 2, 38 f.)

26 It is quite apparent that Chemnitz has compressed an enormous amount of material into these eight theses so that they will eliminate from both the Roman and the Reformed systems much that is wrongly taught and practiced with respect to the sacraments. But one should in no sense conclude from these eight points that Chemnitz proceeds as though Baptism and the Lord's Supper are as identical in virtually every respect as are Tweedledum and Tweedledee. For he asserts that "each individual sacrament has its own proper and peculiar word of definition, which in a sense is its form. There the sacrament or mystery of the Lord's Supper is safely, rightly, and in fact understood and evaluated on no other basis than that word or definition and according to that word which is its own proper and peculiar form The Son of God has put His Word by which He has given us the sacraments into opposition to our thoughts and has willed to do so in such a way so that we must learn from His Word whatever we need to know about these mysteries and must oppose all the absurdities that can be raised in objection to His Word, because He who is true, wise, and powerful has spoken it" (LS 87 f.).

27 As Chemnitz has noted, the Roman sacramental system with its seven sacraments has fallen far short of the Scriptural standards which he distilled for judging the sacraments. But the Sacramentarians, too, misused Biblical material, especially to destroy the Sacrament of the Altar as the Savior had instituted it. They did not want to

take the words of the Supper in their natural, literal meaning, trying, rather, to support their point by speaking in general terms of similarities among the sacraments, using, as Chemnitz says, “ill-defined and sweeping assertions,” but when pressed, they “adduce only individual and particular examples,” such as the Lamb of the Passover (LS 257).

28 In answer, Chemnitz first points out that one cannot draw a universal from particular examples. He grants that there are some similarities but “what the similarity and what the difference is has to be considered and determined not on the basis of passages which indicate similarities or relationships but on the basis of the clear Word of God and *the institution of the individual sacraments*” (LS 257; emphasis added). Chemnitz recognizes that arguments from analogy can become pitfalls which keep one from following the path of truth. He well understands the truth of the old proverb, *omne simile claudicat*.

29 Since the Reformed had raised the old familiar charges against the Formula of Concord with respect to the doctrine of the Real Presence, Chemnitz, Selnecker and Kirchner note that the Words of Institution must determine what one is to hold and believe with regard to each Sacrament. The sacrament of circumcision and the Paschal Lamb have nothing to do with the true presence and distribution of the body and blood of Christ.³

PRECISING THE TERMS “ACTION” AND “USE”

30 One need not read far into Chemnitz without noting the frequent occurrence of the terms “action” (LS 42, 78; Ex 2, 29) and “use” (LS 37; Ex 2, 243) with regard to the Supper. Besides these terms, one may also find “ceremony” (LS 78) and “rites” (Ex 2, 34, etc.). These are words broad in their usage, extremely common in the secular world but also used in religious language, especially in connection with the sacraments. Luther apparently employed the terms “action” and “use” quite rarely when speaking of the Lord’s Supper. But the terms have been used by the Catholics, Sacramentarians, and the Gnesio-Lutherans. For Chemnitz, in contrast to Luther’s use, the terms have become normal in the discussion of the Sacrament of the Altar, as a cursory review of his *Examination* and *The Lord’s Supper* will quickly reveal. And the terms have found their place in a critical axiom set forth in the Formula of Concord to determine “the true Christian doctrine concerning the Holy Supper, ‘Nihil

habet rationem sacramenti extra *usum* a Christo institutum oder extra *actionem* divinitus institutam” (SD VII, 85; emphasis added). The significance of this axiom for Chemnitz will be examined more closely in the chapter on what the consecration means to him, but as a preliminary, one should recognize in what ways Chemnitz employs the terms. Not to do so is to miss much of the significance in Chemnitz’s explication of what he regards as the Scriptural doctrine of the Sacrament of the Altar.

31 As one makes such an investigation, a rather startling observation emerges, one which may have some bearing on what Luther, Chemnitz and the Formula of Concord really had in mind in their presentations of this doctrine. The indexes for *The Examination*, the *Lord’s Supper* and the *Formula of Concord* (both Tappert and the Triglot) have no entries for the words “action” and “use.” This may be partly due to the fact that these words have such a wide, common usage that it was considered superfluous to collect the entries, and it may also be partly due to the fact that in our study of the Reformation fathers we have not always heeded what Chemnitz calls the “very excellent rule of Hilary: “He reads best who looks for the meaning of the words on the basis of what is said rather than imposing his own ideas; who draws from the material rather than adding to it; who does not force the material to contain what seems best to him because he has, even before reading it, had a preconceived notion as to how it should be understood” (LS 33).

32 Chemnitz can, with reference to the Lord’s Supper, use the terms “action” and “use” in a general sense to refer to what the Roman Catholic Church taught on the Lord’s Supper. But in both cases he makes it clear that in their “use” or “action” they are guilty of changing the institution of Christ. It is wrong for the Papalists to teach that there is an “absolute and unchanging presence in the elements outside of their *use*,” e.g., as with the reservation (LS 37). In the *Examination* similar charges are made against Trent, where the opinion is defended “that the Eucharist is a sacrament . . . [which] contains Christ also apart from the *use* for which it was divinely instituted.” Here Chemnitz cites the Sacrifice of the Mass, the non-distribution of the consecrated elements to the people gathered there, and the teaching that the sacrament contains the body and blood of Christ “permanently apart from its *use*” (Ex 2, 242 f.; emphasis added).

33 Similarly, the Calvinists alter the Supper and its observance (*actio*) by asserting that the substantial body of Christ which is in the Supper is “in the fiery heaven outside this world” (LS 42; emphasis added).

34 Chemnitz recognized that the meaning of these terms had to be clarified because of the doctrinal issues involved. There was a genuine disagreement regarding what the Sacrament of the Altar was, and these divergences led to serious consequences, since they ran counter to the Biblical revelation. In such a vital matter it was necessary to go beyond lexical definitions and give what logicians call a “precising definition” of the key words “action” and “use” in this context. There *are* cases where “ordinary usage must be transcended . . . The definiendum is not a new term but one with an established, although vague usage.”⁴ Just as precising definitions are of extreme importance in the defining of laws and legal terms, so they are also imperative when theological terms are used. They must have precise Scriptural content. Chemnitz asserts that “Christ has commanded us to do in the *action* of the sacrament what he himself did. He did not, however, perform a mute action but spoke” (Ex 2, 226; emphasis added). Speaking of the consecration, he says, “Therefore the Words of Institution are spoken in our Lord’s Supper, not merely for the sake of history but to show to the church that Christ Himself, through His Word, according to His command and promise, is present in the *action* of the Supper and by the power of this Word offers His body and blood to those who eat it” (Ex 2, 229; emphasis added). A few pages later Chemnitz precises the definition of “action” even more, “The institution of the Supper prescribes the *action* thus: To take bread and wine, bless, divide, offer, receive, eat, and add this Word of Christ: “This is my body; this is my blood,’ and do all this in remembrance of Him” (Ex 2, 249; emphasis added). Within the limits of this precise definition Chemnitz regards the terms “action” and “use” as synonymous (Ex 2, 245; Ex 2, 494).

35 Chemnitz elaborates further by stating that the institution of the Lord’s Supper has not only been handed down as a dogma, “but there are used in it a number of words which expressly signify a precept and a command of Christ: “Take; eat; drink of it, all of you; do this” (Ex 2, 341). Chemnitz also makes clear that the words “do this” are intended for the church to the end of time, “The words of command are not meant for only the time and *action* of that first

Supper, but there was added the perpetual and universal command that it should be done to the end of the world. For the Savior says: “This (namely what has now been done in the first Lord’s Supper) do in remembrance of me” (Ex 2, 341; emphasis added).

36 *The Examination of the Council of Trent* appeared during the years 1565—1573, years during which the true Lutherans were forced to contend not only against the Roman Catholics but also against the Sacramentarians who had even penetrated their own ranks (SD VII, 73). One of the fundamental differences had to do with the meaning of the two terms “action” and “use.” The precisizing by Chemnitz of the definition of these two terms was taken over into the Formula. SD VII, 38, in defining the sacramental union, explicitly states that it obtains only in the “ordered action” of the sacrament. And to settle the controversy on the consecration that arose among the Lutherans (SD VII, 73), Chemnitz and his fellow formulators insisted that “use” and “action” are synonymous (SD VII, 86), and that the command of Christ, “Do this,” includes three constituents: *consecration* of the elements; the *distribution* of the consecrated elements; and the *oral manducation* of the consecrated elements (SD VII, 75, 76, 83–87).

37 On reading Chemnitz, it is important for one to understand that when he refers to the doctrine of the Lord’s Supper employing the words “use” or “action,” he includes these three elements, the consecration by which the presence is effected, and the distribution and reception of the consecrated elements. The presence of the body and blood of our Lord is not limited to the reception, nor is it there before the consecration. When, for example, Chemnitz says, “In the *use* of the Lord’s Supper He gives us His body and blood in order that, when we approach the throne of grace, we may obtain mercy and find grace in timely help, may lay hold of and in faith set before God the merits of the one offering of Christ” (Ex 2, 499 f.; emphasis added), he has in mind all three constituents.

38 It is unfortunate that some historians and theologians have perpetuated the vagueness of the terms “actio” and “usus” in the context of the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord’s Supper despite the fact that Chemnitz’s precisizing definition has been taken into the Solid Declaration. This has been a cause for considerable confusion and misunderstanding of the Sacrament among some present-day Lutherans.⁵

Notes 3–5, Chapter II

3. Ap. F.C. 154B, “Da Sakrament der Beschneidung und Osterlamb sagen oder haben gar nichts uberall von der waren Gegenwertigkeit und Austeilung des Leibes und Elutes Christi/ als die dazumal auch noch nicht gewesen/ sintemal Christus zu der Zeit noch nicht warer Mensch empfangen und geboren gewest: Wie sollte dann aus den Reden/ in welchen dieselben *Sacramenta* beschrieben/ mit Grundt und Warheit können geschlossen werden/ was in H. Abendmal von Christo *ex speciali quadam ordinatione* is eingesetzt und gestiftet worden.”
4. Copi, Irvin M., *Introduction to Logic*, 3rd ed., 89–103.
5. For example, Bente (*Hist. Int. Trig.*, 179), writing of Saliger (Beatus), says that Saliger taught that “in virtue of the consecration before the use (*ante usum*) bread and wine are the body and blood of Christ, denouncing all who denied this as Sacramentarians.” From these words it appears that Bente has omitted the consecration from the divinely instituted action and restricted it to the distribution and consumption, a concept foreign not only to Chemnitz, but also to Luther and the Formula.

CHAPTER III

The Biblical Foundation for the Lord's Supper and Principles of Interpretation Necessary for its Correct Understanding

- 39 This chapter will not review the full scope of Chemnitz's theology of the Word, since Dr. Eugene F. Klug has recently accomplished that in his *From Luther to Chemnitz on Scripture and the Word*.⁶ Rather, the intention is to zero in on how Chemnitz draws his doctrine of the Lord's Supper from the Scriptures alone and what principles of interpretation guide him in understanding the revealed will of God with respect to this sacrament.
- 40 From the very outset Chemnitz is determined to examine the decrees of the Council of Trent "according to the norm of Scripture," and he is confident that having done that on such a basis, the publication of his results will be of "some benefit to the reader" (Ex 1, 30). He is committed to the rule which he confessed with the other authors of the *Formula of Concord*, "We believe, teach, and confess that the prophetic and apostolic writings of the Old and New Testaments are the only rule and norm according to which all doctrines and teachers alike must be appraised and judged, as it is written in Psalm 119:105, 'Thy word is a lamp to my feet and a light to my path,' and Paul says

in Galatians 1:8, 'Even if an angel from heaven should preach to you a gospel contrary to that which we preach to you, let him be accursed'" (Ep., Rule and Norm, 1).

41 Chemnitz was determined to teach no more and no less than what the sacred Scriptures taught. He treads a very precise but firm line. He does not want to be drawn into arguments concerning classifications and terminology if these cannot be drawn from the Scriptures. For example, in the *Enchiridion* he instructs his Brunswickian pastors not to be drawn into fruitless debates as to whether or not absolution is to be regarded as a sacrament. One can confess the truth of Scripture in different ways. His carefully chosen words regarding absolution can well serve as a model for showing that theologians need to be precise, but they can be that without being pedantic. He writes, "Absolution indeed has one marked characteristic of the sacraments, namely, that the universal promise of the gospel is applied and sealed individually to each believer through absolution. And in view of this mark, some are not wrong in that they number absolution among the sacraments of the New Testament but since no outward sign or element was ordained and instituted by Christ for its administration, it cannot properly be called a sacrament in the way in which Baptism and the Lord's Supper are called sacraments. Yet *logomachiai* [wars about words] are not therefore to be stirred up, provided the thing itself, taught in Scripture, is kept pure, as the Apology of the Augsburg Confession teaches" (MWS 110).

42 In his controversy with the Catholics, Chemnitz continually drives home the point that Scripture, and not papal authority, is the source for determining the essential nature of the sacraments and their divinely instituted use. The Romanists practice the withholding of the cup from the laity chiefly because "the Pope has arrogated to himself and his the authority and power of imposing whatever he pleases on consciences, even if it cannot be shown and proved from Scripture, and again of changing, mutilating, and abrogating even those things which have the institution and testimony of Scripture" (Ex 2, 358 f.). After having carefully weighed every word in the Tridentine chapter on communion under both kinds, Chemnitz records that "I have not been able to discover that they give so much as the tiniest reason from the Word of God by which they might attempt to instruct and quiet the consciences of the lay people so that they could state with

certainty that, although there are words of command in both parts, also the lay people are obligated by those in the first part but that the precepts in the second part [i.e., “drink from it all of you”] do not pertain to the laity at all” (Ex 2, 397). In short, he keeps urging the Catholics with respect to the sacraments in general that we are to retain “those rites which have an explicit command of God in Scripture, and added to them the clear promise of grace which is peculiar to the New Testament” (Ex 2, 22). Such a position quickly eliminated Pope Urban IV’s invention of a Corpus Christi Festival in 1260 A.D., and his “strict command that it should everywhere be celebrated.” The Pope’s basis for this was that a certain nun, a recluse, was said “to have received this revelation” (Ex 2, 285).

43 When the Christian comes to ascertain just what our Savior’s intention was in instituting the Lord’s Supper, Chemnitz admits that the controversy has reached such immense dimensions that “the various questions are so completely intermingled that the minds of the readers are confused by arguments, some relevant and others irrelevant; thus they are kept from a true understanding of the real issues under dispute” (LS 37). In order to discard the irrelevant, Chemnitz in a series of chapters in *The Lord’s Supper* sets forth general principles of interpretation that should guide the reader in the study of all Scripture (LS 25–89), and he then on the basis of these principles minutely examines the four Scripture passages which give the institution of the Lord’s Supper (LS 91–126). He finally looks at the other Scripture passages (1 Cor. 10 and 11) which, while not containing the Verba, make express mention of the dogma of the Lord’s Supper (LS 127–148).

44 Since Chemnitz is well aware of how the Sacramentarians have ever since the time of Carlstadt tried to reduce to absurdity what Luther taught by means of extreme interpretations of his doctrine, he purposes to approach his task “with great reverence . . . because they are the words of the last will and testament of the Son of God” (LS 25). The Father had called from heaven “Hear Him.” So for Chemnitz the doctrine of the Lord’s Supper is a matter of faith, and therefore he has the high resolve to follow the dictum of Augustine, “What decides in matters of faith is not: ‘This I say; that you say; that he says,’ but; ‘Thus says the Lord’” (Ex 2, 312). Chemnitz agrees with Cyprian who in “speaking of the Supper says: ‘We ought not to

give heed to what someone before us thought should be done, but to what He, who is before all, did' " (Ex 2, 312).

45 For Chemnitz this means that since every dogma of the church has its own foundation in certain texts of Scripture where each is clearly explained, we, to find the true meaning of each doctrine, should diligently make an accurate study of these texts (LS 31). This means that Scripture interprets Scripture. It is true that in some passages the dogmas are not clearly set forth or only touched on in passing. "Therefore, if we are to interpret passages of this kind correctly, we must seek an analogy from other passages in which the dogmas have their own proper foundation and deal with them according to this explanation" (LS 32). In passages where "dogmas are set forth under a kind of cover of rather obscure words or are presented in the polished form of figures of speech," Chemnitz holds that "in interpreting such passages it is sufficient to hold to the meaning which is in keeping with the other clear and appropriate passages of Scripture" (LS 32). If we do not follow this rule, "all dogmas can be overturned and destroyed" (LS 32).

46 This distorting of the clear texts and then going to obscure texts for an entirely different doctrine has been the historic method of the heterodox. Pelagius departed from the natural meanings of Rom. 5:12, where the dogma of original sin is treated in its own proper setting. The Papalists, to justify their doctrine of justification, turn to texts which seem to speak of works, but "try to evade the perfectly clear passages in regard to justification in the Epistles to the Romans and the Galatians, where the doctrine of justification has its foundation" (LS 33). And at least one Sacramentarian, Victorinus, confesses that with regard to the doctrine of the Lord's Supper he is "with his right eye looking at the religion of all times and with his left at the words of the Supper" (LS 32).

47 The doctrine of the Lord's Supper is to be sought in the Words of Institution, for "it is beyond controversy that the correct belief concerning the Lord's Supper has its own particular foundation and its own basis in the Words of Institution" (LS 31). This must be so because "these are the words of the last will and testament not of a mere man but of the very Son of God" (LS 26). The question in the entire controversy that surrounds the sacrament "concerns the words of the last will and testament of the Son of God" (LS 43). We should

never forget that “the dogma of the Lord’s Supper did not exist in the church before its institution, and only on the night in which Christ was betrayed was the Lord’s Supper dealt with for the first time with a definite form of institution, with definite words in the actual last will and testament of the Son of God” (LS 34).

- 48 Today there are efforts to try to connect the Lord’s Supper with the Passover Feast so as to show it chiefly as being a religious fellowship meal. Attempts have been made to reconstruct some kind of Eucharistic prayer for modern liturgical forms from prayers used at the Passover meals at the time of Christ. Chemnitz, however, draws a sharp line between the Lord’s Supper and any other meal. In examining Luke 22 he concludes that Christ “through Luke wants to have it [i.e., the order of events of the Last Supper] so precisely described that His dominical Supper of the New Testament is by the very order of the events distinguished from all other suppers, whether secular ones, observed by the necessity of nature, or sacred, typical, and symbolic ones, such as the eating of the Passover Lamb as prescribed in the Old Testament” (LS 110).

THE VERBA CONSTITUTE CHRIST’S LAST WILL AND TESTAMENT

- 49 That the words of Christ are his last will and testament are of extreme importance to Chemnitz, because this points to the fact that we must interpret these words literally. This is a hermeneutical principle recognized even in the secular world, “When the last will and testament of a man has been, executed we are required under the law to observe the words with special care so that nothing be done which is either beside or contrary to the final will of the testator. Even the civil laws regard such a will as so sacred that they have determined that those who have made any profit at all from the will for themselves shall be deprived of it, and their inheritance through the provisions of the laws themselves shall be taken away from them as being unworthy, on the grounds that they have departed from the will of the testator as it is stipulated in the words of the testament” (LS 27).
- 50 If this is the case in the reading of human wills, how much more important is it that “we should give very careful thought that we do not thrust anything upon these words of the last will and testament of the Son of God, lest we deprive ourselves of the benefits of eternal

happiness conveyed to us by His will or our own inheritance itself be taken from us as being unworthy because we have departed from the will of the Testator as it has been given to us in the words of His last testament” (LS 27).

51 For Chemnitz one has here come to the heart of the controversy especially with the Sacramentarians, and the arguments come together at this point. The last testament and will of the Son of God must be reverently accepted since there “are not sufficiently serious, weighty, definite, and firm reasons to compel a person to reject that sense which the words of the testament of the Son of God convey and demonstrate by their proper and natural meaning” (LS 40). The rhetorician Quintilian’s principle can well be applied here, “What is the difference between no laws and uncertain ones?” Chemnitz applies it to the present controversy, “What is the difference between no testament of the Son of God or an uncertain one?” (LS 86). Chemnitz here falls back on Luther’s criteria as extremely useful for bringing out the true questions at issue:

1. Are the words of the last will and testament of the Son of God to be understood in their proper and natural sense as they read?
2. What is present in the Lord’s Supper which is celebrated among us here on earth; what is distributed and received orally?
3. Is the body of Christ only in heaven, so that it cannot also at the same time be present when His Supper is celebrated here on earth according to His institution?
4. What do the unworthy receive when to them the Son of God also says: “Take eat; this is my body?” (LS 43).

52 Chemnitz in his *The Lord’s Supper* has been contending against the Sacramentarians who refused to take the Verba literally. He takes the same position over against the Roman Church when it argues that the body of Christ is present apart from the divinely instituted use. He insists that the “institution of the Lord’s Supper is to be determined by a comparison of the descriptions which are found in the four places of Scripture” (Ex 2, 248).

53 To carry out this principle of interpretation that one does not depart from the clear words of the last will and testament, it is imperative that one take his reason captive. We can learn this from the Biblical example of Abraham. Humanly speaking, the probability of Abraham and Sarah having a child in their old age was so remote that one would be tempted not to understand the words of promise in their literal sense.

As a matter of fact, Chemnitz remarks that “Sarah tries by some special kind of interpretation to escape the literal meaning of the words, Gen. 16:2” (LS 71). But Abraham “joined together the certainty of the oft-repeated promise with the power of God and thus came at last to the full assurance of faith (Rom. 4:21)” (LS 74).

54 Possibly even more striking in the life of Abraham is his conduct when commanded to sacrifice his son (Gen. 22:2). Chemnitz observes that “the natural meaning of the statement is perfectly clear.” However, they seem to be in contradiction to Genesis 9:6 and Genesis 21:12, “so that the proper and natural meaning of this precept seems to be in diametric opposition to both the Law and the Gospel, that is, contrary to the analogy of the entire Word of God.” But Abraham did not stumble in faith: “Though various conflicting and contradictory interpretations seem to stand in the way, he did not dare to depart from the proper and natural meaning.” Chemnitz then draws the conclusion that “if Abraham in the face of this most powerful opposition did not dare to depart from the proper and natural meaning of this precept which he had heard only one time, . . . with what kind of conscience will we dare in this present controversy, in the face of much more insignificant objections, to depart from the proper and natural meaning of this dogma which has been repeated in several places in Scripture with consentient and equivalent words?” (LS 74–76).

55 The Solid Declaration, after summarizing the historical background of the sacramental controversy, in giving the Lutheran doctrine takes as its starting point the position here developed by Chemnitz (SD VII, 43–60). This section contains so many verbal parallels to what Chemnitz has written that one can almost see the authors of the Formula having at their side the works of Chemnitz which they are compressing into a shorter paraphrase. Here is another example of where we can easily see the significance of carefully studying not only Luther but also Chemnitz for a better understanding of the Formula of Concord.

ARISTOTLE AND CHEMNITZ

56 In giving Chemnitz’s stance with regard to the Scriptures and his hermeneutical principles, it is necessary to consider his view of reason and the use of Aristotelian terms and conceptual usages. Chemnitz is a sharp thinker who recognizes the necessity of precise definitions and nice distinctions. He will draw valid conclusions from clear proposi-

tions of Scripture. But he follows Luther in holding that there is no place in theology for reason corrupted by natural man. In spiritual matters reason must take its premises from the Word. While at times it may be harmless to borrow Aristotelian terminology (such as *causa efficiens*, *causa instrumentalis*, *causa finalis*, *rem sacramenti*, etc.), it can become dangerous and limit the Word of God because these terms of Aristotle are designed for the secular world. There is a vast difference between the earthly kingdom and the spiritual or heavenly kingdom, where we deal with things which eye has not seen nor ear heard nor entered into the mind of man.

57 On several occasions Chemnitz warns us against these pitfalls. When he discusses the Roman doctrine of original sin, he remarks, "But my opponent Andrada, when he is about to explain his view, what he thinks of original sin, brilliantly follows the manner of the philosophical method, as if he were in the school of Aristotle or Galen. But not even once does he attempt to establish and prove with a single testimony of Scripture the things which he states about original sin" (Ex 1, 322). More directly, Chemnitz uses the force of this argument against the Catholics with regard to communion under both kinds. While he grants that the disciples "were receiving the not bloodless but living and whole body of Christ already in the bread, but as they were commanded: 'Drink of it all of you,' so they complied in simple obedience with this command, without inquiring into the reason and without the pretext that it would be dangerous But the Apostles have instructed us by their example, that in the mystery of the Supper we should adhere with simple obedience to the institution and command of the Son of God and that no reasons or arguments should be admitted against the express Words of Institution" (Ex 2, 343).

58 Against the Sacramentarian argument that the body and blood of Christ could not be in the consecrated elements, because this would not agree with John 13:1 ("leave the world"), Chemnitz will not grant the validity of the entry of Aristotelian modes of thought. He answers that what this means "must not be learned from Aristotle but from those Scripture passages which speak of Christ's departure from this world and His going to the Father" (LS 225 f).

59 It is significant to note that Chemnitz in explicating the doctrine of the Lord's Supper in his own writings, does not use the Aristotelian terminology, just as Luther before him had not. The Swabian-Saxon

Concord, however, which was the product of several re-writings by other theologians besides Chemnitz, did contain a rather elaborate exposition of the Sacrament which employed the Aristotelian terminology such as that already mentioned (par. 56). When the formulators of the Formula met in May 1576 at Torgau, they did not accept this section of over four hundred words into the Torgau Book.⁷ This elaboration on the Aristotelian model was found in the Swabian-Saxon Concord immediately after what is now SD VII, 90. This explanation can be correctly understood, although one might infer that the consecration is conditional so that the Real Presence is not there until the oral summption completes *the* “action” of the Sacrament, the *causa formalis* (see p. 91 and note #65).

60 John Warwick Montgomery, on the authority of J. Fritschel, recognized Chytraeus as one of the chief authors of Article VII of the Swabian-Saxon Concord. Chytraeus, acting as the secretary of the Rostock faculty, “preferred to rewrite two articles, the second and the seventh [i.e., of the document that was finally presented as the Swabian-Saxon Concord].”⁸

61 On March 1, 1577, at the Elector’s request, Andreae, Chemnitz and Selneccer cloistered themselves at the Bergen Abbey to revise the Torgau Book, taking into consideration the reactions that the Elector had received to its circulation in the preceding year. By March 14, they had completed their work and were ready to report to the Elector.⁹ Not only did the Aristotelian elaboration remain excised, but for good measure the committee eliminated about 1500 more words following the Aristotelian paradigm.¹⁰ This latter section was devoted to refuting the standard Sacramentarian objections to the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord’s Supper, all of which had their origin in the denial of the communication of attributes resulting from the personal union of the two natures in Christ. The Bergic Book (the present Formula of Concord) substitutes for all this what is now SD VII, 91:

All the imaginary reasons and futile counter-arguments of the Sacramentarians concerning the essential and natural properties of the human body, concerning the ascension of Christ, concerning His withdrawal from this world, and the like, have been thoroughly, extensively, and definitively refuted on the basis of God’s Word by Dr. Luther in his polemical writings, *Against the Heavenly Prophets, That These Words “This is My Body” Still Stand Firm*, his *Great and Small Confessions Concerning the Holy Supper*, and other writings of his. The Spiritualists have advanced

no new arguments since his death. We shall, therefore, for the sake of desirable brevity, merely refer the Christian reader to these writings and desire to have them considered as appealed to herewith.

In the enumerated writings of Luther one finds none of the Aristotelian paraphernalia. It is almost as though the final revision of the Formula is not only warning us against the use of Aristotelian terminology, but emphatically telling us to stick closely to Luther's more Biblically-based expositions of the Sacrament of the Altar.

62 Planck describes how after the March meeting, the Elector, no doubt on the advice of Andreae and Chemnitz, called in Chytraeus from Rostock and Musculus and Koerner from Frankfurt-on-the-Oder to be along for the final revision of the document. This took place at the Bergen Abbey, May 19–28. Planck also reports, with appropriate documentation, that Chytraeus was quite unhappy with the revisions that had been made.¹¹ Montgomery takes note of Chytraeus' offended feelings at the fact that so much of his material was cut out. But he agrees with Fritschel that Chytraeus "was exaggerating."¹²

63 But if Chytraeus was the author of the 2,000 words here excised, and his heart was set on the Aristotelian method of making the doctrine of the Lord's Supper seem internally consistent, one can easily see why he was so disaffected. At any rate, the Formula of Concord here avoided the Aristotelian method which seems to make the actual presence of the body and blood of Christ contingent on the oral reception. It would seem that it is impermissible for later generations to introduce this type of reasoning in reading the Formula of Concord on the Lord's Supper. Chemnitz has revealed his position in these words:

The sacraments are mysteries that are unknown to human reason and hidden from our sense perceptions. They are made manifest and revealed by the Word alone. Therefore we must come to a proper understanding and correct judgment on the basis of the words by which the sacraments are revealed and given to us. Moreover, each individual sacrament has its own proper and peculiar word and definition, which in a sense is its form (LS 87 f.).

Notes 6–12, Chapter III

6. Part III, "Chemnitz on the Word," 143–224; see note #2.
7. "Denn dass wir die gewöhnlichen Schulwörter brauchen, so ist die wirkliche Ursache oder *causa efficiens* der wahren Gegenwartigkeit des Leibes und Elutes Christi im Abendmahl

nicht unser Glaube, sondern allein des wahrhaftigen und allmächtigen Sohnes Gottes, unseres Herrn und Heilandes Jesu Christi wort oder Einsetzung, Wille und Ordnung, dass er will sein, wo man seine Einsetzung halt und sein wort sagt kraft der erst en Einsetzung, gleichwie er will Waizen geben kraft der ersten Schopfung, wo man waizen saet.

“*Causa instrumentalis* ist *pronuntiatio verborum* (die gesprochenen worte der Einsetzung), dadurch Christus selbst wirkt and kraftig ist. *Causa materia/is* sind die Elemente, natiirlich Brot und Wein, und die wahre, wesentliche Leib und Blut Christi. *Causa formal is* is die ganze Handlung, die Consecration, Austeilung und Empfangung des Brotes und Leibes, des Weins und Blutes Christi, von welcher wesentlichen Form dieses Sacraments die gemeine Regel gilt: *Nihil habet rationem sacramenti extra institutam actionem seu usum*.

“*Causa Finales et effectus* sind die Applicationem und Zueignung oder Niessung der Krafte und Gutthaten, die uns Christus und seinem Leibe und Elute erworben hat, nemlich Vergebung der Siinden und ewige Seligkeit, welche durch dieses Mittel gleichwie durchs Wort den Glauben zugeeignet, applizirt und versiegelt wird; item Erweckung und Starkung des Glaubens, gnädige Verbiindnis und Vereinigung mit Christo, dadurch wir ihm eingeleibet und seine Gliedmassen werden, und von ihm erhalten, regiert, gestarkt, und nach dem Tode wieder zum ewigen Leben, auferweckt worden, dieweit unsre Leiber mit dem unsterblichen Leibe Christi gespeist worden sind, wie denn diese und andre mehr Friichte und Nutzbarkeiten dieses Abendmals in den Glaubigen anderswo erzalet/ werden.

“Diese Frucht und Werkung, namlich Vergebung der Siinden, Gerechtigkeit, Leben und Seligkeit nennen die Vater *rem sacramenti*, welcher die Unglaubigen nicht teilhaftig werden, ob sie schon das Sacrament, d.i. den Leib und das Blut Christi empfaen. Nun bleibet das wesen, oder *materia et forma* der Sacra mente ganz und gar vollkommen, obschon die Endursachen und Wirkungen wegen unseres Unglaubens nicht allezeit folgen. Denn dass vorgegeben wird, dem der da nicht glaubt, sei die Verheissung nichtig; nun sei im Abendmahl der Leib Christi verheissen, darum werden die Unglaubigen sein nicht teilhaftig, da antwortet Augustinus auf, *Lib 3 de bap. contra Donat* cap 14: ‘Es lieget nichts daran, wenn man von des Sacraments V ollkommenheit und Heiligkeit handelt, was der, der das Sacrament empfaet, glaube, und was fiir einen Glauben er habe. Es ist wol, was seine Seligkeit belanget, viel daran gelegen; aber des Sacraments halben ist nichts daran gelegen. Denn es kann Einer das ganze Sacrament empfaen und gleichwohl keinen rechten Glauben haben.’“ See Heinrich Heppe, *Der Text der Bergischen Concordienformel verglichen mit dem Text der Schwuibischen Concordie, der Schwuibische-Siichsischen Concordie und des Torgauer Buches*, Marburg, 1857, p. 140. See also Heinrich Heppe, *Geschichte des Deutschen Protestantismus in den Jahren 1555–1581*, Marburg, 1857, Vol. 3, Beilagen, p. 273 f.

8. John Warwick Montgomery, *Chytraeus On Sacrifice*, St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1962, p. 21.
9. G. J. Planck, *Geschichte der Protestantischen Theologie von Luthers Tode bis zu der Einfuhrung der Kondordienformal*, Leipzig, 1800, Vol. 3, p. 535.
10. See Heppe, *Der Text*, etc., pp. 140–144; and Heppe, *Geschichte*, etc., Vol. 3, pp. 274–279. The Gottingen *Bekennnisschriften* (1976), pp. 1002–1004, notes and carries the excision of the last 1500 words, but not the first 400, since it compares only the Torgau version with the Bergic Book.
11. Planck, Vol. 3, p. 546.
12. Montgomery, p. 22 f.

CHAPTER IV

The Sacramental Union and Its Christological Basis

- 64 When Chemnitz came to analyze the Roman Catholic doctrine of the Lord's Supper, he treated simultaneously the Real Presence and the consecration, as his heading for the chapter shows, "Concerning the Real Presence of our Lord Jesus Christ in the Sacrament of the Eucharist and Concerning the Consecration" (Ex 2, 221). This was probably due to the fact that here the Papalists and the Lutherans had some common ground. They both believed in the Real Presence and they both believed that it was achieved by the consecration. There were, of course, some great differences here also on these two points, as Chemnitz demonstrates in the next 115 pages of the *Examination*. But he does acknowledge the differences between the Sacramentarians and the true Lutherans to which Trent in Session 13 (October 11, 1551), Chapter I, alludes. Here the Tridentine Fathers call it an "intolerable disgrace" that the words of Christ are twisted "to artificial and imaginary figures of speech by which the reality of the flesh and blood is denied" (Ex 2, 221). This chapter also declares "that our Redeemer instituted this so wonderful a sacrament at the Last Supper, when, after He had blessed the bread and the wine He witnessed and expressed in clear words that He was giving them His body and blood" (Ex 2, 221).
- 65 In answer, Chemnitz can only say, "I for my part confess that I disagree with these opinions [i. e., of the Sacramentarians]. I simply confess truly and openly that I embrace and approve the judgment of those churches which acknowledge and teach the true and substantial presence of the body and blood in the Supper in that sense which the words of the Supper give in their simple, proper and genu-

ine meaning. I give my assent to this understanding after diligently considering the arguments of both sides” (Ex. 2, 222).

- 66 But the Sacramentarians, in rejecting the Roman aberrations with regard to the consecration (Ex 2, 224), had fallen into the error of de-potentiating (removing the efficacy of) the Verba by changing their meaning and disregarding the fact that Christ’s “This do” is included in the Words of Institution as given to His church. With regard to these, Chemnitz notes that some “rejected the Papistical consecra-tion in such a way that they imagined the Lord’s Supper could be celebrated without the Words of Institution” (Ex 2, 225). Chemnitz makes his position clear with the curt answer, “This is manifestly false” (Ex 2, 225). He summarizes from the Scripture and also the Church Fathers what is the doctrine of the true church with regard to the consecration. This will be examined in detail in the next chapter, since in view of the widespread Sacramentarian error, even within the church of the Augsburg Confession, it was necessary for Chem-nitz to treat exhaustively the question of what is the Real Presence according to the Words of Christ. He follows this procedure in his work specifically directed against the Sacramentarians, *The Lord’s Supper*. With regard to the Roman Church and this problem he is content merely to make a general reference to this work against the Sacramentarians (Ex 2, 223; 327).
- 67 If there had been no controversy in the church regarding the Real Presence, Chemnitz would have been content to stop with Luther’s definition of the Lord’s Supper in the Small Catechism. In his *Enchiridion* written for the periodic examination by the superinten-dents of the pastors in Brunswick,¹³ he begins the examination of the Sacrament with just that definition, “What is the Lord’s Supper or the Sacrament of the Altar?” “It is the true body and true blood of our Lord Jesus Christ under the bread and the wine for us Christians to eat and to drink” (MWS, 120). But after stating that the essential parts of the Sacrament are “Word and element,” he in a practical vein adds that “these must be rightly explained” (MWS, 120).
- 68 The real heart of the question at issue in the controversy is, “What is present in the Lord’s Supper, distributed and received orally by the communicants?” (LS 38). There is, of course, also the second point which must be treated later, “For what purpose and use did Christ in His Supper distribute those elements to be received by the com-

municants and what is the salutary use or what is the spiritual benefit of those things we receive in the Supper from Christ who distributes them?" (LS 38).

- 69 Those are the "relevant" points from which we should separate the "irrelevant." The question does not have to do with transubstantiation, or the local enclosing of the body of Christ in the bread, or with a crass "Capernaitic chewing, swallowing and guzzling of the body and blood of Christ," both of which we reject. Nor is it a controversy about the spiritual indwelling of Christ in us through His Word and faith, nor is it an argument about the spiritual eating of Christ's body and blood through faith, as it is described in John 6. "We both believe and teach [that]" (LS 37).

**THE BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST GIVEN IN THE
SACRAMENT ARE NOT SEPARATED FROM THE
PERSONAL UNION OF THE TWO NATURES**

- 70 After emphasizing in several ways that *this* is the key question, Chemnitz directs us to the Verba. It is clear that something is present in the Lord's Supper, "that by an external distribution is given or offered, and that the Son of God has commanded that we receive it. . . . He is prescribing the mode of reception, namely, that we receive [it] orally" (LS 39). Further, "in regard to what is present in the Lord's Supper, what is distributed, what those who eat receive orally, He has pronounced and affirmed: "This is my body which is given for you. This is my blood which is shed for you for the remission of sins."" (LS 39).
- 71 Examining the description of the institution of the Lord's Supper as recorded by Paul in I Cor. II, Chemnitz draws the following conclusion, "It is not one body which was sacrificed for us on the cross and another which is distributed and received in the Supper; but the same substance of the body of Christ which was given for us on the cross is broken in the Supper with the bread for those who eat, that is, it is offered and distributed" (LS 123 f.).
- 72 It is the body and blood of the resurrected Christ that is given in the Sacrament. There is no question that Chemnitz agrees with the Apology which, in defending the doctrine that in the Lord's Supper the body and blood of Christ are truly and substantially present and offered, declared that "we are talking about the presence of the liv-

ing Christ, knowing that ‘death no longer has dominion over him’” (Ap X, 4). Chemnitz knew that the body of Christ was not lifeless, that is, without the blood. The body remains in the personal union as part of the God-Man. Equally, it remains in its risen state in full possession of the blood. Chemnitz is quite specific, “Christ mentions His body and blood, not because His body is separated from His blood or because both are separated from His soul and outside the personal union with the deity, apart and separate, *as if He wished us to believe He is present in the Supper only in the abstract*” (TNC 432; emphasis added). Chemnitz seems to recognize that there may be a temptation to separate the personal union because of references in the Scripture (e.g., the Verba) to the natural properties of the human nature. Hence he says that “we also must be on guard that the personal union is not dissolved, destroyed, or separated because of the natural properties, and this requires the fullest and most intimate union and presence of the natures in and with one another” (TNC 443).

73 The position of Chemnitz becomes apparent in his lengthy examination of Trent on the withholding of the cup from the laity and the clergy when they are not celebrants. He first advances evidence from Scripture for communion under both kinds. Here his chief argument is the command of Christ, “Drink of it, all of you.” Luke (as it should be diligently noted) shows that Christ willed that both parts should be equal in the way they are distributed and used” (Ex 2, 340).

74 Another reason for not changing the command of Christ for all communicants to drink of the cup is the example of the Apostles. They knew at the first Supper that they were receiving the living and whole body of Christ already in the bread, and yet they complied with Christ’s words, “Drink of it, all of you.” Chemnitz explains:

The fourth reason is taken from the example of the Apostles. For although the Apostles saw that, when he offered them the cup, the blood had not yet been separated from the body of Christ nor shed, they nevertheless did not judge that for this reason the use of the cup depended on their will or that it might simply be omitted since they were receiving the not bloodless but living and whole body of Christ already in the bread; but as they were commanded: “Drink of it, all of you,” so they complied in simple obedience with this command without inquiring into the reason and without the pretext that it was dangerous. For Mark says: “And they all drank of it.” Thus the Apostles have instructed us by their example that in the mystery of the Supper we should adhere with simple obedience to the institution and command

of the Son of God and that no reasons or arguments should be admitted against the express words of institution. (Ex 2,343).

75 Later, in pursuing the Roman teaching of Concomitance as a defense for distributing only the body of Christ to the communicants in the service, Chemnitz demonstrates the late date at which this custom was introduced by calling attention to the fact that “it was known to the ancients that, wherever Christ is present, He is present whole and entire, that His body is not present without His blood, nor His blood apart from His body. Nevertheless, no one in the Ancient Church so much as even argued that for this reason the testamentary institution of Christ about the dispensation and reception of both kinds could be changed and mutilated” (Ex 2, 429).

76 Chemnitz is so committed to letting the clear words of Scripture stand alone without any kind of human rationalization (p. 17, 21f.), that he will not permit the Sacramentarians to employ the Concomitance argument in reverse against the Biblical doctrine; that is, since holding that the body of Christ is in the bread and the blood in the wine would be to disrupt the body of Christ, and hence we must reject the natural meaning of the Verba. At the very end of *The Lord's Supper* Chemnitz firmly asserts that

we are correct in refusing to admit the following argument against the Words of Institution taken from the Popish doctrine of Concomitance: It is impossible to understand how the body of Christ in the bread and the blood in the wine can be substantially present, distributed, and received without any physical pulling asunder or tearing apart of the body and blood of Christ. Therefore [they say] the proper and natural meaning of Christ's last will and testament must rather be repudiated.

But if, because of unexplainable absurdities we are forced to depart from the clear Word of God, nothing will remain safe among the chief articles of faith. (LS 268).

77 In instructing the Brunswickian clergy, Chemnitz in his question to them recognizes that the body of the living Christ is not without blood. In the answer he sharply rejects any use of reason to try to explain or circumvent the mystery and miracle of the Lord's Supper:

But *the body of Christ, as being alive, is not without blood.* Therefore, when the body of Christ is received under the bread, isn't His blood also received, even if the use of the other kind is omitted?

We should not, on the basis of the judgment of our smart-aleck reason, which Scripture declares is not only blind, but blindness itself, in divine things, take the testament of the Son of God to ourselves to reform and change [it], as though in the night in which He was betrayed and instituted His Supper, He was not rational enough to know that a living body does not exist without blood; but we should rather take our foolish reason captive to the obedience of His infinite wisdom, and in simple obedient faith we should believe His Word and obey [His] command. He does not say and command that we should eat His blood, but that we should eat His body, but drink His blood from the cup of blessing; if we very simply obey that command, there is no danger of any error to fear. (MWS 122 f.).

THE ENTIRE PERSON OF CHRIST ACCORDING TO BOTH NATURES IS PRESENT IN THE SACRAMENT

78 Despite the clear and simple words of the Savior, there are some, Chemnitz asserts, who “teach that only the divine nature in Christ is present and communicated in the Supper” (LS 40). Calvin, in particular, “spoke emphatically to his followers and said that he understood the Words of Institution to refer to the very substance of Christ’s body” (LS 41). Chemnitz, however, knowing Calvin’s Christology, is skeptical. He warns, “But beware of traps. You hear the terms and you hear the agreements that there is a substantial presence of the body of Christ in the Lord’s Supper. But then the deception is immediately added, namely, that the body of Christ is present in the Supper, that is, in the fiery heaven outside this world. In this way they alter the Supper and its observance (*actio*).” (LS 41 f.).

79 This necessitates a careful scrutiny of the Person of Christ as Scripture has revealed it. But before doing that, one should, first of all, note that Luther did not build his doctrine of the Lord’s Supper on Christological arguments, as is sometimes suggested. He took it from the clear Words of Institution. By 1525 he realizes that Carlstadt “objects that Christ would have to leave the place where He sat in order to creep into the bread, and would have to leave heaven, were He to come into the bread” (LW 40, 216). Luther rightly prognosticates that “all the ridicule that Carlstadt heaps on the Sacrament, he has to direct also to the deity of Christ in the flesh, as he will also surely do in time” (LW 40, 216). And sure enough, Zwingli picked up this argument from Carlstadt, so that by 1527 Luther was forced to reckon with it. This is why Luther studied the Biblical Christology in connection with the Sacramentar-

ian controversy. He had presented his fundamental approach to the doctrine of the Sacrament in the words, “We are not bidden to search out how it can be that our bread becomes the body of Christ. It is the Word of God that says so. We hold to that and believe it. Chew on it, you poor devil, and search for as long a time as you need to discover how it occurs” (LW 40, 216).

80 In 1527 in his *That These Words, etc.*, Luther introduces the subject of Christ’s omnipresence. All he does with this doctrine is to show that it is possible for Christ to be at the right hand of God and at other places, and also in the Sacrament, “*even if* Christ had never spoken or set forth these words at the Supper, ‘This is my body,’ still the words ‘Christ sits at the right hand of God’ would require that His body and blood *may be there* as well as at all other places” (LW 37, 64; emphasis added).¹⁴

81 In 1528, in the *Great Confession*, Luther repeats his position of the previous year, “When I proved that Christ’s body is everywhere because the right hand of God is everywhere, I did so — as I quite openly explained at the time — in order to *show at least in one way how God could bring it about that Christ is in heaven and His body in the Supper at the same time*, and that He reserved to His divine wisdom and power many more ways to accomplish the same result, because we do not know the limit or measure of His power” (LW 37, 207; emphasis added). It is evident that Luther, as he often declared, took his stand for the Real Presence on the Verba. The Christological doctrine only showed that the Sacramental presence was possible.¹⁵

82 Chemnitz takes the same position as Luther did. One can begin by examining his massive *The Two Natures in Christ*. In *The Lord's Supper* he does make a couple of references to the research he had done on the person of Christ (LS 188 and 202; see bibliography for note on the two editions. In *The Two Natures in Christ*, Chemnitz quickly sets forth his fundamental thesis, “In the first place Christ himself clearly establishes that He consists of both a human and a divine nature and that He has existed and subsisted as a person before He was conceived and born of Mary according to the human nature, for He says in John 8:58: ‘Before Abraham was I am’” (TNC 38 f.). The first chapter of John is the principal starting place for Chemnitz, “John [the Evangelist] clearly states that He had existed from eternity, even before the human race and before every creature,

for in Chapter 1:1 the Word, which afterwards ‘became flesh’ (1:14), ‘was in the beginning’” (TNC 39).

- 83 But the problem with the Sacramentarians was not Arianism but their Nestorian view of the person of Christ. Since there was no essential union between the Logos and the man Jesus, Christ’s body could not be at one and the same time in heaven and on earth in the Holy Supper. Chemnitz agrees with the Athanasian Creed’s statement, “that for salvation the correct faith is necessary not only regarding the divine nature in Christ but also regarding the human” (TNC 49). He summarizes the doctrine in the statement that “the true teaching of Scripture is that the Son of God has assumed a true, complete, and total human nature which is of the same substance with us and possesses all the conditions, powers, and desires of our nature as its own normal properties, yet is not wicked, but is without sin, uncorrupted, and holy, but in which are the infirmities that have entered into our nature as the penalties of sin” (TNC 49).
- 84 But Scripture reveals to us even more about this great mystery that God was made manifest in the flesh. One must accept what the divine Revelation teaches about the hypostatic or personal union of the two natures, “It is not sufficient to know and believe that in some way or other there are two natures in Christ, the divine and the human. We must add that they have been joined together so intimately in a personal union that there is one and the same person consisting of and subsisting in these two natures . . . The church, in order that it may approach as closely as possible to the language of the Word of God, on the basis of the Scriptural term ‘unity’ or ‘union,’ has spoken of the union of the two natures into the unity of one person” (TNC 67).
- 85 Chemnitz then devotes the fifth chapter of *The Two Natures* (73–85) to arranging and analyzing the wealth of Scriptural evidence supporting his thesis of the hypostatic union. It is not necessary for us to go into all this evidence here. In his dedicatory letter to Christian, Duke of Saxony, Chemnitz modestly remarks that at the Torgau Castle (May 28–June 30, 1576) where the first draft of the Formula of Concord was hammered out, his study on the two natures in Christ “received rather favorable mention” and that “a careful and diligent study of the statements dealing with this subject was undertaken” (TNC 21). It may be correctly said that the results of Chemnitz’s Christological studies are embodied in Article VIII of the Solid Declaration (1577) and in that

part of Article VII which employs Luther's *Great Confession* (LW 37, 214–224) that Jesus Christ is true God and Man in one person (SD VII, 93–103). The Christology of Chemnitz and Luther is identical, as will become apparent in the following paragraphs.¹⁶

86 As a result of the personal union of the two natures in the one person, Jesus Christ, there took place a communication of attributes, that is, a communion of properties (SD VIII, 31). The Formula of Concord follows the arrangement of Chemnitz in discussing these three kinds of communication of attributes which result from the personal union, *genus idiomaticum* (SD VIII, 36); *genus apotelesmaticum* (SD VIII, 46–47); and the *genus majesticum* (SD VIII, 48–75).

87 The nub of the controversy with the Sacramentarians on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper centered on the exchange of properties according to the *genus majesticum*. It is so central to understanding the answer to the question Chemnitz posed as to what is present, distributed and received orally in the Sacrament (see p. 26) that it is helpful to present Chemnitz's position at some length. He writes:

Up to this point we have spoken about the two natures in Christ; about the hypostatic union of these two natures; about the person of Christ; about the difference of the natures and of their natural or essential attributes, a difference which remains intact in the union; about how the attributes of the individual natures are communicated to the whole person; and how each nature performs in communion with the other that which is proper to it. But some people compress and confine this entire doctrine within the bounds of the essential attributes or natural properties, and they will permit nothing more for themselves nor will they allow it to others. But because it is right and correct to say that the hypostatic union of the divine and the human nature in Christ has taken place while the difference of the natures and of the essential attributes of properties remains intact, some men have understood this point in so erroneous a manner and have urged their case in so wicked a way that they are willing to recognize only the essential and natural attributes in Christ's human nature. Despite the clear teachings and affirmations of Scripture they utterly oppose believing that the human nature, when it is considered according to its natural principles in itself, of itself, either outside or inside the union, possess qualities above, beyond, or contrary to the natural conditions of nature.

On the basis of Scripture the evidence for this teaching is so great that those who, as I have just mentioned, have long and acrimoniously debated the point are now compelled to acknowledge and confess that we must attribute to Christ's human nature not only its essential attributes and natural conditions, but also, especially because of the

hypostatic union with the deity, innumerable supernatural qualities and characteristics which are contrary to nature. Yet they still restrict them to created gifts, as we shall point out shortly. (TNC 242 f.)

- 88 Chemnitz proceeds to pile up the Scriptural evidence which demonstrates that while one must hold to the integrity of the two natures and not allow for any blending of the two natures and of their essential properties, one at the same time must believe that “Christ has received this majesty in time, moreover, not according to the divinity or the divine nature, but according to His assumed nature, or according to the flesh as man, or as the Son of Man” (“Catalog of Testimonies,” Trig. 1115). Included in the chain of Scripture texts which Chemnitz adduces to prove the point are: John 5:21, 27; 6:39, 40; Matt. 28:18; Dan. 7:14; John 3:31, 35; 13:3; Matt. 11:27; Eph. 1:21, 22; Heb. 2:8; 1 Cor. 15:27; John 1:3, 10, etc. (TNC 242–265; SD VIII, 55; Trig. 1113 f.).
- 89 Because the divine nature of Christ “powerfully manifests and actually exerts its majesty, power and efficacy . . . in, with, and through the human nature personally united to it” (Trig. 1139), Chemnitz and Andreae draw two conclusions solidly based on revelatory evidence:
- 1) “that this communication of the divine majesty occurs also in glory, without mingling, annihilation, or denial of the human nature” (Trig. 1141); and
 - 2) “also, that according to the nature and because of the personal union, the human nature is participant and capable of the divine majesty which belongs to God” (Trig. 1143).
- As further support for these theses they quote Matt. 16:27; 28:18; Col. 2:3, 9.
- 90 Chemnitz freely grants that the mystery of this union far surpasses the comprehension and language of all men; yet “concerning this mystery the Holy Spirit in the Scripture has revealed to us as much as is necessary for us to know and believe in this life in order to be saved” (TNC 68). But “with the simplicity of the partial knowledge which is given” we must adhere to the “sure and clear testimonies of Scripture, albeit in part, through a mirror, and, as it were, in a riddle” (TNC 69).
- 91 Chemnitz, in accordance with his principles of interpretation (see p. 17), will not be drawn into making any propositions that are not

founded on the Scriptures. He notes which attributes belonging to the deity have been communicated to Christ in time according to his assumed human nature. Christ has been given life and authority to judge, because He is the Son of Man (John 5:27). Scripture expressly mentions the human nature by name in His blood purifies our consciences (Heb. 9:14; 1 John 1:7) (TNC 287). Further, Christ is omnipresent (Matt. 28:20), that is, “He can be present with it [i.e., “the assumed human nature”] beyond every localization where He wills to be present” (TNC 448). This is true because in advance of that promise of omnipresence He has asserted His omnipotence, “All power has been given to me in heaven and on earth (Matt. 28:18)” (TNC 450). The Solid Declaration (VIII, 57–62) also enumerates these divine attributes, as do Chemnitz and Andreae in the “Catalog of Testimonies” (Trig. 1139–1145).

92 The Reformed theologians of Neostadium, in attempting to refute the Formula of Concord, argued that the divine attributes are indivisible and hence all must be ascribed to Christ according to His human nature, including eternity. The answer of Chemnitz, Selnecker, and Kirchner in the Apology to the Formula was simply: We answer to this in a few words, that in the communication of divine majesty or attributes we do not go or teach beyond what the Word of God clearly tells us. Since God’s Word does mention the communication of other attributes but says nothing of eternity, it is proper for us, too, not to say anything about it. Nor need we fear for this reason that we are dividing the divine attributes; for the Son of God who has revealed the doctrine of the communication of divine omnipotence, quickening power, and other attributes, undoubtedly well knows how this communication can occur without any separation of the attributes. To Him we should commend this mystery and not speculate or rationalize on it beyond His Word (Ap., FC, 81a).¹⁷

93 These Christological facts revealed in the Word mean for Chemnitz that we cannot abandon the simple, usual meaning of the Verba, “this is my body,” because “this meaning does not clash with a single article of faith” (Ex 2, 223). So the answer to the question which is at the heart of the controversy (“What is present in the Lord’s Supper, distributed and received orally by the communicant?” — see p. 26 f.), is that “it is certain that because the whole fullness of the Godhead dwells bodily in the human nature of Christ, and the human nature

of Christ has been exalted through His ascension above every name which is named, whether in this or in a future age, that therefore Christ can be present with His body wherever He wills and do whatever He wills. Therefore the presence of the body of Christ in the Sacrament does not conflict with the articles of faith, either of the true human nature or of the ascension of Christ. This understanding also has the constant consensus of the ancient, true, and purer church; moreover, it is full of the sweetest consolations. If the absence of the body and blood of Christ is established, consciences are robbed of all these things.” (Ex 2, 223).

THE MODES OF CHRIST’S PRESENCE

- 94 It now becomes necessary to penetrate more deeply into Chemnitz’s view of the modes of Christ’s presence. This is of considerable importance because it is sometimes asserted that Chemnitz did not agree with Luther on this point. It has been a conventionally-held view that Chemnitz, in distinction to Brenz, “taught only a relative ubiquity depending on Christ’s will.”¹⁸ This has been called his doctrine of “multivolipresence” (or “multipresence”), that is, that the human nature of the exalted Christ is present only when and where He wills. In other words, it is held that Chemnitz rejected the general omnipresence of Christ’s human nature, while Brenz espoused completely Luther’s view.
- 95 The Formula of Concord takes as its own the presentation of Luther on the manner (mode) of the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Supper (SD VII, 91–106). By means of several quotations and paraphrases it compresses a significant part of Luther’s *Great Confession* into a couple of pages (LW 37, 214–224). Luther contends that the one body of Christ has at least “three different modes, or all three modes, of being at any given place” (SD VII, 98; emphasis added). At this juncture it should be noted that Luther is ready to grant that Christ has possibly more modes, “I do not wish to have it denied by the foregoing that God may have and know still other modes whereby Christ’s body can be in a given place” (LW 37, 223).
- 96 These modes of presence are possible for Christ because “the humanity of Christ from His mother’s womb was more profoundly and deeply in God and in God’s presence than any angel,” and “Christ

was in heaven even while He was still walking on earth, as John 3 [:13] says" (LW 37, 232).

97 At times Jesus Christ, true God and Man in one person, employed the *circumscriptive mode*, "the comprehensible, corporeal mode," as when He walked bodily on earth and as He will do on the Last Day (SD VII, 99; LW 37, 222).

98 The second, or *definitive mode* (SD VII, 100), is described by Luther (LW 37, 215 and 222 f.). The space is really material and circumscribed, with its own dimensions (LW 37, 215), but Christ's mode is an "uncircumscribed, spiritual mode of presence according to which He neither occupies nor yields space but passes through everything created as He wills" (LW 37,222). "The space is really material and circumscribed, and has its own dimensions of length, breadth, and depth; but that which occupies it has not the same length, breadth, or depth as the space which it occupies, indeed, it has no length or breadth at all" (LW 37, 215). Some examples of this are represented by Christ's emerging from the grave, going through locked doors, and being in the bread and wine.

99 With respect to this second mode of presence, the authors of the Formula were afraid that some Sacramentarians might read a wrong idea into Luther's use of the term "spiritual mode." This fear resulted in a clarifying addition in the final revision (the Bergic Book, 1577). Here the authors added SD VII, 104 and 105, where it is spelled out that they had in mind a spiritual, heavenly mode by which His body and blood are present in the Supper for believers and unbelievers alike. Of course, He is not present according to the first, circumscriptive mode, and it is totally wrong for the Sacramentarians here to ascribe to the Lutherans "the Capernaite conception of a gross, carnal presence."

100 The third mode is called "repletive" (Eph. 4:10). Since Christ is one person with God, He also has the divine heavenly mode (SD VII, 101). This is far beyond things created, for "you must place this existence of Christ which constitutes Him one person with God, far, far beyond things created," etc. (LW 37, 223). He is simultaneously present in all places, whole and entire, and fills all places, yet without being measured or circumscribed by any place; see Jer. 23:23 (LW 37, 216).¹⁹

101 Before entering into Chemnitz's presentation of this doctrine, it would be well to summarize the points which Luther and the Formula have made:

1. The second mode is to be sharply differentiated from the first. Christ's body and blood can be substantially present without being circumscribed, but the place is circumscribed.

2. The second mode is also to be differentiated from the third mode, where Christ is present in all places, whole and entire, because He is one person with God.

3. The second mode is also to be differentiated from "the spiritual mode," whereby we receive Christ by faith.

102 Luther had allowed for several modes whereby Christ's body could be in a given place (p. 36). But in his analysis of the Scriptural material, he formulated three distinct modes. The approach of Chemnitz is somewhat different when he comes to discuss the matter in the chapter, "Christ Present in the Church According to Both Natures" (TNC 423–465). He posits five kinds of presence, "I therefore distinguish also these kinds of presence: In the first place He walked on earth, in the second He appears in heaven in glory, in the third He is present in the Supper with the bread and the wine, in the fourth He is present in the whole church, and in the fifth He has all creatures present with Him in a sense (*en logoo*)" (TNC 448 f.).²⁰

103 Is there a divergence here from Luther and the Formula of Concord? It is not difficult to find run-of-the-mill assertions to that effect. For example, with regard to SD VIII, 84 f, where Luther's statement from the *Great Confession* is incorporated, Schlink asserts that in the systematic development of Christology here there is a "lack of clarity which is indicated by the difference between Brenz and Chemnitz, between Wuerttemberg and Lower Saxon Christology." It is evident that Schlink believes that Chemnitz's frequent use of the term "wherever He wills" "has not been thought through as to its Christological significance" and that Chemnitz is at odds with Luther's "wherever you put God down for me you must also put the humanity down for me."²¹ But the evidence does not sustain this judgment. In the first point, Chemnitz certainly teaches the circumscriptive, comprehensible, corporeal mode of presence, also giving a detailed explanation (TNC 426 f). In the second mode, he has reference only to Christ in heaven in His glory. This is different from the natural, circumscriptive mode. This mode will be revealed to us only when He "will appear at last in glory for judgment" (TNC 431). But it can be regarded as

being subsumed under the definitive mode, since He “can manifest His bodily presence on earth whenever, wherever, and however He wishes in visible form” (TNC 431). Examples of this are to be found in the case of Paul who “actually saw Christ, not in the Milky Way of heaven but on an earthly road which led from Jerusalem to Damascus, not in some kind of vision but in His own true body, so Paul from this even proves the resurrection of the flesh” (TNC 431). Another case in point is Christ standing “beside Paul in the prison with His own true body” (TNC 431).

104 The third and fourth modes are equivalent to the second mode named in the Formula (SD VII, 100). In describing and accepting the modes of Christ's presence, Chemnitz again falls back on the Scriptural principle, “As far as we have Scripture we follow it in simplicity and safety, as a guide which leads us and as a lamp which brightly shines” (TNC 463; see also p. 17 f., where Chemnitz accepts the principle of Augustine). Following “the Scripture with simplicity and firmness,” we must all agree that “since all power has been given to Him [the Son of God in and with His assumed humanity] in heaven and on earth, and all creatures have been made subject to Him, this Son can do those things of which He gives to us a definite and express word, institution, ordination, or promise in the Scripture, even if we are not able to understand or explain the way in which it takes place” (TNC 426).

105 The church can be certain that Christ is present with His body and blood in the consecrated elements in the definitive mode because “we have . . . an express word and a specific promise instituted in a particular and definite way, ordained as part of His will and testament by the Son of God himself on the night in which He was betrayed, a promise which Christ ratified also after His ascension by sitting at the right hand of the Majesty in His glory in heaven, a promise which was repeated to Paul, a promise that He wills to be present with His body and blood in the observance of His Supper as it is celebrated in the gathering of the church here on earth in accord with His institution” (TNC 432).

106 Having given this precise definition of how Christ is present in the Supper in the definitive mode because of His specific Word of promise, Chemnitz is quick to distinguish this mode from the first, or circumscriptive mode, “We grant that the body of Christ, which is

delimited by the attributes of His nature, is not present in the Supper in all places by a local circumscription or by some mode or condition of human life which is visible, perceptible, or natural, or according to the natural properties of the true body or through any essential attributes of its own. For we have already shown that in this mode of presence Christ has been removed from the earth, at least as an ordinary arrangement" (TNC 433). Chemnitz wants to demonstrate that the Lutheran doctrine is free from any Capernaite charges made by the Reformed, "We do not establish a physical or geometric, crass and carnal manner of presence. We do not dispute about inclusion in a certain place, nor about descent or ascent of the body of Christ. Briefly, we do not hold that the body of Christ is present in the Supper in any manner that is natural to this world" (Ex 2, 224).

107 Subsumed under the definitive mode but at the same time not the identical presence as Christ's body and blood in the Supper, is the fourth mode, "present in the whole church" (TNC 449). On the basis of Matt. 28:20, Chemnitz asserts that "this promise is correctly understood of the whole Christ, God and Man in both natures. For He who was present there before them promises His presence to the church always" (TNC 449; see also pages 318 and 319). That this mode of presence is for Chemnitz different from Christ's presence in the Supper is clear from the fact that he unswervingly holds to Paul's statement that the unworthy partake of the body of Christ but not to their salvation, "It is certain," Chemnitz remarks, "that they are not spiritually eating the body and blood of Christ" (LS 171). And Calvin is certainly wrong when he infers that in the "sacramental reception . . . what those who eat unworthily in the Lord's Supper receive in their mouths is not the body and blood of Christ but only bread and wine" (LS 172). While we cannot fully understand the mystery of the modes of the presence of Christ in His church or in the Supper (Ex 2, 224), it is evident for Chemnitz that there is a difference. The definitive presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Supper does not coincide with Christ's general omnipresence, nor with His presence in the church, but the sacramental presence is restricted to a definite place and time. This is evident from his discussion of the Veneration of the Sacrament, which will be analyzed in a succeeding chapter. Here, however, it is sufficient to show that the definitive presence of Christ in the Supper is a special presence, "If we believe that Christ, God and Man, is present *with a*

peculiar mode of presence and grace in the *action* of His Supper, so that He truly and substantially imparts His body and blood to those who eat, . . . if, I say, we truly and from the heart believe these things, it neither can nor should happen that faith would fail to venerate and worship Christ who is present in this *action*" (Ex 2, 277; emphasis added). Here it is of the utmost importance to remember Chemnitz's "precising definition" of the term "action" with respect to his use of it in the Lord's Supper (see p. 13 f.).

108 It is now necessary to examine the fifth kind of presence to which Chemnitz makes reference, "He has all creatures present with him *en logoo*" (TNC 449; see endnote #20). This would be identical with the repletive mode, "according to which all creatures are indeed much more penetrable and present to him than they are according to the second mode." This must be so because Christ is "one person with God" (SD VII, 101). The Formula anchors this conviction even more firmly in Article VIII, employing part of Luther's *Great Confession*, "Since He is a man like this — and apart from this man there is no God — it must follow that according to the third supernatural manner, He is and can be everywhere that God is and that everything is full of Christ through and through, also according to the humanity — not, of course, according to the first, corporeal, comprehensible manner, but according to the supernatural, divine manner. Here you must take your stand and say that wherever Christ is according to the deity, He is there as a natural, divine person and also naturally and personally there as His conception in His mother's womb proves conclusively" (SD VIII, 81 f.; LW 37, 218).

109 This is precisely the doctrine of Chemnitz. In devoting a preliminary chapter to the definition of the Personal Union, he says that

this intimate uniting of the assuming and the assumed natures brings about the fact that although as a result of this union nothing in itself is added to or subtracted from the divine nature, yet in the human nature of Christ, because of the union, there are not only natural attributes which result from the constitution of human nature, nor are there only particular and finite which inhere formally in the humanity and are more numerous and more excellent in degree than those which come from the indwelling of the Holy Spirit in the saints, but also because of this union the human nature in Christ not only has the fulness of the deity dwelling in it personally, but at the same time, according to the Scripture, it receives the divine majesty which has been given and communicated to it along with the divine power, wisdom, life and other divine qualities.

And this takes place not by a physical communication of commingling, effusion, or equating, but by the communication of the personal union in the way that a soul communicates its animate and vital powers to a living body and as fire communicates the power of giving light and heat to the heated iron. (TNC 83 f.).

110 Since, as will later be seen, this is a crucial point for understanding not only Chemnitz's Christology but his understanding of the Lord's Supper, it is necessary to add more testimony from his works. Upon examining Eph. 1:22 and Matt. 28:18, he concludes, "Here you will clearly hear . . . that all this power [that is, that all things are placed under the feet of Christ] which has been given to Christ pertains particularly to the church or to the work of Christ's kingdom and His priesthood; but it is not so circumscribed by these boundaries and limits that at the same time He does not have all things under His feet in subjection to Him, as the passage teaches God gives great power to the angels in Rev. 18:1, who are thus called powers of strength (Ps. 103:20). But to Christ in time, according to His human nature is given not only great, not only far-reaching powers, but all power both in heaven and earth" (TNC 319). Chemnitz flatly concludes that "Scripture teaches that Christ rules over all things, not only as God according to the divine nature but also as man according to His exalted human nature" (TNC 321).

111 Since Chemnitz is quite aware of the fact that the Sacramentarians have tried to reduce to absurdity the Lutheran doctrine of the Real Presence of the body and blood of Christ in the consecrated elements, he feels that he must in all honesty take up their objections, though they border not only on the ridiculous but also the blasphemous. It is from this passage that some have concluded that Chemnitz rejects the general omnipresence of Christ's human nature and even that the human nature was not capable of the divinity. The passage from Chemnitz reads as follows:

Up to this point, on the basis of Scripture, and the testimonies of the ancient church, we have spoken of the presence of the complete person of Christ according to each nature in the Lord's Supper and in the church; and we have shown how much comfort this teaching affords.

But if we ask further concerning other creatures which are outside the church and subject to the general rule of God, Scripture is clear in its general affirmation that all things have been made subject to Christ as to the Lord, also according to his humanity as the Fathers say, not only in the church but in all ways. Nothing is excepted by Him who subjects

all things to Himself. Clearly and expressly there are mentioned in this subjection the beasts of the field, the fowls of the air, the fish of the sea, and whatever other works are from the hands of God, whether in heaven or on earth or under the earth, even the enemies of Christ, and thus even the devil and death itself (Psalm 8:6–8; Phil. 2:9; Gal. 4:11; 1 Cor. 15:57), where as a correlative to this subjection Paul places a dominion which in Psalm 8:6 is described by the word *Mosel*, which signifies to have power, dominion, and rule over someone and to work in a powerful way. Christ's human nature, therefore, cannot and ought not be removed or excluded from the general dominion which he possesses and exercises over all things or from the administration of the world, since Scripture expressly affirms that all things, even those things which are outside the church, have been put under Christ's feet.

We have shown in many preceding statements that these passages must be understood, not only of Christ's divine nature but properly also of the subjection of all things which the human nature in Christ has received in time through the exaltation. Not that the human nature rules by itself, but the person in, with, and through each nature rules powerfully over all things with a rule which the divine Logos possesses from eternity but which the humanity has received in time because of the personal union. (TNC 462 f.)

- 112 This much of the text should justify the conclusion that Chemnitz taught the general omnipresence and omnipotence of Christ's human nature. If not, the very next sentence clinches the argument, a sentence which Pieper observes that the noted commentator of the Formula of Concord, F. H. R. Franck, omitted, even though it is of central importance to the issue,²² "But the humanity in and with the Logos rules all things, not in the sense of being absent, far away, or removed by an immense interval of space, or through some vicarious work and administration, such as kings are accustomed to exercise when their power is extended widely through many distant provinces" (TNC 463; emphasis added).
- 113 Since the omnipresence of Christ, also according to His human nature, not only includes the church but all things, Chemnitz takes note of the fact that "the arguments and questions center in whether the body of Christ is also in wood and stones, in fruit, in the birds of the air, the beasts of the field, and the fish of the sea, or whether He wishes to be sought and found there. Furthermore, some questions are asked which are foul to hear and abominable to imagine, which cannot be considered or even asked without blasphemy, such as whether the divine nature, which is everywhere, is found in excreta and sewage" (TNC 463; emphasis added).

- 114 The answer to the first part of the question is, of course, an affirmative, given in SD VII, 101, where Luther's *Great Confession* is quoted, "You must posit this essence of Christ since He is one person with God, very far beyond creatures, as far as God transcends them, and you must posit it again as deep and as near in all creatures as God is immanent in them. For He is one indivisible Person with God, and wherever God is, He must be also, otherwise our faith is false" (see also LW 37, 223).
- 115 When Luther wrote this in 1528, he was already aware of the Sacramentarians' efforts to ridicule the Biblical doctrine of the Real Presence in the Lord's Supper by their drawing the conclusion that one could then partake of this sacrament any time and any place without any regard to the institution.²³ Chemnitz may well have had Luther's answer in mind when he again felt compelled to deal with this objection fifty years later, after Luther had written:

By this kind of talk [that is, on the basis of John 3:13 Luther's statement that Christ's "body is at the same time in heaven and on earth, yes even at the ends of the earth"] perhaps I shall now attract other fanatics who would like to trip me up, arguing: If Christ's body is everywhere, ah, then I shall eat and drink him in all the taverns, from all kinds of bowls, glasses, and tankards! Then there is no difference between my table and the Lord's table. (LW 37, 67).

- 116 Luther attacks this naive view which identifies the repletive presence with the definitive presence of Christ's body and blood in the consecrated elements, "Listen now, you pig, dog, or fanatic, whatever kind of unreasonable ass you are. Even if Christ's body is everywhere, you do not therefore immediately eat or drink or touch Him! Nor do I talk with you about such things in this manner, either; go back to your pigpen and your filth . . . There is a difference between His being present and your touching. He is free and unbound wherever He is . . . Although He [Christ] is everywhere, He does not permit himself to be so caught and grasped; He can easily shell himself, so that you get the shell but not the kernel. Why? Because it is one thing if God is present, another if He is present for you. He is there for you when He adds His Word and binds himself, saying, 'Here you are to find me.' Now when you have the Word, you can grasp and have Him with certainty and say, 'Here I have Thee, according to Thy Word'" (LW 37,38). The ordinance and promise of the Word are decisive for Luther.

117 Chemnitz takes the same position as Luther did. He acknowledges the repletive presence of Christ because He is true God and Man in one person (see p. 16.f). But it is simplistic to disregard the equally important question, “. . . or *whether He wishes to be sought and found there* [that is, in wood, stone, animals, etc.]” (TNC 463; emphasis added). In extremely irenic words (at least compared with Luther’s) Chemnitz turns aside the ridicule with a soft answer, “Since we do not have an express and definite promise that He wills to be sought and found in such places, and since these things add nothing to the edification and comfort of the church and are plain offenses which disturb the weak and give the adversaries occasion for endless controversy, it is safest and simplest to drop all such questions from our discussion and to limit ourselves to the boundaries of divine revelation so that we may seek Christ and lay hold on Him in the places where He has clearly promised that He himself wishes to be” (TNC 463). While Luther and Chemnitz both teach the omnipresence of Christ’s human nature, they do not rest the Real Presence on His general omnipresence but on the command and the promise of the Verba.²⁴ The Apology to the FC, after noting the distinction between the circumscriptive and definitive modes of presence, makes the point that the Sacramentarians differ fundamentally from the Formula by denying the definitive presence in (AP FC 149b).

THE SACRAMENTAL UNION

118 Since Christ is present in the bread, or, more precisely, the bread is the body of Christ, what is the relationship between the elements in the sacrament? Very simply, but in clear, definite words Chemnitz instructs his less-informed pastors in Brunswick that there is no transubstantiation but that “two distinct things or substances, which joined by the sacramental union, make one complete sacrament, even as in the one person of Christ there are two complete and distinct natures” (MWS 120). This calls for a very careful examination of the Words of Institution as found in Matthew, Mark, Luke and St. Paul.

119 The word from the first institution, “this” (*touto, hoc*), must not be disregarded, as though the whole controversy generated around the Lord’s Supper centers only in the word “is.” Chemnitz demonstrates that “over and above the fact that transubstantiation cannot be clearly and surely proved and shown from the Word of God, we also have a

simple and clear statement concerning this question . . .” (Ex 2, 262). Considering the bread which Jesus blessed, broke, and gave to His disciples He said, “Take, eat, this is my body.” There can be no doubt about the meaning of the demonstrative pronoun, Chemnitz avers, because “Luke and Paul, in describing the second part state this expressly by the clear addition, ‘He took the cup, blessed it, and gave it to them,’ and add: *Touto to poteerion*, ‘This cup.’” (Ex 2, 262).

- 120 Additional proof that the *touto* refers to the earthly element can be seen from Paul’s words in 1 Corinthians, “As St. Paul says concerning the second part (1 Cor. 10:16): ‘This cup which we bless is the imparting of the blood of Christ,’ so also he says concerning the first part: ‘The bread which we break is the imparting of the body of Christ.’ Therefore he declares and expresses clearly what the little word ‘this’ denotes in each of the two parts, namely, bread and the cup” (Ex 2, 262).²⁵
- 121 Furthermore, even after the consecration, which in the theology of Chemnitz achieves the presence of the body and blood of Christ, Scripture still speaks of the bread as one of the distinct things in the sacrament. This ought to eliminate any kind of philosophical explanation for the mystery of the Supper, such as transubstantiation, “Moreover, after the blessing or consecration, in the very use [of the sacrament], Paul calls it bread, and that not once, lest you should think that the expression had slipped out inadvertently, but four or five times. 1 Cor. 10:16, 17: ‘The bread which we break’; ‘We all partake of one bread’; 1 Cor. 11:26, 27: ‘As often as you eat this bread’; ‘Whoever eats the bread . . . in an unworthy manner’; V28: ‘Let a man examine himself and so eat of the bread’” (Ex 2, 262 f.). In view of this massive Biblical evidence, Chemnitz concludes that “since we have these explanations of Scripture, why do we not adhere to the simple truth? Why should we take pleasure in disturbing it with the labyrinthine arguments about transubstantiation?”
- 122 In his sparring with the Sacramentarians, Chemnitz first calls attention to the fact that by his time everyone (including the Sacramentarians) had rejected Carlstadt’s notion that the “demonstrative article ‘this’ could not refer to the bread because the gender of the demonstrative pronoun did not agree with the preceding word ‘bread.’” All now agreed that “it is common for a demonstrative article to agree in gender with the substantive that follows but it is

impossible to demonstrate that there is always this reference to the preceding.” (LS 95).

123 With this superficial argument out of the way, Chemnitz then shows that the *touto* in Matt. 26:26–28, must refer to the bread and the wine, for “Luke says: ‘This cup’ [Luke 22:20]. And Paul speaks of ‘The bread which we break [1 Cor. 10:16]’” (LS 95).

124 The next words of the Verba to come under scrutiny are the copulative “is” and the noun “body.” Employing the description of Matthew, Chemnitz simply says that “the word ‘is’ (*est*) explains what it is which is distributed and received. And the word ‘body’ is clearly explained, for Christ affirms that it is His body, and by the use of the article ‘the’ (*to*) he strongly confirms the proper meaning of the word which is dealt with so clearly, both in Luke and Paul” (LS 95 f.).

125 But here the words of Christ come into conflict with human reason, as was the case in the Arian Controversy. In both instances we are dealing “with mysteries which do not pertain to our natural reason but to heavenly and divine wisdom and power. These are therefore not to be judged according to the common rules of nature but according to the Word and ordinance of divine wisdom and power” (LS 45). When the orthodox made statements that “God is Man” and “the Son of Man is the Son of God” the “heretics contended that we absolutely must introduce a figure of speech into these words” (LS 45). Various suggestions were made that the figure was in “Man” or in “God” or in “is.” But the church “on the basis of the Word of God” asserted that the words must retain their proper and natural meaning so that “Man” refers to an entity made up of the true substance of the human nature, and the term “God” must mean “the hypostasis of the Son of God truly subsisting in the very essence of the deity” (LS 45 f.). Chemnitz also concludes that the “copulative verb ‘is’ (*est*) explains what actually obtains, namely, that the person is not only a man as he appeared to be but also true God” (LS 46).

126 Similarly,

When we predicate concerning the bread of the Lord’s Supper that it is the body of Christ, the word “bread” has and retains its own proper meaning. And we should add the note regarding the word “body” that because it was given for us we are absolutely compelled to understand it in no other way than in its proper and natural sense — as the substance of the human nature, conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin

Mary, and nailed to the cross. The copulative verb “is” (*est*) denotes what obtains, what is present, what is distributed, and received, namely, that this bread here present, after receiving its name from God, is not only bread but at the same time also the body of Christ. (LS 46).

Because of the Words of Institution faith “believes that with the visible elements a communion (*koinoonia*) of the presence of the body and blood of Christ is also distributed to those who eat” (LS 64).

- 127 Since this is an unusual union it is called the sacramental union (SD VII, 38), and it has been compared to the personal union of the two natures in Christ (SD VII, 36–38). As a matter of fact, it appears that here the Solid Declaration has simply taken over part of Chemnitz’s explication found in his *The Lord’s Supper* (LS 153). The Early Church used the analogy of the personal union of Christ’s two natures and of the earthly elements and the body and blood of Christ, “For they [Justin, Cyprian, Augustine, Chrysostom, Gelasius, and Theodoret] asserted that the person of Christ consists of two natures which are neither disunited nor confused but are joined together and united, just as the Eucharist consists of two things, namely, the external appearance of the elements and the invisible body and blood of Christ” (LS 153). By means of this analogy they refuted the heretics who recognized in the person of Christ only one nature or separated the two natures or “else imagined that the divine nature was not in Christ substantially but only through some power and efficacy” (LS 153). The ancients, however, also considered the obverse side of the comparison “and taught that the Eucharist consists of two things, namely, the bread and the body of Christ, the wine and the blood of Christ, just as the person of Christ consists of two natures which are distinct, to be sure, but not separated or divided” (LS 154). This must be true since the words of Christ are “This is my body,” etc. Scripture uses the same language to express the personal union of the two natures in Christ, John 1:14; Col. 2:9; Acts 10:38 (see SD VII, 35).

- 128 But these are only analogies, and analogies are never perfect in every respect. So there is a difference; in the person of Christ “the union of the two natures is inseparable and hypostatic or personal, which is not the case in the Eucharist” (LS 154). Chemnitz and his fellow Lutherans demonstrate this difference by stating that at times they have used, besides the Biblical “the bread is the body of Christ in the Supper,” other phrases such as “under the bread, with

the bread, in the bread, the body of Christ is present and offered," to reject the papistic idea of transubstantiation (SD VII, 35; the Latin text). The sacramental union is not an "enduring union" (Ex 2, 249), Chemnitz asserts against the Papists. But the union obtains only in Christ's prescribed action, "To take bread and wine, bless, divide, offer, receive, eat, and add this word of Christ: 'This is my body; this is my blood;' and do all this in remembrance of Him" (Ex 2, 249). In short, God is not inseparably in the elements because according to the covenant and the Word "they are not sacraments apart from their use" (TNC 109; emphasis added; see p. 13 f. for the identical meaning of "action" and "use").

129 After the appearance of the Formula of Concord in 1580 the Reformed theologians of Neustadt launched a severe counterattack against the Lutherans. One of the Reformed contentions was that even the Lutherans did not accept the natural meaning of the Verba that the bread is the body of Christ, because the use of such expressions as "in the bread, under the bread," etc., which are not the Words of Institution (Ap. FC 152).²⁶

130 The authors of the Formula may possibly seem to have laid themselves open to the charge of an inconsistency when they acknowledged that besides using the literal formula for the Words of Institution they had at times used some other formulas, such as "under the bread," or "with the bread," or "in the bread" (SD VII, 35). It does appear obvious, however, from the expression "at times" that these terms are not thought of as primary but secondary in their use.

131 But Chemnitz, Kirchner, and Selnecker answer that because of the sacramental union they retain both ways of speaking, namely, that the bread is the body of Christ, and in the bread the body of Christ is present and distributed. They refer to Luther's *Great Confession* where he called this mode of speaking "synecdoche." In the sacrament these two things, bread and the body of Christ, are united with each other in a supernatural way and are present with one another in the Supper and are distributed.²⁷ Luther, in criticizing "Wycliffe and the Sophists," declared that they should take into account "the rules of grammar or the science of words." Grammar "lays down a rule of expression applicable to all languages: When two diverse beings become one being, grammar embraces these two beings in a single expression and as it views the union of the two beings it refers to the

two in one term This mode of speaking about diverse beings is one the grammarians call ‘synecdoche.’ It is quite common, not only in Scripture but also in all languages.” (LW 37, 301f.).

- 132 The Apology to the Formula warns that we must not here misunderstand Luther’s use of the term “synecdoche” as meaning *continens pro absente contento*, but rather as the union of two things, one of which is earthly, as the bread, but the other heavenly, as the true body of Christ, “which, as we often have repeated, is sacramentally united with each other in the Supper.”²⁸
- 133 Hence the Neustadt theologians obviously do an injustice to the Formula of Concord when they raise the accusation that the Formula itself has departed from the natural meaning of the words of the Testament of Christ.²⁹ Further, the Lutherans in speaking of this union have not only used the term “sacramental” but also *singularis* (solitary, alone of its kind) and *inusitate* (unusual, uncommon) (Ap FC 152b). But whatever term may be used, it is the Words of Institution which must determine what is to be taught with regard to the sacrament (Ap FC 154b).
- 134 It should also be noted that, given the basic Biblical understanding that in the Supper the bread is the body of Christ because of the sacramental union, Chemnitz and the authors of the Solid Declaration have at times used the terms “in the bread,” etc., to “reject the papistic transubstantiation” (SD VII, 35 f.).³⁰ Chemnitz also recognizes that terms employed by Lutherans can be misused by the Sacramentarians, as when Lutherans speak of two things in the Supper. The adversaries, unable to deny that the Eucharist consists of two things, “contend that these things are completely separate from one another, namely, the bread is on earth but the body of Christ is only in heaven and therefore called a heavenly thing” (LS 153). More precise is the formula taken from the Verba, the bread is the body of Christ. Luther demonstrates this lack of precision in the other formulas in the *Great Confession*, “If the text read, ‘Take eat, in the bread is my body,’ or ‘with the bread is my body,’ or ‘under the bread is my body,’ it would immediately begin to rain, hail, and snow a storm of fanatics crying ‘You see! Do you hear that?’ Christ does not say ‘This bread is my body,’ but ‘In the bread, or with the bread, or under the bread is my body!’ And they cry, ‘Oh, how gladly would we believe it if He had said, ‘This is my body’; this would have been distinct and clear”

(LW 37, 306). In view of the lack of precision of these other formulas, one is hard put to understand why today conservative Lutherans who profess their allegiance to Luther insist on using almost exclusively the term “in, with, and under.” This is all the more puzzling when one considers how modern Lutherans and the Reformed have been able to agree on the doctrine of the Lord’s Supper, as for example, in the “Leuenberg Theses.”

135 This is perhaps the best place to analyze Chemnitz’s use of the word “change” in connection with the Roman doctrine of transubstantiation and the Lutheran doctrine of the Real Presence of the body and blood of Christ in the sacrament. It is of some importance to understand this today since so many Lutherans, upon hearing and seeing the word “change” in connection with the Sacrament of the Altar, assume that the writer must have in mind the official Roman doctrine of transubstantiation. It is strange that this assumption should be held, since the *Book of Concord* does not hesitate to use the word approvingly when it selects material from the Early Church which corroborates the fact that the Lutheran doctrine of the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Lord’s Supper is not only Biblical but also in harmony with the Early Church. Evidence that the Greek Church held the same position is taken from its canon of the Mass, “in which the priest clearly prays that the bread may be changed and become the body of Christ.” (Ap X, 2). And the testimony of a pre-Lateran Council theologian is invoked, “and Vulgarius, who seems to us to be a sensible writer, says distinctly that the ‘bread is not merely a figure but is truly changed into flesh’” (Ap X, 2).³¹

136 Chemnitz understands exactly what the Roman doctrine of transubstantiation is which has been enshrined in the Decrees and Canons of Trent. He recognizes that its essential feature is that “the substance of the bread is annihilated” (LS 49). He chides the Papalists for their need to keep changing their definition of a sacrament as the number of sacraments grew and as they mutilated the Scriptural doctrine. For example, Chemnitz cites the fact that Hugo’s definition of a sacrament was no longer satisfactory because when they now teach “that in the Eucharist, after the substance is destroyed, only the appearance of bread and wine remains, they saw that Hugo’s definition does not fit sufficiently, namely, that a sacrament is a material and corporeal element set forth externally before the senses, by

likeness representing, by institution signifying, and by sanctification containing some visible and spiritual grace” (Ex 2, 37). It is easy to see that this definition would not allow for the annihilation of the bread and the wine.

- 137 In view of this shift in the understanding of the Eucharist, Chemnitz summarizes the historical development of the theory of transubstantiation. Originally, “the Ancients make mention simply of mutation and conversion of the elements of the Lord’s Supper” (Ex 2, 254). But they have a correct understanding of the Biblical doctrine because they “explain in this way that after *consecration* it is no longer common bread and ordinary wine but is the Eucharist, which is made up of two things, an earthly and a heavenly, a visible and an invisible, as Irenaeus and Augustine speak” (Ex 2, 254; emphasis added). It is evident that when the term “change” was used as a technical term, it was meant to confess that when the Verba had been spoken over the bread and the wine, the body and the blood of Christ are present.
- 138 Chemnitz, however, as an intellectually ethical historian, does acknowledge that some (John of Damascus and Theophylact, and others) afterwards “began to preach in more exaggerated language about the transformation of the elements in the Supper” (Ex 2, 254). But it was not until the twelfth century, in the time of Peter Lombard, “with the advent of scholastic theology, that they began to dispute in France concerning the manner of conversion, whether it pertains to the form or to the substance or is of another kind Lombard clearly indicates that at that time nothing had been defined and determined in the church about this question, when he says, ‘I am not sufficient to define it’” (Ex 2, 254). From this evidence it is clear that while the Early Church recognized that because Jesus commanded that the Words of Institution be repeated, the bread and the wine become Christ’s body and blood on the basis of that repeated word, the church did not attempt to explain philosophically what had occurred but only confessed a “mutation and conversion of the elements in the Lord’s Supper” (Ex 2, 254).
- 139 So, the word “change” was acceptable in the church without the denotation of transubstantiation being attached to it. Luther himself used the term in this sense long after his attack on transubstantiation in the “Babylonian Captivity” (1520), for example, in 1533 (“The Private Mass and Consecration of the Priests”), he uses terms as “effect

conversion” (LW 38, 151, 152); “effect conversion and constitute [the sacrament]” (LW 38, 154, 155, 166, 169, 192); “produce the sacrament or effect conversion” (LW 38, 197, 198); “according to His command we join bread and wine to the Word of Christ; however, not this action of ours, but Christ’s Word and ordinance *effect the change*” (LW 38, 202; emphasis added). Melancthon quite naturally has no scruples about using the term “change” approvingly in the Apology (Ap X, 2), since he well understands that the public Lutheran doctrine in 1530 is that when the elements in a legitimate observance of the Supper have been consecrated, they are Christ’s body and blood without ceasing to be bread and wine.

140 Chemnitz understands that historically Pope Innocent III at the Fourth Lateran Council (1215) “first determined the mode of conversion, which had not been defined in the church before,” and that here was used for the first time the new word “transubstantiate” (Ex 2, 254). But Chemnitz cannot refrain from calling attention to the fact that the Tridentine Fathers in Canon II went beyond the Lateran Council in “hurl[ing] anathemas at those who think otherwise” (Ex 2, 255).

141 In examining the Roman reasons for accepting transubstantiation, Chemnitz is not afraid to recognize that the consecration effects the Real Presence and that because of this, a miraculous change has taken place,

We grant, with Irenaeus, that after the blessing in the Eucharist the bread is no longer common bread but the Eucharist of the body of Christ, which now consists of two things — the earthly, that is, bread and wine, and the heavenly, that is, the body and blood of Christ. This is certainly a *great, miraculous, and truly divine change*, since before it was simply and only ordinary bread and common wine. What now, after the blessing, is truly and substantially present, offered, and received is truly and substantially the body and blood of Christ. Therefore we grant that *a certain change takes place*, that it can be truly said of the bread that it is the body of Christ. But we deny that it follows from this that we must therefore assert the kind of transubstantiation which the Papalists teach” (Ex 2, 257 f.; emphasis added).³²

MODES OF PREDICATION

142 Chemnitz’s analysis of the reasons that the Council of Trent so tenaciously clung to the doctrine of transubstantiation, together with his examination of why the Reformed refused to accept the words

“bread,” “is,” and “body” in their natural meaning (see LS 45 and p. 47 f.), reveal that there is a fundamental similarity between the Reformed and the Roman positions. Both deny that the finite is capable of the infinite. Hence, as Chemnitz says, it is necessary to deal with the question of “the mode or form of predication because this bread is described as being the body of Christ” (LS 46).

- 143 The Papalists in the Tridentine Decrees had confessed that a “conversion is made of the whole substance of the bread into the body of our Lord” (Chapter IV, Third Session, Oct. 11, 1551). In the accompanying Canon II they declared, “If anyone says that in the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist the substance of bread and wine remain with the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and denies the wonderful and unique conversion of the total substance of the bread into the body and the total substance of the wine into the blood, so that only appearances of bread and wine remain, which conversion the Catholic Church very fittingly calls transubstantiation, let him be anathema” (Ex 2, 253).
- 144 Chemnitz notes that the Papists advance three chief arguments for their doctrine. The first one he disposes of very quickly. His Jesuit opponent, Andrada, had argued that “Scripture affirms that with God nothing is impossible. Therefore transubstantiation is to be believed even though it far transcends the powers and manner of nature and human comprehension” (Ex 2, 257). Chemnitz’s answer is curt, “We ought not, just because God is almighty, attribute to Him whatever seems good to us, without the testimony of His Word . . . Scripture teaches this rule: ‘He does whatever He pleases (Ps. 115:3).’ In matters of faith, however, the will of God must be learned and judged from His Word. And when there is certainty about the will of God from His Word, then the argument from His omnipotence is valid” (Ex 2, 257).
- 145 The second argument, which Chemnitz agrees “gets closer to the matter itself” (Ex 2, 257), begins with the assertion that Christ took ordinary bread and wine, but “after the blessing,” “He says of that bread and wine: ‘This is my body; this is my blood’ “ (Ex 2, 257). One cannot say nor believe that about common bread and wine. Hence, “some change must have come about through the blessing, and that change is such that one can say of that bread that it is Christ’s body and of the wine that it is His blood. Therefore it is necessary to assert transubstantiation” (Ex 2, 257).

146 Chemnitz answers in the terms of Irenaeus, “I answer: We grant with Irenaeus that after the blessing in the Eucharist the bread is no longer common bread but the Eucharist of the body of Christ which now consists of two things — the earthly, that is, the bread and the wine, and the heavenly, that is, the body and blood of Christ.” Chemnitz agrees that this is a “divine change,” but he will not grant that “therefore transubstantiation takes place” (Ex 2, 258). This “change” can occur so that it is true as Irenaeus held, that the Eucharist consists of two things — an earthly and a heavenly one. “The presence, offering and receiving of His body and blood can be taught, believed, and held even if the monstrosity of transubstantiation is not foisted upon the churches without the testimony of Scripture and without the consensus of antiquity” (Ex 2, 258).

147 All this leads to the third argument which, as Chemnitz says, is the crowning one, namely, that “they themselves confess that if transubstantiation is not proved certainly and clearly by this, it cannot be proved from Scripture” (Ex 2, 258). The argument “runs as follows”:

1. If in the Eucharist the substance of bread and wine remain together with the body and blood of Christ, He would have said, “This is bread; this is wine; and with them, in them, or under them my body and blood.”
2. But what He does say is, “This is my body; this is my blood.”
3. If “this” (*touto*) denotes the substance of the bread and the wine (because bread and the body of Christ and wine and blood, are two different things), then the one cannot be predicated of the other.
4. “Therefore, in order that the declaration, ‘This is my body; this is my blood’ may be true, there must be posited in these words an *identical proposition*, which is the term one uses when the subject and predicate speak about one and the same thing so that the demonstrative pronoun [“this”] denotes not the substance of bread but the substance of the body of Christ only. But such a positing cannot stand unless the substance of the bread which Christ took into His hands has ceased to exist, having been annihilated through the benediction, and has been transubstantiated, so that nothing else is meant and indicated there by the little word ‘this’ than the substance of the body of Christ only” (Ex 2, 259; emphasis added).

148 In other words, Christ said, “This [body] is my body.” But Chemnitz has demonstrated exegetically that *touto* refers to the earthly elements (see p. 45 ff.). Paralleling this, he has also demonstrated against the Sacramentarians, that “is” explains what is present and

distributed, and that “body” must refer to the true body of Christ which He was about to offer on the cross (par. 124 f.). In effect, for philosophical reasons the Romanists would not take the *touto* literally and the Reformed would not accept “body” literally, but must assert a metonymic figure of speech. The situation is, as Luther said in *The Great Confession*, “The Sophists have retained the body and let the bread go, saying that the bread disappears and sheds its substance when the Words of Institution are spoken, and the word ‘this’ indicates not the bread, but the body of Christ, since the text says, ‘This is my body.’ Wycliffe, on the contrary, opposes this and retains the bread, rejecting the body, and says the word ‘this’ indicates the bread and not the body” (LW 37, 295). Chemnitz agrees with Luther’s judgment, “In the words of the Supper, since the body of Christ can be predicated of the bread, the Papalists in the subject devise a transubstantiation of the bread; the Sacramentarians in place of the substance of the body of Christ substitute in the predicate either a symbol of the absent body or something efficacious which is separate from the substance, which is not present where the bread is” (LS 54). For both groups the finite is incapable of the infinite. In view of these divergences, one must look more closely at their escape hatches.

- 149 The Romanists fell back on the schoolmen’s category of “identical predication” (see p. 55). As he begins his examination of this topic, Chemnitz is thoughtful and does not immediately condemn out of hand Aristotle in every respect, but speaks respect fully of the “rules of praise-worthy men” (Ex 2, 259). He does, however, insist that the answer to the question of what is present and received “should not be handed over to the schools in such a way that the answer is given and defined only according to the rules, precepts, or preconceptions of grammarians, dialecticians, rhetoricians, or some profession of this type as to what kind of predication this is and who should judge it” (LS 46). Rather, Chemnitz is guided by the hermeneutical principle that “divine mysteries can [not] be made subject to the rules of human sciences” (LS 46; see also p. 21f.). Writing specifically against the Tridentine decrees, he declares that “because the sacrament is something supernatural, heavenly, and divine, therefore it is not right that faith in it is measured by the Papalists in this debate according to the rule of Aristotle, *Metaphysics VI*, concerning the place

in the sentence of the last member of the affirmative proposition which they interpret of an identical proposition" (Ex 2,259). Instead, for Chemnitz "the simplest, safest, and surest way is this that the answer and definition of this question be sought in and judged by the clear teaching of the Word of God regarding this mystery and by the examples which are in agreement with this clear teaching" (LS 46 f.). In *The Babylonian Captivity* (1520) Luther had put it somewhat more sharply, "What does it matter if philosophy cannot fathom this? The Holy Spirit is greater than Aristotle" (LW 36, 34).

150 Apparently the medieval schoolmen had taught that Aristotle held that the subject and predicate must be identical and that "is" means to be equal in meaning. This is the way the Papists understood the proposition, and also Zwingli, who had written, "The expression 'this is bread, and moreover it is my body,' has absolutely no support either in God's Word or in philosophy, for two substances cannot be one thing."³³ There can hardly be any question that Aristotle held that the subject and predicate can be identical, that "Tully is Cicero," to employ the common schoolbook example. And certainly he would not have disagreed with Luther when he said that "it is undeniably true that two diverse substances cannot be one substance. For example, an ass cannot be an ox" (LW 37, 295). But it certainly is not true that *all* subject-predicate statements are really identity statements.³⁴ The modern General Semanticists of forty years ago stoutly maintained that Aristotle did, and hence in opposition they called their own system "non-Aristotelian."³⁵

151 Chemnitz in *The Lord's Supper*, says that "Dialecticians have descriptive terms which they call the regular or proper type — those that are in agreement with one of the five modes of predication." It is difficult for one not really qualified to deal with Aristotle or the medieval interpretations of Aristotle to state exactly what Chemnitz is here referring to. Whatever they are, Chemnitz, at any rate acknowledges that "Scripture is replete with examples of these" (LS 47).³⁶

152 But Chemnitz disagrees with those who "argue with great subtlety that we have instances of regular and proper predication when we say of Christ: 'This man is God' or 'The dove John the Baptist saw is the Holy Spirit'" (LS 47). Those who argue in this way use as an example "That it can regularly and properly be predicated of the minotaur: 'This man is a bull'" (LS 47).

- 153 The reason that these expressions do not conform to the regular modes of predication (see p. 57) is that

they refer to the union of two entities. These statements must be understood in this sense: "This man is not only a man but also at the same time God," for the deity and the humanity have been united into one hypotasis. Likewise: "That dove was not only a dove but at the same time the Holy Spirit was also present" united to the dove by a very special mode of presence. Therefore these cannot be called instances of regular or ordinary predication. Thus we correctly state and admit that the regular type of predication does not agree with the modes used of exalted things, when we say regarding the bread of the Supper: "This is the body of Christ." For according to the ordinary rules of predication an entirely false meaning would follow, namely, that it was not the true substance of the human nature which was given for us but only a mass of dough bread baked in the oven. (LS 47).

- 154 To establish the point that Scripture employs "its own special kind of predication" (LS 51), Chemnitz must adduce the evidence. And he does find many examples in Scripture. His thesis is that

in Scripture, when two things or substances are by divine decree joined together in a particular manner, and especially when a heavenly and invisible substance is present and offered together with one that is earthly and visible, then, I say, it is customary in Scripture that the one is predicated of the other. And for the truth of such a predication no annihilation or transubstantiation of the other substance is necessary but only the union and presence of both of these things which are denoted by the subject and predicate is signified. (Ex 2, 259).³⁷

- 157 Chemnitz, following Luther (LW 37, 297 f.), demonstrates the truth of his thesis with the example of the Personal Union, "When Scripture wishes to unfold the union of the divine and human nature in the person of Christ, it does not say, 'this man is God,' but 'God is man' and 'the Son of man is the Son of the living God'" (Ex 2, 260). Chemnitz notes that generally the perceptible thing is put in the subject position and the other entity in the predicate position, and that "Scripture joins these two different entities together through the use of the copulative verb 'is' (*est*), which means nothing else than that there is a *union* or *communion* of these two entities" (LS 51; emphasis added).

- 156 While Chemnitz has noticed that among the "Latins and the more polished authors" this mode of predication is not frequently used, yet "this mode of predication is very common in popular language, as when we say of a vessel which is on display, 'This is wine,'

or of a bag, 'Look, you have money'" (LS 51). And he is very modern and precise when he notes that the "dialecticians do teach that when two different things are mutually predicated of one another, out of necessity from the proper and natural meaning of the words, one must be made into the subject and the other into the attributive or predicate" (LS 51). He is sensitive to the fact that the contrast between subject and predicate is a contrast between that part of a sentence which serves to identify what is being discussed and that part which seems to describe or characterize the thing so identified and that one cannot put the subject-predicate relations into any kind of epistemological straitjacket. This fact may also be why, according to the *Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, some linguists have proposed as substitutes for the traditional terms "subject" and "predicate" the more general terms of "topic" and "comment."³⁸ The bread in the sacrament is the topic, and Christ, the very Son of God in His last will and testament, has said that this bread is His body. What the predicate (comment) of the Savior says with regard to the subject (the topic) is sufficient for Chemnitz to establish the doctrine which he wants to believe. Not only Chemnitz but also Luther arrived at the same conviction as modern linguistic scholars do. Luther would not accept the Sacramentarian contention that "bread must be bread and cannot be body" (LW 37, 297). He answers, "You should reply: It is not contrary to Scripture, indeed it is not even contrary to reason or true logic. They only imagine it is contrary to Scripture, reason, and logic, for they do not see these in their proper relation to one another" (LW 37, 297).

157 Chemnitz has an enormous amount of Scriptural material in his arsenal to prove his point that Scripture employs a special mode of predication because it is speaking of the infinite God, revealing and presenting Himself in the finite world. He pretty much covers the same ground of material, both in *The Examination* and in *The Lord's Supper* (Ex. 2, 260 f.; LS 50 f.). An examination of some of these examples shows how Chemnitz regards in the Lord's Supper. He takes a striking example from the Old Testament, "When the Ark was lifted up in Num. 10:35–36, Moses said: 'Rise up O Lord, and let your enemies be scattered, and when it was set down he said 'Return, O Lord, to the multitude of Israel.' That is to say, God had promised his presence with the Ark by the means of a special kind of grace

(cf. Ex. 25:22; 1 Kings 8:1–11)” (LS 52). In *The Examination*, Chemnitz adds a further explanatory note to this incident. “There was no need for a transubstantiation of the wood or gold in the Ark. Rather, Scripture speaks thus because these men were certain of a *particular mode of the divine presence* from His Word and promise” (Ex 2, 260; emphasis added).

153 Other striking examples of this kind of predication include the dove descending at the baptism of Jesus. John the Baptist “asserts that through the dove he saw the Holy Spirit descending (John 1:32; Luke 3:22)” (LS 52). Chemnitz gives another case “Christ with His external breath breathed on the faces of the Apostles (John 20:22). As a result of this breathing, *which was perceptible to the senses* and which the Apostles received, Christ then proclaimed: ‘Receive the Holy Spirit’” (LS 52; emphasis added). And of course, Chemnitz cites examples of the personal union of the two natures in one person Christ, “The Child is called ‘the everlasting Father’ in Is. 9:6. ‘The Son of Man is the Son of the living God’ (Matt. 16:16). ‘The Word was made flesh’ (John 1:14), that is, by taking on the seed of Abraham (d. Heb. 2:16)” (LS 52 f.).

159 In this frame of reference Chemnitz asserts the particular doctrine of the Lutherans that the Sacramental Word has in it the complete power of God Himself:

Similar to predications of this kind are also these: “The washing of water in the Word” (Eph. 5:26) is the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Spirit, in the sense that the Holy Spirit is present in this act [baptism], and through this means He is given to us, works among us, and gives the seal of regeneration. The Gospel which is proclaimed with our mouths is the power of God unto salvation, in the sense that Christ, who is the power of God (1 Cor. 1:24), is present in this means and instrument (Matt. 28:18, 20), and through this means He shows and exercises His power (LS 53).

160 Chemnitz then reiterates that in speaking, for example, of the union of the Spirit and the dove, he does not mean a “hypostatic or inseparable union, or a local inclusion, or a mixture of substances, or some physical or crass union.” Rather, “in an invisible, heavenly manner, which is impossible for us to understand, we believe that the dove and the Holy Spirit are truly and substantially joined together *for this occasion*” (LS 54; emphasis added). This example is “exactly parallel to the predication by which in the Words of Insti-

tution the body of Christ is predicated of the bread in the Supper and the blood of Christ is predicated in the wine" (LS 54).

161 Chemnitz concurs with Luther who "calls this method of predication synecdoche in his *Contra Carlstadium*, p. 49,³⁹ and in his *Maior Confessio*, p. 222."⁴⁰ He, however, recognizes that here Luther's use of the term is not the customary use of the rhetoricians. What Luther calls "synecdoche is the union of two things which are understood as being present and distributed at the same time, one of which is predicated of the other, either as part of the part, as when the dove is the Spirit, or as part of the whole, as when Adam says of Eve: 'This is my flesh and bone' (Gen. 2:23)" (LS 55). He also recognizes that other terms have been *used* such as "sacramental predication," because of the sacramental union, or an "irregular predication" because it does not fit the usual rules of predication. Chemnitz cuts through this maze of terminology by concluding that "it does not matter by what name it is called as long as we correctly understand the method of predication and as long as the heart of the matter as it is taught in Scripture remains unimpaired" (LS 55).

162 Although the Sacramentarians agree with the Romanists that the finite is incapable of the infinite, they do disagree that in the Supper the bread has been annihilated so that the subject-term "bread" is equivalent to "body." To maintain "identical predication" in the Verba they must find the predicate-term to mean "bread." In view of this it is necessary for Chemnitz to examine the dialecticians' descriptive terms, "figures of speech or tropes" (LS 47).

163 The term "trope" is less frequently employed in modern literary discussions than it was years ago when the fine distinctions of the rhetoricians were still observed. Today the expression "figure of speech" is more currently used to refer to language which departs from its literal meaning. "Trope," however is a useful word to designate an intentional departure from the normal meaning of words, since the term literally means "a turn"; that is, what is involved is a change of sense. Contemporary literary criticism also employs the term "imagery" in a broad sense to designate tropes or figures of speech. Both the ancients and the moderns are aware of the tremendous inner resources of language to express a wide range of ideas, complex thoughts and feelings that are subtle or precise and which cannot be expressed in any other way than through the use of tropes.

- 164 Since the Lord made known His will to men in human language, one would naturally expect Scripture to make use of all the resources that are inherent in language. And it does. Therefore the perceptive, critical reader of the Bible is aware not only of denotations and connotations, but also of figurative language in which there is an intentional departure from normal constructions and meanings of words. One finds in Scripture the usual tropes: metaphor, metonymy, simile, personification, even allegory. Chemnitz is acutely aware of this, for he readily agrees that “there is no doubt that many of these [i.e., figures of speech or “tropes”] are found in Scripture” (LS 47). As an example, he quotes the traditional one, the Savior’s use of metaphor, “Herod is a fox” [Luke 13:31–32] (LS 47).
- 165 Chemnitz also knows that the use of analogy can be less precise and may possibly even lead to a misunderstanding of what is written. He cites a case where such a misunderstanding arose when Cicero used words metonymic ally both in the subject and predicate terms. Cicero had written to *Piso*, “Arms shall surrender to the toga.” *Piso* had understood Cicero to say that “imperial power is going to yield to your toga.” To clear up this misapprehension Cicero replied, “I did not say this toga that I am wearing, nor the arms, shield, and sword of this emperor, but the toga is a symbol of peace and quiet and on the other hand, following the example of the poets, we use the word ‘arms’ as a symbol of tumult and war. I wanted this to be understood that war and tumult would give way to peace and rest” (LS 48 f). Since symbolic language can be misunderstood so that an entirely different meaning can be derived from it, Chemnitz knows that one does not depart from the normal meaning unless there are cogent reasons for it. Seeking to understand the written word, and especially the revealed Scripture, is serious business. Hence Chemnitz is amazed that there are Calvinists “who want to appear learned . . . [who] boldly assert (as if they were dealing with a very minor matter) that in the Words of Institution when we predicate concerning the bread of the Supper that is the body of Christ, we are using the common figure of speech called metonymy, in which by the use of a symbolic word a name is given to the thing designated” (LS 48).
- 166 On principle Chemnitz rejects the discarding of the specific exact meaning of the individual words in Christ’s Words of Institution of

the Supper. They are His last will and testament, where it is a hermeneutical principle that applies even in the reading of human wills that “we should give careful thought that we do not thrust anything upon these words” (LS 27; see p. 19 f.). In language of this kind, the denotation of the words is everything. To cling to this rule is even more important when the eternal Son of God in a solemn moment bestows His testament upon His church.

- 167 It is further evident that in every case one must look at the context to determine the exact sense of the speaker’s words. Besides the immediate context there is the wider context of God’s entire revelation, which confirms the fact that we must take the Verba literally “Even in glory He [the Son of God] repeated these words to Paul thereby showing it was His will that this be the giving of a new and special dogma that should remain in the church to the end of time” (LS 26 f.). In addition, Paul’s inspired words which serve as a commentary on the Verba (1 Cor. 10 and 11) demonstrate that the words of Christ are to be taken in their simple, literal sense. To depart from this sense would not be an “innocent lapse,” because that would involve one in eating to his own judgment and becoming guilty of the body of Christ (LS 28).
- 168 Besides these fundamental objections to finding tropes in the Verba Chemnitz points out that there are some common-sense reasons that militate against such an interpretation. For example, metonymy “is not used for any kind of complete statement” but only in “the case of a change of one of the words and there is no metonymy in the copula or verb of the statement, but it is only in either the subject or predicate or in both at the same time” (LS 48). Cicero could have written, “Arms shall surrender to peace,” or “War shall surrender to the toga,” or what he actually wrote, “Arms shall surrender to the toga,” but there can’t be a metaphorical meaning in “surrender.” It is impossible to make every part of the sentence metonymical.
- 169 At times some, to attempt to prove that Christ’s words “body and blood” are to be taken metaphorically, have taken recourse to explanations from parables (“the field is the world” [Matt.13:38]), visions (“these bones are the whole house of Israel” [Ezek. 37:11]), and the “interpretation of dreams” (“the seven cows are the seven years” [Gen. 41:26]) (LS 49). Chemnitz is sensitive to the fact that a parable is different from an historical fact or an anecdote. Parables

are in a way allegories, and as such they represent a self-contained world. They have their own structure within a larger structure. They depict objects, persons, and actions in a narrative. They carry a second meaning along with the surface story, a meaning of religious or moral significance. For this reason the words with which they express the content of the narrative cannot be transferred directly into historical situations. Chemnitz rejects these interpretations of the adversaries because “in the words of the Supper there is neither a story, a parable, or a vision, the explanation of which lies in the words: ‘This is my body.’ . . . Certainly the things which Christ performed in His Supper were not done in a dream, as if we can interpret the words: ‘This is my body’ as some kind of dream” (LS 49).

170 The papalists, having devised a transubstantiation of the bread, took a slightly different tack to find support for their theory. They went to Exodus 4 and 7, where the staff was changed into a serpent, and to John 2, where the water was turned to wine. But this is unacceptable to Chemnitz because in Exodus “it is written that a rod changed into or became a serpent; that water is made wine (cf. John 4: 46: ‘He made the water wine.’). But the words of the Supper do not speak of the bread and the wine in this way” (LS 50). In *The Examination* he is more explicit, ‘Scripture openly testifies in express words that these things [rod, earth, bone, water] have been changed and turned into something else, so that neither the substance nor the prior form remain, but that they bear the appearance of those things into which Scripture says they were changed” (Ex. 2, 263). Such examples are ruled out by 1 Cor. 10:16. Chemnitz says that “Paul very clearly and definitely shows that he is speaking about that communion of the body and blood of Christ which takes place in the Lord’s Supper” (LS 138).

171 For Chemnitz, Scripture must interpret Scripture. All dogmas of the church have their own foundation in certain passages of Scripture, and the meaning of these doctrines is to be developed on the basis of these passages (LS 31; see p. 18). If someone, on the basis of a specific text, presents a different doctrine from what Chemnitz considers Scripture has clearly presented, he is willing to examine the argument of the opponent. A case in point is his examination of Acts 3:21, “Whom the heaven must receive” (KJV; *hon dei oura-*

non dexasthai). He declares that the adversaries “do not hesitate to change the statement of Peter . . . by a manifest corruption in translation to mean that he had to be kept in heaven, contained, laid hold of, closed in until the day of judgment” (LS 216 f.).⁴¹ This would then mean that the body of Christ could not be in the Supper “although it has His express words concerning the presence of His body and blood” (LS 217).

172 In answer, Chemnitz first quotes Calvin himself that “it [Acts 3:21] is an ambiguous passage because we can understand both that Christ was taken by heaven and that he took heaven. Therefore let us not urge a word of dubious meaning” (LS 217). Since for Chemnitz the clear Bible texts are the analogy of Scripture, Chemnitz carefully examines the immediate context of Acts 3:21. He answers:

The sequence and context of the entire speech demonstrate what the meaning of this passage in Acts 3:21 actually is. Peter is here making the point of his entire oration, namely, that the heavenly Father has adorned that Jesus who was crucified out of weakness 2 Cor. 13:41 with the highest and most incomprehensible glory and power, which He has demonstrated to some degree in the miracle of the restoration of the lame man. And by this argument he is encouraging those who denied and killed Christ that they should repent of that sin, lest they experience His vengeance. But at the same time He is showing by this very argument what those who believe can expect from that glory and power of Christ. However, because the objection can be raised that Christ did not exercise that glory and power of His in person, either in the face of His enemies or for the sake of those who believed in Him, Peter replies that Christ has received heaven itself. Moreover, there is a common Scriptural expression that God Himself is described as inhabiting the heavens, not in the sense that He is locked up there so that He cannot be on earth also, but in the sense that in the heavens He manifests Himself and His majesty and power more clearly and gloriously. For He shows that in heaven He is not to be known through means, but He reveals the quality of His majesty, glory, and power face to face for us to look at, and there He communicates His benefits without means, but He Himself fills all things with His blessing, so that there is no misery, no weakness, no confusion, no cause for sin there. . . . It is absolutely certain that this is what Scripture wants to say when it attributes to God that He dwells and has His habitation in heaven. And Peter is using this language when he describes the reign of Christ. (LS 217 f.)

Chemnitz understands this text to demonstrate also the repetitive presence of Christ’s human nature because of the personal union of the two natures in the one person, Jesus Christ.⁴²

- 173 Chemnitz then goes beyond the immediate context of the passage to the more distant, Scripture as a whole. Since Christ has now been exalted beyond all limitations, “Therefore what Peter says, that it is necessary for Christ to receive heaven until the time of the restitution, is exactly the same as what David says: ‘Sit at my right hand until I make your enemies your footstool’ [Psalm 110:1], and what St. Paul says in 1 Cor. 15:25,26: ‘He must reign until . . . the last enemy namely death is destroyed’” (LS 218). Once again, it is certain that the doctrine of the Real Presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Sacrament does not conflict with any part of Scripture or article of faith. The glorified “Christ can be present with His body wherever He wills and do whatever He wills” (Ex 2,223).
- 174 None of the texts speaking of Christ’s departure from the world can destroy the doctrine of the Lord’s Supper as Christ gave it in the Words of Institution. Such passages as Matt. 26:11 (“The poor you have always with you, but me you do not have always”) and John 113:33, spoken after the institution (“Little children, I am still with you for a little while”), cannot negate the words of the first institution, because Christ was still with them in His circumscribed presence when He instituted the Supper. Chemnitz there fore puts a direct question to the adversaries, “Now I ask of our adversaries whether they concede that the Words of Institution in that first Supper had and retained their proper and natural meaning?” (LS 225; emphasis added).
- 175 Chemnitz supplies the answer which they must give in view of their rejection of the sacramental union and, more particularly, of their rejection of the *communicatio majestatis*, “I know they will answer no. For it would be absolutely absurd to imagine that there is now a different meaning and interpretation for the words of Christ’s last will and testament, as far as its substance is concerned than there was for the first observance of it. For there is nothing different which is offered and received in the Lord’s Supper now than the Apostles received at that first celebration” (LS 225).⁴³
- 176 Chemnitz has now demonstrated exegetically that the sacramental union of the body and blood of Christ with the bread and the wine obtains in the Lord’s Supper as Christ instituted it in the Upper Room. The question however remains whether the church (more specifically, the Lutheran Church) today can be certain that it has the *same Supper* which the Lord instituted. This is an episte-

mological question that will rise for every serious minded disciple of Christ. *How* does one know that he has the same Supper today that Christ instituted in the night on which He was betrayed? The answer to that question separated the Lutherans from the Sacramentarians 450 years ago, as will become evident in the next chapter on the consecration.

Notes 13–43, Chapter IV

13. These periodic examinations of the pastors must have been rather stringent, for there are 333 questions for them to answer. In addition, as the translator, Pastor Luther Poellot notes, the examinations were required “twice a year (*bis quotannis*)” (MWS, inside frontispiece).
14. For a more detailed analysis compare Chapter III (“Possibile-Necessarium”) of Hardt’s *Venerabilis and Adorabilis Eucharistia* (see endnote #1), pp. 75–115. Here he carefully investigates the positions of Luther, Melanchthon, Brenz, Andreae, and Chemnitz. This aspect of the relation of Christology to the doctrine of the Lord’s Supper has been generally neglected among modern Lutherans, including conservative Lutherans, with the result that the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Supper tends to evaporate into a general omnipresence.
15. Pres. J. A. O. Preus has possibly been somewhat misled by some secondary sources when he writes that “Chemnitz was not a man who went about delving into impenetrable and labyrinthian arguments. This is probably best shown in his handling of the ubiquity question. Luther had strongly contended for the doctrine of ubiquity, that the doctrine of the Real Presence is proven by the fact that Christ, also according to His human nature, is everywhere present. Chemnitz rather takes the position that we are to accept His presence in the Lord’s Supper because in the Words of Institution He said that He was present” (“Martin Chemnitz and the Lord’s Supper,” – *Evangelium– Gospel*, published by the German Lutheran Hour, Post Office Box 103546, 2800 Bremen 1/West Germany, #6, December 1979, p. 146). It should be noted that not only Chemnitz but Luther, too, refused to delve into impenetrable secrets not revealed to us in the Scriptural Revelation. In addition to the material in p. 30, one should note that it was not mere sloganism when in 1529 at Marburg Luther wrote on the table before him the words, “This is my Body” before covering the table with a velvet cloth (LW 38,66). He wanted a constant reminder before him not to move from the clear Scripture text. Luther’s sacramental theology as well as his Christology is drawn from the clear texts of Scripture. Also at Marburg he enunciated the truth that every article of faith is a principle in itself and does not need to be proved by another article (LW 38,51f.; this translation is Sasse’s more exact translation in *This is My Body*, rev. ed., Adelaide, S.A., Lutheran Publishing House, 1977, p. 210).
16. For a detailed examination of the Formula’s Article VIII on the Person of Christ, see my article in *A Contemporary Look at the Formula of Concord*, edited by Robert D. Preus and Wilbert H. Rosin, St. Louis: CPH, 1978, pp. 232–252.
17. Weil aber diese Obiection droben/Cap. 3. notdurfftig widerlegt/Wollen wir hie mit wenig Worten antworten: Das wir von Mittheilung der Gottlichen Eygenschaft ten zu befürchten: Dann der Sohn Gottes/der solche Lehre von Mittheilung der Gottlichen Gewalt/lebendigmachenden Krafft/und was dergleiche mehr sind/geoffenbaret/und in seinem unfehlbaren Wort ausgesprochen hat/der wird dich die Weise wol wissen wie

solche Mittheilung/ohne Zertrennung der Eygenschrafft/en geschehen konne/Dem wirs auch befehlen/und in solchem Geheimniiss ausserhalb seines Worts/mit unser Vernunft nichts dichten oder griebeln sollen (Ap FC, 81a).

18. Schaff in *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge III*, 57. Schlink takes the position that in the Formula of Concord, with respect to Brenz's absolute omnipresence of Christ as the only mode of His presence besides the circumscriptive, a compromise was necessary, since Chemnitz taught only a multivolipresence (or a multipresence), "We are faced with a compromise in which neither Chemnitz nor Brenz has his way" (*Theology of the Lutheran Confessions*, Philadelphia: Muehlenberg, 1961, note 25, p. 189).
19. See also LW 37, 65 f., where in *That These Words*, etc. (1527), Luther analyzes these modes of presence.
20. It will be noted that President Preus has translated *en logoo* with the expression "in a sense." I am not entirely sure why he has (possibly because of the lack of the article *too?*). But it seems to me that the phrase would be more accurately translated, "He has all creatures present with Him *in the Word*." Throughout the entire TNC Chemnitz sets forth the thesis that after the Incarnation the Person of the Logos is never outside the human nature, and the assumed human nature is never outside the Logos. Further, a few pages later (463) President Preus has translated *logos* (without the article) in this way, "But just as the human nature subsists *in the Logos*" (emphasis added). The point is worthy of investigation, since some have held that Chemnitz did not teach a general omnipresence of Christ's human nature (see note 18).
21. Schlink, 189 (see note 18). Pieper (*Christian Dogmatics*, St. Louis: CPH, 1951, II, 195–205) and Hardt (*Venerabilis*, etc., III–115) have dealt most thoroughly with this charge, ably refuting it with solid evidence. Hardt traces the popularization of this viewpoint to Seeberg, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichten*, and Ritschl, *Dogmengeschichte des Protestantismus*, Hardt III, note 72.
22. See Pieper, II, 199.
23. In the *Histori des Sacramentstreit*, Chemnitz, Kirchner, and Selnecker quote and summarize from Luther's 1527 polemic against Zwingli, *That These Words of Christ*, "This is My Body," etc., *Still Stand Firm Against the Fanatics* (LW 37, 3–150). They explain that Luther attached such a long title to the writing just because the word of the Son of God clearly says that the consecrated bread and wine in the Supper are His body and blood (HS 113).
24. Vilmos Vajta (*Luther on Worship*; see note #1) says that "Luther defines the presence of God in a twofold sense. First, he speaks of God's omnipresence and second of His presence in the incarnate Christ, in the church, and the service. These two modes of His presence must be kept carefully apart" (85). Such a paradigm imposed on the Scriptural material will not do justice to all the Scriptural evidence which Luther and Chemnitz have pulled together for their systematic presentation of the Real Presence. Vajta makes the general omnipresence of Christ ("God's omnipresence is shared by Christ" – p. 86) the basis for the sacramental presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper, "Christ is in the elements long before they are placed on the altar" (95), "The Real Presence rests on God's presence in all His works" (96).
Luther and Chemnitz sharply distinguish between the repletive presence and the definitive presence of Christ's body and blood in the consecrated elements (see p. 44 f.).
For a thorough-going analysis of Vajta's viewpoint together with his misrepresentation of Luther's understanding of the limits of the natural knowledge of God, see Hardt (note #1), pp. 81–89.
25. Luther understands the *Koinonia* of 1 Cor. 10:16 as "the common possession in which all

share," "the body of Christ as a common possession distributed among many for them to partake" (LW 37, 353). Similarly, Chemnitz understands the term to mean a close, intimate union, "On account of the communion of the bread and the body of Christ, Paul also spoke of the distribution and reception of this bread as the distribution and participation in the body of Christ" (LS 56). Chemnitz establishes the meaning of "communion" in 1 Cor. 10:16 from the Verba, which call the bread the body of Christ, "Therefore the passage in 1 Cor. 10 must be interpreted, understood and judged on the basis of the Words of Institution and not vice versa" (LS 139).

26. Sie werffen auch dem Christlichen Concordibuch für/es bleibe selbst nicht bey den Worten der Einsetzung/darauff es doch so hart dringet/dann es lehre ja das Christi Leib im Brot oder mit dem Brot ausgetheilet werde/welches in den Worten der Einsetzung nicht also stehet (Ap FC 152).
27. Aber das Concordi Buch behelt beyde Art zu reden Nemlich: Das Brot sey der Leib Christi/ und im Brot oder mit dem Brot sey Christi Leib gegenwertig/und werde ausgetheilet/darumb dass das Brot umb der Sacramentlichen Einigkeit Willen Christi Leib genennet wird/oder der Leib Christi mit Dem Brotlin dem Brot/oder durch das Brot gegenwertig und warhafftig ausgeteilet wird. Umbwelcher Einigkeit Willen D. Lutherus auch in seinem grossen Bekenntnis diese Art zu reden *Synecdochen* genennet hat/dieweil nemlich im Sacrament diese zwey Ding/Brot und der Leib Christi mit einander auff ubernatiirliche Weis vereinigt/und mit einander im Abendmal gegenwertig und ausgetheilet werden (Ap FC 152).
28. Wann man aber von der gantzen Proposition/Das Brot is der Leib Christi fraget oder handelt/weil keine Verwandlung da geschicht/sondern ein jedes in seinem Wesen unverruckt bleibet/Brot und der Leib Christi/und doch Sacramentlich/wiemans nennet/oder nach den Worten der Einsatzung mit einander ubernatiirlecher Weise vereinigt sind/so wird recht geantwortet/das diese Art zu reden könne *sacramenta lis, singularis, inusitata*, oder wie Lutherus redet *synecdochia* geheissen werden. Nicht das *Continens pro absente contento* da gebraucht: sondern umb der Vereinigung der Zweyen Ding Willen/welcher eines irrdisch ist/als das Brot/das ander aber Himlisch/als der ware gegenwertige Leib Christi/welche/wie oft *repetieret/sacramentaliter* im Abendmal mit einander vereinigt sind (Ap FC 152b).
29. Thun derwegen dem Concordi Buch öffentlich unrecht/da sie es beschaldigen/als solt es selbst von dem naturlichen Verst and der Wort des Testaments Christi abtreten (Ap FC 152).
30. The Solid Declaration has here taken over from Chemnitz's *The Lord's Supper* (p. 153) the material in SD VII, 35 f., including the names of the "ancient teachers" which Chemnitz has minted from his research.
31. A perhaps typical feeling of apprehension over the word "change" and efforts to escape its significance is that of Pres. Armin Schuetze (*Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly*, January 1981, 71f.). He first suggests that Melancthon "ignores the reference to the body and blood being present 'after the consecration lawfully made,'" by which the Confutators of the Augsburg Confession stated in general that they approved of Article X of the Augsburg Confession. Prof. Schuetze takes the position that Luther and his fellow theologians would not accept the position that the body and blood of Christ are present before the actual distribution. Pres. Schuetze then assumes that Melancthon, in giving evidence from the Greek Church and the Medieval Church, seeks to show with the expressions "changed" and "truly changes" that the doctrine of the Lutherans is not different from the Ancient Church, but that Melancthon and his fellow confessors chose not to take issue with the concept

of transubstantiation at that point. The problem with that interpretation of Ap X, 2, is that it was well known that Luther and others had years before rejected the philosophical explanation of transubstantiation, but took no offense at the word “change” when used in the context quoted by Melancthon. As will be seen, Chemnitz takes a more precise, scholarly view of the situation, and hence does not give up the use of the “change” when employed in the sense of the Early Church.

32. Prof. Lowell Green, examining early Lutheran liturgies (1533–1559), noted that “the consecrated host and chalice are always called the *Body* and *Blood* in the distribution or manducation” (*A Contemporary Look at the Formula of Concord*, edited by Robert D. Preus and Wilbert Rosin, St. Louis: CPH, 1978, 304). From the Chemnitz references already here adduced, it is obvious that Chemnitz would agree perfectly with the liturgies. Green proceeds to show that “in the liturgical forms for Holy Communion used by Lutheran Churches in America it is generally stated that the pastor shall distribute *bread* and *wine*.” Prof. Green calls this “a Reformed practice . . . also retained in the rubrics of the various orders proposed by the Inter-Lutheran Commission on Worship” (p. 304). As will be seen from the material in this chapter and the succeeding one on consecration, Chemnitz would agree with Prof. Green’s judgment. Unfortunately, Prof. John C. Jeske of the Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary, in reviewing the volume and zeroing in on Prof. Green’s essay on Article VII, takes exception to the historical evidence that Prof. Green produced. He writes, “The writer of that chapter [i.e., Prof. Green] also shows a preoccupation with setting the exact moment in the celebration of the Lord’s Supper when the body of Christ is present. He speaks of ‘Luther’s position . . . with its emphasis that the bread is the body of Christ from the consecration onward . . .’ (205). Luther, however, showed no such preoccupation” (*Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly*, April 1979, 169). But Prof. Jeske produces no historical evidence to negate the evidence set forth by Prof. Green.
33. LW 37,295, note #223, where the statement is translated from Zwingli’s *Friendly Rejoinder*, found in CR 92, 779, and in Luther’s Works, St. Louis edition, 20, 1111.
34. See Alfred Korzybski, *Science and Sanity* (1933); Stuart Chase, *The Tyranny of Words* (1938), and *The Power of Words* (1953); S. I. Hayakawa, *Language in Action* (1939), and its revision, *Language in Thought and Action* (1949 and 1964). The use of the word “is” was their great bugaboo against which they inveighed. Hayakawa recommended that writers use “is” only “as an auxiliary verb (‘he is coming’)” (*Language in Thought and Action*, 315). If Shakespeare had been aware of that advice, one wonders what would have happened to his great soliloquy, “To be, or not to be.” One also wonders whether Hayakawa (formerly a senator from California) really ever seriously followed his own advice. Just recently he twice used “is” (“are”) in the general sense of characterizing a thing which he had identified in the subject. Conservative Reagan supporters were unhappy over the vague language of the Washington-Peking joint communique (Shanghai II) on our Taiwan policy. It was so vague that one could read it as the Chinese do that we have shifted our policy, or as Presidential Counselor Edwin Meese contended, we had made no real concessions to Peking. *Time* remarked, “as the noted semanticist and conservative Republican Senator S. I. Hayakawa pointed out, more in admiration than frustration: ‘The wonderful thing about language is its ability to mean whatever you want it to mean. There are enough ambiguities in the agreement so that no one should be seriously offended’” (*Time*, 8/30/82, p. 21; emphasis added).
35. Apparently the only professional philosopher who has deigned to analyze these general semanticists is Professor Max Black. In dismissing this claim that Aristotle taught that all subject-predicate statements are identity statements, he uses such words as “absurd” and “stupid”:

What Aristotle is alleged to have believed and taught is that such statements as “Water is wet” and “Dewey is a philosopher” mean that water is *identical* with wetness, and Dewey is *identical* with the characteristic of being a philosopher . . .

It is worth noting that Korzybski gives no quotation from Aristotle to support this charge. And it should be said, as a matter of historical justice, that there is no evidence that Aristotle or his followers believed anything so absurd. One sufficient reason is that the view with which they are charged would be inconsistent with the standard syllogistic doctrine of the impossibility of converting universal propositions. If the “is” in “Water is wet” were the “is” of identity, as alleged, the truth of that proposition would automatically entail the truth of the converse proposition that all wetness is water. Now it is, of course, a central part of the doctrine of Aristotelian logic that the proposition All A is B cannot be automatically replaced by the converse, *All B is A*. Again, if Aristotle believed the absurd doctrine which is ascribed to him, he would have to believe that Plato and Socrates and Aristotle himself were all the same person. For, if all of them were identical with being a philosopher, all of them must be identical with one another. Even a stupid man would hardly believe in these absurd consequences; and Aristotle was very far from being stupid. (Quoted by William H. Youngren, “General Semantics and Science of Meaning,” *College English*, Jan. 1968, p. 263). The Max Black quotation is from his “Korzybski’s General Semantics” in *Language and Philosophy* (Ithaca, 1949, p. 230).

36. Possibly the key to a more precise understanding of this Chemnitz reference can be found in J. R. Weinberg, *A Short History of Medieval Philosophy*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968, p. 54, Note #1:

In addition to the doctrine of Categories, i.e., the classification of different kinds of being or of “things said in an uncombined way” —namely, *substance, quantity, quality, relation, place, time, situation, condition, action, and passion*—Aristotle has a doctrine about the ways in which terms occur in the predicates of statements. Aristotle’s own classification of these ways of predication was: *definition, genus, property, and accident*. This means that the predicate of a statement can stand to its subject as being either the definition of the subject (e.g., *a triangle is a plane figure bounded by three straight lines*), or its genus (e.g., *a triangle is a plane figure*), or a property of the subject (e.g., *a triangle has two right angles as sum of its interior angles*), or an accident of the subject (e.g., *some triangle is five inches on one side*).

It would seem that many Biblical statements could be classified according to this paradigm, even if one has made only a cursory examination; Chemnitz is right that Scripture has many examples of these kinds of predicate statements.

37. Chemnitz uses virtually the same language in LS 51.
38. *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Paul Edwards, editor-in-chief, N.Y.: The Macmillan and the Free Press, 1967, 8, 33.
39. See LW 40, 197, *Against the Heavenly Prophets*.
40. See LW 37, 301f., *Confession Concerning Christ’s Supper*.
41. *The New International Version*, which has become so popular among us, translates this passage exactly as the adversaries of Chemnitz did, “*He must remain in heaven until the time comes for God to restore everything*” (emphasis added). *The Living New Testament*, many copies of which are found among our people because of Billy Graham’s advocacy of it, perpetuates the same Reformed error, “*For he must remain in heaven until the final recovery of all things*” (emphasis added). *The New King James Version* and the *New American Standard* follow the original King James, “*Whom heaven must receive.*”

42. Grammatically, “heaven” or “Christ” can be the subject of the sentence. Chemnitz and the Formula of Concord take the latter view; “Christ must take possession of heaven” (SD VII, 119); “Christ has received heaven itself” (LS 217). As Pieper has pointed out, the Reformed “falsified the words” (SD VII, 119) by taking the *Dexasthai* as a passive instead of a middle voice; expressed in Christ was enclosed and circumscribed in heaven. For a detailed discussion of this text, see Pieper II, 326–328.
43. Two Swedish theologians have recently arrived at an entirely different conclusion from that of Chemnitz. Dr. Ingemar Furberg, connected with the Biblicum Institute of Uppsala, Sweden, presented the thesis that “Zwingli had maintained that Christ in the first Supper had given His body and blood to His disciples” (*Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly*, January 1977, p. 81). Some months later another theologian of the Biblicum Institute, Dr. Seth Erlandsson, promulgated virtually the same thesis in an article, “The Danger of Presumptuous Questions About the Lord’s Supper.” He wrote that “Luther is carrying on a polemic against Zwingli and his followers who thought that what was true of the first Supper was not true of our Supper” (published in *Biblicum*, 4–5/1977, p. 93 f.; tr. from the Swedish by S. W. Becker, mimeo; n.d., p. 9).

It is difficult to find a plausible explanation for such an egregious historical error. A clue may possibly be indicated in Dr. Furberg’s reference to Luther’s *Great Confession* (W A 26, 283–285; in English, LW 37, 180 f.). Luther here traps Zwingli with his own words. Zwingli had said that there are action- or deed-words (*Thettelwort*) which describe something which actually happened; and there are command-words (*Heisselwort*) in which God commands something. Since Zwingli regards the Verba as deed-words, Luther draws the inevitable conclusion from this premise, “He admits that Christ did give His body to the disciples in the first Supper, for he acknowledges that these words, ‘This is my body,’ are action-words, which did take place at that time. We thank them kindly that they have left us the first, original Supper” (LW 37, 181).

Since Luther very well knew that Zwingli had adopted not only Carlstadt’s idea that Christ’s body is in heaven and cannot then at the same time be in the bread but also Cornelius Hoen’s theory that the bread *signifies* the body of Christ, he indulges in some heavy irony of statement. Apparently Doctors Furberg and Erlandsson either were not aware of Zwingli’s real position, or else of Luther’s use of a trope, verbal irony, in which the actual intent of the writer is expressed in words which carry the opposite meaning. Possibly H. G. Haile in the new biography of Luther has the most satisfactory explanation for this astounding thesis when he speaks of the “sardonic Luther who escaped his biographers,” and “the quips, puns, and allusions which continue to puzzle earnest interpreters” (*Luther: An Experiment in Biography*, New York: Doubleday, 1980, pp. 36 and 41).

CHAPTER V

The Consecration and Its Effects

- 177 The years 1527 and 1528 were crucial ones for Luther in his explication and defense of the Sacrament of the Altar as instituted by the Savior. He felt that his two works of these years (*That These Words*, etc., and *The Great Confession*) were sufficient to make his doctrinal position clear to all. Since his opponents “leap over the points where an answer is needed,” Luther concludes that “for this reason I am through with them. I shall write no more to them, lest Satan becomes still more frantic and spew out still more lies and follies” (LW 37, 161f.). And he really wrote no other exposition of this doctrine until in 1544 when his *Brief Confession on the Holy Sacrament* appeared (LW 38, 287–319).
- 178 The authors of the Formula of Concord, recognizing the fundamental character of his treatises of these years, quote Luther’s *Great Confession* more than any of his other writings on the Sacrament of the Altar and the Person of Christ. Chemnitz, Kirchner, and Selnecker, reviewing in their *Histori des Sacramentstreit* in its year-to-year development of the controversy from 1521, give the same recognition to the *Great Confession* and *That These Words*. In summarizing their contents they quote them extensively, but they urge that “everyone should read them with great zeal” (HS 116). What is of special interest is to note what they consider the essential things to be acknowledged if one is to have the true doctrine of the Lord’s Supper. These are two which are necessary if Lutheran orthodoxy is to be maintained (HS 116).⁴⁴
- 179 The first thing is to accept, as Luther did (LW 37, 213, 223; SD VII, 103), all the implications of the doctrine of the personal union of the

two natures in the God-Man Christ Jesus. Because of this personal union Jesus Christ, true God and Man in one person, is present in many places. His presence cannot be limited to the circumscriptive (*localiter oder, circumscriptive*—HS 119), and one must distinguish Christ's general omnipresence from His definitive presence (HS 116–121; see paragraphs 88–117, esp. 94–100).⁴⁵

180 The second point which is necessary for a correct understanding of the doctrine of the Lord's Supper is to accept Christ's words, "This is my body" in their simple, natural sense. One must understand the mode of predication. Christ is here describing the sacramental union, a mode which Luther calls "synecdoche," and of which he gave many examples from Scripture and which he further explained by means of common usage in everyday language (LW 37, 296–303; see p. 53–64). There is a "union of effect." The bread is not deified nor annihilated and the body has not been eliminated through some figure of speech. Luther's example of the Holy Spirit appearing in the form of a dove is analogous. The Holy Spirit did not stand there visibly present but in the form of a dove (LW 37, 299, 337). Even though body and bread are two distinct substances, nevertheless they are united and designated as one substance. Both bread and body remain, and by virtue of the sacramental union it is correct to say, "This is my body," designating the bread with "this." It is, as Luther says, now "flesh-bread," and not ordinary wine out of the cellar but "blood-wine" (LW 37,303). Thus Luther, through the explication of these two points, helps the Christian reader to a better understanding of the Lord's Supper (HS 121–124).

181 In addition to these two vital factors, there is a third that is necessary for an understanding of the Lord's Supper, and that is the doctrine of the consecration. In Wittenberg Carlstadt had attempted to destroy the true doctrine of the sacrament by teaching that the *touto* referred to Christ's body as He sat at the Supper, and also by insisting that Christ's body is now restricted to heaven.⁴⁶ His third thrust against the Scriptural doctrine was to ridicule the consecration as merely being some kind of external manipulation on the level of magic. In his rejection of the consecration as an effective cause for the present church's certainty that it has the same Supper the Lord instituted for His church in His last testament, Carlstadt ridiculed it by a gross distortion of what Luther taught. It was a sore spot with Luther and the

Wittenberg theologians. In 1525 Luther wrote in exasperation against Carlstadt's contempt for the consecration:

He [Carlstadt] reviles us with many scornful and jeering words, asking how we get Christ into the bread and wine, whether He must strike up the tune we demand, and many similar words of shameful blasphemy. We can plainly see that they are the words of a thoughtless spirit or devil, which serve to excite the profligate mob and charm those who are not much worried about faith and conscience (LW 40, 176).

Tell me when we whisper or breathe upon the bread? Ah, show me! And where have we ever taught that our whispering and breathing have improved the bread? Ah, Now, why don't you answer? All right, I will take an oath . . . My reason for it is that Dr. Carlstadt knows that we do not breathe or whisper over the bread but do speak the divine, almighty, heavenly, and holy words which Christ Himself spoke at the Supper with His holy lips and *commanded us to speak* (LW 40, 211 f; emphasis added).

182 Chemnitz, Kirchner, and Selnecker, confessing with Luther that the sacramental presence of the body and blood of Christ is achieved through the speaking of the powerful words of consecration, record that in the same year that the *Great Confession* appeared, Bugenhagen (Dr. Pomeranus) published his *Confession of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood and Its Institution* (HS 125). They write that in the Preface Bugenhagen said that he wanted to announce what he held with respect to the consecration, as it is called, that is, how it comes about and happens that the bread of the Lord is His body and the cup His blood (HS 125 f.). Since the authors of the *Histori* are convinced that Bugenhagen in this book has correctly and clearly explained the church's doctrine of the consecration, they simply want to present in Bugenhagen's own words the essence of this doctrine for the benefit of young students (HS 126).⁴⁷

183 In Bugenhagen's words:

Christ says: Do this. Because of this word, we confidently do what Christ has instituted. We do not trust in our own consecrations and breathing as they [the Sacramentarians] insultingly hurl at us, but because of the word of Christ, Do this, that is, we put our trust in the institution and command of Christ.

Christ did not say, "Take and eat bread, Take and drink wine, but, Do this, that is, take and eat my body; thus I institute it; thus I wish it; thus I command. I do not say or command that you make bread my body, but that you eat that which is now my body. I institute and desire that in remembrance of my death you eat my body, etc." (HS 126).⁴⁸

184 It is further evident that Bugenhagen, just as Luther does in *The Great Confession*, interprets the “This do” (1 Cor. 11:24, 25) as a command-word which embraces the deed-words of the institution so that the Christians are bound by the command of Christ to say these words in the name and person of the Savior, and thus are certain that they have the very body and blood of Christ (LW 37, 181f.). Bugenhagen writes:

Examine the institution of Christ which says, This my bread is my body; this my cup is my blood, etc. How do we have all this? Through the institution of Christ. He Himself thus instituted, ordained, and desired it. Christians embrace this institution and give thanks [to Him]. Therefore it would be folly to omit these words of institution, and a sin not to trust in them. For without these [words], I ask, what would we look for in the bread and the cup?

The minister of our church publicly recites these words of the sacred institution over the bread and the cup which have been placed upon the altar, without any breathing (as they mockingly charge us), since he knows that here nothing can take place through his own power but that all takes place by the power and the institution of Christ. And he recites [the Words of Institution] so that those who are to commune know how to conduct themselves with regard to this sacrament and what to believe. Against the Sacramentarians this institution replies that it is perpetual for us and that the ordinance of Christ, which is effective, will endure to the end of the world; that there is for us who eat and drink the body and blood of Christ. He does not demand or command that we make the body and blood of Christ. That is given to us; with grateful heart and with rejoicing in this act we accept it. We do not presume to make [the body and blood] because Christ does not command it, and we are unable to do it. For He says, This is my body, this is my blood. He does not say, Make my body, make my blood. He does not desire makers of His body and blood but communicants, that is, that we eat the body of the Lord and drink the blood in His remembrance, which body and blood He has given through His institution; these we do not make for ourselves (HS 127 f.).⁴⁹

185 Several points emerge from Bugenhagen’s somewhat emotional explanation:

1. Christ’s command, “Do this,” includes the consecration, the distribution and the reception of the body and blood of Christ.
2. The command of Christ is specific that the minister speak the Words of Institution over the elements on the altar prepared for the Lord’s Supper.
3. The officiant acts in the stead and on behalf of the Savior when He consecrates the elements, because the Savior has so instituted and commanded it.

4. The officiant does not act in his own power, but because Christ's word is, "Do this."
5. The minister consecrates the elements for the purpose that the communicants eat and drink that which is Christ's body and blood.
6. The Lutheran Church rejects any idea that the consecration is some kind of magic whereby, without the will of Christ, the elements are made into the body and blood of Christ by blowing, whispering, and other external actions.
7. Bugenhagen rejects the Sacramentarian charge that the consecration would make or create a new body of Christ at each consecration and would thus add something to Christ at each consecration. Luther had in the *Great Confession* also rejected this monstrous charge, "We do not make Christ's body out of the bread as this spirit falsely charges us with teaching. Nor do we say that this body comes into existence out of the bread. We say that His body, which long ago was made and came into existence, is present when we say "This is my body." For Christ commands us to say not, "Let this become my body," or "Make my body there," but "This is my body" (LW 37, 187).

186 Throughout all his writings Chemnitz assumes that the consecration as described by Luther and Bugenhagen effects the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the elements and that the consecrated elements are to be distributed and received. In connection with the Lord's Supper, he always limits the terms "use" and "action" to consecrating the elements, and then distributing, eating and drinking them (SD VII, 83–87; see p. 13 f.). In the *Lord's Supper* Chemnitz assumes that the controversy with the Sacramentarians does not have to do with an absolute and unchanging presence "outside their use," since "both parties disapprove of these practices on the basis of Scripture" (LS 37). He notes that "after the *blessing* Paul, just as he had received it from the Lord, still mentions the *bread* and says of that bread that it is the *body of Christ* (LS 50; emphasis added). Similarly, he speaks of "this bread *after receiving its name from God* is not only bread but at the same time also the body of Christ" (LS 46; emphasis added). Numerous other examples can be cited in which he holds that the consecration effects the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Sacrament.

187 It is particularly in the *Examination* that Chemnitz deals most systematically with the consecration and its implications. He first takes note of one of the fundamental differences in the doctrine of the Lord's Supper between the Lutherans and the Sacramentarians, when he observes that the Sacramentarians "rejected the papistical

consecration in such a way that they imagined the Lord's Supper could also be celebrated without the Words of Institution." Chemnitz answers that "this is manifestly false. For it is most certain that there is no sacrament without the Word, as Paul calls baptism 'the washing of water with the Word' (Eph. 5:26). The saying of Augustine has it correctly: 'Let the Word come to the element, and it becomes a sacrament'" (Ex. 2, 225).

- 188 It is of the highest importance that one determines precisely what Chemnitz means with the term "consecration." The usual present-day discussions of the sacrament lightly pass over the analysis of what it meant to the sixteenth century Lutheran theologians.⁵⁰ To clear up any confusion that may rise in understanding Chemnitz's doctrine of the consecration, one should note the synonyms which he employs for the term "consecration" in the context of the Sacrament of the Altar. First, he uses the term "consecration"; quoting Augustine he says, "Our bread and cup become *sacramental* by a certain *consecration*; it does not grow that way" (Ex. 2, 225; emphasis added). He observes that the "ancients" called it "sanctification" and "the common people called it 'consecration'" (Ex. 2, 225). He notes, further, that "Paul, following the description of Mark, calls it 'blessing' when he says: 'The cup of blessing which we bless' (1 Cor. 10:16)" (Ex. 2, 225). This latter observation of Chemnitz is extremely important for understanding the Lord's Supper in the theology of Chemnitz, for he understands this to mean the necessity of the "very repetition of the Words of Institution of the Supper" (LS 104). In analyzing Mark's account of the institution of the Supper, Chemnitz notes that where "Matthew has the words 'After he had given thanks' (*eucharisteesas*), Mark uses the term 'After he had blessed' (*eulogeetas*), an expression which found such favor with Paul in 1 Cor. 10:16 that he followed Mark at this point. He was trying to indicate that this was not the kind of thanksgiving (*eucharistia*) that people give when they are blessing ordinary food, as in 1 Tim. 4:3, or as in Luke 22:17, where Christ Himself, when he had completed the observance of the Passover, took the cup and gave thanks" (LS 104). This excludes the possibility of understanding Chemnitz's doctrine of the consecration as a kind of preparatory prayer that sets the elements apart and blesses them for a holy purpose, as say, a Bible or a baptismal font is dedicated for holy use in a church.⁵¹

189 Also in the *Lord's Supper*, one finds "blessing" for the consecration, "After the *blessing* Paul, just as he had received it from the Lord, still mentions the bread and says of that bread that it is the body of Christ" (LS 50; emphasis added). Still another term for consecration which he employs to show that the officiant speaks as the representative of Christ to effect the presence of the body and blood in the Sacrament is "receiving its name from God," "This bread here present, after receiving it's name from God, is not only bread but at the same time also the body of Christ" (LS 46; emphasis added). Chemnitz no doubt has here in mind one of the favorite quotations from Irenaeus which he often uses in whole or in part in explicating the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, "Just as that which is bread from the earth when it *receives the call of God* is no longer common bread but the Eucharist consisting of two parts, the earthly and the heavenly" (LS 169; emphasis added). Luther uses the same quotation against Oecolampadius to demonstrate that Irenaeus is not "on their [i.e., the Sacramentarians] side" :

I should like to hear and see the man who could interpret this quotation to the effect that nothing but bread and wine are in the Supper. There stands Irenaeus, saying that the bread is not ordinary, common bread, inasmuch as it has been named or called by God, but "Eucharist," as the ancients spoke of the Sacrament. But what can this "naming" be, with which God names the bread? It can be nothing else than the Word which He speaks, "This is my body." There, indeed, He names it and gives it a new name which it did not have before when it was ordinary bread; and He says, "Let this bread after this naming or word, consist of two things, the one earthly — i.e., bread, which is produced from the earth, as Irenaeus says here — the other heavenly," which must certainly be Christ's body which is in heaven. What other sort of heavenly thing can be in the Sacrament along with the earthly thing, which by God's naming or Word is present? (LW 37, 116).

190 It is already quite evident from the foregoing that the consecration is the repetition of the words of Christ over the elements. Chemnitz is aware that the Tridentine theologians spoke in quite general terms with respect to the consecration. They merely said "that after the bread and the wine had been consecrated, our Lord Jesus Christ, true God and Man, is truly, really, and substantially contained under the outward appearance of these things which can be perceived by the senses" (Chap. I, Third Section, Oct. 11, 1551; Ex. 2, 221). Chemnitz knows that many Catholics at that time begged the "fathers

of the Council that, in view of such varied disputes and opinions, they should prescribe a fixed form of consecration" (Ex. 2, 224). But Chemnitz also knows that they did "not explain what and what kind it is" because the Catholics could not agree among themselves what its essence was. Some thought it consisted in the soft murmuring of the four words, "This is my body, "over the bread" so that neither the things which precede in the institution nor those which follow either belong to or are necessary for the consecration." Some thought that the consecration came about through both the Words of Institution and the words of the Canon. Some of the Papalists were writing "publicly that those churches which used the Words of Institution of Christ in the Supper without adding the papistical Canon do not have the true body and blood of Christ, as Undanus says, only a bread-sacrament" (Ex. 2, 224 f.). Chemnitz, however, is certain what the word of blessing is which coming to the bread and the wine makes it the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, "Surely this is beyond controversy, that each sacrament has some certain word of God that belongs properly and specifically to it, so also the Eucharist has a certain specific word which belongs to it, namely, the divine institution" (Ex. 2, 225 f.). The church had always recognized this from the beginning, as Chemnitz points out, "The ancient church, though it used also other exhortations and prayers in the administration of the Eucharist, nevertheless simply and correctly judged that the blessing or consecration of the Eucharist is performed with the speech of Christ, that is, with the Words of Institution" (Ex. 2, 226). In analyzing the Tridentine arguments for the Sacrifice of the Mass, Chemnitz strikes a telling blow against this perversion of the sacrament by demonstrating that even the papalist writers themselves must acknowledge that the very substance of the papalist Mass "did not exist at the time of the Apostles, for they say that the Apostles consecrated simply with the words of the Lord, to which they added only the Lord's Prayer" (Ex. 2, 480; emphasis added).

- 191 The basis for the recitation of the Words of Institution is for Chemnitz the command of Christ himself, "In short, Christ has commanded us to do in the action of the Sacrament what He himself did. He did not, however, perform a mute action but spoke. And what he said is reported to us in Scripture, as much as the Holy Spirit judged to be necessary for us" (Ex. 2, 226). He finds the word of command

in 1 Cor. 11:23–25, “Paul when he made mention of the blessing in the Eucharist (1 Cor. 10:16), soon afterward in the eleventh chapter (1 Cor. 11:23–25), when he is about to show how one may celebrate not a common or private but the Lord’s Supper, recites and describes the whole institution of the Supper” (Ex. 2, 246).

192 The Verba are the powerful, creative words of Christ which achieve the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Sacrament. In a legitimate observance of this sacrament they are more than a mere report of what Christ did in the Upper Room, “The Words of Institution are spoken in our Lord’s Supper, not merely for the sake of history, but to show to the church that Christ himself, through His Word, according to His *command* and *promise* is present in the *action* of the Supper and by the power of this Word offers the body and blood to those who eat. For it is He who distributes, though it be through the minister; it is He who says; ‘This is my body.’ It is He who is efficacious through His Word, so that the bread is His body and the wine His blood” (Ex. 2, 229). In this immediate context Chemnitz, by quoting approvingly the statement of an early church father, Dionysius, that Christ’s words as given in Luke 22:19 and 1 Cor. 11:24, 25, prove that Christ gave the consecration to the church so that it can be certain that it has the same Supper which Christ instituted on the night in which He was betrayed. Thus Dionysius, “as he began the administration of the Eucharist, by way of prerogative, prefaced it with these words: ‘You have said, Do this in remembrance of me’” (Ex. 2, 230).⁵²

193 Chemnitz is here closely following Luther in the *Great Confession* (1528) and the *Private Mass* (1533). The record of what Christ did and spoke in the first Institution consists indeed of action-words (*Thetzelwort*), but with Christ’s “This do,” “they are purely and simply command-words (*Heisselwort*), because they are embraced and embodied in command words” (LW 37, 182). We are to recite the Words of Institution (the consecration) at the command of God which effects the presence of the body and blood in the Sacrament that are to be distributed and received. But Luther says, “Of course, it does not reside in our speaking but in God’s command, who connects His command with our speaking” (LW 37, 184). Luther elaborates by saying, “It is certainly true that Christ nowhere delivered these words to us letter by letter, ‘You shall make my body out of the bread.’ Why should He need to? But when He said ‘Do this,’ by His own com-

mand and bidding He directs us to speak these words in His person and name: “This is my body” (LW 37, 187). In the *Private Mass* Luther is quite explicit on 1 Cor. 11:22 f., “For Christ commanded (as St. Paul says in 1 Cor. 11) [11:22 ff.] that when we meet together and speak His words with reference to bread and wine, then it is to be His body and blood” (LW 38, 199).

194 This exegesis of 1 Cor. 11:23, 24 and Luke 22:19, has become an integral part of the Formula of Concord, not only through quotations and paraphrases from Luther (SD VII, 77–78) but also by express words, “But at the same time we believe, teach, and confess with one accord that in the celebration of the Holy Supper the words of Christ’s institution should under no circumstances be omitted, but should be spoken publicly, as it is written, ‘The cup of blessing which we bless’ (1 Cor. 10:16; 11:23–25). This blessing occurs through the recitation of words of Christ” (*Ep. VII*, 9). The Solid Declaration says that “in the administration of communion the words of institution are to be spoken or sung distinctly and clearly before the congregation and under no circumstances to be omitted. Thereby we render obedience to the command of Christ ‘This do’” (SD VII, 79).

195 Dogmatically it is a basic point in the theology of Chemnitz that there have been given to the church commands which express the will of God and are therefore binding upon the church. In arguing for communion under both kinds, Chemnitz asserts that the reason for it “is taken from the command of Christ. For not only has the institution of the Lord’s Supper been handed down as a dogma but there are used in it a number of words which expressly signify a precept and a command of Christ” (*Ex. 2*, 341). Even more specifically with regard to the recitation of the words of institution, Chemnitz declares, “Therefore the words of institution are spoken in the Lord’s Supper not merely for the sake of history, but to show to the church that Christ himself through His Word according to His *command and promise* is present in the action of the Supper and by the power of this word offers His body and blood to those who eat” (*Ex. 2*, 229; emphasis added). Further more, he establishes it as a given that this must be taught to the whole church, learned and unlearned:

There is no doubt that Christ willed both this ceremony and this dogma be correctly understood, not only by the erudite who by reason of the gift of interpretation are able to penetrate into the depths of

obscure points which are hidden in Scripture, but by the whole church, the greater part of which are those who need to be fed on the milk of the Word. Therefore He is undoubtedly speaking about this new dogma, not previously known, so that it can be understood by all; for He fully realized that attached to it is the guilt of judgment if the proper discernment does not take place. (LS 79).

- 196 The commands which the Lord has given with respect to the Gospel and the sacraments can be said to be *gracious* commands, since they are so closely connected with the preaching of the Gospel of God's grace and the administration of the sacraments. Yet they *are* commands expressing the will of God, and as such the Christians will want to follow all of them. Speaking of the sacraments in general, Chemnitz sets down the premise:

When therefore the question is asked whether the administration of the sacraments ought to be made without any certain and particular external rites, the answer is clear and obvious, For the very name and definition of a sacrament embraces the presence of some visible and external element to which the Word must come and includes this, that the whole action is performed and administered in a certain way with a specific divinely-instituted ceremony, How this ought to be done has been stated in the Scripture and traced beforehand for the church in a sure and clear Word of God, namely, that *those signs and words* should be used which God himself instituted and *prescribed* at the institution of each sacrament and that they should be performed and used as the institution *ordains and directs*. These rites are *essential* and *necessary* in the administration of the sacraments, for they carry out the institution. (Ex, 2, 109 f.; emphasis added).

- 197 At various times efforts have been made to alter the meaning of the consecration. For example, it is sometimes said that the form used by the church for the distribution is the consecratory word, namely, "Take eat: this is the true body of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, given into death for your sins," etc. But these are not really the words of Christ in instituting the Supper. They are only a public confession on the part of the church of the Real Presence. The Roman Church had not only arbitrarily changed Christ's instituting words by omitting the distribution of the cup, but had also inserted certain things into the institution itself, such as "with eyes raised to heaven," and "the mystery of faith," etc. Besides, says Chemnitz, they dropped from the words of institution "given for you" (Ex. 2, 111). They justify these changes in the position taken by Bonaventura that the "evangelists and Paul merely related the history but that the form of the consecra-

tion must be taken from the Roman Church and therefore the words of the Canon should be followed and used rather than those of the Evangelists or St. Paul” (Ex. 2, 111).

- 198 Chemnitz strongly protests against any procedure that would change what the Lord has commanded, “They truly strain out a gnat and swallow a camel (Matt, 23:24). For they ‘leave the commandment of God and hold fast the tradition of men’ (Mark 7:8). Indeed, for the sake of their traditions they are not afraid to transgress the commandment of God (Matt. 15:3)” (Ex. 2, 111). The position of the Lutherans is clear, “But what the position of our churches is can easily be shown from the things we have noted down. For in the administration of the sacraments we distinguish among the ceremonies, and teach that a distinction must be made. For there are first of all certain rites which are commanded in the institution and thus are necessary and essential in the administration of the sacraments. We affirm that in these things nothing is to be omitted, changed, or abrogated” (Ex. 2, 116).
- 199 On Eucharistic prayers that incorporate Christ’s Word into the prayer and are used as an alternative to the Verba, Chemnitz asserts that “he acts wickedly who takes away the consecration of the Eucharist from the words of divine institution and transfers it to the prayers of the Canon which have been patched together by men out of unsound and sound, or rather, mostly out of unsound materials” (Ex. 2, 226). In short, Chemnitz feels that he has shown “two things,” “That the Eucharist is sanctified or consecrated, not by the prayer of man, but by the word of institution; and that the institution is not to be mutilated but is to be used in its entirety for the blessing of the Eucharist and for its administration” (Ex. 2, 228).
- 200 Quite naturally the question arises as to why Chemnitz puts such great emphasis on the *mandatum dei* with regard to the Lord’s Supper. It is important for Chemnitz because God himself is present and active through the Word and the elements to which the Word comes. The doctrine of the sacraments is grounded in Eph. 5:26 (Ex. 2, 244). Further, the church is the creation of God the Holy Spirit through the Word and sacrament, and its only function is to provide these Means of Grace to men so that they might be added to the church and kept in the one true faith. More precisely, just as the Lord has committed the preaching of the Gospel to the church so also He has given the consecration to the church with His command, “This do

in remembrance of me" (Ex. 2, 110). The accounts in Luke and Paul make it clear that this is a universal command to the church and not "a personal one pertaining only to the Apostles at that time, as the command to Peter by which he was ordered to walk on the waves" (LS 107).⁵³ Chemnitz concludes that it is a universal command to the church because "Paul explains these words ["This do in remembrance of me"] thus: 'As often as you eat this bread you show forth the Lord's death till He comes,' 1 Cor. 11:26" (LS 108).

201 Chemnitz's opponent, Andrada, argued that it is not necessary to give the cup to the laity because Christ was addressing only the twelve apostles at the table, when He said, "Drink of it all of you." This is so, Andrada reasoned, because "it still does not follow that all believers in Christ are included under this sign of universality and are obligated by this precept" (Ex. 2, 402). Chemnitz rebuts with this answer:

But I ask whether Christ wanted what He ordered at that time to be done once only, namely, at the first Supper, This Andrada will deny, For Christ adds the command: "Do this"; that is, what had been done at the first Supper should be done afterward or in future until the end of the world (as Paul explains). If this command had not been handed down by Christ, no man would have dared or ought to have imitated what was done at the first Supper. (Ex, 2, 403).

202 To be sure, the power to effect the miracle of the Real Presence does not reside in the officiant. Speaking of the sacraments in general, Chemnitz posits the general principle, "Scripture certainly teaches that in order that the administration of the sacraments may be according to the divine institution, it has been committed to ministers as the instrumental cause; but the power and the working which makes the sacrament true and efficacious is the action and the gift of God alone, for the Father saves through the washing of regeneration (Titus 3:5)" (Ex. 2, 105). And, further, Chemnitz is in complete agreement with a statement of Augustine, "For the ministry Christ gave to His servants, but the power he retained for himself" (Ex. 2, 107). He also agrees with Chrysostom who says, "When you see the hand of the priest holding out to us the body of the Lord, we must remember that it is not the hand of the priest stretching to us but the hand of Christ who says, "Take and eat; this is my body" (LS 159).

203 All this the Lutherans had already confessed in the Apology to the Augsburg Confession. Our speaking and doing do not create any-

thing in the Gospel or the sacrament, but the Words of Institution, which are spoken through men, are words of power because Christ himself speaks through His servants, “Ministers act in Christ’s stead and do not represent their own persons according to the word (Luke 10:16) ‘He who hears you hears me’” (Ap. VII, 47; see also Ap. VII, 28; XII, 40; XXVIII, 18).

- 204 The only ground on which we can know that we are receiving the gift of Christ’s body and blood given and shed for us for the forgiveness of sins is the consecration done only with the words of the Lord. That is the epistemological basis for the certainty that we have the same Supper the Lord instituted in the Upper Room. This sacrament stands or falls with the consecration. Chemnitz spells this out so clearly that his meaning cannot be misunderstood:

Therefore the words of institution are spoken in our Lord’s Supper, not merely for the sake of history but to show to the church that Christ himself, through His Word, according to His command and promise, is present in the action of the Supper and by the power of this word offers His body and blood to those who eat, For it is He who distributes, though it be through the minister; it is He who says: “This is my body,” It is He who is efficacious through His Word, so that the bread is His body and the wine His blood, In this way, and because of this, we are sure and believe that in the Lord’s Supper we eat, not ordinary bread and wine, but the body and blood of Christ. (Ex, 2, 229).

- 205 The principle that ministers act in Christ’s stead as His ambassadors here enunciated is so fundamental to the theology of the Lutheran Confessions that Chemnitz in his dialogue with the Papists on Penance wants to make it clear that his theology in no way holds to a conditional absolution so that nothing is offered and imparted in absolution but only calls attention to something they already had. He disavows such a viewpoint:

For among the Sacramentarians some contend that sins are not remitted through absolution, since men are not able to remit sins — a thing which belongs only to God, Therefore they contend that believers receive nothing in absolution, but that it is only an outward declaration of something they already had before, However, God, who alone remits sins, does not do this without means but through the ministry of the Word and sacraments. Now private absolution proclaims the message of the Gospel through which God is without doubt efficacious and remits sins to those who by faith lay hold of the message of the Gospel in absolution. Therefore in absolution God himself remits sins through

the ministry of the Gospel to individual believers, and in this way the absolution of the minister is a testimony of divine absolution, from which the conscience has the testimony that one's sins are truly forgiven him by God. (Ex. 2, 623),

Similarly, the consecration in the precisely defined "action" of the Lord's Supper is not contingent on the worthiness of the officiant or the faith of the one who receives the sacrament nor on the distribution, as though these parts of the action complete the consecration, which is conditional until the distribution and reception have been accomplished. Chemnitz writes that "what is not consecrated, though it be bread and cup, is food for refreshment, not a religious sacrament" (Ex. 2, 225). But at the same time he is unequivocal about the fact that "after receiving its name from God, [it] is not only bread but at the same time also the body of Christ" (LS 46). Chemnitz makes this fact doubly sure when he writes, "The meaning is not that the blessed bread which is divided, which is offered, and which the Apostles received from the hand of Christ was not the body of Christ but becomes the body of Christ when the eating of it is begun" (Ex. 2, 248).⁵⁴

206 A further consequence of the Biblical principle that absolution and the consecration are the efficacious Word of Christ spoken at His command and connected with His promise, is that "the recitation of these words [of institution] is not to be used in the way magicians recite their incantations in set formulas, for instance to bring down Jupiter Elicius or the moon from heaven, namely, by the strength and power of the letters and syllables if they are recited and pronounced in a certain way" (Ex. 2, 228 f.). Chemnitz carefully explains that here is not a case of "magic," as though man is attempting to compel the Deity to do something. Rather, it is

as Paul asserts, that in the preaching of the Gospel Christ himself speaks through the mouth of the ministers (Rom, 15:18–19; II Cor. 13:3) and that God is "making His appeal through us" (II Cor. 5:20). So in the action of the Eucharist the minister acts as an ambassador in the place of Christ who is himself there present, and through the ministers pronounces these words: "This is my body; this do," etc., and for this reason His Word is efficacious. Therefore it is not a man, the minister, who by his consecration and blessing makes bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, but Christ himself, by means of His Word, is present in this action and by means of the Word of His institution, which is spoken through the mouth of the minister, He brings it about that the bread is His body and the cup His blood, clearly in the same manner as it is He

himself who baptizes, though it be through the minister, and through His Word brings it about that the baptism is a washing of regeneration and renewal. Therefore we use the words of institution as an ordinance, command, promise, and prerogative from our Mediator Jesus Christ, in order that we may be reminded and made sure with respect to what is done and believed in the Lord's Supper. (Ex, 2, 229),

- 207 Even as early as 1528 Melanchthon privately expressed doubts that the consecration effected the presence of the body and blood of Christ. He writes to Balthasar Thuring in January 1528 that Oecolampadius had been pressing him strongly with the questions as to whether it was possible that Christ could be called down from heaven: Does this occur through the merits and prayers of the priest or the people, or, as they say, by the power of the words? Melanchthon answers in the letter that he himself has finally come to the opinion that Christ gives us His body and blood not through the merits and prayers of the priest or the people, nor by the power of the words, for that, as it is said, is magic.⁵⁵
- 208 Subsequently it became the position of the Philippists that the recitation of the Verba do not effect the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the sacrament, but rather, they are merely a general proclamation of the Gospel. In 1563 Erhard Sperber records an incident where a Philippist insists that it is "magic" to teach that through the Words of Institution which the officiant speaks the bread and wine are consecrated to be the true body and blood of Christ, and that the Words of Institution are not a part or a quality of the sacrament but only public proclamation to the people concerning the use and the fruit of the sacrament.⁵⁶
- 209 The answer of the Gnesio-Lutheran to this doctrinal stance of the Philippist is precisely that which Chemnitz asserts (see p. 79), namely, that it is not *magia* because what is done is done at the command and through the word of God, and what takes place is precisely what God says, because it is a powerful word. It would be different if evil people said something without the command of God. That might be termed the devil's magic. But there is no similarity of such activities to the institution of the Lord's Supper.⁵⁷
- 210 It should also be noted that the answer which the Gnesio-Lutheran gave to the Philippist is identical with Luther's answer to the fanatics. The consecration was not superstition or "magic." Luther says:

Now because the fanatics do not see this [that through the Word Christ binds His body and blood so that they are also received corporeally in the bread and the wine], they come with their man-made opinion to the effect that God is thereby performing some kind of hocus-pocus, Well, let them just go on making fools of themselves; you cling to the thought that Christ, as I have said, does all these things through the Word, just as the wonders which He daily performs are countless. Should He not through the same power know how to do these things also here in the sacrament? He has put himself into the Word, and through the Word He puts himself into the bread also. (LW 36, 343).⁵⁸

211 There can be no doubt that the Verba are the Gospel and as such the church is to proclaim their message. The Formula of Concord recognizes this (SD VII, 79–82), when it says that the Words of Institution are not to be omitted for several important reasons. They are to be spoken or chanted clearly before the congregation (*coram ecclesia*). Three reasons are adduced:

1. In the recitation of the words we are obedient to the command of Christ's "This do" (SD VII, 80),⁵⁹
2. Through the clear speaking of the words the faith of the hearers [not only the communicants] is strengthened in the essence and the benefit of the sacrament (SD VII, 81). There is the aspect of spiritual eating, that is, faith (SD VII, 61).
3. The recitation of the Verba must also take place so that through this speaking (*damit*) the elements of bread and wine are consecrated to this holy use, The article here appeals to the doctrine of Paul in 1 Cor. 10:16, "The cup of blessing which we bless," This happens precisely through the repetition and the recitation of the Verba.

212 It is evident that the first and third reasons are here the decisive ones. The second one which calls for the loud speaking of the Verba so that all those present and not merely the communicants can hear them, is of a pastoral nature, namely, so that all will hear and contemplate the Gospel truth that God forgives sins and strengthens faith through the Means of Grace. It is clear that the first reason gives the basis for the recitation of the Words of Institution, namely, the command of Christ; while the third reason sets forth the fundamental fact that because of this *mandatum* Christ is still active through the spoken words of the officiant to achieve the presence of His body and blood so *that* is what is distributed to the communicants. In the Epitome (Ep. VII, 9) only the third reason is given, namely, that the bread and the cup are blessed only through the recitation of the words of Christ

so that the communicants eat and drink the body and blood of Christ for the forgiveness of sins. This is also the position of Chemnitz (see p. 72, 74 ff., esp. 76).

- 213 It may be helpful here to summarize what Chemnitz teaches with respect to the consecration. His doctrine is that bread and wine in the prescribed “use” of the sacrament are after the consecration the body and blood of Christ. This must be true, for the Savior himself says that it is His true body and blood. The church today has that assurance because Christ “by this repetition to Paul [1 Cor, 11:23–25] wanted to explain whatever might seem to have been stated too briefly, obscurely, or ambiguously in the words He had used in the Upper Room” (LS 107). Chemnitz grants that from the words of Matthew and Mark “one might not be able to determine clearly and with certainty whether this command concerning the Lord’s Supper was only a personal one pertaining only to the Apostles at that time, as the command to Peter by which he was ordered to walk on the waves.” Chemnitz concludes, however, that it “was a universal command pertaining to the whole church and to the whole period of the New Testament, “because” Christ in this repetition to Paul adds these words: “This do in remembrance of me”” (LS 107 f.),
- 214 Chemnitz, after carefully examining “the testimony of two witnesses, Paul and Luke,” declares that if one “departs from these repetitions and seeks another point of view, [he] is surely both ungrateful and contemptuous in the face of such exacting care and fatherly concern on the part of the only-begotten Son of God, our Teacher, who alone can open the closed book and read it [Rev. 5:5]” (LS 107). For Chemnitz the understanding of 1 Cor. 11:23–25 and Luke 22:19 is not a mere private opinion on which one could differ. Speaking of Paul’s testimony in 1 Corinthians, he confesses that “there is no doubt that in this repetition after His ascension He is giving us the sure, genuine, and proper meaning of those words which are now called into such sharp controversy” (LS 108).
- 215 That even among the Lutherans after Luther’s death there was controversy about the significance of the consecration as effecting the Real Presence, is evident from the Formula. It admits that there had “arisen a misunderstanding and dissension among the teachers of the Augsburg Confession concerning the consecration and the common rule that there is no sacrament apart from the instituted

use” (SD VII, 73). The points that Chemnitz and the Gnesio-Lutherans had been making over against the Philippists are all incorporated into the Formula. With specific reference to the interpretation of 1 Cor. 11:23–25 and Luke 22:19 as a *mandatum dei* given to the whole church in the New Testament era, the Solid Declaration confesses that Christ “wants” these words “to be repeated” (SD VII, 75b), and that they are under no circumstances to be omitted because by repeating them “we render obedience to the command of Christ, “This do”” (SD VII, 79, 80).

- 216 Chemnitz’s doctrine that the consecration has been given to the church so that the minister, not on his own authority but on the authority of Christ, effects the Real Presence through the repetition of Christ’s words over the elements, is confessed in the Formula through the quotations from Chrysostom and Luther (SD VII, 76–78).
- 217 Chemnitz was certainly correct in stating in *The Lord's Supper* that many were disputing the “pure, genuine, and proper meaning” of Luke 22:19 and 1 Cor. 11:23–25 (LS 108). When the Formula of Concord appeared it was so severely and publicly attacked that the Elector commissioned Chemnitz, Selnecker and Kirchner to write in defense of the document. This is the *Apologia* written in 1583 and published with the Elector’s blessing in 1584. As the first, and as an official commentary which explains the meaning of the Formula, its importance cannot be overestimated for a better understanding of what the authors had in mind. In a systematic manner the *Apologia* takes up the objections made to the doctrine confessed in the Formula.
- 218 Since the *Apologia* is not readily accessible, the pertinent passages will be quoted with some completeness:⁶⁰

15th—They [i.e., the critics of the Formula] want to make the Christian Concordia Book as absolutely papist because it teaches that the elements, bread and wine, must be blessed by means of Christ’s words, as St. Paul writes in 1 Cor. 10. They scream that we are becoming regular papists because there is no difference between the papist consecration and that of our church,

They might, however, have spared themselves such an outcry because the Christian Concordia deals with the consecration in a different way, They should have been deeply ashamed to start defaming the Christian Concordia by attributing to it papist error. But what will not calumny do? It is the devil’s very own artifice for which he has earned the name Slanderer.

As far as the situation is concerned, it is based entirely on the fact, as the Concordia tells you in unmistakable words, that it is not the word or work of any man but alone the word and ordination of Christ the Lord, that His body and blood are present and distributed in the Lord's Supper. For the words of Christ were efficacious not only during the original institution but continued to be so; wherever the Lord's Supper is celebrated according to Christ's institution, and His words are used, His body and blood are present and distributed on the strength and the authority of the same words that He spoke at the original institution.

For wherever a person holds to Christ's institution and speaks His words over the bread and the wine and thus blesses the bread and wine, as Paul expresses it, and distributes the blessed bread and cup, Christ himself by virtue of the original institution is efficacious through the spoken word.

But now they say that Christ has nowhere promised that when the words of institution were repeated, He would be present with His body and distribute it in and with the bread.

We counter with the question: Has not Christ instructed us to do what He did in the original Lord's Supper? Now then, He assuredly spoke the words, and we must by all means do the same. For the element does not become a *sacramentum* without the Word, As Augustine says, *accedat verbum ad elementum et fit sacramentum*, When the Word comes to the element, it becomes a sacrament. The Concordia also does not say that Christ's body and blood is brought about by the speaking of the words which emanate from the officiant but rather because of the original institution and word of Christ which is to be repeated, according to Christ's command, as often as the Lord's Supper is celebrated.

Paul, you see, speaks of the blessed cup which not only Christ blessed in the original institution, but which we also bless. With which words shall we bless the cup so that it may be a participation or communion of the blood of Christ if we do not employ for that purpose the words with which Christ instituted the Lord's Supper: Eat; Drink; This is my body; This is my blood? Add to that the fact that in the Christian Concordia the beautiful quotation of Chrysostom from the sermon on the Betrayal of Judas is cited which settles the whole controversy, if only our adversaries had ears to hear and a heart that could concur with the truth. The words are as follows: "Christ himself prepares this table and blesses it; the words are spoken by the mouth of the priest but by God's power and grace they are efficacious," Is this not true, or is such teaching papist, as our opponents allege? Irenaeus expresses himself in the same way in Book 5: "When the mixed chalice and the bread receive the Word of God, there is a Eucharist of the blood and the body of Christ." And in Book 4, Chapter 34, "Just as that which is bread from the earth, when it receives the call of God, is no longer common bread, but the Eucharist consisting of two parts, etc." But perhaps our opponents also want to make Irenaeus to be a papist, or they will in the end arrive at the point where they will observe the Lord's Supper entirely without the repetition of the words of Christ's institution, thereby to avoid

even the appearance of being papist . . . Concerning the foregoing they allege that if the repetition of the Words of Institution brings about the body of Christ in the Supper, then it must be a sacrament apart from the correct use as Christ has instituted it; and this, they say, simply constitutes papist idolatry,

Come, come now, Gentlemen! The Christian Concordia goes no farther than the correct use instituted by Christ, And it does not say anywhere either that it is to be placed in a pyx and locked up in the eucharistic tabernacle and, as previously stated, it speaks only about the use instituted by Christ himself. To sum up, the doctrine of our adversaries is tantamount to the Epicurean contempt for the whole Lord's Supper, since it considers it as nothing but pure bread and wine. (Ap FC 157 f.)

- 219 Everything Chemnitz, Selnecker, and Kirchner here say in answer to the Sacramentarian objections to the consecration is stated in the Formula. The opponents' problem was that they could not accept the definitive presence of the body and blood of Christ in those elements (and only those) of which Christ himself says that they are His body and blood. They also differed with the authors of the Formula on the meaning of the Verba, and especially with respect to the consecration as it is expressed in Luke 22:19 and 1 Cor. 11:24, 25. It is of extreme significance that in discussing SD VII, 73–90, these formulators of the Formula zero in on SD VII, 74–76, as most pointedly expressing the essence of their confession. More particularly, they quote the words of Chrysostom (76a) as that “which settles the whole controversy.” To underline their doctrine that the consecration effects the Real Presence they add the testimony of Irenaeus.
- 220 One must become aware of the fact that many Lutheran theologians, in discussing this part of the Formula, omit these words (76a) or pass over them so lightly that their significance goes unnoticed. The question one must seriously consider is whether by the omission of this part of the Formula and the failure to accept the precise definition of “action” and “use” (SD VII, 85, 86), one has not imposed on the Formula a different pattern of thinking (a paradigm, if you will) which nullifies the precise meaning which the Formula conveys.⁶¹ This is a practical and important question for those who profess to make a *quia* subscription to the Book of Concord. One can understand that among many Lutherans today a reluctance to accept the full implications of the Formula's doctrine here postulated is the fear that they might be called Papists, or more commonly, have “Romanizing tendencies.”

This is a charge which present-day confessional Lutherans will have to bear, just as the authors of the *Formula* had to 400 years ago when they restored Luther's doctrine from the destructive assaults of the Philippists. They shrugged off the charge with "But what will not calumny do?" In their doctrine they knew from the Word of Christ that in the prescribed observance of the Lord's Supper they could fix when the Real Presence of the body and blood of Christ begins. Since only Christ can effect the miracle of the Real Presence, it was there when Christ said "This is my body," etc. The words are not less effective on our lips than they were on Christ's, for He has said that he who hears you hears me. The unconditional command and promise of the consecration is the *only* basis for the certainty that we today have the same Supper which the Lord instituted and gave as a gift to His church. If we cannot be certain of that when the elements are consecrated, we certainly are less certain of it when we eat and drink the elements. Then, at the very best, we are in a predicament which Luther holds up to Wolferinus, who denied that the consecration effected the presence of the body and blood of Christ. Luther wrote, "Finally time and moment will be the causes of the sacraments and many other absurdities will follow."⁶² More specifically to the point of Wolferinus' contention that since there is no difference between consecrated and unconsecrated elements and hence he could mix them, Luther says that "with this argument you are abolishing the whole sacrament." Luther also asks him this pointed question, "Perhaps you want to be considered a Zwinglian, and am I to believe that you are afflicted with the insanity of Zwingli, when you are so proudly and contemptuously irritating, with this peculiar and magnificent wisdom of yours?"

- 221 It was not, however, only the extreme Sacramentarians connected with the Neustadt book of objections to the *Formula* that refused to accept the doctrine of Luther and the *Formula* of the consecration as the effective means by which the sacramental union is achieved. More serious for succeeding generations of Lutherans was its rejection by some Lutheran theologians who in the next century were regarded as orthodox. One of the first to reject the doctrine of the *Formula* and yet retain some respectability was Aegidius Hunnius (1550–1603). In 1590, only six years after the Apology to the *Formula* appeared (see p. 86 f.), he published a book on the sacraments of the Old and the New Testaments.⁶³ Here he promulgates a Mel-

anchthonian position on the consecration (see p. 83 f.) directly in conflict with the Formula, Luther, and Chemnitz. Since this book is not readily available, we shall quote at some length from his position on the consecration.⁶⁴

222 Hunnius has arranged his material in the form of questions and answers. After disposing of the Roman Catholic view that through the consecration a transubstantiation is effected, Hunnius proceeds:

I leave aside transubstantiation. Concerning the sacramental union which is conceded by us I ask whether that does not take place in that very recitation of the words even before the bread is eaten?

First, I would like you to know that it is not by the power of that recitation which is made by the minister, but by the power of Christ's institution, to which the minds of the faithful are called through that recitation, that Christ wills to be present with His body and blood. For this reason it is established that no union of the bread and the body of Christ takes place during the recitation of the words, before the very act of the bread being eaten, But just as the bread is the *koinonia* of Christ's body exclusively in that the very act of eating and not before, so likewise the bread is united sacramentally to the body exclusively where that *koinonia* and the act of eating takes place; indeed, the sacramental union is nothing else than that the body of Christ is not without the bread nor is the bread without the body, but, with the bread coming in at the same time, the body of Christ is eaten together with it, joined to it and without separation.

These things which we say can be illustrated by a hypothetical case. For if it should happen when the Words of Institution have been recited by the minister and the consecration, as they call it, has been made, that a fire should break out or some other tumult before anyone had approached the Lord's table, and thus in such a case the sacred action would be prevented, it is asked whether by the power of the recitation which has been completed there is in some secret way a union between the body of Christ and the bread, even outside the ordained use of the bread in the eating, which has been prevented by the unforeseen circumstance? Here certainly anyone who is not stupid prefers to respond in the negative rather than the affirmative. From this a judgment is readily made as to what ought to be held concerning the consecration; obviously no magical power should be attributed to it, either towards transubstantiating the bread into the body or towards sacramentally uniting the bread to the body and the wine to the blood. *Why is that recitation called a consecration if you deprive it of all power? And why does the Apostle call it a blessing, saying "the cup which we bless, etc.?"*

Indeed, by no means do I deprive it of its power, For that entire recitation has a bearing on the subsequent action of eating and drinking. Through the recitation the bread and the wine are set apart from the common mass of the other things of its kind, for the special sacred use, through which distribution

they serve a higher honor, indeed that of the body and blood of the Lord. In addition, by the word of blessing in Paul's words, or consecration, as it is commonly called, not only the historical recitation of the Supper's institution is meant; but also a prayer is understood as joined to it, by which we pray the Lord that He prepare us for Himself as worthy and acceptable guests of this holy feast, so that we may be made participants of His body and blood in the mystery of the Supper to our consolation and the strengthening of our faith. This is indeed, just as in the consecration of common bread, in which it is said to be sanctified through the Word of God and prayer, it is sanctified by the prayer and all the things connected to it so that that food, when it is taken and eaten by us, may be useful to us for this life, nourishing and preserving our temporal wellbeing. So also the word of blessing in Paul's writings — 1 Cor. 10, or the word of consecration, in the common way of speaking, reflects the same usage that the body and blood of Christ which are taken at the same time together with the signs, may be for us in the use of this sacrament food and drink which is salutary for the nourishing of spiritual life in us.

- 223 It is hardly necessary to show that the position of Hunnius is at complete variance with the doctrinal position of Luther, Chemnitz, and the *Book of Concord*. He appears to rationalize the Words of Institution into a sort of Aristotelian form via the four causes paradigm: Material, formal, efficient, and final, quite after the fashion of the familiar illustration of the statue: the marble block = the material cause; the sculpting = the efficient cause; the shape of the statue = the formal cause; and the final cause = the purpose for which the statue is intended. Hence it is not really a statue until it is admired or worshiped. Similarly for Hunnius, the body and blood of Christ are not present until they are eaten and drunk, since this is the purpose which is intended. Recent scholars have demonstrated that Aristotle never intended to set up such a rigid, mechanical form for explaining phenomena. One cannot find in Aristotle's expositions his applying the four causes to one example. He generally varies them, using one or two of the causes in one analysis and others in a different arrangement as the material which he is examining might suggest. His system, it has been noted, went into a dogmatic degeneration in the Middle Ages. The scholars also generally agree that this four-fold analysis might work fairly well with respect to man-made objects (statues, libraries, etc.), but the analysis imparts a spurious equality to the four causes. A system may seem to be pertinent when applied to artifacts, but the scholars agree that it goes awry when applied even to natural objects, "natural teleology."⁶⁵

- 224 If this mechanical system of analysis wreaks havoc in the natural field, what does it do in the spiritual, where the supernatural meets the natural? Chemnitz takes the position that Aristotelian modes of thought are unacceptable in spiritual matters to explain away Bible texts that seem to be contrary to reason (LS 226; see p. 22). Hunnius has in actuality made the words of Christ, "This is my body," conditional since he holds that these words cannot be true until the *sumptio* has taken place. For him the objective presence does not depend on the bare word of the Lord. Chemnitz confesses that the Verba are spoken "to show to the church that Christ Himself through His Word according to His command and promise is present in the action of the Supper and by the power of this Word offers the body and blood to those who eat. For it is He who distributes, though it be through the minister; it is He who says: 'This is my body.' It is He who is efficacious through His Word so that the bread is His body and the wine His blood" (Ex, 2, 229; see p. 75 f.).
- 225 Chemnitz and Luther fully agree, for Luther says in the *Great Confession* that the power that causes Christ's body to be in the Supper "does not reside in our speaking but in God's command, who connects His command with our speaking" (LW 37, 184). Regarding this command Luther says, "But when He said, 'Do this,' by His own command and bidding, He directed us to speak these words in His person and name: 'This is my body'" (LW 37, 187). The Formula of Concord made the same confession in SD VII, 73–90. What is necessary, however, is to read this section as it stands and not impose on these words the interpretation of Hunnius and subsequent seventeenth century theologians. The quotation introduced from Chrysostom is so unmistakably clear that it should have "settled the whole controversy" (see p. 86), "Christ Himself prepares this table and blesses it. No human being, but only Christ Himself who was crucified for us, can make the bread and the wine set before us the body and blood of Christ. The words are spoken by the mouth of the priest, but by God's power and grace through the words He speaks, 'This is my body,' the elements set before us in the Supper are blessed" (SD VII, 76a).

LUTHERAN AND PAPAL CONSECRATION

- 226 Since the charge has continued to be raised that confessing that the consecration effects the presence of the body and blood in the

Sacrament is Romanizing (see p. 86), it is important to observe the distinction Chemnitz makes between the “Lutheran” and “Roman” consecration.

- 227 For a better understanding of what here is in controversy, it is first necessary to outline the Lutheran doctrine of the ministry as expounded by Chemnitz. In his *Ministry, Word, and Sacraments*, he gives a detailed exposition from the Scripture of what the New Testament ministry is (MWS 26–38). In his brief summary of this doctrine in the *Examination*, he insists that the functions of this office “must not be established by a bad imitation of the ceremonies of the Old Testament, but must be learned from the description of Christ and the Apostles of the New Testament” (Ex. 2, 681).
- 228 The ministry of the church is not a political function dealing with the matters of the world, but rather a spiritual or ecclesiastic office instituted and ordained by God Himself for discharging the necessary functions of the church: “Through a legitimate call God commits and entrusts to ministers the work of feeding the Church of God with the true, pure, and salutary doctrine of the divine Word, to administer the sacraments according to Christ’s institution, and to administer rightly the use of the Keys of the Church or the kingdom of heaven, by either remitting or retaining sins, fulfilling all these things on the basis of the prescribed command which the Chief Shepherd Himself has given His ministers in His Word for instruction.” No one should be admitted to the ministry of the church without “prior appropriate and solemn examination” to determine whether he “rightly holds the fundamentals of salutary doctrine and rejects fanatic opinion; whether they are endowed with the gifts to teach others sound doctrine; and whether they can prove their lives to be honorable” (MWS 26 f.).
- 229 Chemnitz, of course, is fully aware that all believers are spiritual priests who offer spiritual sacrifices and have a general call to proclaim the Gospel of God and to speak the Word of God among themselves, admonishing, reproofing, and comforting one another (MWS 28 f.). But on the other hand, Chemnitz is specific in declaring that “the public ministry of the Word and Sacraments in the church is not entrusted to all Christians in general . . . , for a special or particular call is required for this” (MWS 29).
- 230 Further, one must not think that the legitimate call of the minister is done by human arrangement or only for the sake of order,

- I. Because God Himself deals with us in the church through the ordinary means and instruments *For it is he Himself that speaks, exhorts, absolves, baptizes, etc. in the ministry*, Luke 1:70; Heb. 1:1; John 1:23 (God crying through the Baptist); 2 Cor. 2:10, 17; 5:20; 13:3. It is therefore absolutely necessary that the minister as well as the church have sure proof that God wants to use this very person for His ordinary means and instrument, namely, the ministry.
- II. Very many and necessary gifts are required for the ministry, 2 Cor. 2:16. . . .
- III. The chief thing of the ministry is that God wants to be present in it with His Spirit, grace and gifts *and to work effectively through it*
- IV. The assurance of a divine call stirs up ministers of the Word, so that each one, in his station, in the fear of God, performs his functions with greater diligence, faith, and eagerness, without weariness. . . .
- V. Finally, on this basis the hearers are stirred up to true reverence and obedience toward the ministry, namely, *since they are taught from Word of God that God, present through these means, wants to deal with us in the church and work effectively among us*. (MWS 29 f.; emphasis added.)

231 Speaking more precisely of the sacraments, Chemnitz is concerned that these Biblical truths be set forth because they treat “of a great matter-of the comfort which is necessary for consciences” (Ex. 2, 105). Hence he unequivocally asserts that “Scripture certainly teaches that in order that the administration of the sacraments may be according to divine institution, it has been committed to ministers as the instrumental cause, but that the power and working which makes the sacrament true and efficacious is the action and gift of God alone” (Ex. 2, 105). Here Chemnitz ends the summary of his point by quoting an Augustinian proverb, “The ministry Christ gave to His servants, but the power He retained for Himself” (Ex. 2, 107).

232 And for those who doubt that the officiant’s speaking of the Words of Institution in a legitimately ordered service, effect the presence of the body of Christ, Chemnitz approvingly quotes Chrysostom on Matt. 26:26–28: “These are not works of human power which He performed at that time in that Supper. He works also now; He does it. We have the order of ministers, but it is He who consecrates these things; it is He who transmutes them” (Ex. 2, 248). In this context Chemnitz is rejecting the viewpoint that the consecrated elements are not the body and blood of Christ but become that “when the eating of it is begun” (Ex. 2, 248; see p. 81).

233 Against this background it is evident that there is a fundamental difference between the Roman doctrine of the public ministry and the

Lutheran. The Sacramentarians had objected that the Lutheran doctrine of the consecration as enunciated in the Formula of Concord was papistic. But in view of the foregoing exposition of the Lutheran position, Chemnitz, Selnecker, and Kirchner are justified in exclaiming in the *Apologia*, “Come, come now, gentlemen. The Christian Concordia goes no farther than the correct use instituted by Christ” (see p. 86).

234 The difference between the Roman and Lutheran positions immediately becomes clear when one considers Chemnitz’s analysis of the Tridentine statements concerning Holy Orders at the 23rd session (July 15, 1563). After stating positively that there was “given to the Apostles and their successors in the priesthood for consecrating, offering, and administering the body and blood, also for remitting and retaining sins,” Trent in Canon 1 declares that “if anyone says that there is not in the New Testament a visible and external priesthood, or there is no power of consecrating [*non esse potestatem aliquam consecrandi*] and offering the body and blood of the Lord, and of remitting and retaining sins, but only an office and bare ministry of preaching the Gospel, or that those who do not preach are not priests at all, let him be anathema” (Ex. 2, 677).

235 To this Chemnitz answers that the “Anabaptists and Enthusiasts are rightly reprov’d” who regard the external ministry of the Word as useless and unnecessary (Ex. 2, 677). But this is not to say that God did not institute the office of the Public Ministry; rather “God arranged by a certain counsel of His that He wills to dispense these things . . . through the outward ministry of the Word. This ministry He did not commit to angels, so that their appearances are to be sought and expected, but He put the Word of reconciliation into men, and He wills that the proclamation of the Gospel, divinely revealed, should sound forth through them” (Ex. 2, 678).

236 Chemnitz then puts together his chief objection to Trent in one brief paragraph so that here the difference between the “Lutheran” and “Roman” consecration can be easily discerned:

But there is no obscurity about what they want and seek, For in this first Canon they say expressly that by that priesthood for which they are contending they do not understand the office and ministry of preaching the Gospel, but declare in the first chapter that they are fighting in behalf of the sacrifice of the Mass, about their external and visible priesthood, which they define as being chiefly the power of sacrificing Christ in the Mass. And they think that such a priesthood is necessary in order that the

church may have mediators who can plead their cause before Christ, the supreme Judge, and by this act of sacrifice placate the wrath of the Father and obtain for the church propitiation and other gifts, both such as are spiritual and necessary for salvation and also bodily gifts that pertain to this life, yes, the liberation of souls from purgatory, (Ex. 2, 679),

- 237 The Roman church holds that “through sacred ordination (which is performed through words and outward signs) grace is conferred” (Session 23, Chapter III; Ex. 2, 691). This gives the priest and him alone the power of consecrating (*potestas consecrandi*) and offering the body and blood of the Lord, and of remitting and retaining sins (Session 23, Chapter I; Ex. 2, 677). It is, as Chemnitz observes, “To these external signs and rites *about which there is neither a command nor promise*, they tie the grace of God in such a way that they imagine that anyone to whom not all the rites of papalist ordination have been applied have not the grace necessary to forgive sins, nor to consecrate the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ” (Ex. 2, 696; emphasis added). This obviously makes the consecration and the absolution partly the work of God and of man (the ordained priest). There is cooperation here between man and God, with the result that the consecration and the absolution are an integral part of the whole Roman synergistic system. The consecratory power does not lie in Christ’s words themselves but rather in the power given to the priest at his ordination. Chemnitz is well aware of this, for he writes, “The Papalists ascribe the consecration or hallowing in part also to the work of the priest, indeed not only to the outward recitation of the words but also to other actions of the priests, as the spreading, folding, lifting up, and gesticulations of the hands, the bending of the neck, the turning of the body, etc.” (Ex. 2, 231).
- 238 It should further be noted that the consecration is at the same time the sacrifice of the Mass, and this, Chemnitz declares, “is not only fabricated but injurious to and blasphemous against Christ” (Ex. 2, 679). This destroys the Sacrament of the Altar as God’s free gift of the forgiveness of sins certified by the very purchase price which won this for man, namely, Christ’s body and blood.
- 239 From this papistic perversion there follows “two not unimportant pillars of the Papalist kingdom, namely, that when the Words of Institution have been spoken over the bread, then also *apart from the use divinely ordained and commanded in the institution*, Christ, God and Man,

by an enduring union is and remains in the bread in no other way than He is present in the true use, and that, over and above and apart from this use, which has the testimony and commandment of the institution, it is permissible to handle the eucharist in another way and for a different use, namely, through sacrifice, reservation, carrying it about, displaying it, and all that is connected with these things" (Ex. 2, 250; emphasis added).

- 240 To get the significance of Chemnitz's indictment of the Roman Church, one must keep in mind his precise definition of "use" and "action" in speaking of the Lord's Supper (see p. 11 f.). It means to consecrate the elements, distribute them, and eat and drink them (SD VII, 84–86; see p. 13 f.). Here Trent's error is to teach that the Roman consecration effects "an enduring union" (Ex. 2, 249).
- 241 Further, Chemnitz charges the Roman Church with inventing and defending the opinion that "blessing with the Words of Christ is not effective and that it is not a true sacrament even though the Word of Christ comes to the elements of bread and wine, unless the consecration takes place in a church or at an altar which has been pontifically consecrated, Thus the genuineness of the Eucharist is judged to depend not so much on the Words of Christ as on the place" (Ex. 2, 310 f.).
- 242 After marshaling the evidence for both positions, the Lutheran and the Roman, Chemnitz exclaims, "Therefore let a comparison be made!" (Ex. 2, 680), He has shown that the Papists "establish as the essence of their priesthood the sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ in the Mass, which was brought into the church without, yes, contrary to Scripture" (Ex. 2, 680).
- 243 The Lutheran position is that the Lord committed the "outward ministry unto men." But to make the Lutheran position on the public ministry clear, Chemnitz continues:

Nevertheless not everyone ought to take and arrogate to himself the public ministry of Word and Sacrament. . . . Paul prescribes a legitimate manner of calling which is made through the voice of the church. . . . There is added also the promise that God will truly work effectively through the ministry of those who teach the Gospel which the Son of God wills to preserve in the church through perpetual calling, as St. Paul says in Ephesians 4:8 ff. . . . Through this ministry there are offered to us eternal blessings, and indeed . . . God in this way receives us, rescues us from sin and the power of the devil and from eternal death, and restores to us righteousness and eternal life, (Ex, 2, 678).

- 244 Chemnitz wants it clearly understood that this ministry of the Gospel has power divinely bestowed:

This ministry does indeed have power, divinely bestowed (2 Cor. 10:4–6; 13:2–4), but circumscribed with certain duties and limitations, namely, to preach the Word of God, to teach the erring, to reprove those who sin, admonish the dilatory, comfort the troubled, strengthen the weak, resist those who speak against the truth, reproach and condemn false teaching, censure evil customs, *dispense the divinely instituted sacraments, remit and retain sins*, be an example to the flock, pray for the church privately and lead the church in public prayers, be in charge of care for the poor, publicly excommunicate the stubborn and again receive those who repent and reconcile them with the church, appoint pastors to the church according to the instruction of Paul, with the consent of the church institute rites that serve the ministry and do not militate against the Word of God nor burden consciences but serve good order, dignity, decorum, tranquility, edification, etc. For these are the things which belong to these two chief points, namely, to the power of order and the power of jurisdiction. (Ex 2, 678 f.).

- 245 Hence for Chemnitz it is totally false to connect in any way the Lutheran doctrine of the consecration and the Roman doctrine.

THE RESULTS OF THE CONSECRATION

- 246 Chemnitz does not hesitate to draw the inevitable conclusion that after the consecration the elements are no longer merely bread and wine, but much more. Through the words of Christ, spoken by the officiant, the sacramental union has been achieved so that the body and blood of Christ are present on the altar before the distribution and consumption. The presence of Christ, God and Man, in the definitive mode, is extended in time and limited to that of which Christ in the consecration has declared to be his body and blood. Some Lutherans even of the conservative stripe have here broken with Luther, Chemnitz, and the Book of Concord.⁶⁶

- 247 This doctrine of the consecration is so intimately a part of Chemnitz's theological position that it surfaces a countless number of times. For example, in *The Two Natures*, in order to show that the exalted Christ has various modes of presence, Chemnitz quotes Chrysostom, "Christ is present invisibly on the table of the Lord's Supper" (TNC 462). In *The Lord's Supper*, in analyzing 1 Cor. 10, Chemnitz observes that "*after the blessing* Paul, just as he had received it from the Lord, mentions bread and says of *that* bread that it is the body of Christ" (LS 50; emphasis added).

248 In Chapter X of *The Lord's Supper* Chemnitz is definite in maintaining that his doctrine of the Lord's Supper is in harmony with "the true, learned and purer ancient church" (LS 149). He does this by means of quotations from the Early Fathers. A perusal of the material under the title "The Substance of Christ's Body is Present Wherever the Lord's Supper is celebrated on Earth," reveals that for Chemnitz the consecration has effected the presence of Christ so that this presence is extended in time. From the works of Chrysostom, Chemnitz quotes, "When you see the body of Christ set forth (*prokeimenon*), tell yourself, 'I hope to receive heaven and the blessings which are there because of this body'" (LS 155); again from Chrysostom, "The table of the Lord takes the place of the manger, for in it lies the body of the Lord, not indeed wrapped in swaddling clothes but clothed with the Holy Spirit" (155).

249 Within this frame of reference Chemnitz also adduces several quotations from the Nicene Canon, "On this divine table let us not humbly fix our gaze on the bread and the cup which are placed there, but raising our minds or our thoughts in faith, let us meditate or think of the fact that *there is also placed on that sacred table the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world*" (LS 155); emphasis added). Lest one might have missed the significance of the previous quotations, Chemnitz comments on another Nicene Canon,

and this Canon expressly states: On the holy table of the Lord there lie (*prokeimena*) two things which are present and set before us, namely, the bread and the cup and then also the Lamb of God Himself with His precious body and blood. And on that sacred table not only those things which are perceptible to the outward senses must be noted and observed, but the mind must also be elevated, so that faith may think also of those things which are not apparent to the senses, namely, the presence of the very body and blood of Christ. (LS 155).

250 Over against the Sacramentarians who deny the power of consecration, Chemnitz adds:

But to what place is the mind to be elevated? Is it to be turned away from the present external celebration of the Supper and spread its wings above the heaven of heavens? Or where ought faith seek the presence of Christ? Do I lay hold on him only in heaven? The Canon surely does not say this, but expressly and distinctly affirms that the mind should be so elevated and faith should so meditate *that it recognizes that on this sacred table has been placed the Lamb of God with His body and blood*. On this table we see the bread and the cup placed and dealt with by the external action of the priests. And when we receive a little from the external bread

and the cup in the Supper, then at the same time faith, on the basis of the Word, recognizes that we also truly receive the body and blood of Christ which are present on the table." (LS 155 f; emphasis added).

251 There can be no doubt that Chemnitz is certain that he can repeat as Biblical truth what the Early Fathers had here said because he believes, teaches, and confesses that after the consecration the body and blood of Christ are present in sacramental union with the bread and the wine. Since there unfortunately were those going under the name of Lutherans at Chemnitz's time who did not accept the doctrine of consecration, Chemnitz wants to make the matter very clear that on the basis of Christ's own words one can and must fix the point within the sacramental *usus* when the presence of Christ's body and blood begins. Therefore Chemnitz writes:

Thus the other Fathers hold that *before the consecration* there is only one substance there, namely, the bread and the wine. But *when the Word and institution of Christ comes to these elements* then not only one substance is present as before, but at the same time also the very body and blood of Christ, as Ambrose says, *De Sacramentiis*, Bk. 4, chs. 4 and 5: "This bread is bread before the words of the Sacrament. But when the words of Christ come to it, it is the body of Christ." Again: "Before the words of Christ it is a cup full of wine and water. When the words of Christ become operative, the blood which has redeemed the people is caused to be there" (LS 156; emphasis added).

252 In his final chapter of *The Lord's Supper* ("Concerning the Arguments of the Adversaries"), Chemnitz gives several quotations from the ancients to confess with them the doctrine that the consecration achieves the presence of the body and blood of Jesus Christ and that we know this from Scripture and should not confess any doubt as to what effects the Real Presence in the Supper and when it begins. Here is some of his evidence, the cumulative effect of which is quite overwhelming:

Likewise the ancients assert that not only the bread and the wine but also the very body and blood of Christ are present on that sacred table and are received orally by those who partake The Nicene Canon says that on the altar the Lamb of God is present Augustine, "From the table is taken the body of the Lord." . . . Chrysostom, "On the altar that body is present which the wisemen worshiped in the manger." . . . Cyril, "We should not tremble at the flesh and blood which have been placed on the holy altar, when God condescends to our weaknesses and fills us with power which is given unto life." (LS 250 f.).

253 This doctrine found expression not only in the writings of the Reformation theologians but also in the rubrics of the early Lutheran liturgies (see note 32). And it has continued to be taught and proclaimed in song by some later Lutherans.⁶⁷ Many others, however, in following Melanchthon, have denied the fact that in a legitimate observance of the Lord's Supper one knows when the sacramental presence begins. This is virtually to deny the words of Christ and make them conditional on something other than His own words, thereby setting up a *monstrum incertudinis* with respect to the Real Presence and the benefits of the sacrament.

CHEMNITZ AND THE VENERATION OF THE SACRAMENT

254 Before one considers how Chemnitz treats the controversial subject of the adoration of the sacrament, it is necessary that one has an exact understanding of Chemnitz's concept embodied in the terms "action" or "use" when applied to the Lord's Supper. Since these terms have already been examined (see pp. 11–14) the main points will only be briefly summarized here. The Verba show that the sacramental action encompasses the consecration of particular elements, their distribution and consumption (Ex. 2, 249; SD VII, 84–87). The consecration is that part of the action that effects the presence of the body and blood of Christ. This means that Jesus Christ, true God and Man in one person has been sacramentally united with these particular elements just as the Apology had said years before, "We are talking about the presence of the living Christ, knowing that death no longer has dominion over him" (Ap. X, 4). The body remains in the personal union as part of the God-Man, so that Chemnitz warns us to "be on guard" that the personal union is not dissolved because of mentioning the natural properties (TNC 443). Before the consecration, however, Christ is not present in the definitive mode (LS 156). But after the consecration the body and blood of Christ are present in this special mode. The "action" of the Lord's Supper is not merely an action in our modern sense of "the doing of something." It includes the "thing" and the doing of something with that "thing." Chemnitz states that "the very name and definition of a sacrament embraces the *presence* of some visible and *external element* to which the Word must come and includes this, that the whole action is performed and administered in a certain way with a specific divinely instituted ceremony" (Ex. 2, 109 f.; emphasis added).

- 255 The divinely commanded consecration effects the sacramental union, but the “divinely instituted ceremony” specifies that *that* which has been consecrated is to be distributed and eaten and drunk. But this is not to be understood as though Christ’s words of institution spoken by the officiant is conditional, depending on the eating and drinking by the communicants. Chemnitz is here quite specific, “The meaning is not that the blessed bread which is divided, which is offered, and which the apostles received from the hand of Christ was not the body of Christ but becomes the body of Christ when the eating of it is begun” (Ex. 2, 248). When the meaning of the words are changed, even if they are spoken, then the divinely commanded action has been disregarded, and one does not have the Supper which the Lord instituted in the Upper Room. In other words, there can be no general false interpretation of Christ’s words. The Sacramentarians “proscribed the body and blood of Christ from the Lord’s Supper which is celebrated here on earth” (LS 251). In the Private Mass the Papists did not distribute the consecrated elements to the communicants; the celebrant took them alone. They have disregarded the divinely instituted action because it is “entirely certain and crystal clear against all sophistical quibbling that Christ did not institute the celebration of the Supper in such a way that he who consecrates takes it alone while the rest only look on” (Ex. 2, 530).
- 256 Further, the Romanists consecrated bread for the purpose of reserving it, locking it up, offering it, or carrying it about on Corpus Christi festivals. This is outside the prescribed action, a fact which Chemnitz emphasizes, “There is no word of God about the bread of the Eucharist being reserved or carried about in procession; in fact, it *conflicts with the Words of Institution when the bread which has been blessed is not distributed, not received, not eaten*” (Ex. 2, 281; emphasis added). In short, there is no sacrament apart from “that *use and action* which is prescribed and commanded by the institution . . . Surely, without any controversy, these words signify an action, and indeed He [Christ] expressly uses a word that signifies doing, for He says, “This do,’ namely, what was done in this My first Supper” (Ex. 2, 245).
- 257 This is precisely what the Solid Declaration confessed, “But the command of Christ, ‘Do this,’ which comprehends the whole action or administration of this sacrament (namely, that in a Christian assembly we take bread and wine, consecrate it, distribute it, receive it,

eat and drink it, and therewith proclaim the Lord's death), must be kept integrally and inviolately, just as St. Paul sets the whole action of the breaking of bread, or of the distribution and reception, before our eyes in 1 Cor. 10:16" (SD VII, 84). Both Chemnitz and the Formula believe that Jesus Christ is present according to both natures with His body and blood in the consecrated elements because, as Chemnitz on many occasions has said, we have an express promise "that He wills to be present with His body and blood in the observance of His Supper as it is celebrated in the gathering of the church here on earth in accord with His institution" (TNC 432; see p. 36–45).

258 Keeping in mind this precisely defined concept of the prescribed action of the Lord's Supper, one can better understand Chemnitz's examination of Chapter V and Canon VI of the Tridentine Decree Concerning the Sacrament of the Eucharist (Third Session, Oct. 11, 1551). They deal with the cult and the veneration of the sacrament (Ex. 2, 276 f.). The striking thing for a modern Lutheran is that at the very outset Chemnitz insists that we must know what has been placed in controversy, for he acknowledges that "a number of things are not in controversy; these I willingly concede" (Ex. 2, 277).

259 In a brilliantly conceived presentation that sets Chemnitz apart from the Sacramentarians and the Philippists who denied the possibility of the veneration of the sacrament, Chemnitz makes three points:

1. That Christ, God and Man, is to be worshiped, no one but an Arian denies (Ex. 2, 277).
2. That also His human nature, because of its union with the divinity, is to be worshiped, no one but a Nestorian calls into question (Ex. 2, 277).
3. That no one therefore denies that Christ, God and Man, truly and substantially present in His divine and human nature *in the action of the Lord's Supper*, should be worshiped in spirit and in truth, except someone who, with the Sacramentarians, either denies or harbors doubt concerning the presence of Christ in the Supper. Neither can the *anamnesis* and proclamation of the death of Christ in the Supper be rightly done without that worship which is done in spirit and in truth (Ex. 2, 279; emphasis added).

260 Chemnitz concedes that it is a permissible practice to worship Jesus Christ who is present in the definitive mode in the prescribed action of the Supper. Of course, Chemnitz also confesses that the final purpose of this sacrament is the oral reception of the body and

blood of Christ in which “the whole treasury of all the benefits which Christ the Mediator procured by the offering up of His body . . . [are] certainly communicated to him [the believer] and firmly given and pledged to him” (Ex. 2, 232). Further, it should be noted that Chemnitz at the outset confesses these three points “lest someone should suspect that we called into doubt whether Christ, God and Man, who is present in the *action* of the Supper should be worshiped” (Ex. 2, 279; emphasis added).

- 261 There can be no question that Chemnitz believes that the consecration in a valid observance of the Lord's Supper achieves the Real Presence, and he could not for theological reasons accept a statement that we cannot fix from Scripture the point within the sacramental *usus* when the Real Presence of Christ's body and blood begins. If the consecration did not effect the Real Presence of Christ, Chemnitz and all those who agreed with him would be guilty of gross idolatry. In view of his stature as a Lutheran theologian, he should be given a fair hearing on the controverted article.
- 262 He begins by asserting that it is “certain . . . that the worship of God is not restricted to either time or place (John 4:21; 1 Tim. 2:8).” From this premise, he concludes “Therefore Christ is to be worshiped always and everywhere” (Ex. 2, 277).
- 263 This leads to a further conclusion drawn from the fact that Scripture teaches that Christ has several modes of presence (see p. 36–45). Chemnitz summarizes:

Therefore if we believe that Christ, God and Man, *is present with a peculiar mode of presence and grace* in the action of His Supper, so that *there* He truly and substantially imparts His body and blood to those who eat, by which He wants to unite Himself with us in such a way that with this most precious pledge He applies and seals the gifts of the New Testament to everyone who eats in faith, gifts He gained for the Church by the offering of His body and the shedding of His blood, if I say, we truly from the heart believe these things, *it neither can nor should happen that faith would fail to venerate and worship Christ who is present in this action* (Ex. 2, 277; emphasis added).

- 264 As further evidence from Scripture Chemnitz cites the example of Jacob (Gen. 28:16–22), Moses (Ex. 34:8–9), and Elijah (1 Kings 19:4 f.). He observes that these “doubtless did not have a special commandment that they should worship God in these places; but because they had the general commandment that they should worship God

everywhere, and *were sure* that God is truly present under these external and visible signs, and that He there reveals Himself by a peculiar mode of grace, they certainly worshiped that God whom they believed present *there* (Ex. 2, 277; emphasis added).

- 265 It seems evident that both in the *Examination* of the Tridentine Decrees on the Adoration of the Sacrament as well as in his other works, Chemnitz has in mind some of the writings of Luther in addition to the two quotations that he will offer as evidence that Luther regarded the adoration of the sacrament as a normal result of one's belief that the consecration effects the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the elements. He seems to be thinking particularly of Luther's "The Adoration of the Sacrament." Luther wrote this work in 1523, when it began to dawn on him that the denial of the Real Presence was becoming widespread. He discovered, especially in some of the writings of the Bohemian Brethren the denial of the Real Presence and the resulting rejection of the adoration, something to which he had been accustomed during his whole life.⁶⁸
- 266 In defending the adoration Luther makes the fundamental point that inward adoration must precede any outward adoration. Outward adoration may or may not follow. The important thing to remember is that "true worship can be nothing else than faith; it [worship] is faith's sublimest activity with respect to God In a word, where there is none of this heartfelt trust and confidence that comes from a true and living faith . . . , there can be no true worship because there God is not recognized with the heartfelt confidence of faith" (LW 36, 293).
- 267 Always coupled with this conviction Luther declares that one must believe and confess that Christ is present when His body and blood are present because His words do not lie and He is not separated from His body and blood:

Now to come back to the Sacrament: He who does not believe that Christ's body and blood are present does well not to worship either with his spirit or with his body. But he who does believe, as sufficient demonstration is shown it ought to be believed, can surely not withhold his adoration of the body and blood of Christ without sinning. For I must always confess that Christ is present when His body and blood are present. His words do not lie to me and He is not separated from His body and blood. And when He lay dead in the grave, He was still Christ and worthy of His honor, even when there was no longer any blood in Him. (LW 36, 293 f.).

- 268 Chemnitz's exposition similarly centers around these two points: faith and one's outward confession of that faith that Jesus Christ, true God and Man, is present, go together. When Jacob, Moses, and Elijah "were sure that God was truly present under these external and visible signs," and that He there revealed "Himself by a peculiar mode of grace, they certainly worshiped that God whom they believed present there" (Ex. 2, 277). As a result of faith "invocation and worship followed." As a matter of fact, if it had not, it would not "have been true faith" (Ex. 2, 277).
- 269 In *The Two Natures of Christ*, Chemnitz has a chapter on "The Worship of the Two Natures" (TNC 411–422). Throughout this chapter he, just as Luther, links "faith and worship" (TNC 412). More specifically Chemnitz notes that some of the Sophists in the Middle Ages had argued that worship (*latria*) could be applied to the divine nature of Christ but only bond service (*hyperdulia*) to the human nature. Chemnitz is determined not to permit this error to exist in the church of the Reformation. Others had said that they could give worship (*latria*) to Christ, just as they would honor a king and his crown, but the latter only incidentally, as they honor the crown as a representative of the royal prerogatives. In answer Chemnitz exclaims, "Surely the ears of pious men recoil when someone says that faith and worship apply to the human nature only by association" (TNC 412). And further, "Thomas certainly would not subscribe to this new wisdom when he says of the wound which Christ had received, 'My Lord and my God' [John 20:28]" (TNC 413).
- 270 In view of the position of some of the Sophists and the Sacramentarians' insistence that Christ's body must be kept in heaven, it is no wonder that Chemnitz makes his points against the Arian, Nestorian, and Sacramentarian positions (see p. 103), and declares that "these things needed to be said lest someone should suspect that we called into doubt whether Christ, God and Man, who is present in the action of the Supper should be worshiped" (Ex. 2, 279).
- 271 Throughout all his writings Chemnitz asserts that the orthodox antiquity accepted the personal union of the two natures of Christ, the special modes of Christ's presence, and the creative power of the Words of Institution when spoken at the command of Christ. There could be no question for him that if one accepts these truths, an external adoration of the sacrament could follow because these truths

called for true faith in the heart. He brings many witnesses from the Early Church.

- 272 To begin, Chemnitz quotes from the Nicene Canon. This great church council of 325 not only dealt with the deity of Christ but also with other theological concerns. Chemnitz, taking his cue from the word *prokeimenon*, writes: “Likewise the word *prokeimenon* is used in the Nicene Canon:”

On this divine table let us not humbly fix our gaze on the bread and the cup which are placed there, but raising our minds or our thoughts in faith, let us meditate on or think of the fact that there is also placed on that sacred table the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world On the holy table of the Lord there lie (*prokeimena*) two things which are present and set before us, namely, the bread and the cup, and then also the Lamb of God Himself with His precious body and blood. And on that sacred table not only those things which are perceptible to the outward senses must be noted and observed, but the mind must also be elevated so that faith may think also of those things which are not apparent to the sense, namely, the presence of the very body and blood of Christ. (LS 155).

- 273 Chemnitz then adds his own comment to this Nicene Canon:

Where ought faith to seek the presence of Christ? Do I lay hold on Him only in heaven? The Canon surely does not say this, but expressly and distinctly affirms that the mind should be so elevated and faith should so meditate that it recognizes that on this sacred table has been placed the Lamb of God with His body and blood. On this table we see the bread and the cup placed and dealt with by the external action of the priests. When we receive a little from the external bread and cup in the Supper, then at the same time *faith, on the basis of the Word*, recognizes that we also truly receive the body and blood of Christ which are present on the table. How these are symbols of our resurrection we shall explain later. (LS 156; emphasis added).

- 274 In the *Examination* Chemnitz appeals to the following comment of Augustine on Psalm 99:5 to demonstrate that it has been the teaching of the Ancient Church (with which he agrees) that the worship of Christ within the prescribed limits of the sacramental action is permissible. He writes, “Therefore Augustine rightly says:

Since the earth is the Lord’s footstool, as the Psalm says: Worship His footstool, for it is holy, I turn to Christ, because here I seek Him and find Him. How can the earth, the footstool of the Lord be worshiped without impiety? He took unto Himself earth from earth, because flesh is from the earth; and from the flesh of Mary He took on flesh. And because He

walked here in this flesh and gave this to us to eat for salvation, no one eats this flesh unless he has first worshiped. There has been found a way in which such a footstool of the Lord may be worshiped; and not only do we not sin in worshiping, but we sin when we do not worship. (Ex. 2, 278).

The fact that he employed the same quotation in *The Two Natures of Christ* (p. 420) and that he together with Andreae also used it in the "Catalog of Testimonies," added as an Appendix to the original 1580 Book of Concord (Triglot 1127), indicates that references such as these had been deeply rooted in his theology.

- 275 The words of Ambrose on the same text (Psalm 99:5) are also advanced as supporting the thesis that on the altar is placed the Lamb of God with His body and blood and that He is worthy of veneration, "By His footstool let the earth be understood; by the earth, however, the flesh of Christ, which today also we worship in the mysteries, which also the Apostles worshiped in the Lord Jesus" (Ex. 2, 278). This quotation is also found in *The Two Natures of Christ* (p. 420) and also in the "Catalog of Testimonies" (Trig. 1127), there to prove that the "Ancient Pure Church" taught that in the personal union the human nature truly received and uses divine majesty.
- 276 Chemnitz must have been acutely aware that the Melancthonians were determined to negate the creative power of the Verba as effecting the Real Presence (see p. 83 f.), for with such rejection they would deny the permissibility of the adoration of the sacrament. In the *Examination* he produces an enormous amount of evidence to show that he did not disagree with the Early Church nor with Luther, both of which held to the personal union of the two natures in Christ and also to an effective consecration. The cumulative effect of this evidence is quite impressive. He quotes the testimony of Eusebius of Emesa (a rather obscure bishop of Syria), "When you go up to the awe-inspiring altar desiring to be sated with spiritual food, look in faith on the holy body and blood of your God, honor them, marvel at them, touch them with your mind, take them with the hand of the heart, and most of all take them with the deep draught of the inner man" (Ex. 2, 278).
- 277 In the same paragraph he quotes the epitaph which Gregory of Nazianzus wrote for his sister Gorgonia, "She called upon Christ, who was honored upon the altar, namely when the sacrament of the Supper is celebrated" (Ex. 2, 278). In the *Lord's Supper*, which Chem-

nitz directs chiefly against the Sacramentarians, he challenges them to consider “those statements of the Ancient Church” as “pertinent which teach that the ancients venerated and worshiped Christ the God-Man, indeed the very flesh of Christ, not only in the Supper but also on the altar where the mystery took place.” And he then refers to the epitaph composed by Gregory for his sister as well as the statements already quoted from Augustine and Ambrose (LS 159 f.).

278 In the joint work with Selnecker and Kirchner (*Historie*, etc.; published before 1585) they especially emphasize their position on the allowability of the adoration. George of Anhalt, one of three brothers who were close personal friends of Luther, died in 1553. To demonstrate that after Luther’s death his pure doctrine of the Lord’s Supper continued to be preached and defended, the *Historie* directs the reader to a series of sermons that George of Anhalt had preached on the Lord’s Supper.⁶⁹ The authors quote copiously from the first and the fourth sermons, the latter of which comes into consideration here. Since the original is not easily available, copious quotations are here given so that one can better grasp the doctrinal stance of Chemnitz and his associates and the quality of their profound awe and respect for the sacrament.

279 The *Historie* introduces George of Anhalt’s sermon with these words, “In the fourth sermon he [George of Anhalt] also speaks there about the outward adoration of the sacrament:

Where one certainly believes that our Lord Jesus Christ, true God and Man, sitting at the right hand of the heavenly Father, Himself our Chief Shepherd and high Bishop of our souls, is bodily present and that he gives us in this most holy, highest and most wonderful mystery His own natural body, which He gave for us, and His precious blood which He poured out for the forgiveness of our sins, to eat and to drink through His servants’ hands, as His clear and irrefutable Word bears witness, so must the heart also truly break out and declare itself outwardly. Where it, however, does not happen or where such outward reverence is neglected knowingly and sacrilegiously out of contempt, then this is a certain sign, that it is not so in the heart, etc.

And again: We want to have nothing to do with those who presumptuously and sacrilegiously deny the true presence of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ in the excellent sacrament, contrary to the clear and irrefutable Word of our Lord Jesus Christ, or otherwise know everything better than our dear Lord’s Word, and bow to their own pleasure, and gloss over, and shorten the right hand of the divine majesty and tie it down to a particular place, and therefore on

that ground conclude, that Christ could not be in the sacrament and therefore consider it as idolatry, to worship the excellent sacrament, indeed, Christ in the sacrament, etc.

These same persons, indeed, could not and cannot handle and use it in a good conscience, because they understand Christ's Word differently from how it actually reads, and do not believe that Christ is actually present there. Thus St. Paul shows, that whatever is not from faith is sin. And if someone should worship [the sacrament] in such doubt, there would be double sin. First, because they do not believe the words of Christ; and second, because they are doing it outside of and contrary to their faith. We want, however, to wish for them true repentance from the heart, and, at the same time, oppose their twisted meaning and error, as we are able, and manfully and faithfully warn against it. And we might also say to them that which our dear Lord said to the Sadducees (Mark 12): "Is not this why you are wrong, that you know neither the Scriptures nor the power of God?" For we believe that Christ's body and blood are truly in the sacrament because the Scripture says so. For it is indeed through the divine power that Christ is present in the sacrament because He sits at the right hand of God, the Almighty Father, although He is omnipresent according to His divine omnipotence. Should He not then also be [in the sacrament], since He has bound Himself according to His institution bodily to the holy sacrament, and even for this reason, that our dear Lord Christ sits at the right hand of the Almighty Father? Thus we also honor Him, call upon Him, and worship Him, as the Scriptures say, that we should worship Him in all places and as St. Paul warns, lifting up to Him holy hands, without anger and doubt. Why should we not also then do that in the handling of His word and sacrament, to which He has bound Himself, and even is bodily present there? Therefore it is not only empty blasphemy, that such people maintain themselves against the Lord's word, and which come from that master who also said to our first parents in Paradise, "You will not die, but will be like gods." This, even when the Lord has said, "When you eat from the forbidden tree, you will die the eternal death," etc.

Again: Although our dear Lord Jesus Christ did not institute His holy Supper for the purpose of adoring it and worshiping it, nor yet is it forbidden nor to be accounted as an excess or as idolatry, but much rather just and right, that this holy Supper might be administered according to its institution by our Lord Jesus Christ, one attended with complete devotion and adoration, and worship our Lord Jesus Christ Himself, true God and Man, who is present in this excellent sacrament, not only according to the nature of His divine omnipotence and spiritual nature, but also bodily, truly and essentially, yet nevertheless unseen, as the one who sits at the right hand of the divine majesty, and who has been exalted by God and given a name that is above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, those in heaven and on earth and under the earth, and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father.

Again: We must judge in this, not according to what the eyes and outward senses grasp and indicate, but according to what faith, grounded in the Word of God, teaches us. The eyes see bread and wine; all outward senses witness nothing else. Faith, however, perceives the Lord Christ truly present, who presents His own body and blood in this most holy mystery. The same Lord Christ, present but unseen under the sacrament, hidden and concealed, is worshiped here by believers, and not the element of bread or the outward appearance. (HS 540–543).⁷⁰

- 280 After quoting at great length also from Prince George’s first sermon, Chemnitz and his co-authors testify, “We have not here mutilated these words of the precious choice preacher (as King Solomon calls himself), Prince George of Anhalt, but we want to set them down fully for the year 1553 as an eternal witness of the teaching about the sacrament [held] in the churches of this land, which has also been [held] after the death of Dr. Luther” (HS 545). They also then add the testimony that “the pious Prince Wolfgang of Anhalt [stood] in the same faith and confession about the Supper of the Lord” and that he remained in this faith until his death on March 23rd of 1566. He was a signer of the Augsburg Confession (1530) and the last one, with the exception of Philip of Hesse, to remain of the original signers.
- 281 In the *Examination* Chemnitz closes his confession that the veneration of the sacrament is permissible within its prescribed action by bringing quotations from Luther’s works. It is somewhat surprising that he does not appeal to Luther’s 1523 detailed discussion found in “The Adoration of the Sacrament” (LW 36, 275–305), nor to his “Brief Confession Concerning the Holy Sacrament” (1544). Here, at the end of his life Luther recalls Carlstadt’s fulminations against it twenty years previous. Some had drawn the conclusion that since the elevation was not universally practiced among the Lutherans, this was an acknowledgement that “Christ’s body and blood was not in the sacrament, and that they are not orally received” (LW 38, 313). Luther disabuses his critics of that notion, and observes that “if you come to a place where they still observe the elevation you should not be offended nor should you condemn them, but accept it because it is taking place without sinning and without endangering the conscience” (LW 38, 319).
- 282 Chemnitz first refers to one of the last articles that Luther wrote, “Against Thirty-Two Articles of the Louvain Theologians” (1545). Chemnitz says, “Luther also, writing against the theologians of Lou-

vain, in Art. 16 calls the Eucharist a venerable and adorable sacrament" (Ex. 2, 278).⁷¹

- 283 Chemnitz's final quotation is drawn from Luther's Commentary on Genesis (1535). Luther observes on Genesis 47:31 ("And Israel bowed himself upon the bed's head."):

Not only when we pray, but also when we baptize, absolve, and receive absolution, and when we approach the holy Supper, yes, also when the promise or the text of the Gospel is recited, we ought to bow our knees or at least stand as a sign of adoration or of reverence and thankfulness. And even if in the Lord's Supper nothing else were offered except bread and wine, as the Sacramentarians blaspheme, nevertheless in the Supper the promise is there, and the divine voice, and the Holy Spirit through the Word. Therefore it is fitting that we should approach it reverently, but how much more fitting it is that this be done when we believe that the true body and blood is there with the Word. (Ex. 2, 278; see LW 8, 144).

- 284 Chemnitz, together with his fellow confessors of the Book of Concord, has put himself squarely in the doctrine and practice of the Gnesio-Lutherans, Martin Luther, and the Early Church. He has done so because he accepts all the implications of the Scriptures regarding the personal union of the two natures in the one person Jesus Christ. This means that also the human nature is worthy of divine adoration, as the church sings in the *Te Deum* ("Thine Adorable True and Only Son"). He, further, accepts the Scriptural evidence that the resurrected Christ has and employs several modes of presence, including the definitive mode (SD VII, 100). This for Chemnitz means that Christ's presence "in the Supper with the bread and wine" is to be distinguished from His presence "in the whole church" (TNC 448 f.), where Christ dwells in the heart by faith. And, finally, Chemnitz accepts the doctrine that Christ effects the miracle of the presence when He speaks through the mouth of the officiant (Ex. 2, 229).

THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE LUTHERANS AND THE ROMANISTS ON THE VENERATION

- 285 But there are differences between the Lutherans and the Papists. Chemnitz classifies them under three heads.
- 286 First, the Roman Church had in the last 300 years invented transubstantiation and hence demanded, as Chemnitz says, that "the whole of that which was instituted by Christ that it might be received, should be adored with the cult of *Latria*" (Ex. 2, 279). But Chemnitz

has confessed that he interprets the Scripture so that he agrees with the “dictum of Irenaeus” that the Eucharist consists of two things, the earthly and the heavenly (on the sacramental union see par. 126 f.). After the consecration the bread has not ceased to be bread (Ex. 2, 257). The elements have not been annihilated. But according to the Tridentine Decrees, Chemnitz notes that “also the earthly elements of bread and wine in the Eucharist would have to be adored with the cult of *Latria*” (Ex. 2, 279). This can in no way be defended because “Paul asserts that it is bread also after the blessing” (Ex. 2, 279).

287 However, “it does not follow,” asserts Chemnitz, “that if Christ is to be worshiped, also those creatures in which He is present should at the same time be worshiped.” One must take careful note of the prescribed “action.” Christ, true God and Man, “in *this action* decreed and promised His presence in a particularly gracious manner” (Ex. 2, 280; emphasis added). In view of all this, Chemnitz issues a warning, “To beware of idolatry, a clear distinction must be made; Christ, God and Man, present in His divine and human nature in *the action of the Supper*, should be worshiped; however, the substance or form of the elements of bread and wine should not be worshiped lest, besides the Creator, we worship also the creature (Rom. 1:25)” (Ex. 2, 279 f.; emphasis added).

288 Second, the Lutherans have another point of disagreement with the Romanists, who worship the Eucharist apart from its divinely instituted use. They “strive, as Canon VI clearly shows, to establish and confirm the worship of the bread *apart from its use*, or *apart from that action which Christ ordained and commanded* when He instituted it; namely, when the bread is carried about in processions or reserved in a repository, that then it should be set before the people to be adored” (Ex. 2, 280 f.; emphasis added).

289 It is evident that to understand Chemnitz and his fellow Lutherans, it is extremely important to keep in mind the precise definition of the terms “action” and “use.” The “divine institution, command and promise [are] bound to the action which is prescribed in the Words of Institution; that is, when the bread is taken, blessed, distributed, received and eaten” (Ex. 2, 280). Even if one speaks the Verba, but the meaning of the entire institution as commanded by Christ (1 Cor. 11:24, 25) has been arbitrarily changed, then one does “not have the promise of the presence of the body and blood of Christ there as it is

present in His Supper" (Ex. 2, 280). Chemnitz concludes that "there is no word of God about the bread of the Eucharist being reserved or carried about in processions; in fact it conflicts with the Words of Institution when the bread which has been blessed is not distributed, not received, not eaten" (Ex. 2, 281). As a matter of fact, such procedure of the Papists is "bread worship" (Ex. 2, 281).

290 Third, Chemnitz mentions the fact that there was a controversy among the Papalists as to the question of what essentially constitutes the veneration in the sacrament. It is obvious to Chemnitz from Canon VI that the Tridentine Fathers are chiefly concerned about the external worship, "splendid housing, extravagant processions, bowing, genuflection, prostration of the bodies, smiting the breast, candles, etc., etc." (Ex. 2, 281). With respect to all these ceremonies Chemnitz remarks, "And to this external cult they ascribe I know not what merits, without true repentance and faith" (Ex. 2, 281).

291 In order not to say anything too severe about the things done in the Eucharist "outside of the divinely instituted use," he sets forth two Scriptural rules which will aid one in deciding about "the definition of worship or cult" (Ex. 2, 281). The first is "that the assumed outward appearance of worship, without the inner spiritual impulses, does not please God," just as Christ told the scribes and Pharisees who came to Him because they were concerned about the disciples transgressing the traditions of the elders, Matt. 15: 8, 9. Secondly, ways of worship instituted or chosen by men are not pleasing to God, Matt. 15:9; Col. 2, 23 (imposed or self-made religion). (Ex. 2, 281).

292 Chemnitz now summarizes the points that Luther had made in "The Adoration of the Sacrament" (LW 36, 290–298). First, there must be "true, inner spiritual worship." After that "the true external indications of inward reverence finally and rightly follow" (Ex. 2, 281). The "true, inner and spiritual veneration and worship is comprehended in these words: 'Do this in remembrance of me.' Likewise, 'You proclaim the Lord's death'" (Ex. 2, 282). This means that "the heart believes and thinks rightly, piously, and reverently about the essence and use of this sacrament according to the Word; . . . that it faithfully ponder and consider, and with the heart and mouth consider the immeasurable benefits of the Son of God, the Mediator; . . . and that He [Christ] communicates this His body to us that it may be eaten, and this blood that it may be drunk in His Supper, in order that in this

way He might apply and seal the benefits of the New Testament to the believers with a most sure pledge; . . . that, when having considered our uncleanness and wretchedness, we call in ardent prayer upon Christ, God and Man, whom we believe to be truly and substantially present in that action, that He would be our Mediator, Propitiator, Advocate, Intercessor, Justifier, and Savior . . .” (Ex. 2, 282).

293 “This,” Chemnitz declares, “is the true inner and spiritual veneration and worship of Christ in the use of the Lord’s Supper” (Ex. 2, 283).

294 Chemnitz finally sums up by citing examples from Justin, Irenaeus, Chrysostom, Basil, etc., that “this kind of worship is certainly observed in the liturgies of the Ancients, in praying and giving of thanks” (Ex. 2, 283). And he concludes that “when this true, inner and spiritual worship has been excited and is present in the heart, then the outward manifestations of reverence and veneration towards this sacrament follow of their own accord, and rightly” (Ex. 2, 283). It is a part of our “genuine confession that we also bear witness publicly, both with the voice and with outward signs to the faith, devotion, and praise which we have just spoken” (Ex. 2, 283).

295 Among other things, this outward veneration is a confession of “what food we believe we receive there” (Ex. 2, 283). It is evident that Chemnitz here has specific reference to the Sacramentarians and those who deny that the consecration effects the presence of the body and blood of Christ (see p. 86, where the *Apologia* repeats the charges of the Sacramentarians). This is evident because immediately following, Chemnitz writes, “With such external confession we separate ourselves from the Sacramentarians and from the Epicurean despisers of these mysteries” (Ex. 2, 283 f.).⁷²

THE FORMULA OF CONCORD AND THE VENERATION

296 The Formula of Concord treads a very precise line in its discussion of the adoration of the sacrament, following very closely the limits which Chemnitz has clearly set forth in the *Examination*. In the Solid Declaration there are three antitheses directed against the Romanists: Transubstantiation and its implications; the Sacrifice of the Mass; and the administration of only one species to the laity (SD VII, 108–110).

297 The first condemnatory clause (SD VII, 108) not only rejects transubstantiation but also the concomitant teaching that after the con-

secration there results the continued presence of the body and blood of Christ “*apart from the use of the sacrament*” (SD VII, 108; emphasis added). Note that this antithesis rejects only what the Tridentine Canon VI says in anathematizing anyone who denies that the sacrament could be venerated in special festivals and carried about in processions (Ex. 2, 276). It is often overlooked that this carefully constructed antithesis speaks *only* about the adoration outside of the prescribed use, which prescribed use is defined in SD VII, 84: consecrate, distribute, and eat and drink.

298 One cannot help seeing how closely the Solid Declaration here follows Chemnitz’s exposition. He always carefully defined the action to which the command and promise are bound, “when the bread is taken, blessed, distributed, received and eaten” (Ex. 2, 280). But “in the fear of God,” Chemnitz says, we should ponder the fact that “we have no Word of God concerning it that it is the body of Christ [when it is set] apart from its proper use” (Ex. 2, 280). This is all that Chemnitz and the rest of the formulators have said in SD VII, 108. In the *Examination* the difference between the Roman and Lutheran positions is made clear, “It does not follow that if in the true use of the Lord’s Supper Christ is rightly worshiped, then a particular cult or worship should be instituted apart from this use, as when it is carried about or reserved” (Ex. 2, 280 f.). As a matter of fact, Chemnitz is very specific about what is commanded in the Verba, “And there is no word of God about the bread of the Eucharist being reserved or carried about in processions, in fact, it conflicts with the Words of Institution when the bread which has been blessed is not distributed, not received, not eaten” (Ex. 2, 281).

299 There is another antithesis, No. 15, against the Sacramentarians, that needs investigation, “Likewise, the teaching that the elements (the visible forms of the blessed bread and wine) are to be adored. Of course, no one except an Arian heretic can or will deny that Christ Himself, true God and Man, who is truly and essentially present in the Supper, when it is rightly used, should be adored in Spirit and in truth in all places but especially where his community is assembled” (SD VII, 126). At first blush this seems to be directed only against the Roman Catholics, and it has puzzled some that it should appear here among the antitheses “against the Sacramentarians, some of whom have had the effrontery to penetrate our

churches as adherents of the Augsburg Confession” (SD VII, 111).⁷³ Why doesn’t this antithesis, so obviously intended against the Papists, appear somewhere in SD VII, 108–110, instead of in SD VII, 126? Could it be possible that Chemnitz and his fellow theologians who almost invariably present their thoughts in a logical and coherent manner, here had a *lapsus*, a slip of the pen?

- 300 This oddity prompts one to take a closer look at what the statement actually says and to see why it is placed where it is. It is obvious that it rejects the teaching that the “visible forms of the blessed bread” are to be adored. Chemnitz, as well as the other true Lutherans, taught that after the consecration the body and blood of Christ are present but the bread and the wine also remain. There is a sacramental union between the earthly and the heavenly elements (see p. 45 f.). And, as has already been noted (see p. 113), Chemnitz makes the true Lutheran position clear, namely, that the “substance or form of the element of bread and wine should not be worshiped, lest beside the Creator, we worship also the creature” (Ex. 2, 280).
- 301 Scrutinizing again the second part of SD VII, 126, one immediately notices that the following words have a familiar ring, “Of course, no one except an Arian heretic can or will deny that Christ Himself, true God and Man, who is truly and essentially present in the Supper when it is rightly used, should be adored in spirit and truth in all places but especially where his community is assembled” (SD VII, 126b). This material is taken from Chemnitz’s *Examination II*, (pp. 277–281), and it has been telescoped into this one sentence (see p. 103 f.). It is almost identical with Chemnitz’s closing words on what is “not in controversy,” “no one, therefore, denies that Christ, God and Man, truly and substantially present in His divine and human nature in the action of the Lord’s Supper, should be worshiped in spirit and in truth, except someone who, with the Sacramentarians, either denies or harbors doubt concerning the presence of Christ in the Supper” (Ex. 2, 279).
- 302 What the antithesis (SD VII, 126), placed as it is among the Sacramentarian antitheses, *does do* is to reject the Sacramentarian charge that the true Lutherans were guilty of artolatry. If one denied, as the Melanchthonians did (see p. 83), that the consecration effected the Real Presence and still venerated the sacrament, then such a one would indeed be guilty of artolatry. This is a charge that

Melanchthon quite often made against his opponents. One should note that the last two antitheses (SD VII 126, 127) of the sixteen are of a different nature from those preceding, in that they reject false accusations made against the true Lutheran doctrine. They are disavowals that the Lutherans ever countenanced the adoration of the visible elements, and that they permitted any kind of thinking which attempted to explain the supernatural mystery of the sacramental union as consisting of the circumscriptive “comprehensible, corporeal mode of presence” (SD VII, 99; see also Ep. VII, 42, LW 37, 222, and TNC 448 f.).

303 From the evidence previously set forth, it cannot be denied that Luther, Chemnitz, and their fellow-confessionals did allow for the adoration and even the elevation within the carefully prescribed limits of the “action” or “use.” In the *Lord's Supper* Chemnitz has precisely explained what is confessed in the fifteenth antithesis (SD VII, 126). He agreed with the ancients who “recognized and confessed that it is a stupendous miracle that one and the same body of Christ which is in heaven is at the same time, although in a different mode, present also on earth in all those places where the Lord's Supper is celebrated according to His institution, because Christ says: “This is my body” (LS 157). Chemnitz further agrees with the ancients who “did not adore the external elements of bread and wine on the altar; therefore they held that Christ is present with His very body and blood not only in heaven but also there where the Lord's Supper is celebrated according to His institution. For this reason they call it a fearful and awesome mystery” (LS 160). Since the Sacramentarians could not accept the few clear words of Christ, they resorted to calling the Lutherans ar-tolators, even though these vehemently denied that they adored the external elements. But the Lutherans did at the same time confess that Jesus Christ, true God and Man in one person, was sacramentally united with the elements through the Words of Institution, and that when the Supper was rightly used, He was to be adored there “in spirit and in truth” (SD VII, 126).

304 Three hundred years later Confessional Lutherans were confronted with the same problem that plagued Chemnitz and his fellow Lutherans. During the controversies preceding the Formula of Concord the phrase “Crypto-Calvinism” was coined to designate those within the Lutheran Church who secretly held to the Calvinistic doctrine as

formulated, for example, in the *Exegesis Perspicua* (1573). In the 1880's in the United States the term "Crypto-Calvinism" was revived with the charge against the Synodical Conference Lutherans that they were secretly introducing Calvin's absolute decree of election and reprobation. While these synods publicly repudiated that they ever taught any kind of Calvinism, and insisted that they confessed the *gratia universalis* with all seriousness, the charge of Crypto-Calvinism persisted into the twentieth century. In 1932 when the Lutheran Church Missouri Synod adopted its "Brief Statement," they publicly and unambiguously repudiated the charge of Calvinism:

On the basis of these clear statements of the Holy Scriptures we reject every kind of *Synergism*, that is, the doctrine that conversion is wrought not by the grace and power of God alone, but in part also by the cooperation of man himself On the other hand, we reject also the *Calvinistic perversion* of the doctrine of conversion, that is, the doctrine that God does not desire to convert and save all hearers of the Word, but only a portion of them Our refusal to go beyond what is revealed in these two Scriptural truths is not "masked Calvinism" ("Crypto-Calvinism") but *precisely* the Scriptural teaching of the Lutheran Church as it is presented in detail in the Formula of Concord. (Brief Statement, par. 12, 13, 15).

305 The situation of the Synodical Conference Lutherans was not unlike that of Chemnitz and others who rejected the veneration of the sacrament outside its prescribed use but did hold to the permissibility of the adoration within the prescribed action. They were both bound to Scripture, even though what they read and from which they drew valid implications seemed contrary to reason and even against the prevailing winds of thought found among their associates. Their conviction that there was a permissible external veneration of the sacrament came from their innermost faith that the words of our Savior are not conditioned on anything man does or leaves undone or on time and place or on the external rite itself. When the Words of Institution sound from the altar by the officiant, they believe them to be almighty creative words that achieve what they say, "This is my body," "This is my blood of the Covenant which is poured out for many." And since it was the Savior's last will and testament, the words, "Do this in remembrance of me" mean that it is an institution for all times. Because of this they were certain that when they followed the mandate to do what Christ did that evening, they had

the same Supper as the one the Lord instituted in the Upper Room. Hence their innermost conviction and confession that when the words, "This is my body" sound forth from Jesus' lips, *that* takes place which the words say. Luther is right when he in this context quotes the Psalmist, "So His word surely is not merely a word of imitation, but a word of power which accomplishes what it expresses, Psalm 33 [9], 'He spake, and it came to be'" (LW 37, 181).

THE RELIQUIAE

306 As Chemnitz unfolds his doctrine of the Lord's Supper, it is evident that he has poured the results of his study of the Words of Institution into the axiom: "*Nothing has the character of a sacrament apart from the use instituted by Christ, or apart from the divinely instituted action*" (SD VII, 85). But, as has already been emphasized, the terms "use" and "action" in the context of the Lord's Supper are not only synonymous, but over against their generalized vague meaning, they have an extremely precise meaning (see p. 13 f.). Within the prescribed "action" of the Savior, the bread and the wine have become the body and blood of Christ, which are then to be eaten and drunk. Chemnitz is quite explicit, "It conflicts with the Words of Institution when the bread which has been blessed is not distributed, not received, not eaten" (Ex. 2, 281).

307 The promise given in the Sacrament is that we receive "the most certain and most excellent pledge of our reconciliation with God, of the forgiveness of sins, of immortality and future glorification" (Ex. 2, 233). But the impartation of these gifts depends upon the ordinance and command of God in His last will and testament. The Son of God has "prescribed" a "particular action . . . in the institution" (Ex. 2, 304; see also Ex. 2, 245). With the *mandata* in the Verba, the Savior has prescribed a three-fold action, "bless, break, and distribute." Chemnitz's doctrinal stance in this respect can be better understood from an approving quotation by Humbert, bishop of Sylva Candida,

We read that the Lord did not teach His disciples an imperfect but a perfect commemoration, blessing the bread *and at once breaking and distributing it*. For He did not just bless it *and then reserve it to be broken the next day*, neither did He only break it and then lay it away; but having broken it, He immediately distributed it . . . For whatever of these three [i.e., bless, break, distribute] is done without the rest, namely, either blessing without breaking and distribution, or breaking

without blessing and distribution, does not display a perfect memory of Christ, even as distribution without blessing and breaking. (Ex. 2, 298; emphasis added).

308 In his preliminary statement before examining in detail the Tridentine Confession on these controverted points, Chemnitz sets down the basic meaning of the Verba,

Therefore the Words of Institution are spoken in our Lord's Supper, not merely for the sake of history but to show to the church that Christ Himself through His Word according to His command and promise, is present in the action of the Supper and by the power of this Word offers His body and blood to those who eat. For it is He who distributes, though it be through the minister; it is He who says: "This is my body." It is He who is efficacious through His Word, so that the bread is His body and the wine His blood. In this way, *and because of this, we are sure and believe that in the Lord's Supper we eat, not ordinary bread and wine, but the body and blood of Christ* (Ex. 2, 229; emphasis added).

And as the succeeding texts demonstrate, Chemnitz has drawn these facts from the words that Christ has said, "Do this in remembrance of me" (Ex. 2, 230). The "basic principle" is that "the institution is the norm and rule from which and according to which all such questions and disputes [i.e., whether the consecrated bread should be distributed or reserved] are to be decided" (Ex. 2, 249).

THE MANDATA DEI

309 There are commands and ordinances for the church of God, and since they express the will of God, the church of God will carefully follow them. Hence obeying these *mandata dei* is not a form of legalism since they actually protect the Christians from legalistic practices which have no foundation in the revealed will of God. There is always the danger that "in the administration of the Sacraments more importance is attached to the ceremonies invented and received by man than to the *ceremonies instituted and commanded by the voice of the Son of God*" (Ex. 2, 109; emphasis added). As a safeguard against all the caprices and extravagant notions of men for beautifying and making more meaningful the administration of the sacraments, Chemnitz insists that

the whole action is performed and administered in a certain way and with a specific divinely instituted ceremony. How this ought to be done has been stated in Scripture and traced beforehand for the church in a

sure and clear Word of God, namely, that those signs and those words should be used which God Himself instituted and prescribed at the institution of each sacrament and that they should be performed and used as the institution ordains and directs. These rites are essential and necessary in the administration of the sacraments, for they carry out the institution. (Ex. 2, 110).

These words are reminiscent of the Augsburg Confession in rejecting the custom of withholding the cup from the laity which says that “such a custom, introduced *contrary to God's command* and also *contrary to the ancient canons*, is unjust” (AC XXII, 10; emphasis added). The Treatise on the Power and Primacy of the Pope declares that it is wrong for the Pope to arrogate “to himself the authority to make laws concerning worship, concerning changes in the sacrament, and concerning doctrine” (Tr. 6).

- 310 Such commands of Christ, Chemnitz further notes by way of explanation, must be for the universal church and not only for a specific time nor for specifically named persons. He recognizes the possibility that if one used only the accounts of Matthew and Mark of the institution of the Supper, he “might not be able to determine clearly and with certainty whether this command concerning the Lord's Supper was only a personal one pertaining only to the apostles at that time, as the command to Peter by which he was ordered to walk on the waves, or whether it was a universal command pertaining to the whole church and to the whole period of the New Testament” (LS 107). Christ, however, in His “repetition to Paul adds these words: ‘This do in remembrance of me’” (LS 107 f.). And Paul is even more specific, “Paul explains these words thus; ‘As often as you eat this bread you show forth the Lord's death till He comes’ (1 Cor. 11:26)” (LS 108). Closely related to this need for the universality of the command for the church, Chemnitz recognizes that in the early church for a time there were miracles of healing, speaking in tongues, etc., which accompanied the preaching of the Gospel. The question naturally arises and disturbs us as to why we don't use those means now as a sort of additional fortification of the genuineness of the Gospel. Chemnitz answers that the fact that the apostles and others in the primitive church were equipped with the gift of healing by no means says that we will have it, because God has not commanded the church universal to perform those things. Chemnitz addresses himself to the Roman Catholic practice of extreme unction by pointing

out that “we lack both command and promise regarding that extreme unction on the basis of the Word of God” (MWS, 111). This is an important theological point for us to remember today. The Reformation theologians understood it much better than we do today since we are afraid that the *mandata dei* might be “legalistic.” Luther in his work, “How Christians Should Regard Moses,” says that he is commanded to preach the Gospel and if Christ had not so commanded, “then I would not listen, would not be baptized, just as I now will not listen to Moses because he is given not to me but only to the Jews” (LW 35, 171). Thus the *mandata dei* do serve to protect us, and at the present time they are a strong reminder to us to avoid any and all types of Pentecostalism.

311 Chemnitz deals most specifically with what should be done with the consecrated elements when he discusses the Roman Corpus Christi Festival (Ex. 2, 285–292), and the Reserving of the Sacrament of the Eucharist and Carrying it to the Sick (Ex. 2, 293–313). Canon VII of the Tridentine Decree concerning the Eucharist states, “If anyone says that it is not permitted to reserve the Holy Eucharist in a sacred place, but that it must of necessity be distributed immediately after the consecration to those who are present, or that it is not permitted that it be carried to the sick in an honorable manner, let him be anathema” (Ex. 2, 293).

312 Chemnitz immediately pinpoints the difference between the Roman and Lutheran positions when he writes:

The principal question here is whether the bread of the Eucharist, when it has been blessed, hallowed, or consecrated by the recitation of the Words of Institution should be at once distributed, taken, and eaten in commemoration of Christ, or whether after it has been blessed, the distribution, taking and eating may be omitted and the bread put away, inclosed, reserved, carried about, displayed, and put to other uses, so that finally, after a number of days, weeks, months, or years the taking and eating may follow.

The Tridentine Decree which sanctions and establishes such reservation confesses that it was brought into the church, though it is prescribed neither by the Word of God nor by the tradition or example of the apostles. Instead, it says that it is an old custom and a most ancient practice. (Ex. 2, 293).

313 Since in this case Trent appeals to ancient custom for withholding the consecrated bread, Chemnitz replies that the custom must be tested by the divine Word,

The matter is very clear in the account of the institution. For Jesus took bread and gave thanks or blessed it. He did not, however, after blessing put it away to be reserved but broke it and gave it to His disciples. Neither did He command that they should put away this bread, reserve it, carry it about, or display it to others, but said: "Take eat." Nor was there interposed a delay or interval of some hours, days, weeks, months, or years between blessing, distribution, taking and eating. But when He had blessed, He at once distributed. And that the disciples at once took what had been distributed, and that they did not put to some other use what they had taken, but ate and drank as they had been commanded—this Mark shows in the description of the second part, when in the midst of the description he interposes these words: "And all drank of it" (Ex. 2, 294).

Chemnitz can find no evidence in the account of the institution of the Lord's Supper which would allow for a delay in the consumption of the consecrated elements, "apart from its use." The entire account also demonstrates this; "for," he observes, "Christ ate the Passover . . . according to the Law . . . between sunset and nightfall." After the common Supper had been finished "then only did He institute the Eucharist." And then after the institution, "He held the lengthy discourse written down in John and from there He went out into the Garden . . ." (Ex. 2, 294). Chemnitz concludes from these facts that "this computation shows plainly that there was no long delay in the action of the first Lord's Supper" (Ex. 2, 294).

314 But in the final analysis, Christ's "Do this" makes everything clear, "We should follow and do what was done at the first Lord's Supper" (Ex. 2, 294). There is no trace in the history of the apostles which might indicate that they tore "apart the distribution and the reception from the blessing" (Ex. 2, 295). Hence we ought to follow the judgment of Cyprian by not giving "heed [to] what others before us thought ought to be done, but what He who is before all did first and *commanded to be done* until He comes to judgment" (Ex. 2, 295; emphasis added; Ex. 2, 312).

315 Since Chemnitz is convinced that this rule is solidly grounded in the final authority, namely, Scripture (see p. 16 f.), he makes the unambiguous confession that

we will not put away the bread and the wine which have been blessed with the words of the Supper, shut them in, reserve them, carry them about, and use them for display, but will distribute, receive, eat, and drink them, and proclaim the death of the Lord. Thus the obedience of faith

will do what Christ did before and *commanded to be done*. (Ex. 2, 295; emphasis added).

- 316 It is a dogmatic demand for Chemnitz that in accord with the will of the Savior all the elements that have been consecrated to be the body and blood of the Savior are to be distributed, received, eaten and drunk in that sacramental service. In disputing with his Jesuit opponent Andrada, concerning communion under both kinds, Chemnitz reveals his awe in the presence of a clear *mandatum dei*, and his desire to do the will of the Lord so clearly expressed,

But I ask whether Christ wanted what He had ordered at that time to be done once only, namely, at the first Supper. This Andrada will deny. For Christ adds the command: "Do this"; that is, what had been done at the first Supper should be done afterward or in future until the end of the world (as Paul explains). If this command had not been handed down by Christ, no man would have dared or ought to have imitated what was done at the first Supper (Ex. 2, 403).⁷⁴

THE RESERVATION IN TRADITION

- 317 Since the Tridentine Fathers admitted that there is no Scriptural basis for either the Corpus Christi Festival (Ex. 2, 285) or for the Reservation of the Sacrament in Carrying it to the Sick (Ex. 2, 293), they had to fall back on custom and tradition to justify their practice. Chemnitz, in a cool and scholarly approach, agrees to "consider and mentally weigh whether the testimonies of antiquity which they advance concerning that old custom and ancient practice [i.e., Reserving the Eucharist] prove that the custom of reserving the sacrament of the Eucharist is necessary, as the Tridentine Decree maintains" (Ex. 2, 296).
- 318 He makes short shrift of the Corpus Christi Festival. Pope Urban IV "first invented this festival about A.D. 1260" (Ex. 2,285). Before Urban became pope, a certain woman, a recluse, revealed to him that such a festival should be instituted and "generally celebrated." As soon as he became pope Urban at once instituted this new festival on the basis of the revelation of the woman and "ordered by a strict command that it should everywhere be celebrated" (Ex. 2,285). Although the record shows that Urban's order was not received by all, and certainly not by the Greeks, it nevertheless became a permanent rite in 1311 at the Council of Vienna, when Clement V commanded that this order

should be observed by all. After briefly examining some of this historical material which is more closely related to carrying it to the sick and looking again at the original institution of the Supper, Chemnitz believes that

the reader will see that this festival is in truth nothing else than a public and solemn protestation against the institution of the Son of God. This festival was instituted once upon a time to obscure, push into the background, and bury the things which are prescribed and commanded in the institution, and in order that other and different uses, concerning which nothing is either prescribed or commanded in the institution, might be put in their place and that the people might be persuaded that this is a more excellent worship. For this purpose this feast was instituted once upon a time and for this it is retained and celebrated today, as is clear from the things we have noted. (Ex. 2, 292).

319 With respect to the reservation for the purpose of carrying the sacrament to the sick, Chemnitz takes greater pains to examine the material presented in its defense. Here, as perhaps in no other place, he demonstrates that he has devoted years to research of church dogma and history, that he has an encyclopedic mind and with it the ability to dissect the most intricate material and lay bare the heart of the matter. Since the Romanists state that they are thinking of the usage “after the time of the Apostles,” Chemnitz begins his examination by going directly to early Canon Law, and he finds that the present Catholic practice is in conflict with it. He reproduces from the Canon Law

copies of the statement from Clement, a Roman pontiff, prescribing how a presbyter, deacon, and minister ought to care for the left-over fragments of the body of the Lord. He does not by this care understand reservation, but adds a clear explanation in the words: “Let as many wafers be offered on the altar as ought to suffice for the people. But if any are left over let them not be reserved until the next day, but let them be eaten with fear and trembling by the attentive clergy.” Lest this be understood of the offering of the people, he adds at once: “These clerics eat the remnants of the body of Christ which are left in the sacristy.” A gloss attempts to evade this, as though only reservation for the work of those who perform the consecration were prohibited there. But the texts speaks expressly of the communion of the people. (Ex. 2, 297).

320 Then comes an array of early authorities who in general called for the consumption of the *reliquiae* by the clergy or scholars from the school; for example, “When after the communion a somewhat larger amount of the parts of the immaculate and divine body was left, it

was not reserved, but certain boys were sent for from the elementary school who were to eat these remnants” (Ex. 2, 298). Clement clarifies this custom by explaining that “the remnants should be eaten by the clergy on the same day,” except when the amount of the remnants was extremely large, scholars were summoned to partake with them.

- 321 Chemnitz notes that the Greeks (“not among the most ancient”) introduced a liturgy called *proeegiasmenon*, “that is, of previously consecrated elements.” During Lent they would consecrate elements only on Saturday and Sunday, and not on any of the five other days. In this new liturgy they would distribute only pre consecrated elements. But Humbert, Bishop of Sylva Candida, strongly criticized this rite of the Greeks, saying, “among other things,

we read that the Lord did not teach His disciples an imperfect but a perfect commemoration, blessing the bread and at once breaking and distributing it. For He did not just bless it and then reserve it to be broken the next day, neither did He only break it and then lay it away; but having broken it, He immediately distributed it” (Ex. 2, 298).

- 322 Chemnitz concludes his listing of witnesses with a very recent one, Gabriel Biel (1420–95), the great nominalist theologian, one of whose students had been a teacher of Luther at Erfurt. Biel’s reference sums up quite succinctly the Biblical objections to consecrating elements but not distributing them. In his Lecture 26 on the Canon he “adduces a statement from Paschasius and says,

Christ, desiring that His disciples might become partakers of the fruit of this sacrament, did not, after He had consecrated His body, stop with the consecration; neither did He give it to the disciples in order that they might preserve it in an honorable manner, but gave it for its use, saying: “Take eat”; and because in the course of use what is eaten is spent and consumed, He gave them the power to consecrate as often as they would, when He adds: “This do in memory of me” (Ex. 2, 299).

- 323 From the facts of the Biblical evidence and the history of the practice of the early church Chemnitz draws the final conclusion, “Therefore reservation of the consecrated Eucharist without distribution and reception has not been received, approved, and observed, either always, or everywhere, or by all as a Catholic dogma and necessary custom. Rather, there were those who not only did not observe this custom but strongly condemned it on the basis of the Words of Institution” (Ex. 2, 299).

- 324 Chemnitz, however, grants that “the Papalists also have certain examples of a reserved Eucharist” (Ex. 2, 299). So these also need to be examined. The “Tridentine lawgivers” claim that they have testimony from the Nicene Synod to prove reservation, namely, the alleged Canon which says that the deacons who did not have the authority to consecrate, were to distribute and eat the elements if the bishop or presbyter was not present. Hence the Eucharist must have “been consecrated beforehand” (Ex. 2, 300). But Chemnitz shows from historical records that it is a matter of uncertainty as to how many canons the Council of Nicea had actually decreed, and in particular, “the canon from which they attempt to prove reservation is not only doubtful but altogether suspect.” It seems to have been “patched on” in the second edition of the canons. At the Sixth Synod of Carthage, as a matter of fact, “the Romans were convicted of having falsified the Nicene Canons.” So, at best it is a doubtful bit of evidence. (Ex. 2, 301).
- 325 Since the Papalists seem to have “surer testimonies from the Early Church,” it is well to note that the Lutherans’ dispute with them is that they reserve the “consecrated bread for worship and adoration, *apart from the distribution and reception*” (Ex. 2, 301; emphasis added). Chemnitz, it will be remembered, has no objection to the veneration within the divinely instituted use (see p. 104). But as one examines somewhat more closely the evidence gained from Justin, it becomes evident that “there is preserved the total divinely instituted action, namely, blessing, distribution, and reception” (Ex. 2, 301). What the deacons did was to carry the consecrated elements from the assembly of the church so that those who were absent might commune.
- 326 The Romanists, in defense of their practice as being of ancient origin, bring forward a report of Irenaeus’ actions as given by Eusebius. But “to be able to twist this example to their reservation and carrying about, they misuse the version of Rufinus” (Ex. 2, 302). Irenaeus had reported that when the Eastern prelates came to Rome, the Roman bishops “would send the Eucharist to them as a witness of harmony and peace, though they disagreed on the observation of Easter” (Ex. 2, 302). Andrada, Chemnitz believes, indulged in a bit of “trickery” when he “feigned on the basis of this history that formerly the Eucharist was carried to places over great distances, namely, all the way from Rome to Asia” (Ex. 2, 302). For Chemnitz demonstrates that the words of Irenaeus refer to a local situation when he uses the word

“*epempon*—they sent,” because Irenaeus is explicit in stating that “these guests had come to Rome from Asia” (Ex. 2, 302).

- 327 In a similar detailed manner Chemnitz analyzes the various examples adduced from antiquity (Ex. 2, 302–305), and he finds that “there is still observed the use or action instituted by Christ.” After the consecration the elements were distributed and received (Ex. 2, 303). He does discuss in some detail the example of the consecrated elements being carried to Serapion, as reported by Eusebius (Ex. 2, 305). There were cases of reservation for private use, but, says Chemnitz, this type of reservation was not “universal nor perpetual” (Ex. 2, 305). While there may once have been some reasons for it (e.g., times of persecution, protecting the sick from receiving an heretical communion, etc.), nevertheless such a custom could “spawn many abuses and various superstitions” (Ex. 2, 306). It is not surprising therefore that in the Early Church the custom “was changed, abrogated, and severely forbidden” (Ex. 2, 306). The First Council of Toledo (400 A.D.) decreed that “if anyone does not eat the Eucharist which he has received from the priest, let him be cast out as a sacrilegious person.” And a certain Caesar Augustanus reports that “with respect to the Eucharist, if anyone is proved not to have consumed it in the church, let him be anathema forever” (Ex. 2, 306).
- 328 Chemnitz does not overlook the extenuating circumstances that permitted the carrying of the consecrated elements to the sick, “We do not condemn those ancient men who observed this custom, because they have weighty reasons on account of the nature of the times” (Ex. 2, 308). But he also adds this judgment, “Let the reader observe that, when there were no sick persons to be communed, *nothing was reserved or put back*” (Ex. 2, 309; emphasis added).
- 329 In the “true antiquity” Chemnitz really finds only one example of such a reservation for the sick, namely, that of Serapion. As Eusebius describes it, “The presbyter, lying sick in his house, gave the Eucharist to a young man to take to Serapion” (Ex. 2, 307). But as a matter of fact “there is also another way to satisfy the institution of Christ and come to the aid of the dying” (Ex. 2, 309). The Lutherans “in the communion of the sick recite the words of the Supper which are in fact the consecration in the presence of the sick person” (Ex. 2, 312). Chemnitz summarizes the reason for this practice as deriving directly from the Words of Institution,

The matter is not obscure if we set before ourselves as norm and rule the description of the institution. For Christ first of all used His words, which He wanted to have come to the element in order that it might become a sacrament; He used them in the place and at the time where and when He was about to distribute communion, and in the presence of those to whom He wanted to communicate His body and blood. Therefore it agrees better with the description of the institution and the example of Christ to recite the Words of Institution and by means of them to bless the Eucharist at the place and time of communion, in the presence of those who are to be communed, rather than at another place and time in the absence of those to whom it is offered.

Second: The words of the Supper: "He said, 'Take, eat; do this,' etc., are directed not to the elements but to those who were about to commune. Therefore it is not in accord with the institution to direct these words only to the bread and wine and that in the absence of those who are to be communed.

Third: Christ did not want communion to be a silent action, as a physician gives and applies a medicine prepared at another place and time, but when He gave the bread He had broken and the cup He had blessed to His disciples, He spoke. And indeed He added the command: "Do this in remembrance of me." Paul interprets this as proclaiming the Lord's death. Indeed, he says that this proclamation ought to be made not only in blessing the elements, as though when they are eaten the action should be silent, but "As often as you eat this bread and drink of this cup you proclaim the Lord's death." And He did not want this done only at the time of the Apostles, but until the Lord comes to judgment. These things are certainly very clear.

Fourth: Comfort concerning the use and benefit of the Eucharist is necessary most of all for the sick. There is no doubt that this is included and taught in the words of Christ by means of which this sacrament is effected. Faith also seeks and apprehends it in the Word, as Paul says of baptism: "Cleansing the church by the washing of water with the Word" (Eph. 5:26). Therefore it is right and beneficial that the words of the Supper, with which the bread and wine of the Eucharist are blessed, are recited in the presence and in the hearing of the sick person.

Fifth: In this way many questions and arguments about the particles of the elements reserved apart from use, which disturbed the simplicity of the doctrine and faith concerning the Eucharist, are obviated and cut off. (Ex. 2, 311 f.).

- 330 A careful examination of the evidence both for the Corpus Christi Festival and the consecrating of the elements at a certain designated place and then bringing them to the sick, against the clear Words of Institution, makes it certain to Chemnitz that the Lord's command to His church is to consecrate, distribute, and receive what is consecrated. His understanding of 1 Cor. 11:24–25 is clear, "For the whole of what was done in the institution of the Supper and not merely

some small part of it is included in the command, "This do" (Ex. 2, 404 f.). Chemnitz is so specific about this that he cannot be misunderstood, "It conflicts with the Words of Institution when the bread which has been blessed is not distributed, not received, not eaten" (Ex. 2, 281; emphasis added).

331 An examination of all the aspects of Chemnitz's doctrine of the consecration, including the veneration and the consumption of the *reliquiae*, reveals that he, in harmony with the *Sola Gratia*, excludes everything on the part of man in the reception of the grace of the sacrament. Faith, the eating and drinking, the carrying out of the rite or service by the assembled church—they all are excluded as effecting the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the sacrament. Man's response is not a condition for God's unilateral last will and testament. Man's response is contained in the gift of the Gospel which effects faith in the heart of man for his salvation. The cause of the Real Presence and of faith depend alone on the powerful creative word of Christ. No contingencies of time and place or the response on the part of man should depotentiate the word of the Gospel. Aegidius Hunnius really does depotentiate (*privas*) the Verba when he holds that we can't be sure of Christ's words, "This is my body," until the final act of the *sumptio* (see p. 89 f.). His example of the burning church, which does smell rather damply of the academic cloister, to escape the clear word of the Lord is rationalistic. He is applying to what according to Scripture is a divine miracle, a mutilated form of an Aristotelian argument which Aristotle himself probably did not apply consistently. What happens to consecrated elements because of an accident will have to be left to the Lord who knows all things. We cannot understand the ways of God's providence which rules and controls all things. But it will not do for puny man to deny Christ's almighty revealed Word, "This is my body, etc.," when He has spoken it. The Psalmist warns us against such fatuous delusions as the supposed Aristotelian model inculcates when he exclaims, "God has spoken once; twice have I heard this; that power belongeth unto God" (Psalm 62:11).

332 Just how concerned Chemnitz is to uphold an ordinance and command of Christ can be seen from his "Arguments From Scripture for Communion Under Both Kinds." He writes:

Because one must judge concerning the sacraments on the basis of their institution, no godly person will be able to doubt, nor should

doubt, that the one and only way of administering, dispensing, and using the sacraments — so far as their essence is concerned, the best, most correct and safest way — is the one which was taught by the Son of God Himself in the institution. For sacraments *are not created by nature or formed by human ingenuity*, but the institution of the Son of God, coming to the elements ordained by Him, makes sacraments. If, however, the institution of the Son of God is either taken away or adulterated or mutilated and changed, then we can in no way make or have true sacraments. This axiom cannot be shaken even by the gates of hell. (Ex. 2, 340; emphasis added).

333 There is no doubt that what Chemnitz here demands is not being followed by many Lutherans who today want to be followers of Luther in the strictest sense and who make a *quia* pledge to the Book of Concord. The Melancthonian blight has become well-entrenched over the years. What can be said about the past and present Lutherans whose doctrine and practice have not been as profound and consistent as that of Luther and Chemnitz? Chemnitz does have a word to say in this regard. He recognizes that when he “reproaches” Canon VII of the Tridentine Decree which anathematizes those who confess that the Eucharist “must of necessity be distributed immediately after the consecration to those who are present,” etc., he may seem to be at once condemning “all ancient churches” who had followed the papal custom. But that is really not the case. Cyprian spoke a word of wisdom here when he said, “If someone of those who were before us either from ignorance or in his simplicity did not observe what the Lord taught us by His example and institution to do, forgiveness may be granted to his simplicity from the gentleness of the Lord” (Ex. 2, 295). The authors of the Formula of Concord in their “Preface to the Book of Concord” take a similar approach in discussing the damnatory clauses in the article on the Lord’s Supper. They write, “It is not our purpose and intention to mean thereby [i.e., with the rejections of false and adulterated doctrine] those persons who err ingenuously” (Tappert, p. 11).

334 But having said that, Cyprian proceeds, “In our case, however, this cannot be pardoned, who have now been admonished and instructed by the Lord, in order that the evangelical law and tradition of the Lord may be everywhere observed and that there may be no departing from what Christ both taught and did” (Ex. 2, 295). Chemnitz notes that Cyprian had a further word of explanation, “He who errs in simplicity may be forgiven; but after inspiration and revelation of the truth has

taken place, whoever consciously or knowingly perseveres in his previous error no longer sins under the pardon of ignorance, for he relies on presumption and on a certain obstinacy, although he is vanquished by reason" (Ex. 2, 296). The Book of Concord is similarly worded in its clarification of its censures of false doctrine with respect to the Lord's Supper, "We mean specifically to condemn only false and seductive doctrines and their stiff-necked proponents and blasphemers. These we do not by any means intend to tolerate in our lands, churches, and schools, inasmuch as such teachings are contrary to the express Word of God and cannot coexist with it" (Tappert, p. 11).

**THE FORMULA OF CONCORD AND CHEMNITZ'S
THREEFOLD ACTION "BLESSING THE BREAD AND AT
ONCE BREAKING AND DISTRIBUTING IT" (EX. 2, 298)**

- 335 The Formula of Concord is in agreement with what Chemnitz has confessed in his writings on the Lord's Supper. Chemnitz does not have a private doctrine which is in conflict with his officially confessed doctrine. The Solid Declaration, VII, 73–90, not only has many verbal parallels with Chemnitz's statements but sets forth his doctrine in summary form. SD VII, 74, eliminates all synergism from the doctrine of the consecration, ascribing the sacramental union to the almighty power of God.
- 336 Sentences seventy-five and six (see also Ep. VII, 35) assert that the first institution confers its power to the consecratory words of the church. The officiant is the ambassador of Christ, speaking in His name and power. Through his words, spoken over the elements, Christ is still active, making the bread and the wine set before the church the body and blood of Christ. The quotation from Chrysostom makes this point clear beyond a shadow of doubt. Sentences 77 and 78 fortify what has so far been said with respect to the consecration. It does this by means of two quotations from Luther's writings on the Lord's Supper. Luther ascribes the power of the consecrating words to effect the sacramental union to Christ's divine command. In this way Christ connects His own command and word with the officiant's speaking.
- 337 Sentences 79 through 84 develop further the thought that speaking the words of consecration over the elements set before the church is

done in obedience to Christ's command, recorded in 1 Cor. 11:23–25 (see Ep. VII, 9). By means of this consecration the elements have been sacramentally united with the body and blood of Christ, and are distributed to be eaten and drunk. Paul in 1 Cor. 10:16 makes this clear when he speaks of the cup of blessing which *we* bless. The Words of Institution are to be spoken or chanted loudly because they have reference not only to the elements set before the assembly, but are also a proclamation of the Gospel for all the hearers (not only the communicants), so that their faith may be strengthened that Christ gives in the sacrament all the benefits He has won for mankind.

338 Sentences eighty-five through eighty-seven clarify the common rule *Nihil*, etc., already mentioned in 73. "Use" and "action" are synonymous when used in expounding the doctrine of the Sacrament of the Altar, just as Chemnitz has clarified them with his precise definition (see p. 11 f.). The terms are not restricted to the *sumptio* (see note #51). The Philippists, regarding an effective divinely mandated consecration as magic, limited the "action" to the *sumptio*. Since Chemnitz has seen that "action" and "use" were so vaguely applied in various ways by both the Philippists and the Genesio-Lutherans, he cuts through the clouds of confusion surrounding them by giving a precisifying definition which has been taken into the Formula. With this understanding of the terms to be retained in the church, it is important to remember that SD VII, 9, 11, 14, established the fact that the Real Presence is not limited to the *sumptio*.

339 In order to eliminate any lingering misunderstanding that may arise, 86 and 87 add specificity to 83–85 so that there should be no doubt as to the intended meaning. "Use" and "action" do not refer to the *sumptio* alone, nor do they primarily mean faith. But the church is to do precisely that which Christ ordained: consecrate, distribute, eat and drink the consecrated bread and wine which are the body and blood of Christ. If this ordinance is in any way changed, it is no longer the sacrament Christ instituted. When the Romanists consecrate in the Private Mass but do not distribute, they have altered the institution. And when they do not distribute what has been consecrated, but offer it in the Mass, lock it up, carry it around for adoration, taking it out of the framework of the ordained action, it is not a sacrament. The divinely instituted use requires that we in the Christian service consecrate bread and wine, distribute, receive, eat and drink what has

been consecrated, thereby proclaiming the Lord's death (SD VII, 84). Any other use made of a sacrament than the divinely mandated one is a perversion of the *Nihil* rule derived from the Scripture. Besides the misuse of the Lord's Supper in the Corpus Christi festivals, the Catholics have misused what they call baptism by baptizing bells, using it for curing leprosy, etc. It is clear that the ordinance of Christ prescribes that persons be baptized for the forgiveness of sins, life and salvation.

340 In closing off this part of the explanation of the *Nihil* rule, the Solid Declaration informs us that to avoid abuses this rule had been set up at the beginning, and it has been explained by Luther in material found in Jena IV⁷⁵ (SD VII, 87). The reference must be to the Wolferinus correspondence, which consists of two letters written by Luther to Simon Wolferinus, pastor at Eisleben, on July 4 and July 20, 1543.⁷⁶ Here is an example of Luther employing the axiom which is being clarified, namely, that nothing has the character of a sacrament outside the sacramental action.

341 The original Dresden edition of the Book of Concord, after the reference to Luther, has in the text, "Tom IV, Jena," but the page or folio number is missing. The new Tappert version has, unfortunately, dropped from the text itself the reference to Volume IV of the Jena Edition. Tappert, however, has added as a footnote (#4) the following reference to SD 87, "WA 30^{II}: 254, 255; cf. Smalcald Articles, pt III, art 15, 4." This note comes verbatim from the footnote 4 of the Goettingen Edition of the Book of Concord, *Die Bekenntnisschriften der Evangelisch-Lutherischen Kirche*, 5th ed., 1963, p. 1001. The Luther reference there given is to Luther's "Exhortation to all Clergy Assembled at Augsburg, 1530" (LW 34, 9–61). But there are problems with this identification that make it impossible to accept it. Luther's "Exhortation" is not found in either the German or Latin Volume IV of the Jena Edition but rather in Volume V of the German Jena Edition. The explicit page numbers in the Bekenntnis and Tappert editions refer to Luther's condemnation of the Roman abuse of the ordinance of baptism, such as baptizing bells, altars, pictures, etc., and its introduction of superstitious regulations, as for example, that only men (no women) could wash the corporals used in connection with the Eucharist, etc. The Smalcald reference is to Luther's afterthought at the end of the articles, stating that he does not wish to have anything

to do with “the pope’s bag of magic tricks which contains silly and childish articles.” But there is no reference in either of these works to the terms “action” or “use” with regard to the Lord’s Supper.⁷⁷ As has already been indicated, both Luther and Chemnitz would not sanction the misuse of the divinely instituted sacraments.

342 The Wolferinus correspondence was well known in the Sacramentarian controversy that preceded and also followed the writing of the Formula of Concord.⁷⁸ It is significant that the first complete American translation of the Book of Concord carries an obvious reference to the Wolferinus correspondence right in the text. This edition translates SD VII, 87, as follows, “For, in opposition to such papistical abuses, this rule was originally established, and it is explained by Dr. Luther, Tom 4, Jen. fol. 597.”⁷⁹ Even as late as a hundred and twenty-five years ago the SD VII, 87 reference to Luther was accepted as being the Wolferinus correspondence.

343 This correspondence uses the term “action,” discusses what effects the Real Presence, when the Real Presence begins, and what the mandatum “This do” includes, matters discussed in SD VII, 73–90. A comparison of a part of Luther’s second letter (July 20, 1543) with the Latin of the Formula will show a high degree of similarity in the formation of an axiom to exclude both Roman and Sacramentarian aberrations:

Luther’s Letter

Sacramentum nullum esse *extra actionem sacramentalem*.

There is no sacrament *outside of the sacramental action*.

SD VII, 85

Nihil habet rationem sacramenti *extra usum a Christo institutum oder extra actionem divinitus institutum*.

Nothing has the character of a sacrament *apart from the use instituted by Christ or apart from the use instituted by Christ or apart from the divinely instituted action*.

344 These two letters of Luther to Wolferinus were occasioned by the fact that in Luther’s home city of Eisleben in 1543 a controversy had arisen between two pastors, Frederick Rauber and Simon Wolferinus. Wolferinus, on the basis of Melancthon’s teaching had been mixing consecrated and unconsecrated elements. Appeals had been made to Jonas at Halle (the superintendent) and Luther at Wittenberg. It is evident

from the first letter (July 4, 1543) that this practice has caused Luther great grief. He writes that it is a “scandal” that Wolferinus was mixing the remains of the consecrated wine and bread with the unconsecrated bread and wine (*nempe quod religium vini vel pan is misces priori pani et vino*). Because of this practice of not having the consecrated elements consumed, Luther asked him if he wants to be considered a Zwinglian and that he is perhaps afflicted with the insanity of Zwingli. To avoid the offense of this evil appearance of mixing consecrated and unconsecrated elements, Wolferinus could easily follow the usage in the other churches, namely, eat and drink the remains of the sacrament with the communicants. By not making a distinction between consecrated and unconsecrated elements Luther insists that he is “abolishing the whole sacrament.” Such a point of view at best would lead to the “absurdity” that “time and moment will be the causes of the sacrament.” Luther declares that here he will oppose Wolferinus’ “scandalous and offensive peculiarity with all his strength”; and that “the Lord whom you oppose will oppose you in turn.”

345 It is evident that Luther believed that the consecration effects the Real Presence and that the “This do” means not only to consecrate the elements to be the body and blood of Christ but also to distribute them, receive them, eat and drink them (SD VII, 84). For Chemnitz, too, this *mandatum* means that everything that has been consecrated in the service is to be consumed, since he has confessed that “it conflicts with the Words of Institution when the bread which has been blessed is not distributed, not received, not eaten” (Ex. 2, 281). The fact that the other formulators of the Formula agreed to insert the reference to the Wolferinus correspondence in SD VII, 87, shows that they agreed with Chemnitz that SD VII, 83, 84, are to be understood as consuming all that came under the consecration in that Christian assembly.

346 Apparently the controversy between the two pastors continued, with Wolferinus defending his position with some theses. This resulted in Luther writing a second letter (July 20, 1543). Here the word “action” comes into consideration and it is evident that the term has not been clearly defined so that the participants are at times talking past each other. Luther acknowledges that Melancthon wrote correctly when he stated that there is “no sacrament outside of the sacramental action.” Luther is thinking of the truth that Christ’s command

is to consecrate, thus effecting the sacramental union, and then to consume that which has become the body and blood of Christ. If one changes the meaning of the words and does not do what Christ has commanded, then, of course, there is no sacrament. But he, as a trusting colleague of Melanchthon, is unaware that Melanchthon does not believe the consecration effects the Real Presence (see p. 83), but that for Melanchthon the Sacrament of the Altar is “action” in the vague sense of something being done which results in God’s promise of grace. A contemporary scholar has written that Melanchthon’s doctrine is a “functional doctrine since it speaks not so much of things (bread, wine, body, blood) or what they ‘are’ (*est*) but of processes (*ritus*, or *usus*) and their effects.”⁸⁰ Luther in the Wolferinus correspondence assumes that Melanchthon with his formula is only warning against what is outside the “sacramental action,” that is, “against reservation of and processions with the sacrament.”

- 347 Wolferinus believed that the presence of the body and blood of Christ was dependent on the ritual action as the cause, just as Melanchthon did. As a Melanchthonian Wolferinus had narrowed down the presence to the reception and eliminated the consecration as the means through which Christ effects the Real Presence. Luther, however, sees that the sacramental action’s most important and powerful part is the “speaking of the words.” Hence he tells Wolferinus, “If you do it in this way, you will appear to have absolutely no sacrament. For if such a quick breaking off of the action really exists, it will follow after the speaking of the Words [of Institution], which is the most powerful and principal action in the sacrament, no one would receive the body and blood of Christ because the action would have ceased.” The sacramental action includes more than the consecration, but the consecration (speaking of the Verba) is the most powerful and chief “action” in the whole sacramental action. They are this, as Luther and Chemnitz have so often reiterated, because they effect the miracle of the Real Presence. And the communicants are directed to eat and drink the consecrated elements *because* they are the body and blood of the Savior. They do not *become* the body and blood of the Savior when the condition of the *sumptio* is fulfilled, as Hunnius erroneously held (see p. 90 f.). The Formula confesses the very same truth with Chemnitz and Luther and nails it down with the reference to the Wolferinus correspondence.

- 348 Luther next writes that the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the consecrated elements must be extended in time, “Therefore one must look not only upon this movement of instant or present action, but also on the time, not in terms of mathematical but of physical breadth, that is, one must give this action a certain period of time and a period of appropriate breadth of time, as they say ‘in breadth.’”
- 349 And now Luther gives a definition of the “sacramental action” which is the doctrinal point under discussion in SD VII, 73–90, “Therefore we shall define the time or the sacramental action in this way: that it starts with the beginning of the Word of the Lord [*ab initio orationis dominicae*],⁸¹ and lasts until all have communicated, have emptied the chalice, have consumed the Hosts, until the people have been dismissed, and [the priest] has left the altar.” Luther understands the “This do” of the Words of Institution to mean that we should do all that Christ Himself did at the First Supper, namely, consecrate the elements with His words, which effect the Real Presence, distribute all that of which Christ has said “This is my body; this is my blood,” and consume all that which has been consecrated at that service. Then the assembly has done the will of the Lord and can be rightfully dismissed by the officiant.
- 350 Luther recognizes that a practical problem may arise in which more has been consecrated than would have been necessary. His solution is a practical one, that the minister and the last communicants should consume the *reliquiae* at the service, “Therefore see to it that if anything is left over of the sacrament, either some communicants or the priest himself and his assistants receive it, so that it is not only a curate or someone else who drinks what is left over in the chalice, but he gives it to the others who were also participants in the body [of Christ].” Chemnitz has understood the Verba in the same way, because he says that “it conflicts with the Words of Institution when the bread which has been blessed is not distributed, not received, not eaten” (Ex. 2, 281).
- 351 That this is the position of the Formula of Concord can be seen from SD VII, 84, which states that “we take bread and wine, consecrate it, distribute it, receive it, eat it and drink it.” But lest there be any misreading of this, SD VII, 87 refers to the Wolferinus correspondence of Luther. As a matter of hindsight we can acknowledge that it would have

been well if the folio number had been given in the original Dresden edition of the Book of Concord in addition to the volume number of Luther's works. But in the controversy over the meaning of the "action" commanded by the Lord, this correspondence of Luther with Wolferinus was used so much that it did not need a more specific reference than "*von D. Luthero selbst, Tom. 4. Jen., erkläret ist.*"

352 From this evidence it is apparent that Luther, Chemnitz, and the Formula have the same understanding of 1 Cor. 11:23–25 also with reference to the matter of the *reliquiae*.

Notes 44–81, Chapter V

44. Es sind aber under andern vielen/zween Punct darauss mit fleiss zumercken/ wölches uns zu dies en zeiten nützlich und nötig sind (HS 116).
45. It is important to note that these theologians in this context regard the terms *localiter* and *circumscriptive* as synonymous and thus referring to that mode of presence as when Christ walked bodily on earth, "in a *circumscribed* and *local* manner according to the definition of this life, . . . as is the case with other men" (TNC 426; emphasis added). They did not want *localiter* to be understood in such a way as to deny the definitive mode of Christ's presence, where the space is material and circumscribed but Christ's mode of presence is a supernatural one, according to which He neither occupies nor yields space. His presence in the Supper is different from His general omnipresence and from His earthly presence 1950 years ago (see p. 37–39).
46. See Sasse, *This is My Body* (see note #1), p. 150.
47. The *Histori* first quotes from Bugenhagen's Latin text (126–130) and then gives a German translation (130–134).
48. Christus dicit, Hoc facite. In quo verbo fidenter facimus, quae Christus instituit. Non fidimus in nostris consecrationibus et anhelitu, ut stulte obijcitur nobis, sed hoc verbo Christi. Hoc facite, hoc est, fidimus in Christi institutione et iusione.
Christus non dixit, Accipite et comedite panem, accipite et bibite vinum, sed, hoc facite, id est, accipite, et comedite meum corpus, sic instituo, sic volo, sic iubeo, etc. Non dico aut iubeo, ut vos faciatis panem corpus meum. Instituo et volo, ut in commemorationem mortis meae edatis corpus meum, etc. (HS 126).
49. Interroga Christi institutionem, quae dicit, Panis iste meus est Corpus meum, Poculum istud meum est sanguis meus, etc. Unde nobis haec omnia? Ex Christi institutione. Ipse sic instituit, voluit. Christi ani hanc institutionem amplectuntur, et gratias agunt. Stultum igitur fuerit haec verba institutionis Christi omittere, impium his non confidere. Nam sine his, quid quaeso in pane et poculo quaeremus?
Haec verba sacrae Christi institutiones publice recitat minister nostre Ecclesiae super pane et poculum, super mensam, super altare posita, nullo eis adhibito flatu (ut irridemur) quando agnoscit, nihil hic sua virtute fieri, sed omnia virtute institutionis et ordinationis Christi. Et recitat, ut agnoscant communicaturi, quid erga hoc Sacramentum sit nobis et faciendum et credendum, ultique contra Sacramentarios perpetuo pro nobis respondeat haec institutio et usque ad finem mundi duratura Christi ordinatio, quae efficit, ut sit ibi nobis ad edendum et bibendum corpus et sanguis Christi, non postulat aut iubet; ut nos Corpus et sanguinem Christi faciamus: quod datur nobis, grato animo et exultante gratiarum

actione accipimus, non praesumus facere, quod quia non iubeter a Christo, facere non possumus. Dicit enim, Hoc est Corpus meum, Hic est Sanguis meus. Non dicit, Facite meum corpus, Facite meum sanguinem. Non factores sui corporis et sanguinis voluit, sed communicatores, id est, ut ederemus Dominicum Corpus et sanguinem biberemus, in eius commemorationem, quod corpus, et quem sanguinem, nobis ipse per suam institutionem daret, non nobis ipsi faceremus.

50. The index to the English translation, *The Lord's Supper* carries no reference to "consecration," although it is used at least once in a significant way which reflects Chemnitz's understanding of it as effecting the Real Presence, p. 156. Nor is there any reference to the synonyms of the term, e.g., p. 46, "this bread here present *after receiving its name from God*, is not only bread but at the same time also the body of Christ." The index to the second volume of *The Examination*, it is true, has several references to the consecration, but they are vague by the omission of direct references to what Chemnitz himself says, and in general limiting the references to the papalists and the Latin Fathers.
51. J. H. C. Fritz, *Pastoral Theology* (St. Louis: CPH, 1932) is here obviously at odds with the Chemnitz understanding of the consecration when he says, "The minister therefore should repeat the Words of Institution at the time when the sacrament is to be administered in order thereby to consecrate the elements, that is, to set them apart and bless them in their holy use in the sacrament even as Christ has commanded, and at the same time thereby to invite the communicants to receive not only bread and wine but also orally, Christ's body and blood (1 Cor. 10:16)," p. 143.
Pieper, too, here differs from Chemnitz, "Consecration is correctly defined as the act whereby bread and wine are detached from their ordinary use and appointed to the use of the Lord's Supper, that is, they 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 is received" (*Dogmatics* III, 366).
52. Prof. Siegbert Becker adopted an entirely different interpretation of these texts. He asserted that "Christ did not say, 'Say, This is my body,' but 'Take and eat, this is my body'" (*Nya Våktaren*, 8/1973, p. 104). He thereby limited the force of Luke 22:19 and 1 Cor. 11:23–25 by holding that these texts do not command us to do what Christ Himself did.
53. Chemnitz is here in agreement with Luther that we preach the Gospel to the world and administer the sacraments only because Christ has given this command to His Church, "We have the Gospel. Christ says, 'Go and preach the Gospel' not only to the Jews, as Moses did, but to 'all nations,' to 'all creatures' [Mark 16:15]. To me it is said, 'He who believes and is baptized will be saved' [Mark 16:16] . . . These words strike me too, for I am one of the 'all creatures,' If Christ had not added 'preach to all creatures,' then I would not listen, would not be baptized, just as I now will not listen to Moses because he is given not to me but only to the Jews" (*How Christians Should Regard Moses*, 1525; LW 35, 171).
54. Prof. Seth Erlandsson has entirely misunderstood Chemnitz in his attempt to defend his own thesis that Chemnitz "makes no doctrine of any moment of consecration" ("The Biblical and Lutheran Doctrine of the Lord's Supper," WLQ, April 1977, 95–112; see especially p. 103f.). While he quotes at length from the Chemnitz *Examination*, he carefully skips over what Chemnitz has to say specifically about the consecration (Ex. 2, 222–230; since Prof. Erlandsson quotes from the Latin, the corresponding pages in the Ed. Preuss Latin edition — 1861 — will also be given, 299–303). Besides, Prof. Erlandsson makes no reference to Chemnitz's discussion of the adoration of the sacrament (Ex. 2, 276–284; Latin 320–323). As will be recognized later, an analysis of this part of the *Examination* will reveal that if Chemnitz did not know when the Real Presence began, he would be guilty of gross idolatry.

In spite of all this evidence, Prof. Erlandsson seeks to defend his thesis that Chemnitz did not know when the Real Presence began by referring to Chemnitz's review of the Roman theory that the presence of Christ extends beyond the mandated use of the consecration, the distribution and the reception (Ex. 2, 241–252; Latin 306–311). Chemnitz and the Formula of Concord operate with a precise definition of the terms “action” and “use,” which they have derived from the Words of Institution (SD VII, 85–87). This “use” includes no more and no less than the consecration, the distribution, and the reception. Prof. Erlandsson uses Chemnitz here as if he were rejecting the teaching that the body and blood of Christ within the precisely defined “action” are not present before the distribution. As a matter of fact, which can easily be seen from reading this selection of the *Examination*, Chemnitz is only attacking the Roman teaching that the Eucharist “contains the body and blood of Christ in a lasting manner and permanently also apart from its *use*” (Ex. 2, 242; emphasis added; Latin, 307). The reservation of the sacrament, Chemnitz contends, “has no basis in the Words of Institution (Ex. 2, 243). As a matter of fact, it “is overthrown by this one rule, which is both wholly true and wholly firm, that sacraments apart from their divinely instituted *use* are not sacraments” (Ex. 2, 243; emphasis added; see pp. 11–14 of this monograph for Chemnitz's precising definition of the terms “action” and “use”). Prof. Erlandsson's fundamental error which leads him to this misuse of Chemnitz is that for him the “blessing” is only a word of praise or thanksgiving, and that the words of Christ, “This is my body” only have “connection with the distribution and reception” (WLQ, April 1977, p. 95). Chemnitz does not admit to the possibility that the “blessing” or the “consecration” could simply be some word of praise or thanksgiving, “The Eucharist is sanctified or consecrated, not by the prayer of man, but by the Word of Institution” (Ex. 2, 228). But “when we ascribe the blessing to the words of Christ in the institution, [we] have a sure and firm foundation” (Ex. 2, 231).

55. “In causa Anexeos me ipsum diu offendit consecratio, ut vocant. Et Oecolampadius vehementer urget, qui fieri possit, ut vocetur de coelo Christus? fiatne hoc meritis ac precibus sacerdotis seu populi, an, ut quid am dixerunt, virtute verborum? Tandem veni in hanc sententiam, nec meritis seu precibus sacer dotis seu populi tribuendum esse, quod Christus det nobis suum corpus et sanguinem, nec virtuti verborum; ed enim, ut sonat, magicum est” (*Corpus Reformatorum* I, 948 f.).
56. “Habe Vitus diesen Zeugen gefragt/Ob auch die worte der Einsetzung/dadurch des Priester das Brot und We in zum Sacrament benedicirt/ein Sacrament/und der ware Leib des Herrn were/Dann er hielt für eine Zauberey/vel Magiam . . . Vitus . . . unter andern gesagt/ *Quod verba institutionis Sacramenti non essent pars vel species Sacramenti, sed tantum contio ad populum, de usu et fructum Sacramenti.*” (Erhard Sperber, *Christliche und notwendige verantwortung Erhardi Sperbers/wider die gewliche bezichtigung und beschwerliche aufflag, der Sacramentirer und Rottengeister zu Dantzig*/, Erfurd, 1563, fol K 21.) (A duplicated copy of this book is in the Rare Book Room of Bethany Lutheran Theological Seminary, Mankato, Minn.).
57. “. . . Das es kein *Magia* wer. Dann was aus dem befehl und durch das Wort Gottes geschege/ das dasselb war/recht und krefftig/und wer solchsl(wann mans ja *Magiam* nennen solte) *Magia sancta et iussa.* Das ander aber/so durch böse Leuta geschege/one befehl Gottes/und desselbigen worts/alleine aus eingebung des Teufels/das es *Magia inconcessa* wer/und hette mit diesem gar keine vergleichung” (Sperber, fol. K21).
58. Prof. Lowell Green has recently demonstrated that the conviction of Luther and his followers that the consecration is the most powerful and principal action in the Supper reflects itself in the early Lutheran liturgies where “the consecrated host and chalice are always called the *body* and *blood* in the distribution or manducation” (emphasis in the original text). Prof.

Green calls it a “Reformed practice” to state in the rubrics “that the pastor shall distribute bread and wine” (emphasis in the original text). — *A Contemporary Look at the Formula of Concord*, Robert Preus and Wilbert Rosin, editors, St. Louis: CPH, 1978, p. 304.

59. Pastor Kenneth Miller, in a recent article (*The Christian News*, Sept. 20, 1982; it is reprinted in the *Christian News Encyclopedia*: Washington, Mo.: Missouriian Publishing Co., 1982, p. 489) asserted that he does not here accept the exegesis of the Formula of Concord. For him the “This do” is limited only to the eating and drinking and not to the recitation of the Verba, “The promise applies to everyone who outwardly obeys the command, Take, eat, drink, though the promise of grace applies only to the worthy communicants. So long as the elements are under the words (of institution), namely, being used via eating and drinking, Christ’s body and blood are there present.” Pastor Miller makes his position clear that he has depotentiated the Verba. To the statement that the consecration is divine creative word, he poses the rhetorical question, “Wo steht das geschrieben?”

Prof. Siegbert Becker apparently held a similar viewpoint (see note #52). He commended Pastor Miller’s exposition “as an excellent piece of scholarship,” and that in the main it is worthy of receiving “a hearty ‘Yea and Amen.’” The only suggestion that he had to make to Pastor Miller is that “for the sake of completeness some of us might have appreciated it, if, when he [i.e., Pastor Miller] added that ‘the Word does not teach a Real Presence apart from the eating and drinking,’ he would have added, ‘neither is there a Real Presence apart from the words of institution’” (*The Christian News*, Oct. 11, 1982).

60. *Apologia oder verantwortung des Christ/ichen ConcordiBuchs/In welcher die ware Christliche Lehre/so im ConcordiBuch verfasset/mit gutem Grunde heiliger Göttlicher Schrifft vertheidiget: Die Verkerung aber und Calumnien so von unrühigen Leuhten wider gedachtes Christlich Buch im Druck aufgesprenget widerlegt werden*, Dresden: 1584. Prof. Em. of German, Milton Zigel of the University of Iowa kindly made the translation.

Zum funffzehenden wollen sie das Christliche Concordi Buch gar päpstisch machen/in dem es lehret/das die *Elementa*, Brot und Wein/durch Christi Wort müssen/wie Paulus 1 Cor. 10. schreibet/gesegnet werden. Da schreien sie: Wir werden gar zu Papisten/und es sey kein Unterscheid Zwischen des Papistischen/und zwischen unser Kirchen Consecration.

Sie hetten aber solches Geschreys gar nicht bedürfft/dann das Christliche ConcordiBuch dermussen unterschiedlich von solcher Consecration handelt: das sie sich billig in jr Hertz hienein hetten schemen sollen/ehe sie angefangen diss fals das Christlich ConcordiBuch zu diffamiren/und demselbigen Papistische Irrthümb zuzumessen.

Aber was that *Calumnia* nicht/welche des Teuffels selbst eigene Kunst ist/daher er auch seinen Namen hat/das er Diabolus heisset.

So viel dann die Sach an jr selbst antrifft/beruhet es allzumal darauff/wil auch das ConcordiBuch mit ausdrücklichen worten vermeldet: Das nicht einiges Menschen Wort oder Werck/sondern allein des Herren Christi Wort und Ordnung sey/das sein Leib und Blut im Abendmal gegenwertig ist/und ausgetheilt werde. Dann die Wort Christi nicht allein in der ersten Einsetzung krefftig gewest/sonder wehren/gelte/wircken/und sind noch krefftig/das an allen Orten/da das Abendmal nach Christi Einsetzung gehalten:und seine wort gebraucht werden/aus Kraft und Vermögen derselhen Wort/die er im ersten Abendmal gesprochen/sein Leib und Blut warhafftig genwertig sind/und ausgetheilt werden.

Denn Christus selbst/wo man seine Einsetzung helt/und seine Wort über dem Brot und Kelch spricht/und also das Brot und den Kelch segnet/wie Paulus redet/und das gesegnete Brot und Kelch austheilet/durch die gesprochene Wort/aus Kraft der ersten Einsetzung krefftig ist.

Da sprechen sie aber: Christus habe nirgendt verheissen/dass/wann die Wort der Einsetzung repetiert würden/das er mit seinem Leibe da gegenwertig/und denselben in und mit dem Brot austheilen wölle. Wir sagen aber ihnen herwider/Ob dann Christus nicht befohlen habe das zu thun/das er im ersten Abendmahl gethan hat? Nun hat er aber die Wort gesprochen/das sollen wir auch thun: Dann das Element wird nicht *Sacramentum* ohne das Wort/wie Augustinus saget: *Accedat verbum ad elementum et fit sacramentum*, Das Wort komme zum Elemente/so wirdts ein Sacrament.

So saget auch das Christlich ConcordiBuch nicht/das umb der Ertzählung der Wort willen/welche vom Kirchendiener geschicht/Christi Leib und Blut da sey: sondern umb der ersten Eynsetzung und Wort Christi *willen/welche/so* oft das Abendmal gehandelt wirdnach Christi Befehl sollen widerholet werden.

Paulus redet ja von dem gesegneten Kelch/den nicht alleine Christus in der ersten Einsetzung gesegnet/sondern den auch wir segenen. Mit was Worten aber werden und wollen wir den Kelch segenen/das er sey eine Ausstheilung oder Gemeinschaft des Blutes Christi/wann wir nicht dazu brauchen die Wort/mit welchem Christus das Abendmal eingesetzt hat: *Esset/Trinket/Das ist mein Leib/Das ist mein Blut*. Zu dem ist auch im Christlichen ConcordiBuch/*ex Chrysostomi Homilia de proditione Jude*, der schöne Spruch angezogen/welcher diese ganze *controversiam* determineret/wann nur unsere Gegentheil Ohren hette zu hören/und ein hertz/und das eter warheit hepplichen köndte. Die Wort lauten also: *Et nunc ille praesto est Christus, qui illam ornavit mensam, ipse quoque Consecrat: Sacerdotis ore verba proferunter, et Dei virtute operantur et gratia*. Und nun is Christus gegenwertig/der dies en Tisch Zubereitet/der heiliget ihn auch: Durch das Dieners Mund werden die Wort gesprochen/aber durch Gottes Krafft und Gnade sind sie krefftig. Is denn das nichts war/oder ist denn solches Papistisch/wie unser Gegentheil fürgiebet?

Und also redet auch Irenaeus *lib 5. Quando ergo mixtus calix, et fractus panis percipit Verbum Dei, sit Eucharistia sanguinis et Corporis Christi*. Derhalben wann zu dem Kelch und gebrochenen Brot das Wort Gottes kömpt/so wirds *Eucharistia* des Blutes und Leibs Christi. *Ec lib 4, cap 34. Qui est in terra panis, percipiens vocationem Dei, iam non communis panis est, sed Eucharistia duabus rebus constans, etc.* Wann das Brot/so yon der Erden ist/den Göttlichen Beruff überkompt/so ist es nicht mehr ein gemein Brot/sondern *Eucharistia*, so aus zweyen Dingen bestehet/ac. Aber vielleicht wird unser Gegentheil *Irenaeum* auch zum Papisten machen/oder wird endtlich da hienaus kommen/das sie das Abendmal ganz und gar/ohne Wiederholung der Wort der Einsetzung Christi/ handeln/damit es nicht das ansehen *habe/das* sie Papisten sein . . .

Aber das vorige geben sie für/Wann die Wiederholung der Wort der Einsetzung mache/das Christi Leib im Abendmal da sey/so müsse es auch ausserhalb das rechten Brauchs/wie er von Christo eingesetzt/ein Sacrament sein: Das aber sey eben die Papistische Abgötterey. Gemach liebe Herren/das Christliche ConcordiBuch gehet nicht weiter/als biss auf den rechten Brauch/von Christo eingesetzt. So sagt es auch nirgendt/das mans in die Monstrantzen legen/und ins Sacramentheusslein einsperren solle: sondern verwirfft dasselbige ausdrücklich/und wie gemeldt/redet es nur von dem Brauch/den Christus selbst eingesetzt. Summa des Gegenteils lehr leufft auff die Epicurische verachtung des ganze Abendmals hinaus/die es nur für lauter Brot und Wein helt (Ap FC 157 f.).

61. Pieper's analysis of SD VII, 73–90 is a case in point (*Christian Dogmatics* III, 365 f., "What Constitutes the Lord's Supper"). While he in this section quotes nearly all of this part of the Formula, his omissions are significant. 76b is quoted but 76a is omitted (p. 365). This is the Chrysostom quotation which meant so much to the authors of the Formula because it "settles the whole controversy." It is a key quotation in Chemnitz's discussion

of the consecration in the *Examination*, as is the Irenaeus quotation (Ex 2, 227). Further, 74 and 75a are quoted, but 75b is omitted (p. 366). 75b nails down the fact that Christ is still active by means of the spoken words we speak over the elements by virtue of the first institution. While Pieper quotes 83 and 84, he does not quote 85 and 86 (p. 372 f.). These latter two sections define precisely the two important words *usus* and *actio*, asserting that they are synonymous when used in connection with the Lord's Supper. This is important because the meaning of these two terms was at stake in the sacramental controversy among the Lutherans in the 1550s–60s. Pieper blurs the meaning of “use” in this context when he says that Saliger held that the sacramental union obtained already before the “use” (p. 372). In accord with the precise definition given in SD VII, 85, 86, Saliger did not, because he held that the presence was effected by the consecration, while at the same time teaching that the consecrated elements, that is, the body and blood are to be distributed and consumed. Pieper, it is apparent, restricts the meaning of *usus* to the *sumptio*, thereby confining the Real Presence only to the eating and drinking. These significant omissions can very easily (and possibly unwittingly) sidetrack Chemnitz's doctrine that “our bread and cup becomes sacramental by a certain consecration; it does not grow that way” (Ex 2, 225). There can be no doubt about Chemnitz's understanding of this sentence, for he has also written, “the meaning is not that the blessed bread which is divided, which is offered, and which the Apostles received from the hand of Christ was not the body of Christ but becomes the body of Christ when the eating of it is begun” (Ex 2, 248). Besides, by not considering these omitted parts of the Formula, one also can sidetrack Luther's doctrine which the authors so assiduously strove to restore. Luther confessed this doctrine in many places, as for example, in the words that just precede what is quoted in SD 77, “For Christ commanded (as St. Paul says in 1 Cor II [:22 f.]) that when we meet together and speak His words with reference to bread and wine, then it is to be His body and blood” (LW 38, 199).

Schmid (*The Doctrinal Theology of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*, tr. Charles H. Hay, 1875; reprint in 1966 by APH, Minneapolis) is also extremely careful not to quote the really pertinent parts of SD VII, 73–90. He quotes only 83 and 84 (p. 572) and 77b (p. 574). But he does quote profusely from the seventeenth century dogmaticians to the effect that the consecration is only the separation of the external elements from common use and setting them apart for a sacred use, so that “the consecrated bread becomes the communion of the body and the consecrated wine becomes the communion of the blood of Christ” (Quenstedt, p. 572). Hutterus is then quoted to clarify the meaning, namely, that it is a “false premise” to assume that “the sacramental union depends upon the force and efficacy of the recitation of the words of institution” (p. 573).

E. W. A. Koehler, (*A Summary of Christian Doctrine*, 1939, 1952, p. 220 f.) quotes without comment SD VII, 74–76, but by means of omission marks (...) specifically omits the Chrysostom quotation (76a) which for Chemnitz, et al., “settles the whole controversy.”

62. W A Br X, 340, 341; in the text of the Formula, SD VII, 87 refers to the Wolferinus Correspondence as found in the Jena Latin edition of Luther, volume 4.
63. Hunnius, Aegidius, *Articulus sive Locus De Sacra mantis Veteris et Novi Testamenti, praecipue de Baptismo et Coena Domini*, Frankforti ad Moenam, 1590. Rare Book #302 in the Bethany Lutheran Theological Seminary Library.
64. Pp. 712–714, Prof. Daniel Metzger, Bethany Lutheran College, has made the translation.

Omitto Transubstantiationem, De unione sacramentali quae a nostris conceditur, quaero, an non ilia fiat in ipsa recitatione verborum, etiam priusquam manducetur panis?

Primo scias velim, non vi huius recitationis, quae fit a Ministro, sed vi institutionis Christi, ad quam mentes fidelium per illam recitationem revocantur, velle Christum sacramentaliter

adesse corpore et sanguine sua. Quare nec inter recitationem verborum statuitur aliqua fieri unio panis et Corporis Christi, ante quam in ipsa actione manducetur panis: sed quemadmodum panis est *Koinonia* Corporis Christi in ipso demum manducationis actu, et non prius: sic idem panis tum demum sacramentaliter unitur corpori, quando fit illa *Koinonia* atque sumptio; imo vino sacramentalis nihil est aliud, quam quod Christi Corpus non sine pane, ut nec panis sine corpore, sed pane inteveniente Corpus Christi manducatur unacum illo iunctim ac sine distractione. Haec, quae dicimus, illustrari proposito quod am casu possunt. Etenim si accideret, ut recitatis iam A Ministro verbis institutionis, facta que, ut vocant, consecratione, exoriretur incendium aut alius quispiam tumultus priusquam ad mensam Domini accessisset; atque sic casu isto impediretur sacra actio: quaeritur, anne vi facta recitationis unitum quodam Arcano modo sit Christi Corpus pani, etiam extra panis usum in manducatione positum, et improvise casu impeditum? Hic certe quisque non stupidus negative respondere mallet, quam affirmative. Unde iudicium facere promptum est, quid de Consecratione habendum, videlicet non tribuendam ei quandam vim magicam sive transsubstantiandi panem in Corpus, sive uniendi sacramentaliter panem corpori, vinum sanguini.

Cur ista recitatio vocatur consecratio, si eam omni virtute privas? et cur Apostolus vocat benedictionem, iniqui: Poculum, cui benedicimus, etc.?

Nequaquam vero sua illam privo aut spolio virtute. Nam ut recitatio ista refertur tota ad actionem subsequendam manducationis et bibitionis: sic per eam segregatur panis et vinum e communi vulgo aliarum eiusdem generis creaturarum, ad singularem hunc usum sacrum, quo Dispensationi potiarum bonorum, nempe corporis et sanguinis Domini subserviunt. Praeterea benedictionis voce apud Paulum, et consecrationis, ut vulgo appellat, non sola institutae coenae recitatio historic a notatur; sed etiam adiuncta intelligitur praecatio, qua precamur Dominum, ut nos sibi paret dignos et acceptos hospites huius sacrosancti convivium, ut ipsius corporis et sanguinis in coenae mysterio ad nostram consolationem fideique confirmationem participes efficiamur. Quemadmodum vero in Consecratione cibi vulgaris, qua is sanctificari scribitur per sermonem Dei ac preceationem, sanctificatio illa praecatioque tota hunc tendit, ut cibus ille, quando a nobis sumitur et manducatur, nobis sit utilis ad hanc vitam et valetudinem temporalem alendam et conservandam: Sic quoque benedictionis vox apud Apostolum I Cor. 10. utque consecrationis vox, in consueta ratione loquendi ipsiusmet usum, ut nobis corpus et sanguis Christi, quae una cum symbolis sumuntur, sint in usu Sacramenti huius cibus et potus salutaris ad alendam vitam spiritualem in nobis.

65. Rosamond Kent Sprague in her essay, "The Four Causes: Aristotle's Exposition and Ours" (*The Monist*, 1968, 52: 298–300) categorically states "that the time honored method of expounding Aristotle's doctrine of the four causes . . . is non-Aristotelian." And she suggests that "the method should be dropped." Examining in detail an exposition of Aristotle's *Physics* II, 3 and II, 7, she notes that "Aristotle changes his example each time." "whereas the traditional method involves choosing a single example, almost always an artifact and following this example through all four causes." She finds that the price to be paid for this in order that the "dimmiest student in the class" can grasp the statue analysis, is extremely high, because it produces four "resulting misconceptions."

Later, Robert B. Todd picked up her analysis for further study in his "The Four Causes: Aristotle's Exposition and the Ancients" (*The Journal of the History of Ideas*, 1976, 37: 319–322). After examining Aristotle even more closely, he concluded that "the only problem with this illustration [the sculptor at work on the statue to show the four causes] is that it does not appear in any Aristotelian text; in fact, Aristotle varies his illustrations of each of the four

causes and uses the case of the sculptor to demonstrate only the relation between the efficient and the material causes." He traces the history of the use of the four-cause illustration as developed after Aristotle through the Middle Ages down to the present. He then agrees that this "over-extended sculptor" should be retired "on the philosophical grounds presented by Prof. Sprague."

Prof. W. T. Jones in *A History of Western Philosophy* (New York: Harcourt Brace) concludes that "the analysis [The Fourfold Cause] requires considerable modification when it is applied to natural objects" (Vol. I, p. 188). And, finally, Roy Bashkar has recently stated that "the system lacked a clear criterion for intellectual intuition, which facilitated its dogmatic degeneration in the Middle Ages" (*Dictionary of the History of Science*, W. F. Bynum, E. J. Browne, R. Porter, eds., Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1981, p. 27).

66. One of the most recent is the statement of Pastor Kenneth Miller in the *Christian News Encyclopedia*, Washington, MO: 1982, p. 489: "Since Holy Writ nowhere teaches that the Real Presence begins at the moment of the blessing, the Lutheran Church has never taught it either If you will say that Luther taught the Real Presence existed prior to the distribution, then you must also acknowledge that he had no Biblical basis for it."
67. In a communion hymn written by the Danish theologian and hymn writer, Thomas Kingo, late in the seventeenth century, one finds these words in stanza 13: "O Jesus, lad mig aldrig gaa Fra dette bord, hvo du est paa." This hymn with its stanza 13 was taken into the Norwegian Synod's *Salmebok* (revised edition, 1903) as hymn #25. This hymnbook is chiefly the work of Pastors Ulrik Vilhelm Koren and Markus Fredrik Wiese. Prof. Juul Madson has translated it into English. Stanza 13 reads as follows:

O Jesus, let me ne'er depart
This table whereon real Thou art.
Indeed, I cast the world aside
And pray that only Thou abide. (*Lutheran Sentinel*, June 23, 1977)

68. See Sasse, *This is My Body* (Note #1), pp. 83–85 for a summary of the contents of Luther's essay. Sasse gives the title as "Of the Adoration of the Sacrament of the Blessed Body of Christ."
69. *Historie*, etc., pp. 539–546. Pastor Kenneth Miller (see note #59) has argued that George of Anhalt could not have written that he had seen Luther fall down and reverently adore Christ when the Sacrament was elevated. He bases his argument on the fact that the Weimar edition of Luther's Works has a "non" (not) instead of a "nos" (we) in a statement of the Prince, namely, "We have not (non) seen Luther," etc. Pastor Miller refuses to accept the possibility that there could have been a misprint perpetuated in the Weimar edition, since the Weimar editors do not even make a note of it" [i.e., that it could be "nos" instead of "non"] (*The Christian News Encyclopedia*, p. 489). Certainly if Pastor Miller would have had the opportunity of studying George of Anhalt's Fourth Sermon on the Sacrament, he would not have been so sure that Prince George did not write, "We have seen Luther," etc. Besides this, Pastor Miller could have read Luther's letter to Prince George (June 26, 1542) who had inquired about the propriety of dropping the elevation from the service. Luther, after telling him that it is permissible but not a necessary part of the service, is quite explicit in stating that if in the future there might be reasons for restoring the elevation, then it is free so that one can again practice the elevation without danger (St. L. XIX, 1340 f.). This letter together with Prince George's Fourth Sermon renders it impossible to accept Pastor Miller's thesis that Prince George wrote, "We have not seen Luther," etc., instead of "We have seen Luther," etc.

70. *Historie*, 540–543. The translation is by Prof. Richard Lammert of Bethany Lutheran College.

In der vierdten Predigt redet er auch von eusserliche Ehrerbietung dess Sacraments also: Wo man gewisslich glaubet/dass unser Herr Jesus Christus/ warer Gott und Mensch/zur Rechten dess Himmlischen Vatters sitzend/ seiber unser Ertzhirt unnd hoher Bischoff/ unser Seelen Leibhaftig/gegenwertig/und in diesem allerheiligsten/hochsten und wunderlichsten Geheimnis/selbst seinen natürlichen Leib/den er für uns gegeben/unnd sein theuwres Blut/so er zur vergebung unser Sünde vergossen/durch dess Dieners Hände uns zu essen/unnd zu trincken darreichet/wil das seine klare und unwidersprechliche wort bezeugen. So muss warlich das Hertz auch heraus brechen/ unnd sich eusserlich zu erkennen geben. Wo es aber nicht geschicht/oder solche eusserliche Reverenz wissentlich und freuentlich auss verachtung/ unterlassen wirdt/ists ein gewisses Warzeichen/das es inn hertzen nicht ist, etc.

Und abermal: Wir wollen nichts zu thun mit denen/welche die ware gegenwertigkeit dess Leibs und Bluts unsers Herren Jesu Christi im hochwirdigen Sacrament/vermesslich und freuentlich/wider unsers Herren Jesu Christi klare und unwidersprechliche Wort verleugnen/oder sonst unsers lieben Herren Wort überklügeln/und ihres gefallens beugen/und glossiren/und die rechte Hand Göttlicher Mayestet verkürzen/unnd an einen sonderlichen ort binden wollen/und alsdenn Auss dem grunde Schliessen das Christum im Sacrament nicht sein köndt/unnd derhalben das hochwirdige Sacrament/ja Christum im Sacrament anzubeten/für ein Abgöttereie halten, etc.

Dieselben zwar sollen und können es mit gutem Gewissen nicht handeln unnd gebrauchen/dieweil sie die Wort Christi auff andern verstandt ziehen/ denn sie lauten/ und nicht glauben/dass allda Christus gegenwertig sey. So Zeiget S. Paulus/was nit auss dem glauben gehet/dass es Sünde ist. Und were in solchem Zweifel die anbettung doppelt Sünde. Erstlich/darumb dass sie den Worten Christi nicht gläuben. Zum andern auch/dass sue ausser und wider jren Gläuben geschehe. Wir wollen jnen aber warhaftige bekehrung von hertzen wünschen/und gleichwol jrem verkehrten Sinne unnd Irrthumb/ wie wir können widersprechen/und männiglich trewlich dafür verwarnen. Und mögen zu jhnen wol das sagen/welches auch unser lieber Herr Christus zu den Saduccern sagte/ Marc 12. Ists nicht also/jhr jrthumb/das jhr nicht wisset von der Schrift/nach von der Krafft Gottes? Denn eben darumb gläuben wir/das Christi leib und blut warhaftig im Sacrament ist/dass solches die Schrift saget. Eben auss der Göttlichen Krafft ist Christus im Sacrament gegenwertig/darumb/dass er zur Rechte Gottes dess almächtigen Vatters sitzt/welcher so er allenthalben nach seiner Göttlichen Allmächtigkeit ist/solte er denn auch nicht seyn/da er sich nach seiner einsetzung leibhofftig an sein H. Sacrament gebunden hat/und eben der ursach halben/dass unser lieber Herr Christus zur Rechten dess Allmächtigen Vatters sitzt/so ihren/anrufen unnd anbeten wir jhn auch/als die Schrift gebeut/dass wir sollen an allen orten anbeten/und wie Sanct Paulus vermanet/zu jhm heilige Hände/ohne zorn und zweiffel/affheben/warumb solten wir denn das nicht thun bey der Handlung seines Worts und Sacraments/daran er sich selbs gebunden/und allda leibhaftig gegenwertig ist? Darumb seinds nur eitel *blasphemiae*, das solche Leute fürgeben/wider dess Herrn Wort/und kommen von dem Meister her/der auch zu unsern erst en Eltern im Paradeiss sagte: Ir werdet nicht sterben/sondern solt sein wie Götter. Da doch der Herr sagt/Wenn sie essen würden vom verbottenen Baum/dass sie dess ewigen todes sterben solte, etc.?

Item/ob wol unser Herr Jesus Christus sein H. Abendmahl/nit dess anschawens oder anbettens halben eingesetzt/den noch zuerbieten/nach zuuil/oder für Abgöttisch zuschetze/

sondern viel mehr billich und recht/da diss H. Abendmahl/nach eynsetzung unsers lieben Herren Jesu Christi/gehalten wird/ dass man darbey sey mit aller andacht und ehrerbietung/ unnd unsern Herren Jesum Christum/waren Gott und Menschen/daselbst anbetten/der in diesem Hochwirdigen Sacrament/nit allein nach seiner Göttlichen Allmächtigkeit/ unnd Geistlicher weise/sondern auch leibhaftig/warhaftig und wesentlich/ doch unsicht barlich gegenwertig ist/als der zur Rechten Göttlicher Maiestat sitzt/und von Gott erholet und den Namen erlanget/der uber alle namen ist/ dass in dem namen Jesu sich beugin sollen aller der knie/die im Himmel und auff Erden/und unter der Erden seind/und alle zungen bekennen sollen/dass Jhesus Christus derr Herr sey zu der ehrer Gottes des Vatters.

Item: Wir müssen hierinn richten/nicht nach dem/das dit Augen und eusserliche Sinne greiffen und anzeygen/sondern was der Glaube auff Gottes Wort gegründet/uns lehret. Die Augen sehen Brodt und Wein/alle eusserliche sinne zeugen nichts anders/der Glaub aber erkennet warhaftig gegenwertig den Herren Christum/der seinen Leib und Blut selbs in diesem allerheyligsten geheimniss darreicht. Derselbe Herr Christus unter dem Sacrament gegenwertig/doch unsichtbar/verdeckt und verborgen/wirdt allhie von Gläubigen angebetet/nicht das Element dess Brodis/oder eusserliche gestalt.

71. In the English translation of this work of Luther it is recorded as thesis 15, and not 16, as Chemnitz numbers it (LW 34, 355).
72. It is well known that Luther's liturgies allow for the veneration of the Sacrament, as did many other early Reformation liturgies. Regin Prenter in his recent book on the Augsburg Confession (*Kirkens Lutherske Bekendelse*, Fredericia, 1978) has called attention to the fact that the Danish-Norwegian ritual of 1685 knows the veneration of the body and blood of Christ under the consecrated elements. One rubric calls for the bending of the knees after the communicants have risen from their kneeling position in receiving the sacrament. This bending of the knees, Prenter points out, is the veneration of the Real Presence of the body and blood of Christ upon the altar. As further evidence for this Prenter refers to Kingo's hymn on the Sacrament (see note #67). Prenter also notes that this 1685 liturgy calls for the re-consecration of the elements if a sufficient amount had not been consecrated under the first consecration (p. 210). This ritual was the one recommended for use in the Norwegian Synod.
73. The Goettingen edition of the Lutheran Confessions (*Die Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-lutherische Kirche*, 1979), as a footnote to SD VII, 126, not only gives the appropriate reference to the Decrees and Canons of Trent, but also adds what it calls examples of "Artolatry" on the Protestant side, by referring the reader to Christian Salig's *Vollständige Historie der Augspurgischen Confession*, Halle, 1735, III, 528. (*Bek.* 1016, note #2). But an examination of the reference does not reveal any veneration of the Sacrament" apart from the action" which has been so carefully defined by Chemnitz and the Formula (see p. 101 f.). Salig evidently follows Melanchthon in denying the power of the consecration to achieve the Real Presence (see p. 83), for he maintains that it is not correct when the Gnesio-Lutherans accused Melanchthon of attributing "Artolatry" to Luther's doctrine. Salig claims that Melanchthon was not opposed to the correct Lutheran doctrine but only against the popery of some Lutheran ignoramuses. As an example he singles out Moerlin (Chemnitz's mentor) as shamefully misusing Luther's letter to the Frankfurt Christians (1533), in which he warns them against pastors who do not want to confess clearly the Real Presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Sacrament (St. L. XVII, 2007 f.). Apparently, according to Salig, Moerlin had quoted from the letter Luther's words that one cannot let the pastor get by with a garbled confession, as though his mouth was so full of porridge that all he could say was "Mum, Mum." Rather, one should ask the officiant what he had in his hand

("sondern was der Priester in der Hand hat" — as quoted by Salig). Salig rhetorically asks whoever directed Dr. Moerlin to state that such doctrine was Lutheran that the priest has the body and blood of Christ in his hand. Salig counters by claiming that Luther says: The body and blood of Christ is in the Sacrament, and outside the use (*Geniessung*) there is no sacrament. Salig continues by asserting that this is what Melanchthon also taught and all true Lutherans still do, and, on the contrary, it is not Lutheran doctrine that apart from the use (*Geniessung*) there is no sacrament. And he asks whether this is not papistic Artolatry [i.e., when Moerlin holds that Luther taught that what the priest had in his hand was the body and blood of Christ before the *sumptio*.] What else are the papists doing when they lift up (*aufstecken*) the Host from the altar or carry it around in procession? And now, Salig laments, Melanchthon must be considered Calvinist because he declaimed against this.

This is an important reference for several reasons. It shows that by 1735 the position of Aegidius Hunnius (see p. 89 f.) has so completely won out over that of Chemnitz and Luther that their real position is misrepresented. The consecration has been deprived of its power and reduced to a general prayer in which, reminded of the first institution, the communicant prepares himself for a worthy reception.

As has been already demonstrated, Luther and Chemnitz *did teach* that the consecration achieves the Real Presence. Therefore it is a fair question to ask the officiant what he is holding in his hand; as a matter of fact, it is a good test question to see whether one accepts Luther's doctrine, just as Moerlin evidently had used Luther's letter (Sasse translates part of this letter and discusses it in *This is My Body*, p. 229 f.).

Further, one realizes how important it is that Chemnitz, recognizing the confusion caused by the use of such vague terms as "actio," "usus," "Geniessung," in connection with the Lord's Supper, precises the definition of the terms so that the precise definition is incorporated into the Formula (SD VII, 85 f.). Salig uses the term *Geniessung*, referring it only to the *sumptio*. In his view the consecration lapses into an unimportant part of the Sacrament. Of course, if the Real Presence exists only in the *sumptio*, then not only is the consecration a conditional element depending on the *sumptio* by the communicant for its effective power, but it also would be Artolatry to practice veneration of the Host after the consecration but before the distribution, a custom which Luther and Chemnitz deemed permissible. It need hardly be added that both Luther and Chemnitz condemned the Corpus Christi processions because this is outside the *use* commanded by the Savior.

This footnote #2 (together with note #4 on p. 1016) indicates that the editor of the *Bekenntnisschrift* (Dr. E. Wolf) is sympathetic to a Melanchthonian view of the Lord's Supper. The Salig reference shows that the Melanchthonian view has been consistently imposed on the Formula of Concord for nearly 400 years.

Salig, in this context, also mentions that Melanchthon was opposed to Heshusius, who, while at Heidelberg, desired that the leftover wine not be put back into the canister. Salig's other examples that brought disapproval from Melanchthon included the demand at Erfurt for the veneration of the Host, and also the practice in Schleswig, Frankfort-on-the-Oder, and other places that insisted so strongly for the retention of the elevation. Salig asserts that Melanchthon should not be considered a Calvinist when he objected to what Salig calls papistic fragments, because they were examples of Artolatry. Neither Luther, nor Chemnitz, nor SD VII, 108 and 126 condemn these Gnesio-Lutherans in this practice.

74. See note #59, where Pastor Kenneth Miller rejects the interpretation that the "This do" includes the consecration, and thus he limits the sacramental union only to the time when some of the elements are received. The sacramental union would not be effected in any other sacramental elements that may have been upon the altar and had come under the

Verba. Chemnitz, however, observes that perhaps “someone says that a person eats *bread* unworthily. The answer is: Paul does not refer simply to bread, but he says ‘*this bread*.’ But what bread is this? *It is the bread which according to the Word of Institution is the body of the Lord given for us*” (LS 131, emphasis added). A few paragraphs later Chemnitz again emphasizes the point by asking what bread is it that one eats that incurs guilt, “But what bread? The bread which Christ affirms is His body” (LS 132). All the elements that came under the words of Christ at the consecration are His body and blood. And hence it is by partaking of those particular elements that one may eat unworthily and become guilty of the body and blood of Christ.

75. The translation in the Tappert edition of the *Book of Concord* is misleading, “It was against such papistic abuses that this rule was first formulated and explained by Dr. Luther.” The translation seems to say that Luther not only explained the rule but first formulated it. The German and Latin versions only say that the rule was originally established, and that the reference to Luther is only in connection with the word “explain.” The *Triglot* translates, “For against such papistic abuses this rule has been set up at the beginning [of the reviving Gospel] and has been explained by Dr. Luther himself, Tom IV, Jena.”
76. WA Br. X, 348f. The English translation of both of these letters is from E. F. Peters, *Extra Usum Nullum Sacramentum: The Origin and Meaning of the Axiom: Nothing Has the Character, etc.*; a Th.D. dissertation at Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, 1968, p. 198 f.
77. Another attempt has recently been made to identify the Jena edition reference as being something other than the Wolferinus correspondence. Prof. Siegbert Becker in the essay, “An Unidentified Luther Reference” (in *Luther Lives, Essays in Commemoration of the 500th Anniversary of Martin Luther’s Birth*, Milwaukee, NPH, 1983, pp. 157–168), maintains that the reference is to some of Luther’s correspondence with the Einsiedel family in 1528. He evidently intends this paper to be an answer to Prof. Bjarne W. Teigen’s “The Case of the Lost Luther Reference” (CTQ, Ft. Wayne, Oct. 1979, pp. 295–309) (P. 159). On going through volume IV of the German Jena edition and examining these two letters (1566 Jena ed., fol. 316b; St. L. XX1a, 1092 f.), he concludes that “it seems evident that the reference . . . in FC SD 87 is a reference to the German edition. The Wolferinus correspondence does not fit the facts of the case” (p. 162).

Prof. Becker bases his conclusion on the following reasons: There is a more marked similarity between SD VII, 85 and the Einsiedel letters than between the Wolferinus letters and the SD; the rule was “formulated and proclaimed by ‘Dr. Luther himself,’” and not one formulated by Melancthon, as in the case of the Wolferinus correspondence (162); the rule was formulated at the beginning “of the reviving Gospel” (the addition in the Latin version of SD VII, 87), which points more to 1528 than 1543 (162); this rule of Luther [i.e., in the Einsiedel letters] was set up in opposition to the papistic abuses of the mass (162); the words of SD VII, 85–87 (“extra usum a Christo institutum . . . extra actionem divinitus institutum”) are apparently an echo of the remark Luther makes in the second opinion [i.e., the second letter to the Einsiedels] (159).

But thoughtful consideration of Prof. Becker’s reasons for identifying the SD VII, 87 reference with the Einsiedel correspondence renders such an identification quite implausible and unacceptable.

Prof. Becker does not inform us as to the person who received the letters; as a matter of fact, one might quite naturally gain the impression that these two letters were answers to different requests for “opinions.” There is no doubt that Luther wrote many letters to different persons on the doctrine of the Lord’s Supper (e.g., see note #73 for Luther’s letter to the Frankfurt Christians), but in this case the two letters are directed to one person

representing a family. The first opinion is dated Jan. 31, 1528, and the editors of Luther's writings give the second one the same date (St. L. XXla, 1092). These letters are directed to Heinrich Hildebrandt von Einsiedel (1497–1557). He was the first of the family to identify with the Reformation, and he together with the family remained loyal to it to the end. Luther carried on a considerable informal correspondence with the family over a long period of time. Hildebrandt unfortunately was not within the jurisdiction of the Saxon Elector, but, as one can see from the letters, his ruler was George the Bearded, Duke of Saxony (1471–1539), a bitter enemy of Luther and of the Reformation. The letters also reveal that Luther in an ironical comment is keenly aware of the enmity, but he also acknowledges that in some matters he and the Duke agreed (e.g., in their opposition to the Sacramentarians on the sacraments and on the necessity of obeying civil government). They were, however, completely at odds over the Private Mass and the retention of the cup from the laity. The Duke had systematically sought to crush the power of the Einsiedels who were the owners of several villages. He did this by releasing their subordinates from responsibilities to their landlords and even requisitioning part of the Einsiedel possessions (Karl Meusel, *Kirchliches Handlexikon*, Leipzig, 1889, 2, 331).

The particular problem facing the Einsiedels in 1528 was to try to find in a Catholic territory a priest who was evangelical enough to stop celebration of the private mass and who would give the sacrament in both kinds. Luther, Bugenhagen, and Spalatin are trying to help, but recognizing the difficulties of dealing with a Catholic ruler, they are quite sure that the next step will lead to some kind of adjudication. In the meantime they remind the Einsiedels that it is improper for a clergyman to say mass alone. But Luther in the second opinion (apparently a very hastily and informally written document) does seem to think it possible that a clergyman could be found who does not say private masses, administers the Lord's Supper in both kinds, and who will not harass those who are accepting the Evangelical faith.

Prof. Becker, in urging that these quite informal letters represent the Luther reference in SD VII, 87, simply overlooks the fact that in SD VII, 73–90 the authors of the Formula are not discussing the Private Mass, but the fact that there had occurred "a dissension among some teachers of the Augsburg Confession concerning the consecration and the common rule that there is no sacrament apart from the instituted use" (SD VII, 73). From the very beginning the authors acknowledge that some who profess adherence to the Augsburg Confession have "perverted" this Confession so as to make it appear to be in full agreement with the Sacramentarians (SD VII, 1). Now, neither the GnesioLutherans nor the Sacramentarians were advocating private masses, but Melancthon and his adherents were denying that the consecration achieves the presence of the body and blood in the Supper (see p. 83 f.), and hence the need for the confession made in SD VII, 73–90.

It is not giving the theologians of the *Concordia* much credit for logical and precise thinking to suggest that in the discussion of the doctrine of the consecration they introduce an informally and hurriedly written document which states the impermissibility of celebrating private masses. Even if these theologians here in Article VII had wanted to introduce a Luther reference to private masses, they would hardly have referred to these informal letters, when they could have picked any number of pertinent quotations from Luther's "Babylonian Captivity" of 1520 to his "The Private Mass and the Consecration of the Priests" of 1533, both of which are carefully worked out presentations of the doctrinal problems involved. It simply will not do to quote from the Einsiedel correspondence and then dismiss the possible objections to this by saying, "With that quotation before us there is nothing left to explain away" (161).

Prof. Becker believes that there is a more marked similarity between SD VII, 85 and the Einsiedel letters than between the Wolferinus letters and the SD (159–161). But when one recognizes that the consecration is under discussion in SD VII, 73–90, one will easily see the similarity of the contents of both the SD and the Wolferinus letters. When Prof. Becker quotes in Latin SD VII, 85 for the purposes of comparison, he omits the words “extra actionem divinitus institutam” (159). Here in the last phrase there is a striking similarity in the use of the word “actio” both in SD VII, 85 and the Wolferinus correspondence (see p. 136), while there is no wording in the Einsiedel letters that has such close resemblance to the SD.

Further, Prof. Becker is quite insistent that the SD declares that the rule was “formulated and proclaimed by Dr. Luther himself,” and hence the Wolferinus letters cannot be meant, since the rule there mentioned is ascribed to Melancthon (160). There seems to be no question that research scholars are correct in ascribing the origin of the rule to Bucer and Melancthon and its popularization especially to the latter. But despite Prof. Becker’s insistence that the SD declares that the rule was formulated by Dr. Luther, the SD does not say that Luther formulated it. The reference to Luther is only in connection with the word “explain.” Both the *Triglot* and the first complete *American Book of Concord* translations are much closer to the original than the Tappert translation which Prof. Becker in part here follows. In contrast to Tappert these two translations read: “For against such papistic abuses this rule has been set up at the beginning [of the reviving Gospel], and has been explained by Dr. Luther himself, Tom IV Jena”; “For, in opposition to such papistical abuses, this rule was originally established, and it is explained by Dr. Luther, Tom 4, Jen. fol. 597” (see note #79).

In this connection it should also be noted that the rule came into common usage not only against the Roman Catholics but also against the Sacramentarians, as SD VII, 88 specifically states.

Prof. Becker’s opinion that the expression added to the Latin text of SD VII, 87, “The beginning of the reviving Gospel” would tend to point to 1528 rather than 1543 is not very relevant. Writing 40 or 50 years later, one would use such terms in such generalized ways as to mean the time of our great forefather, Martin Luther, so that it could refer to any time between 1517–1546. Or it could even refer to a later time since it was not unusual for the later Reformers to refer to the Reformation as restoring to the church the light of the Gospel. Chemnitz frequently employs these terms which speak of the light of the Gospel shining so brightly (Ex. 2, 256, 396, 430, etc.).

It is also of no significance that the SD is written in German, as are the Einsiedel letters, while the Wolferinus letters are in Latin. At that time the theologians were so accustomed to bilingualism that they moved very easily from German to Latin and Latin to German. This easy movement from one to the other in the *Apology to the Formula* and the *Historie des Sacramentsstreit* is ample testimony to this fact.

78. In 1563, for example, Erhard Sperber appeals to the Luther-Wolferinus correspondence as a further explanation of the meaning of the rule eventually posited in SD VII, 85, “Er spricht aber der frome Lutherus in 4 Lateinischer Tomo/zu Jena gedruckt/in einer epistle/so er im 43. Jar an magistrum Wolferinum geschrieben” (*Christliche und notwerdige verantwortung Erhardi Sperbers wider die grewliche bezichtigung und beschwerliche aufflag der Sacramentirer und Rottengeister zu Dantzig*, Erfured, 1563, fol. 14b.).

On July 18, 1619, the theological faculty of Wittenberg rendered a decision with regard to the question as to whether it is right for a pastor to take the remaining consecrated wine home for common use, since with the cessation of the action the sacrament ceases.

The faculty gave a negative answer, although granting that “quod cessante actione cesset sacramentum” (“when the action ceases, the sacrament ceases”). But the faculty then insists that the sacramental action must be correctly defined. They insist that the three parts of the action must be done entirely together in “ipso usu sacramenti”; otherwise the sacramental action is not carried out. From this it follows that such action does not end until all that has been consecrated has been consumed. For this reason it is not proper to take consecrated wine home for common table use. Then excerpts from Luther’s two letters to Wolferinus are quoted to support this decision, and the reference is precisely given, “Tom 4, Jenensi Lat., fol. 585b” (*Redekin: Thesauri Conciliorum*, I, Hamburg, 1671, p. 139).

79. This translation was published by the Henkel brothers at New Market, Virginia, the first edition in 1851, and the second in 1854. The folio number on p. 677 of the second edition is 597. It should be noted that there were three Jena editions, 1558, 1570 (reprinted without change in 1583), and a 1611 edition (see Kurt Aland’s *Hilfsbuch zum Luther Studium*, 3rd ed., 1970, p. 587). The Henkel folio reference is to the 1558 Jena edition. The other editions have different folio numbers for the Wolferinus correspondence.

80. Peter Fraenkel, “Ten Questions concerning Melanchthon, The Fathers and the Eucharist,” in *Luther and Melanchthon*, edited by Vilmos Vajta, Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1961, p. 147.

Quere states that “Melanchthon’s characteristic language is that *with* the bread and wine Christ is present in the ritual action to forgive” (Ralph Walter Quere, *Melanchthon’s Christum Cognoscere — Christ’s Efficacious Presence in the Eucharistic Theology of Melanchthon*, Nieuwkoop: B. DeGraaf, 1977, p. 9). It is quite remarkable to read in a conservative twentieth century theologian that the logical *essence* (genus) of the Sacrament is *action*, not *sign* or *thing*, is with respect to the Lord’s Supper especially important in the polemic against the papists (Ad. Hoenecke, *Dogmatik* IV, 125; see note #91). This trend of thought on what the Sacrament is cannot be reconciled with the doctrinal position of Chemnitz (see p. 98 f. and 101).

81. Peters has translated the Latin phrase, “Ab initio orationis dominicae” with the words, “with the beginning of our Father” (see note #76). Considering the context and the consistently stated doctrine of Luther, it should be translated, “from the beginning of the word (or discourse, etc.) of the Lord.” Prof. Becker holds that it must be translated, “from the beginning of the Lord’s Prayer,” and because of this he believes that one can no longer maintain that Luther teaches that the body and blood of Christ are present from the time of the consecration when those words are used by the pastor in a valid celebration of the Lord’s Supper (see *Luther Lives*, etc., p. 164 f.; see note #77). Further, he asserts that since the phrase must be translated as the “Lord’s Prayer,” then the Real Presence, according to Luther, begins sometime before the Words of Institution are spoken. Prof. Becker’s basis for the necessity of accepting his translation is that ever since the time of Cyprian the phrase *oratio dominica* has become wedded to the Lord’s Prayer (p. 164).

But there are several cogent reasons for here translating *oratio* as “words” or “speech,” etc. To have Luther saying in this one place that the Lord’s Prayer achieves the Real Presence contradicts everything he has said about the consecration, as even the contents of Chapter V of this treatise demonstrate. It even contradicts the Wolferinus correspondence itself, for in it he says that the “speaking of the Words [of Institution] . . . is the most powerful and principal action in the Sacrament.”

There is no doubt that Luther may have used the expression *oratio dominica* for what in English is called “The Lord’s Prayer,” in more formal and solemn contexts. But he usually employed the term “das Vater Unser” or the Latin *Pater Noster*, which had become the

traditional term also in German and Danish. As a matter of fact, a few days after he wrote to Wolferinus (Aug. 5, 1543), Luther in a letter to Hermann Bonn, rector in Lubeck, uses *Pater Noster* for the Lord's Prayer (DeWette 5, 580). It is an exaggeration to state that since Cyprian, the phrase *oratio dominica* has been wedded to the prayer which Jesus taught His disciples.

The word *dominica* obviously refers to the Lord Jesus Christ. The term *oratio* can designate not only prayers of the Lord, but also words, speeches, etc. *dominica* simply identifies the person behind the *oratio*. Any ordinary Latin dictionary gives the information that the most common meaning of *oratio* is "speaking, speech, discourse, language." It is also evident that this meaning carried over into medieval Latin. Hardt quotes from De Ferrari-Berry, *A Lexicon of Thomas Aquinas*, "Oratio: (1) speech . . . (2) Speech of sentence . . . (3) Prayer" (p. 230; see note #1). Hardt also shows from the *Bekennnisschriften* (p. 471, note #1) that Melanchthon used the term *oratio* in its common meaning of discourse, *Oratio de Pontificum Romanorum Ambitione Tyrannide*, 1556.

More specifically to the point, the word *oratio* is frequently used for the Words of Institution. Luther himself used it in this sense in the 1528 letter to Carlstadt (W A Br 4, 367). Gabriel Biel uses *oratio* in this sense in his *Exposition of the Canon of the Mass* (edited by Heiko Oberman, Wiesbaden, 1969, p. 239 f.). In at least nine places in two pages he refers to the Verba with some form of *oratio*. Luther was trained at the University of Erfurt, where one of the faculty members, Bartholomaeus von Usingen, was a "disciple of Biel, teacher of Luther" (Oberman, *The Harvest of Medieval Theology*, p. 118). Luther was well acquainted with Biel's *Exposition of the Canon of the Mass*. There are, as a matter of fact, parallels in the Wolferinus correspondence and Biel's *Exposition*. Most striking is Luther's use of the term *prolatio*. Biel wrote, *Post prolationem huius orationis*, referring to the Verba; Luther employs the expression *post prolationem verborum* ("after the speaking of the words"), referring to the Verba.

J. A. O. Preus in his translation of Chemnitz's *The Lord's Supper* twice translates the word *oratio* with the word "language," where the matter under discussion is "the interpretation of the Words of Institution" (LS 137).

All this is overpowering evidence for translating the phrase in the Wolferinus letter with the words, "from the beginning of the Word of the Lord." It need not refer to any particular syllable or word, as Luther has written to Carlstadt in 1528, but it can very well refer to the first part of the consecration, since Luther believes that this achieves the Real Presence. The Sacrament is a reality already from the first part of the consecration. In "The German Mass" he suggests that after the consecration of the bread, it be distributed before the cup is consecrated (LW 53, 81).

CHAPTER VI

The Effects of the Sacramental Eating and Drinking

353 When Martin Chemnitz in 1569 had completed rewriting his original treatise on the Sacrament of the Altar,⁸² he dedicated the book to the two dukes of Brunswick and Luneburg. In the dedicatory epistle he reiterates that he simply wants to follow in the steps of Luther in proclaiming the doctrine of the Sacrament of the Altar, “I had no desire to bring in anything new but simply was trying to retain the old, fundamental, and simple teaching and to repeat it out of Luther’s writings, namely, that the dogma of the Lord’s Supper has its own proper and peculiar setting (*sedes doctrinae*), in the Words of Institution, and that in these words its true meaning must be sought” (LS 21). This also means for Chemnitz that whatever he confesses with respect to this sacrament is in harmony with the Augsburg Confession and the Apology (LS 21).

354 As can be quite readily seen from the previous chapters, Chemnitz follows in great detail what Luther confessed and taught on the Lord’s Supper. If one asks why the Lutherans appear to be satisfied to put the emphasis chiefly on the fact that in the Supper the true body and blood of Christ is present, distributed, and received, the answer is that with the retention of the Real Presence they have retained everything God had promised. The Sacrament of the Altar is a Means of Grace, just as Luther said, “This sacrament is the Gospel” (LW 36, 289). The forgiveness of sins is the great gift. Luther connects the forgiveness of sins with the body and the blood. He does not regard the Real Presence only as a seal and a sign attached to the

Word, but he specifically confesses, “Therefore, he who drinks this cup really drinks the true blood of Christ and the forgiveness of sins or the Spirit of Christ, for these are received in and with the cup” (LW 37, 325).

- 355 The Word and the body have become one for Luther, “This treasure is conveyed and communicated to us in no other way than through the words, ‘given and poured out for you’” (LC V, 29). Following this point of view, Chemnitz instructs the pastors of Brunswick with these words:

The cup of blessing which we bless, namely through the words of Christ *which we repeat in the administration of the Lord’s Supper and thus connect the bread and the wine with the Words of Institution*, so that in that Sacrament we have neither the element alone, nor the simple Word but, as Luther says, the Word is clothed in the element, and the element connected with the Word. (MWS 120; emphasis added).

- 356 Just as with Luther, the comfort of the Sacrament of the Altar for Chemnitz resides in the fact that we receive orally the true body and blood of Christ, “It has been firmly established that the Son of God Himself in this distribution and reception of His body and blood is also giving and applying and sealing to you all those benefits He gained for us by the giving of His body and the shedding of His blood” (LS 64). Everything depends on retaining the body and the blood in the Sacrament. Chemnitz requests that “everyone consider how much of these most beautiful and sweet comforts would be lost and destroyed if we move the very substance of the body and the blood of the Lord immeasurably far away from the Supper, so that we would conclude that with our mouth we receive only bread and wine” (LS 190).

- 357 The question arises whether one needs the Sacrament of the Altar since the Word, not to mention Baptism, offers and conveys the same fruits of the Savior’s passion. In answer, Chemnitz is adamant in insisting with the Lutheran Confessions that the forgiveness of sins is offered and applied only through the ministry of the Gospel, “Therefore the Augsburg Confession earnestly reproves those who either seek or teach to seek reconciliation with God and the remission of sins outside of and without the ministry of the Word and sacraments” (Ex. 2, 554). But then Chemnitz grants that the “application of the benefits of Christ is made in believers also apart from the use of the Lord’s

Supper” (Ex. 2, 347). And further, he agrees that “rightly . . . does the Apology and the Augsburg Confession say that both the Word and the Sacraments have the same effect, the very same power or efficacy” (Ex. 2, 73).

358 Chemnitz, in dealing with this question, directs one to the individual sinner’s sense of guilt and his need for the assurance that God is reconciled to him. He notes that

it is a very sweet promise which is joined to the communion of the cup by the voice of the Son of God: “Drink of this all of you; this cup is the New Testament in my blood, which is shed for you for the remission of sins.” The New Testament includes the grace of God, reconciliation, forgiveness of sins, adoption, etc., according to the statement of Jeremiah, ch. 31: 31–34. (Ex. 2, 347).

359 As an evangelical pastor called into the public ministry to feed the flock of Christ and the Church of God (1 Peter 5:2; Acts 20:28), Chemnitz was sensitive to the fact that

a pious mind is greatly troubled about the question: “Does the covenant of the grace of God in Christ pertain also to me in particular?” I wish and sigh that I may truly and certainly be received into this covenant of the New Testament, that I may be found, and ever remain in this covenant, that it may be for me forever firm and unalterable. Now the Son of God added to the communion of the cup the most delightful words, by which He testified that He instituted the cup of His Supper that it may be a means or instrument by which He wants to apply, seal, and confirm this New Testament personally and effectively to everyone who receives it in faith. In order that our faith may be certain that we truly and certainly are received, are found, and are confirmed in this covenant, that it may be unalterable and firm to us, He asserts that He offers and imparts to us in this cup that very blood of His by the shedding of which the New Testament has been earned, established, and confirmed. (Ex. 2, 347 f.).

360 If one asks why Chemnitz speaks so glowingly of the Lord’s Supper, it is because, as Luther had said, that it is the Gospel. And he fully subscribes to Luther’s confession in the Smalcald Articles that the Gospel “offers counsel and help in more than one way, for God is surpassingly rich in His grace” (SA III, IV). Chemnitz, paralleling the thought of Luther in the Smalcald Articles, demonstrates why God has given mankind the Gospel in various forms. He writes that

this Mediator the Father sets before us in the Gospel as a propitiation by faith in His blood through the remission of sins (Rom 3:25). “For this is the will of the Father, that everyone who believes in the Son

should not perish but have eternal life” (John 6:40). Thus the Gospel proclaims, offers, and sets before contrite and terrified consciences the grace of God, reconciliation and remission of sins freely on account of the merit of Christ; and it is His will that everyone should lay hold of and apply this benefit of the Mediator to himself. The ministry of private absolution applies this general promise of the Gospel to the penitent individually in order that faith may be able to state all the more firmly that the benefits of the passion of Christ are certainly given and applied to it. Moreover, in the use of the Lord’s Supper Christ offers, applies, and seals to all who receive it in faith the New Testament with the precious pledges of His body and blood, namely, that God wants to be gracious with respect to our sins and to remember our iniquities no more. Then it is rightly said: “Take heart, my son: your sins are forgiven.” For all the prophets give witness that through Christ all who believe in his name receive remission of sins. This is the manner of reconciliation with God. (Ex. 2, 556 f.).

- 361 It is quite evident that in speaking of the benefits of the Lord’s Supper, Chemnitz has been emphatic in expressing the doctrine that these are received in faith (Ex. 2, 347; 556; etc.). The true use of this sacrament is profitable for strengthening of faith. It requires faith and it is used rightly when it is received in faith (AC XIII). Here it is necessary that one “teach the whole dogma of the Lord’s Supper” on the basis of the Words of Institution (LS 36). Otherwise people can be “disturbed” by the contention of some of the adversaries, and miss the fact that in the sacramental words Christ is speaking of the physical eating of the bread and the twofold eating of the body of Christ in the Supper, namely, the sacramental and spiritual. In the *Lord’s Supper* Chemnitz devotes a short chapter (LS 57–64) to clarify this aspect of the doctrine so that one does not fall into a Sacramentarian way of thinking about the sacrament and its benefits. He cites as a case in point the presentation of Peter Martyr (1500–62). Peter Martyr, an Italian who had been influenced by reading the works of Zwingli and Bucer, was forced to flee to England in 1547, where he became Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, and served as a consultant to Cranmer in the formation of the English Book of Common Prayer of 1552. According to Chemnitz, Peter Martyr contended “that the body of Christ in the Supper is eaten only by faith and in a spiritual way, that is, faith turns itself from the celebration of the Supper which takes place in our midst here on earth and by meditation ascends into heaven and there in mind and spirit embraces Christ in His majesty” (LS 57).

362 A presentation such as this is admittedly attractive, since Luther and the Reformers also taught a spiritual eating which is to believe in the Word and promise of God. Such eating, the Formula of Concord has dogmatically confessed, is “intrinsically useful, salutary, and necessary to salvation for all Christians at all times” (SD VII, 61). But what is given up in the Peter Martyr viewpoint is that the consecrated bread and wine *are* the body and blood of Christ and are received orally. If one demurs from such a presentation which the Lutherans make, namely, that in addition to the spiritual eating there is also an oral eating, Chemnitz avers that the proponents of the Peter Martyr position would “immediately let loose with some blasphemous slanders about Capernaite eating of the body of Christ, or about the Cyclops who ate human flesh, or the Scythian slurping of the blood of Christ” (LS 57). Chemnitz is well aware that the Sacramentarians want to center everything on “action” in the sacrament, and not on the presence of the body and blood of Christ (see p. 83, 137 f., and note #80). There is the constant tendency to spiritualize away what Christ has declared in His last will and testament, just as Sasse has remarked, “When Luther’s sacramental realism met with Zwingli’s spiritualizing humanistic idealism, it was the realism of the Bible which met with a spiritualizing and rationalistic Christianity which had been a latent danger to the old Christian faith for centuries.”⁸³

THE THREE KINDS OF EATING IN THE SACRAMENT

363 The point of difference, Chemnitz demonstrates lies in the fact that the Peter Martyr speculation is “unwilling to grant any third kind of eating between the physical and the spiritual” (LS 57). It represents a point of view permeated with rationalism, “for human reason neither knows nor understands any other kind of eating except the physical and gross eating by which the flesh of cattle is eaten or a cow eats hay” (LS 57). In view of this Chemnitz carefully explains the difference between the “three-fold eating” that occurs in the Sacrament of the Altar:

First, there is the eating of the bread which is rightly and properly called a physical eating.

Second, there is the eating of the body of Christ, which although it does not take place in a physical or gross way, yet (according to the words of Christ) takes place orally, for He says: “Take, eat; this is my body.” This is called a sacramental eating in the old method of designation.

Third, there is the spiritual eating of the body of Christ. (LS 58).

- 364 Lest there be any misunderstanding, Chemnitz adds this explanatory sentence to the three points, “The things which I say regarding the word ‘eating’ and regarding the body of Christ I want to apply with equal force to the word ‘drinking’ and to the blood of Christ” (LS 58). He also gives these further explanations with respect to spiritual eating. It “is not described in these words: ‘Take, eat,’ but in the other words of the Supper that follow. That is to say, the sacramental eating is done in memory of Christ because His body is given for us, which by being distributed to us in the Supper sanctifies the new covenant to us. In these words, I say, spiritual eating is also described, and this absolutely must happen in order that the eating of the Sacrament may become salutary for us that we may not do it to our judgment” (LS 58).
- 365 Further, spiritual eating of the flesh and blood of Christ can take place either outside or within the observance of the Supper. That is because “faith embraces and lays hold of Christ, who is both God and man, who is brought to us in the Word — when faith does this in such a way that it applies to itself His benefits which He merited for us by the giving of His body and the shedding of His blood — then we can say that we are eating the body of Christ spiritually (John 6)” (LS 63).
- 366 But spiritual eating means that “there be penitence and fear of God, which is terrified by the contemplation of sin and the wrath of God against sin and puts off the purpose to do evil. Faith also is necessary, that we can accept the remission of sin in the promise” (Ex. 2, 238).
- 367 Having said this with respect to the spiritual eating, Chemnitz issues an important caveat, “But in the Lord’s Supper the spiritual eating must not so turn our mind and faith away from this celebration of the Supper which is taking place in the gathering of the congregation that in our own meditations we are carried beyond the heaven of heavens, as our adversaries imagine” (LS 63f.). Since there is this strong tendency promoted by our own natural reason not to consider that we are actually receiving the true body and blood of Christ orally, it is highly important to analyze the implications of the oral manducation. Here the heart of the controversy lies with the Sacramentarians. Chemnitz faces the matter of the physical eating by analyzing in more detail the objections to it.
- 368 The bread, of course, is consumed and digested in the natural way as all food is. The ancient church as well as the present church has

always recognized that; for example, Origen wrote that “the sanctified bread according to its material aspects goes out with the waste and is ejected by the digestive process” (LS 59). And, furthermore, Luther dare not be charged with Capernaitic eating, “Likewise Luther always and everywhere, and particularly in the book on the Word, declared that when he taught that the body of Christ was eaten in the Supper he did not understand this to mean that it took place in a visible or perceptible way, so that the actual substance of the body of Christ would be torn with the teeth, chewed up or butchered, masticated in the mouth, swallowed or digested, and changed into the substance of our flesh and blood, in the way other food is. For death has no more dominion over us (Rom. 6:9).” (LS 59).⁸⁴

369 Chemnitz, compelled by the New Testament Words of Institution and Paul’s inspired explanation of them (1 Cor. 10 and 11), insists that there is another eating in the Lord’s Supper besides the eating of the bread and the spiritual eating, namely, a sacramental eating, “But because of the union, the body of Christ is predicated of that bread which is eaten physically, so that according to the words of Christ those who eat it are rightly and properly said to be eating not only the bread but also the body of Christ. For He says; “Take, eat; this is my body” (LS 59). These clear words of the Savior simply cannot be explained away by any kind of “secular reasoning.” Rather, “these words of the last will and testament of the Son of God” render it imperative that we “acknowledge and believe that in the Supper there is more than a spiritual eating; there is also a sacramental eating of the body of Christ, as the ancients so correctly called it” (LS 60).⁸⁵

370 Further, this sacramental eating is “not something merely figurative or imaginary but true and substantial, even though it occurs through a supernatural, heavenly and unsearchable mystery . . . , [(for)] the Son of God Himself affirmed . . . that those who eat in the Supper receive and eat with their physical mouths not only the bread but at the same time also that body which was given for us, even though this does not take place in a physical way as when we eat ordinary bread” (LS 60 f.).

This, however, is too much for the Zwinglians, who “cry out,

If you agree that the eating of the body of Christ which takes place in the Supper is not physical and does not take place in the way of other natural foods, whereby they are food in our stomach, then it will be only

a spiritual eating which takes place only by faith, that is, our physical mouth receives nothing but the bread, and meanwhile our soul by faith applies to itself the benefits of Christ which He merited for us by the giving of His body. Meanwhile faith extends its thoughts into the fiery heaven and there in mind and spirit embraces Christ in His majesty. (LS 59 f.).

371 But for Chemnitz the words of the Savior in His last will and testament are too compelling, “This is my body.” It simply is not “true, as certain people imagine, that our physical mouths do not receive the actual substance of the body of Christ but only a kind of sacramental body to which, because of a symbolic designation, we attribute the name ‘the body of Christ.’” On the contrary, “It [the sacramental eating of the body of Christ] [is] true and substantial, even though it occurs through a supernatural, heavenly and unsearchable mystery” (LS 60).

372 The Savior “who is the Author of this tremendous mystery,” “accomplishes this in a manner which is known to Him alone, but it is incomprehensible and ineffable to us” (LS 61). But by way of analogies drawn from the Bible “some light can be shed on these matters” (LS 61). Chemnitz has already referred to Luther’s explanation in his *Great Confession* (LW 37, 302) and in *Against the Heavenly Prophets* (LW 40, 197) (LS 55). Luther called it a “synecdoche” where there is “the union of two things which are understood as being present and distributed at the same time, one of which is predicated of the other” (LS 55). Luther here made use of the distinction made in the doctrine of the person of Christ, namely, that there are two natures and yet they are united in such a way that there are not two Christs (see p. 47 ff.). Chemnitz here picks up from Luther the analogy of the descent of the Holy Spirit in the form of a dove at the baptism of Christ and dwells on it at considerable length to demonstrate that we can get some understanding of the sacramental union and the eating of the body of Christ,

For by reason of this union the dove which John the Baptist saw is called the Holy Spirit, and when the dove descended it is correct to say that the Holy Spirit also descended. Moreover, the descent of the dove is physical and consistent with the normal manner of nature, that is, by a movement from a higher place to a lower one, where the dove had not been before. But the descent of the Spirit did not take place in this physical way, because the Spirit fills all things with His substance and therefore in the proper sense of the Word does not move

from one place to another. Yet not only the dove but at the same time also the Spirit Himself is described as truly having descended, and we believe it is so . . . But because the actual substance of the Holy Spirit willed to join itself to the dove with a peculiar kind of presence and to show itself to the Baptist in this way therefore where the dove was, there also it can rightly and truly be said that the very substance of the Spirit was also present at the same time and with that peculiar kind of presence. For this reason, when the dove descended it is equally correct to say that the very substance of the Spirit also descended, although this descent as it applies to the Spirit did not take place by physical movement. (LS 61 f.).

- 373 From examples such as this (see pp. 53–64 for a detailed analysis of this mode of predication as legitimate), Chemnitz draws his final conclusion,

On the basis of what we have just said up to this point we can draw the sure, firm, and correct conclusion that in addition to the physical eating and spiritual eating, there is a third kind of eating, namely, the sacramental eating of the body of Christ which of necessity must take place in the Supper if we do not want to reject the proper and natural meaning of the words of the testament of Christ. (LS 63).

FAITH ACCEPTS WHAT IS PROMISED AND OFFERED IN THE SUPPER

- 374 Just in connection with spiritual eating in the Supper together with the sacramental eating, Luther had repeatedly said that he agreed that faith was necessary for a salutary reception: “I quite agree. Indeed, I have said further that a bodily eating of Christ’s body without spirit and faith is poison and death” (LW 37, 191; see also LW 37, 86 and 238). It is fundamental for Lutherans to confess, “For this reason they [the sacraments] require faith, and they are rightly used when they are received in faith for the purpose of strengthening faith” (AC XIII, 2).

- 375 Chemnitz’s presentation is no different. He records simply and often that

to worthy or salutary eating faith is above all things necessary . . . Not merely that you say in a general way that these things are true which God promises about His grace on account of the Mediator, but that in the Supper the Son of God by a special action testifies that He wants to receive into the fellowship of His body and blood everyone who eats, that by the impartation of His body and blood He wants to

communicate, give, apply, and seal to each one the benefits of the New Testament (Ex. 2, 318).

- 376 In his pastoral admonition to the Brunswickian pastors under his jurisdiction, Chemnitz explains that outward reverence and veneration of the body and blood of Christ is permissible, but the all-important thing is true faith of the heart. In answer to the question, “With what outward reverence is this sacrament to be observed in [its] use?” Chemnitz answers,

Since bread *per se* is and remains bread and likewise wine, surely divine honor is not to be conferred on the elements. But if the heart truly believes according to the Words of Institution that Christ is present in that action and offers and distributes to us His body and blood, [then] outward rites joined with all reverence and honor, as is proper and as it becomes Christians, will follow of themselves. But let the chief concern be with what kind of heart we come to this table of the Lord. For otherwise it is Pharisaic hypocrisy if we simulate reverence with outward rites, but the heart is far away (Matt. 15:8) (MWS 132).

- 377 But again, this is not to say that faith or spiritual eating is the only thing that occurs in the use of this sacrament. Because of the persistent refusal of the opponents to accept the Verba in their natural meaning, Chemnitz must repeat himself. Near the end of *The Lord’s Supper*, he once more spells out the twofold eating of the *body of Christ*,

Because we have the Word concerning the twofold eating of the body of Christ, both the spiritual and sacramental, as we have demonstrated previously, it surely does not follow that the one kind of eating rules out and nullifies the other, in such a way that for this reason we have to give up the natural meaning of the testament of Christ; but rather both can stand and indeed in such a way that the one supports the other. For in order that the sacramental eating of the body of Christ may be salutary we must add the spiritual. And the spiritual eating is sealed and confirmed through the sacramental eating (LS 234 f.).

- 378 The Lord is so concerned that the individual sinner be assured that his sins are forgiven and that he is justified by faith alone in the atoning sacrifice of the Son of God, that He makes use of various means and comes to us through other senses besides hearing and seeing to assure us that our God is a gracious God. Chemnitz emphasizes in clear words the gift of oral eating:

The very Son of God by this distribution and reception, which He willed with His own counsel and wisdom, determined to employ the service and work of our mouths. He did this not only by His Spirit or by

the efficacy of His humanity, but rather with the very substance of His body and blood He joins us as closely as possible to Himself, not only the soul but also the very bodies of those who eat. And he accomplishes this not by some physical and outward mixing of the substances or by joining something to the food in our stomach, but in a way whereby it becomes a heavenly and spiritual nourishment for both the body and soul of the believers unto eternal life (LS 61).

BODILY EATING WITHOUT FAITH

379 But what of the unbeliever who partakes of the true body and blood of Christ? There can be no doubt that there are those who are guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. Chemnitz remarks on this frequently and discusses it in some detail. In his dedicatory epistle in *The Lord's Supper* he is pained by the “irreverent and superficial attitude, so prevalent in the discussion concerning the holy words of the last will and testament of the Son of God” (LS 19). And he urges that “we should weigh carefully the stern words of Paul concerning the judgment which he declares has been laid upon those who violate the will and Testament of Christ” (LS 20).

380 When he comes to examine the Tridentine Decrees and Canons on “The Preparation which is to be exercised in order that one may receive the Holy Eucharist worthily,” his first task is to explain “in a few words what is the teaching and understanding of our churches concerning this preparation on the basis of the Word of God” (Ex 2, 314). And he acknowledges that in view of Paul's Words [1 Cor. 11:27–30] a grave responsibility is laid on the ministers to expound to their people also this part of God's will. He writes,

There is also no doubt that it is incumbent on all ministers of the church that they diligently and earnestly admonish their parishioners, and indeed set before them the very grave threat of guilt and divine judgment, lest they approach the Lord's Supper without making the prior examination or preparation of which Paul speaks. And if those who sin from ignorance or thoughtlessness eat unworthily, the sin of those will be much more grievous who, although they owe it from the nature of their office, yet do not instruct them by reproving, admonishing, exhorting, and teaching that in that way they should examine themselves, or what preparation they should make, lest they eat and drink unworthily to their judgment but may worthily receive the Eucharist together with its fruits and effects. These things are diligently and earnestly taught and transmitted among them (Ex 2, 315).

381 1 Cor. 11:27–29, Chemnitz notes, is not written in “isolation, but through the use of the subordinate particle [*Hooste — therefore*] he

[Paul] joins it to the account of the institution" (LS 127). Paul specifically says "This bread," "or the bread of which the Son of God says: 'This is my body.' In the same way he speaks of the cup of which the Lord Himself states: "This is my blood which is the blood of the New Covenant." Hence "Paul understands the eating and drinking in a literal sense" (LS 128).

382 Chemnitz explains, "To eat unworthily means not to eat in such a way as is fitting for this Supper or as is worthy of the food which is distributed and received in this Supper" (LS 128). He then gathers from the wider context that Paul is charging the Corinthians with the fact that "they were not coming to the Lord's Supper with any other spirit or in any greater reverence than in their private homes when they sat down to their own ordinary meals" (LS 128). It is evident that they were coming to the table of the Lord "without true repentance and faith" for they were "nourishing hatred in their hearts; they were despising the church, were shaming the poor and were not abstaining from idolatrous practices; they were even coming to the celebration of the Supper drunk" (LS 128).

383 With their use of the Lord's Supper in such frivolous security and worldly indifference they were eating and drinking judgment to themselves, "Therefore, because in the Lord's Supper he eats unworthily, he eats judgment to himself. This is the punishment" (LS 129). "But," asks Chemnitz, "what thing has he violated to bring this penalty upon himself?" He has used the sacrament without considering what it really is: the sacrament of the very body and blood of Christ. "As a result those who eat unworthily in the Supper eat to their judgment because by their misuse and profanation they inflict injury and insult not only on the external symbols but upon the very body and blood of Christ" (LS 129).

384 This situation is paradoxical, "Paul is describing a particular and peculiar mode of profanation and violation of the body of Christ," because the judgment comes by eating and not by rejecting the sacrament, "Therefore in the Supper judgment is incurred not by rejecting but by eating, for he [Paul] says: 'he eats judgment to himself'" (LS 130). Hence "the unworthy partake of the body of Christ but not to their salvation" (LS 171). This must be so because "the genuineness and integrity of the sacrament does not depend on the worthiness or unworthiness of either those who distribute or those who receive,

but rests solely on the divine institution” (LS 172). The judgment of Augustine is correct when he “distinguishes between the spiritual eating of John 6, which is always unto salvation, and the eating of the body of Christ which takes place in the Supper, which is given to believers unto salvation but in the case of the impenitent gives place to judgment” (LS 173).

REPENTANCE AND FAITH

- 385 Repentance and faith are necessary for a salutary eating of the Lord’s Supper, because the Lord has graciously promised great benefits which He wants us to receive. Chemnitz therefore says that “this promise calls for faith; not merely that you say in a general way that these things are true which God promises about His grace on account of the merit of the mediator, but that in the Supper the Son of God by a special action testifies that He wants to receive into fellowship of His body and blood everyone who eats, that by the impartation of His body and blood He wants to communicate, give, apply, and seal to each one the benefits of the New Testament Yes, it is for this reason that we come to the Lord’s Supper, that this faith may be kindled and strengthened in us. For this is the true remembrance of Christ” (Ex. 2, 318).
- 386 In his *Ministry, Word and Sacraments* written to assist the clergy of Brunswick, Chemnitz shows that foremost in his zeal to expound and defend the correct doctrine of the Word of God is that of edifying the Church of Christ. His concerns are always genuinely pastoral. He poses the question, “But since life itself dwells in the body of Christ, what kind of cause of death can then exist for those that eat unworthily?” (MWS 131). He answers his own question with the words, “That does not result from this, that the Lord’s body *per se* is a deadly poison, but that they who eat unworthily sin against the body of Christ by Epicurean security and impenitence.” And he then adds by way of further explanation that “life is indeed in the flesh of Christ, but it does not work life in unbelievers but only in believers, just as also the Gospel is an odor unto life for believers but for unbelievers [an odor] unto death (2 Cor. 2:15–16). And power is given unto Christ not only to quicken believers but also to judge unbelievers (John 5:21–22)” (MWS 131).
- 387 Since Chemnitz recognizes that the solemn words of Paul may cause misapprehensions for some troubled Christians, he makes clear

that “this worthy eating does not consist in a man’s purity, holiness, or perfection. For they who are healthy do not need a doctor but they who are not healthy (Matt. 9–12)” (MWS 131). On the contrary, the examination of oneself should lead one to the acknowledgement of his sins and errors, the wrath of God, so that “with ardent desire [he will] thirst for and long for the grace of God so that by true faith in the obedience, passion, and death of Christ, that is, in the offering of [His] body and shedding of His blood, [he] seeks, begs, lays hold on, and applies to himself the grace of God, forgiveness of sins and salvation” (MWS 132).

LIFE IN THE FLESH OF CHRIST

388 Luther, as has been noted, connects the forgiveness of sins with the body and blood of Christ so that he does not regard these merely as seals and signs attached to the Word (see p. 141f.). Chemnitz does the same (see p. 142). Luther adds the familiar words that “where there is forgiveness of sins, there are also life and salvation” (SC VI, 6). Some of the aspects of this last statement are overlooked, even though Luther expands considerably on its significance in as well known a document as the Large Catechism. Luther notes that this sacrament “is appropriately called the food of the soul since it nourishes and strengthens the new man The Lord’s Supper is given as a daily food and sustenance so that our faith may refresh and strengthen itself and not weaken in the struggle but grow continually stronger” (LC V, 23 f.).

389 Chemnitz devotes a special chapter to the topic, “How Useful and Comforting This Doctrine Is” (LS 185–194). His point of departure is to show that Christ Himself, true God and Man in one person, imparts His body and blood to us. And therefore “our faith ought to lay hold on Christ as God and Man *in that nature* by which He has been made our neighbor, kinsman, and brother. For the life which belongs to the deity resides in and has in a sense been placed in the assumed humanity” (LS 187; emphasis added). When considered in all its implications, this fact is a strong inducement to growth in a sanctified life. For Chemnitz reminds us that

the human nature of Christ, its limitations having been set aside, has been removed from all miseries and injuries of this world and now resides in the glory of the Father. But our nature, although according to

the promise we have in the hope of glorification, is still befouled with uncleanness, oppressed with misery, and exposed to all the darts of Satan, the world, and the flesh. As a result our faith is under the Cross and still terribly tossed about by temptations. Therefore in the Supper Christ offers us His own body and blood which have been exalted above all miseries into the glory of the Father. He does this in such a way that through them He joins Himself to this miserable nature of ours, so that with this most present and sure guarantee and seal He may give us the certainty that He does not wish us to remain in these miseries forever but that some day we shall be conformed to His glorious body which He offers to us in the Supper as the seal of our own coming glorification. (LS 191).

The Christology of the Scriptures is never far removed from whatever part of Scripture Chemnitz is expounding.

390 In the use of the Sacrament all partake of the same body and the same blood of Christ. In his *Brief Confession* (1544) Luther had explained this over against the Sacramentarians, “When you receive the bread from the altar . . . , you are receiving the same entire body of the Lord; the person who comes after you also receives the same entire body, as does the third, and the thousandth after the thousandth one for ever and ever” (LW 38, 292). The same fact applies to the blood of Christ, “You are drinking His entire blood; so, too, does the one who follows you even to the thousand times the thousandth one, as the words of Christ clearly say: “Take eat, this is my body’ [Matt. 26:26]” (LW 38, 292). Luther sums it all up by quoting from the hymn of Thomas Aquinas (*Lauda, Sion, Salvatorem*), “One takes it, a thousand take it; this person receiving as much as that person; nor having taken it, is it consumed” (LW 38, 293).

391 Chemnitz’s entire presentation of the sacrament and its benefits proceeds from this basic concept, “For in the Supper I do not receive a particular body and you a different one, but we all receive the one and the same body of Christ” (LS 143). The result is that through the bread we are united with Christ, “For through the bread we are united with the body of Christ, and through the body with Christ Himself, and through Christ with the Father. Thus we are made partakers (*koinonoi*) with the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. These things are the results of the salutary communion (*koinonia*) of the body and the blood of the Lord in the Supper” (LS 143).

392 The tremendous importance of the doctrine of the personal union of the two natures of Christ and all that it implies for the revelation

of the Gospel as a Means of Grace can be seen from these words of Chemnitz,

Thus the humanity of Christ is the point of connection between us and God Himself, as Cyril says Therefore, in order that we might be able to lay hold on Christ more intimately and retain him more firmly, not only did He Himself assume our nature but He also restored it again by distributing His body and blood to us in the Supper, so that by this connection with His humanity, which has been assumed from us and is again communicated back to us, He might draw us into communion and union with the deity. (LS 188).

- 393 The reference in the previous paragraph to Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444 A.D.), brings to mind that Chemnitz (and Luther, too, for that matter), found Cyril to be a precise expounder of the Scriptural doctrine of the person of Christ.⁸⁶ He was the most brilliant representative of the Alexandrian School of Theology in refuting Nestorianism, and his doctrine has been taken into the Lutheran Confessions. Scripture does teach that the human nature of Christ in the personal union experienced the glorification which still has a practical and personal meaning for the church. Through the hypostatic union of the two natures in Christ the human nature has become omnipotent and quickening. It is not the case, as the Sacramentarians held, that “the deity alone is present with the church without the communion or cooperation of the human nature” (TNC 473). Chemnitz with his reference to Cyril (p. 156) probably has in mind the confession made at the Council of Ephesus (431 A.D.),

The fathers of Ephesus define it [that the flesh of Christ gives life] this way on the basis of Scripture: The flesh of Christ on account of the union with the divine nature which is life itself, is made life-giving or a life-giver (*zoopoion*), and it thus has the authority or power to give life, and this authority it exercises in the action of the Lord’s Supper in the believers. And it gives life to those who eat, just as heated iron has power of giving heat, and does give heat as we have explained in the foregoing, (TNC 474).

- 394 The Formula of Concord repeats what Chemnitz has previously written and gives it confessional status in these words,

Because of this personal union and the resultant communion that the divine and human natures have with each other in deed and truth in the person of Christ, things are attributed to Christ according to the flesh that the flesh, according to its nature and essence outside of this union, cannot intrinsically be or have, for example, that His flesh

is truly a life-giving food and His blood truly a quickening beverage, as the 200 fathers of the Council of Ephesus attested when they stated that Christ's flesh is a life-giving flesh, whence only this man and no other human being in heaven and on earth can say truthfully, "Where two or three are gathered in my name, there am I in the midst of them," likewise, "I am with you always, even to the close of the age." We do not understand these testimonies to mean that only the deity of Christ is present with us in the Christian church and community and that this presence of Christ in no way involves His humanity. (SD VIII, 76, 77).

- 395 The power of the body of Christ is not limited to the souls of the believers. The Large Catechism urges "that we must never regard the sacrament as a harmful thing from which we should flee, but as a pure, wholesome, soothing medicine which aids and quickens us in both *soul and body*. For where the soul is healed, the body has benefited also" (LC V, 68; emphasis added). Chemnitz and Andreae underlined this truth in the "Catalog of Testimonies," when they quote Canon 11 of the Council of Ephesus, "If anyone does not confess that the flesh of the Lord is quickening, because it was made the Word's own, who quickened all things, let him be anathema" (Trig. 1129).
- 396 The theme that the Lord's Supper is also the "medicine of immortality" constantly runs through Chemnitz's exposition of the benefits of the sacrament. Here he first of all is treading in the steps of Luther who confessed:

Irenaeus and the ancient fathers pointed out the benefit that our body is fed with the body of Christ, in order that our faith and hope may abide and that our body also may live eternally from the same eternal food of the body of Christ which it eats physically. This is a bodily benefit, nevertheless an extraordinarily great one, and it follows from the spiritual benefit. For Christ surely will make even our body eternal, alive, blessed, and glorious, which is a much greater thing than giving us His body to eat for a short time on earth. Therefore He wills to be "in us by nature," says Hilary, in both our soul and body, according to the Word in John 6 [:56], "He who eats me abides in me and I in him." If we eat Him spiritually through the Word He abides in us spiritually in our souls; if one eats Him physically He abides in us physically and we in Him. As we eat Him, He abides in us and we in Him. For He is not digested or transformed but ceaselessly He transforms us, our soul into righteousness, our body into immortality. So the ancient fathers spoke of the physical eating. (LW 37, 132).

- 397 Chemnitz follows Luther. The Savior's words clearly teach us that "the physical mouths of those who eat in the Lord's Supper are not eating common or plain bread when they receive the bread, but the

bread which now has been given its name by God, that is, the body of Christ And He accomplishes this not by some physical and outward mixing of the substances or by joining something to the food in our stomachs but in a way whereby it becomes a heavenly and spiritual nourishment for *both the body and the soul of the believers unto eternal life*" (LS 61; emphasis added).

398 Similarly, Chemnitz notes that

The ancients with long discussions asserted and confirmed the fact that Christ is joined or united to us not only in the Spirit or only with His deity by faith, but that in the Lord's Supper He offers His very body and blood to us in such a way that bodily, by nature, and by natural participation, that is, with the very nature or substance of His body, He is joined or united to us We noted those statements from Hilary, Chrysostom, and Cyril, and we warned against all corruptions. Cyril says: "It was surely necessary that not only the soul through the Holy Spirit ascend into a blissful life but even that this rude and earthly body, related to Him by taste and touch and food, be returned to immortality. The life-giving nature of the Word, joined to the flesh in that ineffable manner of union, makes the flesh life-giving, and thus the flesh gives life to those who participate in it. When we eat it, then we have life in us, when we are joined to Him who has created life. But if by a mere touch of the flesh of Christ those who were sick were restored, how can it be that we will not live who both taste and eat that flesh." And we have noted above, several other passages of Cyril which illustrate these points. (LS 250).

399 Of course all the benefits given in the Supper have their source in the vicarious atonement of Christ on the cross. Chemnitz makes note of the fact that "the Fathers preached much about the use and the benefit of communing at the Lord's Supper, because there the sacrifice which is the satisfaction for our sins and the price of our redemption is dispensed to those who take it" (Ex. 2, 513). And he gives innumerable examples of this kind of presentation from the Ancients. In summary form, he says that the "body and blood of the Lord which are in the Supper . . . [are] our ransom, the purchase price of our redemption, the ransom for the sins of the world, a propitiatory sacrifice and a propitiation" (Ex. 2, 491). It is for this reason that "Cyprian says of the Lord's Supper: "This life-giving bread and the cup of blessing, hallowed by the solemn benediction, benefits the life of the total man, being at the same time a medicine and offering, to heal our infirmities and to purge our iniquities"" (Ex. 2, 491).

400 Chemnitz, as a true shepherd of the Church of God and one who is committed to feed the flock of God, is also necessarily concerned

about the growth of sanctification within the lives of the believers. He counsels the pastors of Brunswick to preach from the Gospel that the fruit of the true use of the sacrament is not only for strengthening of faith but also for drawing from the sacrament strength for a godly life,

Christ, in His Supper, offers us His most holy body and blood, so that engrafted by this communion as branches in Him who is the true vine, we might draw thence, new, good, and spiritual sap. Thus we are also joined most closely by this communion with other Christians as members of the one body of Christ (1 Cor. 10:17), so that mutual love toward the neighbor is kindled, increased, and preserved in us. (MWS 129)

401 These wonderful gifts should induce the believer to partake of the sacrament often. Paul, Chemnitz observes, in contrast to the Evangelists, twice emphasizes the term “as often as” (1 Cor. 11:25,26). Paul does this not only to eliminate the thought that the Supper should be observed only once a year, as was the case with the Passover, but especially “in order that we may eat of that bread and drink of that cup as often as we recognize and feel that medicine and remedy which our Good Samaritan pours into our wounds is useful and necessary to us, so long as we only examine ourselves lest we receive it to judgment” (Ex. 2, 330). Chemnitz concludes that “because Christ says: ‘as often as ye do this,’ it is wholly His will that those who are His disciples should do this frequently” (Ex. 2, 331). And, further, that “those are not true and faithful ministers of Christ who in any manner whatever lead or frighten people away from more frequent use and reception of the Eucharist (Ex. 2, 331).

THE EUCHARIST: A TESTIMONY OF UNITY AND FAITH

402 One more facet of Chemnitz’s doctrine of the Lord’s Supper needs examination, namely, the confessional aspect of communing together. Chemnitz derived this doctrine from the fact that by partaking of the body and blood of Christ the communicant is one body and one blood with Christ. He asserts that “through such [salutary] communion the faithful are made members of that body whose Head is Christ, as Paul says: ‘There is one bread, and we who are many are one body, for we are all partakers of that one bread [1 Cor. 10:17]’” (LS 143). One of the fruits of partaking of the body and blood of Christ is the “fellowship of the body of the church” (LS 145). He explains

further by saying that “in the external celebration of the Supper is the medium or means through which this spiritual association both with Christ and with the members of the church is brought about” (LS 146).

403 Participation in the Lord’s Supper with others is a serious act. It is

not only a figurative admonition regarding our mutual, fraternal fellowship and love for one another, in the way that bread is produced from many grains and wine from many grapes, as Augustine says But because Christ in the Supper joins Himself most intimately to us by the very nature with which He is our Head, namely, by His body and blood, at the same time through this assumed nature of His, which is akin to ours, He will work powerfully and efficaciously in the believers, so that, because our Head Himself is above us, we also may be members of one another. For we being many are one body because we all partake of that one bread which is the body of Christ (1 Cor. 10:17), and we all drink into the one Spirit (1 Cor. 12:13). (LS 193).

404 Chemnitz is cognizant of the fact that the Early Church on the basis of 1 Cor. 10:16, 17, recognized and confessed church fellowship through participation in the sacraments. Heretics were not admitted to the Supper of the Lord.⁸⁷ And he is obviously in agreement with the tenet that the unity of the church is the presupposition of church fellowship. Although he analyzes an example from the Early Church to show that the reservation of the sacrament was not a custom in the Early Church, nevertheless, his comments clearly show that he held that participation in the Eucharist is a testimony of unity,

Irenaeus, . . . in the Epistle to Victor relates that all the Roman bishops before Victor, although they disagreed with the Asiatics in the observance of Easter, nevertheless cultivated peace with them. And because fellowship at the Lord’s table is testimony of consensus, harmony, and unity in doctrine and faith, as St. Paul says: “We who are many are one body, for we all partake of the one bread” (1 Cor. 10:17), therefore Irenaeus says that it was the custom that when the bishops or presbyters either of Asiatic or of other churches came to Rome the Roman bishops would send the Eucharist to them as a witness of harmony and peace. (Ex. 2, 301f).

405 As one surveys what Chemnitz has had to say about the benefits of the Lord’s Supper, one cannot but note that there is a richness and warmth in his exposition. The Lord’s Supper is not for him a mere abstract doctrine but a vital Means of Grace through which the Savior imparts to believers all that He has won for them by His incarna-

tion, life, death, and resurrection. He closes one of his chapters in *The Lord's Supper* with these words,

The more we love it [the sacrament], the more diligently we will defend it and the more tenaciously we will retain the proper, simple, and natural meaning of the words of Christ's last will and testament, so that these sweet consolations are not snatched away from us. (LS 194).

Notes 82–87, Chapter VI

82. The first edition was published at Leipzig in 1561, with the title, *Repetitio Sanae Doctrinae de Vera Praesentia Corporis et Sanguinis Domini in Coena*.
83. Sasse (see note #1), *This is My Body*, p. 348.
84. See Luther's *Brief Confession Concerning the Holy Sacrament* (1544), where he disclaims any teaching such as that, "For I can well remember, and it is also recorded in their books, how altogether scandalously they blasphemed us along with our dear Lord and Savior; they called Him a baked God, a God made of bread, a God made of wine, a roasted God, etc. [see the Marburg Colloquy, LW 38, 72]. They called us cannibals, blood-drinkers, man-eaters, Capernaïtes, Thyesteans, etc. Yet they knew that they were doing an injustice to the Lord and to us intentionally and in an exceedingly blasphemous way, and that they were inventing scandalous lies about us" (LW 38, 291 f.). Luther adds the observation that "even the papists have never taught such things, as they clearly knew, but yet they — these holy, spiritual people — wanted to hurt us with the name 'papists'" (LW 38, 292).
85. It is here necessary to remember what Chemnitz has confessed concerning the modes of Christ's presence, especially the definitive mode (see p. 39 f.), and also what he has said about the sacramental union (see p. 45–53).
86. The index to Chemnitz's *The Two Natures in Christ* carries over a column of references to Cyril.
87. Werner Elert has described the doctrine and practice of the Early Church with respect to altar fellowship. See his *Eucharist and Church Fellowship in the First Four Centuries*, translated from the German by N. E. Nagel, St. Louis: CPH, 1966.

CHAPTER VII

Summary and Conclusions

- 406 As has been noted (p. 88; note #61), very few references to Chemnitz's doctrine of the Lord's Supper are made in present day standard texts on dogmatics. In quite striking contrast, references to the seventeenth century Lutheran dogmaticians are rather full and quite detailed.⁸⁸ This omission is all the more striking since Chemnitz is called the prince of theologians, the second Martin, who after Luther is the most important theologian in the history of the Lutheran Church and is regarded as the leading spirit in the writing of the Formula of Concord. Despite two books that deal particularly with the Lord's Supper (*Examen II* and *The Lord's Supper*), he is the forgotten theologian with these later theologians as far as the doctrine of the Lord's Supper is concerned. It appears, however, that this situation will be remedied in the near future since he will soon be the most studied of the Lutheran theologians, at least where the English language is employed. At the present time there are about 2500 pages of Chemnitz rendered into English, and President J. A. O. Preus is well into the monumental task of translating the *Loci Theologici*.
- 407 Chemnitz is a sixteenth century theologian and not a seventeenth century. He was much closer to the original roots of the Reformation than were the later dogmaticians. He is also the chief author of the Formula of Concord. Hence the study of Chemnitz may well serve as a healthy corrective against some of the theological weaknesses found in the seventeenth century dogmaticians. Walther, in more ways than one, made it clear that he was not irrevocably bound to what the seventeenth century theologians formulated. In 1875 he wrote,

They do not know us who label our theology that of the seventeenth century. As highly as we treasure the immense accomplishments of the great Lutheran dogmaticians of that period, it is nevertheless not really

to them that we return, but rather above all to our precious Book of Concord and to Luther, in whom we recognize the man whom God chose as the Moses of His church of the New Covenant, to lead His church which had fallen into slavery to the Anti-Christ, out of that slavery. He is the column of smoke and fire of the Word of God, clear and pure as gold as it is.⁸⁹

Conservative theologians in general will probably echo points of view similar to Walther's, but it is a question whether in reality this position hasn't been observed more in the breach than in the keeping. The stance of Chemnitz on the Lord's Supper, naturally, will correspond to much of what the seventeenth century theologians had to say, but there will be significant differences not only in emphases but also in critical doctrinal positions. A final summary of the chief points of Chemnitz's doctrine will reveal these differences.

408 For Chemnitz the doctrine of the Sacrament of the Altar must be taken directly from the Words of Institution, for they are the infal-
409 lible words of the Son of God, given in His last will and testament. This means that we must interpret these words literally (p. 18–20).

409 To accomplish this task it is imperative that one take his reason captive. The temptation to escape the literal meaning is almost over-
whelming. But there is no place in theology for reason corrupted by natural man. Aristotle's categories are designed for the secular world, where observation and experiment are paramount. But they have no place in dealing with the spiritual kingdom where one treats of things eye has not seen nor ear heard or entered into the mind of man. This may well be the reason why the Torgau Book (1576) eliminated from the Swabian-Saxon Concord the Aristotelian "Four Causes" paradigm as explaining a teaching given by divine revelation. In distinction to the seventeenth century theologians and their followers, Chemnitz evidently sensed its weaknesses, especially in its tendency to warp the spiritual truths into an uncomfortable form which can put the doctrine of God completely askew. It does this by giving a spurious equality to "the causes," which in actuality negates the creative power of the Verba in a legitimate consecration. Chemnitz's verdict is that "the sacraments are mysteries that are unknown to human reason and hidden from our sense perceptions. They are made manifest and revealed by the Word alone" (LS 87) (p. 20–24, 91f.; notes #7 and #65).

410 In beginning with the *Status Controversiae* which confronted Chemnitz in the middle of the sixteenthth century, he recognizes

that it is necessary for him to examine and define two terms that were being extensively used by all sides: “sacrament” and “action.” While he in general is satisfied with Melanchthon’s definition of the sacrament as a rite which has the command of God and to which the promise of grace has been added (Ap. XIII, 3), he does understand that in view of its present use, more needs to be said to reduce the vagueness of the term. From the Scriptures he enumerates eight points that will clarify the word “sacrament”: an external, visible element is employed which has an explicit, divine command in the New Testament; it is a universal command for all time; included is a divine promise of grace given with the command; this is joined to the sign by divine commands; this promise has to do only with the promise of grace, or justification, and not to any and all gifts of God; finally, this promise in the sacrament is not merely announced in general but by the power of God it is offered and applied to the individuals who use the sacrament in faith. One should not, however, infer from this that Baptism and the Lord’s Supper are identical in every respect, since “each individual sacrament has its own proper and peculiar word of definition” (LS 87) (p. 8–10).

- 411 Since there is genuine disagreement with respect to what the Sacrament of the Altar is, Chemnitz realizes that it is of the highest importance that there be agreement as to the precise meaning of the terms customarily used in speaking of it. He singles out two terms which were widely used but which beclouded some fundamental differences because of their vague referents, “action” and “use.” Closely analyzing the Words of Institution, Chemnitz sees that what is instituted is not merely some outward actions or an outward rite which one performs. But there is a “thing” and an “action” combined. It includes the “thing” and the doing of something with that “thing.” This is so because by definition the sacrament embraces some visible element to which the Word comes. Further, Christ has commanded us to do in the sacramental action what He Himself did. He prescribes the following, all of which belong to the “action”: To take bread and wine, bless, divide, offer, receive, eat, and add this Word of Christ, “This is my body,” etc. (Ex. 2, 249). Within the limits of this precise definition, Chemnitz regards the terms “action” and “use” as synonymous (Ex. 2, 245; Ex. 2, 494). Chemnitz’s precisizing of these terms has been taken into the Formula of Concord (SD VII, 85–87). It is wrong and severely dis-

torts the meaning of the Verba to limit the terms only to the distribution and reception, or to extend the sense of the Verba beyond the *mandatum* to consecrate certain elements, distribute and receive that which has been consecrated, as the Roman Catholics do in reserving the Host. For Chemnitz the “action” is to consecrate the elements, which effects the sacramental union, and to eat and to drink those consecrated elements *because* they are the body and blood of Christ (p. 11–14; 141–143; notes #5, 61, 73–5).

412 As to what is present and given in the Sacrament, Chemnitz concludes on the basis of the four accounts that it is the body and blood of the resurrected Christ. It is the same body which was sacrificed on the cross, but the body and blood are not outside the personal union with the deity (p. 27 f.). This fact, however, does not justify the Roman Church to withhold the cup from the laity. Rather, we must adhere with simple obedience to the command of Christ to eat His body and drink His blood. Nor dare one allow the reverse argument of the Sacramentarians against the Real Presence who urged that to hold that the true body of Christ is in the bread and the blood in the wine would be to disrupt the body of Christ; all of which would necessitate the rejection of the natural meaning of the Verba. The entire person of Christ according to both natures is present in the sacrament. Christ, who from eternity as a person in the Godhead, assumed a true and complete human nature in his conception and birth from the Virgin Mary. The divine and human natures have been joined together so intimately in a personal union that there is one and the same person subsisting in these two natures. As a result of this personal union of the two natures in the one person, there took place a communion of properties (SD VIII, 31–75). Neither Luther nor Chemnitz built their doctrine of the Lord's Supper on the doctrine of the personal union instead of the Words of Institution. But the insistence of the Sacramentarians that only the divine nature in Christ is communicated in the Supper necessitated an explication of the Biblical doctrine of the person of Christ. (p. 22–31)

413 Since the Sacramentarians denied the communication of attributes according to the *genus majestaticum*, Chemnitz confesses that while one must hold to the integrity of the two natures and not allow for any blending of them, one must believe that because of the personal union Christ's human nature has received innumerable supernatural

qualities which are contrary to nature. This communication of divine majesty continues in glory so that the human nature is capable of the divine majesty which belongs to God. Although the mystery of this union surpasses our comprehension, we must with the simplicity of the partial knowledge given us in the Scripture adhere to what is clearly confessed in Scripture. Holy Writ teaches that the flesh of Christ makes alive, that His blood cleanses from all sin, that He has been given authority to judge because He is the Son of Man, that He is omnipotent and omnipresent (SD VIII, 57–62). In view of this, one must reject the false doctrine of the Reformed who deprive Christ of His majesty according to His human nature. Further, the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Sacrament does not conflict with any articles of faith, and in particular with what Scripture says of Christ's human nature and His ascension (p. 32–35).

- 414 The personal union of the two natures in the one person, Christ, makes possible the various modes of Christ's presence. The Formula of Concord follows Luther in distinguishing three modes of Christ's presence, although allowing for the possibility of more: the *circumscriptive* mode, the *definitive* mode, and the *repletive* mode (SD VII, 92–105). Luther and the Formula sharply distinguish the second mode from the first; that is, Christ's body and blood can be substantially present without being circumscribed, but the place is circumscribed. The second mode is also to be differentiated from the third mode, where Christ is present in all places whole and entire, because He is one person with God. The second mode is also to be differentiated from the "spiritual mode" whereby we receive Christ by faith (SD VII, 104–106). Chemnitz confesses the same truths, even though in his exposition he posits five kinds of presence. There is no essential difference between his and Luther's presentation. He does distinguish more precisely the definitive mode where Christ can be present with His body wherever He wills and do whatever He wills. Chemnitz makes the point that there is a distinction between Christ's presence in the Supper where His body and blood are received by both the worthy and unworthy, and His presence in the whole church where He dwells in the believer by faith. In view of these modes of presence, we can be certain that Christ is present with His body and blood in the consecrated elements in the *definitive* mode because we have His express Word and promise (p. 36–45).

- 415 Since Christ is present in the bread, or more precisely, the bread is the body of Christ, Chemnitz explains that there is no transubstantiation, but that “two distinct things or substances, which joined by the sacramental union make one complete sacrament, even as in the one person of Christ there are two complete and distinct natures” (MWS 120). There is no transubstantiation because the “this” in the Verba refer to the bread and the wine. Even after the consecration (1 Cor. 10: 16) Paul calls it bread, and he does this several times (p. 45 ff.).
- 416 Next, it is certain that the word “is” must retain its proper meaning even though the words of Christ come into conflict with human reason. Just as in Christology, we are here dealing with mysteries beyond our human reason but which express divine wisdom and power. We must refuse to introduce figures of speech into the Words of Institution, just as the orthodox refused to permit this in the Arian Controversy with such statements that “Son of Man is the Son of God.” The word “is” denotes what obtains, is present, distributed and received. Similarly, the words “body” and “blood” are to be retained in their natural sense, because it is the body given for us and the blood shed for us for the forgiveness of sins. In addition, it is a hermeneutical principle recognized even in the secular world, that in a person’s last will and testament it is imperative that the text be construed in its proper and natural sense. In the sacrament the bread and the wine are the body and blood of Christ without ceasing to be bread and wine (p. 19–21; 47 f.).
- 417 Since it is an unusual union it is called a sacramental union (SD VII, 38). The Early Church used the personal union of the two natures of Christ as an analogy of the sacramental union of the earthly elements and the body and blood of Christ. Christ says, “This is my body.” Scripture uses similar language to express the personal union of the two natures in Christ (John 1:14, Col. 2:9; (Acts 10:38). But this is only an analogy which helps to shed some light on the mystery. And an analogy is never perfect in every respect. There is a difference. In the person of Christ the union of the two natures is inseparable, personal and enduring. God, however, is not inseparably in the elements because they are not sacramental apart from their use. The union obtains only in the prescribed action of consecrating, distributing, and receiving what is consecrated. In view of this difference, Chemnitz and his fellow Lutherans have “at

times” used other phrases such as “under the bread, with the bread, in the bread, the body of Christ is present and offered” (SD VII, 35). They employed these secondary terms to reject the papistic idea of transubstantiation and that the sacramental union obtains “apart from the action which Christ ordained and commanded when He instituted it.” Chemnitz does, however, recognize that some of the terminology the Lutherans have employed may be misused by the Sacramentarians, as when they speak of two things in the Supper. The adversaries counter that the Eucharist consist of two things but they are separate. The bread is on earth but the body of Christ is only in heaven, and hence called a heavenly thing. Formulas other than Christ’s “This is my body,” lack precision and were used only “at times.” The Lutherans, it should be noted, together with the Early Church, use the word “change” to signify what the consecration has achieved, but they do not mean that the annihilation of the elements has occurred, but only that after the Verba were spoken the body and blood of Christ are present (p. 48–53).

418 There is a fundamental similarity between the Reformed and the Roman position in that they both deny that the finite is capable of the infinite. They both deny the sacramental union. The Roman Church states that the “this” (*touto*) refers to the body of Christ, i.e., “This body is my body.” The Sacramentarians, on the other hand, insist that “body” is a metonymic figure of speech so that “body” is the equivalent of “bread” alone, i.e., “This bread is my bread” (p. 53–55).

419 Some medieval schoolmen, purporting to have borrowed it from Aristotle, propounded what is called “identical predication,” that is, that the subject and predicate must be identical, and that “is” means to be equal in meaning. Besides the Romanists, Zwingli, too, held that there is no support either in God’s Word or philosophy for such a concept as “This is bread and moreover it is my body.” The reason for this, it was held, is that two substances cannot be one thing. Chemnitz, in harmony with Luther, demonstrates that the subject-predicate relationships need not be an identical relationship. Scripture joins two different entities with the copulative verb “is” which means nothing else than that there is a union or communion of these two entities. A case in point are the Biblical statements regarding Jesus Christ, who is God and Man in one person, “*The Son of Man is the Son of the living God.*” Similarly, one can truthfully say that the

dove John the Baptist saw was the Holy Spirit. This is a common linguistic fact of life; for example, one does say of the money bag, "Look, you have money." In other words, the subject-predicate relationship need not be only one of identity, but it can express other relationships. The bread in the sacrament is the topic, and Christ, the very Son of God, in His last will and testament has said that this bread is His body. What the predicate or comment of the Savior says about the subject (topic) is sufficient for Chemnitz to establish the doctrine which he believes. Paul has added an inspired commentary that after we have consecrated the elements they are a communion of the body and blood of Christ. Luther called this form of speech "synecdoche," but he was using the term in a broad sense. Other terms as "sacramental predication," or "irregular predication," have been employed. Actually, however, Aristotle did not confine the subject-predicate relationship to identical predication but classified the ways of predication as *definition* or *genus* or *property* or *accident* (note #36). Chemnitz cuts through the maze of terminology with the statement that "it does not matter by what name it is called as long as we correctly understand the method of predication and as long as the heart of the matter as it is taught in Scripture remains unimpaired" (LS 55). (p. 35–61; notes #34–38)

- 420 Chemnitz recognizes that the Bible makes use of all the resources that are inherent in human language, and he acknowledges that this will include figurative language in which there is an intentional departure from normal constructions and meanings of words. But since analogies can be less precise and possibly even lead to misunderstanding, Chemnitz knows that it is fundamental not to depart from the normal meaning unless there are cogent reasons for doing this. On principle Chemnitz rejects the discarding of the specific, exact meaning of the individual words in Christ's Words of Institution because they are His last will and testament which demand a literal meaning. This leaves no room for a metonymic understanding of "body." Not only the immediate context, but the wider context of God's revelation eliminates a symbolic understanding of this text. After His resurrection, in His state of exaltation, the Savior repeated these words to Paul. In addition, Paul's inspired commentary (1 Cor. 10 and 11) demonstrates that these words must be taken literally. Scripture must interpret Scripture (p. 61–65).

- 421 No texts, such as Acts 3:21, Matt. 26:11, John 13:33, force us to take the Verba symbolically. Not only have the adversaries mistranslated Acts 3:21 so as to make it say that Christ must be kept in heaven, but they have in general misinterpreted all these passages which say that the disciples will not always have Christ with them and hence not in the Supper. Their interpretation founders on the fact that the clear texts of Scripture teach the personal union of the two natures in the one Christ who now in His glorified state makes full use of the divine power communicated also to the human nature. Christ is *repletively* present, and He can and wills to be *definitively* present where He has given His Word of promise. The sacramental union of the body and the blood of Christ with the bread and the wine obtain in the Lord's Supper as Christ instituted it in the Upper Room. The question remains, however, whether the church today can be certain that it has the *same Supper* which the Lord instituted. *How* does one know this? The answer to that question separated the Lutherans from the Sacramentarians 450 years ago, and it is still a fundamental point of controversy (p. 61–67; notes #41–43).
- 422 From its very inception the Lutheran Church taught that the speaking of the Words of Institution over the elements at a legitimate celebration of the Lord's Supper achieves the miracle of the Real Presence of the body and blood of Christ in the elements. This has been called the "consecration." This can be easily seen from the works of Luther and Bugenhagen written at the time when Carlstadt publicly repudiated this doctrine (p. 68–72).
- 423 Chemnitz throughout all his writings assumes that the consecration effects the Real Presence and that these consecrated elements are to be distributed and received. As already noted, all this (and only this) is included in the definition of the "sacramental action." He also recognizes that other terms have been used in the church for the consecration, "blessing," "sanctification," "receiving its name from God," "receiving the call of God." To explain his doctrine he often quotes Irenaeus, "Just as that which is bread from the earth, when it receives the call of God is no longer common bread but the Eucharist consisting of two parts, the earthly and the heavenly" (LS 169). The consecration, as the church had recognized from the beginning, "is performed with the speech of Christ, that is, with the Words of Institution" (Ex. 2, 226). (p. 72–75).

- 424 The basis for the recitation of the Verba is for Chemnitz the command of Christ, "This do in remembrance of me" (1 Cor. 11:23–25). The Verba are the powerful, creative words of Christ because of Christ's command and promise. He is efficacious through His Word so that the bread is His body and the wine His blood. Chemnitz, together with the Formula of Concord, confesses that the minister represents Christ when he speaks the Words of Institution over the elements because of the command in 1 Cor. 11:23–25 and Luke 22:19 (p. 72–77; notes #51–53).
- 425 It is a fundamental point in the theology of Chemnitz that there have been given to the church commands which express the will of God. One of these is the command to speak the Verba in Christ's stead. One is not to take the consecration of the Eucharist from the words of divine institution and transfer it to the prayers of the Canon (Ex. 2, 226). Because of the *mandatum dei* God Himself is present and active through the Word and the elements to which the Word comes. To be sure, however, the power to effect the miracle of the Real Presence does not reside in the officiant. Chrysostom is correct when he observes that when one sees the hand of the priest holding out the body of the Lord, it is not the hand of the priest, but the hand of Christ who says "Take and eat, this is my body" (LS 159). The Formula of Concord incorporates a similar quotation from Chrysostom (SD VII, 76) to confess that it is by God's power and grace through the Verba which the priest speaks that the sacramental union takes place. The *Apology to the Formula* asserts that these words of Chrysostom "settle the whole controversy" as to what the *Book of Concord* confesses respecting the Scriptural teaching about the consecration (p. 75–82, 218; notes #52–54).
- 426 This speaking of the Verba is not a case of "magic" as some Sacramentarians have asserted. Man is not attempting to compel the Deity to do something. Rather, the minister uses the Words of Institution as an ordinance, promise and prerogative of the Savior. The minister acts as an ambassador in the place of Christ, who is Himself present and through the minister pronounces these words. The Verba, of course, are a proclamation of God's reconciliation, but because of the *mandatum dei*, they are more. In the service they are the very words of Christ which effect the presence of the body and the blood in the elements.

427 It is clear that when Chemnitz precises the term “action” to mean the consecration, distribution and reception, he in no way intends to convey the thought that, similar to the Aristotelian model of the Four Causes, the body and blood are not present until the *sumptio*. This is evident from his constant use of phrases such as “under the bread and the wine the body and blood of Christ are truly *present, distributed, received*.” His words are here quite specific that “the meaning is not that the blessed bread which is divided, which is offered, and which the Apostles received from the hand of Christ, was not the body of Christ but becomes the body of Christ when the eating of it is begun” (Ex. 2, 248). On the basis of Matt. 26:28, it is clear that the eating and drinking in no way cause the sacramental union. Christ commands the disciples to drink *because* this is my blood” (LS 99). The principle that ministers act in Christ’s stead as His ambassadors is so fundamental to Chemnitz that he disavows the Reformed view that not only the consecration but also the absolution are contingent on other factors that follow Christ’s pronouncement given through His ministry (Ex. 2, 623).

428 The question the church wants to know and needs to know is: *How* can it be certain that the elements it receives are the very body and blood given and shed for many by the Savior? The question whether one is a “consecrationist” or a “receptionist,” or the discussion about the moment of the presence are really secondary to this fundamental epistemological question. Uncertainty about these latter questions, of course, stem from the fact that the first question has not really been answered, or that the answer has been posited in something else besides Christ’s Word. For Chemnitz the sacrament stands or falls with the consecration. Only because Christ has effected the miracle through the minister’s speaking of Christ’s Words of Institution over certain elements, does the church have the unconditional certainty that it has the same Supper instituted in the Upper Room. Only when the Verba are spoken in our Lord’s Supper “are we sure and believe that in the Lord’s Supper we eat, not ordinary bread and wine, but the body and blood of Christ” (Ex. 2, 229). Since only Christ can effect the miracle of the Real Presence, the body and blood are only in those elements of which He has said “This is my body,” etc. The words are not less effective on our lips than they were on Christ’s, for He has said that he who hears you hears me. If one cannot be cer-

tain of this when the elements are consecrated, one is certainly less certain of it when he eats and drinks the consecrated elements. For those who doubt that the officiant's speaking of the Verba effects the presence of the body of Christ, Chemnitz answers with Chrysostom's words on Matt. 26:26–28, "He [Christ] works also now; He does it. We have the order of ministers, but it is He who consecrates these things; it is He who transmutes them" (Ex. 2, 248). In this context Chemnitz is rejecting the viewpoint that the consecrated elements are not the body and blood of Christ but become that "when the eating of it is begun."

429 For Chemnitz the *unconditional certainty* that the church has the original Supper used in its midst is the observance of the divine *mandatum* of Christ, who because of this is speaking the Verba through the servants of Jesus Christ (p. 82–88, 121).

430 After Luther's death the controversy over the meaning of the consecration continued among "some teachers of the Augsburg Confession" (SD VII, 73). To clarify the Biblical doctrine, the Formula of Concord (SD VII, 73–90) confessed what had been enunciated by Luther and Chemnitz and their followers. In 1584 the *Apology to the Formula* reiterated this doctrine, referring specifically to the Chrysostom quotation (SD VII, 76a) as settling "the whole controversy" (p. 85–88).

431 In contrast, Melancthon's doctrine that the sacramental union is not achieved through the consecration but only when the act of eating takes place, was expounded by Aegidius Hunnius in 1590, and subsequently perpetuated by the seventeenth century theologians. According to this model, the consecration merely sets the elements apart and serves as a sort of prayer for worthy reception (p. 89–92; notes #61–65).

432 In answer to the charge that the doctrine of Luther and Chemnitz is Romanizing, Chemnitz analyzes the difference between the Lutheran and Catholic doctrines of the ministry. Since Christ has instituted the office of the Public Ministry it is He who speaks, exhorts, absolves, baptizes, etc., in this ministry. The Roman Church holds that only the successors to the Apostles in their priesthood receive the power for consecrating, offering and administering the body and blood, as well as remitting and retaining sins. Only through sacred ordination (which is performed through words and outwards signs) is the priest given the power. But, objects Chemnitz, there is

nothing in Scripture that ties the grace of God to papal ordination. Their doctrine obviously makes consecration and absolution partly the work of God and partly that of the ordained priest. According to their teaching the consecratory power does not lie in Christ's words themselves but rather in the power given to the priest at his ordination. This is an integral part of the whole Roman synergistic system. In contrast, the Lutheran position is that the Lord commits the "outward ministry unto men," but it is the Lord alone who is effective through this ministry. Hence, it is totally false in any way to connect the Lutheran doctrine of consecration with that of the Roman Church (p. 92–98).

433 There can be no doubt that Chemnitz believes that after the consecration, the sacramental union has taken place. The presence of Christ, God and Man, in the definitive mode is extended in time and limited to that which has been consecrated. This can be easily seen from his many references to Christ's presence on the altar before the distribution and reception, for example, "There is also placed on that sacred table the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world" (LS 155). That Chemnitz has in mind Christ's definitive mode of presence, and not the repletive, is evident from his statements that before the consecration there is only one substance, namely, bread and wine. But when the Word comes to these elements, there is also present the very body and blood of Christ (LS 156) (p. 98–101; notes #66, 67).

434 This means, then, that the veneration of the sacrament is permissible within the prescribed use. Chemnitz does not quarrel with the Romanists over the fact that Christ is present with His body and blood in the consecrated elements, and that He is worthy of worship here. He agrees with the Ancient Church and Luther who defended the practice. After the attack of the Neustadt theologians on the Formula of Concord (1581), Chemnitz, Selnecker and Kirchner completed their *Historie* (HS 714). In this work they include a generous portion of George of Anhalt's sermon on the outward adoration of the sacrament (p. 109 ff.). They approvingly quote a specific part of the sermon which demonstrates that the consecration effects the Real Presence, and that to deny that truth by denying the possibility of the adoration is extremely serious, "We want to have nothing to do with those who presumptuously and sacrilegiously deny the true presence of the body and blood of our

Lord Jesus Christ in the excellent sacrament, contrary to the clear and irrefutable Word of our Lord Jesus Christ, . . . and therefore on that ground conclude that Christ could not be in the sacrament and therefore consider it as idolatry, to worship the excellent sacrament, indeed, Christ in the sacrament, etc” (p. 109 ff.).

435 There is a difference, however, between the Lutherans and the Romanists on this point. Through the adoption of the theory of transubstantiation the elements of bread and wine have been annihilated. But, argues Chemnitz, it does not follow if Christ is to be worshiped, that also those creatures in which He is present should also be worshiped. In the *action* of the Supper a clear distinction must be made between Christ, God and Man, present in His divine and human nature who should be worshiped, and the substance of the elements of bread and wine which should not be worshiped (Ex. 2, 279 f.). This distinction is also made in the Formula of Concord (SD VII, 126) (p. 112 f., 115–120).

436 Further, the Romanists teach that the sacramental union is an enduring union, with the result that they establish the worship of bread apart from the action which Christ ordained and commanded. To lock up the consecrated bread or carry it around as in the Corpus Christi Festival for adoration conflicts with the Words of Institution that the consecrated bread should be distributed and consumed (p. 112–115).

437 Chemnitz has distilled the doctrine of the Lord's Supper into the axiom, “Nothing has the character of a sacrament apart from the use instituted by Christ, or apart from the divinely instituted action” (SD VII, 85). But one will miss the significance of the axiom if one does not subject it to close analysis to see how it is applied. Chemnitz, and of course Luther also, teaches that within the *prescribed action* the bread and the wine by means of the consecration have become the body and blood of Christ, which are then to be eaten and drunk. Chemnitz declares that “it conflicts with the Words of Institution when the bread which has been blessed is not distributed, not received, not eaten” (Ex. 2, 281) (par. 306–308) .

438 The *mandata dei* for the church of God show us the will of God and safeguard us against legalistic practices and the notions of what men think might be pleasing to God. Scripture has stated, and the church from the beginning has recognized, that the sacramental ac-

tion is to be “performed and administered in a certain way and with a specific divinely instituted ceremony” (Ex. 2, 110). With respect to the *Reliquiae* Chemnitz can find no evidence in the account of the institution of the Supper which would allow for a delay in the consumption of the consecrated elements “apart from its use.” Because of the Savior’s “Do this,” “we should follow and do what was done at the first Supper” (Ex. 2, 294). This means that “in the future” the church is “to take bread and the cup, to bless them with thanksgiving, and to distribute what has been consecrated.” This part of the *mandatum* “properly pertains to the ministers” (Ex. 2, 404). SD VII 83–85 coincides precisely with Chemnitz’s rejection of the reservation of the Sacrament. Chemnitz says:

We will not put away the bread and the wine which have been blessed with the words of the Supper, shut them in, reserve them, carry them about, and use them for display, but will distribute, receive, eat and drink them, and proclaim the death of the Lord. Thus the obedience of faith will do what Christ did before and commanded to be done. (Ex. 2, 295) (p. 121–125, 134 f.).

- 439 To sum up, besides the Biblical evidence, Chemnitz examines the doctrine and practice of the Early Church. From all this he is forced to conclude that the reservation of the consecrated Eucharist without distribution and reception was not approved, and only rarely practiced, and then it was strongly condemned on the basis of the Words of Institution (p. 125–131).
- 440 An examination of all the aspects of Chemnitz’s doctrine of the consecration, including the veneration and the consumption of the *Reliquiae*, shows that he, in harmony with the *Sola Gratia*, excludes everything on the part of man in the reception of the grace of the Sacrament. Faith, the eating and drinking, the carrying out of the rite or service by the assembled church, are all excluded as having any part in effecting the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the sacrament. Man’s response is not a condition for God’s unilateral last will and testament. Man’s response is contained in the gift of the Gospel, which effects faith in the heart of man for his salvation. Further, the cause of the Real Presence and of faith depends alone on the powerful creative Word of Christ. The church is invited to eat and drink *because* it is the body and blood of the crucified and risen Lord Jesus Christ (LS 99). No contingencies of time and place,

nor the response on the part of man in a legitimate observance of Christ's institution, ratify Christ's testament of the gift of His body and blood; nor do they nullify His testament, "For the genuineness and integrity of the sacraments does not depend on the worthiness or unworthiness of either those who distribute or those who receive, but it rests solely on the divine institution" (LS 127) (p. 131f.).

441 Melancthon with his denial that the power of the Words of Institution effect the Real Presence (p. 83), and Hunnius with his similar doctrine that not before the very act of eating does the sacramental union take place (p. 90f.), are rationalistic attempts to escape the Word of the Lord. They remove the unconditional certainty that Christ's Word gives by making the gift depend on something other than the sure Word of God. The medieval Aristotelian "Four-Cause" paradigm was eliminated from the Torgau Book (p. 22f.; note #7). The re-introduction of it by the seventeenth century dogmatists mutilated Luther's and the *Book of Concord's* doctrine of the Lord's Supper by giving the resulting misconception that in some way the *sumptio* is the missing key which achieves the Real Presence. This obscures the fact that it is Christ Himself who speaks through the mouth of the minister but by God's power and grace the words are efficacious (SD VII, 76). Any other approach than that of Luther and Chemnitz distorts the doctrine revealed in Scripture, opens the door to a synergistic view of man's cooperation with God, makes of the Sacrament some kind of action or process which one carries out, and thus reminding one of the benefits of Christ.

442 What has been happening as a result of this unfortunate use of the "Four-Cause" paradigm can be illustrated by comparing the formulation of what the Lord's Supper is by an early twentieth century theologian⁹⁰ with that of Chemnitz. The formulation says that the essence (*forma*) of the Supper is the total action, which Christ Himself, viewing the earthly and heavenly elements, then designed and instituted for all time, so that only there the Supper is really celebrated where the three constituting essential joint actions (*actus formales*) take place: The consecration, the distribution, and the reception. It is evident that here a spurious equality has been given to the different causes or actions. The reception is equally determinative in achieving the Real Presence, when, as a matter of fact, the almighty Word of Christ effects the miracle of the Real Presence. It is just as

Luther wrote to Wolferinus (SD VII, 87; p. 138), that the speaking of the Verba “is the most powerful and principal action in the Sacrament.” This modern theologian draws the conclusion from what he has previously stated, that the logical essence (*genus*) of the sacrament is action, not sign (*signum*) or thing (*res*), and this is especially important in the polemic against the Papists.⁹¹ Because he is afraid that someone might hold that the sacramental union is an enduring union, this theologian has sacrificed the truth that the sacrament is a “thing” which Christ commanded us to receive as a gift of grace.

443 In stark contrast, Chemnitz says that the “substance of the Supper . . . [is] that the bread is the communion (Koinonia) of the body of Christ and the cup of the blood of Christ” (LS 144). Of course, the body and blood is to be distributed and received because of its saving benefit. But the consecration, “when it is blessed with the giving of thanks by the words of Christ, as Mark and Paul point out” (LS 96), makes it what it really is, the body and blood of Christ which is to be externally offered and received. Chemnitz adds that “if the question is asked what it is, the Son of God has affirmed with a clear declaration that it is His body” (LS 96). The Reformed theologian, Joseph McLelland, has said that at Marburg the Reformed “insisted on action rather than presence in the Supper.” McLelland also notes that “Melanchthon’s formulae are similar, for his ‘functional doctrine,’ as Peter Fraenkel calls it, prefers to talk of processes (*ritus, usus*) rather than things (*corpus, panis*), of effects rather than being”⁹² (p. 131–140; notes #77–81).

444 Just as with Luther, so also for Chemnitz, the comfort of the Sacrament of the Altar resides in the fact that the communicants receive orally the true body and blood of Christ. By means of the consecration the bread and wine have been connected with the Verba, so that the Word is clothed in the element and the element connected with the Word. The comfort of the Sacrament would be lost if the substance of the body and blood were to be removed from the Supper. This sacrament is the Gospel, and as with the other Means of Grace, the forgiveness of sins is offered and applied in the Supper. This sacrament assures the troubled sinner that God’s covenant of grace applies to him in particular. In this sacrament Christ offers and seals to all who receive it in faith His body and blood, which is the precious pledge that God is reconciled and no longer remembers the sinner’s

iniquities (p. 141–144).

445 Since the benefits are received through faith, it is essential to note the difference here between the Sacramentarian and Luther's view of the Lord's Supper. There is a constant tendency to spiritualize away what Christ really offers in the Sacrament and to turn one's thoughts from the Supper observed in our midst to a meditation of Christ in heaven. Here Chemnitz is of great help. In actuality, he reminds us, there are three kinds of eating in the sacrament. The Sacramentarians say that there is an eating and drinking of the elements—to which the Lutherans agree. Further, they assert that there is a spiritual eating of the body of Christ; that is to say that faith lays hold of the glorified Christ who reigns in heaven. The Lutherans agree that spiritual eating, which is to believe in the Word and promise of God, "is intrinsically useful, salutary and necessary for salvation" (SD VII, 61). This, however, can take place either outside or within the observance of the Supper. But with respect to the spiritual eating, it must not turn the mind and faith away from the third kind of eating which takes place within the Supper. The third kind of eating is the eating of the body of Christ which takes place orally, as Christ Himself declares, "Take, eat; this is my body." This does not, however, take place in a gross or Capernaïtic way. From of old it has been designated as sacramental eating. It takes place in a true, substantial way, occurring through a "supernatural, heavenly and unsearchable mystery" (LS 60). The Son of God affirmed that those who eat in the Supper receive and eat with their physical mouths, not only bread but at the same time also that body which was given for us, even though this does not take place in a way as when we eat ordinary bread (LS 60 f.). Christ is present in the elements in the *definitive mode* (SD VII, 100) (p. 144–148).

446 This is a tremendous mystery which is incomprehensible to us, but it is accomplished by the Savior in a manner known to Him alone. Analogies from the Bible help shed some light on the sacramental union, as for example, the descent of the Holy Spirit in the form of a dove at Christ's baptism. The descent of the dove is physical and apparent to the senses, but the descent of the Spirit is of a different nature because the Spirit fills all things with His substance. Yet not only the dove, but at the same time also the Spirit Himself is described as having truly descended. Therefore Chemnitz believes it, although he

does not understand it. Similarly, in addition to the physical and spiritual eating there is the sacramental eating which takes place in the Supper. The acceptance of this is necessary unless one wants to reject the proper and natural meaning of Christ's last will and testament. It surely does not follow that the one kind of eating of the body of Christ [that is, the spiritual eating] rules out the other, so that we give up the natural meaning of the testament of Christ. Both can stand. The spiritual eating is sealed and confirmed through the sacramental eating (p. 144–151).

- 447 There can be no doubt that the unbeliever partakes of the true body and blood of the Lord's Supper. 1 Cor. 11:27–29 is not written in isolation, but through the use of the subordinate particle [*Hooste*] it is joined to the Verba. Chemnitz gathers from the wider context that some of the Corinthians were coming to the Table of the Lord without true repentance and faith, nourishing hatred in their hearts, despising the church, shaming the poor, etc. The resulting effect is that such eat judgment to themselves. They do not consider what the sacrament really is: the sacrament of the very body of Christ. This situation is paradoxical, because the judgment comes by eating and not by rejecting the sacrament (p. 151 f.).
- 448 But this should not deter the repentant and believing sinner from coming to the sacrament. The promise calls for faith and it strengthens faith, because the Son of God testifies that by the impartation of His body and blood He wants to give and seal to each one the benefits of the New Testament. Since our faith is always under the cross, subject to extreme temptations from the devil, the world, and the flesh, it should lay hold of Christ as God and Man in *that nature* by which He has been made our brother. The Christian knows that the life which belongs to the Deity resides also in the assumed humanity. In the Supper Christ offers us His own body and blood, "He does this in such a way that through them He joins Himself to this miserable creature of ours so that with this . . . sure guarantee and seal He may give us the certainty that He does not wish us to remain in these miseries forever, but that some day we shall be conformed to His glorious body which He offers to us in the Supper as the seal of our own glorification" (LS 191) (p. 151–154).
- 449 In the Supper we all receive one and the same body of Christ. The humanity of Christ is the point of connection between us and God

Himself. Through the bread we are united with the body of Christ and through the body with Christ Himself, and through Christ with the Father. It is not the case, as the Sacramentarians hold, that the Deity alone is present with the church without the communion of the human nature. Chemnitz fully agrees with SD VIII, 76, 77, that because of the personal union and the resultant communion of attributes, Christ's flesh is truly a life-giving food and His blood truly a quickening beverage. Chemnitz closely follows Luther in confessing that not only Baptism but also the Lord's Supper look to the resurrection of the body. It is "a heavenly and spiritual nourishment for both the body and the soul of the believers unto eternal life" (LS 61). He explains further, "The life-giving nature of the Word, joined to the flesh in that ineffable manner of union, makes the flesh life-giving, and thus the flesh gives life to those who participate in it. When we eat it, then we have life in us, when we are joined to Him who created life" (LS 250) (p. 155–159).

450 Chemnitz derives from 1 Cor. 10:17 the truth that through the reception of the Lord's Supper the faithful are made members of that body whose head is Christ. Hence one of the fruits of this participation is "the fellowship of the body of the church" (LS 145). He also recognizes that this same text demonstrates that participation in the sacrament is a confession of unity of doctrine and church fellowship. It is a "testimony of the consensus, harmony, and unity in doctrine and faith" (Ex. 2, 301) (p. 159–161).

451 The main body of material here presented demonstrates how closely Luther and Chemnitz expound the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. Their approach is similar and they differ in no significant detail. Although Chemnitz had been a student of Melancthon and had only incidentally heard Luther lecture and preach during the last year of Luther's life, he nevertheless departs significantly from Melancthon's doctrine of the Lord's Supper and follows Luther point-for-point. He in no way, as has been suggested, represents a mediating position between Luther and Melancthon.⁹³ There are three decisive areas where Chemnitz's doctrine corresponds precisely to Luther and not to Melancthon. These three are of crucial significance for under-

- standing the critical theological points of doctrine currently at stake.
- 452 First, Chemnitz clarified and precised the meaning of the term “action” with respect to the Lord’s Supper (p. 11–14, 101–103). Melancthon taught that the “action” by which God makes Himself present coincides with the “action” of the distribution and reception. Luther held that the body and blood of Christ are effected through the consecration which is the most powerful and principal “action” in the sacrament, and that this presence continues until the consecrated elements have been consumed and the congregation dismissed. Chemnitz enunciates the same teaching (Ex. 2, 249), which has been incorporated into the Formula of Concord (SD VII, 84–87). There is no presence outside of this “action” and the presence is there throughout this “action.” That not only drastically differs from the basic concept of Melancthon but also from latter-day conservative dogmaticians (notes #5, 51).
- 453 Today the term “action” as employed in modern theological and liturgical discussions of the Sacrament of the Altar has the broadest of meanings, as for example in the Gregory Dix “Four Action” shape of the liturgy. Worship is primarily in the sacramental service, the *anamnesis*, a memorial service of recollection, where the church performs the four acts of Christ so that the action of Christ coincides with the action of the assembly, and thus there is a sharing in the redeeming work of Christ.⁹⁴
- 454 Secondly, Chemnitz follows Luther very closely in recognizing that Scripture speaks of the divine-human Christ as having several modes of presence (p. 36). Because of the personal union of the two natures, Christ is omnipresent also according to the human nature, “Wherever you put God down for me you must also put the humanity down for me” (SD VIII, 84). To be sure, Christ at times revealed Himself in a circumscriptive, corporeal mode of presence, as when He walked on earth and will return on the last day. He is also present in His church; there He dwells in the heart by faith. But this is not to be confused with His general omnipresence where as the Logos He has all creatures present with Him. And then because of His ordinance and promise He is present with His body and blood in those elements of which he says that they are His body and blood. This is so because here His body and blood are received not only by the worthy but also by the unworthy. In accordance with the phrase-

ology of Luther, this has been called the *definitive* mode. Both Luther and Chemnitz sharply distinguish between the definitive mode and the circumscriptive mode, and also between the definitive mode and the repletive mode.

455 Today these Biblical distinctions are overlooked, with the result that the presence of Christ's body and blood in the consecrated elements is dissolved into a general omnipresence of the exalted Christ. It has been said that "Christ is present in the elements long before they are placed on the altar. The eyes of sinful man cannot see them there. But faith accepts the Word which reveals His presence for the forgiveness of sins These words [of Institution], read in the service, reveal the presence of Christ not by offering information on a purely intellectual level, but by proclaiming the redemptive activity of Christ."⁹⁵ This is the position taken by Melancthon which differentiates him from Luther, Chemnitz, and the Formula of Concord. He identifies the general omnipresence and the sacramental presence. The presence of Christ's body and blood in the Supper occurs in "that mode by which the person of Christ or the whole Christ is present in all creatures." Christ is present in the sacrament through His general promise that He is in the midst of us and is with us always until the end of the world. He is present in the sacrament when we believe His promises.⁹⁶

456 Thirdly, Chemnitz differs fundamentally from a large part of present-day Lutherans over the meaning of the term "consecration." For him the consecration, by whatever name one wants to call it (Ex. 2, 225), has reference to the same thing, namely, the act to which Paul gives expression in 1 Cor. 10:16, "The cup of blessing which we bless" (Ex. 2, 225). After the blessing or consecration, that bread which has received its name from God is "at the same time also the body of Christ" (LS 46). The consecration consists of the "very repetition of the Words of Institution of the Supper" (LS 104).

457 Here has occurred a decisive break from Luther, Chemnitz and the *Book of Concord*. Some hold that the "This do" refers only to the eating and drinking (note #59). Others, however, agree that the "This do" includes the fact that the minister should repeat the Words of Institution. But that means only that "expressed positively, the consecration of the elements set the bread and the wine apart for the purpose of the Sacrament in order that *at the time of distribution* Christ in accord

with His promise may give to the mouth of each communicant His body and blood to eat and to drink, 1 Cor. 10:16" (emphasis added).⁹⁷

458 The fatal influence of the Aristotelian "Four Causes" paradigm is clearly evident, which in effect denies the words of Christ, "This is my body," making their truth dependent on other conditions or actions which are accomplished by men. To deprive the Verba of their almighty creative power is to follow Melanchthon and Hunnius on this doctrinal point and not Luther, Chemnitz, and the *Book of Concord*. Slipping into this mode of thinking, one can easily accept as the Biblical doctrine of the Lord's Supper the "Four-Action shape" of the Supper, as has been done by many Lutherans today. It is quite remarkable that apparently without any strong objection the LCMS introduced it in its *Worship Supplement* in 1969. But the Synod was probably ripe for this innovation because of its neglect of Luther's, Chemnitz's, and the Formula's understanding of the decisive meaning of the consecration as providing the basis for the certainty that one has the true body and blood of Christ. Another possible contributing factor was the disregard of the precise meaning of the words "action" and "use" as given in the Formula of Concord.

459 The break between the sixteenth century and the seventeenth century on the doctrine of the consecration is decisive. That Melanchthon has here won the day over Luther is clear from a quotation of Quenstedt which is representative of the seventeenth century, "This sacramental union itself does not take place except in the distribution."⁹⁸

460 A survey of the present standard conservative books of Lutheran dogmatics (Baier-Walther, Schmid, Hoenecke, Pieper) demonstrates how complete this triumph is. For example, when the doctrine of the consecration is presented, there generally are profuse quotations from Hunnius through Quenstedt, Gerhard, Hollaz, etc., but not a single quotation from the works of Chemnitz. In fact, these four works refer to Chemnitz only rarely and then the references are of a quite general nature, such as that the correct doctrine of the Lord's Supper has its foundation in the Verba, that the words "bread," "body," and "eat" are to be taken in their natural sense, and that Christ's presence in the sacrament does not conflict with any articles of faith because the right hand of God refers to the majesty and power of God which fills all things.

461 If one should ask the question why it seems so difficult for some confessionally-minded Lutherans to return to the original position

presented by Luther and embodied in the *Book of Concord*, the answer could be that we tend to read great works of the past in the light of our own preoccupations. During the last century there has been an extraordinary effort to demonstrate that the Lutheran doctrine of the Real Presence is not the Roman doctrine of Transubstantiation, and that apart from the mandated use there is no sacrament. This has led to a dread of the word “change” even as used by Luther, Chemnitz, and the Ancients when they harbored no thought that the elements were annihilated but only wanted to emphasize that through the consecratory words the sacramental union has taken place (p. 51–53). The result has been, for example, that one dogmatician has written that it is especially important in the polemic against the Papists to maintain that the logical essence (*genus*) of the Sacrament is action, not sign or thing, with respect to the Lord’s Supper.⁹⁹

- 462 Luther and Chemnitz use human language in expressing their theology derived from Scripture. While one may recognize that language is extremely complex and is used to express the finest shades of meaning, some of which admittedly may be missed by some readers, yet this is not to say that language cannot and does not express objective truth. Otherwise, there could be no transmission of any facts, and no special discipline could exist to record and develop these facts. Luther and Chemnitz in their theological works did write carefully and precisely. The Catholics and the Reformed had no problem understanding where they differed from them, and scholars devoted to historical research today are remarkably good at reproducing what previous minds had expounded. But there is the problem that we come with preconceived opinions and try to fit the material under consideration into previously constructed paradigms. This means that there is a temptation to dismiss some data that do not fit into our paradigm. Our present orientation is so different from what previous scholars formerly held that we discount or distort what we see. To take a case in point, Luther and Chemnitz clearly and repeatedly assert that apart from the use or the action commanded by Christ it is indefensible to practice the veneration of the sacrament, as the Roman Catholics do. But at the same time they state that the veneration and also the elevation are a permissible form of worship after the consecration and before the distribution, because Jesus Christ, true

God and Man in one person, is united with the consecrated elements and is present in the definitive mode (Ex. 2, 277 f.) .

463 These facts seem to be mentally dismissed without any thoughtful consideration, because one has been so imbued with the “Four-Cause” paradigm which asserts that the body and blood are not present until the act of eating and drinking has taken place; just as we cannot call a block of marble a statue of, say, Diana until it is actually being admired as a great work of art. This paradigm has rendered the clear words of Christ, “This is my body,” conditional, so that one must say that one cannot fix the point within the sacramental action when the Real Presence of the body and blood begins. This makes uncertain what is clearly expressed in Scripture, confessed by Luther, Chemnitz, and the *Book of Concord*. The logical result ought to be for those who today operate with this paradigm to state outright that Luther, Chemnitz, and the *Book of Concord* are here, unfortunately, dead wrong, and that one really should go the way of Melancthon that the words of Christ spoken by the officiant in a legitimate service do not effect the presence because that would be “magic” (p. 83 f.).

464 If one has set up in his mind a paradigm for classifying evidence, it is baffling when the results of one’s investigations do not fit the paradigm. This is particularly true where disciplines have been highly systematized as was the case with the seventeenth century theologians, and as the scientific disciplines do with their laws and charts.¹⁰⁰ Faced with such a situation one may unconsciously begin to twist the facts to suit the paradigms, instead of the paradigms to the facts. But when the facts absolutely demand it, one will have to change his paradigm. To cite a famous case, Luther had to reverse his field (to use a football phrase) theologically, because the facts he was gleaning from the Scriptures and from his study of church history would not fit the paradigms he had learned and used in his university days. In 1545, as he muses over his recognition of what was happening to him at the time of the Leipzig Debate (1519), he observes,

Here, in my case, you may also see how hard it is to struggle out of and emerge from errors which have been confirmed by the example of the whole world and have by long habit become a part of nature, as it were. How true is the proverb, “It is hard to give up the accustomed,” and, “Custom is second nature.” How truly Augustine says, “If one does not resist custom, it becomes a necessity” (LW 34, 333 f.).

465 For the Lutheran who today wants to accept the doctrine of the *Book of Concord* on the Lord's Supper, it is necessary that he escape from the pseudo-Aristotelian "Four-Cause" paradigm as giving a satisfactory presentation of this doctrine. As he goes about this, Chemnitz can give him some aid which he has kept in mind as he was about to investigate the Scriptural data on the Lord's Supper:

But this very excellent rule of Hilary is of value at this point: "He reads best who looks for the meaning of the words on the basis of what is said rather than imposing his own ideas; who draws from the material rather than adding to it; who does not force the material to contain what seems best to him because he has, even before reading it, had a preconceived notion as to how it should be understood" (LS 33).

466 To restore Luther's doctrine of the Sacrament of the Altar, there is also a need for self-examination to determine whether one has, through an imprecise understanding of the Formula's use of the terms "action" and "use," unconsciously imbibed the current thought running through the theological cogitations that there is nothing that is static but everything is functional, a process, "dynamic functionalism." The cry is raised that there are no objective "things." One can't really say that the consecrated elements are the true body and blood of Christ and present in the definitive mode.

467 But the Bible presents both the natural and the supernatural as having objective reality. Recently Dr. Robert Preus reminded us that Luther is a realist. The mighty acts of God are historical, actual, real.¹⁰¹ The incarnation and the personal union are "real," as are all the doctrines of Scripture. Sasse has observed that when "Luther's sacramental realism met with Zwingli's spiritualizing, humanistic idealism, it was the realism of the Bible which met with a spiritualizing and rationalizing Christianity which had been latent danger to the old Christian faith for centuries."¹⁰² The Lord's Supper is both a thing and an action in the sense of doing something at the command of God. We should not turn it merely into a process because some current thought suggests that we must get away from "substantialist static thinking" to "dynamic categories" only. In accordance with this type of thinking the recent agreements on the Sacrament of the Altar which have been arrived at between Lutherans and Reformed (*Arnoldshain Theses*, *Marburg Revisited*, *Leuenberg Theses*, etc.), the consecratory command given to the church does not even come into consideration.¹⁰³

- 468 Many conservative Lutherans still insist that they accept the Real Presence, even though they have given up Luther's doctrine of the consecration. They may discuss the question of the moment of the presence, and divide people into "receptionists" or "consecrationists" but generally with the implication that there is no fundamental difference in the viewpoint. Lurking, however, under these discussions lies the fundamental epistemological difference: *How* does one know that Christ's body and blood are present in the bread and the wine? One does not have that certainty by simply asserting that it is there, or merely saying that because Christ said it was there at the first Supper it is there now when we bless the elements in His name by commending the bread and the wine to His blessing and going through certain actions or a certain process. The head-waiter testified that the Savior had turned water into wine at Cana, but no head-waiter today can assure the wedding guests that by commending the water to Christ's blessing it will become wine for them with which to celebrate the joyful event of the wedding.
- 469 Luther, Chemnitz, and the Confessions testify that the decisive difference lies in the fact that the Savior has by command and promise given to the church the power to speak in His name, and as His ambassador to speak authoritatively the consecratory words, "This is my body," etc., which effect the presence (p. 69–80). When Christ has spoken these words of certain elements, then they are true, and on this basis the church knows that this bread and wine are His body and blood. That is the only basis one has on which to assert the Real Presence. This, of course, settles the matter of "the moment," and at the same time it renders permissible the outward adoration of the sacrament as another way of proclaiming the atoning death of the Lord, as the non-Melanchthonian Lutherans confessed.
- 470 To deny the effectiveness of absolution and the consecratory power of the Word given to the church is so serious a matter that Luther in his Small Catechism, demands of the simple catechumen a resounding affirmation to the question, "Dost thou believe that my forgiveness is God's forgiveness?" Similarly, Chemnitz not only explicitly rejects "receptionism" (Ex. 2, 248) but bases his certainty of God's gift of the true body and blood of the Savior on Christ's own words spoken by the officiant at Christ's direction, "In this way [through the consecration] and because of this, we are sure and believe that in the Lord's

Supper we eat, not ordinary bread and wine, but the body and blood of Christ" (Ex. 2, 229).

- 471 The Formula insists that the intention of the Lord in instituting the Lord's Supper must be fulfilled. While it is possible that an administrant may privately deny the Real Presence, or the power of the consecratory Word to effect the sacramental union, or that some communicant may misuse the sacrament, this would not destroy it because it "does not rest on man's faith or unbelief but on the Word and ordinance of God" (SD VII, 32; LW 37,367). The intention, however, of those who are publicly administering the sacrament must be directed towards fulfilling Christ's command and institution as He gave it. If they "change God's Word and ordinance and misinterpret them" (SD VII, 32), then the sacrament as instituted by Christ has been lost. Prof. Martin Albrecht has correctly stated this principle in evaluating the joint Episcopalian-Lutheran communion services:

The actions used and the words spoken may be the same in the Episcopal Church as in the Lutheran, but when the confessional writings do not agree on the meaning of the words spoken in the two denominations, then there must be disagreement in doctrine. In other words, if the interpretation of the Words of Institution is different from what Jesus spoke and intended, then the celebration of Holy Communion is not a sacrament, since there must be a false interpretation of Christ's words.¹⁰⁴

- 472 According to Chemnitz, one changes the intention and the meaning of the Lord when one rejects the consecratory power of the Words of Institution, as does occur in some Lutheran circles (note #59). He asserts that Ambrose is right when he holds that through the consecration the bread is the body of Christ and the consecratory words are "the speech of Jesus" (Ex. 2, 226). Further, Chemnitz judges that it is false what Lindanus ascribes to Basil that "the consecration of the Eucharist is performed with words that are not written" (Ex. 2, 226). Chemnitz thereby eliminates the idea that the words of Christ have connection only with the distribution and reception (note #54). The Melanchthonians and the Reformed rejected the consecratory power of the Verba to effect the sacramental union (p. 83f.; 86f.). Chemnitz is in accord with the judgment of the Formula (SD VII, 32), for he is quite explicit:

For as when the purity of Gospel preaching itself is vitiated and corrupted it is no longer the Gospel nor the power of God for salvation to him who believes, so when in the action or administration of the

sacraments the institution itself is changed, mutilated, or corrupted, it is certain that then it is not a true sacrament. For it is the Word of Institution, coming to the element, which makes a sacrament (Ex. 2, 106).

In his discussion of communion under both kinds Chemnitz repeats the truth, “If, however, the institution of the Son of God is either taken away or adulterated or mutilated and changed, then we can in no way make or have true sacraments. This axiom cannot be shaken even by the gates of hell” (Ex. 2, 340).

- 473 For Chemnitz it is a most serious error to deny the consecratory power of the Verba, which is so commonly done today. Here he speaks with the same voice of Luther and the Confessions. This is reason enough for all confessional Lutherans to devote the most intense study to this doctrine of the Lord’s Supper to determine whether they have neglected to confess it in its fulness. If so, it is only through a “happy inconsistency” that they have had the sacrament of the true body and blood of Christ. But it should be remembered, as Pieper has so often stated, that a happy inconsistency does not extenuate nor legitimize error¹⁰⁵ (p. 132 f.).

Notes 88–105, Chapter VII

88. See Baier-Walther, *Compendium Theologiae Positivae*, St. Louis: CPH, 1879, III, 489–531; Heinrich Schmid, *The Doctrinal Theology of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*, 3rd ed., translated by Charles A. Hay and Henry E. Jacobs, 1899 (reprint by APH, 1961), 555–582; Adolf Hoenecke, *Ev. Luth. Dogmatic*, Milwaukee: NPH, 1909, IV, 99–146; Francis Pieper, *Christian Dogmatics*, St. Louis: CPH, 1950, III, 290–393.
89. *Lehre und Wehre*, 21 (1875) 67; translated by Robert Kolb in the *Concordia Historical Institute Quarterly*, 56, 3 (Fall 1983), 99.
90. Hoenecke (see note #88), Das Wesen (*forma*) des Abendmahls ist die gesamte Handlung, welche Christus selbst in Ansehung der irdischen und himmlischen Materien vorgenommen und dann für alle Zeiten eingesetzt hat, so dass nur da das Abendmahl wirklich gefeiert wird, wo die drei Gesamthandlung bildenden wesentlichen Handlungen (*actus formales*): Konsekration, Austeilung, Empfangen statthaben, IV, 126.
91. Hoenecke, IV, 126 f., Dass das logische Genus der Sakramente *actio* sei, nicht *signum* oder *res*, ist in bezug auf das Abendmahl ganz besonders wichtig in der Polemik gegen die Papisten.
92. *Marburg Revisited* (see note #1), 49.
93. Prof. Lowell Green on Article VII of the Formula, Robert Preus and Wilbert Rosin, editors, *A Contemporary Look at the Formula of Concord*, St. Louis: CPH, 1978, 227.
94. The LCMS *Worship Supplement* of 1969 not only included a Eucharistic prayer instead of the consecration (p. 66), but also the Dix “Four-Action Shape of the Eucharist” (pp. 60–62).

95. Vajta (see note #1), pp. 96 and 103.
96. “. . . sed illo modo quo Christi persona seu totus Christus praesens est omnibus creaturis” CR2, 224; “Christus enim exaltatus est super omnes creaturas, et adest ubique. Inquit enim: in medio vestrum sum,” CRI, 949; “Ego de Christo video exstare promissiones: Ero vobis cum usque ad consummationem seculi Quod cum ita sint, sentio, in illa Coena praesentis corporis Koinonia esse” CRI, 1049.
97. J. H. C. Fritz, *Pastoral Theology*, St. Louis: CPH, 1932, p. 143.
98. Quenstedt quoted in Schmid (see note #88), p. 573.
99. Hoenecke (see note #88), p. 126.
100. T. S. Kuhn in his perceptive volume, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (Chicago: U. of Chicago Press, 1963), has shown that new understandings of the nature of the universe have been hampered by the impulse of scientific research to solve puzzles by trying to fit findings into some currently accepted paradigm. A classic example is the replacement of Ptolemaic astronomy with Copernican.
101. Robert David Preus, “How is the Lutheran Church to Interpret and Use the Old and New Testaments?” the 1973 annual Reformation Lectures, Bethany Lutheran Theological Seminary, Mankato, Minn., *The Lutheran Synod Quarterly*, XIV, No.1 (Fall 1973), pp. 31–33.
102. *This is My Body* (see note #1), p. 348.
103. A typical example of this modern viewpoint has been presented by Prof. Robert Jenson in his “Liturgy of the Spirit,” “Let me persuade you: we cannot at all consecrate bread and wine to be the body and blood of the Lord— not with the epiclesis and not with the verba, and not with the whole thanksgiving. We cannot do it, not because it is too much for us, but because there is just nothing along this line that needs doing. We can only receive bread and wine as the body and blood of the Lord The whole notion of a liturgical consecration of the elements to be the body and blood misses the eschatological time-structure of the event. It is not that a consecration occurs after which the body and blood are there. This is a protological, mythic time-pattern; if we assume it, we cannot avoid conceiving the eucharistic presence as somehow like the presence of a thing, as some sort of ‘substantiation’—for what a thing is, is the temporal after shadow of an event. We will not be able to maintain consistently the doctrine that ‘outside the use there is no sacrament.’ Rather, it is that an eating and drinking occur, before which the body and the blood are present.” *The Lutheran Quarterly*, 26, 2 (May 1974), p. 195 f. (emphasis in the original text).
104. *The Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly*, Spring 1983, p. 140.
105. Pieper (see note #88), I, 89.

Index

(The references are to paragraph and endnote numbers. The number alone refers to the paragraph; the number preceded by this figure, #, refers to an endnote.)

- Abraham, took his reason captive 53, 54
- Absolution, defined 41
 may be called a sacrament 21
 the promise of the Gospel to
 the individual 360
- Action, sacramental 30–38; see also *Use*
 Formula of Concord definition 36
 need for precise definition 30–33
 not limited to reception 37
 precisely defined 34–36
 synonymous with *use* in Supper 36
 vagueness in present use 38, #5
- Administration of the Supper in one
 kind
 contrary to the Verba 73
 rejected by the Formula 296
- Adoration of the Sacrament, see
Veneration
- Albrecht, Martin 471
- Ambrose, confesses the veneration of
 Christ in the Supper 275
- Apology of the Augsburg Confession
 confesses ministers act in Christ's
 stead 203
 on the presence of the living Christ in
 the Supper 254
- Apology to the Formula 15, 218
 confesses an effective consecration
 217, 218, 430, #3, #26, #27, #28, #29
 denies that the communication of
 divine attributes entails eternity
 92
 denies the Formula goes beyond
 correct use instituted by Christ 233
 on the Sacramentarians' denial of the
 definitive presence 117
- Aristotle 56–63, #65
 on classification of modes of
 predication #36
 "Four Causes" paradigm imparts
 spurious equality to the causes
 223, 224, #65
 "Four Causes" adopted by Hunnius
 223
- "Four Causes" excised from Formula
 63, 409
 on identical predication 150
- Augustine, Christ gives ministry to
 servants but retains power for
 Himself 231
 confesses the permissibility of the
 veneration 274
- Bashkar, Roy #65
- Basil, confesses the worship of Christ in
 in the Sacrament 294
- Becker, Siegbert #52, #59, #77, #81
- Bekennnisschriften #73
- Benefits of the Sacrament 353–405
 have their source in the vicarious
 atonement 358, 360, 399
 forgiveness of sins received through
 eating and drinking of the body
 and blood of Christ 354
 final deliverance of body and soul
 guaranteed 389
 faith strengthened 361
 inner life strengthened 388
 believer united with the body of
 Christ and thus with Christ
 Himself 391
 quickens both body and soul 395
 unites believer with the Church of
 Christ 402
- Bente, F. #5
- Beza, regards Acts 3:21 as refuting
 Lutheran doctrine of the Supper 7,
 171–175
- Bible, biblical, etc.; see *Scripture*
- Biel, Gabriel, the Verba command
 distribution after consecration 322, #81
- Black, Max, #35
- Bodily eating without faith 379–384
 without repentance brings judgment
 383, 384
- Body and blood in Supper not separated
 from personal union 70–77

- Book of Concord*, does not hesitate to use the word “change” 135
the quia pledge 333
- Brenz, John 94
“Brief Statement,” rejects the false charge of double predestination 304, 305
- Bugenhagen, John, on the consecration 181–185
- Calvin, denies the Real Presence 78
is wrong in denying the unworthy receive the body of Christ 107
- Capernaïc eating and drinking disavowed 69
- Carlstadt, Andrew, denies the *communicatio majestatis* 79
ridicules an effective consecration 181
- Catalog of Testimonies 395
- Certainty of Christ’s presence in the Supper 105; see also *Epistemological basis*
- “Change,” its meaning when used by the Ancients, Luther, Chemnitz, *Book of Concord* 135–140
not transubstantiation but a miraculous divine change so that the body of Christ is present under the consecrated bread 141
- Chase, Stuart, #34
- Chemnitz, Martin, the forgotten theologian on the Lord’s Supper 406
a sixteenth century theologian in contrast to seventeenth century 407
never quoted on the consecration by standard dogmaticians 460
- Chrysostom, confesses the true veneration of the Sacrament 294
quotation (SO VII, 76a) settles the whole controversy 218–220
quotation often disregarded by later Lutherans 220
- Chytraeus, dissatisfied with the final version of the Formula 60–63
Church Fellowship, confessed through common participation in the Supper 404
- Concomitance, cannot be a defense for withholding the cup 75
cannot be used as an argument for a symbolic understanding of the Verba 76, 77
- Consecration and its effects 117–352
achieves the sacramental union 121, 186, 213, 214, 246, 248 c
commanded by Christ 191
confessed by *Apologia* 218, 219
confessed by Bugenhagen 183–185
confessed by Early Church 248–252
confessed by the Formula 194, 219
confessed by Luther 181, 189, 193
defended by the *Apologia* 217, 218
denied by Carlstadt 181
denied by Hunnius 222–224
denied by Melanchthon 207
denied by Philippists 208–210
defined 190
given to the church through Christ’s command and promise 200
in dispute after Luther’s death 217
not “magic” 206–210, 338
not “Romanizing” 218, 220
not similar to blessing ordinary food 188
synonyms of 188, 189
Chemnitz’s doctrine in harmony with *sola gratia* 331
as effective taught by Lutheran Church from its inception 422
its results 246–253
“Consecrationist” vs “Receptionist,” really a secondary question to certainty 428, 468
- Copi, I. N. #4
- Cyprian, heed what Christ said 44
on erring in simplicity 333, 334
- Cyril of Alexandria 392–394, #86
- Difference between Lutherans and Romanists on the veneration 285–295
- Distribution formulas are not consecratory 197
- Doctrine, every, has its own foundation in certain texts 45
- Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, on “Subject and Predicate” 156, #38
- Effects of the sacramental eating and drinking 353–402
- Einsiedel Letters of Luther #77
- Elert, Werner #87
- Entire Christ present in the Sacrament 78–93

- Epistemological question, how does one know that he has the same Supper today as instituted by Christ 176
 basis for certainty of the Real Presence is the unconditional command and promise of Christ 204, 220, 429, 468
- Erlandsson, Seth #43, #54
- Eucharist, see also *Lord's Supper*
 a testimony of unity and faith 402–405
- Examination II, draws a precise line between Lutheran and Roman doctrine 10
- Faith accepts the gift of the Supper 375–387
 as one kind of eating does not negate sacramental eating 377
 necessary for worthy eating 376, 385, 387
- Forgiveness of sins offered through the ministry of the Gospel 357
 given in the Supper 357, 378
- Formula of Concord on the consecration (SO VII, 73–90) 335–352
 admits dissension among some Lutherans on the consecration 215
 analogy of Personal Union to show Sacramental Union 127
 avoids using “Four-Cause” paradigm 63
 Christ one indivisible person with God 114
 defines the action of the Supper 257
 doctrine of consecration rejected by Hunnius 221–225
 does not condemn those who err ingenuously 333, 334
 enumerates the divine attributes communicated to the human nature 91
 gives confessional status to Cyril's words 394
 intention of the Lord's Word must be fulfilled 471
 on modes of Christ's presence 95–103
 present-day reluctance to accept Formula on consecration 220
 refers to Luther-Wolferinus correspondence 340–352
 on the rule *Nihil habet* 30, 338–352
- spiritual eating useful and necessary 362
 takes over Luther's exegesis of 1 Cor. 11:23–25 194
 refutation of the Formula attempted by Sacramentarians 92
 on the veneration 296–305
 the Verba not to be omitted 211, 212
- Fraenkel, Peter, on Melanchthon's view of the Lord's Supper #80
- Franck, F. H. R., misrepresents Chemnitz on the repletive mode 112
- Fritz, J. H. C. #51, #97
- Furberg, Ingemar #43
- Genus Majesticum, denied by the Sacramentarians 413
- George of Anhalt
 on the Real Presence and the Adoration 278–280
 on his correspondence with Luther #69
 on the outward adoration 434
- Green, Lowell #32, #58, #93
- Gregory of Nazianzus, honored Christ on the altar in the Sacrament 277
- Haile, H. G. #43
- Hardt, Tom G. A. #14, #21, #24, #81
- Hayakawa, F. I. #34
- Heppe, Heinrich #7, #10
- Heretics not admitted to the Supper 404
 Hilary, warns against imposing one's own ideas on the text 31
- Histori des Sacramentstreit, source book to supplement the *Apologia* 16
 confesses the veneration of the Sacrament as proof of an effective consecration 278–280, 434, #23
- Hoenecke, Adolf #88, #90, #91, #99
- Hunnius, Aegidius
 on the consecration 221–225
 depotentiates the Verba 331
 perpetuates the doctrine of Melanchthon 431
 teaches that there is no presence until the *sumptio* #63, #73
- Identical Predication. See *Modes of predication*
- Intention, directed towards fulfilling Christ's command 471–473

- Irenaeus
 consecration effects the Eucharist 218–220
 confesses the veneration of Christ in the Sacrament 294
- Jena, editions of Luther's Works #79
- Jenson, Robert #103
- Jeske, J. #32
- Jesus Christ
 always present, whole and entire 75
 assumed a true, total human nature 83
 existed as a person in the Godhead before the incarnation 82
 the personal union of the two natures in the unity of one person 84–86
 has received divine attributes according to the assumed human nature 87–91
 incarnation does not necessitate a symbolic reading of the Verba 93
 modes of presence, at least three: circumscriptive, definitive, repletive 94–102
 necessity of distinguishing these modes of presence 116–118, 179
 omnipresence is repletive 113, 172–174
 laid hold of only where He promises Himself 114, 117
 personal union not to be separated because of references to natural human properties 72
 faith and worship of Christ include both natures 269
 personal union not dissolved by the mention of natural properties 254
- Jones, W. T. #65
- Justin, confesses the veneration of Christ in the Supper 294
- Kingo, Thomas #67
- Klug, E. F., judgment on Chemnitz and the Formula 4, #2
- Koehler, E. W. A. #61
- Koren, Ulrik Vilhelm #67
- Korzybski, A. #34
- Kramer, Fred, modern translator of Chemnitz 5
- Kuhn, T. S. #100
- Large Catechism 388, 395
- Life in the flesh of Christ 388–401; see also *Benefits of the Sacrament*
- Living New Testament* on Acts 3:21 #41
- Loci theologici* of Chemnitz, does not have detailed exposition of the Supper 6
- Lord's Supper, The the heart of the controversy: what is present and distributed and received and why was it instituted? 68
 did not exist before Christ's institution 47
 doctrine to be taken directly from the Verba 42–45, 408
 final purpose is the oral reception 260
 a means of grace 254
 comfort of the Supper 356
 seals to the individual believer the forgiveness of sins 360
 requires faith 361
 stands or falls with the consecration 204, 428
- Luther, Martin
 accepts the implications of the personal union 85, 179
 criteria for establishing the true questions at issue 51
 on the word "change" 139
 on the difference between the Sophists and Wycliffe 148
 doctrine of the Supper not built on Christological arguments 79–81, #15
- Word and body have become one 355
 on Christ as indivisible person with God 114
 on lack of precision of the phrase, "in, with, and under" 134
 doctrine of consecration in the Formula 216
 on keeping separate the repletive and definitive presence 115, 116
 consecration is not "magic" 210
 Christ commands the church to speak the Verba in His person and name 225
 on "identical predication" 156
 on modes of Christ's presence 95–103
 on the veneration of the Sacrament 265–292

- on “synecdoche” 130, 131, 161
 on the reliquiae 350
 letters to Wolferinus 340–352
 and Chemnitz agree on all details of
 doctrine of the Supper 448
 references #19, #25, #39, #40, #61, #69,
 #71, #72, #73, #77, #80
 Lutheran and Papal consecration
 226–245
 Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod
 Brief Statement 304
 Worship Supplement (1969) #94
- Madson, Juul #67
 Mandata Dei 309–316
 do not include the use of charismatic
 gifts 310
 not a form of legalism 309
 given to the universal church as
 binding 195, 196, 213, 310
 to consecrate 200
 to distribute the consecrated
 elements 315, 316
 Man’s response not a condition for God’s
 gift in the Sacrament 331
 Mass see *Sacrifice of the Mass*
 McLelland, Joseph 443, #92
 Melancthon, Philip
 differs from Chemnitz on the
 sacrament 452–458
 denies that the recitation of the Verba
 achieves the Real Presence
 207, 276
 denies the permissibility of the
 Veneration 276, #73
 position adopted by Hunnius 221, 441
 position adopted by Wolferinus 346,
 347
 won the day over Luther in the
 seventeenth century 459
 Miller, Kenneth #59, #66, #69, #74
 Ministry of the Church 227–245
 given by Christ to His servants but
 the power retained for Himself
 231, 243, 244
 not given to all Christians in general
 229
 ministers are Christ’s ambassadors 205
 Modes of Predication 142–176
 Papists and Sacramentarians both
 teach identical predication in the
 Verba 143, 150
 identical predication as used by
 Romanists 147–149
 as used by Zwinglians 150
 Aristotle and the Schoolmen
 on modes of predication 150–156
 #34, #35, #36
 Scriptural examples of a special mode
 of predication similar to the
 Verba 157–158
 Sacramentarians assert identical
 predication by positing a
 metonymy in the predicate
 162–170
 Modes of Christ’s Presence
 circumscriptive mode 97
 definitive mode 98
 repletive mode 100
 modes to be differentiated 101
 definitive mode of Christ’s body in
 the bread made certain by
 Christ’s Word 105
 Moerlin, Joachim, shows that Luther
 never changed his doctrine of the
 Lord’s Supper in his later life 17, #73
 Monstrum incertudinis 253
 Montgomery, John #8, #12
- Neostadiensium Admonitio (1584), a
 book intended to refute the Formula
 15, 217–219
 New KJV on Acts 3, 21 #41
 New International Version on Acts 3,
 21 #41
 Nicene Canon, confesses that the
 consecration achieves the Real
 Presence 249
 confesses the presence of Christ after
 the consecration 273
 Norwegian Synod *Psalmebok* (1903) #67
 “Nothing has the character, etc.” 306,
 338–341
- Papists evade clear passages on
 Justification 46
 Paradigms, their influence 462–465
 Passover, has nothing to do with the
 Real Presence of the body and blood
 of Christ 29, 48
 Personal Union. See *Jesus Christ*
 Peter Martyr 361
 Peters, E. F. #76, #81

- Pieper, F.
 happy inconsistency does not
 legitimize error 473
 notes that F. H. R. Franck
 misrepresents Chemnitz 112
 endnotes #21, #22, #42, #51, #61
 Planck, G. J. #9, #11
- Poellot, Luther, modern translator of
 Chemnitz 5
- Precising the terms "action" and "use"
 30–38
- Prenter, Regin #72
- Preus, J. A. O.
 modern translator of Chemnitz 5,
 406, #15, #20, #81
- Preus, Robert, Luther a Realist 467, #101
- Principles of Interpretation 43–48
- Scripture interprets Scripture 45
- words of a Last Will and
 Testament to be interpreted
 literally 49, 50
- Quenstedt, John 459, #98
- Quere, Ralph W., on Melancthon's
 view of the Lord's Supper #80
- Quintilian 51
- Real Presence
 achieved by the speaking of the Verba
 182, 183, 186–192, 202, 211, 218–220
 not limited to the *sumptio* 338
 its retention gives everything God has
 promised 354
- Reason, human, to be taken captive
 53, 54
 corrupted by natural man has no
 place in theology 409
- "Receptionist" 468. See also
Consecrationist
- Reliquiae* 306–352
- consumption of demanded by the
 Verba 307, 308, 350
 the Early Church demanded it
 320–323
- Repentance and Faith 385–387
- Reservation of the Host
 sanctioned by Trent 311
 not permitted by the Verba 306,
 312, 313
 in Tradition 317–330
 for Corpus Christi Festival of late
 origin 318
- for the sick, in conflict with early
 Canon Law 319
- Roman examples for it from history
 inconclusive 324–330
- Results of the consecration 246, 253
- Roman Catholic Doctrine of
 consecration 226–245
 and absolution, partly the work of
 God and of the ordained priest 237
 is at the same time the Sacrifice of
 the Mass 238
- Sacrament, consists of a "thing" and an
 "action" combined by divine
 command 411
 deals with mysteries unknown to
 human reason 409
 each has its own proper and peculiar
 word of definition 26
 eight critical points in defining it 25
 Lutherans do not wrangle about the
 term 20
- Sacramentarians destroy the Biblical
 concept 27
- Sacramental Action 18–38
- Sacramental Eating, see *Three Kinds of
 Eating*
- Sacramental Union 64–176
 two distinct things are joined to make
 one complete sacrament 118
 not equivalent to transubstantiation
 118
 demonstrated by the fact that "this"
 refers to the bread and wine
 119–123
 demonstrated by the fact that "body"
 is clearly explained by Christ 124
 an unusual, one-of-its-kind union
 127, 133
 compared to the personal union 127
 not a lasting union apart from its use
 128
 other terms used 133
 the union of the Spirit and dove as an
 analogy 373
 "under the bread" and similar terms
 used to describe it 128
- Sacramentarians Depotentiate the
 Verba 66
 on "identical predication" 162–169
 misinterpretation of Acts 3:21 171–173,
 #41, #42

- Sacrifice of the Mass
 destroys the gift of the forgiveness
 in the Supper 238
 rejected by the Formula 296
- Scripture 39–63
 Scripture interprets Scripture 45, 171,
 172, 174
 its truths can be confessed in
 different ways 41
- Salig, Christian #73
- Saliger #5, #61
- Sasse, Hermann
 on the tendency to spiritualize away
 the realism of the Bible 362, 467,
 #15, #68, #73, #83, #102
- Schaff, P. #18
- Schlink, E.
 believes Chemnitz differs from
 Luther on the modes of Christ's
 presence 103, #18, #21
- Schmid, Heinrich #61
- Schuetze, A. #31
- Seventeenth Century Break with the
 Sixteenth 459
- Sola Gratia*
 Chemnitz's doctrine of the Supper in
 harmony with 220, 331, 440, 441
- Solid Declaration, see *Formula of
 Concord*
- Sperber, Erhard #56, #57, #78
- Spiritual Eating 363
 must not turn us away from oral
 eating 367
- Sprague, Rosamond Kent #65
- Substance of the Supper is the
 Sacramental Union 443
- Symbolic Language
 analogies are used in Scripture 164–165
 the normal meaning generally not
 to be discarded for symbolic
 meanings 166, 167
 symbolic language of the Verba not
 demonstrated by other texts 421
 the use of analogy can be less precise
 and lead to a misunderstanding 165
- Synergistic Viewpoints Rejected 331,
 332, 441
 Roman view of consecration is
 synergistic 237
- Tappert ed. of *Book of Concord*
 translation of SD VII, 87 is
 misleading #75
- Teigen, Bjarne W. #16, #77
- Three Kinds of Eating in the Sacrament
 363–374
 eating of the bread acknowledged by
 Sacramentarians 363
 spiritual eating accepted by
 Sacramentarians 361, 371
 sacramental eating of the body
 of Christ denied by
 Sacramentarians 363
 sacramental (oral) reception does
 not mean that the actual body is
 masticated 368
 sacramental eating is not imaginary
 but supernatural 370
 sacramental eating means eating with
 the mouth the body of Christ in a
 supernatural way 373
 sacramental eating is accomplished in
 a way known only to Christ 373
 sacramental eating must take place in
 the Supper to avoid rejection of
 the Verba 374
 sacramental eating seals and confirms
 the spiritual eating 377
 sacramental eating gives assurance
 of the forgiveness of sins through
 physical senses other than
 hearing and seeing 378
 spiritual eating can take place outside
 the Supper 365
 spiritual eating includes penitence
 and faith 366
 spiritual eating must not turn away
 from oral reception 367
 spiritual eating necessary for salutary
 use 376
- Todd, Robert B. #65
- Touto* (this) refers to the earthly
 elements 119–123
- Transubstantiation, Trent's definition
 143
 annihilation of earthly elements
 not necessary for understanding
 the predicate statements in the
 Verba 154
 Chemnitz's rejection of Roman
 arguments for 144–148

- rejected by the Formula of Concord 296, 297
- The Two Natures in Christ* makes an important contribution to the understanding of the Lord's Supper 11
- Use, see *Action* 30–38
- Vajta, Vilmos #24, #95
- Veneration of the Sacrament 254–305
- no one who accepts the Sacramental Union denies that Christ should be venerated in the “action of the Supper” 259, 260
 - veneration not restricted to time or place 262–264
 - as expounded and confessed by Luther 265–267, 281–284
 - in veneration faith is the all-important thing 269, 376
 - differences between the Roman Church and Lutheran Church on the veneration 285–295
 - veneration of the visible forms of the onseparated elements not allowable 286, 287, 303
 - needs the inner demand of true faith 291, 292
 - veneration observed in the literature of the Early Church 294
 - is a part of the genuine confession of faith in the Real Presence 295
 - veneration and the Formula of Concord 296–305
 - the Formula rejects only the veneration outside the “prescribed use” 297, 298
 - veneration rightly used does not justify veneration apart from its use 298
 - veneration of the Sacrament in its right use will be denied only by an Arian heretic 299
 - Chemnitz's formulation taken into the Formula of Concord 301
- Verba. The Verba are the *sedes doctrinae* for the Lord's Supper 44–63, 353
- constitute the last will and testament of Christ 44
 - to be interpreted literally 49–52
 - declare that the same body sacrificed on the cross is distributed 70, 71
 - the Verba's reference to natural properties are not to be understood as disrupting the personal union of Christ's two natures 72
 - the Verba used in the First Supper retain their proper and natural meaning 174, 175
 - the Verba achieve the Real Presence 192, 331
 - to be spoken at the command of Christ 193
 - to be spoken or chanted loudly for the entire congregation 337
 - Verba not to be changed or misinterpreted lest the sacrament be lost 471, 472
- Vicarious Atonement, is the source of all the benefits of the Sacrament 399
- Victorinus, a Sacramentarian, looks only partly at the Verba, but more generally at the religion of all times 46
- Walther, C. F. W., his theology is not bound to the seventeenth century but to the Book of Concord and Luther 407; #88, #89
- Weinberg, J. R. #36
- Wiese, Markus Fredrick #6
- Withholding of the Cup contrary to the command of Scripture 42, 201
- not justified on the basis of the personal union of the Two Natures 412
- Wittenberg Faculty #78
- Wolferinus, denied an effective consecration 220, 340–352; #81
- Words of Institution, see *Verba*
- Worship, see *Veneration*
- Worthy Eating,
- see *Bodily eating without faith* and *Faith accepts ... gift ... Supper*
 - worthy eating does not consist in man's purity 387
 - worthy eating longs for the grace of God 387
- Wycliffe 131, 148
- Zwingli, U., denies the *communicatio majestatis* 79
- holds that there is no support for the sacramental union 150