

**THE LORD'S SUPPER IN AUGUSTINE  
AND CHEMNITZ**

A Comparison of Two Fathers of the Church

BY

GAYLIN R. SCHMELING

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of  
Nashotah House  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of

MASTER OF SACRED THEOLOGY

April 1993

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### ABBREVIATIONS

CHAPTER	Page
I. Augustine and the Lord's Supper.....	1
A. The Life of Augustine of Hippo (354-430) .....	1
1. Augustine's Early Life and Conversion.....	1
2. Augustine's Struggle Against Manichaeism.....	1
3. Augustine's Struggle Against Donatism .....	2
4. Augustine's Struggle Against Pelagianism.....	2
5. Augustine the Bishop and Pastor .....	3
B. The Background and Foundation for the Lord's Supper .....	3
1. The Old Testament and the Sacraments .....	3
2. The Biblical Basis for the Sacrament.....	4
3. The Form of the Eucharistic Liturgy .....	5
C. The Essence of the Lord's Supper .....	6
1. Augustine's Figurative Concept of the Sacrament.....	6
2. Augustine's Realistic Concept of the Sacrament .....	8
D. The Effectual Cause of the Lord's Supper .....	9
1. The Eucharistic Prayer and the Sacrament.....	9
2. The Consecration and the Sacrament.....	9
E. The Adoration of the Lord's Supper .....	10
F. The Sacrifice and the Lord's Supper.....	11
1. The Commemoration of the Sacrifice of the Cross .....	11
2. The Ecclesial Concept of Eucharistic Sacrifice .....	13
3. The Sacrifice and Those Who Died in the Lord .....	15
G. The Proper Preparation for the Lord's Supper.....	15
H. The Blessings of the Lord's Supper .....	16
1. The Sacrament as the Forgiveness of Sins .....	16
2. The Sacrament as Life-Giving Nourishment and Salvation.....	18
3. The Sacrament as the Bond of Unity .....	19
II. Chemnitz and the Lord's Supper.....	22
A. The Life of Martin Chemnitz (1522-1586), the Superintendent of Braunschweig .....	22
1. Chemnitz' Early Life.....	22
2. Chemnitz the Librarian at Koenigsberg.....	22
3. Chemnitz the Superintendent .....	23
4. Chemnitz the Theologian and Concordist.....	23
B. The Biblical Foundation of the Lord's Supper .....	24
1. The Words of Institution are the Proper Foundation for the Supper .....	24
2. The Words of Institution are Christ's Last Will and Testament .....	26
3. Other Scriptural Testimony .....	26
C. The Essence of the Lord's Supper .....	28
1. The Earthly and Heavenly Elements in the Sacrament .....	28
2. The Connection Between the Earthly and Heavenly Elements in the Sacrament.....	29
D. The Effectual Cause of the Lord's Supper .....	31
1. The Consecration and the Sacrament.....	31

2. The Sacramental Action Must Remain a Unit.....	32
3. The Moment of the Presence in the Sacrament.....	33
4. The Reservation of the Sacrament and the Reliquiae.....	34
E. The Adoration of the Lord’s Supper .....	35
1. The Spiritual Adoration of the Sacrament.....	35
2. Outward Forms of Adoration .....	36
F. The Sacrifice and the Lord’s Supper.....	36
1. The Forms of Eucharistic Sacrifice Acceptable to Chemnitz.....	36
2. The Forms of Eucharistic Sacrifice Unacceptable to Chemnitz .....	37
G. The Proper Preparation for the Lord’s Supper.....	39
H. The Blessings of the Lord’s Supper .....	39
1. The Sacrament and the Forgiveness of Sins .....	39
2. The Sacrament and the Faith-life .....	40
3. The Sacrament and Salvation .....	42
III. A Comparison of These Two Fathers .....	44
A. The Essence of the Lord’s Supper .....	44
1. The Connection Between Sign and Reality.....	44
2. The Real Presence of Christ’s Body and Blood .....	46
B. The Effectual Cause of the Lord’s Supper .....	47
1. The Eucharistic Prayer and the Sacrament.....	47
2. The Consecration and the Sacrament .....	48
3. The Moment of the Presence in the Sacrament.....	50
C. The Adoration and Reservation of the Lord’s Supper .....	51
D. The Sacrifice and the Lord’s Supper.....	52
1. The Commemoration of the Sacrifice of the Cross .....	52
2. The Ecclesial Concept of Eucharistic Sacrifice .....	56
3. The Sacrifice and Those Who Died in the Lord .....	58
E. Proper Preparation for the Lord’s Supper.....	58
1. Worthy Participation and the Sacrament.....	58
2. Altar Fellowship and the Sacrament .....	59
F. The Blessings of the Lord’s Supper .....	59
1. The Sacrament as the Forgiveness of Sins .....	60
2. The Sacrament as Life-Giving Nourishment and Salvation.....	61
3. The Sacrament as the Bond of Unity .....	62
Bibliography .....	64
a. Books.....	64
b. Periodicals .....	68
End Notes .....	69

## ABBREVIATIONS

### Writings of the Church Fathers:

CSEL (Corpus Scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum), Vienna, 1866-.

CCSL (Corpus christianorum). Series Latina. Turnhout, Belgium, 1953-.

PG (Patrologia graeca). Migne. Paris, 1857-66.

PL (Patrologia latina). Migne. Paris, 1878-90.

### Lutheran Confessions (all quotes are from the *Tappert Translation* unless otherwise indicated):

AC - Augsburg Confession

Ap - Apology of the Augsburg Confession

FC - Formula of Concord

LC - Large Catechism

SD - Solid Declaration of the Formula of Concord

### Luther's Works:

LW - American Edition

St. L. - St. Louis Edition

WA - Weimar Edition

### Writings of Chemnitz:

MWS - Ministry, Word, and Sacrament (Enchiridion)

TNC - Two Natures in Christ (De Duabus Naturis in Christo)

Ex - Examination of the Council of Trent (Examen Concilii Tridentini)

LS - Lord's Supper (De Coena Domini)

# I. AUGUSTINE AND THE LORD'S SUPPER

## A. *The Life of Augustine of Hippo (354-430)*

### 1. *Augustine's Early Life and Conversion*

At the Easter Vigil in 387 Augustine was baptized. He did not come to that moment easily. Most of his years to that point had been a struggle between belief and unbelief. But, finally he was graciously gripped by the arms of the crucified and risen Christ. Of this struggle he wrote, "You stimulate him to take pleasure in praising you, because you have made us for yourself, and our hearts are restless until they can find peace in you."<sup>1</sup> His whole life from then on -- as well as the life of the whole Western Church -- was influenced by the splashing baptismal water of that moment.

Augustine was born to a Christian mother (Monica) and a pagan father in 354 at Tagaste, a small town in modern day Algeria. The main source for our knowledge of his youth and his conversion is his *Confessions*, a spiritual autobiography in which he shows how God guided his life in spite of his rebellion and unbelief. Influenced by his Christian mother, young Augustine was enrolled as a candidate for Baptism, but due to his lack of spiritual inclination, he went no further. At the age of seventeen he went to Carthage to study rhetoric. Here he read Cicero's *Hortensius* which led him in a search for truth. This search for truth led young Augustine not to the orthodox Christian faith, but rather to Manichaeism.<sup>2</sup> His fascination with Manichaeism cooled when Faustus, one of the leading Manichaean teachers, was unable to put his anxieties concerning the sect to rest.

In 383, fed up with the rowdy students at Carthage, Augustine decided to go to Rome where he lost his faith in Manichaeism and became an enthusiastic Neo-platonist. Neo-platonism would be an influence in his life even after he became a Christian, so much so that some have held that he was more a Neo-platonist than a Christian. This view, however, is an extreme one. He became a Christian through and through, but he often expressed his Christianity in Neo-platonic categories. Neo-platonism removed the two main hurdles that stood in the way of his intellectual acceptance of the Christian faith -- the incorporeal nature of God and the existence of evil. Neo-platonism provided Augustine with a means of understanding the incorporeal nature of God and a way of explaining the existence of evil without having recourse to dualism as was the case with Manichaeism. From Neo-platonism he came to understand evil not as a nature or as a something. It is not a creature, rather evil is only a negation of good.<sup>3</sup>

After being in Rome for a time, he was appointed to the post of public teacher of rhetoric at Milan. Here he came under the influence of Ambrose's preaching. While Augustine did not find the reserved Ambrose very approachable, he found a spiritual father in the church elder, Simplicianus, who had also greatly helped Ambrose. Augustine's conversion is dated in September of the year 386. While he walked in the garden of Villa Cassiciacum, not far from Milan, amidst violent struggles of mind and heart, he heard a child's voice saying, "Take it and read it," which led him into St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans (13:13-14).<sup>4</sup> Augustine said that at that point the light flooded in and all the difficulties in accepting Christ were ended. On Holy Saturday in 387 he was baptized with his friend, Alypius, and his son, Adeodatus, to the great joy of his mother who had recently joined him from Africa and who died shortly after this.

### 2. *Augustine's Struggle Against Manichaeism*

In 391, Bishop Valerius of Hippo constrained Augustine to become a priest. Four years later he was consecrated as Valerius' coadjutor bishop and succeeded him as bishop shortly

thereafter. While bishop of Hippo, his church was beset by a number of different heresies as has been the case in the church in every age. From the beginning of his ministry until around 400 he was on the offensive against Manichaeism, the sect to which he himself had once belonged.

Manichaeism, founded by Mani, was essentially eclectic, drawing elements from at least three religions. From Zoroastrianism of Mani's native Persia came dualism which was the foundation of his doctrine, from Buddhism came the belief in reincarnation, and from Christianity the reverence for the name, Jesus, whose apostle Mani claimed to be. Like Gnosticism, Manichaeism taught that the human soul was part of the divine substance and must be returned to it in order to fulfill its destiny. In this life the soul endures frightful anguish as a result of its union with matter, the principle of evil. Salvation then is the liberation of the human spirit from the bonds of matter. Augustine fought against Manichaeism upholding the goodness of God's creation.<sup>5</sup>

### *3. Augustine's Struggle Against Donatism*

For the next twelve years of his life (after 400) Augustine's efforts intensified in the controversy with Donatism. The Donatists were orthodox in their teachings, but they did not recognize the Catholic Church (the official church). They separated themselves from it because of the ordination of Caecilian as bishop of Carthage. The Donatists claimed that Caecilian's ordination was invalid since one of the individuals who participated in the ordination, Felix of Aptunga, was accused of surrendering holy things to the Roman persecutors. The Donatists held that Sacraments administered by an unworthy minister or by one who was ordained in an unworthy manner were invalid. The keystone of Donatist theology was its doctrine of the church. The church was the congregation of holy people. Since this was the case, no sinner could effectively administer the Sacraments.

In his writings against the Donatists, Augustine set forth his doctrine of the church and the Sacraments. Augustine attacked the Donatists on several different fronts. He pointed out that the Donatists themselves were far from the saints they claimed to be. Bands of Donatists, named Circumcellians, burnt and pillaged the North African countryside which was not only sub-Christian, but also illegal. On a theological level, Augustine argued that until judgment day the outward visible church remains a mixed multitude, containing both good and bad. His most important argument was his insistence that the unworthiness of a clergyman does not nullify the benefits of his ministry for believing Christians. Augustine emphasized that the validity of the Sacraments does not depend on the character or faith of the individual performing the Sacrament. If the proper form is used in accord with Christ's Word and institution, the Sacraments are valid even when administered by immoral priests and heretics. He explained that it is the Word of God that makes a Sacrament.<sup>6</sup>

### *4. Augustine's Struggle Against Pelagianism*

Today Augustine is perhaps best remembered for his part in the controversy with a Celtic ascetic by the name of Pelagius. Jerome described Pelagius as a Scotchman dulled by eating too much Scotch porridge. In 405 while at Rome Pelagius first came into contact with Augustine's theology and reacted violently against it. He could not accept the teaching that the salvation of man was dependent entirely on the grace of God -- a view which left no room for human efforts and participation. For example, in the *Confessions* Augustine wrote, "Grant us what You command, and command us what You will."<sup>7</sup> Pelagius and his supporters had no time for this kind of theology. Pelagius taught that while God provides the resources, salvation is a matter of personal effort. If man simply uses the mind that God has given him and bends his will to follow God's rules, he will certainly be saved. The theology of Pelagius may not only have been a

response to Augustine, but also a reaction against the moral determinism of the Manichees with which he thought Augustine was still imbued.

For Augustine the teachings of Pelagius contradicted both the Scripture and his own religious experience. Augustine had a much deeper concept of sin and human depravity than Pelagius did. Sin is not just evil actions that man might be able to control, but it consists in an evil nature inherited from Adam. All men without exception are born with this evil nature called original sin. From this bondage no one can set himself free. Salvation and redemption are a result of God's grace in Christ. This controversy deepened Augustine's understanding of the depravity of man and the need for God's grace. It increased Augustine's emphasis on infant Baptism, but it also led him into a doctrine of predestination that would cause more controversies in later church history.

### *5. Augustine the Bishop and Pastor*

In 396 Augustine became the Bishop of Hippo. For the rest of his life he served as a faithful shepherd to his flock while writing a voluminous amount of material on virtually every theological topic. He died on August 28, 430 at the age of 76 as the city of Hippo was being seized by the Vandals. Within a few short years, it seemed that all Augustine's efforts had come to nothing. The barbarian tribes swept across North Africa leaving a path of destruction. Islam followed shortly thereafter, making Augustine's homeland Muslim as it remains to this day. Pelagianism arose in a new form, Semi-Pelagianism. Yet, Augustine's great writings have remained a powerful lasting influence in the church.

Besides his many commentaries on the Scripture and his polemical writings, a number of other works of Augustine merit special attention. The *Confessions*, the best known of Augustine's writings, are autobiographical, pointing out his spiritual odyssey which concluded in a revelation of the grace of God. The *Enchiridion*, written at the request of a friend, is a commentary on the Creed, the Lord's Prayer and the Ten Commandments. It is a short handbook of the Christian faith. The *Treatise on the Holy Trinity (De Trinitate)*, which took Augustine sixteen years to write, deals with the doctrine of the Trinity. The *City of God (De Civitate Dei)*, occasioned by the sack of Rome in 410, sets forth Augustine's view of history and its meaning. It indicates that no human achievement lasts forever. Therefore, we look to the City of God, the New Jerusalem, which comes down from heaven. Finally, the *Retractions*, written toward the end of his life, explain issues where he may have changed his mind, or where he had not been sufficiently clear.

### *B. The Background and Foundation for the Lord's Supper*

#### *1. The Old Testament and the Sacraments*

Augustine's doctrine of the Sacrament is not to be found in a vacuum. It is built on the powerful testimony of Tertullian and Cyprian, the great fathers before him in Africa, and on the witness of Ambrose of Milan through whose preaching the Holy Spirit brought about his conversion. In the tradition of these fathers, Augustine employs many Old Testament pictures or types of the Sacrament. One such Old Testament picture is the Melchizedek type.

The fathers were particularly fascinated by the Melchizedek type. Because the Old Testament Scriptures were viewed as a prophetic whole, it was desirable to find in them a figure who would foreshadow the coming of Christ, and anticipate the end of the animal sacrifices and their replacement through the all-sufficient sacrifice of the cross and through the Sacrament instituted by Christ, which is a presentation of His sacrifice under the forms of bread and wine. Such a figure was found in the person of Melchizedek, king and priest of Salem referred to in the books of Genesis and Hebrews. The influence of this type of Christ on theology in general and on

the Eucharist specifically was immense in Africa, especially in Cyprian and Augustine. For Augustine Melchizedek, who was without beginning and end (Hebrews 7:3) prefiguring Christ, confirms the truth that Christ's priesthood according to the order of Melchizedek (Hebrews 7:17) and the New Testament Sacraments are superior to and the fulfillment of the whole Old Testament ritual and priesthood.

But he (Abraham) received at that time a public blessing from Melchizedek, who was the priest of the Most High God. Many important things are written about Melchizedek in the epistle entitled To the Hebrews, which the majority attribute to apostle Paul, though some deny the attribution. Here we certainly see the first manifestation of the sacrifice which is now offered to God by Christians in the whole world, in which is fulfilled what was said in prophecy, long after this event, to Christ who was yet to come in the flesh: 'You are a priest for all eternity, in the line of Melchizedek.' Not, it is to be observed, in the line of Aaron, for that line was to be abolished when the events prefigured by these shadows came to the light of day.<sup>8</sup>

Another Old Testament picture which Augustine employs is the Exodus type. One of his sermons preached during Easter week is built totally around the Exodus theme. The sermon compares Baptism to Israel's crossing the Red Sea. Having passed through the Red Sea of Baptism, the Christian is now in this present wilderness where he is fed with the heavenly manna, the Holy Supper, until he reaches the heavenly Canaan beyond the Jordan of death.

Regard yourselves as delivered out of Egypt from a harsh servitude, where iniquity ruled over you; and as having passed through the Red Sea by baptism, in which you received the seal of Christ's bloody cross. Prune yourselves therefore of past sins, those enemies of yours which pursued you from the rear. For as the Egyptians perished in the very waters traversed by the people of God, so your sins were blotted out in the waters in which you were baptized.

Seek now the heavenly kingdom, the land of promise to which you have been called, and be vigilant in resisting temptations throughout this earthly life, which is nothing else than a desert wherein you are sojourners. By partaking of the holy Altar, you receive your manna along with the drink that flows from the rock. All this the Apostle Paul has in mind and inculcates in his preaching when he says, "I would not have you ignorant, brethren, that our fathers were all under the cloud, and all passed through the sea. And all in Moses were baptized, in the cloud, and in the sea. And did all eat the same spiritual food, and all drank the same spiritual drink; and they drank of the spiritual rock that followed them; and the rock was Christ."<sup>9</sup>

## *2. The Biblical Basis for the Sacrament*

Augustine, as the fathers before him, finds many types of the Eucharist in the Old Testament. However, Augustine's doctrine of the Sacrament has its basis in the institution narrative of the Gospels. The proper foundation for the doctrine of the Supper is to be found in the *Verba*. In summary, Augustine teaches concerning the institution of the Supper in a sermon for the newly baptized:

At the time His Passion was near at hand, while eating the Passover with His disciples, He took bread and blessed it, saying, "This is my body which shall be delivered for you." In like manner He blessed the chalice, and gave it to them, saying, "This is my blood of the New Testament which shall be shed for many unto remission of sins." You have read this or have heard it in the Gospel, not knowing at the time that the Eucharist is the Son of God. Now, however, having your hearts cleansed of an evil conscience and your bodies washed in clean water, "Come ye to him and be enlightened, and your faces shall not be confounded." If you receive it worthily and keep the new commandment of love for one another, then you have life in you, as promised in the New Testament through which you hope to attain the eternal inheritance. You eat the very flesh of which He who is life itself declared, "The bread that I will give is my flesh for the life of the world;" and again, "Except you eat my flesh and drink my blood you shall not have life in you."<sup>10</sup>

### 3. The Form of the Eucharistic Liturgy

The celebration of the Divine Liturgy in North Africa was the principle Sunday activity in the Christian community. The liturgy consisted of two parts: the service of the catechumens (*missa catechumenorum*) which was mainly didactic and meant for all, and the service of the faithful (*missa fidelium*) which was only for the communicants. At the conclusion of the first part of the Divine Liturgy all but the communicants were dismissed. This dismissal (*missus*), which indicated that the Eucharist proper was about to begin, became the appellation for the entire service - the *missa* from which the English word "Mass" is derived. The service of the catechumens, the public worship, consisted of various lections from the Gospels, Epistles, and the Prophets. Usually a portion of the Psalms was sung. Here too the sermon was to be found. The sermon held a much more important position in the Eastern Church than in the Western Church because in the West the preaching was often poorly done. Chrysostom was an example of preaching at its finest in the East, and Augustine and Ambrose were examples of the same in the West.

The second part of the service began with the prayers of the faithful, prayers for the various needs of the church. After this the gifts to be offered were brought to the altar, possibly by the people themselves in the form of an offertory procession. These gifts included the bread and wine for the Sacrament. The eucharistic prayer was ushered in by the Preface which Augustine explains in one of his Easter sermons.

First, after the prayer, you are admonished to lift up your hearts. This is fitting for the members of Christ. For if you have become members of Christ, then where is your Head? Members have a head, and unless the head has gone before, the members would not follow. Where has our Head gone? . . . Our Head, then, is in heaven. So, at the words "Lift up your hearts," you respond "We have lifted them up to the Lord." And, lest you attribute your having your hearts to the Lord on high to your own strength, your own merits, your own efforts, since it is God's gift to have one's heart lifted up, for this reason the bishop or the priest who is offering the sacrifice, immediately after the people have replied "We have lifted our hearts up to the Lord," continues "Let us give thanks to the Lord our God," that we have our hearts lifted up. Let us give thanks, for, were it not for His gift, we would have our hearts on earth. And you bear witness, saying "It is fitting and right" that we give thanks to Him who has caused us to raise up our hearts to our Head.<sup>11</sup>

The Preface was followed by the *Sanctus* in most of the liturgies. Then came the central action of the Eucharist, the recitation of the Words of Institution, the consecration, together with the signing of the elements with the holy cross.<sup>12</sup> After the Words of Institution the eucharistic prayer continued with the anamnesis and epiclesis. It is believed that the *Pater Noster* was preceded by the fraction.<sup>13</sup>

The Blessed Sacrament was given under both species at the altar.<sup>14</sup> The Lord's body was placed in the communicant's hands. As the host was given, the priest would say, "The body of Christ" (*Corpus Christi*) and the communicant responded "Amen." Likewise, when the chalice was offered the priest said, "The blood of Christ" (*Sanguis Christi*) and again, the communicant responded "Amen." Following the distribution the service came to a rather abrupt end with a final prayer of thanksgiving and the dismissal.

### *C. The Essence of the Lord's Supper*

#### *1. Augustine's Figurative Concept of the Sacrament*

At the outset it must be said that during this period the doctrine of the eucharistic presence was one of unquestioned realism, that is, the consecrated bread and wine were considered to be the body and blood of the Lord. No one would have questioned that in the Sacrament one received the body and blood born of the Virgin Mary which was sacrificed on the cross for the salvation of the world and raised again the third day. There was a definite confession of the real presence. Did Augustine's doctrine of the Eucharist conform with this virtually universal dogma of the period? Did Augustine believe that the body which came forth from the Virgin Mary and died on the cross is present in the Sacrament to be received by the mouth of the communicant? There are a number of statements in Augustine which would cause one to answer this question in the negative.

If, then you wish to understand the body of Christ, listen to the Apostle as he says to the faithful "You are the body of Christ, and His members" (1 Co 12.17). If, therefore, you are the body of Christ and His members, your mystery has been placed on the Lord's table, you receive your mystery. You reply "Amen" to that which you are, and by replying you consent. For you hear "The Body of Christ," and you reply "Amen." Be a member of the body of Christ so that your "Amen" may be true.<sup>15</sup>

What is meant by "one bread"? He explained it concisely, "We, though many, are one body." This bread is the body of Christ, to which the Apostle refers when he addresses the church: "Now you are the body of Christ and His members" (1 Co 12.17). What you receive, you yourselves are by the grace by which you have been redeemed. You show agreement when you respond "Amen." What you see here is the sacrament of unity.<sup>16</sup>

If a word is prescriptive, forbidding a thing that is disgraceful or evil or ordering some good thing, it is not to be understood figuratively. If however it appears to order something which is disgraceful or evil or to forbid something which is good, then the language is figurative. The Lord says, "Unless you eat the Flesh of the Son of Man and drink his Blood, you will not have life in you." This appears to order us to do something disgraceful or evil. Therefore it is symbolic [lit., "a figure": *Figura ergo est*], commanding us to communicate in the Passion of the Lord and to remember pleasantly and usefully that his flesh was crucified and wounded for

us.<sup>17</sup>

Understand what I (Jesus) have said spiritually. You are not going to eat this body which you see, nor are you going to drink the blood which those who will crucify me are going to shed. I have given you a sacrament. Understood spiritually, it will give you life. Although it must be celebrated visibly, yet it should be understood invisibly.<sup>18</sup>

On the basis of passages such as these, F. van der Meer writes concerning Augustine and the Sacrament, "It is perfectly true, however that there is nowhere any indication of any awareness of the real presence of Christ in the Sacrament or that he thought very much about this subject or made it the object of devotion; that was alien to the people of that age -- at any rate in the West."<sup>19</sup>

Before one can make a proper evaluation of Augustine's view of the presence in the Eucharist (whether it is realistic or figurative), one must review the concept of Sacrament (*sacramentum*) in Augustine's thought. Augustine holds to the broad concept of Sacrament which was prevalent throughout the Ancient Church. Not only could he designate certain rites, such as the exorcisms which preceded Baptism, as Sacraments, but upon occasion he even calls the great events of the church year Sacraments. For Augustine a Sacrament is a "sacred sign". (*sacrum signum*)<sup>20</sup> A Sacrament is a sacred sign of a hidden reality (*res*) and power. (*virtus*) He says, "These things, my brothers, are called sacraments for the reason that in them one thing is seen but another is understood. That which is seen has physical appearance, that which is understood has spiritual fruit."<sup>21</sup> Augustine lays particular stress on the contrast between the sign and the reality or power in the Sacrament. "The Sacrament" he declares, "is one thing, the virtue of the sacrament another."<sup>22</sup>

Augustine's concept of Sacrament is influenced by Neo-Platonism. Neo-Platonism maintains that there are two "worlds", the world of ordinary experience (that which one sees, feels and touches), and a world behind or beyond ordinary experience. The world beyond is considered the real world, while the world of ordinary experience is an image, sign, figure, or type of the real world lying behind it. The world beyond gives meaning to the world of ordinary experience. These worlds are not simply parallel to each other. Rather, one could participate in the real world through the sign or image present in the world of ordinary experience. When early Christians expressed their concept of Sacrament in theological terms, they at times used the model of Neo-Platonist philosophy. The bread and the wine are designated "signs", "types" or "figures" which signify the reality which lies beyond them, namely the body and blood of Christ. The sacramental signs, however, not only point to and represent the reality that they signify, they also participate in it and render it present. The signs are not mere signs, but signs filled with reality. Therefore, when the early fathers speak of the Eucharist as a sign of Christ's body and blood, they are not denying the presence of Christ's body and blood in the Eucharist. Rather, they are speaking of the bread and the wine as signs which cause the heavenly reality of Christ's body and blood to be present for the communicant. This is evident from the fact that many of the fathers speak of the Sacrament as Christ's body and blood and as a figure of the same in virtually the same breath.

Augustine uses this Neo-Platonic framework in his interpretation of the Sacrament. Yet, he tends to see a certain distance between the Sacrament as such (the outward sign) and the gift which it is meant to communicate, a danger that is inherent in Neo-Platonic philosophy. Neo-Platonism sees a definite chasm between the material and the spiritual. Augustine makes a greater separation between the sign and the reality in the Eucharist than did most of the early fathers, possibly in opposition to the Manichaeans who held exaggerated physical concepts of the presence of Christ. Thus, at times one can get the impression that the communicant receives the sacred sign, the elements of bread and wine, but the hidden reality, Christ's body and blood with

all the blessings of redemption, is so distant from the sign that it is not received in the same way or at the same time. This is the reason that some have considered Augustine's view of the presence to be basically figurative. However, it will be seen below that this does not do full justice to Augustine's view.

## 2. Augustine's Realistic Concept of the Sacrament

Throughout his writings, Augustine sees himself in agreement with the other fathers of the church who confessed the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the Sacrament. If Augustine did not adhere to this doctrine, he would have found himself at variance with the teachings of Ambrose, from whom Augustine himself had received his catechesis on the Supper before his Baptism. Ambrose clearly taught that the Sacrament was the "true flesh of Christ which was crucified."<sup>23</sup> There was nothing in Augustine's own writings or in those of his immediate contemporaries that indicates that anyone perceived any difference in the eucharistic doctrine of the two men.

As the other church fathers, Augustine teaches that the sacramental sign is never separated from the sacramental power and reality, that the sacramental sign conveys the reality which it pictures or symbolizes. He says, "The word comes to the elements and it becomes a Sacrament". (*Accedet verbum ad elementum et fit sacramentum*)<sup>24</sup> Before the Word of God comes to the element it is a mere sign, but when the Word is united to the element then it is a sacred sign which conveys that which it signifies. One will always find this tension in Augustine's sacramental theology. On the one hand he at times seems to separate the sacred sign from the hidden reality following the presuppositions of Neo-Platonism, and on the other hand he continually tries to hold the two together in accord with the traditional use of these terms.

There are many places in Augustine where he uses realistic language concerning the presence of Christ's body and blood, showing that he was in agreement with the concept of the real presence found in Ambrose and the other fathers. While Augustine often speaks of the bread in the Eucharist as being the body of Christ, the church, after the consecration with the Words of Institution he definitely considers the elements to be Christ's body and blood given for the forgiveness of sins. "The bread which you see on the altar, sanctified by God's word is the body of Christ. The cup or, rather, its contents sanctified by God's word is the blood of Christ. Through these Christ our Lord wished to bequeath His body and His blood which He shed for us for the forgiveness of sins."<sup>25</sup> Here he indicates that the bread and wine are the body and blood born of Mary which won the redemption of the world.

Augustine speaks of Christ's flesh and blood in the Sacrament as being adorable. This is the case because it is flesh from the Virgin with which the pre-existent Logos united Himself for our salvation. "For He took earth from earth, because flesh is from earth, and from the flesh of Mary He took flesh. And because He walked here in that flesh, He also gave us that flesh to eat for our salvation. But no one eats that flesh unless he has first adored it."<sup>26</sup>

In his commentary of Psalm 33 (34) Augustine gives one of the most interesting examples of his belief in the real presence. The inscription of this Psalm states that it was composed by David at the time of the episode in I Samuel 21:10-15. Giving the background of this Psalm to his hearers, Augustine comes across an exegetical difficulty. His Old Latin translation of I Samuel 21:13 reads, He carried Himself in His own hands. (*Ferebatur in manibus suis*) Augustine explains that this expression, unintelligible of David or any mere mortal, is fulfilled by Christ in the Last Supper.

And he was carried in his own hands. Now, brothers, who can understand how this can happen to a man? Who can be carried in his own hands? A man is able to be carried in the hands of others, but no one is carried in his own hands. How this

is to be understood in a literal way of David himself we cannot discover; however, we can discover how this happened in the case of Christ. For Christ was carried in his own hands when, entrusting to us his own Body, he said: "This is my Body." Indeed he was carrying that Body in his own hands.<sup>27</sup>

In the third book of *De Trinitate* Augustine writes:

It is like infants who have no knowledge of what is placed on the altar and of what is consumed when the holy celebration is completed or whence or how it is confected [Lat. *conficiatur*], or whence it is assumed for a religious use. If they never learn through their own experience or that of others and never see that form [Lat. *speciem*] except when it is offered and given during the celebration of the Sacraments, and it is told to them by very great authority whose Body and Blood it is, they will believe nothing other than that the Lord has appeared to the eyes of men in that form and that the liquid has certainly flowed from the side pierced in such a way.<sup>28</sup>

Here Augustine asserts that the chalice in the Sacrament contains the blood which flowed from Christ's side on the cross even though the form (species) may be different. In summary, therefore, a balanced verdict must agree that Augustine accepts the current realism of his time. One could multiply texts like these which show that Augustine takes for granted the traditional identification of the elements with Christ's body and blood.

#### *D. The Effectual Cause of the Lord's Supper*

##### *1. The Eucharistic Prayer and the Sacrament*

Augustine leaves his readers in the dark concerning the form of the eucharistic prayer which was used at his time in Africa. One can, however, assume that the Words of Institution were embedded in such a prayer here as elsewhere. The form of these prayers varied greatly in the different geographical areas of the church. The outline of these prayers was influenced by the Jewish table blessings. The prayers usually begin with the thanksgiving which praises and thanks God for the creation and redemption. In the prayers the *Verba*, the Words of Institution, hold the predominant position. They explain why the church has such a eucharistic meal and they are the words which the Lord gave to His church for blessing in the Supper so that the elements may be His body and blood. The *Verba* are followed by the anamnesis, the remembering of Christ's death and resurrection for salvation, and by the epiclesis which is usually the calling down of the Holy Spirit. There are times when the epiclesis is an invocation of the second person of the Trinity, the Divine Logos.

##### *2. The Consecration and the Sacrament.*

For Augustine, the Words of Institution embedded in the eucharistic prayer are the consecration of the Holy Sacrament. Augustine definitely teaches that the Words of Christ, the Words of Institution, cause the presence of Christ's body and blood in the Sacrament. "For not all the bread, but that which receives the blessing of Christ becomes the body of Christ". (*Non enim omnis panis, sed accipiens benedictionem Christi fit corpus Christi*)<sup>29</sup> Augustine explicates the blessing further, "At the time when His passion was near at hand, while keeping the passover with His disciples, He took bread, blessed it, and said: 'This is my body which shall be delivered up for

you.' (1 Co 11.24) In like manner he blessed the cup and gave it to them saying: 'This is my blood of the New Covenant which shall be shed for many for the forgiveness of sins.'" (Mt 26.28)<sup>30</sup>

What you see here on the Lord's table, beloved, is bread and wine. But once the word is pronounced over them, this bread and this wine become the body and blood of the Word. For that very Lord, who "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God" (Jn 1.1), because of His mercy through which He did not disdain what He created in His own image, "the Word became flesh, and dwelt among us" (Jn 1.14), as you know. The same Word assumed human nature, that is, the soul and body of man, and became man, remaining God. Because of this, and because He also suffered for us, He left us, in this sacrament, His body and blood which He has also caused us to be. For we too have been made His body, and through His mercy we are the very thing which we receive. . .

Next come those things which are done in the sacred prayers which you are about to hear, so that by the presence of the word the body and blood of Christ may come to be. For take away the word, and there is simply bread and wine, but add the word, and it is something else. What is that something else? The body of Christ and the blood of Christ. Take away the word, and it is only bread and wine. Add the word, and it will become a sacrament. To this you say "Amen." To say "Amen" is to agree. "Amen" is translated in Latin as "True."<sup>31</sup>

For Augustine the blessing of Christ, the Words of Institution, is the effectual cause of the presence in the Sacrament. The Word who was in the beginning with God and who was God, became flesh for our salvation and now that Word gives us that flesh for our salvation when His Word is pronounced over the elements. If the Word is taken away there is nothing but bread and wine, yet add the Word, and it is something else, namely, the body and blood of the Lord. It is the all-powerful Word of the Word made flesh that effects the presence in the Sacrament. Notice that while Augustine speaks of the consecration causing the presence just as Ambrose did, he does not use the "change" terminology employed by Ambrose. (*transformatio, transfiguratio, mutatio*).

#### *E. The Adoration of the Lord's Supper*

The attitude of reverence toward the Holy Eucharist and the practice of adoring the Lord present in the Sacrament are occasionally referred to in the time of Augustine. In a commentary on Psalm 98 [99:5] delivered to the people of Carthage, Augustine offers the following remarks:

It says here **ADORE THE FOOTSTOOL OF HIS FEET**, but explaining to me what the footstool of His feet is, it says "but the earth is the footstool of my feet." I am in a dilemma: I am afraid to worship earth, lest He who made heaven and earth (Ps. 133.3) condemn me; but I am afraid not to adore the footstool of the feet of my Lord, because the Psalm says to me **ADORE THE FOOTSTOOL OF HIS FEET**. I ask what is the footstool of His feet, and scripture says to me "the earth is the footstool of my feet." In my doubt I turn to Christ, for it is He whom I seek here, and I discover how earth may be worshipped without impiety. For He took earth from earth, because flesh is from earth, and from the flesh of Mary He took flesh. And because He walked here in that flesh, He also gave us that flesh to eat for our salvation. But no one eats that flesh, unless he has first adored it.

We have found out how such a footstool of the feet of God may be worshipped, and how we not only do not sin by worshipping it, but even sin by not worshipping it. But flesh does not give life, does it? The Lord Himself said, when He was speaking about the legacy of this very "earth": "It is the spirit which gives life, the flesh profits nothing" (Jn 6.64) And so, when you bow down and prostrate yourself before any "earth", do not revere it as earth, but as that Holy One whose footstool is that which you adore.<sup>32</sup>

The context of Augustine's remarks suggests that he is referring to the popular custom among North African Christians of adoring the consecrated elements during the liturgy. He defends the custom by relating it to the verse in the Psalm, "Adore the footstool of His feet." The elements may indeed be worshipped because they are the flesh and blood of the Divine Logos.

Augustine reminds the people that while the custom of adoring the Sacrament is praiseworthy, it must not be understood in a carnal or fleshly manner. He puts these words on Jesus' lips:

Understand what I (Jesus) have said spiritually. You are not going to eat this body which you see, nor are you going to drink the blood which those who will crucify me are going to shed. I have given you a sacrament. Understood spiritually, it will give you life. Although it must be celebrated visibly, yet it should be understood invisibly.<sup>33</sup>

Here Augustine is not denying the real presence as some believe, rather he is rejecting a concept of carnal or Capernaite eating. Augustine defends the legitimacy of reverence toward the consecrated elements in the liturgy and the importance of understanding that Christ's body and blood are received orally in the Supper, but in a sacramental or supernatural manner.

#### *F. The Sacrifice and the Lord's Supper*

##### *1. The Commemoration of the Sacrifice of the Cross*

The earliest concept of sacrifice connected with the Lord's Supper was confined to the offering of praise, gifts, and one's whole life of sanctification. (Romans 12:1) The congregation gave its offering of praise, thanksgiving, and the first fruits offering from which the earthly elements for the Supper were taken.<sup>34</sup> Likewise, in harmony with the institution narrative, the Sacrament was at times referred to as a sacrifice because it was a presentation of Christ's sacrifice in the midst of His people in which they received that which had been sacrificed once and for all on Calvary with all its blessings.

From these biblical concepts grew three different expressions of eucharistic sacrifice in later patristic literature. 1) The first line of reflection connects the Eucharist with the sacrifice of the cross by way of the eucharistic memorial. The Eucharist is identified with the sacrifice of Christ, because the Eucharist celebrates the anamnesis or remembrance of Christ's death. It is a commemoration of Christ's all-sufficient offering upon the cross. 2) The second line of reflection connects the Eucharist with the eternal pleading of Christ's sacrifice in heaven. The concept of the eternal pleading of Christ's sacrifice is based on the Epistle to the Hebrews. (7:25) In this view the eucharistic liturgy is a participation in the heavenly liturgy. 3) The third line of reflection connects the Eucharist with the sacrifice of Christ by way of His body, the church. The congregation is drawn into His one body, the church, by receiving His one body in the Eucharist and the church is offered up as a sacrifice to the Father in union with Christ, its head. The sacrifice of the Eucharist then is Christ's body, the church.<sup>35</sup>

The African church at Augustine's time viewed the Eucharist as a commemoration of Christ's sacrifice on the cross where the benefits of that sacrifice are made present for the congregation. In a sermon ascribed to him (there are some who question its authenticity) Augustine follows this line of thought.

We must tell you the meaning of so great and godly a sacrament such an excellent and noble remedy, such a clean and ready sacrifice, which is offered now, not in one city on earth, Jerusalem, . . . but from the rising of the sun even to its setting . . . No longer is a bloody victim selected from the herds of cattle, . . . but the sacrifice of our times is the body and blood of the Priest Himself. . . Christ our Lord, who offered for us in His Passion what He received from us at His birth, was made the chief of priests forever, and gave us the sacrificial rite which you are witnessing, that of His body and blood.<sup>36</sup>

Here Augustine seems to be saying that the Eucharist is a true sacrifice of Christ's body and blood in and of itself and not only a commemoration of the all-sufficient sacrifice of the cross. This, however, militates against Augustine's understanding of the cross.

It must be said at the outset that for Augustine the one true, perfect and all-sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction is, of course, that once and for all offering of Himself which the Redeemer made on Calvary:

By his death, which is indeed the one and most real sacrifice offered up for us, he cleansed, abolished and extinguished whatever guilt there was by which the principalities and powers lawfully detained us to pay the penalty; and by his resurrection he called us whom he had predestined to new life, those whom he had called he justified, and those whom he had justified he glorified. (Romans 8:30)<sup>37</sup>

This is the sacrifice which all the sacrifices of the Old Testament foreshadowed, and it is a memorial of this sacrifice that Christians celebrate today in the Sacrament.<sup>38</sup> The Eucharist can only be spoken of as a sacrifice because of its relation to Christ's all-sufficient self-offering as propitiation for human sin.

It appears then that Augustine does not look upon the Eucharist as a sacrifice of Christ's body and blood in and of itself, but rather as a commemoration or a presentation of the sacrifice of the cross. Augustine says, "A visible sacrifice, therefore, is the sacrament, that is, the sacred sign of an invisible sacrifice. (*sacrificium ergo visibile invisibilis sacrificii sacramentum, id est sacrum signum est*)<sup>39</sup> The Supper, the visible sacrifice, is a sacred sign of the invisible sacrifice, the cross. It is this understanding of the relationship between Christ's sacrifice on the cross and the Supper which underlies this famous passage in Book 10 of the *City of God* which is one of the finest short statements of Augustine's thought in the whole of his writings.

Hence it is that the true Mediator, insofar as he took the form of a servant and was thus made the mediator between God and mankind, the man Christ Jesus [I Tim. 2:5], receives the sacrifice in the form of God [Phil. 2:6,7], in union with the Father, with whom he is one God. And yet in the form of a servant he preferred to be himself the sacrifice than to receive it, to prevent anyone from supposing that sacrifice, even in this circumstance, should be offered to any created being. Thus he is both the priest, himself making the offering, and the oblation. This is the reality, and he intended the daily sacrifice of the Church to be the sacramental symbol of this; for the Church, being the Body of which he is the Head, learns to offer herself

through him. (*Cuius rei sacramentum cotidianum esse voluit ecclesiae sacrificium, quae cum ipsius capitis corpus sit, se ipsam per ipsum discit offerre*). This is the true sacrifice, and the sacrifices of the saints in earlier times were many different symbols of it. This one sacrifice was prefigured by many rites, just as many words are used to refer to one thing, to emphasize a point without inducing boredom. This was the supreme sacrifice and all the false sacrifices yielded place to it.<sup>40</sup>

Augustine teaches that the Eucharist, the daily sacrifice of the church, is a sacrament of the reality, the sacrifice of the cross. It is not the sacrifice itself, but a presentation of the sacrifice where all the blessings of the cross are made present in the church through Christ's body and blood.

## *2. The Ecclesial Concept of Eucharistic Sacrifice*

Augustine's favorite eucharistic theme is incorporation into the body of Christ: "You are what you receive." He says, "So that there may be no division among you, eat that which binds you together so you may not appear to yourselves to be of little worth, drink your ransom. Just as this, when you eat and drink it, becomes part of you, so also you are changed into the body of Christ when you live in obedience and devotion."<sup>41</sup> Augustine teaches the newly baptized that as they were united with Christ and His body, the church, in Baptism so in the Eucharist they are strengthened and preserved in the unity by receiving His body and blood. This is preliminary to Augustine's principle concept of eucharistic sacrifice. Because the church becomes Christ's body by receiving His body born of Mary, His body, the church, is the sacrifice of the Eucharist. This ecclesial interpretation of eucharistic sacrifice is Augustine's distinctive contribution to eucharistic theology.

Augustine bases this ecclesial interpretation of eucharistic sacrifice on St. Paul's words in I Corinthians 10:17: "For we, being many, are one bread and one body; for we all partake of that one bread." The people of God become the body of Christ, His church, by receiving His body and blood in the Sacrament, thus being united with Him. God's people become members of the body of which Christ is the head. (I Corinthians 12:27) Augustine says, "If you received worthily, you are what you received."<sup>42</sup> The primary purpose and benefit of the Sacrament in Augustine's theology is unity. It is the Sacrament of unity for it unites God's people to Christ, their head, and to each other in His body.

Since the church is united with Christ, its head, in the Sacrament, it is offered up through Him in the eucharistic sacrifice. The sacrifice of His body born of Mary once and for all on the cross makes valid and pure the sin tainted sacrifice of His body, the church. Christ's redemptive sacrifice on the cross makes the offering of His church acceptable to the Father. This is Augustine's point when he writes, "Next, after the sanctification of God's sacrifice, for He willed that we ourselves should be His sacrifice, as was shown when first was presented the idea that we too are God's sacrifice, that is, it is a sign of the reality which we are -- after the sanctification of the divine sacrifice has been effected, we say the Lord's Prayer, etc."<sup>43</sup>

In the *City of God* (10:6), Augustine defines the true and perfect sacrifice. "Accordingly, a true sacrifice is every work which is done that we may be united to God in a holy fellowship, and which is referred to that final Good in which alone we can be truly blessed."<sup>44</sup> This comprehensive definition of sacrifice is typical of Augustine's thought. He sees it as an action directed to union with God which alone makes us truly blessed. There is no happiness or blessedness without God. That which makes one blessed is the final Good Himself. Furthermore, the only way one can be united with God is through the mediation of the God-man, Jesus Christ.

The Christian's whole life of sanctification is an offering to God as St. Paul says, "I beseech you therefore brethren by the mercies of God, that you present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God which is your reasonable service." (Romans 12:1) Augustine emphasizes that if

our body is a sacrifice to God which is an inferior servant or instrument, then how much more should our soul be a proper sacrifice to the Lord. These sacrifices are pleasing to God not because they have a value in themselves. Rather, these things are a sign of what God truly desires, a heart bruised and humbled in the sorrow of penitence.

The sacrifices of believers are valid only on the basis of the mediation of the God-man, Jesus Christ. Augustine, therefore, connects our sacrifice with Christ by way of the Eucharist which is a presentation of the sacrifice of the cross.

Since, therefore, true sacrifices are works of mercy to ourselves or our neighbors, done with reference to God; and since works of mercy have no other object than that we be freed from distress, and that, thereby, we become happy; and since there is no happiness apart from that good of which it is said, "It is good for me to cling to God" (Ps 73.28), it comes about, accordingly, that the entire redeemed City, that is to say, the congregation and society of saints, is offered to God as a manifold sacrifice through the Great Priest, who also offered Himself to God in His Passion on our behalf, that we might be the body of so great a Head, according to the form of a servant (Ph 2.7). For it was this form He offered, in this He was offered, because it is according to this that He is Mediator, in this He is the priest, in this the sacrifice.<sup>45</sup>

Augustine writes, "It comes about, accordingly, that the entire redeemed City, that is to say the congregation and society of saints is offered to God as a manifold sacrifice through the Great Priest." (*universale sacrificium offeratur Deo per sacerdotem magnum*) The interpretation of this statement hinges on the meaning of the phrase "through the Great Priest." The Latin preposition *per* can mean "through, by means of, for the sake of." This statement could simply mean that the Church's sacrifice, which is all that we are and all that we have, is acceptable to the Father for the sake of Christ's once and for all sacrifice on the cross. The Father accepts the sin tainted offering of the Church because of Christ's great sacrifice on the cross. The *per sacerdotem magnum* in itself really means no more than this.

However, one must also look at the wider context of this statement. The One, through whom the church is offered, is the one "who offered Himself to God in His passion on our behalf, that we might be the body of so great a Head according to the form of a servant." (*ut tanti capitis corpus essemus, secundum formam servi*) Here Augustine introduces the concept that the church is the body of Christ in the form of a servant. Christ won this great privilege for His people through His sacrifice on the cross. There He shed His blood for the church so that it could be washed clean from every stain and mark through water and the Word in Baptism. (Ephesians 5:27)

In the next paragraph of Book 10, 6, Augustine has more to say about the church as the body of Christ.

For as we have many members in one body, and all members do not have the same function, so we, though many, are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another, having gifts which differ according to the grace that is given to us" (Rm 12.3-6). This is the sacrifice of Christians: "We, though many, are one body in Christ" (1 Co 10.17), and this is the sacrifice which the church continually celebrates in the sacrament of the altar, known to the faithful, in which she teaches that she herself is offered in the offering she makes.<sup>46</sup>

Augustine quotes Romans 12 and I Corinthians 10 where St. Paul speaks of the church as the body of Christ, and then he equates this body of Christ with the sacrifice of the Eucharist. According to

this statement, the sacrifice of the Eucharist is Christ's body, the church.

This certainly enlarges on Augustine's early statement, "that the entire redeemed City, that is to say, the congregation and society of saints, is offered to God as a manifold sacrifice through the Great Priest." The *per sacerdotem magnum* means more than that the sacrifices of the church are acceptable to God for the sake of the redemptive work of the great High Priest. Remember that Augustine on the basis of Romans 5 sees all people seminally in the first Adam.<sup>47</sup> He also sees the church seminally in the second Adam, Christ Jesus, incorporated into Him through Baptism and the Eucharist. With this in mind the concept *per sacerdotem magnum* also seems to include the idea that the church, the body of which Christ is the head, is offered up through its head and together with its head to the Father. The Church in the form of a servant is offered up in the sacrifice of the Servant of Servants.

In Book 10 of the *City of God*, Augustine summarizes his interpretation of eucharistic sacrifice. The Eucharist is a sacrament or a commemoration of Christ's all-sufficient sacrifice on the cross where the benefits of the sacrifice are made present in the midst of the congregation through His body and blood.<sup>48</sup> However, his primary emphasis is that the sacrifice of the Eucharist is the body of Christ, the church. "This is the sacrifice of Christians: 'We, though many, are one body in Christ' (1 Co 10.17), and this is the sacrifice which the church continually celebrates in the sacrament of the altar."<sup>49</sup> By receiving Christ's one body in the Supper, the assembly is incorporated into Christ's body, the church. The church, the body of which Christ is the head, is a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable to God, on the basis of the all-sufficient sacrifice of Christ's body, born of Mary. All that the church is, and all that it has, is offered up through its head, and together with its head to the Father. "This is the sacrifice of Christians."

### *3. The Sacrifice and Those Who Died in the Lord*

Because the whole church is united with Christ, its Head, and offered up to the Father in the Eucharist, for Augustine the sacrifice is beneficial not only for the living, the church militant, but also for the faithful departed. In the Early Church, the Eucharist offered for the dead was stressed in Africa, in particular. As his mother Monica was dying, she was not concerned about where she would be buried, but only that Augustine would remember her at the Lord's altar<sup>50</sup>, and at Augustine's own death, the holy sacrifice was offered and he was buried.<sup>51</sup> Augustine continually teaches that the sacrifice of the Eucharist is a great benefit to the faithful departed. In fact, the confidence in the eucharistic sacrifice was so great in Africa that it was necessary to forbid the practice of putting the Sacrament on the lips of the departed at burial, because the Lord said, "Take and eat", but a corpse could not take and eat.<sup>52</sup>

#### *G. The Proper Preparation for the Lord's Supper*

For Augustine, as for all the early fathers, St. Paul's admonition concerning unworthy participation in the Sacrament is an extremely serious matter. He urges his flock to approach the Lord's altar with fear and trembling. Those in a state of impenitence receive the Lord's body and blood, but not the grace of the Sacrament.<sup>53</sup> Augustine writes concerning St. Paul's warning in I Corinthians 11:27:

Great mysteries are these, very great indeed! Would you like to know what importance is assigned to them? The Apostle says: "Whosoever eats the body of Christ or drinks of the cup of the Lord unworthily shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord" (1 Co 11.27). What is it to receive unworthily? To receive in contempt, to receive in mockery. Let it not seem common to you because you can see it. What you see is transitory, but the invisible reality signified does not pass

away, but abides.<sup>54</sup>

Not only did immorality exclude one from the Lord's table, but also false doctrine. Augustine declares, "But you receive worthily when you are on your guard against the leaven of false doctrine, so that you may be the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth. (1 Co 5.8)"<sup>55</sup> The Sacrament is the sign of the unity of church and more than that, it makes that unity. Because this is the case, the Sacrament may be received only with those who confess the doctrines of the faith. This truth Augustine put into practice in his dealings with the Donatists. He was continually dialoging with them hoping to reach agreement in doctrine and faith, but he did not commune with them because they were not one in the faith.

The unworthy guest does not merely receive bread and wine. He indeed receives the body and blood of the Lord, but it is to his harm rather than to his benefit.

For just as Judas, to whom the Lord gave the morsel, not by receiving an evil thing, but by receiving it evilly, provided an opportunity in himself for the Devil (Jn 13.26-27), so also whoever receives the Lord's sacrament unworthily (1 Co 11.27) does not bring it about, because he himself is evil, that it is evil, or, because he did not receive it unto salvation, that he has received nothing. For it will be the body of the Lord and the blood of the Lord nonetheless, even to those to whom the Apostle said "He who eats and drinks unworthily, eats and drinks condemnation for himself" (1 Co 11.29). Therefore, let heretics seek in the catholic church not what they have, but what they do not have, that is, the end of the commandment, without which many holy things may be held, but they cannot be of profit.<sup>56</sup>

#### *H. The Blessings of the Lord's Supper*

##### *1. The Sacrament as the Forgiveness of Sins*

The blessings received in the Supper are so marvelous and manifold that they cause Augustine to refer to the Sacrament as "Life". He argues the necessity of Baptism and the Eucharist for children because here they receive forgiveness, life, and salvation. This he maintains in opposition to the Pelagian doctrine which denied the transmission of original sin and, therefore, the child's need for forgiveness of sins.

Quite rightly do the Punic Christians call baptism nothing other than "Salvation," and the sacrament of the body of Christ nothing other than "Life." Why do they do so except, as I think, because of an ancient and apostolic tradition, on the basis of which they hold it to be an inherent principle of the church of Christ that without baptism and the sharing of the Lord's Table, a man is able to arrive neither to the Kingdom of God nor to salvation and eternal life? Scripture also bears witness to this, according to what we have already said. For what else are those who call baptism "Salvation" maintaining, except what is written: "He has saved us through the bath of regeneration" (Tit 3.5), and what Peter says: "Thus has baptism saved you also, by a like pattern" (1 P 3.21)? In addition, what are they maintaining who call the sacrament of the Lord's Table "Life," except the statements: "I am the living bread who have come down from heaven" (Jn 6.52), and "The bread which I shall give is my flesh for the life of the world" (Jn 6.51), and "Unless you eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood, you will not have life in you" (Jn 6.53)? If, then, as so many and such weighty divine testimonies agree, one can hope

neither for salvation nor for eternal life without baptism and the body and blood of the Lord, in vain are these promised to children without them. Furthermore, if it is sin alone which separates man from salvation and eternal life, then it is the guilt of sin which is forgiven children through these sacraments. It is written that no one is free of this guilt, "not even if his life be of one day's duration" (Jb 14.5). On this account, there is also the passage in the Psalms: "For in sin was I conceived, and in sin did my mother nurture me in the womb" (Ps 50.7), for either this is said by human nature in general, or, if David said it as applying to his own person, he is not speaking of fornication, for he was born of lawful wedlock. And so, let us have no doubt that also for the baptizing of infants that blood was shed which, before it was shed, was given and handed on in a sacrament, in such a way that it could be said: "This is my blood, which shall be shed for many for the forgiveness of sins" (Mt 26.28).<sup>57</sup>

The person who receives the Eucharist receives the forgiveness of sins because here is distributed the blood which was shed for the remission of sins. Elsewhere Augustine writes, "The bread which you see on the altar sanctified by God's word, is the body of Christ. The cup or rather, its contents sanctified by God's Word, is the blood of Christ. Through these Christ our Lord wished to bequeath His body and His blood which He shed for us for the forgiveness of sins."<sup>58</sup> The communicant is offered the very ransom money that delivered him from the domination of sin and obtained life for all people. Thus, the Sacrament is designated "Life". Augustine connects the Eucharist to John 6 as Ambrose did and indicates that the Eucharist is "Life" since in it one partakes in the life-giving flesh and blood of the Son of Man. The faith-life begun in the rebirth of Baptism is maintained and strengthened with the Bread of Life.

Augustine, a man who felt deeply his great sin and recognized his need for a sacrificial victim, meditates on the sacrifice of the cross and its connection with the Holy Eucharist as he prays in his *Confessions*:

How greatly have you loved us, good Father, who sparest not Thine only Son, but deliverest Him up for us ungodly! How you have loved us . . . for us He was to you both victor and victim, and victor because victim: for us He was to you both priest and sacrifice, and priest because sacrifice: and He made us sons to you instead of slaves by being born of you and by becoming your slave. With reason, then, my hope in Him is strong, that Thou wilt heal all my infirmities by Him who sitteth at Thy right hand and maketh intercession for us; otherwise I should despair. For many and great are my infirmities, many they are and great; but your medicine has more power still. We might have thought that your Word was far from any union with man, and we might have despaired, unless it had been made flesh and dwelt among us. . . . See, Lord, I cast my care upon Thee, that I may live and consider wondrous things out of Thy law. You know my unskillfulness and my weakness; teach me and heal me. He, your only Son, in Whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge, has redeemed me with His blood. Let not the proud speak evil of me, for my thoughts are on the price of my redemption; I eat it and drink it and give it to others to eat and drink, and, being poor myself, I desire to be satisfied by it among those that eat and are satisfied, and they shall praise the Lord who seek Him.<sup>59</sup>

Here Augustine asserts that he eats the price of his redemption. Jesus' body and blood offered on the cross are the one all-sufficient sacrifice for sin, the price of redemption for all human iniquity. By receiving them in the Supper Augustine and all Christians are satisfied, for within them they

have the very ransom money for sin, the very thing that saved them from hell's destruction. What a treasure that a Christian can say, "I eat the price of my salvation, I drink it."

## 2. *The Sacrament as Life-Giving Nourishment and Salvation*

The Holy Supper is the nourishment and food which sustains the Christian in this life and prepares him for the next life.

The sacrament of this thing, namely, of the unity of the body and blood of Christ, is prepared on the Lord's Table in some places daily, in some places at certain intervals of days, and from the Lord's table it is taken, by some to life, by some to destruction: but the thing itself of which it is the sacrament is for every man to life. . . . we are made better by participation of the Son, through the unity of His body and blood which thing that eating and drinking signifies. We live then by Him, by eating Him; this is, by receiving Himself as the eternal life, which we did not have from ourselves.<sup>60</sup>

And so this food is likewise something new. Until now, as you see, it is simply bread and wine. But once the Consecration takes place, this bread will be the body of Christ and this wine will be the blood of Christ. It happens in the name of Christ and by the grace of Christ, and even though it looks like it was before, yet its worth is not what it was before. Had you eaten thereof before [the Consecration], it would have supplied food to the stomach, but now when you partake, it gives nourishment to the soul.<sup>61</sup>

In these selections, Augustine points out that the Eucharist is the nourishment for the Christian's faith-life. As our bodies need food, so our spiritual life needs sustenance or it will wither and die. The nourishment that is needed is to be found in the Sacrament of the Lord's body and blood. This Sacrament, therefore, is the food for the way in this life and the pledge and assurance of eternal salvation.

There are times in Augustine's writings when he appears to come close to the deification theme of the Eastern Church. In a Christmas sermon he states, "He who was God became Man in His effort to make godlike those who were men (*Deos facturus qui homines erant, homo factus est qui Deus erat*, literally: To make those gods who were men, He was made man who is God); without relinquishing what He was, He desired to become what He had made. He Himself fashioned what He would become, in that He added man's nature to God without losing God's nature in man."<sup>62</sup> The doctrine of deification in Augustine is for the most part equivalent to the New Testament idea of sonship by adoption through faith. This does not mean that human nature is changed in its essence. It remains something created, but the human nature is raised to a new relationship with the Creator by adoption. This deification process takes place within the communion of the church, and therefore is an ecclesial process. The Christian is incorporated into Christ's body in Baptism and nourished and sustained in that body through the Eucharist. It is this nourishing and deification or theosis through the Eucharist which Augustine seems to have in mind when he put these words on the lips of our Lord in the *Confessions*: "I am the food of the grown men. Grow and you shall feed upon me. And you will not, as will the food of the body, change me into yourself, but you will be changed into me."<sup>63</sup>

In a sermon for the Easter Season, Augustine relates the Eucharist to the account of the Emmaus disciples. (Luke 24) "Nevertheless my dearly beloved remember how the Lord Jesus wished those whose 'eyes were held, that they should not recognize him', to acknowledge Him in the breaking of bread. (The faithful understand what I am saying; they know Christ in the

breaking of bread. For not all bread, but only that which receives the blessing of Christ becomes the Body of Christ.)"<sup>64</sup> As the Lord made Himself known to the Emmaus disciples in the breaking of bread so He manifests Himself to us in the breaking of bread. In the Eucharist the arisen Lord is present for His people with all His joy and blessings.

### *3. The Sacrament as the Bond of Unity*

The primary purpose and benefit of the Sacrament in Augustine's theology is unity. This is the great contribution of the Bishop of Hippo to the dogma of the Eucharist. "O sacrament of unity, O bond of charity!" exclaims Augustine as he considers that the real purpose of the sacrament is to further and complete the bond existing between Christ and His Church, between Him and the individual, and between all members in loving reciprocity."<sup>65</sup> It is the Sacrament of unity because it unites God's people to Christ, their head and to each other in His body, the church. Augustine says, "If you received worthily, you are what you received."<sup>66</sup> "Because you have life through Him you will be one body with Him, for this sacrament extends the body of Christ, and by it you are made inseparable from Him."<sup>67</sup> As we were united with Christ and His body, the church, in Baptism, so in the Eucharist we are strengthened and preserved in that unity by receiving His body and blood. In this Sacrament the Lord comes to the believer with His body and blood and unites him with Himself. He remains with us and we with Him ever undivided both here in time and forever in eternity. The Sacrament then is an intimate union with the gracious Savior who brings all the blessings of salvation.

This incorporation into Christ which the Lord's Supper grants, constitutes at the same time a true communion among all members of His body. One cannot be united with Christ without also at the same time existing in communion with all the other members of His body. As He comes into us with His flesh and blood uniting us with Himself, so He comes into all the other communicants drawing us together as His church. Receiving His one body in the Sacrament, we become His one body, the church.

Augustine illustrates this unity with Christ and the incorporation into His body which occurs in the Eucharist, building on St. Paul's words, "For we, being many, are one bread and one body; for we all partake of the one bread." (I Corinthians 10:17) He applies St. Paul's concept of the church being one bread and compares Christians to seeds of grain being milled. "Remember that bread is not made from one grain, but from many. When you were exorcised you were, after a fashion, milled. When you were baptized you were moistened. When you received the fire of the Holy Spirit you were baked. Be what you see, and receive what you are."<sup>68</sup>

John 21:12-19 is given a eucharistic interpretation by Augustine to again illustrate that the Supper is a Sacrament of unity. In the text Jesus urges His disciples, "Come and dine." (John 21:12) The fish that was roasting on the fire as the disciples came ashore is Christ Himself who suffered on the cross. The fish the disciples brought to add to the meal symbolize the disciples and all Christians who become part of the eucharistic meal by being united with Christ's body in the Sacrament. "With Him is incorporated the church, in order to participate in everlasting blessedness. For this reason it is said, 'Bring of the fish which ye have now caught,' that all of us who cherish this hope may know that we ourselves... partake in this great sacrament, and are associated in the same blessedness."<sup>69</sup>

On that first Good Friday when the Roman soldiers came to break the legs of those crucified to hasten their death, they found that Jesus was already dead. Therefore, they did not break His bones. "But one of the soldiers pierced His side with a spear, and immediately blood and water came out." (John 19:34) This statement indicates that Jesus truly died a natural human death, but the fathers found far more significance in this statement. They understood this passage in the light of the words of Zechariah, the Prophet, "And I will pour on the house of David and on the inhabitants of Jerusalem the Spirit of grace and supplication; then they will look on Me whom

they have pierced; they will mourn for Him as one mourns for his only son, and grieve for Him as one grieves for a first born. (12:10) . . . In that day a fountain shall be opened for the house of David and for the inhabitants of Jerusalem, for sin and for uncleanness." (13:1) The God-man Jesus Christ, the Almighty Himself, was pierced on the cross for our salvation. The blood and water from His wounded side has provided that wonderful cleansing fountain for sin and uncleanness of which Zechariah speaks. It can wash away each stain and mark, each spot and wrinkle. His holy precious blood is the source of redemption for the whole world. (I John 1:7, 2:2)

Because John's words in 19:34 were considered to be a fulfillment of Zachariah's prophecy concerning the fountain, the fathers interpreted the water and the blood to be the water of Baptism and the blood of the Lord's Supper which bring to us all the blessings of the cross. From the cross where salvation was accomplished there flows the two Sacraments through which the treasure of the cross is brought to us. From the Savior's wounds come the Sacraments by means of which the church is formed.

This same interpretation of John 19:34 is found in Augustine. Augustine, however, added another dimension to the imagery. As the first Adam's bride was taken out of his side while he slept, so the Second Adam's bride, the church, was formed by the Sacraments flowing from His side as He slept in death.

Then came the soldiers, and brake the legs of the first, and of the other who was crucified with Him. But when they came to Jesus, and saw that He was dead already, they brake not His legs: but one of the soldiers with a spear laid open His side, and forthwith came thereout blood and water. A suggestive word was made use of by the evangelist, in not saying pierced, or wounded His side, or anything else, but "opened"; that thereby, in a sense, the gate of life might be thrown open, from whence have flowed forth the sacraments of the Church, without which there is no entrance to the life which is the true life. That blood was shed for the remission of sins; that water it is that makes up the health-giving cup, and supplies at once the laver of baptism and water for drinking. This was announced beforehand, when Noah was commanded to make a door in the side of the ark, whereby the animals might enter which were not destined to perish in the flood, and by which the Church was prefigured. Because of this, the first woman was formed from the side of the man when asleep, and was called Life, and the mother of all living. Truly it pointed to a great good, prior to the great evil of the transgression (in the guise of one thus lying asleep). This second Adam bowed His head and fell asleep on the cross, that a spouse might be formed for Him from that which flowed from the sleeper's side. O death, whereby the dead are raised anew to life! What can be purer than such blood? What more health-giving than such a wound?<sup>70</sup>

Because Augustine considers the Eucharist to be such a great benefit and blessing for the life of the Christian, he regards it as part of the "daily bread" for which the Christian prays in the Lord's Prayer.

Of course, this request for daily bread is to be understood in two ways: for the necessity of fleshly sustenance, and for the necessity of spiritual nourishment. There is need of fleshly food for our daily sustenance, without which we cannot live. There is sustenance, and shelter too, but we understand all of that from the single aspect. When we ask for bread, we include everything. The faithful [i.e. baptized Christians] know also a spiritual nourishment, which you too will come to know and receive from the altar of God. That too will be your daily bread, quite

necessary for this present life.<sup>71</sup>

The Eucharist is necessary for this life since it is the nourishment and sustenance for both the body and soul of the Christian. Thus, it is indeed the “daily bread” of the church. Following this logic, that the Sacrament is the “daily bread” of the church, Augustine urges that the Eucharist be received daily.<sup>72</sup> For Augustine the Blessed Sacrament is indeed a great treasure for body and soul.

## II. CHEMNITZ AND THE LORD'S SUPPER

### A. *The Life of Martin Chemnitz (1522–1586), the Superintendent of Braunschweig*

#### 1. *Chemnitz' Early Life.*

*Si Martinus non fuisset, Martinus vix stetisset*

The name Martin Chemnitz is one largely buried in antiquity. With the exception of a few Lutherans who remember him in connection with the composition of the *Formula of Concord* (1577), Chemnitz is one of history's forgotten men. Yet, he was the leading light in Lutheranism after Luther, so much so that the seventeenth century had this saying: "If the second Martin (Chemnitz) had not come, the first Martin (Luther) would scarcely have stood." (*Si Martinus non fuisset, Martinus vix stetisset*) This is not to say that he was the only figure of any importance in the generation following Luther. But, of the sixteenth century Lutheran theologians (Andreae, Selnecker, Chytraeus, and others) who transmitted the treasures of the Lutheran Reformation to succeeding generations, Chemnitz was the greatest. He, more than any other, was the bridge and link between Luther and third generation Lutherans, the dogmaticians of the seventeenth century. Chemnitz was not a creative spirit, but he put the theological inheritance which he received from Luther and Melanchthon into a logical and systematic form for future generations.

Martin Chemnitz was born November 9, 1522 in Treuenbrietzen, Germany, a small town located fifteen miles northeast of Wittenberg. His father, Paul, was a wool merchant who died when Martin was eleven years old. The local schoolmaster, Laurentius Barthold, recognized him as a lad with superior gifts and persuaded his mother to send him to Latin school in Wittenberg. Because of financial difficulties, he had to discontinue his education for a time, but later with the help of two prominent citizens of Magdeburg, he continued his studies in the same city from 1539 to 1542. After some additional studies at the University of Frankfurt on the Oder, Chemnitz returned to Wittenburg in 1545. There he studied at the feet of Melanchthon and established a longtime friendship with him. As a bonus he heard Luther lecture and preach, but by his own admission he "did not hear him with due attention then."<sup>1</sup> It was later that he came to treasure the seminal writings of Martin Luther.

#### 2. *Chemnitz the Librarian at Koenigsberg*

When the Smalcald War disrupted the University of Wittenberg temporarily, Chemnitz in 1547 sought the more peaceful atmosphere far to the north at Koenigsberg in East Prussia. As the rector of the city's Kneiphof school, he received his master's degree in 1548 at the newly established University of Koenigsberg. Later he attained the position of librarian at the ducal library of Koenigsberg. Here he had the opportunity to do a considerable amount of study which prepared him for his future as one of the greatest theologians of the age. Chemnitz was very much a self-taught doctor of the church.

With the outbreak of the Osiandrian controversy in Koenigsberg, Chemnitz found himself at odds with Duke Albert of Prussia. Andrew Osiander, the Duke's favorite, advocated a doctrine of justification which stated that the sinner is justified, not by imputed, but by essential righteousness. God does not declare the sinner just, but makes him just; does not impute Christ's obedience and righteousness to the sinner, but has Christ Himself dwell in the sinner for his justification. This view was sharply resisted by Chemnitz and his friend Moerlin. The Duke did not dismiss Chemnitz because he needed his expertise as an astrologer. Chemnitz, however, decided himself not to remain in the hostile atmosphere of Prussia, especially since his friend

Joachim Moerlin had been banished by the Duke.

### 3. Chemnitz the Superintendent

After Moerlin's flight from East Prussia he was called as superintendent at Braunschweig. At his urging, Chemnitz accepted the duties of preacher and coadjutor in Braunschweig. On November 25, 1554 John Bugenhagen, the original developer of the Reformation in Braunschweig, ordained Chemnitz into the holy ministry. In 1555 he married Anna Jaeger, the daughter of a licensed jurist, and to this union ten children were born.

In 1561 Chemnitz became involved in the Hardenberg case. Hardenberg was a preacher at the cathedral in Bremen, where he held to views concerning the Lord's Supper that were considered to be Calvinistic. At a meeting held in Braunschweig, Hardenberg was declared to be a despiser of the *Augsburg Confession* and a Sacramentarian. That same year Chemnitz' first theological publication appeared, a lengthy treatise on the Lord's Supper in reaction to Hardenberg. What Chemnitz found particularly disturbing was the dishonesty in the word-games played by the Crypto-Calvinists. Rather than being straightforward as the Zwinglians had been, the Crypto-Calvinists were concealing their error with deceptive words. Chemnitz emphasized the interpretation of the Words of Institution and the importance of distinguishing between questions having to do with the substance and essence of the Supper, and those dealing only with its power and effect. The Calvinists were more interested in the later, and this he found to be the great weakness in their approach.<sup>2</sup>

In 1567 and 1568 Chemnitz reaped the fruits of his long years of self-preparation, for in 1567 he was appointed superintendent of Braunschweig when Moerlin became bishop of Koenigsberg, and the following year he took his doctorate in theology at the University of Rostock. He faithfully served the church in Braunschweig as superintendent. An important vehicle in developing the confessional consciousness of both the laity and the clergy was the publication in 1569 of his *Enchiridion* which was used in the preparation of the clergy for examinations by the superintendent and for the examination of candidates for ordination.

### 4. Chemnitz the Theologian and Concordist

A short writing by Chemnitz against the new Jesuit order brought him into conflict first with Johannes Alber of Cologne, and then with a more formidable foe, Jacob Payva de Andrada. In answer to Andrada and his defense of the Council of Trent, Chemnitz analyzed the Council in four books, demonstrating with exhaustive evidence from Scripture and from the ancient teachers of the church, where the Council of Trent had departed from the teaching of Scripture. In his *Examen* Chemnitz, following Luther, helped the church to see the difference between justification itself and the fruits of justification. He distinguished clearly between the righteousness which is ours by imputation unto faith, i.e., forensic righteousness and the righteousness that is worked in us gradually as a result of faith, that is, that which belongs to sanctification. Werner Elert writes, "As Martin Chemnitz showed in his critique of the Trent dogma, this concept made it impossible to bridge the opposition."<sup>3</sup> There was an irreconcilable difference between the Lutherans and Rome concerning the central article of the faith. The first volume of the *Examen* which appeared in 1565 covered the chief articles of the Christian faith. In the remaining three volumes he treated the Sacraments and the abuses in the Roman Church which the Council of Trent sought to defend.

Chemnitz is known predominantly for the role which he played during the dissension that arose after Luther's death. After Luther's death, Melancthon was looked upon as the leading theologian in the Lutheran Church, but he was unable to give strong direction. Melancthon did not have leadership qualities. He tended to vacillate on important doctrinal issues. As a result of this, opposing parties like the Gnesio-Lutherans, who believed they were upholding Luther's

doctrine, and the Philippists, who accepted Melancthon's compromises, arose in the Lutheran Church. It was Chemnitz, more than anyone else, who was the guiding force behind the *Formula of Concord* which settled these doctrinal controversies. He was instrumental in putting together this document which was signed by three electors, twenty dukes and princes, many lesser nobles, thirty-five imperial cities, and about 8,000 pastors and teachers. Chemnitz was irenic, yet firm. He did not engage in name calling but focused on the issues, and as a result brought concord out of dissension.

Chemnitz was a prolific writer. Besides the *Formula*, the *Examen*, and the *Enchiridion*, Chemnitz wrote the *De Duabus Naturis*, a learned study of the two natures in Christ; the *Loci Theologici*, lectures on the *Loci Communes of Melancthon*; the *De Coena Domini*, his main work on the Lord's Supper; the *Harmonia Evangelica*, a harmony of the four Gospels; the *Postilla*, his sermons; and the *Apologia*, a defense of the *Formula of Concord* which he authored together with Kirchner and Selnecker.

Throughout his life Chemnitz enjoyed excellent health, which allowed him to do an amazing amount of scholarly work. But by 1582, though only sixty years old, he suffered from what we would today call "burn-out." In 1584 he resigned from his office as superintendent. On April 6, 1586 he died a faithful confessor of the church.

### *B. The Biblical Foundation of the Lord's Supper*

#### *1. The Words of Institution are the Proper Foundation for the Supper*

Chemnitz' doctrine of the Lord's Supper has its foundation in the Words of Institution. Just as all dogmas of the church have their foundation in definite passages of Scripture where they are clearly treated and explained (*sedes doctrinae*), so the proper foundation for the doctrine of the Supper is to be found in the *Verba*. Chemnitz chides all those who want to find a basis for the Sacrament outside the Words of Institution or who refuse to make the *Verba* normative in the study of the Supper. He agrees with Cyprian who says concerning the Sacrament, "We ought not to give heed to what someone before us thought should be done, but to what He, who is before all, did first."<sup>4</sup>

Because the Words of Institution are so important for Chemnitz, he does a careful exegesis of each account of the institution. Chemnitz sees the Lord's Supper in the context of the Passover meal.<sup>5</sup> As our Lord and His disciples gathered that first Maundy Thursday evening, they came together to celebrate no ordinary meal. This was the Passover, the most solemn meal for God's Old Testament people. This meal not only pointed back to God's deliverance in Egypt through the blood of the Passover lamb, but it also pointed forward to the blood of the true Lamb of God who would redeem all men on the cross. In this meal where Old Testament believers ate the flesh of the Passover lamb which was to picture for them the true Lamb of God who would take away the sins of the world, Jesus, the very Lamb of God, gave New Testament believers not only a picture of His flesh and blood with bread and wine, but He gave them His true body and blood, therein He bestowed upon them all the blessings of the cross.

According to Chemnitz, Jesus took ordinary, common bread from the table for His institution.<sup>6</sup> Therefore unleavened bread was used, for only unleavened bread was allowed in the Passover. Jesus took bread and gave thanks or blessed it. Both the giving thanks and the blessing refer to the same act of our Lord. Chemnitz writes concerning this blessing:

Mark uses the word "to bless" (εὐλογεῖν) because it points to the special power of the divine Word, as in the account of the miracle of five loaves which were multiplied... Therefore, because the bread of the Supper received this designation from God by the divine power of the Word of Christ whereby it is the body of

Christ and the wine is the blood of Christ, Mark uses the word "to bless" in order to show that it is the same power and has the same meaning in this passage as does the word 'to thank' (εὐχαριστεῖν).<sup>7</sup>

After our Lord blessed the bread, He broke it. (ἐκλασεν) This breaking was of practical necessity because of the size of the loaves. Chemnitz sees no liturgical or spiritual significance in the breaking of the bread. The loaves had to be broken into fragments to be eaten, even as one would slice a loaf of bread today. The breaking was for the purpose of distribution. In fact, the breaking may be synonymous with the distribution as the word *shabar* is sometimes used in Hebrew.<sup>8</sup> This blessed and broken bread Jesus gave to His disciples saying, "Take, eat, this is my body which is given for you." The demonstrative pronoun "this" (τούτο) according to Chemnitz, points out what is distributed, received, and eaten in the Lord's Supper, contrary to Carlstadt who said that "this" refers not to the bread our Lord had in His hand, but to His body seated at the table. The word "is" (ἐστιν) can be understood in no other way than "is." It cannot mean "This is a picture of My body" nor "This only represents My body." Rather, it means "This is My body." Likewise, there is no figure in the word "body." (σῶμα) It is His natural body born of Mary that would die on the cross and rise again.<sup>9</sup> In summary Chemnitz writes concerning the bread words of our Lord:

Moreover, concerning that bread which becomes the Eucharist or the blessing in the Lord's Supper and is distributed, received, and eaten, if the question is asked what it is, the Son of God has affirmed with a clear declaration that it is His body... Therefore it is not merely bread which after the giving of thanks is distributed to those who eat the Lord's Supper and is received orally, but at the same time the body of Christ is distributed and received to be eaten.<sup>10</sup>

The Words of Institution continue: "In the same way also, the cup after supper." The words "after supper" indicate, according to Chemnitz, that the Lord Jesus instituted His New Testament meal of salvation after they had completed the Passover meal with its paschal lamb.<sup>11</sup> Jesus took the third cup of the Passover, which was a cup of wine, for only wine was used in the Passover. He blessed it even as He had blessed the bread and gave it to them saying, "This is the new testament (covenant, διαθήκη) in My blood which is shed for many for the forgiveness of sins." Chemnitz states that these words of explanation concerning the cup, which is Christ's true blood, allude to the ratification of the first covenant in Exodus 24. As the old covenant was sealed by animal blood sprinkled on the people picturing the blood of Christ, so the new covenant is sealed by the very blood of Christ through which we receive all the blessings of salvation. Real blood ratified the old covenant and the people were given that real blood in testimony of the fact that they received the blessing of the sacrifice. Likewise real blood ratified the new covenant and God's people are still given that real blood of the true Lamb of God so that they are certain that the benefits of Christ's redemptive sacrifice apply to them.<sup>12</sup> The Words of Institution summarize the blessings of the Sacrament with the phrase "for the forgiveness of sins" which indicates that the whole treasure house of salvation is offered in the Supper as Chemnitz points out in the *Examen*:

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)<sup>13</sup>

Jesus concluded His institution with the command, "Do this, as often as you drink it in

remembrance of Me." A similar command had already been given concerning His body. These words explain that this institution was not meant only as a one-time occurrence in the past. It is to be repeated until Christ comes again in glory. (I Corinthians 11:26) Each time Christians celebrate this Supper they bring Christ's great sacrifice into remembrance and receive the treasure of that sacrifice, the forgiveness of sins, life and salvation.

When Christ said, "Do this in remembrance of Me," He commanded Christians to continue this institution. What is necessary for a valid Lord's Supper celebration? Jesus said, "Do this," do what I have done. One is to take bread and wine, bless them with Christ's almighty Words of consecration "This is My body, This is My blood" which effects the presence, and distribute His true body and blood.

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 I Cor. 10:16.<sup>14</sup>

"This Do" includes the entire action of the Sacrament: consecration, distribution and reception.<sup>15</sup>

### *2. The Words of Institution are Christ's Last Will and Testament*

The fact that the *Verba* are Christ's last will and testament is of extreme importance to Chemnitz because this indicates that these words must be interpreted literally.

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... Now, because the Son of God in His last will and testament has not permitted His heirs the liberty of believing or doing whatever seems good to them, but has willed that we believe what He has spoken in His words of institution and do what He has commanded, therefore 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 benefit of eternal happiness conveyed to us by His will or our 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.<sup>16</sup>

If the words of a human will cannot be changed or modified but must be taken literally, how much more shouldn't the last will and testament of God's Son be followed carefully and understood literally?

The fact that Christ's last will and testament is to be taken literally is used by Chemnitz as he contends with his adversaries on both sides of the issue of the Lord's Supper. He opposes the Sacramentarians who refuse to take the *Verba* literally saying that the bread only represents the Lord's body. He takes the same position over against the Roman Church when it argues that Christ's body and blood are present apart from the divinely instituted use or action. Also, because the Sacrament is the last will and testament of Christ, it is a gift or inheritance for God's people and not a sacrifice of Christ's body and blood offered to the Father in the Supper.

### *3. Other Scriptural Testimony*

While the biblical foundation for the Sacrament is to be found in the Words of Institution as they are recorded by the holy Evangelists Matthew, Mark, Luke, and St. Paul the Apostle, for Chemnitz another portion of Scripture which is important in this study is I Corinthians 10:16-17: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? For we, being many, are one bread and one body for we all partake of the one bread." St. Paul says that the cup and the bread are communion in the body and blood of Christ. Chemnitz understands the word "communion" (κοινωνία) to mean a sharing in, a participation in, or a partaking of Christ's body and blood.<sup>17</sup> It is the very same body which came forth from the Virgin Mary's womb and died on the cross, the very same blood with which He washed away the sins of the world.

When St. Paul speaks of "the cup of blessing which we bless" (τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας ὃ εὐλογοῦμεν) "he is referring to and expressing the words in the institution: 'He took bread and likewise the cup and blessed it or gave thanks.'"<sup>18</sup> This cup of Christ's institution is a cup which the church is to bless. It is Christ's commanded blessing which causes Jesus' body and blood to be present. Since the Lord has commanded that the bread and wine be blessed in order to have a valid Sacrament, what is the blessing that the Lord desired His church to use? In close proximity to this Scripture where St. Paul particularly asserts that Christ's followers bless, he also gives the church a word of the Lord in liturgical form concerning the Lord's Supper, "For I received from the Lord that which I also delivered to you, that the Lord Jesus in the night in which He was betrayed, etc." (I Corinthians 11:23) These words which Christ gave to St. Paul He wanted delivered to the church for the celebration of the Supper as Chemnitz confesses with the other writers of the *Formula of Concord*, which says, "... 'The cup of blessing which we bless' which happens precisely through the repetition and recitation of the words of institution."<sup>19</sup>

According to Chemnitz this text from I Corinthians 10 speaks not only of the blessing of the Supper, but also of the other commanded actions of the imperative "Do this" in the Words of Institution. "For these words in the institution refer both to the distribution and reception, which Paul in this passage covers with the words 'breaking' and 'communion.'"<sup>20</sup> All three parts of the sacramental action (consecration, distribution, reception) must occur to have a valid Sacrament.

Another section of Scripture often referred to in the study of the Lord's Supper is John 6. The Sacramentarians of Chemnitz' day held that the Words of Institution must be interpreted in the light of John 6. Since the eating of John 6 refers to spiritual eating by faith and John 6:63 indicates that "the flesh profits nothing," the Sacramentarians maintained that the only eating of Christ's body in the Lord's Supper was a spiritual eating and not a sacramental eating with the mouth.

In response to this argument, Chemnitz agrees that John 6 refers to spiritual eating, but as a result of this he holds that it does not specifically speak to the Lord's Supper. The eating and drinking in John 6 refer to the eating and drinking which a believer does by faith through the means of grace, receiving all the blessings of Christ's body and blood offered up for salvation.<sup>21</sup> John 6 does not specifically apply to the Lord's Supper because here the eating and drinking are figurative, while in the Words of Institution the eating and drinking are literal. If John 6 is to interpret the *Verba* implying that the eating and drinking of Christ's body and blood is figurative, then the eating and drinking of the bread and wine can also be figurative and the whole Dominical directive is abrogated.<sup>22</sup> The second reason that Chemnitz rejects this argument of the Sacramentarians is that the sermon recorded in John 6 occurred a year before the institution of the Supper. Therefore, the sermon in John 6 cannot apply to the dogma of the Sacrament.<sup>23</sup> The third and most important reason Chemnitz rejects this argument is because the eating in John 6 always results in salvation (John 6:51), while in the Lord's Supper many eat judgment to themselves.<sup>24</sup>

At the same time, Chemnitz maintains that there is a definite connection between the Words of Institution and John 6. John 6 speaks of the spiritual eating that is necessary for worthy participation in the Holy Supper. All communicants, both the worthy and unworthy, eat

sacramentally with the mouth the very body and blood of Christ born of the Virgin, but only those who eat spiritually through true repentance and faith receive all the wonderful blessings offered through that body and blood. Thus, John 6 applies to worthy participation in the Sacrament, and in this sense speaks to the Supper.<sup>25</sup> In summary, Chemnitz confesses with the other writers of the *Formula* concerning these two kinds of eating and the connection between John 6 and the Words of Institution:

There is therefore a twofold eating of the flesh of Christ. The one is spiritual, of which Christ speaks chiefly in John 6:48-58. This occurs, in no other way than with the spirit and faith, in the preaching and contemplation of the Gospel as well as in the Lord's Supper. It is intrinsically useful, salutary, and necessary to salvation for all Christians at all times. Without this spiritual participation, even the sacramental or oral eating in the Supper is not only not salutary but actually pernicious and damning.<sup>26</sup>

### *C. The Essence of the Lord's Supper*

#### *1. The Earthly and Heavenly Elements in the Sacrament*

Following the Ancient Church beginning with Irenaeus<sup>27</sup>, Chemnitz speaks of the Sacrament as consisting of both the earthly and heavenly elements. The earthly elements are bread from grain and wine from grapes. The heavenly elements are body and blood of Christ born of Mary, crucified and raised again.<sup>28</sup>

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 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, so that it can truly be 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.<sup>29</sup>

Chemnitz maintains the doctrine of the real presence and is utterly realistic in expressing it. In his *Apologia* written in defense of the *Formula of Concord*, he quotes the beautiful words of Chrysostom:

That which is present in the cup is indeed the very thing which flowed from the side of Christ and that is what we receive. That we also confess and teach. (*Chrysost: I Cor. 11. Hoc, quod in poculo adest, illud est, quod ex latere Christi fluxit, et illud participamus. Das so im Kelch gegenwertig ist/ist eben dasselbig so auss der Seiten Christi geflossen ist/und das empfahen wir. Das bekennen und lehren wir auch*)<sup>30</sup>

Chemnitz uses the word "change" to explain that the bread and the wine through the consecration are the body and blood of Christ. The bread and wine are not changed into the body and blood of Christ. He does not accept the doctrine of transubstantiation as defined by Thomas Aquinas.<sup>31</sup> Rather, the bread and wine are so intimately united with His body and blood that Jesus

can say that the bread and wine are His body and blood. It is not a change in substance, but a change created by union, the sacramental union of two substances.

## 2. The Connection Between the Earthly and Heavenly Elements in the Sacrament

Chemnitz' doctrine of the Holy Supper is incarnational as is all of His theology. In this he follows the tradition of the Ancient Church. In the incarnation Christ took upon Himself our dying flesh so that, through unity with His divinity, He might conquer sin, death, and all our foes in that flesh and raise us to His divine life, as the sons of God with an eternal existence. He partook in our suffering, death, and hell so that we may partake in His glory, life, and heaven -- a wonderful exchange. (*Der fröhliche Wechsel*) The one who became incarnate in the Virgin Mary's womb for salvation is now incarnate in the Sacrament offering the treasure of salvation to all. The Word, who became flesh, is now present with His flesh in the Supper, which is the source of eternal life. Quoting Chrysostom, Chemnitz writes, "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."<sup>32</sup>

With this incarnational concept of the Supper, Chemnitz as the fathers, John of Damascus for instance,<sup>33</sup> compares the union between the earthly and heavenly in the Sacrament with the personal union in Christ. According to the hypostatic or personal union the Divine Logos, who is the only begotten of the Father before all worlds, assumed human nature into His divine person. The personal union is a union of the divine and human subsisting in the one *hypostasis* or person of the Son of God. Here the divine and human form one undivided person in Christ. Similarly, in the Sacrament there is a union where the bread and the wine are united with the flesh and blood of the Divine Logos.

The particular character of this Sacrament requires that there be two distinct things or substances which, joined by sacramental union, make one complete Sacrament, even as in the one person of Christ there are two complete and distinct natures. For all antiquity uses this comparison. But Paul mentions bread and wine also after the blessing, 1 Co 10:16; 11:27. Likewise the fathers also taught the same. In order to testify that they do not approve the papistic transubstantiation, they also usually used these terms, namely that in, with, and under the bread and wine the body and blood of Christ are present, offered, and received.<sup>34</sup>

In the Supper there is both the earthly and the heavenly reality. One does not receive merely bread and wine as the Sacramentarians teach, nor does one receive only body and blood as Rome teaches. Rather, both the bread and wine and body and blood are received through the sacramental union. To put this in christological terms, Rome tends toward "Eutychianism" by saying the bread and wine are transformed into Christ's body and blood, while the Sacramentarians tend toward "Nestorianism" in that the body and blood are so separate from the bread and the wine, that they are not received with the bread and the wine. The doctrine of Chemnitz is incarnational, a "Chalcedonian" approach to the Sacrament which distinguishes between the bread and wine and body and blood, but still holds them inseparably connected. It seems that both of Chemnitz' opponents in this conflict could not accept this intimate connection between the earthly and heavenly because they held that the finite is not capable of containing the infinite. (*Finitum non capax infiniti*)

Chemnitz teaches that the living and whole body of Christ is in the bread.<sup>35</sup> Yet, he rejects the Roman teaching of concomitance as a defense for distributing only the body of Christ to the communicants.<sup>36</sup> In his *Enchiridion* Chemnitz recognizes that the body of the living Christ is not without blood, but this does not give license to distribute under one kind.

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.<sup>37</sup>

Chemnitz bases his doctrine of the real presence on the *Verba* and only on the *Verba*. However, because of the Sacramentarian criticism that the Lutherans were teaching that Christ's body is in the bread in a crude, visible manner like bread in a basket,<sup>38</sup> Chemnitz, following Luther, teaches that there are different modes of Christ's presence, in much the same way that the nominalists did.<sup>39</sup> The First mode is the circumscriptive mode. This is the comprehensible, corporal mode as when our Lord walked bodily on earth.<sup>40</sup> The second mode is the definitive mode. For Chemnitz, definitive means a presence which is not bound to a certain space. This is an incomprehensible or illocal, spiritual presence as when Christ passed through closed doors on Easter and as He is in the bread and wine in the Supper.<sup>41</sup> The third mode is the repletive mode. This is the mode by which Christ, who is one person with God, is present in all things and places and, yet, is not contained in any space.<sup>42</sup>

*D. The Effectual Cause of the Lord's Supper**1. The Consecration and the Sacrament*

The Holy Sacrament bestows upon us all the blessings of salvation. Because it is such a treasure, Christians will want to be certain that they have the Supper in their midst. How does one know that he has the true Supper? What causes Christ's body and blood to be present in the Sacrament or what effects the presence? It is not any power or work of man, but alone the Word and institution of Christ, as Chemnitz declares.<sup>43</sup> It is that all-powerful Word which God spoke at the creation and it was done. (Psalm 33:9) Because the presence is not effected by any human words or actions, Chemnitz does not make the eucharistic prayer or the canon of the Mass a prerequisite for the Supper. In this regard Chemnitz asserts:

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.<sup>44</sup>

Chemnitz clearly states that it is the all-powerful Word of God which consecrates the Sacrament and effects the presence.

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." Likewise: "Take the Word out of Baptism, and what will the water be but water?" In no way, therefore, can there be a Eucharist without the use of the Word. For if the Word is taken out of the Eucharist, the bread will be nothing but bread. For this reason Augustine says, *Contra Faustum*, Bk. 20, ch. 13.: "Our bread and cup becomes sacramental by a certain consecration; it does not grow that way." Therefore what is not consecrated, though it be bread and cup, is food for refreshment, not a religious sacrament. This ground is very firm, being derived from the definition of a sacrament. This addition of the Word to the element in the sacraments is called "sanctification" by the ancients. The common people call it "consecration." Paul, following the description of Mark, calls it "blessing" when he says: "The cup of blessing which we bless." (1 Cor. 10:16)<sup>45</sup>

This Word of God is not any scriptural passage that one would care to use. It is a definite Word of God which consecrates the Sacrament. Discussing Justin Martyr's account of the Divine Liturgy in the Ancient Church, Chemnitz indicates that the consecration of the Lord's Supper is none other than the Words of Institution.

Justin also says that the priest prays and gives thanks for a long time and in many words, but not to this end, that the consecration of the Eucharist may take place in this way. For he adds that he who presides gives thanks "that He saw fit to do these things," that is, that these mysteries were instituted and handed down to us by Christ. Concerning the consecration itself he says that the food of the Eucharist is consecrated "through the word of thanks from Him," that is, through praying the word handed down by Christ Himself. Paul affirms that he received from Christ what kind of word this is (1 Cor. 11:23-25). Justin also explains himself, for he says that this is the word which the evangelists in their expositions of the

institution of the Supper committed to writing.<sup>46</sup>

It is the Words of Institution which bring about the sacramental union so that not only mere bread and wine are present in the Sacrament, but also the body and blood of the Lord.

We understand a sacramental change, that, although before it was only common bread and ordinary wine, when the Word of Christ comes to it, it is not merely bread and wine but at the same time also the body and blood of Christ, which is present, offered, and received here in the Eucharist.<sup>47</sup>

Chemnitz teaches that the Words of Institution spoken by the minister are the effectual cause of the presence. At the same time, he binds the consecration into an intimate relationship with Christ's original institution and command.

For where His institution is observed and His words are spoken over the bread and cup (wine), and the consecrated bread and cup (wine) are distributed, Christ Himself, through the spoken words, is still efficacious by virtue of the first institution, through His word, which He wishes to be there repeated.<sup>48</sup>

The consecration and Christ's original institution are so intimately united that the words spoken by the minister are not human words, but God's Word. Chemnitz asserts this as he comments on Chrysostom's *Sermon on the Betrayal by Judas*.<sup>49</sup>

Also Chrysostom, in his homily on the betrayal of Judas, explains this question beautifully, namely, that it is not man who sanctifies the things set before us on the Lord's Table, in order that they may be the body and blood of the Lord, but that the same Christ who sanctified His first Supper now sanctifies also our Lord's Supper. For although the words are brought forth by the mouth of the priest, nevertheless the sacraments are sanctified by the grace and power of God. For the words, "This is My body" are the words of Christ, not the words of the priest. It is through these that what is set before us is sanctified. After this he undertakes a comparison between this word of Christ and the command, "Be fruitful and multiply," which, once spoken, has efficacy in the article of creation for all time.<sup>50</sup>

Thus the Words of Institution are efficacious by virtue of the original institution. The Words of Institution repeated by the minister in a proper celebration of the Sacrament by virtue of Christ's original command and institution, effect the presence of Christ's body and blood in the Supper.

## 2. *The Sacramental Action Must Remain a Unit*

When our Lord gave us His body and blood in the Supper, He gave it for a certain use, to be distributed and received for the forgiveness of sins. Therefore, while the almighty Word of Christ indeed effects the presence, Chemnitz is extremely careful to keep the whole sacramental action (*usus*; consecration, distribution, reception) as a unit.

Nevertheless, 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. For the whole action of the institution hangs together, and the words, "This is My body"

belong to the entire action. Therefore, it is concerning that bread which is blessed, which is broken or divided, which is offered, received, and eaten -- I say, it is concerning that bread that Christ says, "This is My body."<sup>51</sup>

The blessing of the Eucharist and the promise of the presence of the body and blood of Christ ought not to be torn apart and forcibly separated from the use which is prescribed and commanded in the institution. For it is of the blessed bread, which is distributed, received, and eaten, that Christ asserts, "This is My body."<sup>52</sup>

The Words of Institution indeed effect the presence, but without the distribution and reception there is no Sacrament, that is, no real presence. Chemnitz, as the other writers of the *Formula*, asserts the *Nihil Rule*: Nothing has the character of a Sacrament outside its intended use.<sup>53</sup>

Now we ask, if these words are pronounced over the bread and wine, "This is My body; this is My blood," but no distribution is made, it is given to no one, and there is no one to receive, eat, and drink -- we ask, I say, whether the institution of Christ is being observed there. It is clear that it is not. We ask secondly whether the genuine Sacrament of the Eucharist is there where the institution of Christ is not being observed. Surely, because the sacraments of the New Testament are consecrated by the institution, it is evident and certain that there is no sacrament where the institution is not being observed.<sup>54</sup>

For when the words are indeed spoken over the bread but the action which is prescribed and commanded in the institution is either not observed or is changed into another use, then we do not have the promise of the presence of the body and blood of Christ there, as it is present in His supper.<sup>55</sup>

### *3. The Moment of the Presence in the Sacrament*

The question of the moment was a non-issue in the Ancient Church. The Eastern Church was not accused of error, although it at times spoke of the presence only after the epiclesis in the eucharistic prayer, and not immediately after the *Verba* were recited. They viewed the eucharistic prayer as a consecratory whole with the institution narrative as its most essential part because this was the Word of the Lord. They considered the Words of Institution to be the efficacious Words of God through which the Holy Spirit functions causing the presence of Christ's body and blood.

With the rise of Scholasticism in the Western Church came an almost overriding desire for precision, which in turn set the stage for questions concerning the moment of the presence and conflict between the *Verba* and the epiclesis. The Scholastics tended to stress rational speculation in explaining the make-up of the Sacraments. In trying to explain the "how" of the Lord's Supper, they appealed to Aristotelian causation and to transubstantiation. Transubstantiation is the instantaneous change of the entire substance of bread and wine into the substance of Christ's body and blood with the accidents of bread and wine remaining. Substance is that which exists in itself and not in another. Substance is a metaphysical concept. It is the innermost essence of an individual thing which remains if all the qualities attached to it are removed, that is, the accidents. An accident exists only in a substance. The accidents of a substance are color, size, taste, etc. Some of the Scholastics were not even satisfied with this doctrine which fixed the moment of the presence immediately following the *Verba*. They began to debate whether it occurred at "Hoc" or "Corpus" or "Meum." Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274) was certainly a child of his times in respect to this emphasis on precision. He wrote concerning the consecration:

And therefore it must be said that this change, as stated above, is wrought by Christ's words which are spoken by the priest, so that the last instant of pronouncing the words is the first instant in which Christ's body is in the sacrament; and that the substance of the bread is there during the whole preceding time. Of this time no instant is to be taken as proximately preceding the last one, because time is not made up of successive instants, as is proved in *Phys.* vi. And therefore a first instant can be assigned in which Christ's body is present; but a last instant cannot be assigned in which the substance of bread is there, but a last time can be assigned. And the same holds good in natural changes, as is evident from the Philosopher [*Phys.* viii.].<sup>56</sup>

The Lutheran fathers defended the truth that the Words of Institution effect the presence, but they did not accept the doctrine of the instantaneous replacing of one substance with another. They found no scriptural basis for this theory. They did not develop a dogma of the moment of the presence. Now, to be sure, Chemnitz speaks of Christ's body and blood being on the altar as did many of the Ancient Church fathers. But in Article VII of the *Formula of Concord*, a statement which was to bring peace among Lutherans on this issue, as well as others<sup>57</sup> he demands only this for confessional agreement: that one teach that Christ's body and blood are truly present in the elements of bread and wine in the Supper so that His body and blood may be distributed (*reichen, exhibeo*) by the minister and received by the communicant.<sup>58</sup> This statement does not assert an instantaneous presence immediately after the *Verba* are said. It states only that the Lord's body and blood are present in the Sacrament and that they are offered by the hand of the minister.<sup>59</sup> At the same time this statement disavows "receptionism" that is, that Christ's body and blood are present only at the eating and drinking, and as a result of the same. This statement maintains that Christ's body and blood are distributed by the minister, indicating that Christ's body and blood are present in the minister's hand so that they may be offered to the communicant to be eaten and drunk as Chemnitz teaches elsewhere.

Nevertheless 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. For the whole action of the institution hangs together, and the words, "This is My body," belong to the entire action. Therefore, it is concerning that bread which is blessed, which is broken or divided, which is offered, received and eaten -- I say, it is concerning that bread that Christ says, "This is My body."<sup>60</sup>

#### 4. *The Reservation of the Sacrament and the Reliquiae*

Related to the discussion of moment and time in the Sacrament is the question of the *reliquiae*, the elements remaining after the Lord's Supper celebration. In the High Middle Ages the reservation of the Sacrament for the purpose of adoration and ocular communion became common.<sup>61</sup> In regard to this issue Chemnitz writes, "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."<sup>62</sup> From this statement and others like it, it has been assumed by some that Chemnitz believed that all consecrated elements must be consumed in the Communion Service. However, these words of Chemnitz must be seen in their context. He is rejecting the Roman practice of reservation, veneration, ocular communion,<sup>63</sup> and the Corpus Christi Festival. He is not saying that all must be consumed in the Communion Service, for even in the Ancient Church the elements were sometimes burned<sup>64</sup> or carried to the sick.<sup>65</sup> Rather, he is rejecting the abuses of the Medieval

Church. The Sacrament was not instituted to be carried around but to be eaten.

In *De Duabus Naturis*, Chemnitz specifically says that there is no sacramental presence outside the sacramental action:

In the fifth place, by the external ministry of the Word and Sacraments God is truly present in the church, working with us and effectually acting in us through these means. He is present even in the external signs in the use of the Sacraments, dispensing and communicating through these visible signs His invisible grace, according to His Word. But the signs themselves, by themselves, add nothing toward this grace. God is not present with them inseparably, but because of the covenant and according to the Word they are not Sacraments apart from their use. When these Sacraments have been completed, they either pass away, as Augustine says, or are separated from the Sacramental union. But the hypostatic union of the two natures of Christ is something else, for it is permanent, inseparable, and intimate, constituting one hypostasis of both natures in which each nature works in communion with the other.<sup>66</sup>

The hypostatic union of the two natures in Christ is permanent and inseparable, but the sacramental union exists only in the sacramental action. Therefore, there is no basis for ocular communion, the reservation, and the veneration of the Sacrament outside the use. At the same time, the remaining species should be handled with respect for they were the bearers of the Lord's body and blood.

#### *E. The Adoration of the Lord's Supper*

##### *1. The Spiritual Adoration of the Sacrament*

While Chemnitz rejects all adoration outside the sacramental action, (consecration, distribution, reception) he does speak of a valid adoration in the Lord's Supper celebration.

It is certain also that the worship of God is not restricted to either time or place (John 4:21; I Tim. 2:8). Therefore Christ is to be worshipped always and everywhere. 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 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.<sup>67</sup>

Chemnitz then explains that proper adoration is an inner spiritual worship which expresses itself in true preparation for the Sacrament:

The true inner and spiritual veneration and worship is comprehended in these Words of the Institution: "Do this in remembrance of Me." Likewise: "You proclaim the Lord's death." When do you do this? When, in the first place, the heart believes and thinks rightly, piously, and reverently about the essence and use of this Sacrament, according to the Word. Second, when with a thankful mind we

faithfully ponder and consider, and with the heart and mouth praise these immeasurable benefits of the Son of God, the Mediator, that coming down from heaven for us men and for our salvation He assumed a body of our substance, and offered it to the Father on the cross for our redemption, and poured out His blood in a most bitter death; and that in addition He communicates this His holy body to us that it may be eaten, and this blood that it may be drunk in this 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 and precious pledge, that He might unite Himself by means of the firmest covenant with this our poor and defiled substance, and that He might transform and prepare our soul for health and our body for immortality, etc. Third, 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, that we may, because of His death, be received and preserved in the covenant of the New Testament, by which the Father wills, because of His Son, to be reconciled to the believers; likewise, when faith in prayer interposes the sacrifice of Christ the Mediator between our sins and the wrath of the Father, as Anselm speaks. When we consider the greatness of the mystery and our own unworthiness, we pray that we may not by unworthy eating become guilty of profaning the body and blood of Christ but that, ingrafted by this eating into the body and blood of Christ, we may draw life from it as branches from the vine and that this eating may benefit us for strengthening of faith, increase in love, mortification of the flesh, etc. Therefore we pray that the gifts of repentance, faith, and love may be bestowed on us, preserved, confirmed, and increased in us.<sup>68</sup>

For Chemnitz, true adoration of the Sacrament is an inner worship and preparation of the heart.

## *2. Outward Forms of Adoration*

When this true inner worship is present in the heart, then outward manifestations of reverence will follow of their own accord.<sup>69</sup> These outward signs of reverence will not be tied to the elements, "For He is not contained in them as being locally shut in. We eat the bread of the Supper reverently, but in our worship we look upon Christ Himself, supernaturally present in heavenly majesty in the Supper."<sup>70</sup> True adoration is a proper preparation of the heart for the Sacrament and a proper use of the same. All signs of outward reverence are in the area of Christian freedom.

### *F. The Sacrifice and the Lord's Supper*

#### *1. The Forms of Eucharistic Sacrifice Acceptable to Chemnitz*

One of the most disputed and also most misunderstood issues at the time of the Reformation was the concept of Eucharist as sacrifice. This has been an issue in theological dialogue to this day. In what way is the Lord's Supper a sacrifice? Chemnitz enumerated a number of forms of eucharistic sacrifice in the Ancient Church which are acceptable to him.

It was customary in the Ancient Church that whenever the Sacrament was celebrated, bread and wine and other gifts were offered on the Lord's table or altar for the maintenance of the ministry and of the poor. From these offered gifts some of the bread and wine was used for the Sacrament. Thus, the bread and wine were designated a sacrifice because they were a part of the

people's offering of thanksgiving. Also, the appointed public prayers connected with the Supper were at times named a sacrifice in accord with the Scriptures which speak of the prayers of the faithful as sacrifice. (Psalm 141:2)<sup>71</sup>

The Lord's Supper is called the Eucharist by most of the Ancient Church fathers, Ignatius, Justin, Irenaeus, etc. They do this because in the celebration there is placed before the Christian the contemplation of the many blessings of God and, chiefly, the foremost work of God's love that He sent His Son, who shed His blood to redeem us, that in this way we would be challenged to thanksgiving. The Lord's Supper is a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving. (Hebrews 13:15)<sup>72</sup>

According to Chemnitz, in the true use of the Eucharist the church and individual believers dedicate themselves soul and body to the Lord. Christians present their bodies living sacrifices, holy and acceptable to God which is our spiritual service. (Rom 12:1) Having said this, Chemnitz quotes Augustine's famous statement concerning the ecclesial concept of eucharistic sacrifice.

Therefore Augustine writes, De civitate Dei, Bk. 10, ch. 6: "This is the sacrifice of Christians that we, being many, are one body in Christ. The church frequently makes use of the sacrament of the altar, which is known to believers, where it is demonstrated to her that in the offering which she offers she is herself offered."<sup>73</sup>

The action of the Lord's Supper is called a sacrifice by the ancients because it is celebrated and used as a memorial or commemoration of the one sacrifice of Christ, once performed on the cross. Chemnitz permitted this view of eucharistic sacrifice as long as one bears in mind the following:

These explanations of the ancients should be pondered. They say expressly that Christ was in fact, or in truth, offered only once -- on the cross -- and that the action of the Lord's Supper is called a sacrifice, offering, immolation on account of the similarity, not because a sacrifice of Christ is really made there but because it was instituted and is used in remembrance or commemoration of the sacrifice of Christ, made once on the cross.<sup>74</sup>

Finally, Chemnitz speaks of the Lord's Supper as a presentation of Christ's sacrifice in the midst of His people where they receive His body and blood which bestows upon them all the blessings of the sacrifice of the cross.

The fathers call the body and blood of the Lord which are present in the Supper a saving sacrifice, a pure host, our ransom, the purchase price of our redemption, the ransom for the sins of the world, a propitiatory sacrifice and a propitiation, not because the body and blood of Christ are offered in the Mass by the action of the priest in order that they may become the ransom and propitiation for the sins of the whole world, but because that sacrifice which was once offered on the cross for our redemption and for the sins of the whole world--the body and blood of the Lord--is present, is dispensed, offered, and taken in the Lord's Supper, so that the power and efficacy of this offering, once made on the cross, is applied and sealed individually to all who receive it in faith. Thus 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 an offering, to heal our infirmities and to purge our iniquities."<sup>75</sup>

## *2. The Forms of Eucharistic Sacrifice Unacceptable to Chemnitz*

For Chemnitz, the Sacrament is a commemoration of the one sacrifice of Christ on the cross where the blessings of that sacrifice are made present for the church. Here there is no sacrifice or offering up of Christ's body and blood for the redemption of the world to appease the just anger of God. That was done once and for all on the cross. Rather, the Sacrament is a commemoration or remembrance of the once and for all sacrifice where that sacrifice is made present in the midst of His body, the church, so that repentant sinners may share in the benefits of the sacrifice, the forgiveness of sin, life, and salvation. The Lord's body and blood in the Sacrament are not a propitiatory sacrifice for expiating and blotting out sin because all sins were blotted out through Christ's death on the cross. Instead, His body and blood which were once offered for all, now convey or bring those blessings to the individual in the Supper. Chemnitz disavows all forms of eucharistic sacrifice which militate against the one propitiatory sacrifice of Christ on the cross, or which make it a work or sacrifice of man.

But this I do deny, that the ancients by the term "sacrifice" understood the theatrical representation by which the papalists define the sacrament of their Mass, and that the histrionic action of the priest, handling the body and blood of Christ with certain gestures and acts, is a propitiatory sacrifice for expiating and blotting out sins, for placating the wrath of God, and for obtaining any and all benefits from God. For we have the explanations of the ancients, how they want it understood that they call both the action of the Lord's Supper and the body of Christ in the Supper a sacrifice and a sacrificial victim.<sup>76</sup>

Chemnitz will not accept any view of eucharistic sacrifice which makes the Lord's Supper a new sacrifice or adds to the sacrifice of the cross. With this understanding of the Lord's Supper, John Eck's view of eucharistic sacrifice was unacceptable to Chemnitz.

Therefore Eck says that the Mass is a sacrifice in another, special way, namely, because the church not only uses the Eucharist for a remembrance of the passion but because in the Mass she represents the sacrifice of the suffering of Christ by the total action of gestures, words, ceremonies, and vestments, and by means of this representation offers Christ Himself anew for a sweet-smelling savor to God the Father.<sup>77</sup>

Chemnitz rejects the canon of the Council of Trent which speaks of the Lord's Supper as a propitiatory sacrifice and not only as a commemoration of the sacrifice of the cross. Nor will he agree that the Lord's Supper in anyway benefits the dead because the sacrifice which blotted out all sin, both of the living and the dead, occurred on the cross, while the Sacrament conveys those blessings to those eating in faith. The Lord's Supper can only impart the blessing of salvation to those who are present receiving. The Council of Trent decrees in Canon III, "Concerning the Sacrifice of the Mass":

If anyone says that the Mass is merely a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving or a bare commemoration of the sacrifice performed on the cross, not however a propitiatory sacrifice, or that it benefits him only who eats and that it ought not to be offered for the living and the dead for sins, punishments, satisfactions, and other necessities, let him be anathema.<sup>78</sup>

Chemnitz considers the Tridentine dogma, that the sacrifice of the Mass is the same sacrifice as the sacrifice of the cross, to be a camouflage. To say that the Supper is the same sacrifice as the sacrifice of the cross, meaning that in the Sacrament Christ's body and blood are

offered up to appease God's just anger over sin, impairs the oneness of the once and for all sacrifice on the cross. (Hebrews 7:26-27, 9:12) The sacrifice of the cross cannot be all-sufficient, offered once, and still need to be continually offered in the Mass. The only way that the sacrifice of the Sacrament is the same as the sacrifice of the cross is that in the Supper, that very body and blood which once obtained redemption for all, are now present in the Supper conveying those blessings to the individual. Chemnitz and the Lutheran fathers are extremely emphatic in their rejection of any form of eucharistic sacrifice which militates against the once and for all sacrifice of the cross or makes the Sacrament a human work or sacrifice.

### *G. The Proper Preparation for the Lord's Supper*

In order to obtain the benefits of the Holy Supper one needs to be well prepared to receive it worthily, for St. Paul says, "He who eats and drinks in an unworthy manner eats and drinks judgment to himself, not discerning the Lord's body." (I Corinthians 11:29) This worthiness consists in a sincere sorrow over sin, striving to do better, and in a confident faith in Jesus the Savior who paid for the sins of the whole world on the cross with His body and blood and who gives us that very body and blood in the Supper for forgiveness of sins, life and salvation.<sup>79</sup> When the unworthy come to the Lord's table, they indeed receive the Lord's body and blood, but it is to their harm rather than their benefit. (*manducatio indignorum*)<sup>80</sup>

Immorality indeed excludes one from the Lord's table. The same is true of false doctrine. The Sacrament is a sign of the unity of the church and, more than that, it makes that unity. We become His one body, the church, by receiving His one body in the Supper. Because this is the case, the Sacrament may be received only with those who confess all the doctrines of the Scripture. Otherwise, we are really lying. We are declaring we are one when we are not one.<sup>81</sup>

### *H. The Blessings of the Lord's Supper*

#### *1. The Sacrament and the Forgiveness of Sins*

The Words of Institution summarize the blessing of the Supper in the words, "Given and shed for you for the remission of sins." Forgiveness of sins is the chief blessing of the Sacrament from which flows all the other benefits of the Supper. The Holy Sacrament assures each individual personally of the Gospel declaration of forgiveness. It is a real means of grace which gives us everything which Christ won on the cross in our stead. Christ accomplished salvation on the cross, but He has not distributed or given it on the cross. He distributes it to us through the Lord's Supper and the other means of grace. In the *Examen* Chemnitz discusses the wonderful comfort derived from the various means of grace.

Moreover, in temptations the mind is troubled chiefly about this question, whether, in view of the fact that the promise is spoken in general, I also, who believe, have forgiveness of sins; whether I have it truly, surely, and firmly. Also, a pious mind is concerned lest it be snatched away or wrested from it. For this use therefore, God, who is rich in mercy, which He pours out abundantly on the believers, instituted beside the Word also the use of the Sacraments. However, we leave and ascribe both to the Word and to each Sacrament what belongs to each in particular. Through Baptism we are reborn in Christ; having been reborn, we are nourished with the Word and the Eucharist; if we have fallen, we return through repentance and faith to the promise of grace, and by faith in the promise we are again reconciled to God through the Mediator. Nevertheless the Eucharist, which contains the basis for the remission of sins, namely the body and blood of Christ, is

not excluded from also this use. For the Son of God testifies in the Eucharist by a most extraordinary and sure pledge, namely by exhibiting His body and blood, that He surely communicates, applies, and seals to each and everyone who uses this Sacrament in faith, forgiveness of sins, reconciliation with God, and all the other benefits which He obtained for the church by the offering up of His body and the shedding of His blood that they might be offered in the Word and Sacraments and be accepted by faith. And so faith has in the use of the Eucharist a firm anchor of consolation, trust, and certainty concerning the forgiveness of sins. It also has an effectual remedy for raising up and supporting a feeble faith in the midst of sorrow and trials, against want of confidence, doubt, faintheartedness, and despair.<sup>82</sup>

The forgiveness of sin is offered in the Supper because this Sacrament is the ransom money for sin. In our weaknesses and failures we can often begin to wonder whether we are really forgiven. How can God forgive a wretch like me? Are my sins just too great to be pardoned? In this Supper the Lord Jesus removes our every doubt. As we come to the Lord's Table we are in spirit at Golgotha kneeling before the cross embracing His dying body and drinking from His five bloody wounds. As a kidnapped child is bought back by its parents with money, so Jesus bought us back not with gold or silver, but with His holy precious blood and His innocent suffering and death. His body and blood are the ransom for sin. In the Supper we receive the very thing which paid for sins, the very thing which freed us from hell's destruction. Then no matter how great and terrible our sins may be, no matter how heavily they burden our conscience, receiving this Sacrament we need never wonder whether our sins are forgiven, for within us we have the very ransom money which paid for our sins, namely, His true body and blood.<sup>83</sup>

Chemnitz often describes the treasure of forgiveness in the Supper in the terms of a last will and testament. Chemnitz does this on the basis of the Words of Institution where Christ speaks of "the new testament in My blood." Before a man dies he often prepares his will where he bequeaths his property to whomever he desires. Those remembered in his will may be totally unworthy, but he has the right to do as he pleases with what is his. Then, through his death, the will is made effective. Likewise, Jesus is the testator who prepared for His death and established His will, His gift. The Holy Supper is Christ's last will and testament which He left behind to be distributed to believers for all time. This testament He ratified and made effective through His death on the cross. We, His heirs, do nothing to obtain the inheritance nor are we worthy; the testament was established totally through His death. This wonderful inheritance is the remission of sin and eternal life given through His body and blood. Therefore, the Lord's Supper is totally a gift.<sup>84</sup>

## *2. The Sacrament and the Faith-life*

### *a. The Supper as Life-Giving Nourishment*

The Holy Supper confers life. This is not temporal life which we received through natural birth, but it is that new spiritual life which has been regenerated in us through the new birth in Holy Baptism. Since this life is still weak and imperfect, and constant growth is necessary, the Lord Jesus has instituted this Sacrament as a true spiritual nourishment. It is the strengthening and food for our faith-life as Chemnitz writes, "It becomes a heavenly and spiritual nourishment for both body and soul of believers unto eternal life."<sup>85</sup>

Chemnitz cites the fathers of the Council of Ephesus (431 AD) as saying:

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 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.<sup>86</sup>

The body and blood of our Lord in the Supper are life-giving. They are never unfruitful, impotent, and useless. Here we receive the body and blood of the living God into this body made of dust. What can be more beneficial? What can be more powerful? This is the greatest treasure in the life of a Christian. It is the greatest benefit for body and soul.

This life-giving bread and cup of blessing, hallowed by the solemn benediction, benefits the life of the total man, being at the same time a medicine and an offering, to heal our infirmities and to purge our iniquities.<sup>87</sup>

When discussing the blessing of the Sacrament, Chemnitz' predominant theme is life in the flesh of Christ. This is simply an application of his incarnational theology.<sup>88</sup> The One who became incarnate for our salvation is now incarnate in the Sacrament offering the treasure of salvation to all.

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 for us 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 itself.<sup>89</sup>

As is seen above in his incarnational doctrine of the Supper, Chemnitz, at times, alludes to II Peter 1:4 expressing the benefits of the Supper in the *theosis* or deification theme of the Ancient Church. Christ distributes His body and blood to us so that, we might be drawn into communion and union with the deity, participating in the divine nature.<sup>90</sup>

#### *b. The Supper and the Christian Life*

As the Christian travels in this life, he faces problems and troubles all the way. There is bitterness in the home, conflict with friends, sickness, and even the death of those most near and dear. Yet, in every difficulty and problem of life the Lord Jesus says, "Come to My Table all you that labor and are heavy laden, I will give you rest." Through the Sacrament of His body and blood He gives Christians the strength to face all the problems and troubles of life and the power to do all things through Him, the power to overcome and obtain the victory. Here the Lord offers His life-giving nourishment to resist all the attacks of the devil, the world and our flesh, and the ability to lead a more Christ-like life.

When we consider the greatness of the mystery and our own unworthiness, we pray that we may not by unworthy eating become guilty of profaning the body and blood of Christ but that, ingrafted by this eating into the body and blood of Christ, we may draw life from it as branches from the vine and that this eating may benefit us for strengthening of faith, increase in love, mortification of the flesh, etc.

<sup>91</sup>

The Supper is indeed "a heavenly and spiritual nourishment for both body and soul of the believer unto eternal life."<sup>92</sup>

*c. The Supper as Communion with Christ and His Body, the Church*

Many Christians seek a closer walk with Jesus, a closer relationship with the Savior. At times every Christian feels very distant from the Divine Redeemer. Chemnitz does not direct such individuals to wrestle with the Lord in prayer until they feel His presence, nor are they to seek an emotional experience of Christ within them. Rather, they are to go where the Lord has promised to be found, in the Word and Sacraments. In the Supper there is an intimate union with Christ, for here He comes into the believer with His body and blood and remains with him. Concerning this communion with Christ, Chemnitz writes:

Moreover, the Son of God testifies that in the true use of the Eucharist He grafts the believers into Himself as members that He may bear, sustain, guide, and quicken them, in order that they may be united with Him more and more and may be enabled to continue more firmly in Him and hold fast the benefits they have received. This sweet, useful, and necessary comfort and strengthening of the faith the papalists endeavor to take away from the church, when they remove the application and sealing of the forgiveness of sins from the fruits and effects of the Eucharist.<sup>93</sup>

This incorporation into Christ, which the Lord's Supper grants, constitutes at the same time a true communion among all members of His body. Just as we were united with Christ and His body, the Church, in Baptism, so in the Holy Supper we are strengthened and preserved in that unity. One cannot be united with Christ without also at the same time existing in communion with all the other members of this body. As He comes into us with His flesh and blood uniting us with Himself, so He comes into all the other communicants drawing us together as His church. The Eucharist is both the supreme manifestation of the church's unity and a powerful means to effect that unity. St. Paul says, "Since there is one bread, we who are many are one body, for we all partake of the one bread." (I Corinthians 10:17) As many kernels of wheat are ground together to form a loaf of bread and as many grapes are crushed to form one cup of wine, so in the Supper we become one body by partaking in His one body. Receiving His one body in the Sacrament, we become His one body, the church.<sup>94</sup>

*3. The Sacrament and Salvation*

The Holy Supper confers salvation. Where there is forgiveness of sins there is also eternal salvation. In the Supper the believer receives the very ransom money that paid for his sins and freed him from destruction. This is what has thrown open the doors of heaven and broken every barrier down. As we receive His body and blood in the Supper we know that heaven is ours.<sup>95</sup>

As Christ walked among men, people were healed and raised from the dead by His very touch. His flesh and blood are life-giving. Then as we receive His glorified and risen body and blood into this dying body, we are assured that, even though it returns to the dust from which it was formed, on the last day it will break forth from the grave glorified like Christ's glorified body and so we will ever be with the Lord. Because of this the Early Church fathers have often spoken of the Supper as the *viaticum*, "the medicine of immortality," which is a food preparing us for eternal life. This is a concept closely related to the *theosis* theme. Chemnitz, likewise, espouses this position that the Sacrament is the medicine of immortality, that we should not die but live in God.

Because in the Eucharist we receive that body of Christ which has been given for us, and blood of the New Testament which has been shed for the remission of sins, who will deny that believers there receive the whole treasury of the benefits of

Christ? For they receive that through which sins are remitted, by which death is abolished, by which life is communicated to us, by which Christ unites us to Himself as members, so that He is in us and we are in Him. Hilary says beautifully: "When these things have been taken and drunk, they bring about both that Christ is in us and that we are in Him." Cyril says: "When in the mystical benediction we eat the flesh of Christ in faith, we have from it life in ourselves, being joined to that flesh which has been made life, so that not only does the soul ascend through the Holy Spirit into a blessed life, but also this earthly body is restored by this food to immortality, to be resurrected on the last day." Therefore we receive in the Eucharist the most certain and most excellent pledge of our reconciliation with God, of the forgiveness of sins, of immortality and future glorification . . . Beautiful is that statement of Ignatius, which is found in his Epistle to the Ephesians, where he calls the Eucharist *pharmakon athanasias, antidoton tou mee apothanein, alla zeen en theoo dia Ieessou Christou, katharterion alexikakon*, that is, "a medicine of immortality, an antidote, that we may not die but live in God through Jesus Christ, a cleansing remedy through warding off and driving out evils."<sup>96</sup>

St. Paul says, "As often as you eat this bread and drink this cup, you proclaim the Lord's death until He comes." (I Corinthians 11:26) Not only does the Supper point us back to the sacrifice of the cross, but at the same time it points forward to the final consummation of our redemption on the last day. Each time we celebrate the Sacrament we do it eagerly awaiting the second coming as the whole Ancient Church cried *Maranatha*, "Lord come quickly." The Father then gives us His Son under the form of bread and wine as a foretaste of the great wedding feast of the Lamb which will be ours at His second coming. In the Supper we for a moment step out of our mundane workaday existence where we carry one after another to the grave, and we have a foretaste of heaven, where the Lamb once slain Himself descends and angels prostrate fall. Here is heaven on earth as the fathers prayed, "Your Supper be my heaven on earth, till I enter heaven." (*Dass dein Abendmahl mein Himmel auf Erden werde*) Then as we eat at His Table here, we have the certainty that we will be at His Table there where we will eat of the heavenly manna and drink of the river of His pleasure forevermore.<sup>97</sup>

### III. A COMPARISON OF THESE TWO FATHERS

#### A. The Essence of the Lord's Supper

##### 1. The Connection Between Sign and Reality

For Augustine, a Sacrament is a "sacred sign." (*sacrum signum*)<sup>1</sup> A Sacrament is a sacred sign of a hidden reality (*res*) and power. (*virtus*) He says, "These things, my brothers, are called sacraments for the reason that in them one thing is seen, but another is understood. That which is seen has physical appearance, that which is understood has spiritual fruit."<sup>2</sup> The sacramental sign, however, not only points to and represents the reality that it signifies, it also participates in it and renders it present. The sign is not mere sign, but a sign filled with reality.

This eucharistic tradition of Augustine, together with that of Ambrose, was transmitted to the early Middle Ages initially through Isidore of Seville (560-636), a contemporary of Gregory the Great in the West and Maximus the Confessor in the East. He was born at Seville in Spain and became Archbishop of Seville around 600. Isidore combined the traditions of Augustine and Ambrose in his own thought. He found no conflict between the eucharistic theology of these two Western fathers.

Like Augustine, Ambrose at times spoke of the Sacrament as a sign filled with reality, but the use of the sign and reality distinction was not his normal way of explicating the Sacrament. He usually maintained the identify of the elements with the body and blood of Christ by virtue of the change effected through the consecration. Ambrose's stress on a change in the elements by virtue of the consecration with the Words of Christ is vividly portrayed in this selection from *De Mysteriis*:

For the sacrament which thou receivest is consecrated by the word of Christ. [*Christi sermone conficitur*] But if the word of Elijah was powerful enough to bring down fire from heaven, will not the word of Christ be powerful enough to change the characters of the elements? [*ut species mutet elementorum*] Thou hast read of the works of the whole creation that he spake the word, and they were made; he commanded and they were created. The word of Christ, then, which could make out of nothing that which was not, can it not change the things which are into that which they were not? For to give new natures to things is no less wonderful than to change their natures.<sup>3</sup>

The difference between the Ambrosian and the Augustinian understanding of the Sacrament seems to go back to different liturgical traditions. Ambrose, who has left us some of the first liturgies in Latin in his *De Mysteriis* and in *De Sacramentis*, was familiar with a liturgy in which a change in the elements was expressed. (*transformatio, transfiguratio, mutatio*) This terminology was transmitted in the older Gallic and Spanish liturgies. The Roman and African liturgies which influenced Augustine and in turn were influenced by him, did not speak of a change or a transformation of the elements. These liturgies used such words as "to consecrate", "to dedicate", or "to bless", which were more restrained than the realistic terms of Ambrose.

In the ninth century these two traditions came into conflict for the first time in the eucharistic controversy that arose between Paschasius Radbertus and Ratramnus, two monks of the monastery of Corbie in northern France. This controversy was precipitated by a major shift in thought during the Middle Ages. The fundamental unity between sign and reality, which characterized the ancient world, was beginning to dissolve. The sign was no longer seen as a means of participating in the reality. Rather, it was on the way to becoming a mere sign or pointer

which was separated from the reality it signified. As long as the bread and the wine in the Sacrament were spoken of as signs which cause the heavenly reality of Christ's body and blood to be present for the communicant, there was no problem in using symbolic and realistic language simultaneously. But once the unity between sign and reality began to dissolve, the symbolic language of an earlier era was increasingly misunderstood. Symbolic language concerning the Lord's Supper was perceived as threatening the presence of the reality, the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the Sacrament. Therefore, the conditions were ripe for the eucharistic controversy of the ninth century.

In the Reformation, the Reformed understood the Augustinian eucharistic sign as a mere pointer which was separated from the reality it signified. This understanding was affirmed by those statements of Augustine which seem to separate the Sacrament as such (the outward sign) from the gift which it was meant to communicate.<sup>4</sup> Thus, men like Zwingli believed themselves to be in agreement with Augustine when they maintained that there was no real connection between the elements of bread and wine and the Lord's body and blood. Concerning this he wrote:

I have now refuted, I hope, this senseless notion about bodily flesh. In doing that my only object was to prove that to teach that the bodily and sensible Flesh of Christ is eaten when we give thanks to God is not only impious but also foolish and monstrous, unless perhaps one is living among the Anthropophagi. (cannibals)<sup>5</sup>

Augustine's understanding of the Sacrament as a sign is rooted in his Neo-Platonism.<sup>6</sup> This distinction between sign and reality is easily applicable to Baptism where the visible sign of water points to the invisible grace, but this is not the case with the Lord's Supper. If the bread and wine, corresponding to the element of water in Baptism, are the *signum*, then what is the *res*, the purpose of the Sacrament for which God's grace is given? Is it not communion with the body of Christ, the church, the bond of love existing in the communion of saints? Augustine at times speaks of Christ's body and blood as the *res* of the Sacrament, but more often it refers to the power and benefit of the Sacrament. Thus, one can understand why Zwingli and his followers appealed to the Bishop of Hippo.

The scholastics like Thomas Aquinas attempted to overcome this weakness in Augustine's theory. They distinguished three strata in the Supper: that which is sign only (*sacramentum tantum*), the ultimate reality (*res tantum*), and between these two that which is both sign and reality. (*sacramentum et res*) The *sacramentum tantum* is the bread and wine. The *res tantum* is the mystical union in Christ's body, the church. The *sacramentum et res* is the body and blood of Christ born of Mary, crucified, and risen which is *res* in relationship to the elements, but still sign in relationship to the real *res*.<sup>7</sup> This complicated distinction proves the inherent weakness in Augustine's concept of sign and reality.

Chemnitz, in his writings, usually does not use Augustine's distinction between sign and reality to explain the Sacrament. But when the Sacramentarians used this terminology of Augustine to argue against the real presence, Chemnitz responds by showing how Augustine should be understood.

From another standpoint and in another respect, it was not on account of the absence of the body and blood of Christ that the ancients called the bread and wine signs or symbols. For sometimes they used this simile: As bread nourishes, sustains, preserves, and strengthens the body to natural life, so the body of Christ distributed and received in the Supper nourishes, sustains, and strengthens the soul and the body to eternal life. Sometimes they argue that the external reception of the body of Christ is a figure or likeness of the spiritual ingrafting into the body

of Christ, as Augustine, *Contra adversarium legis et prophetarum*, Bk. 2, ch. 9. . . . Often they argue that the body of Christ signifies the mystical body, that is, the church, as Chrysostom, *Homilia [24] in 1 ad Corinthios*, on 1 Cor. 10, and Augustine, *Ad infantas* and *De consecratione*, dist. 2, ch. 2, *Quia passus*.<sup>8</sup>

The bread and wine are signs or symbols of Christ's body and blood which are the invisible reality of the Sacrament.

While Chemnitz maintains that Augustine, correctly understood, should not be considered a Sacramentarian or defending a Zwinglian position, the sacramental theology of Chemnitz is much more in line with the Ambrosian eucharistic tradition than with the Augustinian tradition. Like Ambrose, Chemnitz asserts a change in the elements by virtue of the consecration so that the bread and the wine are indeed Christ's body and blood. A certain change takes place through the consecration so that it can truly be said of the bread and the wine that they are the body and blood of Christ.

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 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, so that it can truly be 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.<sup>9</sup>

## *2. The Real Presence of Christ's Body and Blood*

Augustine of Hippo and Martin Chemnitz are separated by more than a thousand years. They are separated both in culture and in race, one a North African and the other a Saxon German. Yet, both confess the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the Supper. So firmly does Augustine assert this truth that in a Christmas sermon he can preach, "Him whom the heavens do not contain the bosom of one woman bore... she carried Him in whom we exist; she fed our Bread."<sup>10</sup> However, his distinction between sign and reality in his definition of Sacrament has led many to conclude that the Sacrament for him is merely a bare sign and not a sign filled with reality. This is due in part to a misunderstanding of the ancient world's concept of sign and to an inherent weakness in Augustine's theology of Sacrament.

The Ambrosian tradition of eucharistic theology of which Chemnitz was a part, reached a conclusion during the High Middle Ages in the doctrine of transubstantiation. According to Thomas, transubstantiation is an instantaneous change of the entire substance of bread and wine into the substance of Christ's body and blood with the accidents of bread and wine remaining.<sup>11</sup> The doctrine of transubstantiation was called into question by the nominalists like William of Ockham. According to Ockham, the view that the substance of bread and wine remain, and in the same place and under the same species is to be found in the body and blood of Christ, is very reasonable apart from the decision of the church to the contrary.<sup>12</sup> Ockham believed that it was more in accord with Scripture and reason to hold that both bread and wine and Christ's body and blood were present in the Sacrament and there offered, than to teach transubstantiation. Still, he would not oppose the teaching of the church. Transubstantiation became the official dogma of the Western Church at the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215.

Chemnitz and the Lutheran Reformation upheld the real presence of Christ's body and blood, but on the basis of Scripture they rejected transubstantiation as the way of explaining how the presence occurred. They believed that transubstantiation went beyond the teaching of Scripture and the Ancient Church in explicating the change that occurred in the Sacrament. Rather Chemnitz, as many of the Ancient Church fathers, compared the union between the earthly elements and the Lord's body and blood to the personal union in Christ. Concerning these fathers Chemnitz writes:

For they asserted that the person of Christ consists of two natures which are neither disunited nor confused but 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.<sup>13</sup>

When Chemnitz uses the word "change" to explain that the elements through the consecration are the body and blood of Christ, he does not mean that bread and wine are changed into the body and blood of Christ, but they are so intimately united with them that Jesus can say that the bread and wine are His body and blood. It is not a change in substance but a change created by union, the sacramental union of two substances.

### *B. The Effectual Cause of the Lord's Supper*

#### *1. The Eucharistic Prayer and the Sacrament*

In the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus which is dated around 215, we find one of the earliest examples of a eucharistic prayer in complete form. The prayer begins with the thanksgiving which praises and thanks God for the creation and the redemption. In the prayer the *Verba*, the Words of Institution, hold a predominant position. They explain why the church has such a eucharistic meal and they are the words which the Lord gave for blessing in the Supper. The *Verba* are followed by the anamnesis, the remembering of Christ's death and resurrection for salvation, and by the epiclesis which is the calling down of the Holy Spirit. These thanksgiving or eucharistic prayers did not necessarily follow this form everywhere in the church. There are indications that there was a considerable amount of freedom for the celebrant in formulating the thanksgiving provided that the institution narrative was included. When the dominical narrative was lacking or lost as in the case of the so-called *Anaphora of the Apostle's Addai and Mari*, this thanksgiving prayer would have been considered defective.

The African eucharistic prayer as preserved by Fulgentius of Ruspe, which was probably used by Augustine, has the same basic form as the prayer of Hippolytus. The epiclesis of the African prayer, like the epiclesis of Hippolytus, is not a consecratory epiclesis. The Holy Spirit is not called down to make the elements the body and blood of Christ, but He is called down so that the church may be gathered into the unity of Spirit.<sup>14</sup> For Augustine the most important part of the eucharistic prayer is the institution narrative for this is the Word of Christ.<sup>15</sup>

The text of the Eucharistic prayer with which Chemnitz was acquainted had been fairly uniform since around 700. It was commonly referred to as the canon of the Mass. Chemnitz, as Augustine, considered the Words of Institution to be the most important part of the canon because these words were the Words of Christ. Chemnitz and the other Lutheran Reformers did not make the eucharistic prayer or the canon of the Mass a prerequisite for the Supper. In fact, in the Lutheran Mass, the canon of the Mass was removed in its entirety and was replaced by the Words of Institution.

Chemnitz defended this change in the historic liturgy. He believed that the canon of the Mass obscured the central article of the faith, justification by faith alone. The eucharistic prayer

turns the primary direction of the Sacrament upside down. The Supper then is not a testament or pure gift from God, but man's offering to God; it becomes an action of man rather than an action of God. Whenever the *Verba* are enclosed in a eucharistic prayer the primary emphasis of the Sacrament is not God's presentation of Christ's free forgiveness, but the church's sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving to God. The sacrifice of the cross and forgiveness are gifts of God for man which can only be received with thanksgiving. Instead of trying to participate in and enter into Christ's sacrifice by lifting our hearts to the heavenly altar, we stand in awe with Isaiah of old as Christ speaks to us on earth, granting us forgiveness and thus taking us up into His sacrifice.<sup>16</sup>

When the *Verba* are placed in a eucharistic prayer, the meaning of the consecration is obscured. The Words of Institution are not our words of prayer to God but God's Words of grace. The Words of Institution in the Divine Liturgy are not to be directed to God, rather they are Christ's Words of consecration directed to the elements and Christ's Words of Gospel proclamation directed to the church. Concerning this Chemnitz asserts:

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.<sup>17</sup>

Chemnitz' high estimate of the Words of Institution, which he held in common with Augustine caused him to defend the removal of the canon of the Mass from the Divine Liturgy and its replacement with the *Verba*.

## 2. *The Consecration and the Sacrament*

According to Augustine, the Words of Institution embedded in the eucharistic prayer are the consecration of the Holy Sacrament. Augustine emphatically teaches that the blessing of Christ, the *Verba*, effect the presence of Christ's body and blood in the Sacrament. "For, not all bread, but only that which receives the blessing of Christ becomes the body of Christ." (*Non enim omnis panis, sed accipiens benedictionem Christi fit corpus Christi*)<sup>18</sup> While Augustine says that the bread and wine become the body and blood of Christ through the consecration, he does not use the "change" terminology of the Ambrosian tradition.

The Western Church, in general, held that the Words of Institution were consecratory. While not denying this, it gradually became common in the Eastern Church to speak of the epiclesis as a calling down of the Holy Spirit to make the elements the body and blood of Christ. John of Damascus, whose works are in many ways the capstone of Eastern dogma and theology, brings out the relationship between the efficacy of God's Word and the operation of the Holy Spirit in the Sacrament. He compares the Supper to the creation and incarnation. The creation came into being by the Word of God and the overshadowing of the Spirit. At the Word of God spoken by Gabriel, the Word became incarnate in the Virgin's womb through the working of the Holy Ghost. In the same way, the Words of Institution are the efficacious Words of God through which the Holy Spirit functions causing the presence of Christ's body and blood.<sup>19</sup>

While the Damascene keeps a proper balance between the *Verba* and the epiclesis and considers them a consecratory whole, some of his statements can be understood as teaching that the epiclesis in itself is consecratory. This view became even more pronounced in Eastern Theology as time went on. Still no one in the East would have spoken of the epiclesis as consecratory in contradistinction to the *Verba* until the moment of the consecration question was raised in the Scholasticism of the West. Most in the East spoke of the institution narrative as consecratory, but these words were effective through the power of the Spirit called upon in the epiclesis.

With the rise of Scholasticism in the Western Church, the stage was set for questions concerning the moment of the presence and the conflict between the *Verba* and the epiclesis. The Scholastics appealed to Aristotelian causation and to transubstantiation, an instantaneous replacement of one substance with another. In defining the precise moment of the presence at the *Verba*, they left no room for the epiclesis, the calling down of the Spirit to operate through the *Verba*, as was common in the Eastern tradition. After the failure of the Council of Florence in 1439 to reunite the church, the dialogue concerning the consecration between the East and the West came to an end and remained unsettled.

An underlying issue in the epiclesis question for the East was the relationship in the Sacrament between the Second Person and the Third Person of the Trinity. The Western concept of consecration in which the consecratory power resides solely in the *Verba*, was viewed by the Greeks as undermining of the Spirit's work in the Sacrament. This made Christ alone the consecrator. The Greeks agreed that Christ was the consecrator, but He consecrates through the Spirit.

In the Reformation, Chemnitz met a church divided on the doctrine of the consecration; the East asserting that the epiclesis was consecratory and the West that the *Verba* was consecratory. On the basis of Scripture Martin Chemnitz upheld the Western tradition. In total agreement with the Bishop of Hippo, the great teacher of the Western Church, Chemnitz maintained that the Words of Institution effect the presence of Christ's body and blood in the Supper. Chemnitz quotes approvingly the doctrine of the consecration found in the Western fathers:

Thus the other fathers hold that before the consecration there is only one substance there, namely, the bread and 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 sacramentis*, 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."<sup>20</sup>

For Chemnitz the Words of Institution indeed effect the presence, but if there is no distribution and reception, there is no real presence. The whole action of the Supper must remain united.

Therefore when the bread is indeed blessed but neither distributed nor received, but enclosed, shown and carried about, it is surely clear that the whole word of institution is not added to the element, for this part is lacking: He gave (it) to them and said, Take eat. And when the word of institution is incomplete there can be no complete Sacrament. In the same way it is also not true Baptism if the Word is indeed spoken over the water, but if there is no one who is baptized.<sup>21</sup>

The fact that Chemnitz teaches that the Words of Institution are consecratory does not deny that the Holy Spirit operates in the Supper. As it is the Spirit who works in Baptism through the Word, so it is the Spirit who works in the Holy Supper through the Word. Like John of Damascus before him, Luther draws an interesting parallel between the incarnation and the consecration in the Sacrament, indicating that Christ's body and blood are present through the Word and power of the Holy Spirit.

Take yet another example. How did his mother Mary become pregnant? Although

it is a great miracle when a woman is made pregnant by a man, yet God reserved for him the privilege of being born of the Virgin. Now how does the Mother come to this? She has no husband [Luke 1:34] and her womb is entirely enclosed. Yet she conceives in her womb a real, natural child with flesh and blood. Is there not more of a miracle here than in the bread and wine? Where does it come from? The angel Gabriel brings the word: "Behold, you will conceive in your womb and bear a son, etc." [Luke 1:31]. With these words Christ comes not only into her heart, but also into her womb, as she hears, grasps, and believes it. No one can say otherwise, than that the power comes through the Word. As one cannot deny the fact that she thus becomes pregnant through the Word, and no one knows how it comes about, so it is in the sacrament also. For as soon as Christ says: "This is my body", his body is present through the Word and the power of the Holy Spirit. If the Word is not there, it is mere bread; but as soon as the words are added they bring with them that of which they speak. (*Denn sobald Christus spricht: "Das ist mein Leib", so ist sein Leib da durchs Wort und Kraft des Heiligen Geistes. (Psalm 33:9) Wenn das Wort nicht da ist, so ist es schlecht Brod; aber so die Worte dazu kommen, bringen sie das mit, davon sie lauten*)<sup>22</sup>

The lack of the epiclesis in the historic Lutheran Liturgy is not a denial of the Holy Spirit's operation in the Supper. It is God, the Holy Ghost, who works through the means of grace, Holy Word and Blessed Sacraments.

### 3. *The Moment of the Presence in the Sacrament*

Because the Ancient Church did not designate a precise instant in which the consecration is effective, the question of the moment was a non-issue in the Ancient Church. As has been shown above,<sup>23</sup> Augustine taught that the Words of Institution effect the presence, but he did not assert that the *Verba* are instantaneously effective. He maintained that the *Verba* are effective within the action of the Sacrament. It was only when transubstantiation, with its instantaneous transformation of one substance into another, became the accepted doctrine of the church, that the question concerning the moment of the presence came to the foreground. This same concept of instantaneous transformation, which was viewed by the Greeks as undermining the work of the Spirit in the Sacrament, also raised the question of the moment of the presence. If the *Verba* are instantaneously effective, then Christ's body and blood are present immediately after the words are said.

In the Reformation, Chemnitz defended the truth that the Words of Institution effect the presence against the Sacramentarians, but as Augustine, he developed no dogma concerning the moment of the presence. One should not assume that Chemnitz did not face this issue. In the Saliger Controversy in which Chemnitz participated, some of the main topics under discussion were the efficacy of the Words of Institution, and the duration of the sacramental union of Christ's body and blood under the bread and wine in the Lord's Supper. While this was the case, in Article VII of the *Formula of Concord*, a statement which was to bring peace among Lutherans on these very issues, he held that this was sufficient for confessional agreement: that one teach that Christ's body and blood are truly present in the elements of bread and wine in the Supper so that His body and blood may be distributed by the minister and received by the communicant.<sup>24</sup> This statement does not teach that Christ's body and blood must be present immediately after the Words of Institution are recited. Nor does it limit the presence to the eating and drinking. Rather, it states Christ's body and blood are distributed by the minister, indicating that Christ's body and blood are present in the minister's hand so that they may be offered to the communicant to be eaten and drunk.<sup>25</sup>

### *C. The Adoration and Reservation of the Lord's Supper*

The attitude of reverence toward the Blessed Sacrament and the practice of the adoration of the Lord's bodily presence in the Supper are occasionally referred to in the Early Church. Augustine alludes to such adoration when he writes:

For He took earth from earth, because flesh is from earth, and from the flesh of Mary He took flesh. And because He walked here in that flesh, He also gave us that flesh to eat for our salvation. But no one eats that flesh, unless he has first adored it."<sup>26</sup>

The context of Augustine's remarks suggest that he is referring to the custom of adoring the consecrated elements during the liturgy. When adoration was discussed in Augustine's time, it was normally an adoration within the eucharistic celebration. The remaining elements were usually consumed in the celebration or immediately afterward by the clergy. The carrying of the consecrated elements to the sick and the custom of taking the Sacrament home to be used in time of need were exceptions to this rule. The latter custom gradually fell into disrepute in the church.

In the Middle Ages there was a far greater emphasis on beholding and worshipping the elements and there began a worship of the Sacrament outside the celebration. Throughout the Carolingian period, the norm of eucharistic practice remained active participation in the Divine Liturgy, culminating in the reception of the sacramental elements. But in the tenth and eleventh centuries, attitudes toward the Sacrament underwent an emphatic change. The sacramental elements of Christ's body and blood were viewed separate from the Divine Liturgy, and were regarded as objects of devotion outside of the worship service. With the decline in the frequency of communion, possibly as a result of the dread of unworthy participation in the Sacrament, viewing or beholding the Lord's body was considered to be as beneficial and, at times, more beneficial than oral reception. Ocular communion (communing with the eyes), at least in the popular mind, offered the blessings of oral reception without the danger of unworthy participation inherent in the oral reception of Christ's body and blood. Later, the elevation of the host in the Divine Liturgy, the use of the monstrance, and the Corpus Christi Festival with its processions were innovated to satisfy this desire to gaze upon the host. Thus, there was a movement away from oral reception to ocular reception. This movement was never completed, nor was it officially espoused. However, considering the fact that the average communicant in the Medieval Period communed orally only three or four times a year, ocular communion was by far the norm.

From this history it is evident that Chemnitz faced a considerably different situation than Augustine did as he came to grips with the veneration of the Sacrament. Chemnitz faced a powerful cult of eucharistic adoration outside the liturgy. The excesses of this worship are to be seen in the life of Dorothea of Danzig who lived at the end of the fourteenth century. She is famed to have gazed upon the reserved host as many as a hundred times in a day, and still she craved to see it again.<sup>27</sup>

In response to the medieval custom of the reservation and the veneration of the host outside the liturgy, Chemnitz writes in his *Examen*:

We will not put away the bread and 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 our faith will do what Christ did before and commanded to be done.<sup>28</sup>

Here Chemnitz speaks against the reservation and veneration outside the liturgy. He does this on the basis of Christ's command in the institution: "This do in remembrance of Me." This directive of our Lord demands a prescribed action or use. In the assembly of Christ's body, the church, one called as Christ's representative is to take bread and wine, blessing them with Christ's all-powerful Words of consecration and distribute Christ's very body and blood so that they may be received by the communicant. In this ordered action of the Supper, Christians can be sure that Christ's body and blood are present so that they can be distributed by the minister and received. According to Chemnitz, when the prescribed sacramental use is not complete or changed into another use, there is no promise of the presence of Christ. There is no promise that Christ will be present to be venerated in the host reserved in the monstrance, in the tabernacle, and in the Corpus Christi procession. Concerning this Chemnitz says:

For when the Words are indeed spoken over the bread but the action which is prescribed and commanded in the institution is either not observed or is changed into another use, then we do not have the promise of the presence of the body and blood of Christ there as it is present in His Supper.<sup>29</sup>

When the sacramental action is changed or the whole use (*usus*; consecration, distribution, reception) is not carried out, then there is no Sacrament, that is, no real presence, for nothing has the character of a Sacrament outside its intended use.<sup>30</sup>

Ocular communion, which many in the Medieval Church believed gave the blessings of the Supper without the dangers of oral reception, in the estimation of Chemnitz, was not only contrary to the institution of Christ, but it also had no certainty of Christ's blessing. The blessings of the Sacrament are assured to those who eat and drink Christ's body and blood in a worthy manner. A requisite for receiving the intended blessings of the Supper is oral reception. Beholding or gazing upon the host at the elevation does not offer forgiveness of sins, life, and salvation.

Although Chemnitz rejects the reservation and all adoration outside of the sacramental action, he does assert a valid adoration in the Lord's Supper celebration.<sup>31</sup> He even quotes approvingly Augustine's statement on adoration in his exposition of Psalm 98 (99:5).<sup>32</sup> He then explains that proper adoration is an inner spiritual worship which expresses itself in true preparation for the Sacrament. When this true inner worship is present in the heart, then outward manifestations of reverence will follow of their own accord.<sup>33</sup> All outward signs of reverence for Chemnitz are in the area of Christian freedom. For example, while every allusion to sacrifice linked to the elevation was rejected, the rite of the elevation, which was considered an *adiaphoron*, continued among many early Lutherans as a confession of the real presence.

#### *D. The Sacrifice and the Lord's Supper*

##### *1. The Commemoration of the Sacrifice of the Cross*

The appellation "sacrifice" for the Sacrament is much more prevalent in Augustine than it is in the works of Chemnitz. Chemnitz' careful and sparing use of the term "sacrifice," in reference to the Lord's Supper is a direct result of the abuses of the Middle Ages. In spite of this, there is no question that both these fathers regarded the Sacrament as a commemoration of the sacrifice of the cross. This means that the Sacrament is a presentation of Christ's all-sufficient sacrifice on the cross in the midst of His people where Christ's body and blood, the sacrifice once offered, are made present, conveying all the blessings of the cross to Christ's body, the church. In his *City of God* Augustine says that the Eucharist is a sacramental symbol of the reality which is the sacrifice of the cross.

Thus he is both the priest, himself making the offering, and the oblation. This is the reality, and he intended the daily sacrifice of the Church to be the sacramental symbol of this; for the Church, being the Body of which he is the Head, learns to offer herself through him.<sup>34</sup>

It is not the sacrifice itself, but a sign or a presentation of the sacrifice. Elsewhere he speaks of it as commemoration (*memoriam*) of Christ's sacrificial death.<sup>35</sup>

In his *Enchiridion*, Chemnitz explains in what sense the fathers spoke of the Sacrament as a sacrifice. The fathers understood the Eucharist to be "celebrated in memory or commemoration of the only propitiatory sacrifice which Christ accomplished once on the cross, that is, in thanksgiving and praise of the Lord's death."<sup>36</sup> This is further clarified in the *Examen*:

The fathers call the body and blood of the Lord which are present in the Supper a saving sacrifice, a pure host, our ransom, the purchase price of our redemption, the ransom for the sins of the world, a propitiatory sacrifice and a propitiation, not because the body and blood of Christ are offered in the Mass by the action of the priest in order that they may become the ransom and propitiation for the sins of the whole world, but because that sacrifice which was once offered on the cross for our redemption and for the sins of the whole world -- the body and blood of the Lord -- is present, is dispensed, offered, and taken in the Lord's Supper, so that the power and efficacy of this offering, once made on the cross, is applied and sealed individually to all who receive it in faith.<sup>37</sup>

Chemnitz, together with Augustine, holds that the Sacrament is a commemoration of the once and for all sacrifice of the cross where the blessings of that sacrifice are made present for the church. He, however, totally rejects the assertion that in the Supper Christ's body and blood are offered up as a propitiatory sacrifice for the expiating and blotting out of sin, because all sins were blotted out through Christ's all-sufficient sacrifice on the cross. Here Chemnitz opposes one of the predominant themes of the Medieval Church.

The great theologian of the Middle Ages, Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274), identified the sacrifice of the Eucharist with the sacrifice of the cross implying that they are one and the same, for they have the same victim and the same effects or benefits.<sup>38</sup> A later churchman, Gabriel Biel (1420-1495), who was the best known of the nominalists among the Lutheran reformers, stressed a dissimilarity between the sacrifice of the cross and the sacrifice of the Mass. In his thought, the Mass remained a second sacrifice only historically related to the cross.<sup>39</sup> By not firmly maintaining the unity between the cross and the eucharistic sacrifice, Biel made medieval theology vulnerable to the reformers criticism who held that the Mass had been turned into a new Calvary in which the sacrifice of the Mass added to Christ's work on the cross. Also Biel advocated the value of human merit and work in the Eucharist. As a result of this, Chemnitz, as Luther before him, condemned the Mass as a work and sacrifice of men.<sup>40</sup> In response to the criticism of the Reformation, the Council of Trent decreed in Chapter II, "Concerning the Sacrifice of the Mass":

For the sacrificial Victim is one and the same, the same now offering through the ministry of the priests who then offered Himself on the cross, the manner of offering alone being different.<sup>41</sup>

In Canon III it is stated that this sacrifice is not a bare commemoration of the cross, but a propitiatory sacrifice.<sup>42</sup> Chemnitz could not accept the teaching that the sacrifice of the cross and the sacrifice of the Mass are identical; the self-same offering sacrificed once on the cross and now continually offered in the Mass. This concept in Chemnitz' estimation denies that Christ's sacrifice

on the cross was all-sufficient offered once and for all as the writer to the Hebrews declares, "Who (Christ) does not need daily as those high priests to offer up sacrifices, first for His own sins and then for the people's, for this He did once for all when He offered up Himself." (Hebrews 7:27)<sup>43</sup> If Christ is offered up continually to expiate sin, then Christ's once and for all atonement sacrifice was not perfect and complete. To be sure, Jesus ever lives to make intercession for us, but He does this on the basis of His sacrifice offered once, not on the basis of the Mass continually offered. (Hebrews 7:25) Chemnitz agrees that Christ's body and blood, the propitiatory sacrifice of the cross, are present in the Supper so that the communicant may receive the blessings of the cross, but they are not in any way offered to God to appease His just anger over sin because that was done once and for all on Calvary. In the Supper the propitiatory sacrifice is not offered to God, but God offers and gives the benefits of that sacrifice to His people. The sacrifice of the cross cannot be all-sufficient offered once and still need to be offered daily in the Mass.

Chemnitz considers the Tridentine dogma, that the sacrifice of the mass is the same sacrifice as the sacrifice of the cross, to be a camouflage. To say that the Supper is the same sacrifice as the sacrifice of the cross, meaning that in the Sacrament Christ's body and blood are offered up to appease God's just anger over sin, impairs the oneness of the once and for all sacrifice on the cross. (Hebrews 7:26-27, 9:12) The sacrifice of the cross cannot be all-sufficient, offered once, and still need to be continually offered in the Mass. The only way that the sacrifice of the Sacrament is the same as the sacrifice of the cross is that in the Supper, that very body and blood which once won redemption for all, are now present in the Supper conveying those blessings to the individual. Chemnitz and the Lutheran fathers are extremely emphatic in their rejection of any form of eucharistic sacrifice which militates against the once and for all sacrifice of the cross or makes the Sacrament a human work or sacrifice.

Chemnitz, as Luther before him, is extremely adamant in his rejection of the Mass as a propitiatory sacrifice offered to God. He speaks of it as the abomination of the Mass.

That it lacks true, firm, and solid grounds in Scripture is, however, not the only thing we criticize in the papalist Mass; what we complain about most of all is that it is an abomination, conflicting with the doctrine of the Word, the sacraments, and faith -- yes, that it is full of abuse against the unique sacrifice of Christ and against His perpetual priesthood, as this has been demonstrated at length by the men on our side in fair and honest writings.<sup>44</sup>

This is a very strong statement from Chemnitz who is usually very moderate and conciliatory. He is so firm in this statement because he believes that this concept of eucharistic sacrifice is contrary to the central article, justification by faith alone. When Christ's sacrifice at Calvary is not viewed as all-sufficient, the basis for justification is destroyed. The whole world is declared righteous on the basis of Christ's once and for all vicarious atonement sacrifice. (objective justification) If there is no all-sufficient sacrifice there is no forensic justification. The whole world is declared righteous on the basis of Christ's all-sufficient sacrifice at Calvary, the blessings of which are offered to all in the means of grace (Word and Sacrament) and are appropriated through faith which is worked through those same means of grace. (subjective justification)

This concept of eucharistic sacrifice not only makes the Calvary sacrifice less than complete, but it adds human activity to Christ's sacrifice. The church needs to continually offer Christ's sacrifice to the Father. The priest makes the offering not only in the name of Christ, but also in the name of the church, in the name of the faithful who are present, and even in his own name. This changes the action of God in the Sacrament into our activity or action. As a result, salvation is not entirely the work of God, but it is at least in part the work of man, and Christ is made of no effect. (Galatians 5:4)<sup>45</sup>

This concept changes the primary emphasis of the Lord's Supper. The Lord's Supper is not

man's offering to God, but it is primarily a testament or pure gift from God. It is the last will and testament of Christ where He gives us all the benefits of His atoning death of the cross.<sup>46</sup> Here He bequeaths to us the whole treasure of the cross.

The papalist Mass obscures and overturns the means which the Son of God Himself instituted and ordained in order that through them the merit, power, and efficacy of His death and passion might be applied and accepted for the remission of sins and eternal salvation. For just as a sure and sufficient merit of salvation has been ordained by God, namely, the sacrifice of Christ, so, because an application of His merit must be made, the Son of God instituted and ordained certain means for this purpose, namely, the means of Word and sacrament.<sup>47</sup>

This is not to say that there is no offering of praise, thanksgiving, and one's whole sanctified life in the Sacrament. Still, this is always a secondary emphasis of the Supper. The Supper is primarily sacrament or a gift from God, and, secondary, our offering of thanksgiving in response to that gift.

According to the Lutheran fathers, the Supper contains all the elements of a last will and testament.

Since God in the Scriptures again and again calls his promise a testament he means to announce thereby that he will die; and again, in calling it a promise he means to announce that he will live. And thus, by that one word he wanted to make us understand that he would become man, die; and yet live eternally . . . A testament is nothing but the last will of one who is dying, telling how his heirs are to live with and dispose of his properties after his death. . . . Four things are necessary in a complete and proper testament: the testator, the oral or written promise, the inheritance, and the heirs; and all of these are clearly visible to us in this testament. The testator is Christ, who is about to die. The promise is contained in the words with which the bread and wine are consecrated. The inheritance which Christ has bequeathed to us in his testament is the forgiveness of sins. The heirs are all the believers in Christ, namely, the holy elect children of God -- wherefore Paul in Titus 1 [:1] calls the Christian faith the faith of the elect.<sup>48</sup>

As Augustine gives his presentation of eucharistic sacrifice, it is not in contrast to controversy concerning this doctrine, as was the case with Chemnitz. Therefore, Augustine is not as precise as Chemnitz in his definition of eucharistic sacrifice, nor is there any reason we should expect him to be. He was not facing the same issues as arose in the Reformation. There are times in his writings where Augustine appears to be saying that the Eucharist is a true sacrifice of Christ's body and blood in and of itself, and not only a commemoration of the all-sufficient sacrifice of the cross.<sup>49</sup> Still, he does not explain what he means by this. If he means the Eucharist is a sacrifice because here the body and blood which were the once and for all sacrifice for sin, are present conveying all the blessings of the cross to the individual, Chemnitz would agree with him. In that sense the Eucharist may be called a true sacrifice. If, however, he means that in the Eucharist Christ's body and blood are offered to the Father as a propitiatory sacrifice for sin, Chemnitz would totally disagree.

The idea that the Supper is a propitiatory sacrifice offered to God militates against Augustine's own understanding of the cross. For Augustine the all-sufficient sacrifice and oblation for sin is the once and for all offering which the Redeemer made on Calvary.<sup>50</sup> It appears then that when Augustine speaks of the Eucharist as a sacrifice he does not mean that it, in and of itself, is a propitiatory sacrifice offered to God, but rather a commemoration of the all-sufficient sacrifice of

the cross where Christ's body and blood offered once are made present, conveying all the blessings of the cross to Christ's body, the church.

When Augustine speaks of eucharistic sacrifice in a more precise manner, he usually speaks of it as such a commemoration. For example, he states that the Old Testament sacrifices pointed to the one true sacrifice on the cross, and this sacrifice is commemorated in the Sacrament.

For they were our examples, and in many and various ways they all pointed to the one sacrifice which we now commemorate. Now that this sacrifice has been revealed, and has been offered in due time, sacrifice is no longer binding as an act of worship, while it retains its symbolical authority.<sup>51</sup>

The Hebrews, again, in their animal sacrifices, which they offered to God in many varied forms, suitably to the significance of the institution, typified the sacrifice offered by Christ. This sacrifice is also commemorated by Christians, in the sacred offering and participation of the body and blood of Christ.<sup>52</sup>

Before the coming of Christ, the flesh and blood of this sacrifice were foreshadowed in the animals slain; in the passion of Christ the types were fulfilled by the true sacrifice; after the ascension of Christ, this sacrifice is commemorated in the sacrament.<sup>53</sup>

Both Chemnitz and Augustine would agree that the one true sacrifice to which all the Old Testament sacrifices point is the sacrifice of the cross, and this sacrifice is commemorated in the Holy Supper.

## *2. The Ecclesial Concept of Eucharistic Sacrifice*

While Augustine teaches that the Eucharist is a commemoration of Christ's all-sufficient sacrifice on the cross, his predominant theme by far as he discusses eucharistic sacrifice is that the sacrifice of the Eucharist is Christ's body, the church. Augustine teaches that as Christians were united with Christ and His body, the church, in Baptism, so in the Holy Supper they are strengthened and preserved in that unity by receiving His body and blood. Since they are united with Christ's body, the church, by receiving His body born of Mary, His body, the church, is the true sacrifice of the Eucharist. Out of gratitude for salvation full and free imparted to the church in the Sacrament through Christ's body and blood, the church offers itself, all that it is and all that it has, as a thankoffering to God on the basis of Christ's once and for all sacrifice on the cross. Concerning this Augustine writes in Book 10, 6 of the *City of God*:

For as we have many members in one body, and all members do not have the same function, so we, though many, are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another, having gifts which differ according to the grace that is given to us" (Rm 12.3-6). This is the sacrifice of Christians: "We, though many, are one body in Christ" (1 Co 10.17), and this is the sacrifice which the church continually celebrates in the sacrament of the altar, known to the faithful, in which she teaches that she herself is offered in the offering she makes.<sup>54</sup>

Chemnitz, in his *Examen*, says much the same. According to Chemnitz, in the true use of the Holy Supper the church and individual believers dedicate themselves, soul and body, to the Lord. Christians present their bodies living sacrifice, holy, and acceptable to God which is our spiritual service. (Romans 12:1) Having said this, Chemnitz quotes Augustine's statement from

the *City of God* concerning the ecclesial concept of eucharistic sacrifice.

Therefore Augustine writes, *De civitate Dei*, Bk. 10, ch. 6: "This is the sacrifice of Christians that we, being many, are one body in Christ. The church frequently makes use of the sacrament of the altar, which is known to believers, where it is demonstrated to her that in the offering which she offers she is herself offered."<sup>55</sup>

The only apparent difference between Augustine and Chemnitz in this concept of eucharistic sacrifice is that Augustine tends to stress the offering of the church as a unity, and Chemnitz tends to stress the individual Christian offering of himself.

It also should be noted that Chemnitz is not the only Lutheran father to speak of this concept of eucharistic sacrifice. In his *Treatise on the New Testament, That Is, the Holy Mass*, Luther comes very close to Augustine's understanding.

To be sure this sacrifice of prayer, praise, and thanksgiving, and of ourselves as well, we are not to present before God in our own person. But we are to lay it upon Christ and let him present it for us, as St. Paul teaches in Hebrews 13[15], "Let us continually offer up a sacrifice of praise to God, that is, the fruit of lips that confess him and praise him"; and all this "through Christ." For this is why he is also a priest -- as Psalm 110[4] says, "You are a priest forever after the order of Melchizedek" -- because he intercedes for us in heaven. He receives our prayer and sacrifice, and through himself, as a godly priest, makes them pleasing to God. Again St. Paul says in Hebrews 9[24], "He has ascended into heaven to be a mediator in the presence of God on our behalf"; and in Romans 8[34], "It is Christ Jesus, who died, yes, who was raised from the dead, who sits on the right hand of God, who also makes intercession for us."

From these words we learn that we do not offer Christ as a sacrifice, but that Christ offers us. And in this way it is permissible, yes, profitable, to call the mass a sacrifice; not on its own account, but because we offer ourselves as a sacrifice along with Christ. That is, we lay ourselves on Christ by a firm faith in his testament and do not otherwise appear before God with our prayer, praise, and sacrifice except through Christ and his mediation. . . . If the mass were so understood and for this reason called a sacrifice, it would be well. Not that we offer the sacrament, but that by our praise, prayer, and sacrifice we move him and give him occasion to offer himself for us in heaven and ourselves with him. It is as if I were to say, I had brought a king's son to his father as an offering, when actually I had done no more than induce that son to present my need and petition to the king and made the son my mediator.<sup>56</sup>

Chemnitz and the other Lutheran fathers make use of the ecclesial concept of eucharistic sacrifice. However, it is never as predominant in their writings as it is in Augustine's works. This is due in part to their general aversion to speaking of the Supper as a sacrifice. Whenever the Supper is designated a sacrifice there is always a possibility that it will be understood as a propitiatory sacrifice offered to God. Thus the Lutheran fathers are very reticent to speak of the Sacrament as a sacrifice in any way. They much prefer to highlight the primary emphasis of the Supper which is a testament or a gift from God. It is the last will and testament of Christ where he bequeathes all the blessings of the cross.

Another reason for this reluctance in employing this otherwise acceptable theme of

eucharistic sacrifice may be its use among the Reformed. It was probably deemphasized in reaction to the Reformed teaching that the Supper was merely a sign of the unity of the church as the body of Christ and of the church offering itself. As the Reformed emphasized the church as the body of Christ as the only sense in which Christ was bodily present in the Supper, the Lutherans, desiring to stress the real presence of Christ's body and blood born of the Virgin in the bread and wine, made less use of the theme that in the Supper Christians are united into Christ's body, the church, and offer themselves to the Lord as a thankoffering for salvation full and free.

### *3. The Sacrifice and Those Who Died in the Lord*

Because the whole church is united with Christ, its Head, and offered up to the Father in the Eucharist, for Augustine, the Eucharist is beneficial not only for those who participate, but also for the entire church including the faithful departed. The notion that the whole church is united with Christ's salvific work in the Sacrament leads Augustine to assume that there is a benefit for the whole church in the Sacrament, even for those who do not participate by oral reception. Thus, Augustine teaches that the sacrifice of the Eucharist is a great benefit to those who have died in the Lord by virtue of their baptismal faith.<sup>57</sup>

Here Chemnitz parts company with the great Bishop of Hippo. Because the Sacrament was instituted by our Lord for the prescribed purpose of being eaten and drunk for the forgiveness of sins, the promised benefits can only be received through oral reception. Chemnitz disavows any benefit from the Supper for those absent.

A sacrament, however, is a holy sign through which God freely offers, conveys, applies, and seals His gratuitous benefits to us. It is therefore an extraordinary perversion of the Lord's Supper to make a sacrifice out of a sacrament, in the way the papalists speak of the sacrifice of their Mass, namely, that the representatory action of the priest procures for us the application of the benefits of Christ and that anyone who causes a Mass to be celebrated in his behalf by this work procures grace and whatever other things are ascribed to the Mass. . . . In addition there is this perversion, that whereas Christ instituted the use of His Supper for all who receive it, who take, eat, and drink, the papalist Mass transfers the use and benefit of the celebration of the Lord's Supper in our time to the onlookers, who do not communicate, yes, to those who are absent, and even to the dead.<sup>58</sup>

The Sacrament benefits only those who actively participate in the Supper. Besides this Chemnitz sees no need for any sacrifice, benefit, or prayer for the faithful departed, for they are already with the Lord in glory.

## *E. Proper Preparation for the Lord's Supper*

### *1. Worthy Participation and the Sacrament*

For Augustine, as for all the early fathers, St. Paul's admonition (I Corinthians 11:29) concerning unworthy participation in the Sacrament was an extremely serious matter. These words made a deep impression on the Early Church. Only those individuals who were baptized and instructed in Christian doctrine were permitted to partake in the Supper. If a person was in a state of impenitence, he was considered unworthy and was barred from the Sacrament. Chemnitz affirmed this practice of Augustine and the Early Church. One must be properly prepared to receive the Sacrament worthily. This worthiness consists in a sincere sorrow over sin, striving to do better, and in a confident faith in Jesus the Savior who paid for the sins of the world on the

cross with His body and blood, and who gives us that very body and blood in the Supper for forgiveness of sins, life and salvation.<sup>59</sup>

Both Chemnitz and Augustine taught that the unworthy guest does not merely receive bread and wine. He truly receives the body and blood of the Lord, but it is to his great harm rather than to his benefit.<sup>60</sup> The eating of the unworthy (*manducatio indignorum*) together with the oral reception of Christ's body and blood by the communicants (*manducatio oralis*) became watch words for Chemnitz and the Lutheran fathers as they faced the controversy concerning the real presence with the Reformed. They maintained that only the one who believed in the oral reception of Christ's body and blood born of Mary and the eating of the same by the unworthy, really confessed the true and substantial presence of Christ's body and blood in the Supper.

## *2. Altar Fellowship and the Sacrament*

Immorality indeed excludes one from the Lord's table. The same is true of false doctrine. The Sacrament is the supreme manifestation of the church's unity and a powerful means to effect that unity. As we were engrafted into Christ and His body in Baptism, so in the Supper we are strengthened and preserved in that unity. We are united with His one body, the church, by receiving His one body in the Supper. (I Corinthians 10:17) All Christians who come to the Sacrament present themselves as one spiritual family. What they eat and drink together, Christ's body and blood, ties them together far more closely than any bonds of blood. They are brothers and sisters in Christ. The unity that is effected in the Sacrament assumes a unity in doctrine and belief. Because this is the case, the Sacrament may be received only with those who confess all the doctrines of the Scripture. Otherwise, we are really lying. We are declaring that we are one when we are not one. (Matthew 7:15-19; Romans 16:17; Galatians 1:8-9; Ephesians 4:1-6; II Timothy 2:16-19; II John 9-11) There was no doubt about this truth in the Early Church. The Early Church unanimously practiced closed communion.<sup>61</sup>

In the Reformation this principle was upheld. Luther writes, "Whoever really regards his doctrine, faith, and confession as true, right, and certain cannot remain in the same stall with such as teach or adhere to false doctrine."<sup>62</sup> "When it occurs that individuals become disagreed in doctrine, the result is that it separates them and indicates who the true Christians are, namely, those who have God's Word pure and excellent."<sup>63</sup> Luther put this statement into practice at the Marburg Colloquy of 1529. As the Colloquy began, all participants considered themselves "Catholic" Christians who wanted the Catholic Church reformed, even if they differed on the manner of the Reformation. They viewed themselves as brothers who were coming together to discuss disagreements that had arisen between them. As a result of the Colloquy, Zwingli and the Swiss showed themselves not to be weak brothers but those who were persisting in false teaching in regard to the Sacrament of Christ's body and blood. Thus Luther would not give Zwingli the right hand of fellowship. *The Formula of Concord* of which Chemnitz was one of the authors, quotes Luther's verdict in regard to the Reformed and fellowship with them:

I reckon them all as belonging together (that is, as Sacramentarians and enthusiasts), for that is what they are who will not believe that the Lord's bread in the Supper is his true, natural body, which the godless or Judas receive orally as well as St. Peter and all the saints. Whoever, I say, will not believe this, will please let me alone and expect no fellowship from me. This is final.<sup>64</sup>

Chemnitz, just as Augustine and the whole Ancient Church, would not commune with those who taught doctrine contrary to the Holy Scripture and, thus, practiced closed communion.

## *F. The Blessings of the Lord's Supper*

*1. The Sacrament as the Forgiveness of Sins*

The Words of Institution summarize the blessings of the Supper in the words, "Given and shed for you for the remission of sins." Therefore, it is only natural that both Chemnitz and Augustine speak of the forgiveness of sin as a primary blessing of the Sacrament. Both men knew their lost and sinful condition by nature and yearned for the grace of God. Augustine's *Confessions* are a case study in human depravity, and these insights were deepened in his conflict with the Pelagians. Augustine recognized that his soul was never at rest until it was at rest in the Lord. Such rest Augustine found in the Holy Eucharist where he ate the price of his redemption as he asserts in the *Confessions*:

You know my unskillfulness and my weakness; teach me and heal me. He, your only Son, in Whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge, has redeemed me with His blood. Let not the proud speak evil of me, for my thoughts are on the price of my redemption; I eat it and drink it and give it to others to eat and drink, and, being poor myself, I desire to be satisfied by it among those that eat and are satisfied, and they shall praise the Lord who seek Him.<sup>65</sup>

Chemnitz fought to defend that same certainty of forgiveness and peace with God. In Chemnitz' estimation, the Roman party endangered salvation by making it dependant on human action, and the Reformed took away the comfort of forgiveness in the means of grace by denying their efficacious power. He found wonderful comfort in the truth that the Lord's Supper and the other means of grace truly dispense forgiveness of sins and all God's blessings.

But lest the infirmity, unworthiness, and uncleanness of our flesh disturb or overturn our faith, the Son of God affirms that in His Supper He is offering His body and blood to us in such a way that with the bread and wine we receive them in our mouth, that we may be even more certain that the unworthiness and uncleanness of our flesh can be covered and hidden before the tribunal of God through the most holy body and most precious blood of our Lord Jesus Christ . . . Some prayers of the ancient Greek fathers are extant in which with the sweetest words they say that the body and blood of Christ, when they are eaten by us in the Supper, become for us the 'acceptable offering' which we can bring before the tribunal of God [Rom. 15:16, 31]. Likewise they speak of it as our guarantee of eternal life and salvation.<sup>66</sup>

Because of the controversies which Chemnitz faced in the Reformation, the means of grace are even more predominant in his theology than in Augustine's. First of all he makes a distinction between where salvation was won and where it is dispensed. Salvation was accomplished totally and completely through Christ's holy life for us and His holy death for our sins. (substitutionary atonement) However, Christ did not distribute or give salvation on the cross. This He does through the means of grace, Holy Word and Blessed Sacraments. The Scriptures declare that faith comes from hearing the Word (Romans 10:17), that Baptism saves us (I Peter 3:21), that whenever you forgive sins they are forgiven and whenever you do not forgive sins, they are not forgiven (John 20:23), and that the Lord's Supper gives the forgiveness of sins. (Matthew 26:28) God nowhere promises the Spirit and His gifts outside these means of grace. In this Chemnitz is in agreement with the Lutheran Confessions which state, "We should and must constantly maintain that God will not deal with us except through His external Word and Sacraments. Whatever is attributed to the Spirit apart from such Word and Sacraments is of the devil."<sup>67</sup>

Chemnitz points out that the Christian is brought to faith and reborn through the life-

giving Word and Holy Baptism. The Christian daily returns to his Baptism through repentance and faith and strengthens and nourishes that baptismal faith-life through the Word and the Sacrament of Christ's body and blood.<sup>68</sup> Likewise, Holy Absolution, both public and private, is not merely an announcement of forgiveness, but a real impartation of the same.<sup>69</sup> Through these God ordained means of grace, the Lord both confers on men the remission of sins merited by Christ and works faith in that proffered forgiveness or, where faith already exists, it strengthens and nourishes it.

## 2. The Sacrament as Life-Giving Nourishment and Salvation

As Martin Chemnitz explains the blessings of the Sacrament, another major theme found in his writings is that the body and blood of our Lord in the Supper are life-giving. Here is received life-giving flesh. Chemnitz cites the fathers of the Council of Ephesus (431) as saying:

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 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.<sup>70</sup>

Chemnitz' affirmation of this statement in his *De Duabus Naturis* is in line with his incarnational theology and points to the essential connection between Christology and soteriology in his thought. According to the hypostatic or personal union the Divine Logos, who is the only begotten of the Father before all worlds, assumed human nature into His divine person. The human nature in Christ does not subsist in itself or according to itself, in its own personality, but subsists in another, namely in the *hypostasis* of the pre-existent Logos. (ἀνυπόστατον, ἐνυπόστατον)<sup>71</sup> The personal union is the union of the divine and the human, subsisting in the one *hypostasis* (ὑπόστασις, persona) of the Son of God, producing a mutual and indissoluble communion of both natures.

As a result of the hypostatic union, Chemnitz teaches a real communication of attributes in the person of Christ. On the basis of the communication of attributes Chemnitz maintains that Christ's flesh is life-giving or as Luther says, that it is body and blood that is filled with God or permeated with divinity. (. . . sondern es ist ein Leib und Blut, der voll Gottes ist, oder das *durchgöttert ist*)<sup>72</sup> The fact that Christ's body and blood are filled with God or permeated with divinity is taught, in particular, on the basis of the second genus of the communication of attributes (Genus Maiestaticum) which states that while nothing is added to or taken away from the divine nature, yet, because of the hypostatic union with the deity, countless supernatural qualities and qualities which are even contrary to the common condition of human nature, are given and communicated to Christ's human nature.<sup>73</sup> This truth is expressed by St. Paul when he writes, "For in Him (Christ) dwells all the fullness of the Godhead bodily." (Colossians 2:9) Only the life and death of this One who is God and man in one person could accomplish the redemption of the world. He had to be true man so that He could take our place under the Law and suffer and die in our stead. At the same time, He had to be true God so that His holy life and death would be a sufficient ransom for all men.

Because Christ's body and blood are permeated with divinity, they are certainly life-giving as they are received in the Blessed Sacrament. The Divine Logos, who became incarnate and dwelt among us as the second Adam to undo our lost condition and restore all people to the original righteousness and holiness of the first Adam at the creation and even more, to give us eternal life in heaven -- paradise regained, is now incarnate in the Sacrament dispensing all the treasures of that salvation. Here the altar becomes His manger and we receive His flesh permeated with divinity which transforms us into Himself and prepares us for eternity.<sup>74</sup> Our Lord says, "Whoever

eats My flesh and drinks My blood has eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day. For My flesh is food indeed, and My blood is drink indeed. He who eats My flesh and drinks My blood abides in Me and I in him . . . so he who feeds on Me will live because of Me." (John 6:54-57) While this passage does not specifically refer to the Lord's Supper, its promise certainly applies to all places where He is present for us with His blessings and, therefore, applies to worthy participation in His body and blood in the Holy Sacrament. Thus, there is no end to the benefits which Chemnitz ascribed to this vivifying flesh. It is a heavenly and spiritual nourishment for both body and soul of believers unto eternal life. It is "a medicine of immortality, an antidote, that we may not die but live in God through Jesus Christ, a cleansing remedy through warding off and driving out evils."<sup>75</sup> With this incarnational theology of the Supper Chemnitz, at times, alludes to II Peter 1:4 and I Corinthians 10:16 expressing the benefits of the Supper in the *theosis* or deification theme of the Ancient Church. Christ gives us His body and blood permeated with divinity, so that we might be drawn into communion and union with the deity itself, participating in the divine nature.<sup>76</sup>

Augustine refers to the Sacrament as "Life" in his *On the Merits and Remission of Sins*.<sup>77</sup> However, this explanation of the blessings of the Supper is not as common in Augustine as in Chemnitz. It appears he does not make the same connection between Christology and the soteriological significance of the vivifying flesh of Christ that Chemnitz does. This is more prevalent among the Greek fathers.

In one of his Christmas sermons, Augustine states, "He who was God became Man in His effort to make godlike those who were men; without relinquishing what He was, He desired to become what He had made. He Himself fashioned what He would become, in that He added man's nature to God without losing God's nature in man."<sup>78</sup> Yet, even when he makes a statement like this which sounds much more at home among the Greek fathers than in the West, he makes no connection to the Eucharist. He does not speak of the Eucharist as the medicine of immortality, as the life-giving flesh of God, and as the means of communion and union with the deity, participating in the divine nature. One of the places where Augustine may have this concept in mind is when he puts these words on the lips of our Lord in the *Confessions*, "I am the food of the grown man. Grow and you shall feed upon me. And you will not, as with the food of the body, change me into yourself, but you will be changed into me."<sup>79</sup> Augustine thinks more in terms of the whole church receiving the benefits of the Eucharist, than in the individual participating in the deified flesh of Christ.

### 3. The Sacrament as the Bond of Unity

The primary purpose and benefit of the Sacrament in Augustine's theology is unity. This is the great contribution of the Bishop of Hippo to the dogma of the Eucharist. It is the Sacrament of unity because it unites God's people to Christ, their head, and to each other in His body, the church. Augustine says, "If you receive worthily, you are what you received."<sup>80</sup> As we were united with Christ and His body, the church, in Baptism, so in the Eucharist we are strengthened and preserved in that unity by receiving His body and blood. In the Supper the Lord comes to the believer with His body and blood and unites the believer with Himself. He remains in us and we in Him ever undivided, both here in time and forever in eternity.<sup>81</sup>

Augustine illustrates this unity with Christ and the incorporation into His body which occurs in the Eucharist, building on St. Paul's words, "For we, being many, are one bread and one body; for we all partake of the one bread." (I Corinthians 10:17) He applies St. Paul's concept of the church being "one bread" and compares Christians to seeds of grain being milled. "Remember that bread is not made from one grain, but from many. When you were exorcised you were, after a fashion, milled. When you were baptized you were moistened. When you received the fire of the Holy Spirit you were baked. Be what you see, and receive what you are."<sup>82</sup>

Augustine's concept of the Eucharist as the Sacrament of unity, the bond of charity is the basis for his principle concept of eucharistic sacrifice. In the Supper the assembly is drawn together as Christ's body, the church, and offered up to the Father as a thankoffering on the basis of Christ's atonement sacrifice on the cross. The Sacrament as the bond of unity and the ecclesial concept of eucharistic sacrifice in many ways summarizes Augustine's eucharistic theology.

To refer to the Supper as the source of our mutual fraternal fellowship in the church is not foreign to Chemnitz.

But because Christ in the Supper joins Himself most intimately to us by that 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 among 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)<sup>83</sup>

This, nevertheless, is not Chemnitz' primary emphasis. For Chemnitz the Sacrament is principally a means through which the benefits of the cross are appropriated by the individual. In comparison to this understanding of the eucharistic benefit, the concept of the Eucharist as the bond of unity fades into the background in the works of Chemnitz. This is true because the great questions of the Reformation were how does a man find a gracious God and how is that grace received by the individual? Also, in the Reformation era people were generally more conscious of the individual than in previous eras and thought of themselves as individuals. Augustine, on the other hand, speaks of the benefits of the Supper in relationship to the whole church, almost to the exclusion of the individual. This is the case because he does not think of Christians as individuals in their relationship with the Lord, but a part of Christ's body, the church. While one would never want to underrate the blessings and comfort of the Sacrament for the individual, in our land of rugged individualism we do well to highlight the fact we are not individuals standing alone in relation to the Lord, but are part of Christ's body, the church, drawn together through His body and blood in the Supper.

Augustine of Hippo and Martin Chemnitz are separated by more than a thousand years. They are separated both in culture and in race, one a North African and the other a Saxon German. Yet, they both confess the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the Sacrament, which is effected through the Word and institution of Christ. One cries to Christians today: "O Sacrament of unity, O bond of charity. You, O Christians are what you receive. Be offered up through Christ, your head." The other in eucharistic joy exclaims: "Receive the vivifying flesh and blood of Christ, our ransom, the price of our redemption, the food for sojourners, the medicine of immortality, a foretaste of heaven."

**BIBLIOGRAPHY***a. Books*

- Adam, Karl. *Die Eucharistielehre des hl. Augustin*. Paderborn: Druck und Verlag von Ferdinand Schoningh, 1908.
- Ambrose. *St. Ambrose on the Sacraments and on the Mysteries*. Translator, T. Thompson, B.D. London: SPCK, 1950.
- Aquinas, Thomas. *The Blessed Sacrament and the Mass*. Translator, Rev. F. O'Neill. Westminster, Maryland: Newman Press, 1955.
- Aquinas, Thomas. *The Summa Theologica*. Part III, Vol. 15. Translator, The Fathers of the English Dominican Province. New York: Benziger Brothers, 1914.
- Augustine. *The Confessions of St. Augustine*. Translator, Rex Warner. New York: New American Library, 1963.
- Augustine. *Concerning the City of God Against the Pagans*. Translator, Henry Bettenson. Middlesex, England: Penguin Books Ltd., 1972.
- Aulen, Gustaf. *Eucharist and Sacrifice*. Translator, Eric H. Wahlstrom. Edinburgh, England: Oliver and Boyd, Ltd., 1958.
- Barclay, Rev. Alexander, B.D., Ph.D. *The Protestant Doctrine of the Lord's Supper*. Glasgow: Jackson, Wylie & Co., 1927.
- Bettenson, Henry. *The Later Christian Fathers*. London: Oxford University Press, 1970.
- Birch, T. Bruce. *The De Sacramento Altaris of William of Ockham*. Burlington, Iowa: The Lutheran Literary Board, 1930.
- Bonner, Gerald. *God's Decree and Man's Destiny*. London: Variorum Reprints, 1987.
- Bonner, Gerald. *St. Augustine of Hippo, Life and Controversies*. Norwich: The Centerbury Press, 1986.
- Bouyer, Louis. *Eucharist, Theology and Spirituality of the Eucharistic Prayer*. Translator, Charles Underhill Quinn. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1968.
- Brilioth, Yngve. *Eucharistic Faith and Practice Evangelical and Catholic*. Translator, A. G. Hebert, M.A. London: SPCK, 1965.
- Buescher, Gabriel, O.F.M., S.T.D. *The Eucharistic Teaching of William Ockham*. St. Bonaventure, N.Y.: The Franciscan Institute, 1974.
- Campbell, Thomas L. *Dionysius the Pseudo-Areopagite, The Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, Inc., 1981.
- CCSL. *Corpus christianorum. Series Latina*. Turnhout, Belgium, 1953-.
- Chemnitz, Martin, Timotheus Kirchner, and Nikolaus Selnecker. *Apologia oder Verantwortung des Christlichen Concordien Buchs*. Magdeburg: bei Johan Francken: 1584.
- Chemnitz, Martin. *Examen Concilii Tridentini d.h. Prüfung des Concils von Trient. Aus dem Lateinischen aufs neue ins Deutsche übertragen von etlichen lutherischen Pastoren*. St. Louis: Verlag von L. Volkening, 1875.
- Chemnitz, Martin. *The Examination of the Council of Trent*. Part II. Translator, Fred Kramer. St. Louis: CPH, 1978.
- Chemnitz, Martin. *The Two Natures of Christ*. Translator, J.A.O. Preus. St. Louis: CPH, 1971.
- Chemnitz, Martin. *The Lord's Supper*. Translator, J.A.O. Preus. St. Louis: CPH, 1979.
- Chemnitz, Martin. *Ministry, Word, and Sacraments, An Enchiridion*. Translator, Luther Poellot. St. Louis: CPH, 1981.

- Croken, Robert C. *Luther's First Front*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 1990.
- Crockett, William R. *Eucharist: Symbol of Transformation*. New York: Pueblo Publishing Company, 1989.
- CSEL (*Corpus Scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum*). Vienna, 1866-.
- Daly, Robert J., S.J. *The Origins of the Christian Doctrine of Sacrifice*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1978.
- Davies, J.G. *The Early Christian Church*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1965.
- Deferrari, Roy Joseph, Editor. *The Fathers of the Church*. Vo. 37-38. New York: Fathers of the Church, Inc., 1959.
- Delorme, J. *The Eucharist in the New Testament*. Translator, E. M. Stewart. Baltimore and Dublin: Helicon Press, 1964.
- Dix, Gregory. *The Shape of the Liturgy*. London: Dacre Press, 1975.
- Easton, Burton Scott. *The Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus*. Cambridge: University Press, 1934.
- Elert, Werner. *Eucharist and Church Fellowship in the First Four Centuries*. Translator, N.E. Nagel. Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1966.
- Elert, Werner. *The Structure of Lutheranism*. Translator, Walter Hansen. St. Louis: CPH, 1962.
- Elert, Werner. *The Lord's Supper Today*. Translators, Martin Bertram and Rudolph R. Norden. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1973.
- Emminghaus, Johannes H. *The Eucharist*. Translator, Matthew J.O'Connell. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical press, 1978.
- Fleischer, Manfred P., Editor. *The Harvest of Humanism in Central Europe (Essays in Honor of Lewis W. Spitz)*. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1992.
- Fredrich, E.C., Editor. *Luther Lives*. Milwaukee: NPH, 1983.
- Frankovich, Lawrence F. *Augustine's Theory of Eucharistic Sacrifice*. A Dissertation. Milwaukee: Marquette University, 1976.
- Furca, E.J. *Huldrych Zwingli Writings, In Search of True Religion: Reformation, Pastoral and Eucharistic Writings*. Vol. II. Allison Park, Pennsylvania: Pickwick Publications, 1984.
- Gonzalez, Justo L. *A History of Christian Thought*. Nashville, Tennessee: Abingdon Press, 1970.
- Hagen, Kenneth. *Augustine, the Harvest, and Theology (1300-1650)*. Essays Dedicated to Heiko Augustinus Oberman in Honor of his Sixtieth Birthday. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1990.
- Hardt, Tom, G.A. *Venerabilis et Adorabilis Eucharistia: Eine Studie über die lutherische Abendmahlslehre im 16. Jahrhundert*. Translator, Jurgen Diestelmann. Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1988.
- Heick, Otto W. *A History of Christian Thought*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1965.
- Himmerich, Maurice Fred. *Deification in John of Damascus*. A Dissertation. Milwaukee: Marquette University, 1985.
- Hoenecke, A. *Dogmatik*. Vol. IV. Milwaukee: NPH, 1912.
- Jünke, W.A., Redaktion. *Der zweite Martin der Lutherischen Kirche: Festschrift zum 400. Todestage von Martin Chemnitz*. Braunschweig: Ev.-luth. Stadtkirchenverband und Propstei Braunschweig, 1986.
- Jeremias, Joachim. *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*. Translator, Norman Perrin. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977.

- Jungkuntz, Theodore R. *Formulators of the Formula of Concord*. St. Louis, Missouri: Concordia Publishing House, 1977.
- Jungmann, Josef A., S.J. *The Mass*. Translator, Julian Fernandes, S.J. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1975.
- Kilmartin, Edward J., S.J. *The Eucharist in the Primitive Church*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965.
- Kolb, Robert. *Andreae and The Formula of Concord*. St. Louis: CPH, 1977.
- Lohse, Bernhard. *A Short History of Christian Doctrine*. Translator, F. Ernest Stoeffler. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966.
- Luibheid, Colm. *Pseudo-Dionysius, The Complete Works: The Classics of Western Spirituality*. New York: Paulist Press, 1987.
- Luther, Martin. *Luther's Works*, American Ed., J. Pelikan and H. Lehmann general eds., Vol. 8, 22, 35-40. St. Louis: Concordia, and Philadelphia: Fortress, 1955-75.
- Luther, Martin. *Luthers Sämmtliche Schriften*. Vol. II, VII, XVII, XIX, XX, XXIIb. St. Louis: CPH.
- Macy, Gary. *The Theologies of the Eucharist in the Early Scholastic Period*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984.
- Manschreck, Clyde L. *Melanchthon on Christian Doctrine*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1982.
- Mantzaridis, Georgios I. *The Deification of Man*. Crestwood, New York: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1984.
- Mastrantonis, George. *Augsburg and Constantinople*. Brookline: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 1982.
- McKenna, John H., C.M. *Eucharist and Holy Spirit*. London: Alcuin Club, 1975.
- Meijering, E.P. *Melanchthon and Patristic Thought*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1983.
- Meyendorff, John. *Christ in Eastern Christian Thought*. Washington & Cleveland: Corpus Books, 1969.
- Mingana, A. *Commentary of Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Lord's Prayer and on the Sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist*. Cambridge: Woodbrooke Studies 6, 1933.
- Mitchell, Nathan, O.S.B. *Cult and Controversy: The Worship of the Eucharist Outside Mass*. New York: Pueblo Publishing Company, 1982.
- Montgomery, John. *Chytraeus on Sacrifice*. St. Louis: CPH, 1962.
- Nussbaum, Otto. *Die Aufbewahrung der Eucharistie*. Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlag, 1979.
- Oberman, Heiko Augustinus. *The Harvest of Medieval Theology*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1963.
- Ockham, William of. *Quodlibetal Questions*. Vol 1. Translators: Alfred J. Freddoso and Francis E. Kelley. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991.
- O'Connor, Rev. James T. *The Hidden Manna*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1988
- Ozment, Steven. *The Age of Reform 1250-1550*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980.
- Palmer, Paul F., S.J., S.T.D. *Sacraments and Worship*. Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1955.
- Pelikan, Jaroslav. *The Christian Tradition*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1971.
- Pelikan, Jaroslav. *The Mystery of Continuity*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1986.
- Pelikan, Jaroslav. *Jesus through the Centuries*. New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1985.

- Peters, Edward F. *The Origin and Meaning of the Axiom: "Nothing has the Character of a Sacrament Outside the Use" in Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century Lutheran Theology*. Th. D. dissertation. St. Louis: Concordia Seminary, 1968.
- Pieper, Frances. *Christian Dogmatics*. Vol. III. St. Louis: CPH, 1953.
- PG (*Patrologia graeca*). Migne. Paris, 1857-66.
- PL (*Patrologia latina*). Magne. Paris, 1878-90.
- Porta, Conrad. *Pastorale Lutheri*. Nördlingen: Beck'sche Buchhandlung, 1842.
- Portalie, Eugene, S.J. *A Guide to the Thought of Saint Augustine*. Translators Ralph J. Bastian, S.J. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1975.
- Ratramn. *The Body and Blood of the Lord*. Baltimore: Joseph Robinson, 1843.
- Reine, Francis J. *The Eucharistic Doctrine and Liturgy of the Mystagogical Catecheses of Theodore of Mopsuestia*. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1942.
- Rickaby, Joseph, S.J. *St. Augustine's City of God*. London: Burns Oates & Ashbourne Ltd., 1925.
- Roberts, Alexander, and James Donaldson. *Ante-Nicene Fathers*. Vol. I. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1985.
- Rordorf, Willy and Others. *The Eucharist of the Early Christians*. Translator, Matthew J. O'Connell. New York: Pueblo Publishing Company, 1978.
- Sasse, Hermann. *Here We Stand*. Translator, Theodore G. Tappert. Adelaide, South Australia: Lutheran Publishing House, 1979.
- Sasse, Hermann. *This is My Body*. Adelaide, South Australia: Lutheran Publishing House, 1977.
- Sasse, Hermann. *We Confess the Sacraments*. Translator, Norman Nagel. St. Louis: CPH, 1985.
- Schaff, Philip, D.D., LL.D. *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*. Vol. IV, Vol. VII, Vol. XIV. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1954, 1983.
- Schmemmann, Alexander. *The Eucharist*. Translator Paul Kachur. Crestwood, New York: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1988.
- Schmid, Heinrich. *Doctrinal Theology of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*. Translators, Charles Hay and Henry Jacobs. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1961.
- Schöne, Jobst. *Um Christi Sakramentale Gegenwart: Der Saligensche Abendmahlsstreit*. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1966.
- Sellers, R.V. *The Council of Chalcedon A Historical and Doctrinal Survey*. S.P.C.K., 1953.
- Sheedy, Charles Edmund. *The Eucharistic Controversy of the Eleventh Century*. New York: AMS Press, 1947.
- Sheerin, Daniel J. *The Eucharist, Message of the Fathers of the Church*. Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier, Inc., 1986.
- Spinks, Bryan. *Luther's Liturgical Criteria and His Reform of the Canon of the Mass*. Bramcote, Notts, England: Grove Books, 1982.
- Spitz,, Lewis W. and Lohff, Wenzel. *Discord, Diagogue, and Concord*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977.
- Stead, Dom Julian, O.S.B. *The Church, the Liturgy and the Soul of Man. The Mystagogia of St. Maximus the Confessor*. Still

- River, Massachusetts: St. Bede's Publications, 1982.
- Stevenson, Kenneth. *Eucharist and Offering*. New York: Pueblo Publishing Company, 1986.
- Stöckhardt, George. *Passionspredigten*. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House.
- Stone, Darwell, M.A. *A History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1909.
- Sykes, S.W. *Sacrifice and Redemption*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Tappert, Theodore G. *The Book of Concord*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1959.
- Teigen, Bjarne. *The Lord's Supper in the Theology of Martin Chemnitz*. Brewster, MA: Trinity Lutheran Press, 1986.
- Triglot Concordia, *The Symbolical Books of the Ev. Lutheran Church*. St. Louis: CPH, 1921.
- Valta, Vilmos. *Lutheran Worship*. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1958.
- van Der Meer, F. *Augustine the Bishop, The Life and Work of a Father of the Church*. Translators, Brian Battershaw and G. R. Lamb. London and New York: Sheed and Ward, 1961.
- Wainwright, Geoffrey. *Eucharist and Eschatology*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1981.
- Weller, Philip T., S.T.D. *Selected Easter Sermons of St. Augustine*. St. Louis, Missouri: B. Herder Book Co., 1959.
- Wisløff, Carl. *The Gift of Communion*. Translator, Joseph M. Shaw. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1964.
- Wybrew, Hugh. *The Orthodox Liturgy*. London: SPCK, 1989.
- Ylvisaker, Johannes. *The Gospels*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1932.
- Zorn, Carl Manthey. *Brosamlein*. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1909.
- Zwingli, Huldrych. *Commentary on True and False Religion*. Samuel Macauley Jackson, ed. Durham, N.C., Labyrinth Press, Durham, 1981.
- b. Periodicals*
- Bonner, Gerald. "Augustine's Conception of Deification." *The Journal of Theological Studies*. Vol. 37, No. 2 (October 1986), 369-386.
- Graebner, August L., trans. "An Autobiography of Martin Kemnitz." *Theological Quarterly*. Vol. III, No. 2 (October 1899), 472-87.
- Schmeling, Gaylin. "Chemnitz and the Lord's Supper." *Lutheran Synod Quarterly*. Vol. XXVI, No. 1 (March, 1986), 65-90.
- Schmeling, Gaylin. "God's Gift to you: The Means of Grace." *1989 ELS Synod Report*. 42-71.
- Schmeling, Gaylin. "The Saliger Controversy." *Lutheran Synod Quarterly*. Vol. XXVII, No. 2 (June, 1987), 31-48.
- Schmeling, Gaylin. "The Theology of the Lord's Supper." *Lutheran Synod Quarterly*. Vol. XXVIII, No. 4 (December, 1988).

## NOTES CHAPTER I

1. Augustine, *Confessions* I, 1, trans., Rex Warner, *The Confessions of St. Augustine* (New York, 1963), p. 17.
2. See pp. 1-2 below.
3. Justo L. González, *A History of Christian Thought* (Nashville, 1971), Vol. II, p. 21.
4. Augustine, *Confessions* VIII, 12, trans., R. Warner, op. cit., p. 182.
5. Gerald Bonner, *St. Augustine of Hippo, Life and Controversies* (Norwich, 1986), pp. 157-192.
6. Augustine, *Tractate on John* 80, 3.
7. Augustine, *Confessions* X, 29, trans., R. Warner, op. cit., p. 236.
8. Augustine, *City of God* 16, 22, trans., Henry Bettenson, *Concerning the City of God against the Pagans* (Middlesex, 1970) p. 680; also see Augustine, *Sermon Denis* 3, trans., Daniel Sheerin, *The Eucharist* (Wilmington, 1986), p. 103.
9. Augustine, *Sermon Mai* 89, trans., Philip Weller, *Selected Easter Sermons of St. Augustine* (St. Louis, 1959), pp. 124-125.
10. Augustine, *Sermon Denis* 3, trans., P. Weller, op. cit., pp. 113-114. The reference to Psalm 34 should be noted in this quotation. This Psalm was often associated with the Lord's Supper probably because of verse 8, "Oh taste and see that the Lord is good; blessed is the man who trusts in Him." This reminded the church of the great privilege we have in tasting all the Lord's blessings in the Supper. Having tasted the Lord in the Sacrament, Christians are indeed enlightened and their faces are not confounded.
11. Augustine, *Sermon* 227, trans., D. Sheerin, op. cit., pp. 97-98.
12. Augustine, *Tractate on John* 118, 5.
13. *Fractio*: the breaking of the consecrated bread for the distribution.
14. Augustine, *Sermon* 56.15, trans., P. Weller, op. cit., p. 210.
15. Augustine, *Sermon* 272, trans., D. Sheerin, op. cit., p. 95.
16. Augustine, *Wolfenbüttel Sermon* 7, trans., D. Sheerin, op. cit., p. 100.
17. Augustine, *De Doctrina Christiana* 55, CSEL 80, pp. 93-94, trans., John O'Connor, *The Hidden Manna* (San Francisco, 1988), p. 53.
18. Augustine, *Enarratio on Psalm* 98 [98:9], trans., D. Sheerin, op. cit., pp. 184-185.
19. F. van der Meer, *Augustine the Bishop* (London and New York, 1961), p. 313.
20. Augustine, *City of God* 10, 5, trans., D. Sheerin, op. cit., p. 43.
21. Augustine, *Sermon* 272, trans., D. Sheerin, op. cit., p. 94.
22. Augustine, *Tractate on John* 26, 11, trans., Philip Schaff, *NPNF* (Grand Rapids, 1987), Vol. VII, p. 171.
23. Ambrose, *De Mysteriis* IX, 53, trans., T. Thompson, *St. Ambrose on the Sacraments and on the Mysteries* (London, 1950) p. 148.
24. Augustine, *Tractate on John* 80, 3.
25. Augustine, *Sermon* 227, trans., D. Sheerin, op. cit., p. 96.
26. Augustine, *Enarratio on Psalm* 98 [98:9], trans., D. Sheerin, op. cit., p. 183.
27. Augustine, *Enarratio on Psalm* 33, 1st Sermon 10, CCL 38, pp. 280-181, trans., J. O'Connor, op. cit., pp. 57-58.
28. Augustine, *De Trinitate* III, 4, CCL 50, p. 149, trans., J. O'Connor, op. cit., p. 209.
29. Augustine, *Sermon* 234.2, PL 38, 1116.
30. Augustine, *Sermon Denis* 3, trans., D. Sheerin, op. cit., p. 104.
31. Augustine, *Sermon Denis* 6, trans., D. Sheerin, op. cit., pp. 105-107; also see *Sermon* 227; *Guelf. Sermon* 7; *De Trinitate* III, 4.
32. Augustine, *Enarratio on Psalm* 98 [98:9], trans., D. Sheerin, op. cit., pp. 183-184.
33. Augustine, *Enarratio on Psalm* 98 [98:9], trans., D. Sheerin, op. cit., pp. 184-185.
34. P. Weller, op. cit., pp. 52-53.
35. W. Crockett, *Eucharist: Symbol of Transformation* (New York, 1989), pp. 70-72.
36. Augustine, *Sermon Denis* 3, trans., D. Sheerin, op. cit., pp. 102-103.
37. Augustine, *De Trinitate* IV 13, 17, CCL 50, p. 183.
38. Augustine, *Contra Faustum* 6, 5; 20, 18; also see pp. 56-57 below.
39. Augustine, *City of God*, 10, 5, trans., D. Sheerin, op. cit., p. 43.
40. Augustine, *City of God*, 10, 20, trans., H. Bettenson, op. cit., pp. 400-401.
41. Augustine, *Sermon Denis* 3, trans., D. Sheerin, op. cit., pp. 103-104.
42. Augustine, *Sermon* 227, trans., D. Sheerin, op. cit., p. 96.
43. Augustine, *Sermon* 227, trans., D. Sheerin, op. cit., p. 98.
44. Augustine, *City of God* 10, 6, trans., D. Sheerin, op. cit., p. 45.

45. Augustine, *City of God* 10, 6, trans., D. Sheerin, op. cit., p. 46.
46. Augustine, *City of God* 10, 6, trans., D. Sheerin, op. cit., p. 46.
47. G. Bonner, op. cit., p. 371.
48. Augustine, *City of God* 10, 20, trans., H. Bettenson, op. cit., pp. 400-401.
49. Augustine, *City of God* 10, 6, trans., D. Sheerin, op. cit., p. 46.
50. Augustine, *Confessions* IX, 11.
51. Possidius, *Vita Augustine* 31, 5.
52. S. W. Sykes, *Sacrifice and Redemption* (Cambridge, 1991), p. 111.
53. Augustine, *Sermon* 71.17, PL 35, 453.
54. Augustine, *Sermon* 227, trans., D. Sheerin, op. cit., p. 98.
55. Augustine, *Sermon Denis* 3, trans., D. Sheerin, op. cit., pp. 104-105.
56. Augustine, *Concerning Baptism* 5.8.9, trans., D. Sheerin, op. cit., p. 273.
57. Augustine, *On the Merits and Remission of Sin* 1.34, trans., D. Sheerin, op. cit., pp. 274-275.
58. Augustine, *Sermon* 227, trans., D. Sheerin, op. cit., p. 96.
59. Augustine, *Confessions* X, 43, trans., R. Warner, op. cit., pp. 255-256.
60. Augustine, *Tractate on John* 26, 15-19, trans., P. Schaff, op. cit., p. 173.
61. Augustine, *Sermon Guelf* 7, trans., P. Weller, op. cit., p. 100.
62. Augustine, *Sermon* 192.1, trans., *The Fathers of the Church* (New York, 1959), Vol. 38, p. 32.
63. Augustine, *Confessions* VII, 10, trans., R. Warner, op. cit., pp. 149-150.
64. Augustine, *Sermon* 234.2, trans., *The Fathers of the Church*, Vol. 38, p. 224.
65. P. Weller, op. cit., p. 26.
66. Augustine, *Sermon* 227, trans., D. Sheerin, op. cit., p. 96.
67. Augustine, *Sermon Denis* 3, trans., P. Weller, op. cit., p. 114.
68. Augustine, *Sermon* 272, trans., D. Sheerin, op. cit., p. 95.
69. Augustine, *Tractate on John* 123, 2, trans., P. Schaff, op. cit., p. 444.
70. Augustine, *Tractate on John* 120, 2, trans., P. Schaff, op. cit., pp. 434-435.
71. Augustine, *Sermon* 57.7, trans., D. Sheerin, op. cit., p. 314.
72. Augustine, *De Serm. Dom. in monte* II, 7.26.

## NOTES CHAPTER II

1. August L. Graebner, "An Autobiography of Martin Chemnitz", *Theological Quarterly*, Vol. III, No. 4 (October, 1899), p. 479.
2. Theodore Jungkuntz, *Formulators of the Formula of Concord* (St. Louis, 1977), p. 54.
3. Werner Elert, *The Structure of Lutheranism* (St. Louis, 1962), Vol. I, p. 73.
4. Martin Chemnitz, *Examination of the Council of Trent*, trans., Fred Kramer, (St. Louis, 1978), Part II, p. 312.
5. Martin Chemnitz, *The Lord's Supper*, trans., J.O.A. Preus, (St. Louis, 1979), p. 109.
6. LS 95.
7. LS 104.
8. LS 123.
9. LS 154.
10. LS 96.
11. LS 108-109.
12. LS 100-102.
13. Ex. 2, 347.
14. FC SD VII, 82, p. 584.
15. LS 186.
16. LS 27.
17. LS 41.
18. LS 139.
19. FC SD VII, 82, p. 584.
20. LS 140.
21. Ex. 2, 326.
22. Ex. 2, 410; LS 238.
23. LS 236.

24. Ex. 2, 326-327; LS 238.
25. Ex. 2, 326-327; 2, 410; LS 239.
26. FC SD VII, 61, pp. 580-581.
27. Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses* IV, 18, 5.
28. LS 46.
29. Ex. 2, 257-258.
30. Martin Chemnitz, Timotheus Kirchner, und Nikolaus Selnecker, *Apologia oder Verantwortung des Christlichen Concordien Buchs*, (Magdeburg, 1584), VI, p. 196. When the *Formula of Concord* appeared in print it was so severely attacked that the Elector commissioned Chemnitz, Selnecker, and Kirchner to write a defense of the document. This defense, the *Apologia*, was written in 1584. Because the *Apologia* was produced by the authors of the *Formula*, its value cannot be overestimated as a commentary and explanation of the *Formula* and Article VII. This edition of the *Apologia* is to be found in the Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary Library at Mequon, Wisconsin.
31. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica* III, 75, 5-7.
32. LS 155; also see Martin Chemnitz, *The Two Natures in Christ*, trans., J.O.A. Preus, (St. Louis, 1971), pp. 55 and 122.
33. John of Damascus, *The Orthodox Faith* 4, 13.
34. Martin Chemnitz, *Ministry, Word, and Sacraments: An Enchiridion*, trans., Luther Poellot, (St. Louis, 1981), pp. 120-121; also see LS 153-154; FC SD VII, 37-38, pp. 575-576.
35. Ex. 2, 343.
36. Ex. 2, 429.
37. MWS 122-123.
38. Martin Luther, *Luther's Works* (St. Louis, 1955-75), Vol. 37, p. 65.
39. Gabriel Buescher, *The Eucharistic Teaching of William Ockham* (St. Bonaventure, NY, 1974), pp. 5-76.
40. FC SD VII, 99, p. 586.
41. FC SD VII, 100, p. 586.
42. FC SD VII, 101, p. 587.
43. LS 139.
44. Ex. 2, 226.
45. Ex. 2, 225.
46. Ex. 2, 227.
47. Ex. 2, 267; also see Ex. 2, 258-259, 386, 415.
48. FC SD VII, 75, *Triglotta*, p. 999.
49. PG 49. 380-382.
50. Ex. 2, 227; also see Ex. 2, 229; FC SD VII, 76, p. 583.
51. Ex. 2, 248.
52. Ex. 2, 249.
53. FC SD VII, 85-87, pp. 584-585.
54. Ex. 2, 246.
55. Ex. 2, 280; also see MWS 121.
56. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, III, 75, 7, trans., The Fathers of the English Dominican Province, *The Summa Theologica of St. Thomas Aquinas* (Westminster, Maryland, 1955), Vol. 15, p. 280.
57. The *Formula of Concord* specifically addresses the Saliger Controversy of 1563-69 in which the efficacy of the Words of Institution and the duration of the sacramental union were under discussion; also see G. Schmeling, "The Saliger Controversy," *Lutheran Synod Quarterly*, Vol. XXVII, No. 2, (June 1, 1987), pp. 31-48.
58. FC SD VII, 10-11, p. 571.
59. MWS 124.
60. Ex. 2, 248.
61. Nathan Mitchell, *Cult and Controversy: The Worship of the Eucharist outside Mass* (New York, 1982), pp. 66-195.
62. Ex. 2, 281.
63. Ocular communion is communing with the eyes which took the place of oral reception for many in the Middle Ages.
64. Ex. 2, 298.
65. Ex. 2, 301ff.
66. TNC 109.
67. Ex. 2, 277.
68. Ex. 2, 282-283.

- 69. Ex. 2, 283; MWS 132.
- 70. Ex. 2, 280.
- 71. Ex. 2, 484-485.
- 72. Ex. 2, 485.
- 73. Ex. 2, 486; see also LW 35:99.
- 74. Ex. 2, 490.
- 75. Ex. 2, 491.
- 76. Ex. 2, 486-487.
- 77. Ex. 2, 445.
- 78. Ex. 2, 440.
- 79. MWS 130.
- 80. MWS 130-131.
- 81. LS 193.
- 82. Ex. 2, 239.
- 83. LS 189.
- 84. LS 27; also see Ex. 2, 494; LW 35:86-87; LW 36:179-180.
- 85. LS 61.
- 86. TNC 474.
- 87. Ex. 2, 491.
- 88. See pp. 29-30 above.
- 89. LS 188.
- 90. Also see LS 143.

91. Ex. 2, 283; also see LS 191. In illustrating this communion and union with Christ in the Sacrament, many of the Lutheran fathers used the example of the vine and the branches in John 15. By receiving His body and blood we are engrafted into Him, drawing life from Him as branches from the vine. We are so united with Him that we can say, "It is not I that live, but Christ lives in me." When we remain in Him and He in us through a regular use of Word and Sacrament we will bear abundant fruit, for without Him we can do nothing.

- 92. LS 61.
- 93. Ex. 2, 239-240.
- 94. LS 143ff, 193.
- 95. LS 188.
- 96. Ex. 2, 233-234.
- 97. LS 157.

### NOTES CHAPTER III

- 1. Augustine, *City of God* 10, 5, trans. D. Sheerin, *The Eucharist* (Wilmington, 1986), p. 43.
- 2. Augustine, *Sermon 272*, trans., D. Sheerin, op. cit., pp. 94-95.
- 3. Ambrose, *De Mysteriis* IX, 52, trans., T. Thompson, *St. Ambrose on the Sacraments and on the Mysteries* (London, 1950), p. 146.
- 4. See pp. 7-8 above.
- 5. Huldrych Zwingli, *Commentary on True and False Religions* (Durham, N.C., 1981), p. 216.
- 6. See pp. 7-8 above.
- 7. Hermann Sasse, *This is My Body* (Adelaide, S.A., 1977), p. 21.
- 8. Martin Chemnitz, *The Lord's Supper*, trans., J.O.A. Preus, (St. Louis, 1979), p. 245.
- 9. Martin Chemnitz, *The Examination of the Council of Trent*, trans., Fred Kramer, (St. Louis, 1978), Part II, pp. 257-258.
- 10. Augustine, *Sermon 184.3*, trans., *The Fathers of the Church* (New York, 1959), Vol. 38, p. 6; also see pp. 8-9 above.
- 11. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica* III, 75, 5-7; also see pp. 33-34 above.
- 12. Bruce Birch, *The De Sacramento Altaris of William of Ockham* (Burlington, Iowa, 1930), p. 987.
- 13. LS 153; also see pp. 29-30 above.
- 14. Gregory Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy* (London, 1975), pp. 296-298.
- 15. See pp. 9-10 above.
- 16. Martin Luther, *Luther's Works* (St. Louis, 1955-75), Vol. 35, p. 99.

17. Ex. 2, 226.
18. Augustine, *Sermon* 234.2, PL 38, 1116; also see pp. 9–10 above.
19. John of Damascus, *The Orthodox Faith* 4, 13.
20. LS 156.
21. Martin Chemnitz, *Ministry, Word, and Sacrament: An Enchiridion*, trans., Luther Poellot, (St. Louis, 1981), p. 121; also see pp. 32–33 above.
22. LW 36:341; St. L. XX, 742. Also see Ex. 2, 268.
23. See pp. 9–10 above.
24. FC SD VII, 10–11, p. 571.
25. MWS 124; Ex. 2, 248; also see pp. 33–34 above.
26. Augustine, *Enarratio on Psalm 98* [98:9], trans., D. Sheerin, op. cit., p. 183.
27. Nathan Mitchell, *Cult and Controversy: The Worship of the Eucharist Outside Mass* (New York, 1982), pp. 180–181.
28. Ex. 2, 295.
29. Ex. 2, 280.
30. FC SD VII, 85–86, pp. 584–585.
31. Ex. 2, 277.
32. Ex. 2, 278.
33. Ex. 2, 283; MWS 132; also see pp. 35–36 above.
34. Augustine, *City of God* 10, 20, trans., H. Bettenson, *Concerning the City of God Against the Pagans* (Middlesex, 1970), p. 401.
35. Augustine, *Contra Faustum* 20, 18.
36. MWS 126.
37. Ex. 2, 491.
38. Thomas Aquinas, S. T., III, 83, 1.
39. Heiko Oberman, *The Harvest of Medieval Theology* (Cambridge, Mass., 1963), p. 280.
40. LW 36:313.
41. Ex. 2, 440.
42. Ex. 2, 440.
43. Ex. 2, 457–460.
44. Ex. 2, 493.
45. Ex. 2, 497.
46. LW 35:86–87.
47. Ex. 2, 497.
48. LW 36:179–180; also see pp. 26–27, 40–41 above.
49. Augustine, *Sermon Denis* 3, trans., D. Sheerin, op. cit., pp. 102–103.
50. Augustine, *De Trinitate* IV, 13, 17, CCSL 50, p. 183; also see pp. 12–13 above.
51. Augustine, *Contra Faustum* 6, 5, trans., P. Schaff, NPNF (Grand Rapids, 1987), Vol. IV, p. 169.
52. Augustine, *Contra Faustum* 20, 18, trans., P. Schaff, op. cit., p. 262.
53. Augustine, *Contra Faustum* 20, 18, trans., P. Schaff, op. cit., p. 262; also see pp. 11–13 above.
54. Augustine, *City of God* 10, 6, trans., D. Sheerin, op. cit., p. 46; also see pp. 13–15 above.
55. Ex. 2, 486.
56. LW 35:99.
57. See p. 15 above.
58. Ex. 2, 498.
59. MWS 130.
60. See pp. 15–16 and 39 above.
61. Werner Elert, *Eucharist and Church Fellowship* (St. Louis, 1966), pp. 115ff.
62. St. L. XVII, 1180.
63. St. L. XVII, 1346; also see St. L. XVII, 2016.
64. FC SD VII 33, p. 575. For a complete study of the Marburg Colloquy, also see H. Sasse, op. cit., pp. 151–238.
65. Augustine, *Confessions* X, 43, trans., R. Werner, *The Confessions of St. Augustine* (New York, 1913), p. 256.
66. LS 190.
67. SA III, VIII, 10, p. 313.
68. Ex. 2, 239.
69. Ex. 2, 562.

70. Martin Chemnitz, *The Two Natures in Christ*, trans., J.O.A. Preus, (St. Louis, 1971), p. 474.
71. TNC 31.
72. St. L. VII, 2353; LW 23:143.
73. TNC 6.
74. LS 155; LW 37:101.
75. LS 61; Ex. 2, 234.
76. LS 143, 188; TNC 55; also see pp. 29-30, 41-42 above.
77. Augustine, *On Merit and Remission of Sin* 1.34, trans., D. Sheerin, op. cit., p. 274.
78. Augustine, *Sermon* 192.1, trans., *The Fathers of the Church*, Vol. 38, p. 32.
79. Augustine, *Confessions* VII, 10, trans., R. Warner, op. cit., pp. 149-150; also see pp. 18-19 above.
80. Augustine, *Sermon* 227, trans., D. Sheerin, op. cit., p. 96.
81. See pp. 19-21 above.
82. Augustine, *Sermon* 272, trans., D. Sheerin, op. cit., p. 95.
83. LS 193.