

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

VOL. V.

APRIL, 1901.

No. 2.

Doctrinal Theology.

THE LORD'S SUPPER.

The second sacrament of the Christian church is the Lord's supper, *κυριακὸν δεῖπνον*.¹⁾ It has this in common with all other divine institutions that it is what the Lord God himself made it by the act of institution, nothing more, nothing less. It is not what the church, or the state, or any individual man would make it. It is not what St. Paul made it. Paul, where he is about to state the nature of this sacrament, expressly says: *I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you.*²⁾ Marriage as a divine institution is what God made it in Paradise and by his word, just as marriage as an institution of the State of Missouri is what the State of Missouri has made it, and marriage as a civil status in Nebraska is what that state has made it. A union of a man and a woman which, if contracted in Nebraska, would be marriage, may be non-marriage and incest in Missouri, and what may be marriage in this state may be incestuous and void before God. Thus, also, a ceremony established by a Zwinglian church is what that church has made it, and a rite of the Roman church is what that church has made it; and while they both may call their institutions sacraments, the one may be an empty shell and

1) 1 Cor. 11, 20.

2) 1 Cor. 11, 23.

the other a blasphemy before God. The Israelites might have made it a tradition to celebrate the deliverance of the twelve tribes from Egyptian thraldom by a supper commemorative of the last supper before the exodus, and the manner of such memorial supper might have been in every particular identical with that of the slaying and eating of the paschal lamb; but without divine institution and command it would not have been a sacrament as it was according to and by virtue of the divine institution of the Passover.¹⁾ And the early Christian church might have instituted a custom of commemorating the last paschal supper of Christ and his disciples by a memorial meal of bread and wine with prayer and benediction, and such institution would have been precisely what the church had made it by common consent and tradition or by whatever modifications it might have introduced at various times and places. A rite and custom thus established and practiced might have been highly appropriate, as the rite and custom of Confirmation, also established by the church, is to-day; but it would not and could not have been a sacrament, in itself an efficacious means and seal of divine grace, just as Confirmation in the Roman church or in any other church is not a means of grace, a sacrament.

To learn and understand what Confirmation is in the Roman church, it is necessary to learn and understand what the Roman church has made it as an institution of that church. Nothing less than this will do, and nothing beyond this will avail. Nor will any amount of investigation into the nature of the Roman institution ascertain the nature of Lutheran Confirmation. In like manner, the nature of the sacrament of the Lord's supper, a divine ordinance instituted by Christ himself, can be ascertained only by inquiring what Christ has made it. Well did Queen Elizabeth of England say,

1) Exod. 12, 1 ff.

It was the Word that spake it;
 He took the bread and brake it;
 And what the Word doth make it,
 That I believe and take it.

Where it is what the Word, Christ Jesus, the Lord, did and does make it, there it is the Lord's supper, his own sacrament; and there only. And where the Lord's supper is administered, it is what, by his institution, the Lord has made it, and that only.

What the Lord has made his Supper and would have it be for all time, we can learn only from the Lord himself and from those who "have received of the Lord that which also they delivered unto us." Of the institution of the Lord's supper we have four narratives, one in each of the synoptic gospels, and one by St. Paul in his first epistle to the Corinthians.¹⁾ All these narratives agree in all points common to all, and supplement each other in details. The texts followed by the English Bible are critically attested in a way that no established reading creates any exegetical difficulty; only in 1 Cor. 11, 24 *κλώμενον*, *broken*, is to be eliminated as spurious according to all the best manuscripts and versions.²⁾

According to the gospel narratives, the occasion of the institution of this sacrament was the last celebration of the Old Testament sacrament of the Passover in which Jesus united with his disciples, "the same night in which he was betrayed." This Old Testament, *παλαιὰ διαθήκη*, was about to be abrogated. The paschal lamb of the New Testament was about to be led to the slaughter, *Christ our passover sacrificed for us*.³⁾ The flesh of the lamb made ready for Jesus and his disciples had been eaten, and the cup of benediction had been passed and divided among the twelve.⁴⁾

1) Matt. 26, 26—28. Mark 14, 22—24. Luke 22, 19. 20. 1 Cor. 11, 23—25.

2) \aleph , A, B, C, D, Copt. Sahid. Vulg. al.

3) 1 Cor. 5, 7. Cf. Is. 53, 7. Acts 8, 32 ff.

4) Luke 22, 15—17.

The table was not yet cleared. There was still some of the unleavened bread, ἄρτον, at hand. Another cup of wine, probably the customary fourth cup, the after-supper-cup, μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι,¹⁾ was in readiness. And now, before the meal was fully over, ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν,²⁾ *Jesus took bread.*³⁾ All the four narratives mention this. Paul, who does not mention the passover in his account, makes this his opening statement.⁴⁾ It was the beginning of the solemn act he would here describe. What Jesus took was simply bread, as simple as it can be made, baked of flour and water. But he who took this bread was *the Lord Jesus*, ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς,⁵⁾ Jesus, the son of Mary, but at the same time the Lord, the Son of God. It was not the first time that Jesus took bread. When by the sea of Tiberias, "Jesus took the loaves," he fed five thousand men, and twelve baskets of fragments remained.⁶⁾ Thus here, too, it was *the Lord* who took into his almighty hand the bread of the passover. And it is a remarkable coincidence that in all instances recorded in the gospels where Jesus "took bread" he revealed himself and manifested his goodness and power, though in various ways.⁷⁾

The next statement of the four narratives is couched in an aoristic participle, εὐλόγησας in Matthew and Mark, εὐχαριστήσας in Luke and St. Paul. Εὐλόγησας, *having blessed*, and εὐχαριστήσας, *having thanked*, are synonymous terms. Thus the same act is elsewhere described by βλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν εὐλόγησεν,⁸⁾ and by εὐχαριστήσας.⁹⁾ As when he took the loaves to feed the multitudes, so when he took bread to feed the little flock, Jesus spoke words of blessing, praise and thanksgiving. What these words were, we are told neither here nor there, and the various opinions expressed

1) Luke 22, 20.

2) Matt. 26, 26. Mark 14, 22.

3) Matt. 26, 26. Mark 14, 22. Luke 20, 19. 1 Cor. 11, 23.

4) 1 Cor. 11, 23.

5) Ibid.

6) John 6, 10—13.

7) Matt. 14, 19 ff.; 15, 36 ff. Mark 6, 41 ff.; 8, 6 ff. Luke 24, 30 ff. John 6, 10 ff.; 21, 13 ff.

8) Matt. 14, 19. Mark 6, 41.

9) John 6, 10; cf. Matt. 15, 36. Mark 8, 6.

by various expositors are nothing to us either here or there, when the question is what the text says. Being words of blessing, praise and thanksgiving, they were certainly words whereby God was acknowledged as the giver of every good gift and every perfect gift, and especially of the gift about to be dispensed as by the host to his guests, or by the house-father to the members of the household.

The next statement of the text is *ἔκλασεν*, *he brake it*,¹⁾ or *ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς*,²⁾ *τοῖς μαθηταῖς*,³⁾ *he brake it and gave it unto them, unto his disciples*. Of Christ feeding the multitudes, it is likewise said: *κλάσας ἔδωκεν*, *breaking he gave*,⁴⁾ or *ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν*,⁵⁾ *ἔκλασεν καὶ ἐδίδου*,⁶⁾ *κατέκλασεν καὶ ἐδίδου*,⁷⁾ *he brake and gave*, or simply *διέδωκεν*, *he divided, distributed*.⁸⁾ These words are descriptive of one act, the act of distribution. When Christ *distributed*, *διέδωκεν*, the five loaves, he did so by breaking and giving them, *κλάσας ἔδωκεν*, or *ἔκλασεν . . . καὶ ἐδίδου*.⁹⁾ And the bread of the pass-over being likewise baked in loaves or cakes of some size, Jesus distributed it by breaking it into smaller pieces and giving each disciple a piece. Thus also when at Emmaus he supped with the two pilgrims, he took bread, blessed and distributed it, *κλάσας ἐπέδιδου αὐτοῖς*, *he brake and gave to them*.¹⁰⁾ In all these instances, at the lakeshore, at Jerusalem, at Emmaus, the *κλάσις* in the narrower sense, the breaking into fragments, as distinguished from the *δόσις*, the giving of the fragments, had no particular or independent significance, as the spurious reading in 1 Cor. 11 would indicate.¹¹⁾ The act described by both terms is the act of distribution, *διάδοσις*. He who gave was Jesus. They to whom he gave were *οἱ μαθηταί*, his disciples. What he gave was bread.

1) 1 Cor. 11, 24.

2) Mark 14, 22. Luke 22, 19.

3) Matt. 26, 26.

4) Matt. 14, 19.

5) Matt. 15, 36.

6) Mark 8, 6.

7) Mark 6, 41.

8) John 6, 10.

9) John 6, 10; coll. Matt. 14, 19. Mark 6, 41.

10) Luke 24, 30.

11) See above, p. 67.

But not bread only. The word came to the element. Jesus said: *λάβετε, φάγετε, take, eat.*¹⁾ These words are not recorded by Luke and Paul, according to the manuscripts. Mark has only *λάβετε, take.* This does not mean that the words were not spoken as recorded by Matthew. But what the omissions do show is that the words omitted are not in themselves essential to the sacramental act. They are implied in the *δόσις*. When Jesus *gave* to his disciples, he, as a matter of course, meant that the disciples should *take*. And giving them at the supper table from what was on the table to be eaten, *bread*, an article of food, he, again as a matter of course, meant that they should *eat*. Still it is of importance that according to the records of two evangelists Jesus also expressly *said* what his act indicated. Mark records the word, *λάβετε, take*, which, under the circumstances, implied *φάγετε, eat*. When a physician or a nurse *gives* a patient a dose of medicine, that implies that the patient is to take it, and take it as medicine is taken. And when the act of giving medicine is accompanied by the word, *take*, that word means that the patient is to *take medicine*, that is, to take it into his mouth and swallow it. And now we learn from Matthew that Jesus also expressly said what he meant by *giving* the bread and by saying, *take*; he said *φάγετε, eat*.

The omission of the word, *φάγετε*, and of *λάβετε, φάγετε*, by Luke and Paul, is, however, of significance in view of the fact that the following words, *τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου,*²⁾ or, as Paul has them, *τοῦτό μού ἐστιν τὸ σῶμα,*³⁾ *this is my body*, are found in *all* the narratives. This statement was certainly not implied in the act of giving bread, nor in the words, *take, eat*. Without these words, *take, eat*, the disciples to whom Jesus gave bread from and at the supper table might and must have known that he would have them

1) Matt. 26, 26.

2) Matt. 26, 26. Mark 14, 22. Luke 22, 19.

3) 1 Cor. 11, 24.

take and eat what he gave them. And they certainly would have taken and eaten, as the thousands in the desert took and ate when Jesus gave and what he gave, *bread*. But here in the upper room as there in the desert Jesus would give and did give more than he had taken, not according to the nature of the bread, but according to the will of the Giver, who *knew* τί ἔμελλεν ποιῆν, *what he was about to do*,¹⁾ and was able to do what he purposed to do. According to his divine will expressed by his divine word and by virtue of such word he now gave unto his disciples his own body. What he gave them was certainly bread; for the text says that it was, the bread which Jesus took and brake and gave, that they should take and eat. But what he gave, that they should take and eat, was just as certainly more than bread; for the words say so, *Τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου, This is my body*. The statement is very plain and simple. The sentence consists of a subject, *τοῦτο*, and a predicate, *τὸ σῶμά μου*, connected by the copula, *ἐστίν*. *Τοῦτο*, *this*, the neutral demonstrative pronoun, points to what Jesus gave and of which he said, *take, eat*. The predicate, *τὸ σῶμά μου*, *my body*, in the proper sense of the words, denotes the material part of his human nature, as distinguished from his soul or spirit, *ψυχή* or *πνεῦμα*, the immaterial part of his human nature. When, in the house of Simon the leper, a woman poured precious ointment on his head, Jesus said: *She is come aforehand to anoint MY BODY*, *μου τὸ σῶμα*,²⁾ and no one doubted what he meant. And when he had commended his spirit into his Father's hands and given up the ghost,³⁾ Joseph begged *the body of Jesus*,⁴⁾ and Pilate knew at once what he wanted, and commanded it to be delivered,⁵⁾ and the women of Galilee followed it to the sepulchre and beheld *how the body was laid*.⁶⁾ And when Jesus said, *This is my body*, his body was precisely what

1) John 6, 6.

2) Mark 14, 8.

3) Luke 23, 46; cf. Matt. 27, 50. Mark 15, 37.

4) Matt. 27, 58. Luke 23, 52.

5) Ibid.

6) Luke 24, 55.

it was before and after the night in which he was betrayed, and what he and his friends and his enemies alike understood when his body was mentioned. The Greek form τὸ σῶμά μου is even more precise than the English, *my body*, or the German, *mein Leib*, as the article, τό, makes it all the more distinct that the one, well-known, particular body, which was then and there visibly and palpably before the disciples, was what the words denoted. That the statement was not figurative speech, was likewise plain. For where should the figure be? It could not be in the subject, τοῦτο; for no pronoun as such was ever or could ever be used tropically; it always really points to or represents that for which it stands, or it is not a trope, but an untruth. Nor is there any tropical concept in the preceding context for which τοῦτο might stand. The bread mentioned before was real bread. Jesus did not figuratively break and give, but he really broke and gave, when he distributed what was in his hand and which he would have his disciples really take and eat. There is nowhere a trope to be associated with τοῦτο. Nor could the trope be in the copula, ἐστίν; for the copula simply and solely indicates that the subject and the predicate are connected as subject and predicate. Hence, where this relation is clearly intended, the copula may be, and often is, entirely omitted, as in μεγάλη ἡ Ἀρτεμις,¹⁾ or, where that relation does not really obtain, the copula, too, is not a trope, but an untruth, connecting what should not be connected as subject and predicate. When Christ says, *This is my body*, he really and truly and actually places the subject, *this*, and the predicate, *my body*, in the real and actual relation of subject and predicate, and this, and this only, is indicated by the copula, *is*. Since, then, neither the subject, τοῦτο, nor the copula, ἐστίν, admits of a tropical sense, the predicate only remains to be looked into, and this

1) Acts 19, 28. 34. Cf. Mark 14, 36. Rom. 11, 16; 14, 21. 2 Cor. 1, 21. Phil. 4, 3. Eph. 1, 18; 4, 4; 5, 17. 2 Thess. 3, 2. 1 Pet. 4, 17. Luke 4, 36. Rom. 3, 1; 8, 27. 31 and many other places.

predicate, τὸ σῶμά μου, *my body*, is so far from containing a trope, that it is not even possible to smuggle a trope into this part of the proposition and keep it there with any show of right or reason. Jesus certainly had a real body, over which he was certainly free to dispose. That real body was present, in full view of the disciples to whom Jesus was speaking. The disciples might disbelieve, but they could not misunderstand, what Jesus said when he said, *my body*. The words could not be taken, either by the speaker or by the hearers, in a tropical sense. Or what might the words say figuratively? When Jesus said, *I am the vine, ye are the branches,*¹⁾ this was tropical speech, and the context clearly shows the meaning of the words. There was a *tertium comparationis* underlying the trope. It was apparent from the preceding words, *As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine, no more can ye, except ye abide in me,*²⁾ and from the subsequent words, *He that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit, etc.*³⁾ And here the rule, *ne tropus ultra tertium*, holds good. The *tertium* was not that the vine is one and the braches are many, or that the vine is stronger and the branches are weaker, but that the branches bear fruit only while they are in the vine. Again, when he says, *I am the door*, the meaning of the trope is plain, and the *tertium* appears from the subsequent context, *by me if any man enter in, he shall be saved.*⁴⁾ The *tertium* is this, that the door is the proper inlet and outlet of the sheepfold. When he says, *I am the good shepherd,*⁵⁾ the meaning, again, is plain, and the *tertium* is at once pointed out in each case. It is the faithfulness of the good shepherd as distinguished from the hireling,⁶⁾ and the familiarity of the good shepherd with all his sheep.⁷⁾ To extend the trope to the shepherd's crook and dog, or to the difference between the shepherd

1) John 15, 5.

2) John 15, 4.

3) John 15, 5.

4) John 10, 9.

5) John 10, 11. 14.

6) John 10, 11 ff.

7) John 10, 14 f.

and the sheep, he being a man, and they being brutes, would do violence to the words and their meaning. When Jesus said, *I am the living bread*,¹⁾ the *tertium* is the nourishing, life-sustaining virtue of bread, and what Jesus would say is, that as bread sustains the physical life of the eater, so he sustains the higher life of those who partake of him by faith that they live for ever.²⁾ In all these instances, the trope lies in the predicate, and the point of comparison is plain from the words preceding or following the figure of speech. It was necessary to grasp the *tertium*, in order to understand the tropical speech. Hence, the Jews who failed to comprehend the point of comparison were at a loss what to make of the figurative words, and *strove among themselves, saying, "How can this man give us his flesh to eat?"*³⁾ If they had understood that Jesus had stated the theme of his speech in v. 47, *Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth in me hath eternal life*, and that all that followed was an enlargement on this theme in tropical speech, in which the life-sustaining power of meat and drink was the *tertium comparationis*, all would have been plain to them.

But it is remarkable that, while even his disciples, when they had heard this tropical exposition of the truth that faith in Christ gives everlasting life, had murmured and said, *This is a hard saying; who can hear it?*⁴⁾ they too having failed to grasp the point of comparison, we do not hear of any slowness on their part to comprehend the meaning of the words, *This is my body*. Not that the disciples were particularly bright in that gloomy night. When Jesus had spoken of his going to the Father, and that a little while they should not see him, they had said among themselves, *What is this he saith unto us? . . . We cannot tell what he saith.*⁵⁾ And Jesus, knowing that they were desirous to ask him, explained the meaning of his words.

1) John 6, 51.

2) John 6, 50. 51; coll. v. 47.

3) John 6, 52.

4) John 6, 60.

5) John 16, 17 f.

But here, when he said, *Take, eat, this is my body*, there is no such questioning. The words are plain as words can be. There is no trope to be interpreted or misinterpreted, no point of comparison which they might grasp or fail to grasp, no symbolism with a hidden meaning. If he had said, "Take, eat, this bread is the staff of life," there would have been a trope, and the meaning might have been, "As a staff supports a pilgrim, so shall this bread support your life and give you strength on the way you are about to go." But what trope could there have been in the words, "*my body*"? The *tertium comparationis* in a trope must be some characteristic, some quality, state, or relation, inherent in or connected with the person or thing denoted by the word in its real signification. Thus when Jesus calls Herod a *fox*,¹⁾ the *tertium* was the dangerous slyness of the real fox. When Jesus says, *I am the bread of life*,²⁾ the *tertium* is the nourishing virtue of real bread. And if there be a trope in the predicate, *my body*, there must be some quality or relation of Christ's real body in view of which that body might serve as a symbol of what, in a tropical way, it should signify. Thus Christ's real body was the habitation of his soul, it was an organism, it had all the qualities of a human body. Should, then, the disciples understand Jesus to say, "*Take, eat, this is the habitation of a soul, this is an organism*"? Should they look for some symbolism based upon some one of the many qualities of a human body in order to understand the hidden meaning of the Master's words? No, the assumption of a tropical sense in the words, *Take, eat, this is my body*, is simply nonsensical. If these words do not mean what they say in their real, proper signification, nobody in the world can say what they *do* mean, or even what they *might* mean. They simply cannot mean anything but what they properly say, *This, which I give you and bid you take and eat, is my body, my real body*,

1) Luke 13, 32.

2) *Vide supra.*

the body which you see here before you, and which is about to be offered up for the sins of the world.

And now, to make assurance doubly sure, we learn from St. Paul that Jesus added the words τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, *which is for you*,¹⁾ or, according to the still more complete record of St. Luke, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον, *which is being given for you*.²⁾ These words are descriptive of the *real* body of Jesus, the body which was bound, and buffeted, and spit upon, and scourged, and crowned with thorns, and crucified, and laid in Joseph's tomb. All this was real. Jesus was not tropically or figuratively given for us; or we would still be unredeemed. If it was Christ's particular purpose to shut out every possibility of misinterpreting his words by forcing upon them a figurative sense, he most effectively achieved his purpose by adding the descriptive clause, *which is being given for you*. No symbol of his body was symbolically given for us, but his real body was really given for us. And this real body given *for* us in his suffering and death is, according to his plain words, really given *to* us in his sacrament. The words are so plain, and the meaning is so real that it is, in fact, hard to understand how anybody could deem it reasonable to depart from what the words say and still profess to believe that Jesus is the Truth as he is the way and the life. While they were eating, really eating, Jesus took, really took, bread, real bread, and gave, really gave, to his disciples, his real disciples, and said, really said, *Take, eat, this is my body*. When a man gives, and says, take, what can he mean but that they to whom he actually and really gives should actually and really *take*? When, at a supper, while he and his guests are eating, he gives an article of food and says, take, *eat*, what can he mean but that they should really *eat*? When, by the demonstrative pronoun, *this*, he points to what he really gives to be really taken and eaten, what can he mean but really

1) 1 Cor. 11, 24.

2) Luke 22, 19.

this which he really gives? When he uses the copula, *is*, to connect the real subject and the real predicate of a sentence which he really speaks, what can he mean but that such subject and predicate should be really connected? And when he whose real body was about to be given, really given, for his real disciples and other real sinners, says, *my body which is being given for you*, what in the world can he mean but that real body? No manner or amount of ingenuity can really find in such words spoken under such circumstances even a semblance of symbolism. Even an inversion of the terms of the proposition, while it would be a violent perversion of the statement, would not open a way to symbolism. For if the Savior were made to say, *My body which is being given for you, is this*, the subject, my body, would again stand for Christ's real body, the copula would again really connect the subject and the predicate, and *this* would again point to what was really given to be really taken; and even if *this* could point to *bread*, this bread was real bread really taken from the real table. In short, whatever the impugners of the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's supper may do, the words of Jesus stand as an adamant wall and persistently refuse to admit of any interpretation which, with a view of satisfying reason and common sense, is nonsensical, defying the laws of interpretation, of language and of logic, of philosophy and theology alike. The words are fully as plain as the first words in Genesis, *In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth*, or as the last words in Revelation, *The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all*, or any other words of Scripture between the two. That they have occasioned much controversy and a great variety of interpretation is no argument against, but in favor of, taking them in their proper sense. The most general rule of interpretation, not only in theology, but everywhere, is, *The true meaning of words can be but one.*¹⁾

1) Lieber, Legal and political Hermeneutics, p. 158.

But the various endeavors to force upon these words a tropical sense have led to a multitude of contortions probably without a parallel in all history, Carlstadt, and Schwenkfeld, and Zwingli, and Oecolampad, and Calvin, and Beza, all disagreeing as to the meaning of the words, and only agreeing in the assumption that "This is my body" really meant "This is *not* my body." The multifarious attempts to pervert the true sense of the words are but so many evidences of the persistent refusal of the words to yield any other sense than the proper sense of the terms. The real difficulty lies not in the words, but in the substance of the statement, *This is my body*. The real cause of the refusal to accept what the words say is not in the words but in the readers and hearers of the words who, instead of saying with Queen Elizabeth, "And what the Word doth made it, that I believe and take it," persist in saying with the Jews of old, "How can this man give us his flesh to eat?"

How it was possible that Jesus, in the night in which he was betrayed, should give his body to his disciples, and his disciples should take and eat what he gave them, bread and his body, does not concern us here, our present object being to learn what, according to the Scriptures, took place when Christ instituted this sacrament. And that this was really what Jesus was about, the institution of an ordinance, also appears from the narratives. Having taken bread, blessed and given thanks, and distributed the bread, saying, *Take, eat, this is my body*, he continued, *Τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν*, *This do in remembrance of me.*¹⁾ The pronoun *τοῦτο*, as the object of *ποιεῖτε*, *do*, refers to the *action* which was then and there going on. And of this action, Jesus says, *do it εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν*, *in remembrance of me*. To remember is to recall to the mind what is no longer present to the senses. Remembrance of things present belongs to the future. A departing friend asking to be

1) Luke 22, 19. 1 Cor. 11, 24.

remembered thinks of the future, of a time when he will be no longer where they could see and hear him. So Jesus, while yet present where they could see and hear him, looked forward to the time when he would have departed,¹⁾ and they should not see him.²⁾ And then they were to remember him, and in remembrance of him they were to do what was now going on in his visible presence, enacted by him and them. According to this charge, *This do in remembrance of me*, it was the will of the Master that his disciples should, after his departure, perform the act which was then being enacted at the paschal board. It was his will and covenant that in future assemblies of his disciples, he being invisibly in the midst of them, bread should be blessed and distributed, his words should be repeated, *Take, eat, this is my body which is given for you*, and by virtue of these words, his own words, he would give his body with the bread distributed to the guests at his supper, and they should eat the bread and what he would give them with the bread, his body given for them. And doing this, they should remember him, as he was before them in the night in which he was betrayed, the Savior who was about to offer himself as the paschal lamb of the new covenant, of which the Jewish passover was a type and shadow. Thus should this sacred act be to them an ordinance whereby they were to be in a peculiar way reminded and assured of the atoning sacrifice once offered up for the sins of the world, as they should partake of the very body of the Lamb of God slain for an expiation of their sin and guilt. All this is implied in the words, *This do in remembrance of me*.

But as the first testament was not dedicated without blood,³⁾ so also the new covenant must be sealed with blood. And the Lord Jesus, after he had done and said what has been considered, *after the same manner also took the cup*.⁴⁾ From Matt. 26, 29, Mark 14, 25, and Luke 22, 18,

1) John 16, 5. 7. 28.

2) John 16, 16—19.

3) Hebr. 9, 18.

4) Matt. 26, 27. Mark 14, 23. Luke 22, 20. 1 Cor. 11, 25.

we learn that the cup contained τὸ γένημα τῆς ἀμπέλου, *the fruit of the vine*. This was not must, the unfermented juice of the grape. For it was in the days of Jesus, and is to this day, a matter of course in Palestine, as in other oriental countries, to use wine, not must, as a beverage on festive occasions, and at no time was must used by the Jews at the Passover. Thus, also, we learn from 1 Cor. 11, that the wine used in the apostolic church was fermented wine, which, if taken to excess, would intoxicate.¹⁾ Again Jesus *gave thanks*,²⁾ and as he had given the bread, so he now gave the cup, ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς,³⁾ and said, Πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες, *Drink ye all of it*. And of what he gave, and of what he bade them drink, he said, τοῦτο γάρ ἐστι τὸ αἷμά μου, τὸ τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὁμῶν,⁴⁾ τὸ περὶ πολλῶν,⁵⁾ ἐκχυνόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, *this is my blood, the (blood) of the new testament, shed for you, for many, for remission of sins*. Jesus himself here tells his disciples what, as he gave them the cup and the wine therein contained, he gave them to drink. It was *his blood*, not the blood of a brute sacrifice, as the blood of the old testament had been, but the blood prefigured by the typical blood of the Levitical cult, the blood of the Lamb of which Isaiah had prophesied,⁶⁾ the blood of the New Covenant, shed for many, also for those especially who were to partake of it in the sacrament. Thus was this sacrament a seal of the *new covenant*, a covenant *in his blood*,⁷⁾ not the old covenant in the blood of brutes, pointing forward to the coming Savior, but a covenant in the blood of the Savior who was now come to shed his own blood for the remission of the sins of the world. The words, τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ αἷμά μου correspond to the words, τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου, and must, of course, be taken in the same proper sense. The words, also aside from this parallelism, admit of no tropical signi-

1) ὅς δὲ μεθύει. 1 Cor. 11, 21. 2) Matt. 26, 27. Mark 14, 23.

3) Matt. 26, 27. Mark 14, 23. Luke 22, 20.

4) Luke 22, 20.

5) Matt. 26, 27. Mark 14, 23.

6) Is. 53, 7.

7) Luke 22, 20. 1 Cor. 11, 25.

fication. The blood of Jesus was real human blood. The blood which was shed for many as blood of the new covenant was not figurative, but real blood, really shed, not for a figurative, typical atonement, as in the Jewish ritual, but for the real atonement whereby the world should be reconciled with God. If what Jesus gave in the sacrament was the blood of the new covenant, it could not be a symbol of that blood. As it is in the nature of the type to be symbolic, it is equally in the nature of the antitype to be real, not again a symbol, but the thing itself. And this is precisely what the words say. Jesus not only plainly says, *this is my blood*, but by adding, τὸ τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης, *that of the new covenant*, he expressly distinguishes his blood from the blood of the old covenant, which was indeed symbolic. And by adding the words, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, περὶ πολλῶν, ἐκχυνόμενον, *which is being shed for you, for many*, he describes what he gives as his real blood, the blood which flowed in his veins which were about to be opened by the scourge and the thorns and the nails and the spear. The blood of Jesus is nothing to us and for us, unless it is the real, true blood which was shed for us and for many for the remission of sins, our real sins.

But the words, τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης, *of the new covenant*, were significant in still another way. The new covenant established by the blood of Jesus was not intended for the twelve apostles only, but for all men, and not for that pass-over night only, but for all times. What Jesus enacted in that upper room was not a sacrifice, but a sacrament, whereby those who ate and drank were to be made partakers of the sacrifice about to be enacted in Gethsemane and on Golgotha. And as these benefits were to endure long after the night in which Jesus was betrayed, and to be enjoyed by many besides the twelve disciples, so also the means whereby such benefits were to be dispensed and appropriated should be of permanent endurance. Hence, as the Lord had said of the first part of the sacramental act, *This*

do in remembrance of me, so he also adds the words recorded by St. Paul, *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε, ὡσάκις ἂν πίνητε, εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν, this do, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me.*¹⁾ When he should be no longer with them in visible presence, his disciples should, in remembrance of him as their Savior, and of his obedience unto death, of his atoning sacrifice, celebrate this supper, wherein they should not only eat his body in, with, and under the sacramental bread, but also drink his blood in, with, and under the sacramental wine, and by virtue of the sacramental word, again and again drink his blood once shed for them for the remission of sins.

Thus did the Lord Jesus, in the night in which he was betrayed, institute the ordinance of the Lord's supper. Of this ordinance, the Apostle says, *As often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come.*²⁾ To the end of time, till the Son of man shall come to judge the quick and the dead, this sacramental bread shall be eaten, and men shall drink this sacramental cup, and in so doing shall voice forth the Lord's death. This sacrament shall be for all times a form of preaching Christ crucified, of setting forth the cardinal truth of the Gospel that in Christ Jesus we have forgiveness of sins, an efficacious means of grace. And wherever this sacrament shall be celebrated, it shall be what it was in the upper room at Jerusalem, not mere bread and wine; but *the cup of blessing which we bless is the communion of the blood of Christ, and the bread which we break is the communion of the body of Christ.*³⁾ And *whosoever shall eat of this bread, and drink of this cup of the Lord, unworthily, shall be guilty, not of mere bread and wine, but of the body and blood of the Lord,*⁴⁾ *eating and drinking damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body.*⁵⁾ Wherever this sacra-

1) 1 Cor. 11, 25.

2) 1 Cor. 11, 26.

3) 1 Cor. 10, 16.

4) 1 Cor. 11, 27.

5) 1 Cor. 11, 29.

ment is celebrated, it is what the Lord himself has once made it in the act of institution. Though men break the bread and bless the cup,¹⁾ speaking the words that Jesus spoke, they do not make the sacrament, they are not performing a work of their own, but are only repeating what Jesus did and whereof he said, *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε, this do*; i. e., repeat my acts and repeat my words, and also do as my disciples did at my bidding when I said, *take, eat, and drink ye all of it*. Nor is it the faith or unbelief of the communicants which makes or unmakes the sacrament; for the unworthy communicant also is guilty of the body and blood of Christ. When and where that is done whereof Christ says, *this do*, there is the sacrament with all the sacramental grace and efficacy, and no Judas among the communicants can undo it by his unbelief. And where that whereof Christ says, *this do*, is not done, there is no sacrament, and no amount of faith in the communicants can make it such. Where cider or water is used instead of wine, or where only a semblance of the words of institution is pronounced, while the meaning is professedly changed into "This signifies my body," there is no sacrament, though the celebrant and the communicants be believers in Christ and children of God by faith, every one of them. On the other hand, where the elements and words and acts essential to the sacrament are observed according to Christ's commandment, *this do*, a valid and efficacious sacrament is celebrated, though the communicants, on a given occasion, were hypocrites and rejected the grace offered by this means of grace, every one of them.

The Lord's supper, then, is a means of grace, of reminding us of Christ, the Redeemer of the world, of assuring us that the sacrifice for the expiation of our sins was really and truly offered up by him who was both the High Priest and the sacrifice. As in Baptism a visible element, water,

1) 1 Cor. 10, 16.

is bound up with the word in the sacramental act, so in the Lord's supper visible elements, bread and wine, are, by divine institution, bound up with the sacramental word.

And thus this sacrament too is of the nature of a seal. A memorial supper instituted by the primitive church, the apostles and other disciples of Jesus, would and could not have constituted a seal of divine grace, an assurance of the forgiveness of sins. But when Jesus, in his own words, solemnly assures us that his body is given for us, and his blood is shed for us, for the remission of sins, and in the same solemn act adds to his words the visible elements of bread and wine, again assuring us that with them he gives his body and blood to all those who eat and drink the elements thus given under his ordinance, this is to each recipient a solemn token and testimony of God's gracious will that he, the individual sinner, shall enjoy the benefits of Christ's redemption. As Baptism is the application of water bound up with words of divine promise, applying and securing that promise to the particular person to whom this sacrament is administered for establishing and confirming a personal relation, a covenant of grace, between that person and God, so in the Lord's supper Christ would assure the individual sinner with whom he deals in this sacrament that he who hears the words and eats and drinks shall, by faith in these words and the visible tokens of his redemption attached thereto, have, hold, and enjoy what the words say and the tokens confirm. Thus, while this sacrament, too, is essentially Gospel, a means whereby the benefits of Christ's meritorious sacrifice are applied and appropriated to the individual sinner, this form of applying and appropriating what God's grace has provided and Christ has procured for all mankind is intended to emphasize this act of appropriation as a solemn transaction between God and the *individual* sinner.

Being essentially Gospel, a means of grace, the Lord's supper does not confer grace *ex opere operato*. It is ὄργανον

δοτικόν, the giving hand of God, which extends itself to an ὄργανον ληπτικόν, a taking hand, which is faith. The efficacy of the sacrament is inherent in the sacrament. Here as everywhere the Gospel is *the power of God unto salvation*,¹⁾ but *unto every one that believeth*.²⁾ The power exerted in and through the sacrament is God's, not man's, nor God's and man's working together, but God's alone. And here as everywhere the power of the Gospel is active as *vis collativa* and *vis effectiva*, giving and conferring what is offered and working or promoting the acceptance of such gift. The assurance of divine grace in Christ the Redeemer, which is so directly and impressively set forth to the communicant in the Eucharist celebrated *in remembrance of Him* who lived and died for the sinner who partakes of this memorial feast, is not only incidentally, but by divine intention, a means whereby the faith of the communicant shall be nourished and preserved.³⁾ But here again the sacrament works as a means of grace. While its power is everywhere and at all times efficacious, its efficacy is that of divine power exerted not by immediate but by mediate action. It operates in such a way that its effect can be, as it often is, frustrated by man's obstinate resistance. There are those who *eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord, unworthily*,⁴⁾ who eat and drink, not life and salvation, but *damnation*, to themselves.⁵⁾ And such should be warned not to partake of the sacrament, which was instituted as an assurance of divine grace in Christ for disciples of Christ,⁶⁾ and for them only. St. Paul says: *Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup*.⁷⁾ And the apostle also states the reason (γάρ) for this injunction, as he continues: *FOR he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself*.⁸⁾ Since, then, the Lord's supper was instituted and intended for Christ's

1) Rom. 1, 16.

2) Ibid.

3) 1 Cor. 11, 25. 26. Luke 22, 20.

4) 1 Cor. 11, 27.

5) 1 Cor. 11, 29. Luke 22, 21.

6) Matt. 26, 18. 26. Mark 14, 14. Luke 22, 11.

7) 1 Cor. 11, 28.

8) 1 Cor. 11, 29.

disciples only, and those who on examining themselves find, or should find, that they cannot worthily partake of this sacrament, are solemnly warned lest they eat and drink damnation to themselves, it is clearly incumbent on those who administer the sacrament to guard against its abuse by manifestly unworthy communicants, and to refuse access to the Lord's table to those who cannot or will not examine themselves, who do *not discern the Lord's body*,¹⁾ or who by word or deed show that they are not disciples of Christ.

But there is still another aspect under which unity of faith must be considered a condition of admission to the same altar in the celebration of the Eucharist. While the Lord's supper is in itself a sacrament, a means of divine grace, the celebration or use of this sacrament is in a certain sense a sacrificial act, not a propitiatory sacrifice as offering up the body and blood of Christ, but a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving and a profession of faith. This was one of the purposes for which "the Lord's supper was instituted that . . . we might publicly confess our faith, and proclaim the benefits of Christ, as Paul says (1 Cor. 11, 26): *As often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death.*"²⁾ "For," says the same Apology, "just as among the sacrifices of praise, i. e. among the praises of God, we include the preaching of the Word, so the reception itself of the Lord's supper can be praise or thanksgiving."³⁾ Now, common confession of faith, as communion of worship generally, demands communion and unity of faith. Of the primeval church at Jerusalem it is said that *they continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers.*⁴⁾ Especially does altar fellowship presuppose and demand unity of faith and doctrine concerning the Lord's supper itself. By being *all partakers of that one bread* the communicants exhibit themselves as *one body*,⁵⁾ and it is cer-

1) 1 Cor. 11, 29.

2) Apol. Aug. Conf. III, 6, 89.

3) Ibid. XII, 24, 33.

4) Acts 2, 42.

5) 1 Cor. 10, 17.

tainly improper that those who dissent and are divided on the very nature and sacramental character of *that one bread* should fellowship and exhibit unity by communing together where there is actually dissent and division concerning the very act in which they unite and which is to constitute a bond of unity. When Christ instituted and administered the sacrament, saying, *Take, eat, this is my body*, he certainly did not want those to take and eat who hold and say that what they take and eat is NOT his body. Nor would he have his true disciples, who continue in his word, partake of a purported sacrament where the truth of his sacramental word is questioned or denied.

That the Lord's supper should not, as the sacrament of Baptism, be administered but once to any one person, but should be partaken of repeatedly by the worthy communicant, is apparent from the words of institution, *This do as oft as ye drink it*,¹⁾ and by the words of St. Paul, *For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come*.²⁾ Here the words, ὁσάκις ἐσθίητε καὶ πίνητε, are addressed to the same persons, and we know that the church of the apostolic age, and in the days of Trajan³⁾ and Marcus Aurelius⁴⁾ so understood the words of Christ and of St. Paul.

From the same words it also appears that the cup must not be withheld from any communicant in the sacrament. Jesus expressly said of the cup, *Drink ye ALL of it*,⁵⁾ and St. Mark expressly states that *they ALL drank of it*.⁶⁾ And if it be said that there were no laymen among the first communicants, the argument, proving too much, proves nothing; for on the strength of it the bread also might or must be denied to the lay members of the church. Besides, the words of St. Paul, *As often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup*,⁷⁾ and the subsequent words,⁸⁾ are addressed to the

1) 1 Cor. 11, 25.

2) 1 Cor. 11, 26.

3) Plinii epp. X, 97.

4) Justin, Apol. I, c. 65—67.

5) Matt. 26, 27.

6) Mark 14, 23.

7) 1 Cor. 11, 26.

8) 1 Cor. 11, 27—29.

local congregation at large.¹⁾ To the members of the congregation, as many as are able to examine themselves in their relations to God and their neighbor, and are known to be one with the congregation in the profession of true discipleship²⁾ and in godliness of life, the sacrament, whole and entire, may and should be administered. And as this sacrament and all the means of grace are entrusted to the church as constituted in local congregations, it is proper and in accordance with the will of the Master that the Lord's supper should be administered by the ministers of the church as the organs of the congregations. In this as in every other official function the minister is responsible to the congregation. But the church is not the mistress of the sacrament. It is the Lord's table, and must be administered according to the Lord's will and instruction as above set forth. And the pastor is also a minister of Christ and, therefore, responsible to the Lord over all as truly as he is to the church, his Master's bride, in the administration of the Lord's sacrament.

Such is the scriptural doctrine of the Lord's supper. While this doctrine is plainly taught in its *sedes doctrinae*, the sacrament itself is a mysterious thing which no man's mind can fathom, and the doctrine of the Lord's supper is an article of faith. The doctrine of the person of Christ is also clearly set forth in the Scriptures, and that doctrine, too, is an article of faith, the theanthropic person of the Redeemer being an inscrutable mystery even to angels and archangels. How it is possible that in a human nature the fulness of the Godhead should dwell bodily in a personal union and with a real communication of attributes is far above all human understanding, and no amount of speculation can carry us nearer to the mystery. On the contrary, to speculate where we should simply believe is culpable in itself. Thus, also, we cannot comprehend how it is possible that the body and blood of Christ should, in the sacramental act, enter into a sacramental union with the visible elements,

1) 1 Cor. 1, 2.

2) John 8, 31.

bread and wine, and no amount of speculation can bring us nearer to a solution of this mystery. But the Lord's supper is not to be made the subject of physical or metaphysical, physiological or mathematical enquiry, but must be and remain for all time an object of faith. We know *that* even in the days of his humiliation, the Son of man, who was discoursing heavenly things with Nicodemus on earth, was at the same time in heaven, according to his word,¹⁾ though we cannot comprehend the *how*. Nor is it our business to comprehend this mystery; we simply believe what his plain words plainly say. And we know *that* the same Son of man, while bodily sitting with his disciples at the passover board discoursing heavenly things and instituting his sacrament, gave unto the same disciples that same body with the sacramental bread, and *that* the same Lord Jesus, who was visibly *taken up into heaven*,²⁾ gives his body and blood to all who, *till he come*,³⁾ do and shall partake of his sacrament, eating and drinking, with this bread and this cup, the body and blood of the Lord, though we do not comprehend the *how*. Nor is it our business to comprehend this mystery; we simply believe what his plain words plainly say, *Take, eat, this is my body; take, drink, this is my blood*. We know that this union of Christ's body and blood with the eucharistic elements is not a natural union in a local or circumscriptive presence, and that the eating and drinking of such body and blood in the sacrament is not a physical, Capernaïtic⁴⁾ eating and drinking; but the peculiar mode and manner of such union and presence and eating and drinking we do not know. We term it *sacramental*, not to explain it, but to describe it as being peculiar to this sacrament, in accordance with and by virtue of the sacramental word, which we believe. We do not construe this sacramental presence from the doctrine of the person of Christ and of the communication of attributes, especially of divine omnipresence, to the human

1) John 3, 13.

2) Acts 1, 9. 11.

3) 1 Cor. 11, 26. Cf. Acts 1, 11.

4) John 6, 52.

nature of Christ. We learn that *where two or three are gathered together in Christ's name, there is he in the midst of them,*¹⁾ and that *he is with us alway, even unto the end of the world,*²⁾ also according to his human nature, according to which *all power is GIVEN unto him in heaven and in earth;*³⁾ and this, too, we believe because he has said it. But if he had said only this, and not the sacramental words recorded by the evangelists and St. Paul, there would be no doctrine of the Lord's supper in Lutheran theology. We reject Nestorianism and Eutychianism, because both heresies are at variance with what the Scriptures teach concerning the personal union, the one separating and the other confounding what the Scriptures exhibit as personally united. And, likewise, we repudiate Zwinglianism and Calvinism on the one hand and Transsubstantiation and Consubstantiation on the other, because all of them are at variance with what the Scriptures teach concerning the sacramental union. We will not permit the sacramental bread and the body of Christ to be separated as, to use Beza's words, *summum coelum ab infima terra*. Nor will we permit the bread to be changed into the body of Christ by transsubstantiation, or the bread and Christ's body confounded into a new substance by a sacramental Eutychianism, consubstantiation. We refuse to accept the alternative constantly forced upon us of being either Zwinglians or Papists. We hold, teach and confess that *the cup of blessing which we bless is the communion of the blood of Christ, and the bread which we break is the communion of the body of Christ;*⁴⁾ that in a peculiar, sacramental way known to Christ and brought about by his divine power and will, we eat and drink in his holy sacrament his true body sacramentally present and united with the consecrated bread and his true blood sacramentally present and united with the consecrated wine by virtue of Christ's sacramental word, *Take, eat, this is my body; drink ye all of it, this is my blood.*

A. G.

1) Matt. 18, 20. 2) Matt. 28, 20. 3) Matt. 28, 18. 4) 1 Cor. 10, 16.