

Concordia Theological Monthly

Continuing

LEHRE UND WEHRE

MAGAZIN FUER EV.-LUTH. HOMILETIK

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY-THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY

Vol. X

November, 1939

No. 11

CONTENTS

	Page
The Roman Doctrine of the Lord's Supper. F. E. Mayer	801
Kleine Prophetenstudien. L. Fuerbringer	816
The False Arguments for the Modern Theory of Open Questions	
Walther-Guebirt	827
Fighting Liberalism with Blunted Weapons. Th. Engelder	834
Predigtentwuerfe fuer die Evangelien der Thomasius- Perikopenreihe	846
Theological Observer. — Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches	857
Book Review. — Literatur	873

Ein Prediger muss nicht allein *wei-*
den, also dass er die Schafe unter-
weise, wie sie rechte Christen sollen
sein, sondern auch daneben den Woel-
fen *wehren*, dass sie die Schafe nicht
angreifen und mit falscher Lehre ver-
fuehren 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.



ARCHIVE

Concordia

Theological Monthly

Vol. X

NOVEMBER, 1939

No. 11

The Roman Doctrine of the Lord's Supper

There are evident traces of Neoplatonism¹⁾ in Roman theology, especially in the doctrines concerning man and the sacraments. The majority of Roman theologians make a careful distinction between the spiritual, as the higher, and the material, as the lower, nature in man. Soul and body belong to two different spheres, the soul being inclined to the spiritual, the body to the sensual, the world of sense. The rational soul, *created* by God in the moment of conception, is united with the totally heterogeneous body, and this junction of the two dissimilar natures results, according to Bellarmine, in *pugna quaedam* and in *ingens difficultas bene agendi*. The warfare between the spiritual and sensual natures is present in man before the Fall, and without the *donum superadditum* the soul would have been unable to return to God. This view explains Rome's interest in asceticism and mysticism. The flesh as the seat of concupiscence, i. e., the interest in the world

1) Neoplatonism as developed by Plotinus in the third century is an attempt to explain the relation of the One to the many in such a way that the spiritual unity of the universe could be maintained. This Greek philosophy assumed that there is a series of gradations between God on the one hand and Matter on the other. Similar to Gnosticism, it maintained that God overflows in emanations, such as Intelligence (νοῦς), the World-soul (ψυχή), and the final grade, Matter. Being farthest removed from God, Matter, or the world of sense, is evil. When the individual soul is united with Matter, it forgets its divine origin and is interested only in the world of sense. Neoplatonism therefore endeavored to show a way in which this dualistic or pluralistic universe could end in monism. Asceticism and mysticism were viewed as the best means of bringing about the reunion of the soul with its divine origin. Porphyry and Plotinus viewed the human body as a garment which burdened and defiled man or as a prison from which the soul must seek escape. Origen (d. 254) transmuted the contents of the faith of the Greek Church into ideas permeated with Neoplatonism. There is no doubt that Augustine's early contacts with Neoplatonism deeply affected and to some extent determined his concepts of sin, grace (*gratia infusa*), and justification. Seeberg, *Dogmengeschichte*³, II, 406; 550 ff.

of sense, must be weakened by fasting, watching, celibacy, etc., in order that the soul in the full exercise of its wonderful powers may unite itself with God.²⁾ Extreme mystics, like Theresa of Spain, believed that the soul when divorced from the sensual could enter into direct union and communion with God.

This dualism manifests itself also in the Roman doctrine concerning the sacraments, and particularly the Lord's Supper. According to the Catechism of the Council of Trent "man, as a being belonging to the world of sense, stands in need of a sensible type to obtain and to preserve the consciousness of what passes in his supersensual part. . . . If man were a pure spirit, then would the divine powers, which produce justice and holiness, require no sensible medium." The Catholic theologian J. A. Moehler states: "To this inferior order of things (the world of sense) the Church opposes a higher order, not to annihilate the former but to bestow on it the blessings of redemption, to explain its significance, and to purify by heavenly influences all the stages of earthly and sinful existence. . . . Symbolical signs bring the higher world more immediately within the perception of sense and withal convey from that world the capacity for its influence."³⁾ Rome's approach to the sacraments is fundamentally different from that of Scripture and Lutheran theology. Whether we emphasize Rome's Neoplatonism or sacerdotalism or sacramentalism (*opus operatum*) or mysticism (elements of superstition), the fundamental error of Rome will always come to the surface, namely, the doctrine of work-righteousness. This was pointed out in a previous article of this series.⁴⁾ Virtually all the distinctive elements of Roman theology, such as rationalism, sacerdotalism, sacramentalism, mysticism, are evident in the center and heart of the Roman worship and cultus, in the Lord's Supper, or the Holy Eucharist, as it is usually called by Roman dogmatists. The works of dogmatics⁵⁾ present this doctrine under three headings: 1. the Real Presence; 2. the Eucharist as a sacrament (Communion); 3. the Eucharist as a sacrifice (Mass).

2) Walther, *Lehrbuch der Symbolik*, 57 f.; 150 ff.

3) *Symbolism or Doctrinal Differences between Catholics and Protestants*, p. 203 ff.

4) C. T. M., 1939, pp. 241—250.

5) The following Roman Catholic sources were consulted: *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*, Waterworth ed.; Pohle-Preuss, *Series of Dogmatic Text-books*, 1930, Vol. IX; Wilmers, *Lehrbuch der Religion*, Vol. IV, 375—576; *Catholic Encyclopedia*, s. v. "Eucharist" and "Mass"; *Catechismus Romanus*; Jean de Puniet, *The Mass* (translated by Benedictines of Stanbrook, 1930); M. Cochem, *Erklärung des Mess-Kanon*. Naturally the reader's attention is directed to Luther's masterful treatises against the Roman Mass and to Melancthon's Apology, Articles XXII and XXIV.

I

1. Neoplatonism causes the Roman "doctors" considerable difficulty in the doctrine of the Real Presence. Because of the Neoplatonic background Roman theology places a low estimate not only upon human nature in general, but also upon the human nature of Christ. Christ's humanity does not receive *latreia* but only *hyperdulia*, the same worship accorded to Mary. Like the Reformed, Rome believes that the human nature of Christ also after His ascension is limited to a specific place in heaven.⁶⁾ Rome can accept only a *praesentia localis* for the human nature of Christ. And still Rome teaches the Real Presence, for Trent has declared: "If any one denieth that in the sacrament of the most holy Eucharist are contained truly, really, and substantially the body and blood together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and consequently the whole Christ, but saith that He is only therein as in a sign or in a figure or virtue, let him be anathema."⁷⁾ Rome has solved the apparent contradiction between the axiom: *Finitum non est capax infiniti* and the Real Presence by positing a local presence of Christ's body and blood in the Lord's Supper. And such a local presence is conditioned upon Rome's theory of *transubstantiation*, the keystone of its entire doctrine of the Eucharist.

Roman dogmaticians insist that transubstantiation is not an accidental change, such as occurs when a wax figure is changed from a ball to a cube, nor a material conversion, as when wood is changed to ashes; for in the one only the accidents are changed, the substance remaining the same, and in the other the matter

6) In the paragraph on Christ's session Wilmers says: "Da die menschliche Natur ueberhaupt sich an allen Orten nicht befindet, so ist auch keine Ursache vorhanden, der Menschheit Christi die Allgegenwart zuzuschreiben. . . . Der an und fuer sich beschaenkten Menschheit nach wird der Leib Christi ebensowohl von einem Raum umschlossen als jeder andere Leib." (*Lehrbuch der Religion*, II, 339 f.) Over against Luther's position that the Real Presence is possible because of the communicated omnipresence, Wilmers states: "Luther beachtete nicht, dass die Schrift ausdruecklich lehrt, . . . dass Christus als Mensch . . . sich bei seiner Auffahrt gen Himmel von der Erde ueberhaupt entfernt, was offenbar gegen die Alloertlichkeit ist." (*L. c.*, IV, 380, N.) Pohle-Preuss review the arguments which Roman theologians since the days of the "Angelic Doctor," Aquinas, have advanced to explain philosophically the apparent contradiction. They say that multilocation does not multiply the object, but only affects its external relation to and presence in space. They speak of a continuous, discontinuous, mixed, and circumscriptive multilocation—all miraculous, of course, but making it possible from a rational viewpoint for "Christ with His natural dimensions to reign in heaven, whence He does not depart, and at the same time to dwell in sacramental presence on numberless altars throughout the world." (*L. c.*, 175—184. Cf. *Popular Symbolics*, p. 159.)

7) Council of Trent, Sess. XIII, Can. I. The doctrines of Zwingli, Oecolampadius, and Calvin respectively are condemned in this canon.

remains the same. Rome argues for such a conversion where the substances of bread and wine (*i. e.*, the elements which actually make bread bread and wine wine) cease to exist in order to make room for the body and blood of Christ. All that remains of the bread and wine are their accidents, such as color, taste, smell, form. Trent defines the doctrine as follows: "By the consecration of bread and wine a conversion is made of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the body of Christ, and of the whole substance of the wine into the substance of His blood; which conversion is by the Holy Catholic Church suitably and properly called transubstantiation."⁸⁾ The theologians are not agreed as to the manner in which the body and the blood enter into the species of bread and wine. According to the Thomists the glorified body of Christ is reproduced in such a way that the change "has something in common with creation and transmutation." Transubstantiation is virtually both an annihilation and creation, and the only reason why it does not actually create the body of Christ is that the body already exists. Bellarmine explains transubstantiation as a conversion which does not cause the body to begin to exist, but to begin to exist under the species of bread and wine. While the theologians today usually avoid the term "creation," they nevertheless believe that "the power inherent in the words of consecration is so great that, if the substance of the Eucharistic body did not already exist, these words would as surely call it into being, as the fiat of the Almighty created the universe."⁹⁾ This is tantamount to claiming for the priesthood the power of the creature over the Creator.

8) Sess. XIII, Can. 4. Pohle-Preuss offers the following explanation of the decree according to Aristotelian dialectics: "In the Holy Eucharist we have a true conversion. There are, first, the two extremes of bread and wine as the *terminus a quo* and the body and blood of Christ as the *terminus ad quem*. There is, secondly, an intimate connection between the cessation of the one extreme and the appearance of the other, in that both events result not from two independent processes (*e. g.*, annihilation and creation) but from one single act. At the words of consecration the substance of the bread vanishes to make room for the body and blood of Christ. Lastly, there is a *commune tertium* in the unchanged appearances of the *terminus a quo*. Christ, in assuming a new mode of being, retains these appearances in order to enable us to partake of His body and blood. The *terminus totalis a quo* is not annihilated, because the appearances of bread and wine continue. What disappears is the substance of bread and wine, which constitutes the *terminus formalis a quo*. Nor can the *terminus totalis ad quem* be said to be newly created, because the body and blood of Christ, and in fact the whole Christ, as *terminus formalis ad quem*, preexist both in His divinity (from eternity) and in His humanity (since the Incarnation). What begins to exist anew in the *terminus ad quem* is not our Lord as such, but merely a sacramental mode of being, in other words, the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ." (P. 109.)

9) Pohle-Preuss, *l. c.*, 127. See also Tract No. 30, Our Sunday Visitor Press. *Lutheraner*, 79, 129.

Rome believes that the charge of sarcophagy (eating of flesh) would be in place if any one asserted that in the Eucharist merely the flesh and the blood of Christ were received. Rome admits that by virtue of the words of consecration only the body and the blood are present, but claims that by reason of a natural concomitance there is simultaneously present all which is physically inseparable from the body and the blood, namely, the soul and the humanity of Christ and, by virtue of the personal union, also His divinity. Christ, whole and entire, with His flesh and blood, His body and soul, His deity and humanity, is present.¹⁰⁾ The same argument is used to establish the concomitance theory, namely, that Christ whole and entire is received under either species and that as much is contained under either species as under both."¹¹⁾ Not only is the entire Christ present under each of the species, but also under each and every particle of each species. Of course, the opinions differ as to the manner of the presence. Some believe that the body of Christ is present even before the division as many times as the host can be divided into separate particles; others say that, as an unbroken mirror reproduces one reflection, the broken mirror as many complete reflections as there are fragments, so also the body of Christ is present whole and entire under each fragment of the host.

Transubstantiation is the starting-point for Romanists in the doctrine of the Eucharist. The doctrine of the Real Presence is contained in this theory, but it does not follow for Romanists that transubstantiation is contained in the dogma of the Real Presence. The Real Presence is possible—also according to Romanists—with consubstantiation (the view which Luther was supposed to

10) Council of Trent, Sess. XIII, Chap. III and Can. I, Pohle-Preuss, *l. c.*, 88 ff. Roman theologians enjoy speculation. What would disciples have received had they celebrated the Lord's Supper while Christ was in the grave? Answer: His body as it then existed, namely, separated from His soul, though not from His deity. Wilmers, *l. c.*, IV, 458, N., and other sources.

11) Rome's Scriptural argument: In 1 Cor. 11:27, 29 both the disjunctive and copulative conjunctions (or—and) are used. The same guilt attaches to unworthy eating and drinking whether one receives bread *and* wine or only the bread *or* the wine. A person cannot be guilty of the blood when partaking only of the bread unless both, body and blood, are present under the bread. This is but another example of Rome's arbitrary use of Scripture. The Bible is only pretext, and rationalistic argumentation is the deciding factor. Rome admits that by virtue of the words of consecration the body is present only under the bread and the blood only under the wine, but claims that the law of concomitance will not allow the glorified body to be without blood nor the living body without His soul nor the sacred humanity without the Logos. Therefore Christ whole and entire is present under the host as well as under the chalice. Pohle-Preuss, 94, 109. Trent, Sess. XIII, Chap. III.

have held) or impanation. But Rome insists on transubstantiation. As a result of Rome's theory the substantial body and blood of Christ are present in the Eucharist before, in, and after the use.¹²⁾ This raises the problem for Roman theologians as to what happens to the body and blood in the Eucharist in case the species are destroyed by fire, mold, evaporation. The accepted answer is as follows: The body and blood is present under the appearances of bread and wine as long as these are really appearances and ordinarily apt and capable to contain the substance of bread and wine. When corruption sets in, Christ is no longer present. But the cessation of the Real Presence is not viewed as "retransubstantiation." Thus the physicist's argument that Rome's theory of transubstantiation is contrary to the law of physics is met by the dogmaticians' dictum: "The miracle of the Eucharistic conversion does not abolish the law of the indestructibility of matter."¹³⁾ Is it any wonder that in view of such speculations the indifferent Romanist approaches the Eucharist mechanically and disinterestedly and the conscientious member will be harassed by doubts and questions as he approaches the Eucharist?

2. The fundamental difference between Roman and Lutheran theology in method and approach is apparent when one studies the arguments which Rome advances for its theory of transubstantiation. It is evident that Rome's theory is a preconceived notion which is superimposed on Scriptures.¹⁴⁾ The "Scriptural" argument for transubstantiation is taken from John 6:52 ff. Among several Roman reasons why the words "flesh" and "blood" should be taken literally, only one need to be mentioned, viz.: "If we take the manna of the desert (v. 49 ff.) as a type of the Eucharist, we can argue as follows: Assuming that the Eucharist contained merely consecrated bread and wine, . . . the original

12) Trent, Sess. XIII, Can. IV. — The Lutheran John Saliger in his polemics against the Crypto-Calvinists maintained that by virtue of the consecration the body is present also *ante usum*. This prompted the framers of the Formula of Concord to show the necessity of consecration, both over against the Reformed who underestimate the importance of it, and the Romanizing tendencies which attach miraculous powers to it. Article VII, *Trigl.*, 998 f.

13) Pohle-Preuss, *l. c.*, 133—135. Wilmers, *l. c.*, 434 f. The theory of the permanence of the body and blood in the Eucharist has given rise to superstitious and pagan practises, e.g., signing the sentence of a heretic with ink into which "Christ's blood" had been poured; placing the species into corner-stones of churches; pulverizing or toasting the host in order to preserve it. The "Mass of the presanctified" belongs into the category of superstitious practises. Since no Mass is to be said on Good Friday, the host which was consecrated on the day previous (hence "presanctified") "is placed on the altar, incensed, elevated, and consumed by the celebrant." *Cath. Encl.*, VI, 644.

14) "Romanism, Calvinism, Lutheranism, on Authority of Bible," C. T. M., VIII, 260.

would not excel the type by which it was prefigured. But St. Paul teaches that the original must transcend its type in the same way in which a body excels its shadow, and consequently the Eucharist contains more than mere bread and wine."¹⁵) Are the Roman doctors ready to say on the basis of vv. 54, 56, 58 that every one who attends Communion shall live forever? — Rome's arguments for the theory of transubstantiation from the words of institution and from tradition are well known and shall be omitted in this paper. (Wilmer's has 20 pages of 9-point-solid type on testimonies from tradition for this doctrine.) The clinching argument for the Romanist is the fact that the Church has spoken through the Council of Trent, and the dogmatists can do no more than show from reason that the doctrine is probable, proper, reasonable, and according to the "analogy of faith." Here are two samples. (a) The Old Testament was a type of the New. In the Old Testament the presence of God was indicated through the Ark of the Covenant. The peculiar presence of God among Israel must be fulfilled in richer form in the New Testament. The Incarnation was a partial fulfilment of the Old Testament type, but it was only temporary, and therefore the presence of Christ in the Eucharist is necessary if the type is to have its complete original. (b) Essentially Christianity is the religion of love. Love manifests itself in a desire to associate with those whom one loves. There is a desire both on the part of God and of man to be near each other. This is possible in the Eucharist. But in order to exercise man's faith, Christ does not come in His real form nor forever, but under the species of bread and wine.¹⁶) Rome's theology is still the theology of Scholasticism. This becomes apparent in the manner in which the theologians endeavor to answer the objections against transubstantiation. We ask: How can the outward appearances of bread and wine exist without the substances? Rome is ready to answer this, first, "with the certainty of faith," secondly, "with theological certainty only," and, thirdly, as "a matter of speculation." Faith answers that a miracle takes place; theology debates whether the appearances are physical entities or subjective impressions (optical illusions), the former opinion finding most adherents today; and philosophical speculation enters the labora-

15) Pohle-Preuss, *l. c.*, 15. Wilmer's, *l. c.*, 382.

16) Wilmer's, *l. c.*, 415 ff. After quoting from Thomas Aquinas, the author adds significantly: "Das sind Gruende, die der einfache Glaeubige mehr mit dem Gefuehle als mit dem Verstande erfasst, und vielleicht haben wir es diesem richtigen, wenn auch dunklen, Ahnen teilweise zuzuschreiben, dass der Glaube an die wirkliche Gegenwart auch bei den verkommensten Sekten des Orients sich erhalten hat." Rome need not be surprised when we charge it with false enthusiasm (*Schwaermerei*) and definite elements of paganism, particularly idolatry. Walther, "Lehrbuch der Symbolik," 166—170.

tory and tells us that accidents (e.g., quantity) can be removed from the substance; after all, how little do we know about matter? are the scientists not compelled to discard one theory after another? — Rome's theology is a theology of speculation, of doubt, certainly not the theology of God's Word.¹⁷⁾

3. The implications of this theory are of far-reaching importance for the Romanists. Claiming to be the possessor of the physical presence of Christ, the Roman Church claims to be the only legitimate Church. The avowed purpose of Catholic Action is to "bring Christ physically into the world." In private, nuptial, requiem, and public Masses the priest brings the physical Christ into the lives of his people, and they, in turn, by promoting Eucharistic devotion among other men make the entry of Christ into human lives more general¹⁸⁾ The second significant implication of the transubstantiation theory is the idolatrous adoration of the host. For the Romanist the "adorableness" of the Eucharist is self-evident, "for the Eucharistic Christ is identical with the Lord who sitteth at the right hand of God." Rome is frank to admit that "in the absence of Scriptural proof this proposition must be demonstrated from tradition."¹⁹⁾ What do Romanists actually worship in the Eucharist? Defending itself against the charge of *artolatρεία* (in other words, idolatry), Rome claims that there can be no worship of the bread because the bread has ceased to exist. At the same time Rome admits that the adoration extends both to Christ *and* to the appearances, and does not hesitate to say: "The adoration which Catholics give to Christ under the appearances of bread and wine is not separate and distinct from that which they give to the sacred species as such. . . . We give no *separate* adoration to the accidents. The object of our adoration is the *totum sacramentale*. . . . In practise neither the Church nor the faithful pay any attention to this subtle distinction" (between the Eucharistic Christ and the species).²⁰⁾ When we tell our confirmands that Rome practises gross idolatry, we are not overstating the case, for three reasons. (a) Rome expressly teaches that the Eucharistic Christ is entitled to *latreia* (the worship due to God alone), but the species not being a part of the hypostatic union, only to *hyperdulia*. In spite of all technical distinctions between *latreia* and *dulia*, a practical difference is not observed. Why does the canon law prescribe minutely the care and the cult of

17) Pohle-Preuss devotes 41 pages to the chapter "Speculative Discussion of the Mystery of the Real Presence, l. c., 143—184.

18) Confrey, *Catholic Action*, 59 ff. Daniel Lord, *Call to Catholic Action*, 20 ff. (Tract published by Queen's Work, St. Louis.)

19) Trent, Sess. XIII, Canons 5 and 6. Pohle-Preuss, 136 f.

20) Pohle-Preuss, l. c., 141.

the most holy Eucharist? Why must the altar in which the host is preserved be especially ornated? Why dare the sanctuary lamp never be extinguished? Why can only a cleric touch the monstrance, the vessel on which the consecrated host is exposed to view? Why do Romanists praise Franz Xavier for spending entire nights before the "tabernacle" to commune with the "physically present" Christ? — (b) The theory of transubstantiation, specifically the permanence of the Real Presence, is nothing but superstition. — (c) There is no command to adore the species with *hyperdulia*, *dulia*, or any other kind of veneration.²¹⁾

Opportunity to bring the "physical Christ" into the lives of the people and to worship the species are amply provided in the Roman cultus. There is the elevation of the sacrament immediately after consecration; there is the exposition of the sacrament providing an opportunity to "look upon and to salute the body of Christ"; there are societies for the Perpetual Adoration, so that somewhere throughout the world at all times some one is rendering adoration to the species, an honor which according to Rome belongs to God alone; there is the Corpus Christi Festival with its pomp and superstitious practises,²²⁾ the Eucharistic congresses, the Forty Hour devotions, the Devotion of the Sacred Heart of Jesus. And the purpose of these exercises is to "keep alive an ardent and devout faith in Him who said: 'Behold I am with you alway.'"²³⁾

II

Rome views the Eucharist both as a sacrament and as a sacrifice. Some dogmatists discuss the sacrificial character of the Eucharist first, because the Mass is seemingly the more important feature of the Eucharist. Wilmers, for example, discusses the communion after the Mass because according to the example of the Old Testament peace-offerings the partaking of the offering naturally

21) When advancing this reason, be prepared for the following sophism: The will (*i. e.*, command) to be eaten and drunk does not contradict the will to be adored. Christ lay in the manger for the purpose of *resting*. But the Magi did not conclude that the purpose of being worshiped was excluded. Christ journeyed through Palestine to *preach*. But it did not follow that those who recognized Him as the Son of God were forbidden to worship Him. Wilmers, *l. c.*, IV, 465.

22) Celebrated on the Thursday after Trinity. The German word *Fronleichnamsfest* is derived from *fron*, master. The purpose is avowedly to prepare a royal entry for Christ and, by taking the host into the open, to proclaim Christ as King of creation and to make the entire nature a temple of God. It is furthermore a testimony of the faith against heretics, especially against Berengar of Tours (1050), who held to a symbolical interpretation of the sacrament. And lastly it is viewed as a satisfaction for all the indignities inflicted on the Eucharistic Christ. (Wilmers, *l. c.*, 467.)

23) Pohle-Preuss, *l. c.*, 140.

follows the sacrificial act. Other theologians give more importance to the sacramental character of the Eucharist than Wilmers's view appears to do.²⁴⁾ We shall discuss the Roman view of the Eucharist as a sacrament first. According to its Neoplatonic background Rome views man as spiritual and sensual. In striving for the spiritual things, man requires sensory means, such as the *visible* teaching office as constituted in the clergy, the imposing cathedrals or the churches on prominent corners and elevated plots of ground, and especially the Eucharist, a "symbol of a sacred thing, the visible form of an invisible grace." The communion fulfils the soul's desire "to partake of the heavenly grace by the material food" and to seek "in the visible creation a ladder to heaven."²⁵⁾

1. Rome's approach to the definition of the Sacrament of the Altar is so basically different from that of the Lutheran that Rome's terminology is rather confusing to the Lutheran. Deharbe defines the essence of the Eucharist thus: "The Holy Eucharist is the true body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is really and substantially present under the appearances of bread and wine for the nourishment of our souls." The *Catechismus Romanus* states that the consecration, which is a sacrificial act, and the communion, which is only the reception of an already existing sacrament, do not, properly speaking, belong to the essence of the Eucharist as sacrament. This catechism does not approve Augustine's definition that the sacrament consists in the visible elements and the invisible body and blood of Christ, but claims that the sacramental essence is rather the species of bread and wine. The majority seem to define the sacrament of the Eucharist as consisting in the union of the Eucharistic species and the body and blood of Christ as the matter and in the words of consecration as the form of the sacrament. It seems, that this definition emphasizes the Eucharist as a sacrifice more than as a sacrament. And the fact is that Rome is interested almost entirely in the sacrificial character of the Eucharist. This is evident also in the withholding of the cup.²⁶⁾

24) The distinctions between a sacrament and a sacrifice are clearly set forth by Melancthon in the Apology, Art. XXIV.

25) Wilmers, l. c., 574, 548.

26) The usual arguments are fairly well known: By the law of concomitance blood is present under the bread.—There is no additional benefit in receiving the wine after having received the bread.—There is no *command* to receive both kinds.—Acts 2:42, "breaking of bread."—Mother Church, fully conscious of her authority, has so ordered it.—"Blood" might be spilled.—Great difficulty to preserve the remaining "blood" under the species of wine.—Pope Gelasius ordered the laity to use the chalice to unmask the uncovered Manicheans, who would not touch wine. Before this decree there must have been communion under one kind.—The sacrament is a symbol of spiritual nourishment and either species accomplishes this.

When Rome is asked why Christ ordained two elements if one is sufficient, its answer runs about as follows: The two species are indeed instituted by Christ and therefore must be used. But the use of both kinds need not be observed in the Eucharist as *communion*. The use of both kinds is essential for the Eucharist as a *sacrifice*, i. e., in the Mass, and the main purpose of the Eucharist is a *sacrifice*, not a supper. In every sacrifice there must be a real slaying of the victim. The "unbloody" sacrifice of the Mass is effected when, by virtue of the consecration, "a two-edged mystical sword," the priest separates the body and the blood of Christ under the elements of bread and wine.²⁷⁾ Rome speaks of the Eucharist as a sacrament, and we would expect them to stress the communion as a *means* of grace, but this concept seems to be very remote in Rome's thinking. Communion is not so much a means whereby God conveys "grace" to the sinner but rather a fulfilling of an *obligation*, which the faithful must perform at least once a year, when they *make* their Easter communion. In short, the idea of a sacrifice, at least a eucharistic sacrifice, is more predominant than that of a sacrament.

2. The effects of the sacrament are defined by Trent chiefly negatively, namely, "that the principal fruit of the most holy Eucharist is not the remission of sins." The dogmaticians usually list two effects. First, the union of the soul with Christ. The physical consumption of the host effects a sacramental union, and this results *ex opere operato* in a mystical union through the "theological" (?) virtue of love. At the same time communion establishes a bond of charity between the faithful. Since communion is a sacrament only for those who are already united with Christ, who are under grace and have remission of sins, it can only increase sanctifying grace, that is convey powers to avoid sin and to perform good works. The second effect is nourishment for the soul, an antidote whereby we may be free from daily faults and preserved from mortal sins.²⁸⁾ Frequent, if not even daily, communions are recommended to subdue the flesh and overcome concupiscence, the source of mortal sin. Roman theologians have debated whether the Eucharist is directly conducive to the remission of the punishments due to sin, as is the case in Penance. The opinion seems to prevail that the fruits of communion may be viewed as a satisfaction for sin, yes, that these fruits may even be applied to others, especially the souls in purgatory.²⁹⁾ Being an effective prophylactic against mortal sins, the purpose of communion is, finally, a pledge of the body's resurrection on the

27) Pohle-Preuss, *l. c.*, p. 347.

29) Pohle-Preuss, *l. c.*, p. 231.

28) Trent, Sess. XIII, cap. 2.

basis of John 6:55. By its contact with the Eucharistic Christ the body has a moral right to the future resurrection.³⁰⁾

As to the necessary preparation for communion virtually all the requirements are negative, e. g., abstaining from food (the regulations are of such a nature that only doubt and uncertainty can arise), not living in mortal sin, not placing an *obex* (hindrance) in the way of worthy communion.

In spite of the resolution of Trent and especially of the encyclical of Pius X which admonishes the people to commune frequently, the general rule seems to be that the Eucharist as communion is treated rather disparagingly, while the Eucharist as a sacrifice seems to be the all-important thing. Even the Pope, when celebrating Mass at high festivals, communes only himself and his two assistants, not the assembled cardinals.³¹⁾ Though communion and mass are observed in the same service, there is a vast difference between the two, some dogmaticians even treating the mass separately in a different connection. As a sacrament the Eucharist is permanent, since the Real Presence continues after communion; as a sacrifice it is a transient action. As a sacrament it can be effected by the consecration of *one* element; the mass requires two. In the sacrament "sanctifying grace" is conveyed to the sinner; in the mass, man brings an offering to God.

III

1) The mass is the heart and center of Roman worship. Campegius stated at Augsburg in 1530 that he would rather be torn into pieces than give up the mass.³²⁾ Without the mass Rome actually would cease to be Rome. In the mass the material principle of Rome, the doctrine of work-righteousness, finds full and complete expression. Roman dogmaticians prove the necessity of a sacrifice, i. e., the duty of man to bring an offering to God, by claiming that man stands in a threefold relation of obligation to God. (a) As a creature of soul and body, man owes God mental and physical adoration. The latter particularly is possible only through a physical sacrifice (*sacrificia latreutica*); (b) as a sinner

30) Pohle-Preuss, *l. c.*, pp. 218—234; Wilmers, *l. c.*, pp. 548—576. Rome's Neoplatonism comes to the surface in this entire discussion, for some dogmaticians have gone so far as to speak of a "conversion of the human flesh into that of the God-man." There is a vast difference between Rome's view and that expressed by Luther, viz., that the mouth which orally receives Christ does not know what the heart receives. The mouth must live on account of the heart which will live through the word. (Cp. St. L., XX, 830—837 f.: Large Catechism, *Trigl.*, 768, § 68 and 742, § 45.)

31) Hase, *Protestantische Polemik*, p. 487.

32) Smalcald Articles, *Trigl.*, 464, § 10.

before the Judge, he must appease God's wrath (*propitiatoria*); (c) as the recipient of many blessings, man has the twofold duty of thanking God for past favors and imploring Him for future help (*sacrificia eucharistica et impetraria*). According to Rome a sacrifice is absolutely necessary if man is to express in a physical way his various obligations to God. (Neoplatonism!) Reason tells the Romanist that Christianity requires a sacrifice; for if it had none, it would be inferior to the Mosaic religion, in fact, to all pre-Christian ethnic religions.³³⁾ Rome, of course, seeks Scripture proof and therefore, as Melancthon somewhere says, consulted the concordance *s. v.* "sacrifice." The Roman Confutation of 1530 contains a fair sample of Rome's exegetical maneuvers. Melancthon not only refuted Rome's misinterpretation of such passages as Mal. 1:10; 3:3; Ps. 110:4; Heb. 5:1; Dan. 12:11 (daily sacrifice), but also showed the fallacy of Rome's entire argument in favor of a sacrifice.³⁴⁾

2) Satisfied that it has established the necessity of a sacrifice, Rome next sets out to demonstrate that the mass, not Christ's death upon the cross, is the real sacrifice. Rome adduces three arguments in its contention that the mass is *the* sacrifice: (a) the words of institution "Given and shed for you" (*ἐκχυννόμενον*, pres. part.) refer not to the sacrifice on the cross, but to the sacrifice he was then and there offering in the Last Supper;³⁵⁾ (b) the argument from prescription (in law prescription denotes acquisition of rights in property by possession for a certain period): "The Church's legitimate possession as regards the mass can be traced back to the beginning of Christianity. It follows that the mass was instituted by Christ." Naturally the Romanists make every effort to show that the early communion liturgies contain the consecration, which

33) The professors of the Christian faith, in order to be able to satisfy their duty of worshiping God, must have a permanent sacrifice just as well as the Old Testament Jews. This craving of the heart, which has deeply imbedded itself in all religions, is not satisfied by the sacrifice of the cross, since that was offered "once for all" and in one place only. The Catholic Church, being "the mystical Christ," must have a sacrifice of her own, because otherwise she could not fulfil her duty of worshiping God in the most perfect manner possible. Pohle-Preuss, p. 293. This is the old standard argument repeated with monotonous regularity since the days of Thomas, advanced with great fervor by Eck against the Augustana; cp. Plitt, *Einleitung*, II, 460. Cp. also Wilmers, *l. c.*, 488. Soederblom asks: "Why does the mass attract so many even outside Catholicism?" and answers: "The religious idea behind it. God has a share in our suffering." *Christian Fellowship*, pp. 146—148.

34) *Trigl.*, 388, § 16—24; 31—40; 52—59. The Confutation is reprinted in Luther, *St. L.*, XVI, 1048.

35) Strange, the Vulgate uses the future *fundetur*, though Pohle-Preuss calls attention to some codices using the present tense *funditur*, p. 308.

according to Rome is the real essence of the sacrifice. Thus, Rome claims to have been in possession of the mass as a sacrifice since the days of Christ; (c) the argument from tradition. Rome's misuse of the Church Fathers is well known, and every statement must be examined carefully in its context.

Is Rome really in earnest when it claims that the Eucharist is truly a sacrifice? The popular treatises on the mass impress upon the people that for the celebration of the mass an altar or at least an altar stone is necessary, that the crucifix must be erected, because "the sacrifice of the mass is the same as that offered on Calvary."³⁶ All dogmaticians claim that in essence there is no difference between the offering on the cross and the sacrifice of the mass, for in each Christ is both Priest and Victim. The difference between the two consists only in the manner of the sacrifice, the one being bloody and the other unbloody, for Christ cannot die again. A twofold shedding of blood is possible in a sacrifice, the real and the sacramental. The former took place on Calvary; the latter occurs when the priest through the "two-edged mystic sword" of the words of consecration separates the blood from the body.³⁷ The consecration is the real sacrificial act, not the breaking of the bread, for this affects only the species; nor the communion of the priest. Bellarmine saw in the communion the destruction of the sacrificial victim. The communion, however, belongs to the integrity of the mass, for every sacrifice is followed by a sacrificial banquet. Many questions are discussed, and no fewer than seven theories are advanced concerning the metaphysical essence of the mass. Is there a real slaying of Christ, or is the double consecration only a represen-

36) *Ceremonies of the Mass*, Paulist Press, 407 West 59th St., New York.

37) "Das Opfer wird ueberhaupt durch jene Handlung vollzogen, durch welche der zu opfernde Gegenstand zerstoert wird oder Veraenderung zulaesst. Das aber geschieht im gegenwaertigen Falle durch die Konsekration: durch sie wird am Heilande selbst auf geheimnisvolle Weise eine Veraenderung, eine Zerstoerung bewirkt, durch welche die am Kreuze in seinem Leibe selbst vollzogene vergegenwaertigt wird. Kraft der Worte oder des Wortlautes wird unter der Gestalt des Brotes nur der Leib und unter der des Weines nur das Blut Christi gegenwaertig. Das Wort des Priesters ist demnach das geistige Schwert, wodurch das Osterlamm auf geheimnisvolle Weise geschlachtet wird." Wilmers, l. c., 541. "Since it was no mere death from suffocation that Jesus suffered, but a bloody death, in which His veins were emptied of their blood, this condition of separation must receive visible representation on the altar. This condition is fulfilled only by the double consecration, which brings before our eyes the body and blood in the state of separation and thus represents the mystical shedding of the blood. It is this consideration that suggested to the Fathers the idea, which was adopted into some liturgies, of the double consecration as a two-edged 'mystical sword.'" Pohle-Preuss, p. 347.

tative, a dramatic repetition of the slaying of Christ? Does the sacrificial act culminate in a *kenosis*, a real self-abasement or in glorification? If it is a *kenosis*, how does the impassibility of the transfigured Lord permit His body and blood to be reduced to the condition of food and thus be placed at the mercy of mankind? Does the glorified Lord experience an actual suffering?³⁸⁾

3. The benefits of the mass are said to be virtually unlimited. Cochem lists 77 graces and fruits which result from a pious hearing of the mass.³⁹⁾ In accordance with the threefold sacrifice which man is obligated to render unto God, the mass has a threefold effect. First, it is the best means whereby man can render to God the honor which is due Him, for the mass is the very center of Roman worship. Hearing the Word cannot compare with hearing the mass, for in the mass "heaven bows down to earth." The second and chief effect of the mass is that it removes the temporal punishment due to sin. In practise this means that the mass takes sin away and placates God.⁴⁰⁾ This is thoroughly unevangelical, yea, pagan. Of course, Rome claims that it does not invalidate the death of Christ; for do they not "apply the merits of Christ through the mass to the individual"? But there is no appropriation on the part of the faithful, the benefits are *applied* to him, i. e., the "application" is nothing more than the intention of the priest to convey specific blessings to a designated person or persons, present or absent, living or dead, Catholic or non-Catholic. There is no faith which appropriates the merits of Christ. The third effect of the mass is said to consist in temporal blessings. Masses may be ordered for every possible contingency and condition in life, for success in business, for health, for gaining of friends; nor is it necessary to mention to the priest the purpose for which the mass is ordered.

And Rome makes it so easy to obtain these blessings. Everything is left to the priest. The mass is efficacious *ex opere operato* and will work its effects upon those present, unless a person is in mortal sin, laughs, whispers, jokes, disturbs others, or sleeps volun-

38) Pohle-Preuss, p. 349—370.

39) Martin v. Cochem, *Erklärung des heiligen Messopfers*, 106 ff. Examples: Christ's blood cries for you with as many words as drops of blood flowed from His body.—As often as you piously look upon the host, you merit a special reward in heaven.—Through every mass you earn for yourself the "grace" of a blessed death.—Hearing of the mass will avert misfortune and bring temporal blessings.

40) Trent: "This sacrifice (of the mass) is truly propitiatory. . . . For the Lord, appeased by the oblation thereof and granting the grace and gift of penitence, forgives even heinous crimes and sins. . . . Wherefore not only for the sins, punishments, satisfactions, and other necessities of the faithful who are living, but also for those who are departed in Christ, and who are not as yet fully purified, is it rightly offered, agreeably to a tradition of the apostles." Sess. XXII, Chap. II.

tarily (?) during mass. The *opus operatum* becomes patent especially in private masses. Since the priest is the only acting person, no congregation is required. As long as he reads the official text in the church language correctly, performs the 500 ceremonies and observes the 400 rubrics (none of which dare be omitted without committing mortal sin), the mass will accomplish the effect for which it is read. And yet Rome is careful not to make it too easy. The majority of theologians are agreed that "the satisfactory value of a mass is so strictly circumscribed and limited from the outset that it (the satisfactory value) accrues pro rata (according to a greater or less number of individuals for whom the sacrifice is offered) to each of the individual beneficiaries." What serious doubts must this theory raise if it is really brought to the attention of the people! The *ex-opere-operato* theory is modified, furthermore, by the theologians when they say that the effects of the mass are conditioned also by the disposition of the participant (*ex opere operantis*). The individuals hearing mass are benefited in proportion to their personal devotion, yes, also the personal piety of the celebrant. Cardinal De Lugo goes so far as to say that the "value of the mass is dependent on the greater or lesser holiness of the reigning Pope, the bishops, and the clergy throughout the world," including even the Church in her members.⁴¹⁾ Space forbids enumerating the "numerous vermin brood of manifold idolatries which the dragon tail (mass) has begotten." (Luther.) He was thinking of the stipends; of private masses, especially at renowned shrines where the orders for masses far exceed the facilities to read them all; of the magical powers ascribed to the mass vestments, etc.

There can be no appeasement as long as Rome clings to its doctrine of the Eucharist, and no Romanist will ever give up the mass. "Therefore we are and remain forever separate and opposed to each other."⁴²⁾

F. E. MAYER

Kleine Prophetenstudien

Die messianische Weissagung Soels

Luther gibt in seiner berühmten „Vorrede auf das Alte Testament“ eine „kurze Anleitung, Christum und das Evangelium zu suchen im Alten Testament“. ¹⁾ Er sagt in seiner ebenfalls berühmten „Vorrede auf die Propheten“, daß wir „diese mit Ernst und Nuß lesen und gebrauchen sollen. Denn erstlich verkündigen und bezeugen sie Christi

41) Pohle-Preuss, 385—397.

42) Luther, in Smalcald Articles, *Trigl.*, 464.

1) St. Louiser Musg. XIV, 16.