

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

ARTICLE V.

HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE LUTHERAN
DOCTRINE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

BY PROFESSOR J. W. RICHARD, D. D., SPRINGFIELD, OHIO.

[Continued from Vol. xlv. p. 69a.]

D. WITH these antecedents we are now prepared to advance to the Colloquy of Marburg, October 1-3, 1529, which closes this period of Development.

This Colloquy was brought about by Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, for the purpose of putting an end to the Sacramentarian Controversy, and to the strifes and divisions which it had engendered. It was attended from the one side by Luther, Melancthon, Jonas, Osiander, Brentz, Agricola; from the other, by Œcolampadius, Zwingli, Bucer, Hedio. The principal subject of dispute was the Lord's Supper. Zwingli advanced three arguments: 1. John, 6. Christ said the flesh profiteth nothing. Therefore we must not conclude that the flesh of Christ is present in the Sacrament, because fleshly eating profiteth nothing. Luther replied that the words, The flesh profiteth nothing, must not be understood of the flesh of Christ, because he says, 'My flesh quickeneth;' but of flesh without the Spirit. It is dreadful to hear that the flesh of Christ profiteth nothing. Moreover these words of Christ do not apply to the Supper. 2. That one body cannot be at the same time in different places. The body of Christ is in heaven. Luther replied that human reason neither can nor ought to judge the omnipotence of God. Zwingli replied that God does not propose to our faith things which we cannot comprehend. Luther replied: 'The Christian doctrine has articles more incomprehensible

and sublime, as that God became man, that this person Christ, who is true God, died.' 3. Zwingli said that so great things cannot be brought about by wicked priests, as that the body of Christ should be present. Luther replied: It does not depend upon the merit of the priest, but upon the appointment of Christ. "This," says Melanchthon, from whom we have condensed the above arguments and answers, "is, in a word, the sum of the colloquy: Luther persisted in his view that the true body and blood of Christ are present in the Supper. Nor would the other party depart from their opinion."¹

Fifteen articles of religion were drawn up by Luther and signed by all of both sides who were present. In fourteen of these articles they agreed. In the fifteenth, of the Lord's Supper, they expressed their agreement in the use of both kinds, in the rejection of the Mass as a sacrifice, and in the use of the Supper. They disagreed in regard to the real presence, but prayed that Almighty God would confirm them in the true understanding.² Luther could not be shaken

¹ See Melanchthon's Report of the Colloquy in Chytraeus' Hist. Augs. Con., p. 637, and in Luther's Works, Leipzig, xix. p. 528.

² No discussion of the Marburg Colloquy can be complete which omits reference to Luther's refusal of Zwingli's proffered hand. 1. Luther no less than Zwingli was anxious for peace and concord. This is evinced (*a*) by his prompt acceptance of Philip's invitation (See letter of acceptance, Works, Leipzig, xix. p. 527. In Latin Chytraeus' Hist. Augs. Con. p. 637); (*b*) by his hearty commendation of the prince's diligence in trying to secure peace and concord; (*c*) in his declaration that he will not, by the help of God, allow the other side the praise of being more desirous of peace than he is (See letter *supra*); (*d*) by the fact that he actually attended the Colloquy; (*e*) that he said fifteen years afterwards in his Shorter Confession of the Lord's Supper, that for the time he cheerfully overlooked all of Zwingli's harsh and unrecanted sayings, and hastened to the Colloquy; (*f*) that he actually signed the agreement to drop disputes—an agreement which neither he nor his side was the first to break. 2. Zwingli had not only been very severe in the controversy, but even blasphemous. He had used such phrases against the Lutheran doctrine as "Baked God," "Bread God," "Wine God," "Roasted God;" and such epithets against the Lutherans as "flesh-gormandizers" (*fleisch-fresser*), "blood-guzzlers" (*blutsäuffer*), "anthropophagi," "Capernaïtes," "Thyestes," and the like—none of which had been retracted, neither

from his opinion, for as he had written to the Landgrave (see letter *supra*) he was certain in his conscience that they had erred, and in addition that they were not even certain of their doctrine—as the sequel plainly proved. Thus ended the Second Period of Development, that of the Sacramentarian Controversy. For the Lutheran doctrine it had corrected the slight subjectivism into which Luther had fallen during the controversy with the Romanists. But this correction was made not by a surrender of any subjective feature, but by complementing the subjective with its proper objective. Greater emphasis was now laid on the real presence of Christ than had been done in the First Period, because this feature had been the special point of attack by the Sacramentarians. The result, as Lutherans believe, is a doctrine of the Lord's Supper symmetrical and evenly balanced as between the

had he changed his views in regard to the subject which had been the occasion of such abuse of language, but had defended these views at this Colloquy as earnestly as ever before. 3. It was with such antecedents and under such circumstances that he offered Luther his hand, which was declined with the observation: "I am exceedingly astonished that you wish to consider me your brother. It shows clearly that you do not attach much importance to your doctrine." (Chytraeus' Hist. Augs. Con. p. 642.) Here now is the point of difference between the two men. The one held his doctrine dearer than his life, because in *Hoc est corpus meum*, he saw the very Word of God. The other would sacrifice his doctrine for an external unity, either because he did not believe it to be the truth, or because he did not feel bound in conscience as Luther did (see Luther's Letter to Philip, *supra*) to stand by and defend the truth. Besides, as Professor Fisher well says (Hist. Reformation, p. 150): "The obnoxious theory . . . was associated in Luther's mind with the extreme spiritualism or subjective tendency which undervalued and threatened to sweep away the objective means of grace, the word as well as the sacraments, and to substitute for them a special illumination or inspiration from the Spirit," and which in less than six months led Zwingli to deny that the sacraments are means of grace (see his *Ratio Fidei* sent to Augsburg). 4. For Luther to have accepted Zwingli's hand and to have recognized him as a brother, as he understood Zwingli to mean that he should do, would have been to acknowledge that Zwingli's error and the principle on which it was based, were pure *adiaphora*, sentiments which had no value for the Christian system; and the action of Luther here has been powerfully vindicated by the fact that Zwingli's error has found place in no Reformed creed or confession of faith, and that his principles of interpretation led him

objective and the subjective—the objective feature being bread and wine, body and blood, in sacramental union, and, in the completed act of the Supper, administered alike to all. The benefit of the Sacrament depends upon the faith of the recipient. Without faith it works condemnation and death. With faith it works forgiveness of sins and eternal life. This brings us to

THE THIRD OR CONFSSIONAL PERIOD OF DEVELOPMENT.

The articles agreed upon at Marburg and signed by both parties to the controversy, were not wholly satisfactory to the adherents of Luther. As a consequence new articles were submitted at the Schwabach Conference, October 16. These articles,⁸ seventeen in number, contain a more positive statement of the Lutheran faith, and are the direct historico-

in less than two years from this Colloquy to declare that such pious heathen as Socrates, the Catos *et al.*, died in the same faith with Adam, Noah and Abraham. It was not that Luther did not desire peace, or that he was obstinate in *his* opinion, but because he was a glorious prisoner to the Word, and could not betray *its* plain meaning. Grasping Zwingli's hand would have meant to Luther full fraternization and, as in the Wittenberg Concord, *communion* in the Lord's Supper,—that which even the Evangelical Alliance could not do in the year of grace 1873 in New York. 5. If it be said to his disparagement that Luther even despaired of Zwingli's salvation, let it be told how earnestly he prayed that God would convert him from his error and show him the truth, and how he groaned in sorrow when he heard of Zwingli's death; and finally let it not be forgotten that Luther's stand at Marburg was in *principle* identical with that taken by him at Worms. At both places he stood by his conscience and by the Word. Surrender at either place would have brought disaster to the Reformation. For as Dr. Henry J. Van Dyke has written, *Presbyterian Review*, April, 1887, p. 207, "Zwinglianism is essentially *rationalistic* in the evil sense of the word. Its chief effort is to explain away or reduce to a minimum the mystery of the Lord's Supper. It assumes that the theory which is most level to our comprehension, which brings the holy Supper nearest to a common meal, where Christians have sweet fellowship together, and makes it agree most with ordinary human experience, is for that reason nearest to the truth." If a Presbyterian theologian of the nineteenth century can discern this *rationalistic* element in the evil sense of the word, how much more Luther, who had personal contact with it!

⁸ Book of Concord (Jacobs), II. 72. Original in Corp. Ref. xxvi. p. 155.

confessional basis of the doctrinal articles of the Augsburg Confession of June 25, 1530. The article on the Lord's Supper which agrees in number with that on the same subject in the Augsburg Confession, is as follows: "The Eucharist or Sacrament of the Altar also consists of two parts, viz., that there is truly present in the bread and wine, the true body and blood of Christ, according to the sound of the words: 'This is my body, this is my blood;' and that it is not only bread and wine, as even now the other side asserts. These words require and also convey faith, and also exercise it in all those who desire this sacrament, and do not act against it; just as baptism also brings and gives faith, if it be desired." In the Augsburg Confession, Article X., this is verbally changed only, and in a literal translation from the German reads as follows: "Of the Supper of the Lord it is also taught that the true body and blood of Christ, under the species of bread and wine, are truly present in the Supper and are there administered and received. Therefore the opposite doctrine is rejected."⁴ Henceforth this is the fundamental and universally accepted symbolical statement of the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper. On the part of Luther it is the result of twelve years of almost ceaseless thought and study of God's Word. On the part of Melancthon it shows the inimitable power of condensation and the felicity of expression which characterized the *Preceptor Germaniae*. In itself it is clear, positive, and, when read in the light of the foregoing history, unmistakable in meaning.

I. *It is antithetical.*

1. (a) To the Romish communion under one kind, since it mentions both bread and wine; (b) to the sacrifice of the Mass, since (in the Latin) it speaks of those who eat; (c) to Tran-

⁴ The originals are: Vom Abenmahl des Herrn wird also gelehret, dass wahrer Leib und Blut Christi wahrhaftiglich unter der Gestalt des Brots und Weins im Abenmahl gegenwärtig sei und da ausgetheilt und genommen wird. Derhalben wird auch die Gegenlehre verworfen. De coena Domini docent, quod corpus et sanguis Christi vere adsint et distribuantur vescentibus in coena Domini; et improbant secus docentes. Müller's *Symbolische Buecher*, p. 41.

substantiation, since it speaks of the species of bread and wine. These errors Luther had rejected in the first period of the development of his doctrine, as noted above; and it was no part of the design of the Augsburg Confession to maintain an attitude of indifference to these errors.⁵ 2. To Zwinglianism

⁵ Dr. Schaff is greatly in error when he says (Creeds of Christendom, 1. p. 232, note): "The wording of the article—*quod corpus* (German, *wahrer Leib*) et *sanguis Christi vere* (*wahrhaftiglich*) *adsint et distribuuntur* *vescentibus* in *Coena Domini*—leaves room for both theories (consubstantiation and transubstantiation). . . . The Papistical Confutation, while objecting to the articles *de utraque specie* and *de missa* in the second part of the Augsburg Confession, was satisfied with Art. X. of the first part, provided only that it be understood as teaching the presence of the *whole* Christ under the bread as well as wine. . . . It (the Lutheran church) teaches consubstantiation in the sense of a sacramental conjunction of the two substances effected by consecration." In refutation of the first charge we quote Romish authorities: 1. The Papal Confutation of the Augsburg Confession says: "The Tenth Article *in words* offends nothing, when they confess that in the Eucharist, after consecration legitimately made, the body and blood of Christ are substantially and truly present, *provided that they believe, that under each species, the entire Christ is present, so that by concomitance, the blood of Christ is no less under the species of bread than it is under the species of wine, and so of the other.* Otherwise in the Eucharist, the body of Christ would be bloodless, contrary to St. Paul that Christ, being raised from the dead, dieth no more. Rom. 6." This is not "satisfaction." But the confutation expressly says further: "*One thing is to be added as an Article exceedingly necessary to this Confession, that they shall believe the Church (rather than some who falsely teach otherwise), that by the omnipotent word of God in the consecration of the Eucharist, the substance of the bread is changed into the body of Christ.*" (*Book of Concord*, (Jacobs) II. p. 214. Original in Chytraeus' Hist. Augsburg Conf. p. 179.) But it is very certain, as learned in the foregoing history, that the Tenth Article does not mean to teach that the *entire Christ* is present under one species. That is the first tyranny denounced by Luther in *The Babylonish Captivity*. Nor does it mean to teach the *change of the substance of the bread into the body*—the second tyranny. 2. John Cochlaeus who helped to compose the Romish Confutation, says in the discussion of the Article: "Though that Article be brief, *there are many things of which we complain as wanting in it (multa in eo desideramus).* Luther frivolously denying transubstantiation, though in words he disputes at large against Zwingli and Ecolampadius, *yet in the thing itself, he thinks with them, and is, in collusion with them, (cum eis colludit).* And Luther's followers have reached such a pitch of madness, that they *refuse longer to adore the Eucharist, because Luther has impiously taught that it is safer not to adore, and has openly denied the doctrine of concomitance.*" From Krauth's *Conservative Reformation* p. 625. The

which is the "opposite doctrine" rejected in the Article, and which taught that in the Sacrament there is present nothing except bread and wine, that the Lord's body is locally circumscribed in one place and that the sacraments are not means of grace. (See the *Ratio Fidei* which Zwingli sent to Augsburg, 1530.)

II. The thesis of this Tenth Article teaches and was intended to teach the doctrine of the Real Presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist, that is, that wherever and whenever the sacramental act is performed,

Confutation and its authors hold expressly that the Tenth Article is deficient because it does *not* teach Transubstantiation. Dr. Schaff, it seems to us, very conveniently omitted here *unter der Gestalt des Brots und Weins*, from the German.

In the matter of "Consubstantiation in the sense of a sacramental conjunction of the two substances effected by consecration," we ask in what creed and by what Lutheran theologians? We have read every Lutheran creed in existence, but we fail to find it either stated or implied that "the sacramental union is effected by the consecration." We have read nearly all the great Lutheran dogmatists on this subject, and we find they expressly deny that the sacramental union is effected by consecration.

Heunisch (*Epitome Logica* p. 260): "God alone effects the sacramental union. Therefore it is not ascribed to the dignity or intention of the Minister, nor to the words of consecration which are spoken by the Minister, nor to the faith of the one who uses the sacrament. It has place in the true use of the Supper, which consists in eating and drinking."

"The true presence of the body and blood in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, is not effected by the word or work of any man, whether it be the merit or utterance of the minister, or of the eating and drinking, or the faith of the communicants; but this presence must be ascribed wholly to the almighty power of God and to the Word, institution and ordaining of our Lord Jesus Christ alone." *Form of Concord*, Art. VII.

Quenstedt: "Christ does not say simply of the consecrated bread that it is the body of Christ, but of the bread broken and given to be eaten." *Systema* p. 1268. Again: Such a statement is contradicted by the entire Lutheran conception of a sacrament: (a) That nothing has the nature of a sacrament aside from the use of the element in the appointed way; (b) that no change whatever is effected in the bread and wine by consecration; (c) that there is no sacrament apart from the entire sacramental act, which includes *blessing, giving, receiving, eating, drinking*. Hence until the consecrated bread is *eaten* there is *no sacramental union*, so with the blood; and hence should a crumb of the consecrated bread fall to the ground, there is

(*consecratio, distributio, manducatio, bibitio*) there the sacramental union takes place, but without any mingling, or commingling, or *consubstantiating* of the earthly element, the bread and wine, with the heavenly element, the body and blood, or *vice versa*, but each element remains distinct in its substance and power, the earthly element becoming the divinely appointed medium for communicating the heavenly element, so that both elements truly present, are received in the sacramental act by all who use the Supper.

This relation between the earthly element and the heavenly

no sacrilege of the body of Christ; (*d*) that apart from the completed sacramental act there is not even the *unum aliquid*, the sacramental complex, which is constituted out of the *unchanged* bread and the *unchanged* body, which are never *consubstantiated*, that is, moulded or mingled into one substance, which has not the nature *per se* of true bread and true body, as those charged who first used the word *consubstantiation* against the Lutheran doctrine. Hence the word is not equivalent to Real Presence, for both etymologically and historically it designates a *commingling* or a *fusing together of the two substances*, bread and body; and of this Reinhard says: "Our Church has never taught that the emblems become one substance with the body and blood of Jesus, an opinion commonly denominated *Consubstantiation*. And Buddeus; (1728): "All who understand the doctrines of our Church know that with *our whole soul we abhor the doctrine of Consubstantiation*. Miscel. II., p. 86.

Dorner Hist. Prot. Theol. I, p. 160: "Even without transubstantiation the real presence of Christ's body and blood is possible, in that bread remains bread but is appropriated by Christ. This view, propounded by Ignatius, Irenæus, Ruprecht Von Deutz and Pierre d'Ailly, received the name of *Impanation*, also *consubstantiation*,—with no more right than if one were to regard the utterance of Ignatius, the gospels are the $\sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\kappa\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$ as a doctrine of incarnation."

Dr. Henry J. Van Dyke, *Presbyterian Review*, April, 1887, pp. 202-3: "There is a popular impression that the Lutheran differs but little from the Romish doctrine of the sacraments. This impression is due either to ignorance or to prejudice. The Lutheran doctrine is essentially and explicitly protestant in its rejection of transubstantiation and in the errors which logically flow from it. It repudiates and condemns the worship of the consecrated elements, and the idea of the repetition in any sense of Christ's one everlasting sacrifice for sin. The term *Consubstantiation*, commonly applied to it, is a nickname, which is not found in any of the Lutheran symbols, and the ideas it conveys to ordinary readers are repudiated by Lutherans as strenuously as by ourselves. No intelligent Lutheran believes that the body and blood of Christ are literally *mixed up*, as Hooker says, with the bread and

is called *sacramental union*; not, however, for the purpose of describing the *mode* of the presence, for that is incomprehensible; but for the purpose of affirming the *reality* of the presence of body and blood, and of distinguishing *this* union which is peculiar to the sacrament from a *substantial*, or *personal*, or *local*, or *significative* union, each of which unions has its place in the Christian system, but neither of which can be affirmed of the earthly and heavenly elements in the Eucharist. The presence is called *true, real*, to distinguish it from a merely representative, or figurative, or memorial presence. In the Apology and often by the theologians it is called *substantial* presence, in order to distinguish it from a merely efficacious presence of the body and blood of Christ. It is called *mys-*

wine, or that they are locally confined to the elements in the sacrament, or that they are received and consumed with the mouth in the same way with the bread and wine. The Formula of Concord and many eminent divines indignantly reject the notion of a physical eating with the teeth of Christ's body as 'a malignant and blasphemous slander of the sacramentarians.' Schaff's Creeds, Vol. I., 317.

The Lutheran doctrine not only repudiates transubstantiation, the worship of the consecrated elements, the repetition of Christ's sacrifice, and the carnal eating of His body and blood by the mouth of the communicant—all of which gross conceptions are essential to the Romish doctrine—but it rejects also the Romish notion that the sacrament of itself *contains* the grace which it signifies, and that its saving effects are independent of the faith of the recipient. At this point the Lutheran doctrine is a strong protest against the errors of the Church of Rome. How could it be otherwise, since it is Luther's doctrine? The saving efficacy and the absolute necessity of a personal faith in Christ was with him the very centre and stronghold of Christianity. In the beginning of his conflict with Rome, he declared 'whatever be the case with the sacrament, faith must retain its rights and honors.' From this point he never swerved, 'Non sacramentum sed fides Sacramenti justificat,' was one of his axioms. He also insisted that faith may receive apart from the sacrament the same thing as in the sacrament. 'He never doubted, indeed, that the sacrament conveys a blessing, but he stands upon this, that the Almighty God Himself can work nothing good in a man unless he believes.' Dörner Vol. I., p. 150. Here, then, in its application to the vital question of a sinner's justification before God, Lutherism is forever divorced from Romanism. This alone is a sufficient answer to the flippant assertion that consubstantiation is the same thing as transubstantiation under another name." We accept these statements of Dr. Van Dyke, a Calvinist, as discriminating, just and true.

terious, supernatural, incomprehensible presence; because not after any of the modes of this world, but mysteriously, supernaturally, incomprehensibly, the body and blood of Christ are present in the Holy Supper and are there administered to the communicant, "under the species of bread and wine"—"not as if it meant the *species, not the reality*; but on the contrary, the species or kinds of *true bread and true wine, not of the accidents* of them," (Krauth, *Conservative Ref.* p. 620); or, as Melancthon has explained in the Apology, Art. X., "with those things which are seen, bread and wine." That is, the doctrine of the Confession at this point, is that the visible earthly element in the sacrament is real bread and wine, and the invisible heavenly element is real body and blood, and not the symbols or memorials of them. This relation of the earthly and heavenly elements in the Eucharist is thus described by Carpzov, the greatest of the commentators on the Lutheran Symbolical books:

The sacramental union, which is most firmly based on the words of institution, signifies that the eucharistic bread and the body of Christ, the eucharistic wine and the blood of Christ, are together given in real communication. It denies transubstantiation into one substance; also mixture of bread with body, or of wine with blood, or local inclusion. But there is a true and real uniting, by which, by virtue and power of the words of Christ, the bread and the body of Christ, the wine and the blood of Christ, are so united in the Supper, that the bread becomes the medium for communicating the body of Christ; and by a simultaneous eating the body and blood of Christ with the bread and wine are received by the mouth. The sacramental union takes place only when the sacramental action is performed, and ceases when that action is completed. *Isagoge*, p. 348.

This explanation, which is the true Lutheran conception, introduces in express terms, eating with the mouth, and, by implication, the reception by the unworthy of bread and body, wine and blood; for both are involved in *distribuantur vescentibus*. But by "oral manducation" is meant, as explained by Luther and by the standard theologians, simply that the *mouth* is the *organ* by which the sacramental complex, the *unum aliquid*, is received, just as the written word is received by the eye, and the spoken word by the ear, "and no emphasis," says Dorner, (*Hist. Prot. Theol.* I. p. 161), "is

to be laid upon the passage where, in order to make sure the real presence, he [Luther] charges Melancthon, as to his negotiations with Bucer, to maintain that we, in the Holy Supper, *dentibus Christum laceramus*. For that is only said by him *παρὰ συνεδόχην*.⁶ Hence this oral manducation does not take place in any gross or carnal way, or in any way that can be likened to the manducation of earthly substances. This like the Real Presence itself is an inscrutable mystery. It was insisted on so strenuously, because like the Real Presence, it was strenuously denied by "the opposite doctrine." It is sometimes called "spiritual eating," but not in the sense of the Calvinists, viz., that it is performed by the aid of the Holy Spirit, but to distinguish it from *material* eating.

As to the communion of the unworthy, it is based upon the doctrine that the bread is the medium for communicating the body. Whoever in the sacramental act receives the bread, receives the body, "for," says Luther, "what the bread does and suffers, that the body of Christ does and suffers." *De Wette*, IV. 572. But the effect is different. The unworthy eat and drink condemnation, not discerning the Lord's body.

It may be considered that now with the Augsburg Confession, the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper is fixed. Both by the historical circumstances attending its preparation and delivery, and by its own intrinsic merits, this confession has become the fundamental Lutheran symbol. Those who subscribed and presented it, declared that it was their own confession and that of their churches; and by it these confessors and their churches became ecclesiastically distinguished, on the one hand, from the Romanists, who did not receive its explanation of Christian doctrine; and on the other hand,

⁶ See Dorner, *ibid.* p. 336, note 2. Also the letter of Martin Bucer to the Saxon chancellor, Dr. Pontanus, (July 22, 1529, Chytraeus' Hist. Aug. Con. p. 662): "Licet enim Dr. Martinus scribat, fatendum esse, corpus Christi, ore percipi, dentibus conteri, et alia plura, quibus loquendi formulis etiam Chrysostomus utitur: tamen et hoc fatetur, corpus Christi per se non manducari, nec dentibus conteri ea ratione, qua visibiliter alia caro manducatur et conteritur: sed quæcumque in pane fiuit, ea propter Sacramentalem unionem de corpore Christi quoque dici et intelligi posse."

from the Zwinglians and the four cities who presented their own confessions (*Ratio Fidei* and *Confessio Tetrapolitana*). Henceforth the Lutheran theologians direct their labors to the defence of this confession, and to the elaboration of its system of doctrine—not because it was their confession, but because they were convinced in their consciences that in it they had spoken in accordance with the oracles of God. Hence in the Apology (1531), which is the earliest and most valuable explanation of the Augsburg Confession, Melancthon states the Tenth Article as follows: “In cœna Domini vere et substantialiter adsint corpus et sanguis Christi et vere exhibentur cum illis rebus, quae videntur pane et vino, his qui sacramentum accipiunt.”

In the Wittenberg Concord (1536) Luther, says Seckendorf,⁷ “dropped none of his determination, but demanded a retraction of all those things which taught a figurative interpretation of the words of institution.” It is declared in the Concordia that in the Eucharist there are two things, an earthly and a heavenly; that with the bread and wine, the body and blood of Christ are truly and substantially present, given and received; that by the sacramental union the bread is the body of Christ; that the true body and blood of Christ are truly given to and received by the worthy and the unworthy; that the worthy receive unto condemnation, because they dishonor the Sacrament when they receive it without true repentance and faith. They deny transubstantiation and the local inclusion of the body and blood in the bread and wine.⁸

In 1537 the Smalcald Articles were written by Luther and signed by him and by many other distinguished theologians. Of this article they say: “Of this Sacrament of the Altar, we hold that the bread and wine in the Supper are the true body and blood of Christ, and are given to and received by not only the good and pious, but also to and by the impious and

⁷ III. p. 130.

⁸ Latin in Chytraeus' Hist. Augs. Con. p. 680. Trans. Book Concord (Jacobs) II. 253.

unworthy Christians." He calls the Mass "the greatest and most terrible abomination," and denounces transubstantiation as a "subtle sophistry." There is here a more positive assertion than ever before of the characteristic Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper. When it is remembered that these Articles were written to be sent to a general council of the Church, it will be the better understood that there was not meant any compromise with Rome, for all the Romish tyrannies are here openly condemned.

But now followed forty years of controversy, in which the subject of the Lord's Supper played a conspicuous part. The Lutherans were not by any means all agreed on this article; but the main strife was with the Calvinists.⁹ The immediate occasion of this controversy according to Buddeus (*Isagoge Historico-Theologica*, p. 477) was Melancthon's change

⁹Luther himself had no controversy with Calvin. In his earlier works at least, as for instance the *Institutio* of 1536 and the *De Coena Domini* of 1537, Calvin maintained views very similar to those of Luther. "It has been observed by learned men," says Buddeus, *Isagoge*, p. 1283, "that Calvin at the beginning agreed with our theologians on the doctrine of the Holy Supper; certainly he did not differ much from our doctrine." In 1539 Calvin wrote of Zwingli: "I remember how profane is his doctrine of the sacraments." Gieseler, *Ec. Hist.* IV., p. 415, n. 44. In 1539 Luther wrote: *Saluta mihi Sturmium et Calvinum reverenter, quorum libellos singulari cum voluptate legi*. As at this time Luther must have known of the *Institutio*, it follows from this declaration, that he was at least fairly well pleased with Calvin's view of the Lord's Supper. On reading Calvin's *De Sacra Coena* in 1545 he exclaimed: "This is certainly a pious and learned man, with whom I could have from the first settled this whole controversy. I confess, for my part, that if the opposition had treated the subject in this way, we would have been agreed from the outset. For had Æcolampadius and Zwingli thus expressed themselves, then we would not have fallen into such endless disputes." Gieseler IV., p. 414-5, n. 43. Dorner says, *Hist. Prot. Theol.* I., p. 407: "The new attack made by Luther [against the Sacramentarians] in the Smaller Confession of 1544 in no way applied to Calvin." These facts leave no doubt that had Calvin been at Marburg instead of Zwingli, Luther would have grasped the proffered hand, as between his own view of the Lord's Supper and Calvin's, he did not see difference sufficient for controversy. But it is not to be supposed that Luther would have surrendered his own view to that of Calvin. Luther could distinguish between Zwingli's *Rationalism* and a reasonably close adherence to the Word.

of the Latin Augsburg Confession in the Tenth Article, so as to read: "De coena Domini docent, quod cum pane et vino vere exhibeantur corpus et sanguis Christi vescentibus in Coena Domini," instead of: De coena docent, quod corpus et sanguis Christi vere adsint, et distribuantur vescentibus in coena Domini; et improbant secus docentes." The principal change here, and that upon which the controversy hinged, was the use of *exhibeantur* for *distribuantur*. This with the changes introduced by Melanchthon into the other articles has given rise to the distinctions *Confessio Variata*, and *Confessio Invariata*. But the change in the Tenth Article "was especially grateful," says Buddeus, (*ubi supra*) "to the Reformed doctors, who contended that in this way the Augsburg Confession was not corrupted but explained and improved." Certain it is that both the Reformed and the Romanists charged that Melanchthon had changed his views on the Lord's Supper, and Dr. Schaff says (*Creeds of Christendom* I. p. 241, note) that *exhibeantur* is more indefinite than *distribuantur*. But it is capable of demonstration that Melanchthon intended no change of view in the *Variata*, and that *exhibeantur* as applied to the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper is not more indefinite than *distribuantur*, but that on the contrary it more accurately expresses the Lutheran doctrine than does the word which it supplanted.

I. As to Melanchthon's supposed change.

1. The *Variata* was made in 1540. In that same year at the Colloquy of Worms Melanchthon declared that he still adhered to the *Invariata*. Buddeus' *Is.* p. 447.

2. When Eck charged at the Colloquy of Worms that Melanchthon had changed the Confession, the latter replied: "As to the dissimilarity of copies, I answer that the *meaning of the things is the same* (*rerum eandem esse sententiam*), although some things here and there, in the later edition, are more free from harshness (*mitigata*), or are more explicit." Says the learned Krauth, from whom we requote the above (*Conservative Ref.* p. 247): "If Melanchthon consciously

made a change of meaning in the Confession, it is impossible to defend him from the charge of direct falsehood."

3. At the Diet of Ratisbon, 1541, he signed the Unaltered Augsburg Confession, and again at Worms in 1557, and acknowledged in addition as his Creed, the Apology, and the Smalcald articles, and by name and *in writing* condemned the Zwinglian doctrine.

4. His *Corpus Doctrinae*, to which he wrote a preface, February 16, 1560, only a few weeks before his death, contains *inter alia* (a) the Tenth Article of the Confession in *both* forms; (b) The Apology *unchanged*; (c) The Repetition of the Augsburg Confession, written in 1551 to be sent to the Council of Trent, and signed by Melanchthon and thirty other theologians and pastors. This article contains "In hac communione vere et substantialiter adesse Christum," p. 270; (d) The Examen Ordinandorum in which we find, *Quid est Coena Domini? Est Communicatio corporis et sanguinis Domini nostri Jesu Christi, sicut in verbis Evangelii instituta est, in qua sumptione Filius Dei vere et substantialiter adest—* in which it is not possible to discover any other than the purest type of Lutheran doctrine. The most that can be said is that Melanchthon, without surrendering his own views, was perfectly willing to tolerate the earlier views of Calvin (not those of Zwingli, see *supra*) and to fraternize with him as a Christian (as was shown above of Luther), and therefore omitted altogether the clause *improbant decus docentes*, out of his great desire for peace. In this sense and in no other can it be said that Melanchthon *Bucerized*.

5. Melanchthon made no change in the German Confession, to which, says Hase, he had given greater care.

6. In the Apology which is regarded as Melanchthon's most positive work, and where in the Tenth Article, he is understood to have asserted the *substantial* presence of body and blood in the most unqualified terms, he says: "*Vere exhibeantur cum illis rebus quae videntur.*" In his *Loci* of 1535 he employs the same identical form of expression, also, *Panis est communicatio corporis Christi.* In the Wittenberg

Concord he uses *Exhibeo*. No one even dreams that up to this time Melanchthon had changed his views; and we here have this form of expression definitely fixed in both the confessional and the dogmatic theology before 1540. Why then did Melanchthon make the change? Simply, as he told Eck, to render the expression more *explicit*. He strove after absolute perfection of style.

II. As to *Exhibeantur* being more indefinite than *Distribuantur*.

1. This contradicts Melanchthon's express statement of his reason for making the change. He changed the confession in order to make it more *explicit*, not more *indefinite*.

2. The word *Exhibeo* as used by the theological writers of the sixteenth century, means *to present, to give, to deliver*. The very title of the Augsburg Confession is "*Confessio Fidei Exhibita . . . Carolo v. Cæsari.*" No one will dare to say that it does not here describe one of the most *definite* acts known in history. The Confession was *presented* to the Emperor, not merely *tendered*, which might imply that it was not received, as Zwingli *tendered* his hand to Luther who did not receive it. Hence Dr. Jacobs is inconsistent, when in the title (*Book of Concord* I. p. 33), he translates the word *presented*, and in the Apology and the Variata, *tendered*, and in the Wittenburg Concord, *offered*.

3. In the Apology Melanchthon used *Exhibeantur* to express exactly what in the Confession he had expressed by *Distribuantur*. It is inconceivable that he should have intended to be more *indefinite* here than in the Confession. The only explanation possible is that given to Eck.

4. The dogmaticians give *emphatic* preference to *Exhibeo* in stating the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper. (a) Chemnitz in his *Fundamenta Sacræ Cænæ*, the standard Lutheran dogmatic treatise on the Supper, has for the title of the book and for the heading of Cap. III. "*De Exhibitione et Sumptione Corporis Christi*, and throughout the treatise he employs *Exhibeo* with *corpus* and *sanguis*, to the almost entire exclusion of every other word, in setting forth the *presenting* or

administering of Christ's body and blood in the Eucharist. (b) In the Saxon Visitation Articles (1592), the most positive confessional exhibition of Lutheran doctrine ever written, in article on the Lord's Supper we have *Exhibeo* used three times, as: Quod in sacramento duæ res sunt, quæ exhibentur et simul accipiuntur. Quod hæc unio, exhibitio, et sumptio fiat hic inferius in terris. Quod exhibeatur et accipiatur verum et naturale corpus Christi. The corresponding word in the German text is *geben*. (c) Heunisch (Analytical Epitome of Hutter's Compend): *Forma S. Coenæ consistit partim in δόσει sue exhibitione corporis Christi cum pane . . . partim in ejusdem λήψει sue sumptione*. (d) Gerhard repeatedly as in *Loci*, pp. 134, 159 (Cotta). The fact is, as we are prepared to *demonstrate*, the dogmaticians use the word *Exhibeo* more frequently than all other words put together to state the peculiar Lutheran doctrine that the body and blood of Christ are *administered* to those who eat in the Sacrament. (e) They often distinguish between *distributio panis* and *exhibitio corporis et sanguinis*. *Distributio* applies more properly to the earthly element which is *distributed* among the communicants. *Distributio*, when applied to body and blood, is inelegant and inexplicit. In the *Variata* the change itself requires *exhibeo*; since it begins, *cum pane et vino corpus et sanguis*. The elements are here *distinguished*, as they were not in the *Invariata*, with the emphasis upon *body* and *blood*, which are to be, not *distributed*, but *given, administered*. Therefore the true and proper translation of the Tenth Article in the *Variata* is: "With the bread and wine are truly *administered* the body and blood of Christ to those who eat in the Supper." Moreover, since the article retains *vescentibus* it cannot be construed as favoring the Calvinistic view, which would require *credentibus*, since Calvin maintained that believers by faith eat the true body and drink the true blood of Christ, or as he has put it in his Institutes: "There is a *true* and *substantial* communication of the *body* and *blood* of our Lord."

And yet this *Variata*, though it was frequently quoted and approved by Luther and other stringent Lutherans (see Gies-

eler, IV., p. 433, note), was nevertheless the occasion of much controversy on the Lord's Supper after Melancthon's death, as then it began to be looked upon as favoring the Sacramentarians and the Calvinists. But already for several years a controversy, begun (1549) by Westphal of Hamburg, had been going on between the stricter Lutherans and the Calvinists, on this article of faith. This brought out more definitely the views of Calvin, Peter Martyr and others, who maintained that the words of institution were not to be taken literally, and that Christ's body being *located* in heaven, could not be present in the Eucharist. To refute this doctrine and to defend and expound the Lutheran doctrine, as contained in the Tenth Article of the *Augustana*, is the object of Martin Chemnitz's great work, *FUNDAMENTA SACRÆ CŒNÆ* (1569). Here the main question is not as to the power of God, or as to the mode of presence, but as to the *reality* of the presence as determined by the words of Christ. "And as is the union, or the presence of the body of Christ in the Supper, so is the eating. But the union or presence is not physical, according to some mode of this world. Therefore we can more easily show what the sacramental eating of the body of Christ is not, than what it is. It is not physical, and does not consist of mastication, deglutition, digestion of the substance which is eaten, because the presence of the body of Christ in the Supper is not natural, after some mode of this world; and yet it is not figurative or imaginary, but true and substantial, although it takes place through a supernatural, heavenly and inscrutable mystery." Cap. V.

To the proposition that the body of Christ cannot at the same time be in heaven and in the Supper, he opposes "the right hand of God," which is everywhere, and which means the glory, majesty, power, excellence and authority of God; and with Luther he rejects all philosophical subtleties, and approves Luther's declaration that even the personal union, without the words of institution, would not suffice for the conclusion that the body of Christ is with the consecrated bread in the Eucharist. "But as by the authority of the

Scripture, on account of the hypostatic union with the divinity, we receive and believe many things of the body of Christ, which greatly exceed the natural or essential properties of our bodies; so because we have the express word about the essential presence of the body and blood of the Lord in the Supper, we must not depart from the native meaning of the words of the testament of Christ, even though it should not agree with the essential or natural properties of a true body."

But the time had now come when in the judgment of many pious and earnest men there was need of a restatement and a reaffirmation of the Lutheran doctrine on many disputed points. The result of this judgment was the *Formula Concordiæ*, whose object was to reconcile the conflicting parties in the Lutheran communion, and also to refute various errors in Calvinism. The article on the Lord's Supper has for its immediate object "to repeat the true meaning and proper sense of the words of Christ, and of the Augsburg Confession, concerning this article." Art. VII. It states the position of the Sacramentarians in their own words: "*Abesse Christi, Corpus et sanguinem a signis tanto intervallo dicimus, quanto abest terra ab altissimis cælis.*" That is, that bread and wine, the only things received in the Sacrament by the mouth, are here on the earth, and that the body and blood of Christ are in heaven and not on the earth; that the pious receive the body of Christ spiritually by faith, that is, appropriate the benefits of his body. It quotes with approbation the Augsburg Confession, the Wittenburg Concord, the Smalcald Articles, the two Catechisms. It rehearses a part of Luther's Larger Confession and presses his explanation of the words of institution and Paul's words at 1 Cor. x. 16. It reaffirms Luther's fundamental positions: The person of Jesus Christ as perfect God and perfect man; the right hand of God; the certainty and infallibility of the Word; the three modes of being present, the *circumscribed*, the *incomprehensible*, the heavenly in which Christ is present in the Eucharist or wherever he promises to be present. It "rejects and condemns" Transubstantiation, the Mass, communion under one

kind and sixteen other errors which are supposed to embody the errors of the Sacramentarians.

In a word, the article contains only a fuller development of the doctrine found in the earlier creeds of the Lutheran Church and in Luther's Larger Confession; but the discussion has been regarded by many Lutherans as too full and elaborate, too argumentative and polemical, too theological and scholastic for a confession, although all intelligent Lutherans agree that the article is an exceedingly valuable commentary on the Augsburg Confession, and is of great dogmatic worth. The same judgment has been passed by many Lutherans on the Formula as a whole. Hence the *Formula Concordiæ* is not a universally accepted Lutheran Symbol.

We have now reached the year 1580, the date of the publication of the Book of Concord (in Latin *Concordia*), which closes the period of the confessional development, or rather of the confessional statement of the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper. This book contains a statement of the Lutheran doctrine on this subject in six different forms, as different circumstances and occasions required, but the doctrine itself is one, and each statement is helpful in the interpretation of the other. The one feature which the doctrine brings into greatest prominence is the real presence, after a heavenly and incomprehensible manner, of the true and substantial body and blood of the Lord Jesus Christ, which in the completed act of the Sacrament, *in, with* and *under* bread and wine, are administered to those who commune in the Lord's Supper.¹⁰

¹⁰ "Quite erroneous would be the opinion, that Luther does not conceive of the whole Christ as present, but only His body, on the ground that it is certainly the latter that possesses for him the most immediate significance as a pledge, and that Luther sometimes emphasizes Christ's body apart from his soul." Dorner, *Prot. Theol.* I. p. 161. "The sacramental predicates, 'This is my body;' 'This is my blood,' . . . cannot be better explained than by the particles *in, cum, sub*, by which the conjunction of the things united, and the conjoined administration, are expressed. *Hoc est corpus meum* commodissime resolvitur: *in, cum, sub*, hoc pane exhibeo corpus meum. Gerhard *Loci*, § 96. (Cotta) X. p. 159.

Other questions, touching the use of the Sacrament, the abuse to which it has been subjected, the necessity of faith, and so forth, are treated in these same confessions under appropriate heads, but they form no proper part of the present discussion, except that it may be important to state in the words of the Apology the use of the Sacrament:

The proper use of the Sacraments requires faith to believe the divine promises, and to receive the promised grace, which is offered through the Sacraments and the Word. . . . As the Sacraments are external signs and seals of the promises, their proper use requires faith; for when we receive the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, Christ clearly says: "This cup is the New Testament in my blood." Luke xxii. 20. We should firmly believe then that the grace and remission of sins promised in the New Testament are imparted to us. Art. VII.

THE DOGMATIC AND MODERN PERIOD.

We cannot properly speak of development of this doctrine after the Form of Concord, 1580. During the seventeenth century the subject was treated by the dogmaticians with all that massive learning, skilful exegesis, and subtile logic which characterized the period; but they all adhered rigidly to the confessional doctrine of the church, which had already received its most profound and elaborate dogmatic statement in the *Fundamenta Sacræ Cœnæ* of Martin Chemnitz, 1569. We follow Luthardt, (*Compend. Der Dogmatik*, p. 346) in selecting Hollazius as the representative of this period:

The Eucharist is a holy and solemn action instituted by Christ, in which the true and substantial body of Christ with the consecrated bread, and his true and substantial blood with the consecrated wine, are given to communicating Christians to be eaten and drunk, and both are received by them [Christians], and in an incomprehensible manner eaten and drunk, in commemoration of the death of Christ and for the confirmation of the grace of the Gospel. *Τούτο* denotes the whole sacramental complex, consisting of bread and the body (wine and the blood) of Christ. *Ἔστι* denotes that that which is given in the Supper is truly and really not only bread, but also the body of Christ. The presence of the body and blood is not physical, nor local, nor circumscribed, but supernatural and definitive.

Following the lead of Melanchthon in his *Loci* of 1535 (*Nec addidi inclusionem, aut conjunctionem talem, qua affigeretur τῷ ἄρτι τρωσῶμα, aut ferruminaretur, aut misceretur*) they in general say with Gerhard, (*Haren. Evan.* p. 784):

When we profess a true, real, and substantial presence of the body (and blood) of Christ, we by no means set up *impanation*, or *consubstantiation*, or *incorporation*, or *physical inclusion*, or *local presence*, or *delitescence* of particles under the bread, or the essential conversion of the bread into the body, or a *permanent* affixing of the body to the bread after the use of the Supper, or a personal union of bread and body; but we believe, teach and confess that, according to the institution of Christ, in a manner known to God only, but to us incomprehensible, the body of Christ, truly, really and substantially present, forms a union with the eucharistic bread as a divinely appointed medium, so that by the instrumentality of that bread, we take and eat the true body of Christ in sublime mystery.

It will thus be seen that even during the scholastic and dogmatic period of her history, the Lutheran Church preserved her doctrine of the Lord's Supper free from all gross, carnal, physical, local conceptions. The dogmaticians no more than Luther, attempted to explain, either the mode of the presence of the body and blood, or the nature of the sacramental union, or the manner of the sacramental eating, except that the same mouth which receives the bread, receives the body. And equally with Luther did they insist on faith as necessary in order to the reception of the blessing of the Sacrament, viz., the forgiveness of sins. Nor did Spener, the illustrious father of Pietism, decline from the true Lutheran doctrine. The invisible material of the Sacrament is "the substantial body of Christ, which was given for us, which hung on the cross, the whole body, not certain particles of the body." "Likewise the true blood, the sacrificial blood, propitiatory, the seal of the New Testament." *Catechism*, p. 200.

But when, during the closing decades of the eighteenth century and the former half of the nineteenth, Rationalism had deeply invaded the Lutheran Church, both in this country and in Germany, the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper had but few advocates or confessors. In this country especially, bald Zwinglianism prevailed generally in the Lutheran pulpits. But during the last twenty-five or thirty years there has been a marked return to the historical faith of the church. Every Lutheran theological professor in the United States is bound by his official oath to conform his teaching to the Augsburg Confession of 1530 as the very least. In

some institutions the professor's oath includes the entire Book of Concord. And, as we have reason to know, the doctrine of the Real Presence is now taught in all Lutheran theological seminaries in this country, and is held by the vast majority of the Lutheran pastors; although it is also true that some of the phraseology peculiar to the controversies of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries is not now used, and the doctrine is carefully guarded from crass expressions. And as Luther's Small Catechism in its pure text is used almost universally in Lutheran congregations as a manual of instruction, the doctrine is taught to the young people who are in preparation for the duties and benefits of church membership. But no effort is spared both in theological and in pastoral instruction to make the impression that the doctrine must be *believed on the authority of God's Word*—that it cannot be comprehended by the reason, or likened to any modes of bodily presence known on earth.