

Concordia Theological Monthly

Continuing

Lehre und Wehre (Vol. LXXVI)

Magazin fuer Ev.-Luth. Homiletik (Vol. LIV)

Theol. Quarterly (1897—1920)-Theol. Monthly (Vol. X)

Vol. I

March, 1930

No. 3

CONTENTS

	Page
PIEPER, F.: Der eine Punkt.....	161
KRETZMANN, P. E.: The Eucharist between 30 and 325 A. D.....	167
ENGELDER, TH.: Marburg: Der Sieg des Schriftprinzips	183
KEINATH, H. O. A.: The Contacts of the Book of Acts with Roman Political Institutions. (Concluded.).....	191
LAETSCH, THEO.: Sermon Study for the First Sunday in Lent.....	199
Dispositionen ueber die Eisenacher Evangelienreihe.....	208
Theological Observer. — Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches.....	216
Vermischtes und zeitgeschichtliche Notizen.....	229
Book Review. — Literatur.....	233

Ein Prediger muss nicht allein *weiden*, also dass er die Schafe unterweise, wie sie rechte Christen sollen sein, sondern auch daneben den Woelfen *wehren*, dass sie die Schafe nicht angreifen und mit falscher Lehre verfuehren und Irrtum einfuehren. — *Luther*.

Es ist kein Ding, das die Leute mehr bei der Kirche behaelt, denn die gute Predigt. — *Apologie, Art. 24*.

If the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle?
1 Cor. 14, 8.

Published for the
Ev. Luth. Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States
CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, St. Louis, Mo.



unter denjenigen, welche das Bekenntnis der Konfordinenformel von der Erbsünde und vom freien Willen Wort für Wort unterschreiben zu können vermeinen, solche befinden, welche von allen pelagianischen Vorstellungen noch keineswegs geheilt sind. . . . Die Konfordinenformel bleibt dabei: daß Menschen selig werden, das hat seinen Grund lediglich in Gottes freier Gnade; hingegen daß Menschen verdammt werden, das hat lediglich seinen Grund in des Menschen Sünde und Schuld. Sie sieht auch, daß sich dies nach der Vernunft nicht reimen lasse; sie sieht auch, daß nach der Vernunft, wenn Menschen nur um ihrer Sünde willen verdammt werden, die andern um ihres Besserseins willen selig werden müssen, oder, wenn Menschen nur aus freier Gnade selig werden, die andern aus Mangel des Gnadentwillens Gottes verdammt werden müssen; aber weil beides in Gottes Wort steht, daß Gott die Erwählten allein nach dem Wohlgefallen seines Willens zu Lobe seiner herrlichen Gnade schon von Ewigkeit erwählt und daß die Verdamnten, während Gott aller Menschen Seligkeit wolle, um ihrer eigenen Sünde und Schuld willen verworfen sind, so glaubt, lehrt und bekennet die Konfordinenformel beides, schlägt nicht mit den Calvinisten eine Vernunftbrücke über den gähnenden Abgrund dieses unerklärlichen Geheimnisses, läßt beides stehen und betet in Demut Gott in seiner unbegreiflichen Weisheit an, die Lösung dieses scheinbaren Widerspruchs im ewigen Leben erwartend.“

Wenn Prof. Grau-Königsberg von uns Missouriern sagt: „Sie machen solche Folgerungen nicht“, nämlich aus dem Lehren der sola gratia die Zeugnung der universalis gratia zu „folgern“, so stellt er damit uns Missouriern das Zeugnis der Orthodogie im Sinne der Konfordinenformel und der lutherischen Kirche aus. Wenn die Bekämpfer der Missourishode veranlaßt werden könnten, „solche Folgerungen“ auch zu unterlassen, so würden sie damit ihre eigene Lehrstellung wesentlich verbessern und den Punkt aus dem Wege räumen, den sie zum Trennungspunkt zwischen sich und den „Missouriern“ gemacht haben.

F. Pieper.

The Eucharist between 30 and 325 A. D.

It was in the year 30 A. D., on the evening of the fourteenth of Nisan, corresponding roughly to one of the last days of our March. On this first day of Unleavened Bread, Jesus, responding to a reminder on the part of His disciples, exercised the functions of the head of the household or family in sending Peter and John to make ready the Passover for the evening celebration. Mark 14, 12, 13; Matt. 26, 17—19; Luke 22, 7 ff. The room where the Lord celebrated the Passover with His disciples for the last time is described as being furnished, or fitted out, with sofas and one or more tables, all ready for the purpose which Jesus had in mind,

namely, that of a meeting- and dining-room. The surroundings were utterly unlike those which had characterized the life of Jesus in His lifelong poverty, relieved as it was but occasionally by the ministrations of faithful friends. Luke 8, 3. The entire scene and setting, there in the upper room of the house at Jerusalem, is in keeping with the purpose of Christ, namely, to give to His disciples of all times a meal of remembrance and spiritual values befitting their rank as kings and priests before God and His Father. Rev. 1, 6.

The incidents of that evening can easily be set forth on the basis of the inspired account and other fairly reliable sources. Jesus came in with His disciples "when even was come," Matt. 26, 20, the day of the feast having come with sunset or when the first stars became visible in the sky. The celebration was formally opened when the head of the house spoke a prayer of thanksgiving and a blessing upon the meal, the first cup of the feast then being passed around. It was at this point that Jesus solemnly declared to His disciples: "With desire have I desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer." Luke 22, 16. And it was here also that there arose a contention among the disciples which of them should be accounted the greatest, Luke 22, 24, whereupon Jesus gave them the lesson of the washing of feet, ordinarily the work of the house-slaves, but in this case taken over by Himself, as a rebuke directed against their false ambitions, John 13, 1—20.

The supper had meanwhile been served (*δείπνου γινόμενον*). The bitter herbs were dipped in vinegar or salt water; the roast lamb was brought in, together with the sauce known as charoseth, and the slabs, or loaves, of unleavened bread. The small assembly sang the first part of the Great Hallel, and the second cup of wine was passed around.

But before the meal actually began, the Head of the house had solemnly spoken the blessing over the wine: "Blessed be Thou, Lord, our God, King of the earth, who createst the fruit of the vine," just as he pronounced the words of benediction over the bread: "Blessed be Thou, Lord, our God, King of the earth, who bringest forth bread out of the earth." As He now broke one of the loaves of unleavened bread, he distributed it with some of the bitter herbs, saying: "This is the bread of affliction which our fathers ate in Egypt." A thanksgiving was spoken also over the lamb in order that it could be served to all. The morsels of bread were dipped into the sauce, which could be reached by all those partaking of the meal, one large vessel serving the purpose. It was during this part of the meal that Jesus dipped the sop, or

morsel, and gave it to Judas Iscariot after He had made the announcement that one of His own band would betray Him, the excitement which followed being so great as to cover the little byplay which was so carefully noted by John, John 13, 27—30, and incorporated also into the Gospel of St. Matthew, chap. 26, 25.

The main course of the meal having come to an end, the benediction over the cup was again pronounced, for the third cup, which was now passed around, was called the cup of blessing, τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας or ὑμνήσεως. 1 Cor. 10, 16. Goodwin (*Moses et Aaron, seu Civiles et Ecclesiastici Ritus*, 496) here remarks: *Sic benedictio calicis et inchoat et claudit convivium*. At this point Jesus interrupted the ceremonies of the Passover celebration. He did not denounce or repudiate the Sacrament of the Old Testament, but He quietly and effectively substituted for it the corresponding Sacrament of the New Covenant. He took bread (ἄρτος), and when He had spoken the blessing, or the thanksgiving, He broke it and gave it to the disciples, saying: "Take, eat; this is My body, which is given for you; this do in remembrance of Me." And He took the cup, as Luke in particular notes, after supper, μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι, saying: "Drink ye all of it; for this is the cup of the new covenant in My blood, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." Then He added: "But I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new with you in My Father's kingdom." Cp. Matt. 26, 26—29; Mark 14, 22—25; Luke 22, 19. 20. There followed the wonderful farewell discourses of the Savior before the singing of the last part of the Great Hallel, Matt. 26, 30; Mark 14, 26, after which the little company left the upper room, if, indeed, they had not already proceeded to the courtyard of the house where John 15 and 16 may have been spoken, later continuing through the valley of the Kidron to the Garden of Gethsemane, while Judas Iscariot assembled and led forth his motley band of Roman soldiers, members of the Temple guard, and servants of Sanhedrin members, in particular those of the high priest, in order to betray his Master into the hands of His enemies.

Such is the story of that memorable evening, the night in which Jesus was betrayed, when He established His last will and testament, the Sacrament of His body and blood. And the early Christian Church treasured this gift of the Savior's grace. We are told that the believers at Jerusalem continued daily with one accord in the Temple, in the public services of the Word, and broke bread from house to house, in the closed meeting of the

Eucharist. Acts 2, 46. In the congregations outside of Judea also, where the majority of the members may have been of Gentile origin, the disciples came together upon the first day of the week to break bread. Acts 20, 7. They also connected with the celebration of the Eucharist the celebration of a common meal of fellowship, later known as the agape, which was to symbolize both the union and the communion of the believers. Cp. 1 Cor. 11, 19, 20; Gal. 2, 12—14; Jude 12. This meal evidently intended to carry out the former significance of the Passover supper. We shall briefly touch upon its later history below. Chrysostom writes of this period of the Church: "The first Christians had all things in common, as we read in the Acts of the Apostles; and when that ceased, as it did in the apostles' time, this came in its room, as an efflux, or imitation, of it. For though the rich did not make all their substance common, yet upon certain days appointed they made a common table; and when their service was ended and they had all communicated in the holy mysteries, they all met at a common feast, the rich bringing provisions; and the poor, and those who had nothing, being invited, they all feasted in common together." (Bingham, *Antiquities*, Book XV, chap. VI, sec. 6.)

Twenty-seven years after the institution of the Lord's Supper, approximately 57 A. D., shortly after Easter, a man who was not present on that memorable evening wrote down the first account of the institution, having, as he states with great emphasis, received of the Lord that which he had delivered to the Corinthians by way of oral preaching and which he now fixed for all times in the written form of 1 Cor. 11, 23—25, adding to the historical narrative an exposition and application which is essential for the proper use of the Lord's Supper to this day, vv. 26—34. That man was the Apostle Paul. And within approximately the next decade three others wrote the same account, two of them in Rome, both of these not having been present in Jerusalem in the year 30, and one in Palestine, who was indeed an eye-witness of the institution. The former two were Mark and Luke; the latter, Matthew. Such is the history of the institution of the Eucharist and of its celebration in the early decades of the Christian Church.

How may we summarize the facts, both as to doctrine and practise, given in these accounts? As for our Lord Himself, the following is clearly shown:—

He brought the Old Covenant to an end with the last celebration of its Sacrament of the Passover lamb, but He connected its

symbolism with that of the New Covenant, in the assembly of believers in one communion.

He affirmed in the most emphatic manner the vicarious atonement (given for you, broken for you, new testament in My blood, for the remission of sins).

He gave to the believers of the New Testament a most remarkable seal of the objective justification wrought for all men in offering to all who partake of that meal, by the sacramental presence, the full assurance of the atonement, the ἀπολύτρωσις διὰ αἵματος αὐτοῦ.

He showed that the sacramental presence is actual and factual, not merely symbolic or commemorative, and yet He taught neither transubstantiation nor consubstantiation.

To this we add the application made by St. Paul in his inspired account:—

He, as implied by Jesus, showed that the Sacrament was to be celebrated throughout the period of the New Testament.

He set forth the essential qualifications of the worthy communicant, especially as to self-examination and faith.

He showed, and warned against, the dangers of unworthy reception.

He safeguarded the Sacrament against the contamination of transubstantiation, consubstantiation, impanation, communion under one form, and the adoration of the elements by the simple and clear manner of his teaching.

Such was the situation between 30 A. D. and the end of the first century of the Christian era. The Christians of these seven decades evidently accepted the teaching of Christ and of His great apostle as it was brought to their attention and carefully abstained from human speculation concerning the miraculous gift.

We now come to the period of the Apostolic Fathers, extending from the beginning to somewhat beyond the middle of the second century and bringing to our attention such names as Clement of Rome, Ignatius of Antioch, Polycarp of Smyrna and such titles as the *Didache*, the *Letter of Barnabas*, the *Shepherd of Hermas*, and the *Epistle to Diognetus*. During this time we find no formal treatises on the Lord's Supper, but certain incidental remarks and an occasional short paragraph enable us to form a fairly correct picture of the attitude taken by the Christians while the disciples of the apostles were the teachers of large congregations.

Clement of Rome, who was nearest to the Apostolic Age in point of time and local contact, has only one reference which may be construed as referring to the Eucharist, when he writes (*I. Epistle*, XL, 2): "He commanded us to celebrate sacrifices and services and that it should not be done thoughtlessly and disorderly, but at fixed times and hours." But in the other writings of the Apostolic Fathers we find at least a few passages which give us some idea of the attitude taken by the Christians of that day with regard to the Lord's Supper and its celebration. As for the external features connected with the Sacrament, Ignatius writes to the Ephesians (chap. XIII): "Seek, then, to come together more frequently *εἰς εὐχαριστίαν θεοῦ καὶ εἰς δόξαν* (for the Eucharist of God and for praise). For when you gather together frequently, the powers of Satan are destroyed, and his mischief is brought to nothing, by the concord of your faith." The *Didache* prescribes (chap. XIV): "On the Day of the Lord come together, break bread, and hold Eucharist after confessing your transgressions that your offering may be pure; but let none who has a quarrel with his fellow join in your meeting until he be reconciled, that your sacrifice be not defiled."

That the Eucharist continued to hold a permanent place in the Postapostolic Church appears also from the fact that its liturgy is referred to in several places. Ignatius writes to the Ephesians (chap. XX): ". . . you all severally join in the common meeting in grace from His name, in one faith, and in Jesus Christ, who was of the family of David according to the flesh, the Son of Man and the Son of God, so that you obey the bishop and the presbytery with an undisturbed mind, breaking one bread, which is the medicine of immortality, the antidote that we should not die, but live forever in Jesus Christ." Evidently the writer has certain passages from the liturgy of the Eucharist in mind here, but at the same time he sets forth the doctrine of the Sacrament as it was held at the beginning of the second century. The most extensive passage that we have with reference to the liturgy of the Eucharist at this time is that contained in the *Didache*, chaps. IX and X: "And concerning the Eucharist, hold Eucharist thus: First concerning the cup: 'We give thanks to Thee, our Father, for the holy vine of David, Thy child, which Thou didst make known to us through Jesus, Thy Child; to Thee be glory forever!' And concerning the broken bread: 'We give Thee thanks, our Father, for the life and knowledge which Thou didst make known to us through Jesus, Thy Child; to Thee be glory forever! As this broken bread was

scattered upon the mountains, but was brought together and became one, so let Thy Church be gathered together from the ends of the earth into Thy kingdom; for Thine is the glory and the power through Jesus Christ forever.' But let none eat and drink of your Eucharist except those who have been baptized in the Lord's name. For concerning this also did the Lord say: 'Give not that which is holy to the dogs.' But after you are satisfied with food, thus give thanks: 'We give thanks to Thee, O holy Father, for Thy holy name which Thou didst make to tabernacle in our hearts and for the knowledge and faith and immortality which Thou didst make known to us through Jesus, Thy Child. To Thee be glory forever! . . . Let grace come and let this world pass away. Hosanna to the God of David! If any man be holy, let him come; if any man be not, let him repent: Maran atha, Amen.' But suffer the prophets to hold Eucharist as they will."

A feature of the attitude of the Church in those days was the insistence upon the prerogatives of the clergy, as stewards of the mysteries of God. Ignatius writes to the Smyrnaeans (chap. VIII): "Let that be considered a valid Eucharist which is celebrated by the bishop or by one whom he appoints." This is said in connection with another statement, which makes the situation very emphatic: "See that you all follow the bishop, as Jesus Christ follows the Father, and the presbytery as if it were the apostles. Let no one do any of the things appertaining to the Church without the bishop."

But the specific doctrinal discussion was not entirely lacking during this period. Ignatius writes to the Philadelphians (chap. IV): "Be careful therefore to use one Eucharist (for there is one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ and one cup for union with His blood, one altar, as there is one bishop with the presbytery and the deacons, my fellow-servants), in order that whatever you do you may do it according unto God." And again: "They [the heretics] abstain from Eucharist and prayer because they do not confess that the Eucharist is the flesh of our Savior Jesus Christ, who suffered for our sins, which the Father raised up by His goodness."

The following points appear in the various passages quoted, most of which have been noted and a number correctly evaluated by various writers in the history of dogma:—

Frequent meetings for the purpose of celebrating the Lord's Supper were urged, and the Sunday celebration was specifically mentioned.

There was a fairly complete liturgy, with special prayers concerning each of the elements, naming also the benefits derived from the Sacrament.

The celebration of the Eucharist was in the hands of the bishop as a prerogative connected with his office.

The real presence was taught, but without any reference to transubstantiation or any but a sacramental presence.

The Lord's Supper was distinctly connected with the atonement.

It was asserted that knowledge and faith was wrought through the Sacrament.

Only baptized persons and mature Christians were permitted to partake of it.

The Sacrament was supposed to confer strength against the power of Satan.

Those living in a quarrel with their neighbors were regarded as unworthy.

The Sacrament was considered a medicine of immortality, and the eschatological idea was stressed.

The heretics were condemned for not accepting the truth of the Sacrament.

The Eucharist was regarded as a communion, or fellowship, through the one bread.

The concept of an offering (*θυσία*) connected with the Eucharist was mentioned, though as yet confined to the prayers and the act of worship.

The last part of our investigation concerns the so-called Ante-Nicene Church Fathers, including some apologists and theologians ordinarily not included in the list of these men. The following writers are of importance for our topic: Justin Martyr (110—166), Irenaeus (125—202), Tertullian (150—220 or 240), Clement of Alexandria and Jerusalem (fl. 193—211), Cyprian of Carthage (fl. 248—258), Hippolytus (d. 236), Origen (158—254), to which will be added, as offering summaries or the culmination of the theological work of the Ante-Nicene period, as well as the transition to the Post-Nicene period, the *Apostolic Constitutions and Canons* (second to eighth century), Athanasius (279—373), Cyril of Jerusalem (315—386).

Our first consideration is that pertaining to *external rites and customs* connected with the celebration of the Eucharist. The administration of the Lord's Supper was in the hands of the clergy,

in particular those of the bishop, it being understood during this entire period that they held a distinct office as stewards of the mysteries of God. In the appendix to the works of Hippolytus (*Ante-Nicene Fathers*, V, 257, 31. 37) we read: "When a bishop celebrates the Holy Communion (*Synaxis*), the presbyters who stand by him should be clothed in white. . . . A deacon may dispense the Eucharist with the permission of a bishop or presbyter." In the *Apostolic Constitutions*, chap. LVII (VII, 421) we read: "As to the deacons, after the prayer is over, let some of them attend upon the oblation of the Eucharist, ministering the Lord's body with fear." And that such ministering included the carrying of the consecrated elements to the sick persons of the diocese appears from the note in Cyprian (V, 488) which warns the ministers against having their hands spotted with the sword and blood after the Eucharist has been carried in them (*nec post gestatam eucharistiam manus gladio et cruore maculatur*). A summary of the situation with regard to the administration of the Sacrament is found in the *Apostolic Constitutions* (VII, 429, X): "Neither do we permit the laity to perform any of the offices belonging to the priesthood; as, for instance, neither the sacrifice, nor Baptism, nor the laying on of hands, nor the blessing, whether the smaller or the greater; for no one taketh this honor to himself but he that is called of God. For such sacred offices are conferred by the laying on of the hands of the bishop. But if a person to whom such an office is not committed, seizes upon it himself, he shall undergo the punishment of Uzziah."

As for the feast of the *agape*, which had been celebrated in connection with the Lord's Supper since the time of the apostles, it continued for several centuries, although its object was often misunderstood by the heathen, a situation for which the Christians were themselves partly to blame, chiefly on account of their *disciplina arcani*, which kept them from explaining many of their usages and observances to such as were not yet *bona-fide* candidates for membership. The feast of the *agape* was at first celebrated before the Communion, in imitation of our Savior's institution. But in the beginning of the second century, as we may infer from the well-known account of Pliny, the Sacrament was celebrated first, and a later meeting was devoted to a common meal; for his words read: ". . . that they met on the Lord's Day to sing hymns to Christ and bind themselves by a Sacrament. . . . When this is done, their custom is to depart and meet again to partake of an entertainment, but that a very innocent one, and common to all"

(. . . *quod essent soliti stato die ante lucem convenire carmenque Christo quasi Deo dicere, . . . seque sacramento obstringere, . . . quibus peractis morem sibi discedendi fuisse, rursusque ad capiendum cibum, promiscuum tamen et innoxium*). (Plinii liber X, ep. XCVII.) This is affirmed also by Tertullian about the end of the century. According to him the celebration of the common meal came after that of the Lord's Supper. (*Apol.*, c. XXXIX.) As for the conclusions to be drawn, Bingham remarks (*Antiquities*, Book XV, chap. VII, § 8) : "It was the rule in the African Church to receive the Eucharist fasting at all times, except one day, which was the Thursday before Easter, commonly called *Coena Domini*, because it was the day on which our Savior celebrated His last supper and instituted the Eucharist after supper; in imitation of which it was the custom to celebrate the Eucharist after supper on this day in the African churches, but on no other day whatsoever." The agape later deteriorated with the increasing worldliness of the Church, so that its celebration was forbidden by Ambrose of Milan and by several councils (Third of Carthage, Laodicea, Orleans, Trullensis I).

During the almost two centuries here concerned the earthly elements used by the Lord at the time of the institution were used in every part of the Church. There was never the slightest question as to the fact that bread (*ἄζυρος*) must be used, although there was a long controversy on the question whether leavened or unleavened bread should be used, the discussion subsequently leading to the Azymite Controversy between the Oriental and the Western Church (Council of Florence, 1439). There was also never the slightest doubt within the orthodox section of the Church as to the use of wine as the second element, all the teachers of the Church being unanimous in their denunciation of the followers of Tatian, called *Hydroparastatae* or *Aquarii*, and of the Encratites. But it was a peculiarity of this age that the mixture of wine and water, originally introduced, according to the best authorities, partly on account of the great strength of the Oriental wines, partly on account of the celebration of the Eucharist in the early morning, after which the slaves had to return to work without a suspicion of an intoxicating drink on their breath, partly on account of the symbolism spoken of by John in connection with Christ's death, when blood and water flowed from His riven side, was insisted on as necessary for a proper celebration of the Eucharist. Clement of Alexandria writes in the *Instructor*, chap. II (II, 242) : "Accordingly, as wine is blended with water, so is the Spirit with man. And

the one, the mixture of wine and water, nourishes to faith, while the other, the Spirit, conducts to immortality. . . . And the mixture of both, of the water and the Word, is called Eucharist, renowned and glorious grace; and they who by faith partake of it are sanctified both in body and soul." In the *Epistles* of Cyprian we read (V, 359): "Know, then, that I have been admonished that, in offering the cup, the tradition of the Lord must be observed and that nothing must be done by us but what the Lord first did on our behalf, as, that the cup which is offered in remembrance of Him should be offered mingled with wine. For when Christ says, 'I am the true Vine,' the blood of Christ is assuredly not water, but wine; neither can His blood by which we are redeemed and quickened appear to be in the cup when in the cup there is no wine whereby the blood of Christ is shown forth, which is declared by the Sacrament and testimony of all the Scriptures." And again (V, 362): "For because Christ bore us all in that He also bore our sins, we see that in the water is understood the people, but in the wine is shown the blood of Christ. But when the water is mingled in the cup with wine, the people is made one with Christ, and the assembly of believers is associated and conjoined with Him on whom it believes; which association and conjunction of water and wine is so mingled in the Lord's cup that the mixture cannot any more be separated. . . . Thus, therefore, in consecrating the cup of the Lord, water alone cannot be offered, even as wine alone cannot be offered. For if any one offer wine only, the blood of Christ is dissociated from us; but if the water be alone, the people are dissociated from Christ; but when both are mingled and are joined with each other by a close union, there is completed a spiritual and heavenly Sacrament. Thus the cup of the Lord is not indeed water alone nor wine alone, unless each be mingled with the other; just as, on the other hand, the body of the Lord cannot be flour alone or water alone, unless both should be united and joined together and compacted in the mass of one bread, in which very Sacrament our people are shown to be made one, so that in like manner as many grains, collected and ground and mixed together into one mass, make one bread, so in Christ, who is the heavenly Bread, we may know that there is one body, with which our number is joined and united." Fortunately Luther, with his usual good common sense and correct evaluation of Scriptural background, set aside the false insistence upon the *κράμα* and the conclusions based upon false premises. — If space permitted, we might have at least some discussion of a peculiar aberration con-

nected with the celebration of the Eucharist during these centuries, namely, that of admitting all baptized members of the congregation, including children, to the Lord's Supper, a practise which is referred to by Cyprian in his *De Lapsis* and quoted with approval by Augustine. Fortunately the full development and defense of this custom belongs to the next period of church history. The statement of the *Apostolic Canons* concerning the attendance has far more to recommend it: "All such of the faithful as come to church and hear the Scriptures read, but stay not for the prayers and to partake of the Holy Communion, ought to be suspended as authors of disorder in the Church." (Thalhofer Ed., 318.)

Much interest naturally attaches to the *liturgical ordinances* of this period because they are so intimately connected with the life of the believers. These refer, in part, to the days and to the frequency of celebration. Tertullian writes, in his *De Corona*, chap. III: "We take also, in congregations before daybreak, and from the hand of none but the presidents, the Sacrament of the Eucharist, which the Lord both commanded to be eaten at meal-times and enjoined to be taken by all alike (men and women, rich and poor)." (III, 94.) In the *Epistles* of Cyprian the statement is found (V, 363): "It behooved Christ to offer about the evening of the day, that the very hour of sacrifices might show the setting and the evening of the world. But we celebrate the resurrection of the Lord in the morning." One of the sentences in the works of Hippolytus reads (V, 252): "Come, ye hierarchs, who did Me sacred service blamelessly day and night and made the oblation of My honorable body and blood daily." On the other hand, light is thrown on the changing conditions at the end of this period by the decrees of Fabian, taken from the *Decretal of Gratian* (VIII, 640): "Every one of the faithful should communicate three times a year. . . . Although they may not do it more frequently, yet at least three times in the year should the laity communicate, unless one happen to be hindered by any more serious offenses, to wit, at Easter, at Pentecost, and the Lord's Nativity."

As for the *liturgy* itself, Justin gives us the following picture at the beginning of the period of the Church Fathers, in his *First Apology* (I, 186): "Then we all rise together and pray, and, as before said, when our prayer is ended, bread and wine and water are brought, and the president in like manner offers prayers and thanksgivings according to his ability, and the people assent, saying Amen; and there is a distribution to each and a participation of that over which thanks have been given, and to those who are

absent a portion is sent by the deacons. And they who are well-to-do and willing give what each thinks fit; and what is collected is deposited with the president, who succors the orphans and widows and those who, through sickness or any other cause, are in want and those who are in bonds, and the strangers sojourning among us, and, in a word, takes care of all who are in need. But Sunday is the day on which we all hold our common assembly, because it is the first day on which God, having wrought a change in the darkness and matter, made the world; and Jesus Christ, our Savior, on the same day rose from the dead." To this information we add a section from the *Apostolic Constitutions*, including a statement concerning the so-called kiss of peace, as it was continued in the Church for centuries after the time of the apostles as a remnant of a Jewish ceremony connected with their meals of fellowship. We read (VII, 442): "Then let the men give the men, and the women give the women, the Lord's kiss. But let no one do it with deceit, as Judas betrayed the Lord with a kiss. After this let the deacon pray for the whole Church, for the whole world, and the several parts of it, and the fruits of it. . . . After this let the sacrifice follow, the people standing and praying silently; and when the oblation has been made, let every rank by itself partake of the Lord's body and precious blood in order and approach with reverence and holy fear, as to the body of their King. Let the women approach with their heads covered, as it is becoming the order of women; but let the door be watched, lest any unbeliever or one not yet initiated come in." — We add here a few significant passages from some of the earliest liturgies. From the consecration of the liturgy contained in the *Apostolic Constitutions*: "That Thou mayest send down Thy Holy Spirit upon this sacrifice as the memorial of the suffering of Thy Son, the Lord Jesus, in order that He may set forth (*ἀποφέρειν*) this bread as the body and this cup as the blood of Thine Anointed." The distribution was made with the words: "This is the body of Christ. — This is the blood of Christ." From the *Liturgy of St. James*: "Having blessed, having sanctified, having broken, He gave it to His holy disciples and apostles, saying, Unto the forgiveness of sins and unto eternal life. . . . We give thanks to Thee, Christ, our God, who hast made us worthy to partake of Thy body and blood for the forgiveness of sins and unto eternal life." From the *Liturgy of the Syrian Jacobites*: "Again and again by this pure, holy oblation and propitiatory sacrifice which has been offered to God the Father and consecrated and accomplished and consummated by the descent of the living Holy

Ghost . . . for the blessed folk who draw nigh and receive it in the belief of the truth and those for whom it is offered and consecrated: again and more especially we are praying.” (Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western.*) This list could be enlarged almost indefinitely.

In most of the passages thus far submitted there was some doctrinal thought pertaining to the Eucharist. But we also find a number of direct doctrinal expositions, which enable us to form a fairly complete picture or concept of the ideas connected with the Eucharist between 150 and 325 A. D. Justin Martyr writes in his *First Apology*, chap. LXVI (I, 186): “And this food is called among us *εὐχαριστία*, of which no one is allowed to partake but the man who believes that the things which we teach are true and who has been washed with the washing that is for the remission of sins and unto regeneration and who is so living as Christ has enjoined. For not as common bread and common drink do we receive these; but in like manner as Jesus Christ, our Savior, having been made flesh by the word of God, had both flesh and blood for our salvation, so likewise have we been taught that the food which is blessed by the prayer of His Word and from which our blood and flesh by transmutation are nourished, is the flesh and blood of that Jesus who was made flesh. For the apostles, in the memoirs composed by them, which are called gospels, have thus delivered unto us what was enjoined upon them — that Jesus took bread and, when He had given thanks, said, ‘This do ye in remembrance of Me, this is My body’; and that, after the same manner, having taken the cup and given thanks, He said, ‘This is My blood,’ and gave it to them alone. Which the wicked devils have imitated in the mysteries of Mithras, commanding the same thing to be done. For that bread and a cup of water are placed with certain incantations in the mystic rites of one who is being initiated you either know or can learn.” Irenaeus says concerning the bread of the Lord’s Supper (*Adv. Haer.*, lib. IV, cap. XXXIV): “The bread, which is taken from the earth, has the invocation of God upon it, and then it is no longer common bread, but the Eucharist.” And again (I, 528): “But vain in every respect are they who despise the entire dispensation of God and disallow the salvation of the flesh and treat with contempt its regeneration, maintaining that it is not capable of incorruption. But if this indeed do not attain salvation, then neither did the Lord redeem us with His blood, nor is the cup of the Eucharist the communion of His blood, nor the bread which we break the communion of His body. For blood can come only from veins and flesh

and whatsoever else makes up the substance of man, such as the Word of God was actually made. By His own blood He redeemed us, as also His apostle declares: 'In whom we have redemption through His blood, even the remission of sins.' And as we are His members, we are also nourished by means of the creation. . . . He has acknowledged the cup (which is part of the creation) as His own blood, from which He bedews our blood; and the bread (also a part of the creation) He has established as His own body, from which He gives increase to our bodies." And again (Fragment, 36): "The oblation of the Eucharist is not fleshly, but spiritual and therefore clean. For we offer to God the bread and the cup of blessing, giving thanks to Him that He bade the earth send forth these fruits for our nourishment; and afterwards, having performed the oblation, we call on the Holy Ghost that He would make this sacrifice, the bread the body of Christ and the cup the blood of Christ, that they who receive these antitypes may receive forgiveness of sins and eternal life." In the *Epistles* of Cyprian a number of passages are noteworthy for our purpose (V, 350. 398. 363), of which the second is valuable in setting forth his teaching on the union and communion: "Besides, even the Lord's sacrifices themselves declare that Christian unanimity is linked together with itself by a firm and inseparable charity. For when the Lord calls bread, which is combined by the union of many grains, His body, He indicates our people, whom He bore as being united; and when He calls the wine, which is pressed from many grapes and clusters and collected together, His blood, He also signifies our flock linked together by the mingling of a united multitude."

Just a few more testimonies, and we shall be able to summarize the teaching of these centuries. Tertullian writes: "Taking bread, He made it His body. . . . Our Lord in the Gospel showed bread, making it His body, in order that you might thence understand Him to have given the bread the figure of His body." (*Ad Marcionem*, 20. 40.) Clement of Alexandria states: "The vine bears wine as the Word bears blood; both are drunk by men into salvation, the wine bodily, the blood spiritually." (*Paedagogos*, 1.) Origen has a very strong sentence: "We eat with prayer and thanksgiving the bread which we offer, which by prayer becomes a holy body." (*Contra Celsum*, 8. 33.) Athanasius writes: "We are deified, not by partaking of the body of some man, but by receiving the body of the Word Himself." (*Letter to Maximus*, 61.) Cyril of Jerusalem, very probably shortly after *Nicaea*, sums up the teaching on the Eucharist when he says in his catechetical lectures:

“Since, then, He Himself declared of the bread, ‘This is My body,’ who shall dare to doubt any longer? And since He has Himself affirmed, ‘This is My blood,’ who shall ever hesitate, saying it is not His blood? . . . Consider therefore the bread and wine not as bare elements; for they are according to the Lord’s declaration, the body and blood of Christ; for even though sense suggests this to thee, yet let faith establish thee. Judge not the matter from the taste, but from faith be fully assured without misgiving that the body and blood of Christ have been vouchsafed to thee.” (Lecture XXII.)

The following summary represents the consensus of doctrine from the days of Justin Martyr to the Council of Nicaea:—

Only baptized members of the Church were admitted to the Holy Supper, and at first only adult Christians, later also children.

Frequent celebrations of the Sacrament were enjoined, the daily administration being still in vogue at first, later at least every Sunday and festival day, while the later order of three Communion a year paved the way for still greater modifications.

The Sacrament was invariably celebrated under both forms, bread and wine, the latter mingled with water, being the elements.

The Eucharist was connected with the atonement of Christ, whose benefits were to be applied through faith.

The true sacramental presence was taught.

The union with Christ and communion with one another were pointed out as being among the benefits received.

The eschatological significance was still in evidence — a preparation of the bodies for immortality. (Cp. Muentzer, *Handbuch der ältesten christlichen Dogmengeschichte*, II, Part 2, sec. 9, 116 ff.)

There is only one false note in this symphony of correct doctrinal views, and that is the concept connected with the word offering, or sacrifice (*θυσία*), as found in so many theological writers of this period, chiefly in Cyprian. It was he who gave to a specific hierarchical class the specific sacrifice of the Eucharist, who named the suffering of Christ and the bread as the Eucharistic offering (*calicem in commemorationem Domini et passionis eius offerre — sanguinem Christi offerre*). The offerings of the Christians in their entire life of sanctification, Rom. 12, 1, specifically their acts of worship, were now extended to include the Eucharist as being a sacrificial satisfaction of the kind required by the sinner for the full reconciliation with God. Thus the prothesis of the elements and the Sacrament commemorative of the sacrifice of Christ became a propitiatory memorial sacrifice. In other words, the idea gained

ground, being supported by the development of the liturgy and the increasing hierarchical powers, that the body and the blood of Christ had to be offered again and again in order to effect a constant reconciliation. The *προσφέρειν τὴν μνήμην τοῦ σώματος* became *τὸ σῶμα προσφέρειν*. The first instances of decay asserted themselves, which finally led to the abomination of the Mass.

P. E. KRETZMANN.

Marburg: Der Sieg des Schriftprinzips.

(Fortsetzung.)

„Nach dem Sündenfall ist es mit der menschlichen Logik schlecht bestellt.“ (Chr. Dogm. II, 564.) Das kommt daher, daß die Menschen die angeborene böse Lust, in diesem Fall die Feindschaft gegen die Schriftwahrheit, lieber zu Worte kommen lassen als die ihnen seit dem Sündenfall noch zur Verfügung stehende Vernunft. (Trigl., 334.) Diese würde ihnen sagen, daß sie von diesen Dingen nichts weiß. Wer trotzdem von der Vernunft aus gegen eine Schriftwahrheit argumentiert, tut dies gegen den Protest der gesunden Vernunft. Er läßt sich auch gewöhnlich von seiner Leidenschaft so verblenden, daß er ungeschert die einfachsten Regeln der Logik übertritt. So ein jämmerliches Ding ist das Vernunftprinzip: es kann nur unter Aufopferung der Vernunft verfochten werden. — Mit den Vernunftargumenten der Schweizer war es nicht weit her. Ehrard meint allerdings, Luther habe keines ihrer Argumente widerlegen können. Luther hat sie mit einem Schriftwort widerlegt. Nebenbei widerlegte er sie auch mit der Vernunft. Sie machten ihm nicht viel zu schaffen. Er schrieb an Joh. Agricola: „Kurz, es sind ungeschickte Leute und unerfahren im Disputieren.“ (17, 1954.) Das hielt er ihnen auch im Gespräch vor: „Ich bitte Euch noch: Eure Fundamente sind gar schwach; gebt nach und gebt Gott die Ehre!“ (W. Köhler — so immer, wo keine andere Quelle angegeben ist.) „Vos habetis malam dialecticam a baculo ad angulum.“ (Hedio, W. Ausg., 125.) Ihre Folgerungen paßten wie die Faust aufs Auge. (S. Luther, 9, 86.) Das mögen dreizehn Exempel dartun.

1. Nach einem Bericht, der auf mündlicher Mitteilung Skolampads beruhen mag (Hagenbach, Väter der reformierten Kirche II, 140), erklärte dieser im Vorgespräch: „Ist des Herrn Brot der rechte und natürliche Leib Christi, wie Ihr erstlich sagt, wie ist er denn dabei, darunter und darin verborgen, wie Ihr hernach redet? Ist Christi Leib wesentlich vorhanden im Nachtmahl, warum ist er denn unsichtbar? Denn wo er wesentlich und natürlich vorhanden ist, da kann man ihn greifen und sehen.“ Im Hauptgespräch formulierte er das Argument so: „So ein großer Leib kumt nicht in so kleiner Hostia noch an so viel Orten sehn; derhalben muß er sehn zur Rechten des Vaters; aber hie