

TWO TREATISES ON THE MEANS OF GRACE

By
M. REU, D.D., LITT.D.



Published by Augsburg Publishing House Minneapolis

CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
LIBRARY
SPRINGFIELD, ILLINOIS

TWO TREATISES ON THE MEANS OF GRACE

Reprinted by permission of
the Wartburg Press, Columbus, Ohio

Manufactured in the United States of America
by Augsburg Publishing House, Minneapolis, Minnesota

FOREWORD

This volume offers reprints of two essays by the sainted Dr. M. Reu which are perhaps as timely today as when they first appeared. The frequent requests coming to Reu Memorial Library and the eagerness with which seminarians acquire used copies testify to the abiding value of these two treatises. We at Wartburg Theological Seminary in particular greatly appreciate the service which the Publishers are rendering the Church by again making this material available.

EMIL W. MATZNER
Wartburg Seminary
Dubuque, Iowa

February 1952

CONTENTS

What Is Scripture and How Can We Become Certain of Its Divine Origin	1
Can We Still Hold to the Lutheran Doctrine of the Lord's Supper	39

WHAT IS SCRIPTURE

and How Can We Become Certain
of Its Divine Origin?

WHAT IS SCRIPTURE AND HOW CAN WE BECOME CERTAIN OF ITS DIVINE ORIGIN?

I

What is Scripture? Many are ready to say it is a collection of moral precepts surpassing all other law-books of the world. Even when they refuse to recognize its authority in other respects they will applaud its ethical statements. The Ten Commandments, a number of moral passages in the Psalms and the prophetic books, the sublime character of Jesus and His moral teachings, especially parts of the Sermon on the Mount win their approval. Very many of the eulogies of the Bible that have been written by men of fame are to be understood from this view point. They compare Scripture with the Code of Hammurabi, with the Ethics of Aristotle, the Morals of Epictetus, the precepts of the Koran, the ethical directions of Buddha and Confucius, Spinoza's philosophy of life, with Kant and Eucken and then, sometimes reluctantly and slowly, sometimes with firm conviction and loud enthusiasm, they proclaim the superiority of the Bible. We indeed rejoice over such evaluations, but they do not go down to the root of the matter and do not consider the fundamental difference that exists between natural and biblical Ethics. We are very thankful for the moral directions and principles of Scripture; and in our judgment they surpass all other systems of morality as the light of the sun exceeds the light of all the stars; they stand above them as the sky above the earth and they have their origin in another world. But to say the Bible is nothing more than a code of morals is to remain at the periphery instead of penetrating to the center and grasping the heart of Scripture.

Others strike a higher note and say: Scripture is a code of divine teaching as they appreciate, not only the ethical but also the doctrinal contents of Scripture. Now it is certainly true that Scripture is brimful of wholesome doctrine; that all the teaching concerning our salvation is to be found in Scripture alone. St. Paul emphasizes its ability to make us wise unto salvation and that it is "profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness (II Tim. 3:15 f.) that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." But frequently this is understood as though in Scripture, all doctrinal statements are on the same level, like the paragraphs of a code of laws so that one could dive into it at

random, pick out a truth in the form of a Scripture passage and apply it to the given case. As far as they all are God's word, they are undoubtedly on the same level, but it does not follow that they are therefore all of the same value nor even that they are applicable to the given case. Their distance from the center varies and whether they are applicable to the case in question depends upon the connection in which we find them in Scripture and upon the light which the whole of Scripture throws upon them; sometimes their value depends on the stage of revelation in which they are found. Not all Old Testament passages, even though they are divine words can be applied without further ado to our New Testament times. How many heresies arose in the course of history because this fact was overlooked! And many a so-called scripture proof of the old dogmatics was manufactured in just that way. As Hauck once said, Sometimes the whole house of Scripture was ransacked and what was found at times in the most obscure place furnished the Scriptural basis for a certain dogmatical thesis. And a still greater evil crept in. The idea was encouraged that the whole divine revelation consisted in nothing but the transmission of specific truths and concepts, and that, consequently the whole of Christianity, established on this basis, would be primarily or exclusively a matter of the intellect. And this again in many cases suggested and actually led to the idea that what Scripture calls justifying and saving faith is not much more than mere knowledge and a purely intellectual assent to the truths contained in Scripture. It is hardly necessary to demonstrate the viciousness of this error.

No, Scripture is primarily a book of history. It begins with the history of the creation, the primitive state and the fall of man, and leads on to its center, the account of the incarnation, the suffering, death and resurrection of Christ, and we can easily see that the so-called doctrinal and prophetic books are also necessary links in the great historical process that is related in Scripture.

If, to begin with, we leave the divine factor, active in the production of Scripture, completely out of consideration and consider the Bible as a purely human book like other human books, then the Old Testament presents the history of Israel and the New Testament the history of Jesus and His first congregation on earth. Considered from the purely human standpoint it is quite conceivable that at the time of Moses the idea was entertained of writing a history of the people of Israel and the preceding times. Through the liberation from Egypt and the giving of the law on Mount Sinai, Israel had become a nation and had received its fundamental statutes. This immediately carried with it the need of recording these important events for the coming generations and to transmit them to posterity by means of written records. It was only natural then to go farther

back and to show the antecedents of this history as they are found in the time of the patriarchs, and finally by prefacing it with the first eleven chapters so as to make the nation conscious of the fact that its history is only the history of one branch of the tree of mankind. And Moses, the savior and leader of the people, by means of his position and his intimate knowledge of all the wisdom of the Egyptians, which for centuries had included the art of historical presentation, was the logical man to write this fundamental book of history. We understand that in writing things of which he had been neither eye- nor ear-witness, he made use of the oral tradition which among the people of antiquity was far more tenacious and reliable than it is today. We would not be surprised if written accounts of the events of the days gone by had been preserved in the sarcophagus of Joseph and had been used by Moses. Since we know that Abraham came from Babylonia with its highly developed culture and at the same time was in contact with Egypt, where there was a similar cultural development, and that in the Amarna period each town of Canaan had its own clerk whose business it was to write the official letters and to note down the important events of his time, there is no longer any reason to reject the assumption of the existence and use of such written accounts. After the basic beginnings of Israel's history had been written down by Moses, these beginnings themselves naturally led naſionally minded and prophetically gifted men to record the further development of Israel's history. Since the statutes given by Moses were of fundamental character, the further development had to show how they operated in the life of the people; and it was natural to consider the further development of Israel in the light of these beginnings. And this it is what we find in the second part of the Hebrew Old Testament. This view establishes the connection between the earlier and the later prophets. The former do it by means of their historical accounts, the latter by the prophetic discourses. It is hardly necessary to emphasize the fact that the books of Joshua, the Judges, Samuel and the two books of Kings are what we call "Tendenzschriften" taking this term in the good sense of this word. They relate history, relate it in a trustworthy way, but relate it with the special purpose of recording how these fundamentals laid by Moses were carried through, and how the weal and woe of Israel depended upon the measure in which they were observed. And the powerful discourses of the prophets, filled with threats of punishment and calling to repentance are all linked in some way with the foundations laid by Moses and they view their present in the light of that past. In order to understand them correctly one certainly must investigate the historical occasion which demanded them. but this endeavor just mentioned permeates them all. Even many of the great prophetic discourses that point to future salvation

or judgment had their basis in the foundations laid by Moses and would never have come into existence without them. And in the third part of the Hebrew canon, in the "Ketubim," we have a collection of such noble blossoms which grew out of the meditation of the especially religious concerning the Law and the preceding national history, and from their hope of its future development. How rich and full these blossoms were we learn from the Psalms, while the book of Koheleth makes one conscious of the limitations under which they developed.

It is the same with the books of the New Testament. Those who experienced such great and unique events as did the disciples in the fellowship of their Master could not keep silence, but must proclaim the story of His life to every one, even if no direct command had demanded this of them; furthermore some of the disciples and their co-workers must have felt the urge of writing down what they had experienced, especially at a time when the eye- and ear-witnesses passed away one after another. So certain traditional material for the purpose of preaching came into existence, collections of discourses of Jesus in oral or written form were formed, so our Gospels and the book of Acts as the history of Jesus and His first congregation came into existence. Paul and the other apostles would not have fulfilled their duty if they had abandoned the congregations established by them in their times of need. They had to come to their assistance by means of their personal presence or by writing letters to them. Now they had to put the work of Christ in its proper light over against heretics of various kinds; now they had to apply the basic directions of Jesus concerning the moral life to the various congregations as it was demanded by the special needs of every one of them. And as the antagonism of the world-power to the Church of Christ became stronger and fiercer, they also had to answer the question concerning the final outcome of this conflict. Thus the ground was prepared for the rise of an apocalyptic literature.

In so far liberal theology will agree, although it claims that parts of the Old and even New Testament are only legends and myths and although it applies the principle of evolution to both, especially to the Old Testament, and in the latter reverses the order of Law and Gospel. It concedes that Scripture is a book of the history of Israel and of Jesus and His first congregation. But is Scripture not more than this? Most assuredly! It is the book of the history of *God's* dealings with men, of His revelation and of the reaction of man towards this revelation. Everywhere God stands in the foreground, not only in Deuteronomy, often compared with the Gospel of John on account of its inwardness and deep conception of the religious, and not for the first time with the prophets Amos and Hosea, Isaiah and Micah, who, it is said, changed the national God of Israel into the God of heaven and earth, but even in Genesis and all the following books. If

we only compare the Biblical account of creation with the Babylonian we will at once recognize the fundamental difference between them. Here we see the free, living God who is Lord over all and who by means of His word, that is, His free will calls the whole universe into being and whose whole creation finds its goal in His fellowship with man who had been made after His own likeness. Here the abiding foundations are laid for the whole history which in following times was to be enacted between God and man. And how God steps into the foreground after the fall of man, in the judgment of His holiness and the grace of His eternal love! Now we have the beginnings of what Scripture calls revelation in the narrow sense of this term. For to reveal means to uncover, to disclose, to draw back the veil, and so revelation presupposes that God, on account of man's sin, has withdrawn from man and retired into darkness, that for man He has become an unknown God. From the darkness He will again emerge into light, from the remoteness into closer touch that we might recognize Him and He might again enter into fellowship with us. He is about to withdraw that thick, impenetrable veil by which He had covered His face in order that we might look into His face and heart once more. Not all at once, but step by step. As in creation He chose to go the way of gradual development, so now in this self-disclosure to man. And Scripture is the history of this His gradual revelation or self-disclosure. All that it tells us about God's acts and utterances in speech is to be viewed from the angle of revelation, whether this term is used or not.

The word of divine warning and judgment to Cain, the removal of Enoch, the admonition to the antediluvian mankind, the command to Noah, the judgment of the flood, the protection of Noah and the promise given to him was the hardly perceptible raising of the veil from God's face. Directly designated as revelations are the theophanies of patriarchal time. The term *mirak* (ἄφῃ in Septuagint) so often used after Gen. 12, "He was seen, showed Himself, appeared" is only another term for "He revealed Himself." The apparition for the purpose of calling Moses, the deliverance from Egypt, the miracles during the migration through the desert, the appearance on Mt. Sinai, the giving of the Law — all these fall under the viewpoint of revelation. The condescending passing by of God before Moses that permitted him to look after Him and to hear the words of that wonderful self-description of God: "Yahweh, Yahweh, a God merciful and gracious, slow to anger, and abundant in loving-kindness and truth" which sound as though they were given in the New Testament — what else was it than a drawing back of the veil in order that Moses could see as much of God's face as mortal man could endure at that time? The appearance of the divine glory in the tabernacle, the introduction into the promised land,

the speaking and acting of God with Samuel, the establishment of the kingdom of David, the dwelling of the divine glory in the temple, the influence exerted upon the prophets and the communication of God's decrees to them (compare especially Amos 3:7)—it is all included under the view-point of revelation. The leading away into captivity and the deliverance therefrom is often *expressis verbis* termed a divine revelation (Is. 40:5, 9; 35:2, 4).

And when God by means of law and promise and the whole direction of its history had sufficiently prepared His people, He revealed Himself by the incarnation and the whole life work of His son in an entirely new and unheard-of way. "God revealed in the flesh." Here the veil was withdrawn completely and all concealment was put aside. "We beheld His glory, glory as of the only begotten from the Father, full of grace and truth" says St. John in jubilant tone. He calls Jesus the *λόγος*, because God had spoken through Him and revealed His most inner being. And Jesus Himself says, "He that hath seen Me, hath seen the Father." In Bethlehem we have the appearance "of the kindness of God our Savior and His love" (Tit. 3:4), on the cross the *ἐνδειξις* or manifestation of His punitive and saving righteousness. In Christ Jesus the hidden God became the revealed God. The Bible is the history of this revelation. The establishment of the Christian Church, the knowledge of Peter that the Gentiles may participate in the salvation wrought by Jesus without becoming Jews, his introduction into the understanding of the Gospel—this all is called revelation. Even the history of the expansion of the Christian Church among the Jews and the Gentiles was enacted only by means of divine revelation, since none recognizes the Son but alone the Father, and none recognizes the Father but alone the Son and to whomsoever the Son reveals Him. And the letters of Paul and the other apostles were not written without revelation nor did they attain their goal without revelation, that is, without the operation of the Spirit upon the hearts of their readers. This is the reason why Paul in Eph. 1:17 prays that God might give them the spirit of wisdom and revelation. And what shall I say about the final consummation of the Church of Christ predicted by Scripture! Is it not brought about by the apparition, the *ἐπιφάνεια* or *ἀποκάλυψις* of Christ? Thus Scripture contains the history of God in His relation to mankind, the history of the revelation and self-disclosure of God in its gradual development from the first beginnings to its final consummation, from the first hardly noticeable lifting of the veil to the full withdrawal of the same, thus enabling us to behold Him as He is. This is what raises Scripture infinitely above all other books in this world.

And the history of the divine revelation recorded in Scripture is the history of a revelation for the sake of our *salvation*. It is the history of salvation, the history of the preparation of salva-

tion in the Old Testament and the history of the establishment of salvation in the New Testament. It cannot be otherwise if, as we have seen, the history of revelation recorded therein found its climax in Christ, because Christ is the author of salvation, the Savior for all men. We are indebted to the school of Erlangen which emphasized so emphatically the two-fold fact, that Scripture is history and that this history is the history of our salvation, finding its climax and consummation in the incarnate Son of God. For this reason we readily condone Hofmann for having emphasized God's revelation by deed in such a degree that only little room was left for the revelation by word without which the revelation by deed is silent and cannot be understood. His over-emphasis of the revelation by deed was a wholesome and necessary antidote over against the old dogmaticians who by their strong and almost exclusive emphasis upon the divine revelation as doctrine almost completely forgot what is fundamental, namely, the revelation by deed. The great Wuerttemberg theologian, Albrecht Bengel, whose memory was celebrated in 1937, had already preceded the Erlangen school in this particular, for, according to him, we have in Scripture the gradual unfolding of a great divine economy of salvation, an *unum continuum systema*, an organism of divine deeds and testimonies beginning in Genesis with the act of creation, gradually continuing and finding in the person and work of Christ its summit and in the new heaven and earth predicted in Revelation its consummation.

On account of the unity of this economy of salvation that meets the reader in Scripture, Bengel demanded that all facts and thoughts of Scripture must be understood in their relation to the economy of salvation as a whole. It was a fine observation of Hofmann when, in explaining Micah 5:1, he underscored the fact that instead of Luther's *Ausgang* the Hebrew text offers the plural, and that the terms *olam* and *kedem* are often relative and not absolute concepts, one of them in Amos 9:11 pointing to the times of David and the other one in Micah 7:14, 20 to the days of Moses. Therefore he translated: "His issues, the issues of the Messiah, date back to the days of yore, to the days of remote antiquity" and offered this explanation: "The Messiah is He who is the goal of the whole history of mankind, of Israel, of the house of David, and all advancements of this history are beginnings of His coming, are issues of the son of Jesse." Whether this explanation of Micah 5:1 is correct or not, the thought expressed is no doubt correct. Ever since Gen. 3:15 the Messiah was about to come, and all progress in the history of salvation, the calling of Abraham, the election of Israel from all nations, its deliverance from Egypt, the establishment of the whole divine service in the tabernacle, the founding of the theocratic kingdom under David and Solomon, the liberation from Babylon with all the prophecies pertaining thereto were begin-

nings of the coming of the Messiah, were steps leading gradually upward, seeking and finding their goal in Bethlehem and Golgotha. Not only the Law was a παιδαγωγὸς εἰς Χριστόν, still more the promise; but also the whole divinely ordained course of Israel's history with its peak in the reign of David and its low point in the Babylonian exile. When the kingdom of David and Solomon was broken down, the hope for a worldly Messianic reign was also shattered and room was made for a new hope, one that still contained the expectation of earthly glory, but which was completely permeated by the waiting for a spiritual deliverance, the deliverance from sin and death.

Whatever our attitude may be toward Hofmann's great book *Weissagung und Erfuellung*, its fundamental thought, without doubt, is correct. It is this: History itself is prophecy; each stage of its development points to the step following; it holds the germ of future development in its bosom and is a prefiguration of it. So the whole sacred history in all its essential progress is prophecy of the final, abiding relation between God and man. The first advent of Jesus Christ is the beginning of the essential fulfillment—the essential, because He is the new man, the antitype of the former, but only the beginning, for the head demands its body, the firstborn all his many brothers, before the eternally intended complete communion with God becomes a reality. To the prophesying history the word of prophecy is closely attached, having its roots in this history, always accompanying it, and it can be understood correctly only with this as its basis. Each new epoch in history brings an advancement of prophecy. But the final goal to which all advancement tends is Christ incarnate. All the various stages of development are to be explained in view of this goal, without forgetting, however, the gradual advancement of the divine revelation and without pressing artificially the last stage already into those which are only preparatory. So Scripture pictures Christ, the God-man, as the goal of a history of salvation extending through thousands of years and as the source and center of the history of His Church upon earth, without whom she never would have come into existence and without whom she cannot live. And the history of the Church upon earth is to Scripture again only prophecy of that future stage when Christ's redeemed with body and soul shall rejoice over their eternal communion with God in Christ Jesus.

This then is what we have in Scripture: the description of the complete self-disclosure of God and of His entrance into history, in order to prepare, to establish, to apply and to complete the salvation for mankind, and at the same time the description of the reaction of men over against this revelation of salvation. Therefore the Bible is often called the document or record of the divine revelation. And indeed this term expresses a two-fold truth. In the first place, it shows that the formation of Scripture

itself belongs to the process of revelation. For what distinguishes a document or record from the mere report of any happening? Is it not this that the document or record is in itself an essential part of a certain happening that took place and that this happening comes to a close by the execution of the document? Take the sale of a piece of property. That the sale is reported by the newspaper does not add a single thing to the sale nor does it deduct anything from it. The sale is not closed before the deed is made out and handed to the new owner. So when we call Scripture the document or record of divine revelation, it is likewise designated as something that belongs of necessity to the process of revelation. The production of the Scripture itself then is based upon revelation and is a component part thereof. In the second place, if the Scripture is a document or record, using these terms in their full import, then it is an absolutely trustworthy report of the facts under consideration. This lifts the Bible far above all other historical books. It is then not a book based upon careful human investigation, or the use of merely human traditions and sources; the discourses of the prophets registered therein are not only the result of human deductions and human expectations, and the Psalms are not only the purely human expressions of the reflection made by revelation upon the hearts of men, but revelation itself participated in their formation.

* * *

Thus we have reached an important result; however, is it already the full truth or does the testimony of Scripture about itself lead us still farther? The result reached is a truth of great value, but it is still rather general. Does Scripture not speak still more precisely and concretely about its own formation and its abiding character? Theologians such as Ihmels and Hausleiter, although exponents of the Erlangen school, were not satisfied with this assumption of their great teacher Hofmann. They were of the opinion that Scripture should not be defined merely as the record of revelation, but as the documentary *testimony* of revelation. Ihmels in his *Zentralfragen der Dogmatik in der Gegenwart*, published in 1910 and again for the fourth time in 1931, made this statement: "Scripture has nothing in common with a lifeless book of minutes. It is a living testimony. What we call record is something that is dead as stone, and petrified and petrifying. By registering a certain fact of history it becomes itself a fact of the past. Living testimony, on the contrary, assists us to experience what happened in the past again and again in our present time. To designate Scripture as the record of revelation is expressing a truth not to be given up, but it does not express the whole truth. Scripture is rather the documentary testimony of the divine revelation enacted in the process of a human-divine history." This remark of Ihmels is

certainly correct, but in the present connection of our investigation it does not lead us farther. The truth it contains shall come to its own, when later on we have to consider Scripture as a means of grace. At the present stage of our investigation it does not lead us a step ahead, because it does not say more in detail concerning the influence of revelation to which we owe the formation of Scripture. When in 1883 at Dorpat, a controversy about Scripture was started by a pupil of Hofmann, Wilhelm Volck, the question debated upon was just this whether Scripture is not more than the record or the documentary testimony of the divine revelation. Volck maintained it is merely this, while pastor Nerling and others defended the assumption, that it is the revelation of God and His word itself. What does Scripture testify about itself?

Our first question is what does the Old Testament testify about itself? In answering we confine ourselves to pointing out a threefold fact: 1. Moses on several occasions was commanded by God to write down parts of the Law and consequently the Law of the Covenant and, in case the pronoun in Deut. 1:5 refers to the preceding, the whole Thorah or, to be more specific, the whole code of Law is said to be written by him. This time the *impulsus ad scribendum* was the direct command of God; 2. In not a few cases the discourses of the prophets are introduced with the remark, "Thus said the Lord to me" and thereby are directly designated as the word of God; 3. The prophet Jeremiah expresses again and again his unflinching certainty not only that he was called by the Lord, but also that it was His word that he spoke. By no other prophet is this certainty so repeatedly and so unflinchingly expressed. If one reads his book carefully he must recognize how sharply he draws the line between that which he received as divine word and that which he says in a merely human way. When he heard the false prophet Hananiah prophesying Jeremiah at first did not know what he should answer (Jer. 28). He stood there surprised and perplexed. He only would maintain that the former prophets spoke differently than his opponent Hananiah. Sneered at by the people he left the scene. But all of a sudden he gained the certainty: in this moment Yahweh spoke to me, "return and tell Hananiah that he is a false prophet who will be punished by Yahweh for his false prophecy!" At another time he waited ten days before he gave his questioner a divine answer; but when he did, he was absolutely certain that what he spoke was God's voice. Although by nature inclined to reflect, one thing never became doubtful to him: that the word of Yahweh was with him. Even his enemies never doubted that. Zedekiah, this weakling of a king, could surrender Jeremiah to them, but secretly he again sent for him in order to ask him whether he had a word from Yahweh. Baruch, the friend of Jeremiah, and Ebedmelech, the stranger from Ethiopia, the

priests of Jerusalem, his most bitter enemies, and the common people so fickle and wavering,—in this they all agreed: Jeremiah had the word of God. Some will say, this third point as well as the second mentioned above is of value only as far as the oral word of the prophets is concerned. Certainly, but who will maintain that a man like Jeremiah who when speaking, so carefully made a sharp distinction between his own reflections and God's word, would have mixed them up when he was writing down his discourses? No, what he called God's word, was really God's Word; he only wrote down what God told him. We begin to see that we have more in the Old Testament than a trustworthy, but merely human report; we have in the Old Testament the revelation of God, the word of God itself.

What does the New Testament say concerning the Old? What opinion about the origin of the Old Testament was held by the Jews at the time of Jesus, can be seen, although only through the necessary deductions, from the pseudo-epigraphical literature. For our purpose the wellknown word of Josephus in *Contra Apionem* I, 7 f. is sufficient: "Into every Jew it is implanted in his early youth to recognize the canonical books as Θεοῦ δόγματα, to hold fast to this and, if it is necessary, gladly to die for it." Since this estimation of the Old Testament was so general among the Jews, it was not necessary for Jesus and His apostles to develop a detailed doctrine about the Old Testament and its origin. Their respective utterances are of a more casual character, but nevertheless sufficient, and for that reason perhaps all the more convincing.

What we notice first in reviewing these occasional utterances is the unity of Old Testament Scripture. It follows from the manner in which Jesus and the apostles quote the Old Testament writings. At times when quoting they mention the name of the author of the respective book (f. i. in Matt. 13:14), but as a rule they do not stress the fact that the quotation is taken from the writing of this or that certain author, but they are content with the fact that the quotation is taken from Scripture, being a part of the whole of the Old Testament Scripture. "It is written" or "Scripture says" is the form generally used in introducing a quotation (compare Matt. 4:4, 7. 10; 21:42; 26:31; Mark 11:7; Luke 20:17; John 6:45; 19:36; Rom. 12:19; 14:11; 15:9 ff. etc.). Jesus and the apostles would not have quoted in this manner, if the books of the Old Testament in respect to their trustworthiness and their origin were not placed by them on the same level and if, inspite of all their differences, they did not form one coherent unity. It is just this absolute trustworthiness and uncontradictory unity of the Old Testament which Jesus maintains *expressis verbis* in the important passage John 10:35: οὐ δύναται λυθῆναι ἡ γραφή. Since Jesus had said, "I and the Father are one" the

Jews took stones to stone Him. They considered this word a blasphemy, and according to Lev. 24:16 a blasphemer was to be stoned. Jesus now calls their attention to the fact that in Psalm 82:6 the term *Elohim* and *Bene Eljon* is applied to the judges in Israel installed by God. Therefore, instead of being ready to stone him on the basis of Lev. 24:16 they should first examine whether He too, was not similarly called and installed by God and, consequently, would be entitled to the term "God" or "Son of God," at least in the sense in which it was applied to the judges in Israel. Close observation would show them that the Father, already before His birth at Bethlehem, had sanctified Him, that is, set Him apart for the work of redemption and sent Him into the world. When Jesus in this connection says οὐ δύναται λυθῆναι ἡ γραφή, this can mean nothing else but this: The Old Testament Scripture cannot in such a way be dissolved into fragments, that by doing so its unified structure is destroyed and its individual parts lose their validity. If the enemies of Christ want to take their stand upon Lev. 24:16 and stone Him on the basis of this passage, they cannot do that, since Psalm 82:6, being a part of Scripture as well as Lev. 24:16, would then not receive its due. It is wrong to emphasize one passage of the Old Testament so strongly and one-sidedly that by so doing another passage loses its validity. This hardly can mean anything else but this: The Old Testament Scripture is a wonderful unity without contradiction. Jesus apparently was of the conviction: with the formation of the Old Testament God—we say God, not the individual writers, who did not even know that their writings were to become part of a whole, authoritative for all the future—aimed at the establishment of a coherent unity of holy writings containing no contradictions and, therefore, took the greatest care that the statements of the individual book as well as the statements of all books came into a relation of complete harmony to each other. It is further to be noted that neither Lev. 24:16 nor Psalm 82:6 deals with a central truth valid for all times. It is true, behind the designation of the Old Testament judges as *elohim* and *bene eljon* stands the conviction based upon the theocratic idea that the judges in Israel were representatives of God, but this conviction did not demand the term *elohim* or *bene eljon*. It is even probable that in Psalm 82:6 this term was used only in order to emphasize the contrast: They, the judges, have been installed as "gods" (v. 6), but on account of their injustice they must die like *men* (v. 7). Consequently, even more casual and unimportant statements of the Old Testament dare not be considered negligible nor should they be deprived of their validity by a one-sided emphasis upon others. They belong to that coherent, unified whole in which there are no contradictions. We do not waste words to show that such a unified whole did not come into existence without special divine cooperation, all the

more so, since it took a period of more than a thousand years to write the Old Testament Scripture. This leads to the next point.

The second point resulting from the testimony of Jesus and His apostles concerning the Old Testament is this: The Old Testament came into existence only by the cooperation of a divine and human factor. This again can be seen from the manner in which the Old Testament is quoted. It is true, in many passages the Old Testament is quoted as the word of Moses, David, the Psalmist, Isaiah, etc. (f. i. in Acts 2:16 ff.; 1:20; Heb. 2:6; Rom. 10:19, 20; 11:9), but not seldom as the word of God, the word of the Holy Spirit, most frequently so in Acts and Hebrews (f. i. in Acts 1:10, 16; 4:25; 13:34; 28:25; Heb. 1:5 ff.; 3:7 ff.; 8:8 ff.; 9:8; 10:15), but not in these writings alone, f. i. also in II Cor. 6:16. This is possible only, if God made use of human writers and spoke through them. Several times we read *expressis verbis*: God spoke through David, through the prophet (f. i. Matt. 1:22; 2:15); even in Hebrews we find examples, as in 4:7. The prepositions used are *διὰ* and *ἐν*; they make it evident the Lord or the Holy Ghost is to be considered as the real author, man only the instrument used by Him. If, therefore, Church Fathers or some dogmaticians of our own church called the human authors *notarii, calami, amanuenses, instrumenta*, this is by no means to be considered wrong in every respect. It is wrong only if one, by the use of these terms, degrades them to merely mechanical instruments or machines that wrote without participation of their soul life. It is correct and an expression of a Biblical truth only if these terms are used merely to designate human instrumentality without any definition of the latter. The prepositions used give us the right of speaking of a cooperation of the divine and human factors in the formation of the Old Testament Scripture.

Those utterances of the apostles that speak in a more doctrinal manner of the Old Testament point in the same direction. I have in mind Heb. 1:1, 2; II Peter 1:20, 21; I Peter 1:11, 12; II Tim. 3:16. In Heb. 1:1, 2, it is true, we find only the rather general statement that it was God who in the time of the Old Testament spoke through the prophets (*ἐν τοῖς προφήταις*), and it is exclusively or primarily the spoken word to which the writer refers. Also in II Peter 1:21—not in II Peter 1:20—it is the spoken prophecy that the apostle has in mind. He proceeds in v. 20 from the *πᾶσα προφητεία γραφῆς*, that is, from the prophecy at his time written in the Old Testament, and makes the statement that it is not subjected to *ἰδία ἐπίλυσις*, that is, to an explanation which man can find by his own reason. But why is the prophecy of Scripture not subjected to man's own interpretation and why can it not be explained by human reason? Verse 21 gives the answer and in doing this goes back from the written word of prophecy to the spoken word and its origin: In the first place

the spoken prophecy did not come into existence by the activity of human reason. If it did not come into existence by the activity of human reason, how should human reason be able to explain it? How did it come into existence? In this manner that men carried or driven by the Holy Ghost have spoken ἀπὸ θεοῦ, from God. The correct reading without doubt is: ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου φερόμενοι ἐλάλησαν ἀπὸ θεοῦ ἄνθρωποι. "Ἄνθρωποι emphatically stands at the end: *Men* they were who spoke; but at once at the beginning of the sentence they are characterized as being men driven by the Holy Spirit, and their speaking is described as coming to them from God as the source. Also the contrast between οὐ θελήματι ἀνθρώπου and ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου is to be observed, not by the will of man, but by the Holy Ghost. Whether we translate carried by the Holy Ghost, or driven, set into motion, makes no difference. Φέρειν means to carry, but often connoting movement, to move by use of force in order to change the location. So in Homer's *Iliad* it is used with ships that are moved from one place to another, but also with the winds that fill the sails and move the ship. In Acts 27:15-17 we read of the ship that was to bring Paul to Rome: "it was unable to make headway against the gale; so we gave up and let it drive" (ἐφερόμεθα). Thus it fits excellently into our context. Also here it was a wind that drove the prophets to speak, but it was a holy wind, πνεῦμα ἅγιον, the Holy Spirit. It is, in the second place, hardly accidental that Peter wrote ἀπὸ θεοῦ; it designates the source out of which came what the prophets spoke. So it is a two-fold fact that we find expressed in this passage concerning the spoken prophecy: 1. The prophets spoke only when and because they were driven by the Holy Ghost; in the old dogmatics this is called the *impulsus*; 2. What they spoke under such impulse, they did not speak from themselves, but it came to them from God. Our passage speaks of prophecy. Since this word, in consonance with the Hebrew *nabi*, is often used in a wider sense, Benjamin Warfield, the great Princeton theologian, was inclined to take it here in the same wider sense, designating the whole Old Testament. But this is a generalization not permitted by our context. Peter speaks of prophecy, and of the spoken prophecy of the Old Testament at that. But this we are permitted to conclude: What is said about the spoken prophecy can be applied to the written prophecy. The writing down of the prophecy did not occur without the divine impulse, and what they wrote came to them from God. It was not their own word, but the word of God.

Whether I Peter 1:10-12 is to be considered in this connection depends upon the answer to the question whether it speaks of New Testament or of Old Testament prophets. While it was common to think of Old Testament prophets, this assumption became somewhat doubtful through Wohlenberg's argumentation. In case the apostle speaks of Old Testament prophets, then he says

about those among them who prophesied that salvation is to come also to the Gentiles (εἰς ὑμᾶς) that, at that time when they spoke of this salvation, the spirit of the preexistent Christ testified in them just as the Spirit poured out on Pentecost was active in Paul and those of his co-workers who brought the Gospel to the congregations in Asia Minor. The operation of the Spirit upon the Old Testament prophets and the operation of the Spirit upon Paul and his co-workers is put on the same level. Reference is also made to their writing down of their prophecies, but only in order to emphasize that thereby they rendered a valuable service to the New Testament congregations. Finally it is stated that they made their own prophecies, after having received and very likely written them down, an object of study, not their contents—because then they would not have understood what they predicted—but at what time their prophecies concerning the participation of the salvation by the Gentiles would find their fulfillment. This finds its explanation when we recall the peculiarity of the Old Testament stage of development. At that time the Spirit did not yet take permanent habitation in the prophets, but came upon them only at certain periods and for a definite purpose. Even the disciples before Ascension and Pentecost were still asking at what time the establishment of the kingdom of Israel would take place, and we would not wonder if even Paul after Pentecost at times had asked himself when Christ would come again to usher in the final consummation of all.

II Tim. 3:15-17 is of special importance for our question. Here the purpose is noted for which the Old Testament has been given to us and which is to be attained by those who have known Scripture from childhood. The Scripture of the Old Testament is able to make wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus. Why? "Because πᾶσα γραφή θεόπνευστος is also profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness." What does θεόπνευστος and πᾶσα γραφή mean? Cremer in his *Woerterbuch der neutestamentlichen Graezitaet* years ago tried to prove that it is to be taken in the active sense and translated *Gottes Geist atmend*, and Dr. Schodde in his *Outlines of Biblical Hermeneutics* followed him. And it is true, there are examples for the active meaning of participial adjectives ending in τός, but the most frequent sense is the passive, f. i. ἀγαπητός, εὔθετος, διδακτός, γραπτός, κρητός, and among the forms connected with θεός there is only one with active meaning. So θεόπνευστος is to be translated "produced by the breath or the waft of God," *geistgewirkt, gottgehaucht*. Also πᾶσα γραφή has been translated in different ways. The most improbable version is "every scripture" in the sense of "every book of the Old Testament," because γραφή is never used in this sense in the New Testament and since we do not know that at Paul's time the theopneusty of one or the other book of the Old Testament canon

was doubted, we would hardly understand why he should have emphasized "every Old Testament book." Others translate "the whole Scripture," but then we should expect the article: *πᾶσα ἡ γραφή*. After all, only two translations deserve serious consideration: either "all Scripture" which the A. V. offers, or "every Scripture" in the sense of "every Scripture passage," which the R. V. prefers. Since we may rightly assume that what Timothy had learned from a child consisted in individual Scripture passages, we might be inclined to accept the rendering of the R. V. as the correct one. However, the following words would hardly fit, because not every Scripture passage, although written down under the influence of the Holy Spirit, is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, etc. (f. i. the passage Gen. 12:6; "and the Canaanite was then in the land"). So Luther's *alle Schrift* and the rendering of the A. V. "all Scripture" is to be preferred. *Πᾶσα γραφή* then has its analogue in *πᾶσα οἰκοδομή* in Ephesians 2:21, or *γραφή* as designation of a known quantity is treated as a proper noun, as *πᾶσα Ἱεροσόλυμα*. Of less importance is the question whether *θεόπνευστος* is to be taken predicatively ("all Scripture is breathed by God and profitable"), or attributively introducing an explanation or reason ("all Scripture breathed by God, is also profitable"), although the latter rendering is linguistically quite possible and fits best into the context. That the term *πᾶσα γραφή* is to be understood in the light of the preceding *ἱερὰ γράμματα* and, therefore, refers to the Old Testament, does not need to be proved.

The progress between the passages considered before and II Tim. 3:15-17 consists in this: Here for the first time we have a statement not about the spoken, but about the written word; so we do not have to draw a conclusion from the former to the latter. And the statement is made about the written word of the Old Testament in its whole extent that it has been produced by the breathing of the Spirit of God. Whether some one else participated in its production is not stated, it is neither maintained nor denied. Emphasized, however, is the fact that God was the *causa prima* in producing it; He is the *author principalis* of the whole of the Old Testament Scripture; it is He Himself who here speaks with us. And because it is really God who is speaking here with us, therefore even the word of the Old Testament Scripture is a means that informs us about the will of God, that convicts the sinner, improves the penitent, trains for a life pleasing to God.

Finally we call attention to the fact that the New Testament does not only confirm all the important deeds of God related in the Old Testament beginning with the creation of the world by His almighty word, but that also the less important and as it seems insignificant and trifling is to the writers of the New Testament so trustworthy that they draw from it far reaching

consequences. To the reader of Genesis 12-25 it might seem of no importance that in the account of the life of Abraham we find related first his justification and afterwards his circumcision. Not so to Paul. In Rom. 4:10 he uses this sequence as a proof for the fact that his circumcision did not help to bring about his justification. He was justified before he was circumcised; the circumcision following afterwards was only a seal for the justification experienced before. To the superficial reader it might seem of little significance that in Gen. 21 the expulsion of Hagar and Ishmael is told in such detail, but Paul in Gal. 4:21 ff. draws important deductions from this particular incident.

Above all, attention must be called to Gal. 3:16, a passage on account of which the apostle is so often sneered at, although only by people who wrongly interpret the whole verse. Here it is of importance to Paul that he reads in the promise given to Abraham *καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ* and not *καὶ τοῖς σπέρμασιν*, the singular and not the plural. This, indeed, is not caused by his lack of sufficient mastery of the Greek and Hebrew languages as some expositors would make us believe. He knew as well as they the collective use of the singular *sera* or *σπέρμα* and did not from the use of the singular draw the deduction that it points to a definite individual, to Christ. He knew the Greek and Hebrew better than some of his critics. In view of the fact that Abraham was the ancestor of three different lineages—one by Sarah, one by Hagar and one by Keturah—when the question was to be decided to whom the inheritance promised to Abraham belongs it was of importance to Paul that the Old Testament promise nowhere spoke of a number of lineages, but only of one, that of Sarah and Isaac; to that lineage and to that lineage alone the promise was given. When the apostle adds the relative clause *ὃς ἐστὶν Χριστός* he does not want to be understood as if to him the use of the singular *σπέρμα* would prove that Christ was meant. By no means. Since, however, the Old Testament promise points to only one lineage, that of Sarah and Isaac, the important question arises: in whom do we find today when finally the inheritance is to be disposed of, this lineage? Paul by this relative clause gives the answer: today this lineage is represented by Christ; only he who is in fellowship with Him can participate in this inheritance. Only one who was convinced of the absolute trustworthiness of the Old Testament account could make use of this line of argumentation. Paul could do it, because to him the whole of the Old Testament Scripture had come into existence by the breath of the Spirit of God and, therefore, was God's own word.

What testimony does the New Testament give concerning itself? Since at the time when the apostles wrote, the New Testament was still incomplete, we cannot expect such general statements as we have them in the New Testament concerning the

Old. We are, however, by no means left entirely in the dark about the question concerning its origin and its abiding character.

We must recall the fact that the apostles were called to be witnesses of Christ the Crucified and Risen One in order to gather by their witnessing a congregation of Christ upon earth, and that for the giving of this testimony the Holy Ghost was promised to them in order that He should "teach them all things" and "bring all things in their remembrance whatever Jesus had said unto them" (John 14:26), "that He should reveal and show them things to come and guide them into all truth" (John 16:13-15). "To bring to their remembrance"—this referred to the preaching of what they had heard and seen; "reveal"—this included the disclosure of the future; "lead into all truth"—this refers to the introduction into the right understanding of the saving value of the facts of Christ's life. Pentecost came and the outpouring of the Spirit upon all disciples, and the Spirit fulfilled all that Jesus had promised. The apostles experienced the unique influence of the Holy Spirit necessary for their life work and consequently maintained with all certainty that their message was the word of God (II Cor. 5:20; I Cor. 14:37). Paul curses him who dares to preach another gospel (Gal. 1:8), because he can triumphantly say: "What no eye has seen and no ear has heard, this God has revealed unto us by His Spirit" (I Cor. 2:9, 10). Out of this Spirit he and his coworkers spoke, and they spoke in words "taught by the Spirit" (I Cor. 2:12, 13). The Spirit did not only drive them on to speak, He was also the source from which their words flowed. This power to speak the word of God Paul certainly possessed in no lesser degree than Jeremiah of old. And yet there can be no question that their preaching was at the same time labor of their own mind performed under the exertion of all their mental powers, a labor that accommodated itself to the needs and peculiarities of the changing audience—compare the sketches of the sermons of Peter and Paul given in Acts 2 and 3 and 4 and in Acts 14 and 17—, which they performed in the strength of their own resolution and in conformity with the rules of human oratory. They certainly were no mere talking-machines and lifeless tools; their speeches were efforts of their whole personality with all its intellectual, emotional and volitional powers. Haman's word has been rightly applied to them: Πάντα θεία καὶ ἀνθρώπινα πάντα, although we have to emphasize the divine factor more than he did.

The apostles, however, would have misconceived their calling if they had not put down their spoken word in writing. This was a necessary and essential part of their calling as witnesses of Christ. Over against those congregations in which grave moral faults were in danger of prevailing, they would not have fulfilled their duty if they had not warned them either by word of mouth or by letters. Furthermore, since death took away one

after the other of the eye- and ear-witnesses it became more and more necessary to fix in writing what they had heard and seen in order that they might bear witness also after their death. And finally, the certainty of the fact that the final struggles between the Church of Christ and the world-power would cause many afflictions and sufferings for the Christian congregations demanded a book of comfort as we have it in Revelation, in order that the Christians through all these tempests would have a guide and a hold. And if the fixation of their testimony in writing was a necessary part of their calling, then the promise of Christ extended also to this and they performed this work under the same influence of the Spirit as when they orally preached and taught. If it were right to differentiate in this respect between the spoken and written word we would have to recall the principle expressed in the Latin saying *Litera scripta manet* and maintain a still greater measure of divine influence for the fixation in writing, because the spoken word is more for the present moment, the written for the future; indeed, in God's plan it should be the abiding testimony for the whole development of the Church until the end. Beside this, in I John 1:1-4 the apostle puts his written word positively on the same level with his spoken word, and Paul does likewise in II Thess. 2:15. Also when the apostles in their calling fixed their message in writing they were conscious of the fact that at all times and in all matters they wrote nothing else but the Word of God, so much so that Paul in a certain instance when he gave advice according to his own personal judgment, makes this known *expressis verbis* as something extraordinary (I Cor. 7:25).

* * *

The unique influence of the Holy Spirit upon the writers of the Old and New Testament is an established fact. Are we now in a position on the basis of the testimony of Scripture itself to define this influence more closely? In some quarters of the Lutheran Church in our country this is denied and the slogan has been formed: "We confess the fact of inspiration, but we refuse to define its mode." This sounds like noble minded reserve, always commendable when we speak of spiritual matters. But by one stroke the situation changes when by this reserve statements of Scripture are as much as eliminated, especially statements that do not speak of the *mode* of inspiration, but of its *extent*. About the mode of inspiration we also on our part are not ready to make any statement. The mode was a mystery and will remain a mystery at least for this life. It is always a mystery how the Spirit of God works upon human personality. He who has experienced this operation is able to state the fact, but cannot define the mode. All the more, this holds true when we speak of inspiration, because here we have to deal with something unique experienced by none of those now

living. But this inability dare not keep us from making a statement about that concerning which Scripture is not silent. According to Scripture three points must be mentioned as describing the extent of the divine factor in inspiration: 1. the *impulsus ad scribendum*; 2. the *suggestio rerum*; 3. the *suggestio verbi*.

The *impulsus ad scribendum* mentioned in II Peter 1:21 *expressis verbis* concerning the spoken word of the prophets, was of very different character. In some cases it was given in form of a special command, as sometimes with Moses (Ex. 17:14; Deut. 31:19), with the prophets (Is. 8:1; Jer. 36:2; Heb. 2:2), with the author of Revelation (Rev. 1:11). In other cases it was given by the divinely ordained historical situation. God shaped the course of history in such a way that the situation thus brought about was for the author an unmistakable divine impulse. This holds true especially of the New Testament letters which were occasional writings in the full sense of this word. Perhaps it likewise holds true of the Gospels of which at least the Gospel of Matthew is easily recognized as written for Jewish Christians in defense of the life and teachings of Jesus against Jewish attacks and slander. Luke 1:3 with his *ἔδοξε μοι* perhaps even demands the assumption that sometimes the authors were not conscious of the divine impulse; *mentioned*, at least, is only Luke's own determination. By awakening in the hearts of the authors the determination to pen a writing the Spirit in no way deprived them of their freedom. At times their own determination formed spontaneously may afterward have come home to them brought forth by the Spirit of God. To use a comparison: the manifestation of love toward God in the life of a Christian is the free action of his innermost life and yet at every moment and in its whole extent based upon and brought forth by the urges of the divine Spirit. Entirely wrong, however, would be the assumption that the writers were conscious of the fact that their writings were destined to become parts of a whole called Holy Scripture, or that they were inwardly driven to write a book for this purpose. That would be imaginable only with Moses who with his *thorah* laid the abiding religious foundation for his people. In nearly all other cases they were occasional writings in the narrow or wider sense of this term. Certainly the writers were aware of the fact that their written messages and accounts were something more abiding than their oral word. We know of Paul's direction in Col. 4:16 that the congregations at Colossae and Laodicea should exchange the letters primarily addressed to them. But this is entirely excluded that the authors knew beforehand that their writings later should become parts of the Old and New Testament canon, still more that they had been inwardly urged to write them for that purpose. *God*, indeed, knew about this, *He* aimed at that and took care that such writings came into existence as He could use later for this purpose.

The *suggestio rerum*, the communication of the contents, is the second element included in divine inspiration. This follows from II Peter 1:21: they spoke *ἀπὸ θεοῦ*; from II Tim. 3:16: all Scripture is *θεόπνευστος*, brought forth by the breath of God, is His word; from the mode of quotation according to which it is God who spoke; from other statements according to which it is God who admonishes through the word of the apostles (II Cor. 5:20), or according to which what Paul writes are the commandments of God (I Cor. 14:37). What Paul writes in Gal. 1:8 cursing every one who preaches another gospel would be the conceit of a deranged mind if the contents of his gospel had not been given him by God. The mode of the communication of the contents, of course, was varied. At times God put the contents in the form of a vision before the mental eyes of the writers; as, for instance, when John wrote his Revelation. Perhaps likewise when the account of creation was penned; because, if God puts future events in the form of a vision before the writer's eyes, what would hinder Him from using the same means of communication in revealing events of the past that no human eye has observed? Or as Daniel received a revelation concerning the four world-powers which he saw in the form of beasts. How often the Old Testament speaks of visions; and during the New Testament times not only John, but also Peter and Paul had visions. The vision was usually accompanied by the audition, the hearing of what was spoken by God or His messenger. At times the divine communication took the form of an imageless inward divine speaking; it consisted in the awakening of the remembrance of what the writer once had heard or seen, or also in the direction of the writer's mind to sources of which he could and should make use, in an extraordinary, unique ability of distinguishing between the trustworthy and untrustworthy. It is probable that Moses made use of material that came to him by oral or written tradition; but this traditional material passed through the cleansing fire of the Holy Ghost; the wafting of the Spirit began, and utilizing this material brought forth the absolutely trustworthy account that today stands before us as the word of God. Why should the Spirit not have directed Mark who knew only very little of what he relates in his Gospel as an eye and ear witness to the spoken word of Peter or other written material and then formed his presentation in such a manner that the outcome was the Word of God? The Spirit supplied the writer with the material and gave him the correct understanding. He introduced it into his memory, his thinking and feeling, put it so before his eyes that he grasped it, meditated upon it, pondered it, molded it, arranged it—all under the permanent influence of the Spirit.

From this follows again that the writers themselves were no machines nor lifeless tools, no mechanical amanuenses nor dead

flutes through which the Spirit worked, they were rather mentally active, as active as today any human writer is in the production of his works, and their whole personality participated in their efforts. How well Matthew arranged the material in his Gospel, in the best possible conformity with its purpose; what nearly systematic presentation we have in Romans; how Paul in Galatians step by step takes away the foundation upon which the errorists stood and victoriously maintains the truth of his law-free gospel. This was mental work for the apostle, and yet at every moment he was absolutely certain, the real driving, urging, writing and acting agent was not he himself but God and His Spirit. Luke says *expressis verbis* that he used sources, probably oral as well as written sources in order to write all "from the beginning" (ἀνωθεν), carefully (ἀκριβῶς) and in a certain sequence, "coherently" (κατεξήης), in order that Theophilus might be convinced of the trustworthiness of the things of which he so far had only a superficial knowledge. Luke permits us here to look into the workshop, as it were, in which the third Gospel came into existence, and yet at the same time the Spirit of God was active in such a measure that the outcome was God's own Word. Or one might compare the fourth Gospel with its eclectic and supplementary character so distinctive of this Gospel in comparison with the Synoptics, and yet not John but the Spirit of God is its *author principalis*.

Finally, the *suggestio verbi*, the supply or communication of the fitting word, always conform to the contents was the third divine element in the inspiration of Scripture. Verbal inspiration was the storm center during the last 150 years, and is so still today. It is true, there is a theory of verbal inspiration that must be refuted. It is that theory of inspiration that degrades the authors of the Biblical books to dead writing machines who without any inner participation wrote down word for word what was dictated to them by the Spirit. We meet this doctrine in the Lutheran Church occasionally already during the sixteenth century, more frequently in the seventeenth century although it can hardly be called the earmark of the presentation of all orthodox dogmaticians; later it is limited to popular writers, and today it is found only in some fundamentalist camps. This theory is in direct contradiction to everything that Scripture says elsewhere about the influence of God upon human personality, and several facts in Scripture itself speak against it. When, however, during the last years a hot pursuit was started against this theory in some quarters of our church, this appears to me to be nothing more than a "fight against windmills," because there are hardly many among us who cling to this mechanical theory. Alas, not seldom this pursuit aims at the verbal inspiration in every form, and thus the combat becomes a fight against the testimony of Scripture concerning itself. We do not want to emphasize at

present the fact that without verbal inspiration we lack every guarantee that the divine content is expressed in Scripture correctly and without abbreviations; we rather stress the fact that Scripture itself demands it. It is demanded by the form of the quotations: "The Holy Spirit speaks," "God says;" furthermore, it follows from the fact that Jesus as well as Paul draw important conclusions from the wording of Old Testament passages, a few times even from a single word as *elohim* in Ps. 82:6 or *σάραμα* in the story of Abraham; and in particular does it follow from I Cor. 2:12, 13: ἃ καὶ λαλοῦμεν οὐκ ἐν διδακτοῖς ἀνθρώπινης σοφίας λόγοις, ἀλλ' ἐν διδακτοῖς πνεύματος, πνευματικοῖς πνευματικὰ κρίνοντες = "Of these we also speak—not in words which man's wisdom teaches us, but in those which the Spirit teaches—interpreting spiritual (things) by spiritual (words)." Here concerning the word spoken by the apostle and his co-workers we find expressed both the operation of the Spirit and the cooperation of the apostle. Bachmann recognized that and expressed it better than many another expositor. Even the formation of the word was taught by the Spirit. Not as if man had been inactive. Even here and not only as far as the contents are concerned, the writers worked as living personalities. Paul at times apparently is wrestling with the language; the richness of thoughts flowing in upon him is now and then so overwhelming that he drops the construction, from the Septuagint which he as a rule is following he goes back to the Hebrew original, once or twice he corrects himself as in the well known passage about the numbers of those he had baptized in Corinth (I Cor. 1:14-16); and above all, each author uses his own style, has his own vocabulary and his own circle of concepts. And yet the finished product is after all not his word but God's Word, even the selection of the fitting word was taught him by the Spirit. So I Cor. 2:13 while not being the only proof passage for the *suggestio verbi* is nevertheless an important statement concerning the question at hand. Some exegetes, indeed, maintain it does not belong here at all, because the *λαλεῖν* mentioned would not refer to the word of apostolic preaching. Since Paul uses the first person plural he would speak of the *λαλεῖν* of all Christians. But this is not tenable, the context points to nothing but the apostolic preaching. In 2:1-5 Paul characterized his own preaching at Corinth as a preaching not adorned with surpassing power of eloquence or earthly wisdom. In 2:6ff. he continues and says, that also he can speak words of wisdom when he has to deal with mature Christians. In both sections he refers to his preaching; the transition from the first person singular in 2:1-5 to the first person plural in 2:6 ff. shows only that he no longer speaks only of his own preaching activity but also of that of his co-workers. In 2:1-5 the apostle had to use the first person singular because he spoke of his activity at Corinth where he had no co-workers; in 2:6 ff.

he makes the general statement about the preaching among the mature wherever they are; here it was only fitting not to speak only of his own preaching but also of that of his co-workers. Therefore, we do not see any reason why we should eliminate I Cor. 2:13 from our discussion. Still less do we stoop to what some call an "atomistic use of Scripture" when we refer to this passage, because the whole context speaks exactly of the same matter with which we are dealing here. It is true, Paul here speaks of the spoken word while we think of the written word; but it should not be necessary to repeat that what is true of the spoken word holds all the more true of the written word.

* * *

By this unique operation of the Spirit upon the holy writers a Scripture came into existence which in all its parts is God's infallible word for mankind for the purpose of its salvation. It is well known that not a few limit this infallibility or inerrancy of Scripture to those parts that pertain to our salvation. And, indeed, this is the chief thing, and when we remember the purpose for which according to II Tim. 3:16 the inspired Scripture is given, and the emphasis with which we stressed the fact that Scripture is the history of the divine revelation for the sake of our salvation, then no doubt the inerrancy of the parts mentioned is nearest to our heart and our first care. Scripture is no textbook on history or archaeology or astronomy or psychology. But does from this follow that it must be subject to error when it occasionally speaks of matters pertaining to that field of knowledge? A certain holy awe kept me always from the assumption of errors in the original copies of the Scripture and its parts; even the mere possibility of errors seemed to me excluded by this reverential fear. However, this reverential fear alone should not hold one back from a serious reckoning with this possibility. It may be the result of training, and this training may have been wrong. Then there is the difficulty of drawing an absolutely correct line of demarkation between those parts that pertain to our salvation and those that do not. With some passages it might be drawn successfully; with others, not. Passages that today apparently do not belong to the sphere of salvation might in the course of history be experienced by the Church at large or by individual members as pertaining to that sphere. These are serious considerations, but none of them is decisive. The testimony of Scripture alone is decisive. And here II Tim. 3:16 and John 10:35 again stand before our eyes. If in II Tim. 3:16 it is said of "all the Scripture" that it is *θεόπνευστος*, brought forth by the Spirit of God, does this not exclude every error from the original copy to which the term *θεόπνευστος* alone can refer? If in John 10:35 the general rule "The Scripture cannot be broken" is applied to a single, one might say, incidentally

written word—if in Scripture we may term anything at all as casual and incidental—which was, indeed, important for the understanding and time of theocracy, but has nothing to do with *our* salvation, have we then a right to assume errancy for any part of Scripture? I know some answer that Jesus and Paul in speaking or writing these passages were subject to the tradition of their times and assumed in these things what was common among their Jewish contemporaries. Some point as an explanation even to the state of *κένωσις* in which Jesus lived when He spoke John 10:35. I must confess this assumption makes me all the more careful. Where does Scripture speak of such a *κένωσις* that made Jesus subject to the errors of this time concerning the nature of Scripture? This does by no means follow from Mark 13:32.

We repeat, the inerrancy is to be ascribed only to the original copies. Not a few wonder about this limitation, but hardly with good reasons. We speak here of the operation of the Spirit upon the holy writers called inspiration, and this was active not in the preservation of the existing copies, but in their production. The original copies were the outcome of that operation. Whether they have been preserved in every respect in their original state is another question. We know this was not the case. The large number of variant readings makes that evident. In some cases the text as it has come down to us is entirely impossible. So we read in the Hebrew text of I Sam. 13:1: "One year old was Saul when he became king, he reigned two years over Israel." This impossible text we find also in the Septuagint; it is therefore at least as old as 200 years before Christ. Other examples could be mentioned. Facts like these give rise to objections such as this: Of what practical advantage is it to hold fast to the inerrancy of the original copies as long as the text that has come down to us is not inerrant? Was it impossible for God to preserve the inerrant text? Since He did not do it, why do we any longer defend the thesis of the inerrancy of the original text? We answer: 1. Careful and painstaking work of the text critics can restore and has in many cases restored the original reading; 2. because Scripture itself demands this assumption, we have not only the right, we have the duty to maintain it even if we cannot point out its practical value. We remember, however, the historical development of the doctrine of inspiration; at first, the inerrancy of the Bible in non-religious portions was questioned, then the inerrancy in portions joining the religious field or already belonging to that, finally the fact of inspiration was given up entirely and the Bible was degraded to the level of a purely human book, by many representatives of higher criticism with their various source theories it was rated even below that level; for what independent human writer would pen a book that has more resemblance to a crazy quilt than to a coherent and har-

monious whole, the outcome of a sound and independent mind? *Vestigia terrent*. Even in the Lutheran Church of our country the development is on the down grade. Some already doubt not only the inspiration of Scripture, but also its authority and trustworthiness even in religious matters and reserve the right to distinguish between the binding and not binding force of Scripture for their enlightened modern minds. This down grade development in our own Lutheran Church causes me to emphasize the Scripture truth of the inerrancy of the Bible more than I did before.

It is true, there are many observations concerning the original as well as the present text of Scripture which make it difficult to hold fast to the absolute inerrancy of Scripture. I mention only the various accounts of one and the same event, especially in the Gospels, which now and then seem to contradict each other, or the difficulty of harmonizing the chronological data of the history of Israel's kings. What are we to do about them? Shall we conceal them? shall we artificially bridge them over as has often been done? By no means. We shall apply all our grammatical and historical knowledge and make use of all sound methods of scientific investigation, and when we still find ourselves unable to verify Biblical data by our knowledge of other sources, then we shall let them stand until further discoveries bring the verification—as so far was very often the case—, or, being unable to harmonize some features of one account with others, we again shall wait for further enlightenment—and the history of exegesis is full of cases in which later expositors by new and closer investigation have found the key to a door closed perhaps for centuries. And finally, we should not forget that the statement "Scripture is the inerrant word of God" is a statement of faith. Faith, however, according to Haman is the *coincidentia oppositorum* and, according to Luther, brings about the necessary *mediatio*. Faith does not close its eyes to what has been called the "Knechtsgestalt" (μορφή δούλου) of Scripture; it recognizes what is human in Scripture not less than its critics; but at the same time faith keeps an open eye for its glory and, therefore, holds fast to Scripture as the Word of God. It is the art of faith to see both and to ascend above both in order to find and hold their unity.

* * *

Since Scripture is the history of God's revelation for the sake of our salvation and is itself the Word of God, the old dogmaticians were right when they ascribed to it the following *affectiones* or permanent characteristics: *auctoritas causativa et normativa*, *sufficientia* and *perspicuitas*. When they spoke of the *auctoritas causativa* and *normativa* of Scripture, they did not

intend to say anything else than what Luther expressed in these words: *Die Schrift allein kann Glaubensartikel stellen*, or what the Formula of Concord means when it calls Scripture "the pure, clear fountain of Israel" (*limpidissimi et purissimi fontes*) and the only true standard by which all teachers and doctrines are to be judged (*unica et certissima regula, ad quam omnia dogmata exigere et secundum quam de omnibus tum doctrinis tum doctoribus iudicare oporteat.*) Because it is the Word of God it is the only authority in matters of saving knowledge and faith. I do not need to enlarge here upon the fact that this is to be held fast in contrast to Rome, which recognizes beside and beyond Scripture the Church and the Pope as authorities in matters of doctrine and faith, as well as in contrast to all who consider human reason and experience, be it the reason and experience of natural man or the experience of the reborn man, as authority in matters of faith or as the source from which religious knowledge flows. The Erlangen school considered Scripture as the norm in matters of faith, but not as the source; compare the dictum of Hofmann: "*Ich, der Christ, bin mir dem Theologen, eigenster Stoff meiner Wissenschaft.*" But if we have in Scripture and nowhere else the embodiment and re-presentation (*Vergegenwaertigung*) of the divine revelation, God's own Word apart from which no man, past or present, ever could attain to saving knowledge, then Scripture is not only the norm but also the only source. The Old Testament was used again and again as norm by the people of the New Testament. About the Jews of Berea we are told, "they searched the Scriptures daily whether those things preached by Paul were so." The proof taken from prophecy and fulfillment that played such a great role in the New Testament age presupposes the fact that Scripture is the decisive norm for all preaching and teaching. We stated advisedly that Scripture is the source and norm of religious doctrine and saving faith; not in order to take back what we said about the inerrancy of Scripture in the preceding, but in order to emphasize the purpose for which Scripture has been given. It does not intend to convey information of every sort to the Church, but only such elements of knowledge that make wise unto salvation. It is the religious standpoint from which Scripture must be viewed and judged. All other items of knowledge are subordinate to saving knowledge.

Because of the interpenetration of the divine and the human elements Scripture as the re-presentation (*Vergegenwaertigung*) of divine revelation, and in view of the purpose for which Scripture is given, possesses the attribute of perspicuity, that is to say, it is the clear and perspicuous Word of God. This point must be emphasized over against the Roman Catholic doctrine that Scripture is obscure and ambiguous, that, therefore, the church

fathers, tradition and the popes are needed as the necessary and the only dependable interpreters of Scripture—whereby these factors, especially the Pope as the inspired mouthpiece of the Church is actually raised again to a position higher than Scripture. The perspicuity of Scripture cannot be disproved by reference to Acts 8:31, because the literal sense of Isaiah 53 was understood by the Ethiopian, but he wanted to know to whom this prophecy pointed and in whom it finds its fulfillment. Nor can the reference to the various interpretations of the Words of Institution or to II Peter 3:16 disprove the perspicuity. The Words of Institution offer no difficulty for the literal understanding; the difficulties arise only then when the reader approaches them with certain philosophical or otherwise rational presuppositions which hinder the literal understanding. And in II Peter 3:16 it is true, Peter admits that among those points which Paul treated in his letters (we have to read ἐν οἷς among those points, not ἐν αἷς in which letters) there are some that are difficult to understand (f. i. Rom. 5:20 where sin abounded, grace did much more abound), but he also adds for whom they are difficult to understand, namely for those who are unlearned and unstable and ready to distort them. No, the Scriptures are clear and perspicuous *per se*; their perspicuity is the basis and presupposition for all exegetical work in the Church. But this perspicuity must be rightly understood. It will not do to cite Luther's well known discussion of the clearness and simplicity of the Christmas Gospel and generalize that and apply it to the whole of Scripture. All of us in reading the Bible or in doing exegetical work have met with puzzles whose solution we did not find easy. For Gal. 3:20 more than 400 different shades of exposition have been counted. The perspicuity of Scripture is a growing thing and here John 16:13 with its promise, "The Spirit will lead you into all truth," is to be applied. It is a fact that the Church did not from the very beginning understand every phase of Scripture, but during the course of history, under the guidance of God, the meaning of Scriptures *becomes* ever plainer and clearer. Centuries passed and St. Paul was not understood, and Luther himself had read his Bible for years, being certainly an honest seeker after truth, and did not find the right understanding of Rom. 1:17 with its term δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ, until God Himself opened his eyes. If the Church continues faithfully to ponder the Word of God, if it makes ever more complete use of all auxiliary branches of study (such as grammar, lexicography, history, etc.), and if it makes moral progress, then the Spirit will lead the Church in corresponding measure, but in His own time, into the comprehension of Scripture, often in opposition to errors that may arise from time to time. The sin of man not seldom works as a barrier, obscuring what is clear *per se*. That is the reason why we mentioned also progress in sanctification as one means that might

accelerate the process. Furthermore, the exegetical work must be done according to proper principles: 1. Each passage has but one sense or meaning, the *sensus literalis*, and it is our task to discover this sense with the aid of grammar and dictionary, through a reconstruction of the historical situation with all its psychological possibilities, and by careful observation of the context; 2. The individual passage is to be considered in the light of the whole Bible, because Scripture is its own interpreter; 3. Obscure passages are to be interpreted in the light of the clear ones dealing with the same truth; 4. The sum total of the perspicuous passages is to be, as it were, the guardian of truth so that a disagreement between individual exegetical results in explaining an obscure passage and this sum total is an indication that the divinely intended sense of the respective passage has not yet been discovered. This last rule which is really a specification of the second we find applied, f. i., when the Formula of Concord refutes the thesis of Flacius that original sin belongs to the essence of fallen man. Here the Formula proves the untenability of the thesis by showing that it is in conflict with the doctrine of creation, incarnation, sanctification and the final resurrection.

What has been said so far indicates that not seldom the understanding of Scripture by the Church and here again, especially by those who have been called upon to interpret Scripture precedes the understanding by the individual members. To concede that, is not Romanism, it is only the statement of a fact, and long experience of the Church; it becomes Romanism, however, when it exempts the individual from the duty, the right, and the privilege of studying Scripture independently, and when it denies the ability of the Christian to study Scripture independently. In reference to the prophesying in the congregation of the Thessalonians Paul admonishes the members "Prove all things, hold fast that which is good," and Wilhelm Loehe put this as a motto under his pulpit, both expressing and stressing thereby the hearers' ability as well as their duty to examine the preached word whether it be true to Scripture. So far we had in mind Christians already instructed in the fundamentals of Scripture; the same can not be said of non-Christians who were never made acquainted with the fundamental Biblical truths. Although we do not deny that now and then a heathen soul can find the way of life by mere Bible reading without the help of any spoken word of the preacher or missionary or Christian layman, this is certainly not the rule but an exception. Therefore, we Lutherans do not believe that distribution of the Bible among non-Christians is the better part of missionary work. We mention that, only to show the necessity of guarding our thesis of the perspicuity of the Bible against a wrong understanding. And yet the fault is not with the Bible, it is perspicuous *per se*, but with man and his

sin. In the end the Church of God will learn that by the grace of God the meaning of Scripture has been ever more fully disclosed. The last book of the New Testament will then be understood as was the Epistle to the Romans during the time of the Reformation, and in eternity even the last exegetical riddle will be solved.

Finally, by virtue of that unique cooperation of God and man, by which Scripture became the Word of God, it possesses as permanent characteristic also *sufficiencia*. Instead of *sufficiencia* sometimes the term *perfectio* is used. It is better not to use it, because it is so often misunderstood. Indeed, Charles Porterfield Krauth years ago published an admirable essay "The Bible, a perfect Book," entirely free from any vestige of these misunderstandings. In 1638, however, the theological and philosophical faculty of the University of Wittenberg had to examine a writing published at Hamburg which conceded that in the New Testament Greek there were some linguistic barbarisms. What opinion did the revered and learned faculty voice regarding this? It said: "Whoever charges Holy Scripture with a single barbarism, is guilty of a by no means insignificant blasphemy." And about 40 years later Quenstedt wrote: *Stylus Novi Testamenti ab omni barbarismorum et soloecismorum labe immunis est*. And Hollaz ascribed the *perfectio* even to the textus receptus claiming that it contained nothing but the original reading: *Advigilante provida Dei cura canon biblicus in verbis omnibus et singulis adeo illibatus et purus conservatus est, ut neque Iudaeorum malitia textus hebraicus Veteris Testamenti sit depravatus, neque textus Graecus Novi Testamenti haereticorum perfidia falsatus neque descriptorum incuria aut inscitia textus originalis in omnibus exemplis corruptus sit*. You understand why I prefer to speak of *sufficiencia* rather than of *perfectio*.

From the manner in which the New Testament builds upon the Old it is apparent that Jesus considers the Old Testament as the sufficient foundation until His own revelation set in. He quoted the Old Testament, but not once any of the many traditions in circulation among the Jews. The canon of the Old Testament sufficed for His purpose. Should not the same hold true concerning the New Testament? The New Testament, however, not without the Old which together form one organic whole. The attacks upon the Old Testament, now so fierce in Germany, and the readiness of so-called Christians to give up the Old Testament and to be content with the New is dangerous. The whole Scripture, Old and New Testament together, is sufficient for the Church's mission of leading the world into fellowship with God, and it is sufficient to assure its own continued existence; for whatever religious problems may arise, Scripture will provide an answer—though only for religious problems, because the religious field alone is its province; other problems may be solved by science. Scripture is also sufficient for the individual Christian:

it offers him enough light, so that he can find the way to the Father; but if he independently studies the Bible he should not despise nor ignore the assured results of the Church's theological scholarship, although it is to be used with discrimination. Adding the word of tradition or new revelations to Scripture is superfluous; more yet, to wait for new revelations militates against the all-sufficiency of Scripture; we must rather, in the light of Scripture, examine everything that claims to be a new revelation, as to its truth and correctness, precisely as Christ and the apostles demonstrated the truth of their revelations by a comparison with the Old Testament Scripture.

Scripture is not a dead record but a living testimony with the power to give life. Ihmels and Haussleiter emphasized this. In the connection in which they stressed it it did not help us much, but now this observation is to come into its own. The old dogmaticians mentioned as the fourth *affectio Scripturae* its *efficacia*. When we speak of the *efficacia verbi*, we think primarily of the spoken or preached word, and Scripture, as a rule, ascribes the *efficacia* also to the spoken word; so did Luther and the Augsburg Confession. The form of this Confession of May 30th makes this especially clear by quoting as proof Rom. 10:17: "So then faith cometh by hearing and hearing by the Word of God." Contrasting the word read in the Mass and the preached word Luther once even said: "The devil does not care about the written word, but when it is preached he flees." And yet to Luther Scripture is a means of grace, as he repeatedly emphasized. Scripture and experience testify to that. In II Tim. 3:16 it is the written word of the Old Testament to which Paul refers and "it is able to make wise unto salvation and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works," and in the Psalms we find similar statements concerning the written word. Experience confirms this, for how often did meditation upon the written word bring comfort, peace, strength! In conceding this we do not take back what we formerly said about the circulation of Bibles as a sufficient means of missionary activity.

II

The divine origin of Scripture is a fact well established by Scripture itself. But how can we become subjectively certain of this fact? It is indeed, a good thing if one is trained from childhood in this belief. Happy is he who had teachers who did not make him uncertain in this belief. And yet all this might be no more than a purely intellectual conviction, no more than a bowing down before outward authorities, no more than *fides humana*. We repeat, we think by no means little of such a recognition of and assent to outward authorities, especially not be-

cause Scripture itself is one of these authorities, the only and the most authoritative one of all. But now we want to know how we can become subjectively, inwardly, in heart and conscience certain about the divine origin of Scripture. There is too much purely intellectual knowledge about it, too much is merely *fides humana*; and this does not stand the test in time of tribulation, at least it does not make the heart happy and glad and firm in the midst of trial and sorrow. How do we become subjectively, inwardly certain of the divine origin of Scripture?—this is, therefore, our question.

Melanchthon introduced into the dogmatics of our Church a number of "*indicia*" or "*testimonia*" of the trustworthiness of the Christian doctrine and the divine origin of Scripture upon which this doctrine is based. Most of the later dogmaticians followed him in this. So the *Catechesis* of David Chytraeus published originally in 1554 and much enlarged since 1575—next to Melanchthon's *Loci* the most used book on dogmatics in all the Latin schools of Germany; I have traced not less than 95 Latin editions between 1554 and 1611, that means nearly two editions for every year. It asks the question: *Quae est causa certitudinis in doctrina Christiana?* and after having answered: *Causa certitudinis est autoritas et patefactio divina, quae extat in libris prophetarum et Apostolorum*, it goes on with this question: *Quod autem sola haec doctrina sit vera, certa et divina testantur?* And not less than eight *testimonia* are mentioned: 1. *Miracula, quibus sola doctrina Christiana confirmata est*; 2. *Universalis experientia omnium piorum*; 3. *Antiquitas*; 4. *Vaticinia illustrata*; 5. *Ipsum genus doctrinae patefaciens arcana et ignota humanae rationi*; 6. *Miranda conservatio ecclesiae*; 7. *Odiūm diaboli adversus hanc doctrinam*; 8. *Series doctorum et instauratorum doctrinae continua inde usque ab initio generis humani*. Since then for centuries hardly a single dogmatical work was published without a chapter on these *indicia* or *testimonia*. When Loeber in 1711 published his popular dogmatics under the title: *Die Lehre der Wahrheit zur Gottseligkeit*—re-published in America by Walther in 1872—he counted not less than ten such *testimonia* for the divine origin of Scripture. We mention the *sufficientia et sanctitas Scripturae*; 2. *Stili simplicitas cum gravitate coniuncta*; 3. *Antiquitas*; 4. the prophecies and their fulfillment; 5. the miracles; 6. the expansion of Christianity into the whole world; 7. the martyrs who gave their life for the truth of the Scriptures, etc. Loeber concedes these *testimonia* are hardly convincing when taken separately, each for itself, but he maintains when they are taken together they constitute an absolutely reliable proof for the divine origin of Scripture. Here we cannot follow. We do not say, these testi-

monies are without value. In my own popular book *The Book of Life* the reader will find paragraphs setting forth the following statements: 1. The Bible taken as a collection of so many books is the oldest of books; 2. The Bible is the most persecuted of books; 3. The Bible is the most widely distributed of all books; 4. The Bible is the most significant of books answering those questions upon which all in life and death depends, so clearly and simply; 5. The Bible is the most uniform of books forming a wonderful unity although written in the course of 1500 years; 6. The Bible is the most efficacious of books. But in the same connection I also stressed the truth that all these facts can make no one inwardly certain of the divine origin of the Scriptures; they prove the superiority of the Bible over all other books, but not its divine origin. They produce a readiness of the soul to read that Book and listen to its message, but not more. They may perhaps create a *fides humana*, an intellectual conviction of the divinity of Scripture, but not that inward unshakable certainty about it.

This certainty cannot be created by any rational consideration. It cannot be created otherwise than as the subjective certainty of the truth of Christianity in general into whose province it belongs. And how is such certainty brought about? Certainly not by means of scientific investigations. For in that case only they who are able to engage in such investigations could attain to such certainty.

Is this really an evangelical thesis? Would it not, finally, lead to an intolerable dependence of the Christian layman and most of the pastors and leaders in the Church upon the work of a few? Can we forget how forcefully Luther once warned against building the certainty of truth upon the authority of the Church? Every certainty built alone upon these foundations will not hold when needed most. Luther said, "If you are at the point of death and have no other certainty than the pope and the councils and say, this is spoken by the pope and decreed by the councils, the holy fathers, Augustine, Ambrose have decided thus, then the devil immediately will strike a hole into your faith and ask you, 'what, if that is not true? what if they have erred?' As soon as such temptation befalls you, you already are overcome." Would Luther not say the same against a papacy of science? And I firmly believe even the scientific man is helpless in the critical hour if his certainty does not rest upon a better foundation than his own investigations. I am afraid that in the face of death he would not be able to marshal all his scientific findings in the unbroken sequence in which alone he formerly considered them an invulnerable proof. Furthermore, the certainty of which we speak is a religious certainty; is it possible to arrive

- at religious certainty in any other way than in the religious? Does not scientific investigation belong to an entirely different sphere? If I really had arrived at the certainty of the trustworthiness of the Scripture by way of strict historical investigation would that really help me? The certainty (upon which everything depends) that in that history related by Scripture *God* has opened His heart, revealed His will and stretches out His hand toward me to take me to His heart—that certainty can never be gained by scientific research. Only when *God* Himself stoops down to me, moves my heart, convinces my soul of His reality, His holy love, His gracious will, does He create in me that faith which trusts His word and depends upon it alone. Ask any of those who have come, let me say, from their theoretical unbelief to the certainty of the truth, how that happened. They will all answer, "Not that we laid aside step by step our former scientific convictions and arrived step by step purely intellectually at the truth; but truth came upon us when we did not expect it, *God* who is truth personified got hold of us and led us into truth." In Jer. 20:7 we find a strange word: "Thou hast deceived me and I was deceived; Thou art stronger than I and hast prevailed"; it is to be understood from the personal situation in which the prophet was at that time, but take it in a more general sense and it expresses exactly what happens when *God* comes upon man and convinces him of the truth. Such a man can afterward say, "Thou hast persuaded me, and I was persuaded; Thou hast been too strong for me and hast prevailed." Now we repeat: we arrive at the subjective certainty of the divine origin of the Bible in the same way in which one attains to the certainty of Christian truth.

It is Scripture itself by means of which this certainty is given, or, it is Christ and His Spirit working through the written or oral word who creates it in man. We don't have to wait until our own investigations or those of others concerning the genuineness of this or that part of Scripture or concerning the history of the canon or the efforts at solving this or that exegetical problem have come to a successful end. All that is necessary is to hear and read the Word and to abide by it. We do not know when the Spirit begins His work on the individual soul (Augsburg Confession, art. 5), but we know that He works by means of the Word and we have the promise that He is all willingness to work faith in all who hear the Word. In His own time and place He works through the Word in such a manner that we know and experience: now we are confronted with *God*, the Most High. To withstand the Word is to withstand *God* and His Spirit. As Jacob after that wonderful dream could say, "Surely, the Lord is in this place and I knew it not, How dreadful is this place! this is none other than the house of *God*, and

this is the gate of heaven," so the soul knows in that hour: it is God with whom I am dealing, and the conscience confirms it in an unmistakable way. This consonance of the voice of conscience and the voice of God speaking through the Word makes it still more impossible not to recognize the divine voice. The soul, of course, can resist the voice of God and the voice of conscience, but it cannot deny that it was dealing with God. The voice of God was the voice of the Law and possibly also of the Gospel. In case it was the spoken Word of God, as is usual, which man heard, he then finds the same word in Scripture, and when he reads it the message has the same effect upon him. That makes him sure, inwardly certain: it is God's word that here speaks to me. At first, this is only a certainty of the divine character of the words which he heard and read. But now he begins to perceive that other parts of Scripture have, in spite of all differences, the same message, Law and Gospel, and exercise the same power and influence; he begins to see and experience the fact that Scripture is a living organism in which all parts are closely connected and share in this divine life from their center out into their farthest periphery. Furthermore, as a believer he is a member in the great communion, the Christian Church of all ages, his fellow believers all have had this experience, and the individual does not wonder that the extent of their experience is wider than his own. His partial experience is proof to him for the authenticity of their wider experience, and so in growing measure he becomes inwardly certain: Here is truth, divine truth, the Bible as a whole is the Word of God.

But our question was not, how do we become subjectively certain of the divine truth of Scripture? but how do we become subjectively certain of the *origin*, the divine origin of the Scriptures. And yet, the result at which we arrived is by no means without value for finding the answer to the question about the origin of Scripture. If the whole of Scripture is full of divine life, should it then have come into existence without the exercise of this life? But more than that. If we have become certain of the fact that Scripture is the book of divine truth, why should it not be true in that which it testifies about its own origin? If it is true and trustworthy when it says, "Thou art the sinner and must face God's wrath and condemnation" or, "Here is Christ, the Risen One, in Him alone is salvation,"—and as Christians we have experienced that it is true—why should it not be true when it says, "The prophets were driven by the Holy Ghost and spoke ἀπὸ θεοῦ," or, "Paul and his co-workers have spoken in words taught by the Spirit," or, "All Scripture is θεόπνευστος," or, "The Scripture cannot be broken?" The question about the truth of the Bible is not identical with the question about its

divine origin, but by proving the first we immediately prove the second; our subjective certainty about the divine origin of Scripture is based upon and given with our subjective certainty about the truth of the Bible. One follows the other of inner necessity.

I hope no one will understand what we here said about the subjective certainty of Biblical truth and the divine origin of the Bible so hopelessly wrong as if we belonged to those that think the contents of the Bible are not to be considered as truth before we have gained that subjective certainty. No, our experience neither adds anything to nor takes away anything from the Bible. It stood there in all its beauty and splendor, trustworthiness and absolute authority long before our experience. But something might be true centuries before it becomes true for me. However over against the legalistic idea: here is the Bible; it is a code of doctrine that must be recognized by all as the jurist recognizes the statutes of the state, we ask, "Is there not also an evangelical approach to the Bible by which we can become inwardly certain of its truth?" And to this question we find the answer in what we said. And against that superficial merely intellectual assent to the Bible which is so frequent among us we emphasize the necessity of becoming inwardly certain of its objective truth. Many fight for the Bible who never have become subjectively certain and are not becoming subjectively certain of it more and more. Nor do we think little of the written Word, as if any one could do without it after having made the inner experience of its truth. The Church at large needs the written Word. The Church was founded by means of revelation. Just as a kingdom can be preserved only by the same means by which it was established, so here either continuous revelation would have been necessary or its continuous presentation in literary form. Nor can the Church permanently remain in fellowship with Christ unless its faith is nourished from Scripture and its life and teaching corrected according to the norm of Scripture. Also the individual Christian needs the written word. He would not be able to persevere in affliction unless he possessed a firm objective assurance and undoubted, documentary evidence of God's good and gracious will. In the hour of trial mere subjective experience is insufficient. A believer who does not reflect may for a while be satisfied with his happy experience of salvation in Christ. But when, in the time of trial, the feeling of God's gracious presence vanishes, when we are compelled to inquire about the ultimate ground of our state of grace and after definite assurance of our salvation, then we need some objective reality, something absolutely independent of vacillating emotions, something on which we can stand and which will offer a safe refuge. Such objective realities are the means of grace, the spoken word, Baptism, the Lord's Supper, and the written

Word of God, namely Scripture. Even the spoken word of absolution, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, in turn, however, can be such firm realities only, if they are divinely instituted and if the Spirit testifies to me, that Scripture which relates their institution, is reliable ground, created by God Himself, that it is the Word of God itself.

NOTE: In *Luther and the Scripture* (Lutheran Book Concern, Columbus, O., Wartburg Publishing House, 2018 Calumet Avenue, Chicago, Ill.) the author shows that the position taken by him in this pamphlet is in full consonance with Luther's standpoint. Compare also his *Luther's German Bible*. (Columbus, 1934).

Can We Still Hold to the
**LUTHERAN DOCTRINE
OF THE LORD'S SUPPER**

CAN WE STILL HOLD TO THE LUTHERAN DOCTRINE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER?

When we are about to study the meaning of the Lord's Supper, we stand, as it were, before the "Holy of Holies" of our faith and we hear a voice saying, "Put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground." Therefore, sorrow fills our hearts when we realize that modern exponents of exegetical and historical criticism have laid violent hands on this sacred mystery of our faith and tried to rob it of the very elements which have made it holy and sublime for us. Despite the fact that Luther differed fundamentally from Zwingli and Calvin in his conception of the Lord's Supper, they nevertheless agreed with Him that it was instituted by Christ Himself as an institution to be observed again and again by His disciples. The dispute was not as to the historic origin of this sacrament, but as to its meaning. This, however, is the main consideration in modern research on this subject: whether the Lord's Supper is really an institution established by Christ Himself, or merely the result of a gradual development resting upon a misconception of the farewell meal of Jesus with His disciples and his whole teaching, and strongly influenced by heathen beliefs and rituals. It is true, not all critics go as far as Ditlef Nielsen, a Danish writer, in his book *Der dreieinige Gott in religionshistorischer Beleuchtung* (1922) where in I, 145 he calls the Lord's Supper *ein Stueck klotzigen Heidentums*, which the church has dragged along. But this is a widely accepted theory, that principal features of our present celebration of the Lord's Supper and our Lutheran doctrine concerning it go back to heathen thoughts and customs and smack strongly of that origin. It follows, therefore, that our discussion must first consider the origin of the Lord's Supper before studying its meaning.

I

Schleiermacher in his *Glaubenslehre*, chapter 139, section 3, had already thrown out the question whether the Lord's Supper

as we celebrate it today is, in its principal features, really the same as the farewell supper which the Lord had with His disciples, and whether one can really say that Christ gave the command that this supper should be repeated. It is strange that these statements or questions were entirely overlooked. At least, neither during Schleiermacher's lifetime nor in the decades that followed did any one challenge these statements.

Several years later David Friedrich Strauss in his *Leben Jesu* (first edition 1836, I, 396 ff.) declared that the command of Jesus to repeat His supper is unauthentic, and, therefore, he also denied that there is any connection between the Lord's Supper and His death, since it was impossible that Jesus would have foreseen His death with such certainty. Bruno Bauer in his *Kritik der evangelischen Geschichte* in 1842 maintained, "A real human being living in flesh and blood does not think of offering his body and his blood to others to eat and to drink; therefore, the account given by Mark and the other apostles is pure fancy" (III, 241). E. Renan in 1863 in his *Life of Jesus* (pp. 385 ff.) declared that what according to the Synoptic accounts was considered a sacramental supper, in reality was nothing more than a common evening meal of Jesus with His disciples. But the gulf between Strauss, Bauer and Renan on the one hand, and the church on the other, was so deep that their assumptions concerning the Lord's Supper did not disturb many. Along with them there went a throng of such who did not doubt that the Lord's Supper was instituted by Christ and was meant to be a permanent holy rite. The point in which they differed was not the question of the origin of the Lord's Supper but the question of its meaning.

This situation, however, was entirely changed during the last decade of the 19th century and the first decades of the twentieth. In 1891 Adolf Harnack published his investigation, *Brot und Wasser: die eucharistischen Elemente bei Justin*. Here he declared that the supper of Jesus on that night with His disciples, as well as the celebration of the Lord's Supper by the Early Church, were simply intended as a consecration of necessary functions of human existence, namely of eating and drinking. In 1893 W. Brandt of Amsterdam wrote, *Die evangelische Geschichte und der Ursprung des Christentums*. Here he stated that the command to repeat this supper as well as its relation to the sacrificial death of Christ were merely later interpolations and the original supper had been only a fellowship meal. In the same year there followed Spitta's thorough investigation of *Die*

urchristlichen Traditionen ueber Ursprung und Sinn des Abendmahls. To Spitta, Jesus' command to repeat the supper is unhistorical; the thought of Christ's suffering being connected with the supper he declares to be only a secondary element; the real essence of the first supper he sees in its eschatological character and brings a wealth of material to prove this. In the prophetic and in the apocalyptic literature, in the Septuagint and in the rabbinical literature, Spitta maintains, the consummation of the Kingdom is found in the Messianic meal in which the Messiah Himself is the meal that is eaten. On the basis of this idea Jesus could presuppose that the disciples would understand Him when He urged them by the participation in the supper to partake of Himself. The supper in the night when He was betrayed was an anticipation of the great eschatological Messianic meal, and its present repetition by the church is likewise such an anticipation. When in the following year, in 1894, Prof. A. Grafe at the third "Vacation course for pastors" at Bonn reported concerning the most recent investigations concerning the original celebration of the Lord's Supper and identified himself with their results, a mighty storm of indignation arose against him, but it was impossible to check the movement and it dominated the following decades in Germany and Scandinavia, found support in England and France and, at least in one point, was championed in America with greater cock-sureness than anywhere else. Not the question concerning the meaning of the Lord's Supper but concerning its origin was the focus of interest.

If I see correctly, then, there were three factors that worked together and made this question acute. The first one was the conviction that in our four Gospels we do not possess a trustworthy rendering of the words and actions of Jesus but only a rendering of them as they lived in the consciousness of the second and third Christian generation, in the years of about 70-140. The second factor was the wide-spread assumption of a decided contradistinction between Jesus and Paul and of the fact that the original picture of Jesus had been strongly changed by the Pauline theology. The third factor was the rise and reign of the school of the history of religions within theology.

The first factor, fraught with the most baneful consequences, did not consist in careful comparison of texts, which endeavors to establish the original text of the Biblical writings by careful comparison of the codices and manuscripts, the old translations and the quotations of the Church Fathers, but it was conjectural or "higher" critique, something essentially different. Here one

does not want to establish the original text, but to find the thoughts and words that lie behind this text. What we find in Matthew, Mark, Luke as the original text must by no means be a correct rendering of what Jesus has said and done. It is perhaps only the last stage of a development which has already run through two or three stages and may have experienced various changes. The text that has come down to us and is established in accordance with the recognized canons of sound text critique can be compared with a picture which has been painted over and over again. Here we must often remove carefully two or three layers until the original appears in its full splendor. However, there is this baneful difference, that with a picture these layers really exist and can be removed, and that behind them the original really exists, while here, after a period of nearly 2000 years, these layers can be assumed, and by the removal of these assumed layers the critic presumes to lay bare what he calls the original.

It is evident how much is left to the subjective imagination of the critic and how, for that very reason, the results cannot be more than poor guesses. Certainties can never be established that way. The results to which such a method may lead can be seen in a statement made by Professor W. Bousset of Goettingen. He said: "What we possess in our present Gospels of doubtlessly genuine words of Jesus can be written upon a single octavo leaf." Do we then need to wonder that the Berlin historian, Eduard Meyer, in 1921, in his work *Ursprung und Anfaenge des Christentums* (I, 179) writes as follows: "It is most questionable whether any of the words ascribed to Jesus by the Synoptic accounts concerning the Lord's Supper are historical and authentic"? And in what degree subjective arbitrariness produces decision in these investigations can be seen by the reasons that Meyer gives for his assumptions. He says: "Because the thought that the congregation by the eating and drinking of bread and wine in the fellowship agape-meal enters into an immediate association with Christ, into a mystical or magical communion, and thus in reality partakes of His body and blood, this *could* never have been said by Christ Himself, least of all at a meal in which He Himself was still present bodily and took part."

The second factor that helped to arouse the question concerning the origin of the Lord's Supper was the wide-spread conviction of the strong contradistinction between Jesus and Paul. It is wellknown that Professor Ferdinand Christian Baur of Tuebingen already in 1845 had powerfully emphasized this disagreement. In his pioneer work of that year *Paulus, der Apostel Jesu Christi* he had written: "It is an undeniable fact

that only through Paul has Christianity become the universal religion as we know it today." But the new feature introduced by Paul in contradistinction to the Gospel of Peter consisted, according to Baur, only in the universality of Christianity. It is true, this differentiation between Jesus and Paul in the following decades was occasionally widened, but only since 1900 did it enter a new phase and become of fundamental importance. In 1903 Hermann Gunkel published his book: *Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Verstaendnis des Neuen Testaments*. The title shows that here the second and third factor mentioned above converge, and just in this union they unfolded their detrimental power. The last decade of the 19th century and the first of the twentieth had brought us the first philological-historical investigations concerning the relation between the Christianity of the first three centuries and the religions outside the Christian Church. In 1889 there appeared *Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen* by the Bonner philologist Hermann Usener concerning *das Weihnachtsfest*; in 1894 followed Erwin Rhode's *Psyche, Seelenkult und Unsterblichkeitsglaube der Griechen*; since 1899 the Belgian writer Franz Cumont wrote his investigations concerning "The Mysteries of Mythra" and the *Orientalischen Religionen im roemischen Heidentum*; the years 1891-1903 saw the publications of Albrecht Dietrich: *Abraxas, Studien zur Religionsgeschichte des spaeteren Aeltertums, Nekyia, Beitrage zur Erklaerung der neuentdeckten Petrusapokalypse*, and his *Mythrasliturgie*; since 1904 the important investigations by Richard Reitzenstein have been published: *Poimandres, Studien zur griechisch-aegyptischen fruehchristlichen Literatur, Hellenistische Wundererzaehlungen*, and *Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen*; in 1913 Eduard Norden wrote his *Agnostos Theos*, later (1924) followed by *Die Geburt des Kindes*, while Paul Wendland in 1907 summarized the results gained up to that time in his book *Die hellenistisch-roemische Kultur in ihren Beziehungen zu Judentum und Christentum*.

Influenced by these investigations concerning the history of religions made by representatives of classical philology, there arose in the church the so-called *Religionsgeschichtliche Schule* which maintained that not so much the message of Jesus as the theology of Paul came into existence only by means of a deep-going and widely-expanded influx of thoughts from the ancient religions outside of Christianity. Hermann Gunkel, in the book mentioned above, blazed the trail. He said: "When a scholar of the Old Testament reads the Synoptic accounts he soon feels at home in them. Here reigns a spirit well-known to him from

the noblest of the prophets; very little of the teachings of Jesus sounds strange to him; only Jesus' eschatology and his teachings concerning the resurrection are to be excepted. Of an entirely different nature, however, is the greater part of the remaining New Testament, especially the writings of Paul and John. Here the Old Testament scholar, step for step, meets doctrines for which he has no analogies whatsoever and which he cannot understand historically. With Jesus everything is centered around an ethical imperative, with Paul the center is a belief in a system of redeeming facts happening in heaven and happening on earth. Here one meets concepts such as regeneration, divine sonship in the metaphysical sense, propitiation by the death of Christ, mystical union of Christ and His church, creation of the world by Christ and similar doctrines. From whence, Gunkel asks, did these new thoughts come into Christianity? Not through the historical Jesus nor through His original disciples. They flowed in during the second and third generation. It was especially Paul through whom this new spirit came into Christianity. And from whence did Paul receive it? From the oriental gnosis. The thought-world of the gnosis streamed into Paul and by him was connected with the figure of Jesus. Christianity is a syncretistic religion. Strong religious motives originating in the religious world of those days, the oriental as well as the hellenistic, were adopted, clarified and deepened. The thought-world of Jesus is only one root of Christianity. It became universal religion only through amalgamation with the ripest fruits of the oriental and occidental religions. By this process of assimilation it reached the necessary climax in the development of the human mind. It is Paul who performed this transformation of Christianity. Gunkel's trail was followed by Brueckner, Wrede, Bousset and others. M. Brueckner published his *Entstehung der paulinischen Christologie* in the same year and explained the difference between the historical Jesus and the Christ of Paul by the fact that Paul applied the myth of the dying and rising divine savior in the oriental religions to Jesus. William Wrede maintained in his *Paulus* in 1905 that Paul, already before his conversion, had a detailed Messiah-idea, which after his conversion he applied to Jesus and so received a Messiah picture that had very little in common with the original Jesus of history. Its roots were Jewish dreams and speculations, as a comparison with the Psalms of Solomon, the symbols of the Book of Enoch, the fourth Ezra, the apocalypsis of Baruch and the Testaments of the twelve Patriarchs makes evident. So

Wrede could call Paul "the second founder of the Christian religion" and hold that he exercised greater influence than the first. The boldest and most comprehensive attempt, however, to explain Paul and Early Christianity upon the basis of the history of religions was made in 1913 by W. Bousset at Goettingen by his book "Κύριος Χριστός." But it is beyond my task to delineate its contents. My only interest is to emphasize the nearly absolute reign of these three factors in the time between 1890-1910, without which the question about the origin of the Lord's Supper would hardly have arisen at all and certainly would not have gained such momentum. Since for the majority of the New Testament exegetes of this period it was a matter of course to go behind the transmitted text and reconstruct the original, why should they not have done the same as far as the transmitted texts concerning the Lord's Supper came into consideration? Since the assumption of a contradistinction between Jesus and Paul was considered a historical fact, why should it then be unnatural to expect such a disagreement regarding the Lord's Supper? And finally, since the whole Pauline Christianity came into existence not without a strong influx of elements belonging to the Jewish or oriental-hellenistic world of religious thought, why should the celebration of the Lord's Supper have kept itself free from such influences?

Wilhelm Heitmüller, at that time still *Privatdozent* at Goettingen, later Professor at Marburg, Bonn and Tuebingen, in 1903 published his book: *Taufe und Abendmahl bei Paulus*. Here we find the first determined application of the three factors mentioned before regarding the question concerning the Lord's Supper. For that reason we devote relatively much time to a detailed study of his view, but in such a way that we turn our attention first to the last meal that Jesus held with His disciples and then to the Lord's Supper as it was celebrated in the Pauline congregations, although these two cannot be kept absolutely separate.

Heitmüller takes his departure from the "sources," that is, the four accounts of the Lord's Supper in I Cor. 11:23-25; Mark 14:22-25; Matt. 26:26-29; Luke 22:15-20, but immediately calls our attention to the fact that the so-called longer form of Luke is hardly original, but of a later date, originating in the endeavor to assimilate Luke with Paul, and that the so-called short form, which omits v. 19b and 20, as we find it in Codex D and a few minuscule, is to be considered the original text of Luke. Since Mark and Matthew are very closely related to each other we would have to distinguish three lines in the transmitted

texts: 1. Paul; 2. Mark-Matthew; 3. Luke. Methodically nothing can be said against this, although it is true that today a few writers still maintain the originality of the longer form of Luke. Since we have three accounts, it is also methodically correct to raise the question which one of the three reports the words and acts of Jesus in instituting the Lord's Supper with the greatest detail and trustworthiness; it is the duty of the careful exegete to raise this question. But Heitmueller has hardly designated these three accounts as "sources" and made the impression upon the reader that we have firm ground underfoot, when he immediately erects a warning signal by adding the assertion that the accounts of the institution of the Lord's Supper as we have them today, strictly speaking, are not accounts of what really happened during that meal, but accounts of the way in which the Lord's Supper was understood and celebrated in the circle of the readers of that time. Because, as far as the Synoptic accounts of that last meal come into consideration, they are on the same level as the Synoptic Gospels as a whole. Concerning these, however, "deep-digging" investigation has shown beyond the shadow of a doubt that they are not to be considered historical accounts in our modern sense, but only testimonials made by faith in the service of mission and edification. They reflect Jesus' words and acts in that form in which they were alive in the second and third generation, not seldom changed by the theology of their day. They are "aetiological cult-reports" written for the purpose of showing the reason (αἰτία) for the celebration of this holy rite in the midst of the congregation. To take them as historical accounts of what happened on that evening would contradict their real nature.

Heitmueller then goes to work immediately to find his way from the transmitted accounts back to that which Jesus really said and did in that night among His disciples. According to the Synoptic accounts and their context Jesus instituted His meal in connection with the Passover-meal, and this is right from the start of no small importance for its understanding. According to Heitmueller, however, such a connection was impossible. It is excluded, he says, not principally because the Fourth Gospel (John 18:28; 19:14. 31) says the Passover-meal was eaten not on the day before Jesus' death, but on the very day of His death. This statement of John does not weigh much with Heitmueller, because the author of that Gospel apparently wants to design Jesus as the true Passover-lamb and therefore cannot be absolutely trusted concerning the dates given. The principal reason

for Heitmueller is the improbability, or rather the impossibility, that imprisonment, hearing, the whole legal process and condemnation of Jesus took place during that most holy Passover-night and his execution on the first day of the Passover week, held holy as a Sabbathday. To that Heitmueller adds a number of other observations. The passage in the Pauline account: "In the night when He was betrayed." Was it Passover-night, why does Paul not say so? Even the Synoptic account in its oldest form with Mark according to Heitmueller still shows traces of a former and different relation. According to Mark 14:2 they wanted to avoid doing away with Jesus on the day of the feast-day. This is apparently the oldest tradition. According to Mark 15:21 Simon the Cyrenian came from the field; he had apparently worked in his field, which was impossible on the first Passover-day. In all accounts, Heitmueller goes on, we read: Jesus took "bread" (ἄρτος), with the Passover-meal, however, unleavened bread (ἄζυμα) was in use. If Jesus' meal was a Passover-meal why did Paul not use the prescribed term? Finally, the section Mark 14:12-16 that speaks of the preparation of the Passover-meal is, in our present text, in no wise connected either with the preceding or with the following and is, therefore, to be regarded as a later interpolation. Thus, Heitmueller says, the original account of Mark did not know at all of a connection between the Passover-meal and the meal that Jesus held with His disciples, and the text itself of this meal of Jesus does not contain an indication of such a connection. All the evaluations of the meal of Jesus, rich and valuable as they may be, based upon the supposed connection between the Passover-meal and the last meal of Jesus, especially the idea that Jesus' death was a sacrifice for our sins and that the Lord's Supper is a sacramental meal in which the fruit of His death is offered to his believers—these evaluations are, therefore, without foundation; at least they cannot be truly based upon this connection.

Now we come to the words and acts of Jesus spoken and performed by Him in connection with that last meal. What part of them is without doubt to be considered historical? Heitmueller says, the passage Mark 14:25: "Verily I say unto you, I will drink no more of the fruit of the vine, until that day that I drink it new in the kingdom of God," is apparently trustworthy tradition, offered also in Matt. 26:29 and Luke 22:18. That it is not mentioned by Paul is not surprising, because it would not have served his purpose. So we can assume that Jesus, perhaps when taking a drink of wine, expressed the thought that now

He would be separated from His disciples, but—and this has the emphasis—that He most certainly would be united with them again in the kingdom of God. This statement, Heitmueller thinks, has the stamp of not being invented by later tradition and shows so little connection with the theology of the early congregations and their understanding of the Lord's Supper that we have no right to doubt its historicity. However, whether it was made *after* the word concerning the bread and the cup—as according to Mark and Matthew—or *before* the word concerning the bread—as according to Luke—cannot be made out; also not whether it was made when a cup was passed—as according to Luke—or not—as according to Mark and Matthew, although the account by Luke seems to be the more probable one.

The second element that, according to Heitmueller, can in no way be considered unhistorical is Jesus' action with the bread. All four accounts tell us that Jesus—whether at the beginning of or during an evening meal, we do not know—took bread, spoke the “blessing” (Mark 14:22; Matt. 26:26) or “the prayer of thanksgiving” (I Cor. 11:24; Luke 22:19), broke it and gave it to His disciples, that is, distributed it among them. The breaking was necessary for the purpose of distribution. This whole act contains nothing that is strange. The Jewish housefather always opened the meal with a prayer of thanksgiving for the bread and—if wine was used—also for the wine. So Jesus performed only the usual functions of the housefather, as He always did, and the prayer of thanksgiving which He offered very likely had no other content than usual, and ran: “Praise to Thee, Lord, our God, Thou King of the world who bringest forth from the earth the bread.” The whole action became unusual only through the fact that—according to the traditional account—the distribution of the bread was accompanied by some mysterious words. With the exception of the opening words—“take” according to Mark, “take, eat” according to Matthew—these are handed down unanimously by Mark, Matthew and Luke, the words: “This is my body.” The account of Paul, however, adds two elements: 1. “That for you;” 2. This do in remembrance of Me.”

How about these two Pauline additions? Are they original or not? Especially the second, this command of Jesus to repeat His action with the bread? Since neither Mark nor Matthew nor Luke mention this command—and we should expect them to mention them, all the more because in the circles for whom their Gospels were written the Lord's Supper was held in remembrance of Jesus—they cannot have been spoken by Jesus. Heit-

mueller calls this an unavoidable, cogent proof. Whether Paul has invented this addition or it was already contained in the form then in use, he leaves open to question, but suggests a way by which such a command might have come into use. In Mark 14:23, he reminds us, we read: "And they all drank of it," while according to Matt. 26:27 Jesus commanded: "Drink ye all of it." What originally was only common use was later on changed into a command by Jesus Himself. We must assume a similar development concerning the words: "This do in remembrance of Me." They are a later addition.

As a later interpolation likewise are to be considered the Pauline words: "That for you." The simple fact that neither Mark nor Matthew nor Luke has them proves that they were not spoken by Jesus, because the simplest form is always the original one. Furthermore, these words point to the death of Christ as a sacrifice for us, and such a thought is not even hinted at by the plain form: "This is my body," and according to the Synoptic accounts of Jesus' life, He, in all His former discourses with His disciples and the people, had never spoken of His death as a ransom for sinners, as a sacrifice that He is going to bring for them. How could Jesus assume that His disciples could understand Him if He now would all at once say that He is going to give His body into death in order to redeem them? What after Pentecost and especially by the theology of Paul had become an important element of Christian belief was later dated back by the Christian congregation and put into the mouth of Jesus.—So much then, according to Heitmueller, is original: Jesus, after the prayer of thanksgiving, distributed among His disciples a broken bread and said: "This is My body."

Whether a second act, the taking and passing of the cup, followed at all is, according to Heitmueller, not impossible but very doubtful. At least the short form of Luke, in contradistinction to Mark, Matthew, St. Paul and the longer form of Luke, knows only of the distribution of the bread, and the cup mentioned in 22:17 cannot be considered as a counterpart to the distribution of the bread. Is the shorter form of Luke the original text—and Heitmueller does not doubt this for a moment—then either Luke must have lived in a Christian congregation that knew only of the first part of the meal or he must have been in possession of a source that did not contain the second part and must have had good reasons why he followed this source in contradiction to Mark whose Gospel he otherwise used so copiously. Other observations besides this short form of Luke,

according to Heitmueller, seem to corroborate the fact that the evening meal which Jesus held with His disciples consisted only in one act, the distribution of the bread: 1. In Acts 2:46 we read: "When they brake bread in their houses, they ate their meal with rejoicing and simplicity of heart." The character of the Lord's Supper as celebrated by the first Christian congregations seems to have been one of joy and jubilation and not one of remembrance of Christ's death, and that would be in full agreement with Luke's shorter form (Luke 22:18); 2. The Book of Acts calls the Lord's Supper repeatedly (2:41. 46; 20:7. 11) the "Breaking of Bread," and that seems to indicate that nothing but bread was distributed or that at least the passing of the cup was a secondary, less important element; 3. The feeding of the 5,000, in the judgment of the Evangelist, was without doubt a type of the Lord's Supper and yet the wine is not even mentioned; 4. It is a fact that later Jewish Christian sects living in the Jordan valley celebrated the Lord's Supper without wine; 5. The strange remark in Mark 14:23: "they drank *all* of it" seems to be a polemical word against the omission of the cup in some circles. But more decisive than the short form of Luke and these five observations for Heitmueller's position is, apparently, the fact that the word concerning the cup in Mark and Matthew as well as in Paul is of such a strange "theological" character. It considers the death of Jesus as a sacrifice by which a covenant, even the new covenant, has been established between God and men, and this is a thought never expressed by Jesus before His death and, therefore, impossibly a part of the words spoken by Jesus in connection with His last supper with His disciples.

And even if the Lord's Supper had included the second part, what words did Jesus then speak in connection with the cup? Heitmueller answers: Certainly not the words of command to repeat the act. If this is not original with the first part, how should it be original with the second? And certainly not the words as we find them recorded by Paul. Jesus did not speak of the cup of the New Testament in His blood. The more simple form of Mark-Matthew is to be preferred; it brings us nearer to the words really spoken by Jesus. And here again Mark has a simpler form than Matthew. That means, the passage "for remission of sins" is a later addition. How did it come that Matthew added this clause? Heitmueller declares: The Evangelist or the circle for whom he wrote understood the clause "that is shed for many" in that sense; they in their thoughts and experience connected the cup and the remission of sins and added

this clause to the words which Jesus had been reported to have spoken—in the sure belief: what they experienced was certainly said by Jesus. And yet the critical sensorium of Heitmueller is not satisfied. The clause: “My blood of the covenant” is still too clumsy; the double modification of “blood”—“My” and “of the covenant”—seems to him hardly tolerable. Now since the covenant-concept is characteristically Pauline the genitive τῆς διαθήκης must be likewise removed. The word then concerning the cup—if a cup was used at all and was accompanied by the words of Jesus—was only: “This is my blood,” in full correspondence with the word that accompanied the distribution of the bread.

What is then the final result at which Heitmueller arrives? It is this: There is a remarkable difference between the Lord's Supper as it was celebrated later on by the Christian Church and that evening meal that Jesus held with His disciples on the evening before His suffering and death. The latter was a common meal in which Jesus performing the function of the Jewish housefather, spoke, perhaps in connection with a drink of wine, a word about His imminent separation from His disciples and His re-union with them in the kingdom of God, broke a bread and distributed it among them with the mysterious word, “This is my body.” Whether He also passed the cup and spoke the word, “This is my blood” is very doubtful.

What was the meaning of this last meal of Jesus? When we read Heitmueller's answer, we feel that he was still under the mysterious spell that this Sacrament exercised upon his soul. His answer is this: Jesus, in a ceremonious way took bread and distributed it among His disciples. Immediately with this eating of the same bread a symbol was given to the partakers of the meal, and not only a deep symbol, but also an important effect was brought about, namely, a close brotherly bond between the partakers. Because for ancient, especially Semitic, sentiment, common eating was an important, even a holy act. Table-fellowship symbolizes and brings about the closest kind of fellowship. By eating of the same meal there pulsates as it were the same blood in all the table-fellows. Jesus and His disciples were acquainted with these most ancient ideas. So the disciples very readily understood the mysterious action of their Master; they understood that Jesus by this common meal intended to establish a close, intimate fellowship between them, that He wanted to unite them to a holy communion. Paul's words in I Cor. 10:16: “Because there is one bread, therefore are we, the many, one

body, for we all partake of the same bread," verify this. And since Jesus added the words: "This is *my* body" therefore by the act of eating there should be established not only a close union among the disciples, but also with Jesus Himself. Neither the earthly body of Jesus nor His future glorified body is meant by these words. Jesus' "body" represents Jesus Himself, His personality, all that He symbolized and included of religious values and experiences. His body, that is He Himself, whatever by His teaching and life-work He had offered to them, all this He gives to them as a food that effects their union, as the fountain out of which they are to renew their blood; He Himself it is who wants to bind them together. By giving them the bread and speaking the words, "This is my body," Jesus wanted to say: "Just as I give this one bread to all of you and as you all eat therefrom as a symbol and for the purpose of establishing a close union between you all, just so you are to receive Me into yourselves as the medium of the very closest union and fellowship." We concede that by this explanation the sacramental character of the meal was maintained at least in some measure.

In the following decades, however, the exponents of the hypercritical school went much farther. They stripped the Lord's Supper completely of its sacramental character and left nothing but a common farewell supper. They had to do so since even the words "This is my body" were considered by them as a later interpolation. The article on the Lord's Supper written in 1927 by Prof. K. L. Schmidt, then at Bonn, for the second edition of the widely distributed five volume encyclopaedia *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart* is typical. Here he says: "The oldest tradition of which we have a record comprised probably only verses 15, 16 and 18 of Luke 22, that is, the words: "And He said unto them, With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer. For I say unto you, I will not any more eat thereof, until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God. For I say unto you, I will not drink of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come." What thus remains as original and historical describes how Jesus at the last meal with His disciples expressed the certainty that He will eat the next meal with His own in the Kingdom of God. Of this oldest account there remain only meager traces in Mark 24:25 and Matt. 26:29. In the traditional accounts we have an "aetiological cult-report" written in order to explain and justify a cult at that time in use in the congregation. The oldest account spoke only of a common eating and drinking in the kingdom of God, containing

neither a command to repeat this meal nor anything pointing to a saving effect of the death of Christ and all those ideas that follow from the connection of this meal with the Jewish Pass-over." What the church calls Lord's Supper and this farewell meal of Jesus, according to these results of the modern hyper-critical school, apparently have nothing in common at all.

So we can understand that since 1921 an entirely new method was applied in order to find at least the stages of the development that led to the celebration of the Lord's Supper as it existed in the church of the fourth and fifth century. The starting point this time was not the Synoptic accounts of its institution, but the liturgies of the fourth and fifth centuries. From these the investigation tried to trace their predecessors back to the first century and so to lay bare the real essence of the Lord's Supper. It was a Swedish theologian who tried this method first, G. P. Wetter of Upsala. He published 1921 *Altchristliche Liturgien: Das christliche Mysterium, Studie zur Geschichte des Abendmahls*. Wetter thought the New Testament accounts of the Lord's Supper were too meager and ambiguous to serve as a basis for the investigation concerning the essence and historical meaning of the Lord's Supper; in the liturgies, however, pulsates and centers the religious life of the Church, especially in the first centuries; to know and to understand them means to know and to understand the religious life of the church by its best and richest exponents; from the liturgy of the Lord's Supper in the later centuries it should be possible to go back to its simpler forms and thus find the roots out of which the whole splendid tree grew. Five years later, in 1926, Hans Lietzmann, of Berlin, in his book *Messe und Herrenmahl*, followed the footsteps of Wetter and tried likewise to trace the connection between the Mass of later centuries and the evening meal that Jesus held with His disciples. His investigation was more thorough going than Wetter's and is a rare example of historical insight and erudition. He investigated, first, the most important liturgies as far as they concern the celebration of the Lord's Supper: the *oriental liturgies*, that is, the liturgies of Constantinople (Chrysostom and Basilus), of Syria (Cyrill of Jerusalem; Book II and VIII of the *Constitutiones apostolicae*), of Jerusalem (Liturgy of James in its Greek and Syriac form), of Persia (Liturgy of the Nestorians), of Egypt (Liturgy of Mark, the liturgy of the papyrus Dev-Balyzeh, the Euchologion of Serapion), and the *occidental liturgies*: the church-order of Hippolytus and its various versions, the Ambrosian, the Gallican

and the Mozarabic liturgies. By a most careful comparison of these liturgies Lietzmann shows that they can all be traced back to two primal forms: the Hippolytus-Roman form and the Egyptian. After an exact and minute examination of the church order of Hippolytus and the oldest Egyptian liturgy extant in the "Anaphora" of Serapion Lietzmann arrives at the result that the form of Hippolytus developed from the form in use in the Pauline congregations, and the form of Serapion from the form in use at Jerusalem. At the same time he scrutinized the structure of Serapion's *Anaphora* with the result that many sections are to be removed as later interpolations and only the dialogue, the *praefatio* with the *Sanctus* and the *Epiclesis* are recognized as original, that means, that according to Lietzmann there was once a holy meal in use in the congregations in Jerusalem that did not grow out from the last meal of Jesus at all and had no relation to his sufferings and death in any way. A verification of this result Lietzmann sees in the eucharistic liturgy of the Didache which likewise does not speak of a remembrance of Christ's death, of His body and covenant blood, nor of the last supper of Jesus with His disciples.

This leads to Lietzmann's final result, the true character of Jesus' last meal with His disciples and the Lord's Supper as it was celebrated by the first congregation at Jerusalem. Both had their roots in the *Chaburah*, so common among the Jews. The *Chaburah* was a Jewish meal, adorned with a certain religious sanction, which was held at any time by a company of friends. What we call the Lord's Supper of the first congregation at Jerusalem was, according to Lietzmann, only a continuation of the table-fellowship which the disciples had with their Master when He still lived with them upon earth. According to Jewish custom they had formed with Him a bond of friendship, a *Chaburah*, in which Jesus, being the housefather at the beginning of the meal, broke bread, blessed it and thus opened the meal. This breaking of bread was observed with each Jewish meal and in the course of time, on account of the prayer connected therewith, had become a kind of a liturgical rite that gave to each meal a religious character. Each Israelite was in duty bound at every meal to remember God in prayer. This was observed by Jesus and His disciples whenever they sat down at the table, also when they had their last meal before Jesus' death. After the resurrection of their master the disciples, being certain that He lived, came together for their customary table-fellowship, only with this difference, that they no longer had Him in their midst

bodily. But they were certain that in spirit He was present among them, according to His own promise: "Where two or three are together in My name there I am present among them." The κοινωνία with the Exalted One had taken the place of the κοινωνία with the historical Jesus. As before, bread was blessed, broken and distributed and a simple meal followed. However, not wine was drunk but water, because they had learned from their Master to be content with water. But they were not in a depressed mood, they rather held the meal rejoicing, hoping for His early return, even anticipating the same. To Him as the One already present they sang their *Hosannah*. In the course of time this single meal took on more and more elaborate forms. Influenced by Hellenistic thoughts and rites, sacrificial ideas were connected with the meal and it was considered a sacrificial meal. At the time when the *Anaphora* of Serapion in the first half of the fourth century received its present form, this process was completed even in those Christian congregations whose Lord's Supper had its root in the Jerusalemic type of celebration. With the rise of the sacrificial idea the door was opened for many other notions. The sacrifice was an expression of the consciousness of sin. Therefore, expiatory effects were ascribed to the elements; they were no longer considered as common food, but the bread eaten and the wine taken—by and by the wine had taken the place of water—had become a means of obtaining forgiveness of sins. The elements were considered holy food of a pneumatical character; the "name," the "power" of the Lord was in them, and by means of partaking thereof they were transmitted to all who approached the meal well prepared and effected in them incorruptibility, immortality, and eternal life.

So Wetter and Lietzmann and all their followers, although they begin with an entirely different starting point, arrive at the same result as do the exponents of a hypercritical critique of the transmitted texts like Heitmueller and K. L. Schmidt: What we today celebrate as Lord's Supper does not rest upon a command of Christ nor has it anything at all in common with Jesus' last meal with His disciples in the night when He was betrayed. Its roots go back to the Jewish *Chaburah*, and what makes the Supper so holy to us goes back to ideas that have their roots, in great measure, in religious circles outside of Christianity. When in 1932 Hans Lietzmann published the first volume of his learned but dangerous: *Geschichte der Alten Kirche*, now also translated into English, he offered this opinion about the origin of the Lord's Supper without feeling the

necessity of proving it. With him the theory has already become a historical fact. If it is really an established fact, then we should stop celebrating the Lord's Supper and all our teaching and preaching about it is without foundation.

But before we begin to examine the correctness of all these assumptions, let us look to Paul and ask what he taught concerning the Lord's Supper and what influences, according to the modern critical school, worked together in the formation of his thoughts about it. Here we are surprised to see that Heitmueller thinks the right starting point to find Paul's doctrine is I Cor. 10 and not I Cor. 11. Heitmueller remarks correctly, that what Paul says in I Cor. 10 about the Lord's Supper is stated by him to prove something else and therefore must have been true not only in Paul's mind but also in the minds of his congregations, because only that can be used as proof which is evident to both, the speaker and the hearer. Does it, however, follow from this that the description of the Lord's Supper given in I Cor. 11 is less trustworthy, is more a personal construction of Paul than a precise historical account? But we leave this and are glad to see that Heitmueller sums up Paul's belief in these three statements: 1. The Lord's Supper is primarily a fellowship-meal with Jesus Christ; 2. The Lord's Supper is a fellowship-meal with all partakers; 3. The Lord's Supper is a remembrance meal of the death of Christ. Concerning the first he emphasizes that it did not only symbolize but also effect real communion with Christ. To show how real and concrete this communion was to Paul, Heitmueller reminds us of the fact that Paul himself compares the Lord's table with the table of the demons and adduces a number of proofs how realistic this communion with the demons was understood by the popular Jewish and Hellenistic beliefs. The demons, by means of the sacrificial meals common among Orientals and Greeks, were really introduced into the bodies and souls of the partakers. So the exalted Christ, by means of the Lord's Supper, really takes abode in all that take part in the holy meal. The blessed cup really effects a communion with the blood of Christ, the broken bread a communion with the body of Christ, a communion in consequence of which we, indeed, partake of the body and blood of Christ. It is true, Heitmueller then immediately exchanges the clause "blood and body of Christ" with the other one "Jesus Christ," since he assumes this strange clause was used by Paul only because the so-called words of institution spoke of blood and body, but this he emphasizes as strongly as possible: the Lord's Supper according to Paul effects real

communion with Christ so that by this means the exalted Christ is introduced into the partaker of the meal; and he underscores that this is in complete consonance with a central point in Paul's theology: the εἶναι ἐν Χριστῷ, Christ in the believer and the believer in Christ. Concerning the third statement, that the Lord's Supper is a commemoration of the death of Christ, Heitmueller writes: By the celebration of the Lord's Supper itself the Christians proclaim the Lord's death until He cometh, because the broken and blessed bread represents the body of Christ that was given for them, and the cup represents the new covenant that has been established by the blood shed on the cross. So the believers experience and "act," in the celebration and by the celebration, the sacrificial death of Christ. As in a mystery celebration, a "drama," the drama of Golgatha, passes before our eyes and we experience its effects: it is to us a proclamation of the cross and a sermon concerning its saving value. Here again, Heitmueller adds, we have another central thought of Paul's theology, his theology of the cross.

All this we read with more or less satisfaction, but the whole picture is immediately changed as soon as the question concerning the origin of the Pauline conception of the Lord's Supper is raised. Heitmueller concedes that there are few features in Paul's doctrine of the Supper that remind of the first Supper celebrated by Christ Himself: fellowship among the disciples and fellowship with Christ, but they are overshadowed by entirely new features: 1. the command to repeat the last meal; 2. the concept of a commemoration of the death of Christ; and especially, 3. the belief that by this holy meal a spiritual and bodily union with the Exalted Christ is effected. What is the root of these three new and strange elements? Concerning the first Heitmueller reckons with the possibility that the idea that the last supper should become a permanent institution may have arisen already before Paul; in order to explain the fact of the weekly repeated celebration it was stated that this was the meaning of Christ, and finally, the respective words we put into His mouth. Others, e. g., Lietzmann and Wetler, give another explanation. They say Paul emphasizes in I Cor. 11 that "he received it from the Lord" and by this remark he would refer exclusively, or primarily, just to this point, that the Lord's Supper should be repeated. At present we are more interested in the question regarding the roots of the second and third elements. Heitmueller and all his followers declare explicitly, that their

origin cannot be found in the teachings of Jesus, nor in the Jewish heritage of Paul, nor in his peculiar conception of "his gospel," but in the syncretistic religion of Hellenism. There were two lines of connection between Paul and this syncretistic religion, one indirect, the other direct. Indirectly, it exercised its influence because the Diaspora-Jewry, in the midst of which Paul grew up at Tarsus, had been strongly influenced by Oriental and Greek elements, which was still more true of Antioch where he worked during decisive years of his development. Directly, because on his missionary journeys he constantly came in contact with this syncretistic world, meeting many of these ideas in his Gentile-Christian congregations, who when they became Christians certainly did not forget over night all their former religious concepts. Paul formed his congregations but he and his world of thought were also formed by his congregations. Characteristic of the social and religious life, especially among the lower classes at the beginning of the Christian era, was the widespread formation of clubs and unions. Most of these clubs and societies had, by their recognition of a certain deity, a more or less religious character. In these clubs fellowship-meals played an important part, cult-meals in honor of deity but also in honor of the founder of the club or its patron. Of special importance were the commemoration-meals in honor of a deceased member of the fellowship. Most of those who accepted Christianity were formerly members of such clubs and brought many of their concepts into their new society, the Christian congregation. The "breaking of bread" in use in the Christian congregation reminded them of the sacred meals that were common in their former religious clubs and so not a few of their features were merged with the "breaking of bread" and transformed it more and more. Especially significant were the sacred meals in remembrance of the dead. What wonder, then, that the Pauline Gentile-Christian congregations when assembled at the holy rite of breaking bread remembered Christ not only as the Living and Exalted One, but also as the One who died for them, who shed his blood for them and by doing so founded a new covenant, a new congregation, the Christian Church into which they were initiated when they were baptized. Paul writes: "This do in remembrance of Me," and in statutes for heathen cult-clubs we find the same phrase "in remembrance of Metrodoros." Paul speaks in I Cor. 10:21 of the "table of the Lord," and just so, in connection with heathen holy meals, they spoke of the "table

of lord Serapis," or the "table of God." Paul speaks of "partakers of the altar," of "partakers of the table of devils," of "participation in the body and blood of Christ," and just so, in connection with the cult-meal, the Gentiles spoke of "table-fellows" and "table-fellowship" with the deity. These and other observations have been brought forth to prove that the second element that is peculiar to Paul, namely the remembrance of the death of Christ, came into the Lord's Supper from outside sources and had nothing to do with this sacred meal in its original form.

Still more characteristic for Paul's conception of the Lord's Supper is the third element, that it is a sacramental meal by means of which Christ—or to be more specific—His body and blood is given us and made a part of our being. From where did Paul get this idea? The exponents of the *Religionsgeschichtliche Schule* think they can answer also this question in a satisfactory manner. They remind us of the fact that one thing is common to all forms of true piety: the desire of being united with the deity. In the mystic form of religion this desire manifests itself in ἕκστασις and ἔνθεσις, in the endeavor to get rid of oneself and to be in God. And the means of becoming thus united with the deity is eating and drinking. Even the most primitive form of religion knows of this means. By eating holy food, by drinking a holy drink, especially by eating of the sacrificial animals or their equivalents, the deity, his life and powers, are assimilated. In the Dionysius-cult in Thrace the maenad bacchantes, in their nocturnal celebrations, tore into pieces the sacrificial steer, ate him up and believed by doing so to absorb the god himself, his life and power. At the beginning of the Christian era these old mystery-rites were awakened to new life whereby oriental, Greek and Egyptian elements were merged in an often phantastic manner. Especially the mystery-religions of the Isis, the Mythra and the Attis promised to transmit by earthly elements cleansing and propitiation, immortality and divine life. In the regions that Paul traversed in his missionary journeys two mystery-religions played an important role, that of the Mythra and of Attis. Both knew of a sacramental meal consisting of the eating of bread and drinking from a cup, and their worshippers believed that these earthly elements were the bearers of supernatural effects. The relation to the Lord's Supper of the Christians was so close that Justin in his first Apology (ch. 66) called their meal a diabolical imitation. Only from this background, Heitmueller and his followers declared, can we understand the idea of Paul of the sacramental meaning of the Lord's Supper.

The mystics of Dionysos wanted to be "in the deity," and the partakers of the Lord's Supper wanted to be "in Christ," both by eating the sacramental meal. Some called both of them "God-eaters," and Preserved Smith, in 1922 wrote a whole book concerning the "God-eaters," *A Short History of Christian Theophagy* is the title. The first representatives of this assumption, that Paul in his teaching of the sacramental meal was influenced by these oriental-hellenistic mystery-religions, spoke of it only as of a possibility, others deemed it probable, to Smith it was an absolute certainty.

What do we say concerning both, this modern theory of the origin of the Lord's Supper as He held it with His disciples and as it was later celebrated in the early church at Jerusalem, and of the origin of Paul's doctrine that later on dominated in the church?

Concerning the first we must say: it is based on an exegetical method that does unbearable violence to the transmitted texts and knows of no other critical canon than that of its own subjective arbitrariness. Feine, professor at Halle, did not say too much when in 1927 he wrote in his *Der Apostel Paulus* concerning the method applied by K. L. Schmidt in his article on the Lord's Supper in *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*: "It is a typical example of an exegetical method that should never be followed. I am confident that I am able, by the application of such a method, to prove from the New Testament whatever I like, because whatever does not agree with my momentary whim is to be considered an interpolation." The literary critique of the Old Testament is bold indeed and makes a crazy-quilt of many of the Old Testament books, especially the Pentateuch, but it is a rather innocent offense compared with the critique on the New Testament employed by the writers mentioned above. The former cuts the transmitted text into many pieces of different periods, but it at least permits, more or less, these pieces to stand, while the latter intends to find various layers behind the present text without any indications of the contents in the transmitted text itself. It is all guesswork, more or less vivid exercise of man's fancy. Nothing destroys confidence in the written Word more than this method. That is the reason why we lament it heartily that even a man like Joachim Jeremias at Goettingen, one of the most able and conservative exegetes of the younger generation in Germany, in his thorough treatise *Die Abendmahlsworte Jesu* (1935), still rendered some homage to this method.

Furthermore, the time between the resurrection and ascension of Christ on the one hand and the writing down of our present text, is much too short a period to allow such important changes in the religious thought world and beliefs of the first generations of Christians as they are here presupposed, especially since some of the apostles during that period were still alive. Even if we had to concede that all the Synoptic Gospels were not written before 70, the time would be too short. Forty or fifty years do not suffice for such fundamental changes in the written or oral accounts of the life of Christ and His teaching and actions.

Thirdly, to assume that the disciples at the time of their last meal with Jesus *could* not understand any reference to the fact that their Master would die for their sake, would shed His blood in order to effect for them remission of sin and establish a new covenant in which there can be obtained such remission, itself rests upon another assumption of our modern critics, unfounded in itself. It rests upon the assumption that Jesus before His death had never spoken of the saving effect of His death. But this is not true. This much is true, namely that Jesus did not often speak of such an effect of His death, compared with the numerous passages in Acts and the Epistles, and for good reasons. But beside a number of indirect references carefully collected by Borchert in his booklet, *Der Tod Jesu im Licht seiner eigenen Worte und Taten, 1. Teil: Jesu Voraussagen seines Todes* (1922) to be compared with *Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu* by W. Grau (1887) and *The Self-Disclosure of Jesus* by Gerhardus Vos (1926), we have two unmistakable declarations of Christ concerning the saving effect of His death before the last meal. I like to call them the granite pillars rising as bulwarks in the midst of a stormy sea of doubt. One is John 10, the pericope of the Good Shepherd who gives His life for His sheep, the other is Matt. 20:28: "Even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister and to give his life a ransom for many." I know, of course, that the passage in John is immediately eliminated by our modern critics by the assumption that John gives the speeches of Jesus, not as He had rendered them, but as they lived in some circles after 100 and had gradually been transformed. And I am well aware of the fact that the same critics assert that Luke 22:27 did preserve the original form of this saying of Jesus, which rendering does not contain a reference to the death of Jesus, still less to the saving effect of the same, and that the form given by Matthew is the result of a later development in the belief of the early church. But both these assumptions of

the critics are unproved and unprovable. We have here rather an example of the usual procedure of the hypercritics. First they form an assumption, and then immediately use this assumption as a well founded basis for a new assumption—and this they pronounce as the correct method that is to be followed by every one who wants to work methodically and scientifically.

Fourthly, they all agree and maintain that Jesus did not hold His last meal in connection with the Passover-meal and that therefore all the thoughts of a sacrifice, a sacrifice for the sake of the people, and a sacramental meal must be eliminated. Over against this first of all, we maintain that the transmitted texts of Mark and Matthew, as well as of Paul, demand the understanding that Christ's imminent death will be a sacrifice for the sake of mankind and that the eating and drinking in the Lord's Supper is a sacrificial meal, whether it was instituted in connection with the Passover-meal or not. However, we were always certain that such a connection existed and had a number of good reasons for our conviction. Since in 1935 Joachim Jeremias published this investigation *Die Abendmahlsworte Jesu*, we are in a still better position to prove our thesis.

Heitmueller and many of his followers not only pointed to John 18:28, where we read, "Then they led Jesus from Caiaphas unto the hall of judgment, and it was early; and they themselves went not into the judgment hall lest they should be defiled, but that they might eat the passover" and according to which passage the Jews in that year seemed to celebrate the regular Passover-meal not—to use our way of expression—on Thursday, but on Friday evening, not on the 14th but on the 15th Nisan by which fact a connection between the Lord's Supper and the Passover-meal seemed to be excluded. More than John 18:28 they emphasized a number of other facts that would make such a connection impossible. Most of them we mentioned above. These we take into consideration first and show how unfounded they are.

1. It was objected that the last meal of Jesus could be no Pasover-meal, because in Mark 14:22 we find the term ἄρτος used while ἄζυμα demanded if it was a Passover-meal. Jeremias, however, brings overwhelming proof for the fact that the Hebrew אַרְתִּי as well as the Greek ἄρτος designates both the leavened as well as the unleavened bread, and that even the unleavened bread used in the Passover-meal was called אַרְתִּי in the Old Testament and in the Mishna and ἄρτος in the Septuagint.—2. It was objected that the description of the last meal of Jesus would not fit into the passah-ritual. On the one hand it was said that at

the Passover-meal the first act was the breaking of bread and the second the table benediction, while in Mark 14:22 we have the reverse order; on the other hand, it was objected that even at the time of Jesus the individual cup was used in the Passover-meal, while according to Mark 14:23 all drank from a common cup at Jesus' last meal. And finally, it was pointed out that at the Passover-meal every partaker had his own dish or bowl, while according to Mark 14:20 they had a common dish or bowl at Jesus' last meal. It would lead us too far afield to show how thoroughly Jeremias, on the basis of his exceptionally thorough knowledge of the Talmud and Rabbinic literature, refuted the first and third of these points. Concerning the second point he concedes that since the second century after Christ we occasionally find voiced, in the rabbinic literature, an aversion toward the use of one cup for many for hygienic reasons, but he also shows that in the middle of the third century at meals both were still in use, the individual and the common cup, and Dalman made it at least very probable, if not absolutely sure, that it was the older custom to pass around to all partakers at least that cup, that had been blessed by the table prayer. And as far as the specific Passover-meal is concerned, at least one passage in the Mishna reports that the housefather passed his cup to his children and the other members of his household. And Jeremias adds that it had been practically impossible that every one of those celebrating the Passover-meal had his individual cup for ten thousands of them sat together as closely as possible, in their homes, in the open courts and on the roofs of the houses. Whoever is acquainted with oriental households and their scarcity of cups and dishes hardly needs further proof that at the Pasover-meal a common and not individual cups were used.

The third objection is based on Mark 14:2: "The chief priests and the scribes sought how they might take Him by craft and put Him to death; but they said, Not on the feast day, lest there be an uproar of the people." It is said that this resolution excludes the Synoptic chronology according to which Jesus was taken captive in the night of the first day of the feast that had begun with the setting of the sun. But here two things are forgotten: first, it is a question whether the clause ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ is to be taken in the temporal sense (on the feast day) at all. Jeremias brings sufficient proof for the translation: "in the presence of the festival throng" and that would agree with the ἄτερο ὄχλου in Luke 22:6: "when Jesus was not surrounded by the throng of the people," and so would not fix the time at all, since the throng

of people was at Jerusalem before and after the specific first day of the feast; and if it does not fix the time at all, it certainly cannot contradict the Synoptic chronology concerning the day of Jesus' death. The second fact that is forgotten is the question whether that resolution of the chief priests was carried through. It was made before Judas had offered to betray his Master and thereby given an unexpected opportunity to take Jesus captive during the feast. If we accept Jeremias' translation, all the better, because on account of Judas' betrayal they could really take Jesus captive when He was not surrounded by the throng of people.

The fourth objection, based on the observation that Paul in I Cor. 11:25 uses the expression "in the night when he was betrayed" instead of the more definite "in the night of the Passover," hardly deserves any consideration, because this expression, as we shall see later, was occasioned by the intention of Paul in that section.

Very much is made of the fifth objection, namely, that it is impossible that a great part of the events mentioned in Mark 14:17-15:47 took place on the first day of the Passover-feast because this day was on the same level with a Sabbath day. Not less than nine events are mentioned that could not have taken place on that day: 1. Jesus' walk out to Gethsemane; 2. The carrying of weapons by the servants of the high priests and some of the disciples; 3. The meeting of the Sanhedrin and the condemnation of Jesus; 4. The participation of Jews in the trial before Pilate on the morning of this festival day; 5. The arrival of Simon the Cyrenian ἀπ' ἀγροῦ on the morning of the 15th Nisan; 6. The crucifixion of Jesus on that high festival day; 7. The purchase of the fine linen to cover Jesus' body; 8. The funeral connected with the rolling of a stone unto the door of the sepulchre; 9. The preparation of the spices and ointments ascribed to the women.

This is indeed a mighty arrayal of facts that can and must make some impression upon the uninformed. We say upon the uninformed, for G. Dalman and P. Billerbeck who were best informed concerning the Jewish laws, prescriptions and customs of that time, in 1922 took up the challenge and showed, the first on not less than 12 pages of his *Jesus-Jeshua* and the latter on 20 pages of the second volume of his profound *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, that not a single one of these nine events was in contradiction to the Jewish laws and customs governing the celebration of the first day of the

Passover-week. We advise the exponents of the critical school first to refute the results of the most careful investigation of these experts who are recognized in the whole scientific world, before they continue to maintain that these nine events could not possibly have taken place on the first day of the Passover-week.

Concluding herewith the refutation of the objections against the assumption that the Lord's Supper could not have been instituted in connection with the Passover-meal, we go on and try to show that a number of incidents related by the Synoptics demand such connection. It was in 1917 when we published our *Gnadenmittellehre*. Here, on the basis of R. Seeberg, we compared the sequence of events and the words spoken at the Passover-meal with all that is related by the Synoptics concerning the Lord's Supper with the result that the Lord's Supper, if it should really not have been instituted in connection with the Passover-meal, was at least instituted in forms peculiar to the Passover-meal. Since then we made this comparison year for year with our classes, always with the same result. In 1935 appeared the investigation of Joachim Jeremias, *Die Abendmahlswoorte Jesu* mentioned several times before. Here the same thesis is defended, but with still better proof-material. Let me summarize his four principal points. 1. All three Synoptics as well as John (18:1) tell us that Jesus' last meal took place in Jerusalem. That is by no means a matter of course nor is it unimportant. In the days of the Passover-meal Jerusalem was overcrowded; we have to figure with at least 150,000 who celebrated in those days in Jerusalem, that is, about 100,000 who came for that purpose to the holy city. There was no room for all of them inside the walls of Jerusalem and many of them found lodging in tents and in the neighboring towns, just as we are told that Jesus spent the nights outside of the city. Why did He, then, not eat His last meal likewise outside of the city? Because it was the Passover-meal and this had to be eaten in Jerusalem; when there was no room in the houses, then, in spite of the rather cool season, in the open courts or even on the roofs of the houses.—2. According to Mark 14:17 and Matt. 26:20, Jesus came with his disciples to eat the last meal, "when the evening had set in," and John 13:30 and I Cor. 11:23 tell us that it was held "in the night." Jeremias again emphasizes that this is neither a matter of course nor of no significance. The Jews had as a fast rule two meals, a very plain breakfast in the forenoon between 10 and 11, and the principal meal, always in the later part of the afternoon; only on Sabbath days did they

have three meals, and even then the last meal was in the later part of the afternoon. Talmudic sources leave no doubt about that, and even in the Gospels we hear only of one occasion that the meal took place during evening time (in connection with the feeding of the 5000, Mark 14:15), but here it is stated *expressis verbis* that "the time, namely, the time for meal, had already passed." The talmudic literature knows only of two occasions when the meal lasted into the night time, and these were the festivities connected with circumcision and marriage. So it is an assured fact that Jesus did not hold His last meal with His disciples at the customary time, and that indicates that it was no common, but a specific meal, and since we know that the Passover-meal had to be held when the evening had set in and lasted deep into the night hours, must we then not conclude that Jesus instituted His last meal in connection with the Passover-meal?—

3. The Synoptics as well as John (Mark 14:18; Matt. 26:20; Luke 22:14; John 13:12. 23. 25. 28) unanimously tell us that Jesus as well as His disciples ate the last meal not in a sitting, but leaning position (the German and English translations do not show this in all passages, but the Greek demands this understanding). This is strange, because the whole Rabbinical literature knows of only one position at the meal, the sitting one, and it is in complete agreement with this that also the Gospels speak of a leaning position only in connection with special occasions, as a festival meal, a royal meal, a marriage meal or at the meal of the final consummation—the two exceptions we find in Luke 24:30 and Mark 16:14 do not neutralize this statement. Since it was the custom to sit at table at every common meal, why did Jesus at His last meal, if it was really only a common meal, chose another position? This question would be answered if the last meal had been, as some maintain, a so-called "*Sabbath-Kiddus*," that is, a ritual sanctification of the Sabbath by benediction of bread and wine, but this rite always took place immediately before the actual celebration of the day, that is, on Friday evening, while the last meal, according to the testimony of all four Evangelists, was held on Thursday evening. And as far as the *Chaburah*, to which Lietzmann and others degraded the Lord's Supper, is concerned, Jeremias concedes that such *chaburah's* and *chaburah* meals existed, but only in the form of such meals in which participation was a moral duty and even meritorious, that is, in the form of the betrothal, marriage, circumcision and funeral meals, and no one will assume that the last meal of Jesus belonged into one of these classes. It was, however, the Passover-

meal, at the celebration of which the leaning position formed a part of the ritual, because it was a symbol of liberty, as we read in the Talmud: "Slaves have to eat in standing position, we, however, at the Passover-meal eat in a reclining position in order to manifest that we left slavery and came to liberty." Since it is impossible to assume—and so far no one did assume such nonsense—that Jesus' last meal belonged into the class of those meals at which the reclining position was observed, and besides, the reclining position was customary, even commanded only at the Passover-meal, we must conclude that it was the Passover-meal in connection with which the Lord's Supper was instituted.

—4. Jesus and His disciples, at the last meal, drank wine, Mark 14:23. 25. Only on special, festival occasions was it custom to drink wine in Palestine, at family festivals as at a banquet, the circumcision, betrothal, marriage meal, also during the first week after a funeral; then on Passah, Pentecost and Tabernacle festivals. For the Passover and Purim festival, the use of wine was prescribed, it was used also at the meals for sanctification and farewell-bidding of the Sabbath. In daily life wine was hardly ever used except for medical purposes. That Jesus and His disciples at their daily meals should have drunk wine is entirely excluded; in Mark 6:38 we are told they were provided with bread and two fishes. How can we explain then that Jesus drank wine at His last meal? Because it was Passover-meal and here every partaker was required to drink wine, even the poorest—the Talmud says at least four cups—, even if it had to be paid from the fund for the poor.—5. The last meal was concluded by a hymn (Mark 14:26; Matt. 26:30). Since the *Hallel* at the close of the common meal is only a product of fancy, and since the thanksgiving after the meal (Mark 14:23) cannot be called a *ὑμνεῖν*, nothing else can be meant here but the second half of the Passah-Hallel which at times, even in the rabbinic literature, is termed *הַיְמִנִי* — Finally, and this is of special importance, Jesus adds to bread and wine certain words interpreting the eating of the bread and the drinking of the wine. The same custom was a regular part of the Passah ritual. After the second cup had been passed, the housefather took one unleavened bread lying on the table, broke it into pieces, lifted up one of the broken pieces and said: "This is the bread of misery which our fathers ate in Egypt." And again, after the meat of the pascal lamb was eaten and that part of the meal was closed, the third cup, "the cup of thanksgiving," was passed. I do not know whether the passing of this third cup was also accompanied by a word of

interpretation, but Jeremias quotes three passages from the Rabbinic literature that demand this assumption. I think he goes too far when he writes: "This rite of the Passover-meal caused Jesus to add His new interpretation," but this is true: it must have been a Passover-meal because only here do we find the distribution of bread and the passing of the cup accompanied by a word of interpretation. Instead of saying, "This is the bread of misery which our fathers ate in Egypt," He said, "This is my body for you," and instead of using the customary formula with the wine, He said, "This cup is the New Testament in my blood" thereby closing forever the celebration of the Passover-meal and instituting in its place a new meal, all in consonance with the new covenant that He was going to establish.

But how about John 18:28? Does not this passage demand that in that year the Passover-meal took place on Friday evening, and does it not necessarily follow from this that the meal, which according to the Synoptics was held on Thursday evening, was not held in connection with the Passover-meal? This always was and still is an interesting question. One class of exegetes declares John is right and therefore maintains either that the Lord's Supper was in no connection with the Passover-meal or says that the Synoptics are to be interpreted according to John, and this interpretation consists in the assumption that Jesus celebrated the Passover-meal one day ahead of all the other people. We cannot accept the first or the second of these assertions. The results gained so far do not allow us to accept the first, and the second is excluded by the fact that Jesus always acted in conformity with the Mosaic law. Should He have failed to conform with this law on such an important point? The other class of exegetes maintains that the Synoptics are right and that the passage in John is to be interpreted in accordance with them. The interpretation then consists in the assumption that we must distinguish between a narrower and a wider use of the term "to eat Passover." In the narrower sense this term means the eating of the Passover-meal, in the wider sense it means the participation in any eating of the festival sacrifice during the Passover week, the so-called *haghigha*. Then John would apply this wider sense and there would be no contradiction between the Synoptics and John. There can hardly be a doubt that in Deut. 16:2 and II Chron. 35:7 all the sacrifices offered throughout the Passover week are called **חֶדֶשׁ** and, therefore, the eating thereof could be called φαγεῖν τὸ πάσχα, but so far we have no proof that at the time of Jesus this usage was still known and that John could

presuppose such knowledge among his readers to whom the narrow sense no doubt applied by the Synoptics was familiar. So a third class of exegetes maintains that both John and the Synoptics are right and that there exists no need to interpret the one in the light of the other and thereby always arrive at some forced interpretations. Lichtenstein, in his commentary on *Matthew* (1913), showed the way and Strack and Billerbeck followed, the latter in a very careful study in his *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, II, 847-853. Here he shows that the difference between John and the Synoptics can be explained from the stubborn fight between the Sadducees and Pharisees over the dating of Pentecost, based upon a different exegesis of Lev. 23:11; this difference brought with it a difference in the dating of the Passover. The Pharisees dated the Passover-meal a day earlier than the Sadducees, and in the year of Jesus' death the Sadducees had conceded to the Pharisees that they celebrated the Passover one day earlier than the Sadducees. Jesus would have held the meal on the day when the Pharisees observed it. Both reports would be correct: the Synoptics followed the numbering of the days of the month maintained by the Pharisees, while John would follow the numbering of the Sadducees. And yet, this is no more than a very learned but hardly satisfying conjecture. Instead of accepting it, Jeremias assumes that John's statement in 18:28 is to be considered a slip of John's pen.

But there is another honest way out of the difficulty. In 1872-73 Hofmann in Erlangen, in his lectures on the Biblical History of the New Testament, showed with absolute certainty that all the other dates of the Gospel of John demand that also according to him Jesus died on the 15th Nisan. If he died on the fifteenth Nisan, then the date for the Passover-meal had to be the 14th Nisan as stipulated by the Synoptics or, expressed after the Jewish terminology, on the first part of the 15th Nisan. This lecture by Hofmann was published in 1927; we immediately republished it in our *Kirchliche Zeitschrift* because of its importance. Now, if according to John, Jesus died on the 15th Nisan and the term "to eat Passah" without doubt can be taken in the wider sense why do we have no right to take it in John 18:28 in this wider sense? Then it is not the report of the Synoptics that forces us to understand it this way, it is rather John's own chronology. This weighs much more than the consideration mentioned above as speaking against the application of this wider terminology. So even John 18:28 does not hinder

us from holding fast to the statement: The Lord's Supper was instituted in connection with the Passover-meal.

So as far as the last meal of Jesus is concerned, we have no reason why we should not hold fast to these facts: Jesus Himself instituted this Supper; He instituted it in connection with the Passover-meal; it consisted of two parts, the distribution of the bread and the passing of the cup; both parts were accompanied by certain words which brought the meal in connection with His death for the sake of men, whatever the meaning of these words might have been.

But what about Paul and all the assertions made about him and his teachings of this sacrament? Time does not permit me to go into detail in answering this question, but the most important points must be mentioned. These assertions must be refuted for these reasons:

1. There is no contradiction between Paul and Jesus as far as Paul's teaching concerning the eternal sonship of Christ is concerned, even if the fourth Gospel should not relate the discourses of Jesus correctly. Nor is there a contradiction between them concerning the redeeming character of Christ's death, if we only take the transmitted texts of the Synoptics as a trustworthy rendering of the discourses of Jesus. Only this is true, Paul speaks more often of this redemptive character than Jesus did, and this for good reasons, because Jesus had to be careful in preparing the disciples for this fact lying at that time still in the future, while after the death of Jesus had taken place this was the great riddle or mystery that had to be explained again and again. The words "This is my body for you" and "this cup is the new covenant in my blood" do not contain a single feature that was new, still less in disagreement with that what Jesus said according to the Synoptics. Even the thought of the "new" covenant was no entirely new idea compared with the discourses of Jesus, since it was indicated by the emphasis which Jesus in Matt. 16:18 laid on the future tense and on the personal pronoun: *οἰκοδομήσω* and *μου*, I *shall* build *my* *ἐκκλησία*; the new *ἐκκλησία* and the new covenant are closely connected ideas.

2. The time between Jesus' last meal and the introduction of the Lord's Supper into Paul's congregations—less than twenty years—was too short for such a fundamental change concerning it.

3. If the difference between the Lord's Supper celebrated at Jerusalem and the one celebrated in the Pauline congregations had been of such a fundamental character as the modern school asserts, that without doubt would have caused a bitter controversy

against Paul, but in the whole biblical literature we do not find the slightest trace of such a controversy; the controversy turned exclusively about Paul's exclusion of the works of the law from the way of salvation.

4. What about the honesty of Paul, if he in I Cor. 11 emphasizes the fact that his understanding and use of the Lord's Supper came to him—directly or indirectly—from the Lord, while according to the modern assumption he had been influenced, even in fundamental features, by the ideas and rites of non-Christian religions?

5. It is true that at the time when Rome became an *imperium* the faith in the old gods had nearly died out and that a strong influx of oriental and Egyptian and hellenistic religions took place, but it is likewise true that the literary and other evidences of the new mystery religions are of a much later date; they begin about the second half of the second century and are growing in number during the third and fourth century,—the Mythras liturgy published by Dietrich belongs even to the fifth century, and it is very doubtful whether it is a Mythras liturgy at all. The historical and philological scholars who opened this whole religious world for us were much slower than our modern theologians in maintaining the hypothesis of an influx of the mystery religions into Christianity. Especially Franz Cumont, who blazed the trail, declared again and again that it is impossible to prove that there existed any relation at all between Paul and the Mythras religion.

6. If we have in the Pauline religion—and the Pauline religion became the Christian religion—a mixture of Pauline thoughts and heathen ideas, then the Christian religion may represent a higher stage of religion than other religions, but it must certainly cease to assert that it has and represents the absolute truth; the absolute character of the Christian religion is given up if we accept these fantastic hypotheses of the modern school.

Does this mean that we cannot and should not learn anything at all from this phase of the work of the modern school? By no means!

First of all, it should be a warning signal to all of us who now and then are troubled by the question whether we can trust the transmitted text of the New Testament. It shows us into what an abyss of purely subjective human speculations we are led, as soon as we put the authentic transmitted text aside. Ascertain with all approved means of sound textual critique the authentic form of the transmitted text, but then stick to this

text and correct your theology if this text demands it. Not your theology should dare to change the text, but the text as it is transmitted must be the deciding canon for your theological thoughts. Explain Scripture by Scripture, but stick to your text! It is God's holy Word.

Secondly, do not treat your text superficially nor shut your eyes to the difficulties offered by it. This we have to emphasize strongly. To say that all the four accounts concerning the Lord's Supper are in agreement with each other might, perhaps, suffice for confirmation instruction; it never can suffice for our exegetical or dogmatical work. Here we must know the differences between Matthew and Mark on the one hand, and Paul and the longer form of Luke on the other, especially that neither Matthew nor Mark have the words: "This do in remembrance of me," and must find a plausible reason for this important omission. We must know about the shorter form of Luke and must try to explain how it came about. About twenty years ago a physician from Minneapolis, a member of the Christian Church, was troubled about this shorter form and was anxious for information. He thought that since the Lutherans think highly of the Lord's Supper, they could certainly give him the information he sought. He inquired personally at four Lutheran seminaries, and they did not even know that the short form of the Luke account existed, still less that it had been the subject of many learned investigations for more than 20 years. I still possess a costly work in my library, a token of thanks from this Minneapolis physician. Such things should not happen; they are a disgrace to our church. Since we have four accounts concerning the institution of the Lord's Supper and since they vary much, even in most important points, this question must become a burning question for us: Which one is to be used as the basis for our dogmatical statements concerning the Lord's Supper, and what is the relation between this account and the other three. As far as I know, my *Gnadenmittlelehre* is the only dogmatical treatise in the Lutheran Church in America which takes up these questions; even Pieper, in his voluminous *Christliche Dogmatik*, glides superficially over the real difficulty. We are still of the conviction that Paul's account must be used as basis for all dogmatical statements. We take up this and all similar questions in the second part of this lecture.

Finally, we might mention a third factor brought out by the investigation of the modern school concerning the Lord's Supper: it is the remarkable observation that all exponents of

this school take it for granted that the Synoptic accounts, as well as Paul's, express the belief that the Lord's Supper was a sacramental meal and that in and with the eating of the bread and the drinking of the cup supernatural powers were transmitted to the partakers. This their belief is the reason why they assume the influx of heathen religions into the understanding of the Lord's Supper. These consequences we deny, but we gladly make a note of this fact: Even to the exponents of the modern school it is an indisputable fact that the *Verba Testamenti* must be so understood that bread and wine are the bearers that bring us heavenly blessings, in other words, they testify to the correctness of our Lutheran understanding of the words of institution. This leads us to the second part, which is to show whether our Lutheran doctrine concerning the meaning of the Lord's Supper can still be held fast. The first part proved that we still have good reasons today to hold fast to these points: Jesus Himself instituted the Lord's Supper; He instituted it to be repeated and be a permanent rite in His church; it rightly consists of two parts, the distributing of bread and the passing of a cup of wine, each accompanied by a certain formula; these formulae refer to the death of Christ and its redemptive effect; the Lord's Supper was instituted in connection with the Passover meal and for this reason we can expect it to be a sacramental meal based on Christ's sacrifice upon the cross.

II

The result of the first part of this lecture can be summarized as follows: In spite of all the learned investigations of a liberal theology we have no reasons why we should not hold fast to these facts: 1. The Lord's Supper is not the outcome of a longer or shorter historical development, more or less influenced by non-Christian elements, but an institution of Jesus Himself; 2. He instituted it in connection with the Passover meal; 3. it consisted of two parts, the distribution of bread and the passing of the cup; 4. both parts were accompanied by certain words which brought this meal in connection with His death for the sake of men, whatever the meaning of these words might have been. Thus the first part of this lecture treated the origin of the Lord's Supper; the second part will have to answer the question concerning the meaning of the Lord's Supper, whether we still can hold fast to the doctrine that under, in and with the bread and wine the body and the blood of Christ is given to all who participate in the meal.

In order to find the answer we must first of all become certain what Scripture passages must be considered as the foundation for this doctrine, the so-called *sedes doctrinae*.

Today it should no longer be necessary to prove that John 6 cannot be used as the basis for a Biblical doctrine of the Lord's Supper. At the time of Luther this was maintained by Caspar Schwenkfeld and Valentin Krautwald; both held that the words of institution must be explained in view of John 6; still more by Ulrich Zwingli, for whom the passage, "The flesh profiteth nothing," was basic for his Christology as well as for his doctrine of the Lord's Supper. He called it the "brazen wall" before which all will break down who believe that the visible flesh should be of any value for our salvation. Even the doctrine of Calvin is based much more on John 6 than on the words of institution. In his *Institutio* he adduces them several times, but twice as often John 6. At the time when Cryptocalvinism tried for the second time to get a firm hold on Saxony, Magister Seb. Leonhart of Dresden published a *Spruchbuch* or Collection of proof-passages for the individual points of the Catechism, a voluminous book of 576 pages. Concerning the Lord's Supper it contained 24 Scripture passages, but the *verba testamenti* were not among them; five passages, however, from John 6 are quoted.

Two reasons do not permit us to use John 6 as a basis for our doctrine of the Lord's Supper: It is by no means clear from the outset whether John 6 refers to the Lord's Supper at all, and in the earliest liturgies we find the words of institution alluded to or directly quoted but not John 6. In the communion prayers of the Didache we find the expression "spiritual meat and drink," but this refers to I Cor. 10 and not to John 6. When Justin Martyr about fifty years later (ca. 150) in his First Apology describes the celebration of the Lord's Supper, he writes: "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." In the ancient Egyptian liturgy used at the end of the second century we find them quoted; so again in the *Euchologium* of Serapion, and in the form offered in the so-called *Constitutiones Apostolicae*. There is no doubt that the *verba testamenti* were

the root of the celebration of the Lord's Supper, and, therefore, they are to be the basis for any doctrine about it.

But since they are transmitted to us in very different forms, the question arises which one of them is to be considered as the most adaptable basis. Luther preferred the long version of Luke, the only one known at that time. In his *Bekentnis vom Abendmahl* of 1528 he wrote: "If anyone is ready to listen, we would have enough with St. Luke's account; so well and clearly does he speak of the Last Supper. He first describes the farewell draught (*Letze Trunk*) of Christ and says: 'And He took the cup and gave thanks and said, "Take this and divide it among yourselves; for I say unto you, I will not drink of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come."' Here Christ testifies that this will be the last draught of wine that He will share with His disciples, but soon after He gives them the cup of wine of the new Supper, etc. If now in this new Supper we had only common wine, how could He then say that the previous one should be the farewell draught and that He did not intend to drink wine any longer? If it is not wine, it must be what He calls it, namely His blood. So Luke here states conclusively that there cannot be mere wine in the Supper of Christ. Here the objection may be raised, who knows whether Christ spoke these words concerning the farewell draught before or after His Supper? Because Luke writes that He spoke such words before the Supper, while Matthew and Mark write that He spoke them after the Supper. Very well, then it depends on this, which one of the Evangelists kept the correct order in his account? If Luke did so, the matter is simple and our understanding of it correct, and without doubt the fanatics have nothing to stand on. But if the fanatics question this, we are still sure that we are right, and that is sufficient. Now let us hear from the Evangelists' own statement which one preserves the right sequence in his account. St. Luke testifies at the beginning of his Gospel that he wanted to record all things from the beginning in order. And he proves his assertion by his Gospel, in which one event follows another most fittingly, as all the world knows. But Matthew and Mark made no such promise. Neither do they do so, as could be shown by many examples, as when Matthew describes the temptations of Christ and the appearances of Christ after the resurrection, etc., where he does not retain the regular order. And St. Augustine in *De Consensu Evangelistarum* bestows much labor on the question. Just at this point in the Supper, Mark departs from the regular order, when he places

“And they all drank of it” before the words: “And he said, ‘This is My blood,’” which from the very nature of things it ought to follow. — Since then there is no question that Matthew did not retain the exact order, but Luke has obligated himself to do so and does so in fact. So Matthew and Mark must be considered according to the order given by St. Luke, and not the opposite. So we must say that Matthew and Mark have placed after the New Supper what took place after the old Supper and is to be located there. For they were not greatly concerned about the order but were satisfied if they wrote history and truth. Luke, however, who wrote after them, states that the reason for his writing was that many others had written such accounts without regard to the order of events, and that he, therefore, had resolved to write them in the proper order. And so many are of the opinion, which is quite credible, that St. Paul referred to St. Luke when he said approvingly, “we have sent with him the brother whose praise is in the Gospel throughout all the churches.” So that further shows that Luke strove to maintain the correct order, that he not only describes the farewell draught but all the Passover proceedings and says: “And when the hour was come, He sat down, and the twelve apostles with Him. And He said unto them: ‘With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer; for I say unto you, I will not any more eat thereof, until it will be fulfilled in the Kingdom of God.’ And He took the cup, etc.” here you can see that in one account everything is related in correct order, both concerning the eating and drinking, which Matthew and Mark do not do. As the farewell eating stands in orderly fashion before the New Supper and should stand there, so certainly the farewell drinking stands before the New Supper, for both have a farewell character and should not be separated.

Today Luther would hardly maintain what he wrote in 1528, because today we know about the so-called short form of Luke, as it is preserved in Codex D, in the Itala and in a few Syriac manuscripts, which of the *verba testamenti* contains only the words: τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμα μου, does not mention the cup of the Lord's Supper at all, and consequently, of course, no words referring to this cup. And there can hardly be a doubt that this short form is the original text of Luke. Two reasons demand that: 1. It is easy to explain that in later editions of the Gospel of Luke, at a time when the letters of Paul with the text of I Cor. 11:24, 25 and the Gospels of Matthew and Mark became known and were read side by side, the original short form of Luke was supplemented from the forms of Paul, Matthew and

Mark, while it would be a very strange and unexplainable procedure that a later copyist should have shortened the longer form and retained nothing but the words: τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμα μου.

2. The so-called longer form could not be written by Luke because it contains such a surprising grammatical mistake as Luke, who always wrote a correct, even beautiful Greek, could not have written. The long form is the product of a very awkward and clumsy redactor. He supplemented the short form of Luke by taking over literally the corresponding form of Paul. If he had done more than this, he would have gotten a complete text and one that is linguistically correct. But now he added to the Pauline ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματι μου the words τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυνόμενον from Mark 14:24 and did not notice that in order to fit grammatically to the accepted Pauline version they ought to be changed from the nominative to the dative reading τῷ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυνόμενον. As the Greek words of the long version now read they speak not of the *blood* that was shed, but of the *cup* that was shed, because the nominative τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυνόμενον of the transmitted long text can grammatically only refer to ποτήριον and not to the dative τῷ αἵματι. It is impossible to assume that Luke made such a mistake. Since Westcott-Hort in their edition of the Greek New Testament in 1881 considered the short form as the original text of Luke, they have had many followers: Robinson, Gardner, Andersen, Brandt, Loisy, Nicolardat, Seeberg, Zahn, Wendt, Rietschel, Haupt, Titius, B. Weiss, J. Weiss, Schmiedel, Grafe, Schuerer, Pfeleiderer, F. Barth, v. Dobschuetz, R. A. Hoffmann, Heitmueller. All these wrote between 1881 and 1911. Since 1922 the following took the same position: G. Dalman 1922, v. Dobschuetz-Nestle 1923, W. Bauer 1923, H. Lietzmann 1926 and 1931, A. Oepke 1926, F. C. Burkitt 1927, R. Harris 1927, Johannes Jeremias 1928 and 1930, E. Klostermann 1929, Fr. Hauck 1931, R. Otto 1934, J. Finegan 1934, A. Hoffmann 1934, Joachim Jeremias 1935. During the last ten years I know of only three who still believe in the originality of the long form: Dibelius 1933, Hupfeld 1935 and the Roman Catholic Arnold 1937, but all three combine strange ideas with their assumption and for this reason alone do not create much confidence.

As soon as we assume the originality of the short form, we have to give answer to the question: Why did Luke break off after those mysterious words τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμα μου? It was Zahn, who already in the first edition of his *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* 1897-1899 indicated the correct answer. He explained it as a well-founded reserve of Luke over against the

first reader of his Gospel. Theophilus had not yet joined the Christian congregation when Luke wrote his Gospel for him, and for an outsider it sufficed to know that here a mysterious act took place; to tell him in detail in what it consisted was neither necessary nor advisable. In Zahn's commentary on Luke of 1913 we find the same explanation. Schlatter accepted it 1922 in his *Theologie der Apostel*; H. N. Bate wrote 1927: "I am tempted to think that we have here such a genuine trace of a *disciplina arcani* as reappears in the Fourth Gospel. One can quite readily conceive that St. Luke's narrative was published under circumstances which made it inadvisable to disclose the inner meaning of Christian worship." Zahn thought primarily, but by no means exclusively, of the defamations of the Christians based on the slanders of the Lord's Supper, as we find them mentioned in the report of Pliny to the Roman Emperor. He added: "But even besides the possibility of such slander it was apt to limit to the members of the congregation the information concerning this most holy treasure of Christianity." On the basis of this I gave the same answer in my *Gnadenmittlehre* of 1917. And yet there remained a certain uncertainty with me because of my inability to prove definitely that already in the first century, some kind of an *arcani disciplina* existed. Joh. Leipoldt and still more Joachim Jeremias removed also this uncertainty. Jeremias showed by a number of fine observations that even in the New Testament time the *disciplina arcani* was in use, and not only outside of the Christian congregations, but a number of the terms used in the New Testament itself indicate its use also in the Apostolic Church.

Today the version of the *verba testamenti* as we find them in Mark is considered by many as the oldest and most trustworthy. We mention some: C. Weizsaecker, 1892; Juelicher 1892, P. W. Schmiedel 1899; A. Schweitzer 1901; J. Wellhausen 1909, M. Werner, 1923; A. Oepke 1926; H. Weinel 1928; T. H. W. Masfield, 1933; Joach. Jeremias 1935. Joachim Jeremias, to his own surprise, arrived at this result by a mere comparison of I Cor. 11:23-25; Mark 14:22-25; Matt. 26:26-29 and Luke 22:15-19a. Since his investigation shows in what measure even relatively conservative scholars give room to personal, individualistic notions over against the transmitted text in order to discover the form lying behind the transmitted text, we show the procedure of Jeremias somewhat in detail. He first wants to find those words of Christ that accompanied the distribution of the bread. Here he states that the words *τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμα μου*

are common to all four accounts and therefore must be considered as original words of Christ. Then he takes up those three phrases that go beyond these and are not related by all four versions. He finds three of them: 1. The command to take, which we find in Matthew and Mark, and to eat, offered by Matthew. This additional element of Matthew over against Mark, Jeremias thinks, could lead to the assumption that λάβετε as well as φάγετε, added to the original words of Jesus, has its root in the liturgical usage. This, he believes, is correct as far as φάγετε is concerned, not as far as λάβετε is taken into consideration, for λάβετε seems to be absent only in Luke's account although he had used it before, in 22:17. Therefore we could say, even λάβετε is common to Matthew, Mark and Luke. This finds an auxiliary testimony in the fact that that old Jewish gold cup preserved in the library of the Vatican bears the inscription, Λάβε εὐλογία; it seems that such formulae were in use when the Jews passed the bread and the cup at the passover meal. A second additional element, not common to all accounts, is the Pauline τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν. This, according to Jeremias, was not spoken by Christ because it is impossible to translate it into Aramaic; it may have its root in the fact that the liturgical usage demanded for the bread a parallel element to the ἐκχυννόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν, and because ἐκχυννόμενον did not fit, no verb was used at all, leaving only τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν. This assumption seems to find support in the observation that, when later the long form of Luke was formed, the τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν was changed into τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον. The third additional element, not common to all four accounts but found in Paul alone, is the command, τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. This Jeremias does not consider as spoken by Christ; it came into use rather because similar phrases were a common element applied at that time when memorial celebrations for the dead were established. So the words: λάβετε, τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμα μου remain as original words of Jesus.

As far as the words are concerned that accompanied the distribution of the wine, the element common to all four accounts is this: τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ αἷμα μου τῆς διαθήκης τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν. It is true, even these words are not found in all four accounts in the same way, but Jeremias rightly holds that the difference is only an apparent rather than a real one. If we read with Paul: "his cup is the new covenant in my blood" or with Mark and Matthew: "This is my blood of the covenant" — it means the same. That becomes apparent from a comparison of the subject and the predicate of both formulations. With Mark

and Matthew the subject is the wine in the cup; the same is the case with Paul, who with his *τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον* does not mean the cup but its contents. Also the predicate in these two formulations is the same. Mark and Matthew with their formulation *αἷμα μου τῆς διαθήκης*, as well as Paul with his formulation "the wine is the New Covenant in virtue of my blood" compare the wine with the blood by the shedding of which the New Covenant is established. Over and above what in this second part of the *verba testamenti* is common to all four accounts we have four or five additional elements that vary more or less. The first is the command to drink: *πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες* with the following *γάρ*, transmitted by Matthew. Jeremias considers this command as a later, secondary element, not spoken by Christ. Its source is the phrase *καὶ ἔπιον ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες* in Mark 14:23, which was merely changed to the imperative form in order to have a parallel to the *λάβετε* in the first part. The second additional element is the adjective *καινή* modifying *διαθήκη*. According to Jeremias this modifier came into the Pauline version because in Jeremiah 31:31-34 the future covenant—the same of which Jesus here spoke—was characterized thus. The third additional element is the command, *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἑμὴν ἀνάμνησιν*, which is considered by Jeremias a later supplement, not spoken by Jesus, for the same reasons mentioned above. The fourth additional element consists of all the words modifying the word *αἷμα*. Paul's account does not have any modifying elements, while Mark transmitted *τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν*, and Matthew: *τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυννόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν*. But according to Jeremias this is only a seeming and not a real difference, because the thought expressed by Matthew and Mark is not lacking in Paul, it is by him connected not with the cup or wine but only with the bread (*σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν*). The *ὑπὲρ πολλῶν* is preferred by Jeremias because it is more Semitic than *ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν*; the difference between *ὑπὲρ*—thus Mark—and *περὶ*—thus Matthew—is of no importance because they are often used interchangeably; *εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν* is considered correct by Jeremias, but not spoken by Jesus.

Finally, the outlook to the meal of the eschatological future is found in all accounts in this or that form. We meet it in Mark 14:25; Matt. 26:29; Luke 22:15-18 and in I Cor. 11:26. More of that later.

According to Jeremias the oldest account of the *verba testamenti* then consisted of the following: 1. The pascal word Luke 22:15-16: "With desire have I desired to eat this passover

with you before I suffer. For I say unto you, I will not any more eat thereof, until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God"; 2. The word about the fruit of the vine Mark 14:25: "Verily I say unto you, I will drink no more of the fruit of the vine, until that day that I drink it new in the kingdom of God"; 3. The word accompanying the distribution of the bread: "Take, this is my body"; 4. The word accompanying the passing of the cup: "This is my blood of the covenant that will be shed for many."

No doubt, this result is much more acceptable than the results of Heitmueller or Lietzmann. The last supper of Jesus then was no common meal; it really had a specific significance, differentiating it from all other meals. Then it was celebrated in connection with the Passover meal, and the words spoken by Jesus would have brought the Supper into inseparable connection with His vicarious death immediately following and the establishment of the New Covenant. And yet even this outcome of Jeremias' investigation is not completely satisfying. The elimination of the words *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν* rests upon very doubtful subjective reasoning. It is true, neither Matthew nor Mark nor the original text of Luke contain these words; but since when does it follow from the fact, that when one of the three or four telling the same story offers a new feature, this new feature is a later interpolation. Just apply this rule to the accounts of historical events in general and you will immediately see how wrong it is. Apply it to the testimonies given before a court and ask an experienced judge what he thinks of new features brought in, even if it is only one witness that testifies to this new feature. The judge would consider it his duty to follow it up most closely because it could change the whole picture. And when he finds that it fits well into the given situation, he certainly would not eliminate it as unessential nor ignore it entirely. The only reason given by Jeremias in order to justify the elimination of this passage is his reference to the Hellenistic habit of those days establishing in the form of a last will yearly repetitions of certain cult celebrations for the purpose of the remembrance of some loved one. We do not doubt this habit and readily concede that Jeremias collected much more material to verify it than Heitmueller and others before him did. But the existence of this habit and its application by Paul to the celebration of the Lord's Supper are two different things; the first by no means proves the second. We are all the more surprised that Jeremias finds no other explanation for this passage

and rather eliminates it as a later interpolation into the words of Christ, because he concedes both, the close connection of the last meal of Jesus with the Passover meal and its inseparable connection with the vicarious death of Jesus immediately following. Whoever as Heitmueller, Lietzmann and many others denies this connection can imagine that he is able to explain our passage by a reference to those Hellenistic habits; however, he who maintains that twofold connection should at once rid himself decidedly of any such attempt at explanation, because just this twofold connection offers him all the material necessary to understand our passage. The Passover meal was a remembrance of the divinely commanded application of blood and the following liberation from the angel of death and the slavery in Egypt; it was exactly stated in Exod. 12:14 that the yearly repetition of the Passover meal should serve *lesikkaron*, as a memorial of this wonderful event, and whenever the Passover meal was held, the whole account of this event was told by one of the participants of the meal. Now if that last meal of Jesus had its specific significance and was to be something new, if it was held in connection with the yearly repeated Passover meal and pointed to Jesus' death for the sake of the salvation of men, was it then not natural that the question arose, whether it should be likewise repeated and whether this repetition should take place in remembrance of Him who was going to shed His blood for the salvation of men? Instead of being a later interpolation our passage, although containing a new element in comparison with the other accounts, fits admirably into the situation and should not be eliminated.

That leads to the other question, if not, perhaps, the Pauline version instead of Mark's account ought to be the basis of the doctrine of the Lord's Supper? It no doubt contains every feature given in Mark's account, and concerning the principal addition, the command of repetition, we just found that it can hardly be termed a later interpolation but has all the earmarks of originality. I really believe the Pauline account is to be the basis, and this for two reasons: It is the oldest account, and it is written under circumstances that demanded a version setting forth the nature and purpose of the Lord's Supper in an authoritative and all-comprising manner.

There is, of course, no doubt that Jesus spoke the *verba testamenti* in Aramaic and that they at the beginning were transmitted orally in that language. Now Jeremias and others think that the account of Mark would have retained this original

oral tradition of the *verba* in the most reliable way, while Paul's account, although following the same Aramaic oral tradition, would represent already a transformation of this original tradition, caused by the special needs of the Hellenistic congregations. Jeremias thinks this would follow from two facts: 1. from the fact that Mark's account contains more Semitisms than Paul's; 2. from the fact that Paul's account contains such later additions as *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε*, etc. But we already saw that the second point rests merely upon a very doubtful subjective assumption, and the first point dwindles more and more into nothing, the closer it is examined. For those who believe that Paul, as well as Mark, Matthew and Luke, were when writing their accounts under special control of the Holy Spirit, it is a matter of course that every part of every account is to be considered in order to get a correct and complete picture of the institution of the Lord's Supper, but even if we, for the sake of investigation, look at these accounts as purely human reports, we believe that Paul's account ought to be made the basis for doctrinal statements concerning the Lord's Supper.

Not because we are of the opinion that the passage *Ἐγὼ γὰρ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου ὃ καὶ παρέδωκα ὑμῖν* would indicate that Paul received his knowledge of the Lord's Supper by immediate revelation. That is untenable, for the verbs *παραλαμβάνειν* and *παραδίδόναι* are the technical terms used for human oral tradition. *Παραλαμβάνειν* is a translation of the rabbinical term *מִן פֶּה* and *παραδίδόναι* a translation for the rabbinical term *לְמִסֵּר*, and these rabbinical terms always refer to human oral tradition. The comparison with I Cor. 15:1 ff. alone should prove that beyond any doubt, for here Paul says of his *κήρυγμα* that he had received it, and he uses the same *termini* *παραδίδόναι* and *παραλαμβάνειν* as in I Cor. 11:23, and it is impossible that he is here thinking of anything else but oral tradition. Therefore, I Cor. 11:23 does not want to say anything else but this: the chain of tradition concerning the Lord's Supper that he has transmitted to the Corinthians goes back without interruption to Jesus Himself. He does not state when he himself was made acquainted with this tradition. There are, however, only two possibilities. Either it was done when he became a member of the congregation at Antioch (Acts 11:26) and that was hardly later than 43 and hardly earlier than 40, or immediately after his conversion in 35, because it is hardly correct to assume that the congregation at Damascus did not celebrate the Lord's Supper even once during the "many days" that he stayed there (Acts 9:23). This brings

us into close proximity to the year when the Lord's Supper was instituted. It is impossible to assume that between 30, the year of the Lord's death, and 35, the year of Paul's conversion, the tradition concerning the Lord's Supper had undergone any essential change, as e. g. the addition of *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν*. Thus we may rest assured, the account of Paul is the oldest account and the most trustworthy basis for the doctrine of the Lord's Supper.

But we mentioned a second reason: Paul wrote his account under certain conditions existing in the congregation at Corinth that demanded an account setting forth the true nature and real purpose of the Lord's Supper in an authoritative and all inclusive manner. Paul's report in I Cor. 11 presupposes that at that time the *κυριακὸν δεῖπνον* was celebrated in connection with another common meal, and that the necessary food and the usual wine were brought along by the members, especially the wealthier members of the congregation, and that the Lord's Supper was considered as a meal not of one or two, but of many, if not all members of the congregation. But now an abuse in several directions had crept in. The members of the congregation, consisting partly of slaves and other members of the working class, could often not come in time to this common meal. In that case the well-to-do should have waited for the poor that were prevented from coming there in time. Instead of waiting for them, however, the well-to-do began to eat and to drink of those supplies which they had brought along for themselves as well as for the poor, and so it happened that the rich were filled to satiety and some even were drunk, while for the poor, when they finally came, little or nothing was left, so that they hungered. By this abuse the Lord's Supper, that was to be held in connection with this meal, could not be held at all. Paul does not only say they lacked the right spiritual preparation — that certainly was also true, and the following verses, therefore, emphasize the necessity of the worthiness of the participants —, but he writes: consequently its celebration at all was made impossible, because not only were the provisions used up, but also it could be celebrated no longer as a meal of the whole communion of the congregation. This appeared to Paul as a terrible abuse, a lack of differentiation between a common meal and this holy supper. Let them eat and drink in their homes, he says, whenever they feel the necessity to eat and drink; the meal in connection with which the Lord's Supper is celebrated is a singular and peculiar meal and must be recognized and kept as such.

In order to do away with this abuse and to lead the Corinthians back to its proper celebration, Paul reminds his light-minded and superficial congregation, that was ever in danger of sinking into its former heathen ways, concerning the nature and the purpose of this holy meal. And to accomplish this he knows of no better way than to recall to their mind the fact that the origin of the Lord's Supper is not human but divine: The Lord Himself did once institute this meal, and He did it at a most solemn time: it was in the night when He was betrayed, when He entered upon the most dangerous road He had ever trod, the road of His suffering and death. How is it possible for Christians to deal lightly with a divine institution established in the most decisive hours, as the last will and testament of Jesus Christ their Lord? For the same reason Paul reminds the Corinthians that participation in this meal is an ever-repeated proclamation of Christ's death and that whoever eats this meal unworthily, that is, whoever does not discern the Lord's body, who eats of that meal, is guilty of the body of Christ and will not escape the divine judgment. But a still more effective protest against the abuse of the Lord's Supper by the Corinthians and a stronger appeal for its correct estimation in Paul's eyes are the *verba testamenti* themselves. According to them the meal once instituted by Christ is to be repeated by His disciples for the purpose of a remembrance of Him, a fact entirely forgotten by the Corinthians, and the gift of this meal is nothing less than the body and the blood of Christ given unto death for the accomplishment of forgiveness of sin. How should the realization of this nature and this purpose of the Lord's Supper bring the Corinthians back to their senses and a God-pleasing use of this holy meal!

Indeed, we have reasons enough to use Paul's account as the basis for the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. In doing so, we always compare the other accounts, especially Matthew's and Mark's, because they go back to the same oral tradition and might supplement Paul's account in this or that point. They were written later than Paul's account, for congregations in whose midst the Lord's Supper had been celebrated and correctly estimated for several decades, and since their repetition was not necessitated by abuse, they could be shorter; especially was there no reason to remind the readers that the Lord's Supper was to be repeated, repeated for the purpose of being an ἀνάμνησις of Jesus and His work of redemption.

Now we know the source out of which the doctrine of the Lord's Supper can be developed. According to Paul the last meal of Jesus connected with the Passover meal consisted in this: In the night in which Christ was betrayed, that is to say, in the night in which his fate was sealed and his road became the *via dolorosa*, He took some of the unleavened bread used in the Passover meal, gave thanks over it — apparently, as the Jewish head of the house was accustomed to do at the Passover meal, when he took the bread in his hands and gave thanks for the fruits of the earth —, broke it — on account of its thin, flat shape — into pieces and (gave it to His disciples and) said certain words, again, as the head of the house did when during the Passover meal after the passing of the second cup he had taken the unleavened bread in order to distribute it among those that participated in the meal. The head of the house usually said, "This is the bread of misery that our fathers ate in Egypt." Jesus, however, said: "This is my body which is for you," τοῦτό μου ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν. The τοῦτο referred apparently to the bread which He held in His hands and distributed among His disciples. That Christ, as He spoke the word τοῦτο pointed to his body and made a statement about it, is a queer notion for which Carlstadt very properly earned Luther's ridicule and scorn. The words τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν lack the corresponding verb. Some codices supplemented κλώμενον, others θρουπτόμενον and still others διδόμενον. This variety alone makes it at least probable that Paul did not write any of these participles and left the τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν without any complement; it did not necessarily need one. The reading κλώμενον, testified to mostly by Western and Syriac texts, would create difficulty; since it would be in contradiction to the story of Christ's death and especially to John 19:36; and to follow Hofmann who thinks κλώμενον could indicate the forceful spraining and dislocation of Christ's body on the cross, is — although this usage in itself is to be conceded — made nearly impossible in our passage by the fact that Paul had used κλῶν in the same sentence in an entirely different sense. "This is my body" — these words can hardly mean anything else but this: "In eating this bread you are eating at the same time my body, that body that is about to be given in your stead or for your sake unto death." While at first sight the thought might seem worthy of consideration that the bread had suddenly been transformed into Christ's body, this thought is forever excluded by the immediately following statement: "This cup is the new covenant by virtue of my blood" — how could

the cup or its contents, the wine, have been transformed into the new covenant? Such an interpretation is even more definitely excluded by the fact that Paul in I Cor. 10:16 calls the bread of the Lord's Supper a *κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος*. Whatever *κοινωνία* may mean, it can be used only then when the relation between two objects is to be expressed. So here bread and body of Christ are the two objects that mutually participate. It is bread, but bread that has part in the body of Christ; it is the body of Christ, but the body of Christ that has part in the bread; by taking the one we at the same time take the other. And the body of Christ, in which the disciples received part by receiving the bread, was the body that that night, when Jesus was betrayed, was about to be given into death for their sake.

Then followed the second part of the holy act, because there really was a second act. We know why Luke did not mention this second part and wrote, according to the original text only the words: *τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου*. This second part, however, did not immediately follow the first. So we celebrate the Lord's Supper today, and so we might, if we had only the accounts of Matthew and of Mark, assume that it was celebrated on the evening when it was instituted. But Paul writes that the second part followed *μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι*, that is, after they had "supped." It would be puerile to think that this clause referred to the just mentioned eating of the bread. Then it would not only be superfluous, but the Greek word *δειπνῆσαι* would also not come into its own. *Δειπνεῖν* denotes the eating of the whole meal, whether breakfast, dinner or supper, not only of a single part of it. *Μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι* is, therefore, identical with our German *nach dem Essen*; *ich komme erst nach dem Essen*. Luther's translation *nach dem Abendmahl* is correct, although one might wish he had written *nach dem Abendessen* in order to do away with the possible misunderstanding that he would here use the term *Abendmahl* in its dogmatical sense. If we take *δειπνεῖν* in its only possible sense, then it fits excellently into the historical situation. It was the Passover meal in connection with which Jesus instituted His new supper, and here followed, after the head of the house had taken a part of the unleavened bread and distributed it with the words: "This is the bread of misery that our fathers ate in Egypt," the eating of the Passover lamb. This it is that Paul had in mind when he wrote *μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι*. The eating of the Passover lamb was followed by a long, more general prayer and after that by a prayer of thanks (Matthew as well as Mark wrote *εὐχαριστήσας*); and now the third cup,

called the cup of thanksgiving, was passed. As Jesus had connected the first part of His new supper with the distribution of the unleavened bread, so now he connected the second part with the passing of this cup of thanksgiving as the eating of the lamb was over.

Jesus took the cup that stood upon the Passover table, filled with wine, fermented, but highly diluted wine — Rabbi Eliezer according to Berakkoth 7, 5 even forbade the table-blessing over undiluted wine; the assumption of some fanatic prohibitionists that it was grape juice hardly deserves to be mentioned. According to Matthew and Mark He spoke a prayer of thanks over the cup and passed it to his disciples, saying: τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ αἵματι. The addition of τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο makes it incontrovertibly clear that in the first part of the act the word τοῦτο referred to the bread, though really no proof is necessary to establish this fact; neither should it be doubted that τὸ ποτήριον is used by metonymy for the wine which was contained in the cup and drunk from it. So, according to this Pauline account, Jesus now made a statement concerning the wine, as He shortly before the eating of the Passover lamb had made one concerning the bread. According to Matthew and Mark the statement was: τοῦτο ἐστὶν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης, this wine contained in this cup is the blood of the covenant; according to Paul the statement was: τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ αἵματι. At first sight the Pauline wording seems somewhat distorted and as having another sense than the wording in Matthew and Mark; but really neither is the case, as has been shown above in another connection. The preposition ἐν is to be taken in the causal sense meaning "on account of" or "by virtue of." That there is such a causal use of ἐν no one can doubt, and the position of ἐστὶν shows that this sense is to be applied here: "this cup or this wine is the new covenant by virtue of my blood." If my blood would not be, and if it would not be contained in this cup or wine this cup or wine would never be the new covenant, in fact, the new covenant would not be established if it were not for my blood. If that is the sense, then the harmony between the Pauline wording and the wording of Matthew and Mark becomes apparent, although the latter brings out more clearly the parallel between the words accompanying the distribution of the bread and the words accompanying the passing of the cup: "This is my body — this is my blood." "This blood" is modified as the blood of the new covenant; and this can mean nothing else than the blood that established the cove-

nant. To speak accurately we must say: According to Matthew and Mark Jesus spoke of the blood by means of which the covenant is established, and according to Paul He spoke of the covenant that is established by the blood. In both cases blood and covenant are inseparably connected. Furthermore: Matthew and Mark describe the blood as blood that is about to be shed (τὸ περὶ [Mark ὑπέρ] πολλῶν ἐκχυνόμενον). Paul does not have this modifying clause, but this causes no uneasiness to him who knows that the New Testament, when speaking of the blood of Christ, never means the blood that flowed in His veins while He lived but always the blood that was shed. So the meaning of the statement according to all three accounts is: By means of drinking of the cup filled with wine the disciples participate in the blood of Christ and thereby become members of that new covenant that is to be established by the shedding of this blood.

We say: by means of drinking from the wine they participate in the blood of Christ — that this is the correct understanding of Paul's account becomes evident when we again compare what he himself says in I Cor. 10:16. Here he says of the cup that it is κοινωνία τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, and that means: who drinks of this cup has part in the blood of Christ. Since Matthew also adds εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, he emphasizes the purpose for which the blood of Christ is shed, and in so doing adds a statement about the effect of this drinking of the cup. If they with the wine drink that blood of Christ that is about to be shed for the purpose of obtaining forgiveness of sins, then they will certainly by drinking this blood obtain that end for which it was shed, that is forgiveness of sins. But even this addition does not go beyond the wording of Mark and Paul, since forgiveness of sins, as we shall presently see, is one of the principal characteristics of the new covenant of which Mark and Paul speak as well as Matthew.

The terms διαθήκη, καινὴ διαθήκη and the composite term τὸ αἶμα τῆς διαθήκης demand special attention. Luther translated διαθήκη with *Testament* and translated *Blut des Neuen Testaments*, and the A. V. followed him, and in this translation we have the principal reason why we call the words of institution *Verba Testamenti*, and why, especially in popular literature, we speak of the institution of the Lord's Supper as the last will of Christ whose words we should not dare to alter in any particle but should ponder every one most carefully. Now it is true, we can call the words of institution a testament or the last will of Christ, and it is especially true that we have no right to alter them in any way; but the use of the term διαθήκη has nothing

to do with that. While διαθήκη, formed from διατίθημι, to order or dispose of, can mean an order or arrangement by which one disposes of his property, and in legal language often meant really nothing else than testament or last will, we find it in the New Testament in this sense only once, in Gal. 3:15, according to some also in Heb. 9:16, 17; in all other cases it has the meaning of the Hebrew בְּרִית (compare Luke 1:72; Acts 3:25; 7:8; Rom. 11:27; II Cor. 3:14; Heb. 7:22; 8:6, 9, 14; 9:4, 15, 20; 10:16; 12:24; 13:20 esp. II Cor. 3:6; Heb. 8:8; 9:15); בְּרִית, however, means any order or disposition and is the term for the relation arranged or established between God and His people. When applied to a relation established between men and men, it always expresses a mutual relationship in which both promise each other this or that. But when it is applied to God's relationship towards His people, it is always a one-sided relationship. It is God who establishes this relation between Himself and His people, and whatever order He establishes stands whether men on their part agree with and enter into this relationship or not. This was true of the διαθήκη established at Sinai: God ordered that His relation to Israel should be governed by the law. In distinction to this Jeremiah (31:31-34) promised a new covenant that has three characteristics: (1) all shall know God as one knows his friend by personal, loving intercourse; (2) the law of God will be written in everyone's heart, so that they have both willingness and strength to live in accordance with it; (3) they all shall have forgiveness of sins. This new covenant or relation between God and men was established by Christ, Heb. 8:8-12; it was established by the shedding of His blood upon the cross. Since Christ shed His blood on the cross, the relation between God and man is changed; it is now of such a nature that there is real communion with Him, forgiveness of sins and the creation of a new heart.

That this is the meaning of διαθήκη, and that Jesus referred to Jer. 31 when He spoke of the καινή διαθήκη is more and more generally conceded. But what is the meaning of τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης? Usually it is explained by reference to Exod. 24:8. Here we have a description of the establishment of the covenant at Sinai. Sacrificial animals were killed, and then for the purpose of the sealing of the covenant between God and His people a twofold blood-rite was carried out: half of the sacrificial blood was sprinkled on the altar, concerning the other half, however, we read, "And Moses took the blood and sprinkled it on the people and said: 'Behold the blood of the covenant which the Lord has

made with you.'” Formerly I believed with others that the words of the institution pointed back to this passage; and the fact that, as we can prove from the Targum of Onkelos and the Targum Jerusalem I, the Jews at Jesus’ time considered the sprinkling of the blood upon the altar as an act of expiation, seemed to strengthen this explanation. But meanwhile we have learned from Jeremias, that in two places in the Talmudic literature in the explanation of Zech. 9:11 and Exod. 12:6 the blood of the Passover lambs that were killed in Egypt is called “the blood of the covenant.” While to the sacrifice of the Passover lambs, as they were killed year after year and their blood was sprinkled on the altar, there was not ascribed any expiatory effect, this was done as far as the first Passover lambs in Egypt were concerned. If in connection with a meal that was held during the night of the Passover the expression “the blood of the covenant” is used as here by Jesus, and the blood of the first Passover lambs had expiatory effect and was likewise called by this name, then there should be no doubt that this expression refers not to Exod. 24, but to Exod. 12. And then it follows that Jesus here ascribed to the shedding of His blood expiatory effect, the power to cover up sin and thereby to bring into communion with God.

Keeping all this in mind, we must say: By the second part of the *Verba Testamenti* Jesus declared to his disciples: By drinking of this cup you partake of my blood, of the same blood by the shedding of which your sins are covered, you are protected against the power of death and are lifted up into real communion with God. In the greatness of this gift the account of Matthew finds the reason (γάρ) why *all* the disciples should drink of the cup.

The repeated injunction τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν, peculiar to Paul’s account, leaves no doubt as to Christ’s intention of instituting an act that was to be perpetually observed by His followers, for, as we have seen, we have no right to consider this passage as not spoken by Christ Himself. The τοῦτο in both cases refers to all the acts mentioned before, to the taking, breaking (as far as necessitated by the shape of the bread that is to be distributed), giving thanks, distributing, speaking and eating, and again to the taking of the cup, giving thanks, distributing, speaking and drinking. Moreover, these acts are to be performed “for the purpose of Christ’s remembrance.” The term ἀνάμνησις is often taken in the subjective sense: whenever the disciples celebrate the Lord’s Supper, they are in their

thoughts to go back to this fateful and blessed hour in which Christ prepared Himself to go into death for their salvation. They shall recall Him and all He did for them; instead of only outwardly performing these acts they shall with their whole personality take part in them and remember His great love. Now there is no doubt that every disciple should do that when partaking of the Lord's Supper, but the Biblical usage of ἀνάμνησις points in another direction. Ἀνάμνησις is sometimes used interchangeably with μνημόσυνον or even with μνημεῖον and both express whatever keeps the memory alive and renews it again, be it a stone or a meal or something else. The twelve stones taken from the Jordan and set up at Gilgal Josh. 4:8 should serve as a זכרון, as a μνημόσυνον, that is, they should keep alive the memory of the great deed by which God led the Israelites across the Jordan. The Passover lamb should be killed year after year and thereby serve as a זכרון or μνημόσυνον (Exod. 12:14), that is, a means of keeping alive the memory of their liberation from the bondage of Egypt. The shewbread, over which the pure frankincense has been put, lay before Yahveh as an אזכרה, as an ἀνάμνησις (εἰς ἀνάμνησιν προκειμένα τῷ κυρίῳ), that is, they were a means of reminding God of His people (Lev. 24:7). The trumpets blown over the burnt offerings should serve Israel as a memorial before God (לזכרון, ἔσται ὑμῖν ἀνάμνησις ἔναντι τοῦ θεοῦ ὑμῶν). In Heb. 10:3 the author emphasizes the fact that the sacrifices of the Old Testament, instead of being able to cover the sin, served as an ἀνάμνησις of sins, they caused God to think of them again. Whether stones or sacrifices or shewbread or trumpets — all these lifeless or at least impersonal objects served εἰς ἀνάμνησιν; we think especially of the yearly Passover lambs and Passover meals. Just so, Jesus says, the repetition of the acts He performed at His last meal with His disciples is to serve as an ἀνάμνησις, as a reminder, as a holy drama that re-presents, re-enacts before the congregation what He did and said in the night when He went to His death. The mere repetition in itself — whether men participating in this holy meal think of Christ and His death, or not, whether they believe or not — the mere repetition of this meal in itself puts Christ before the eyes of all as He was about to give His body and His blood unto death. We only need to be witnesses of the repetition of these acts of Jesus and hear the accompanying words, and we cannot help thinking, we must think of Christ and of what He was ready to do. So every repetition of the Lord's

Supper is in itself a proclamation of Him and of His death, as Paul reminds the thoughtless Corinthians: the fact that the celebration of the Lord's Supper is a proclamation of Christ's death (I Cor. 11:26) should bid them stop to think and urge them to participate in it in a way corresponding to this fact.

There is still another point that should not be overlooked. Jesus said: τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. What word has the emphasis? In popular literature we again and again find the emphasis laid on ποιεῖτε. Now there is no doubt that ποιεῖτε must come into its own, but it does not have the emphasis. The emphasis is entirely on εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν, but here again on the possessive pronoun ἐμὴν. Εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν is stronger than εἰς τὴν ἀνάμνησιν μου. Luther already recognized this and said, ἐμὴν indicates a contrast, and the antithesis is to be found in the Passover meal and its purpose, The Passover meal should be repeated year after year לזכרון, as a memorial of the deliverance from Egypt (Exod. 12:14). The new supper that Jesus instituted is likewise to be repeated, and its repetition is likewise to serve as a memorial, but as a memorial of *Him* and the greater deliverance that *He* was about to accomplish by shedding His blood.

The result so far attained is: (1) The Lord's Supper is not the outcome of a longer or a shorter historical development, more or less influenced by non-Christian elements, but an institution of Jesus Himself; (2) He instituted it in connection with the Passover meal; (3) It consisted of two parts: the distribution of the bread and the passing of the cup; (4) Both parts were accompanied by certain words that brought this meal in connection with His death for the sake of men; (5) According to these words Jesus gave His disciples in and with the bread His own body to eat and in and with the wine His own blood that He was about to give into death in order to accomplish for them the remission of their sin; (6) This last Supper that Jesus ate with His disciples was to be repeated, and its repetition should be a memorial of Him and the salvation to be accomplished by Him just as the yearly repetition of the Passover meal was a memorial of the Passover lamb and the deliverance from Egypt.

But did we really understand Jesus rightly, when we said that in and with the bread He gave to His disciples His own body and in and with the wine His own blood, and are we Lutherans still justified in believing in the *unio sacramentalis* expressed in these words and in its consequences, the *manducatio oralis* and the *communio indignorum*?

Since ancient times attempts have been made to interpret the *Verba Testamenti* in a symbolical fashion, and during the last decades these attempts have been renewed in many quarters. All of them can be reduced to three forms.

Some think that the *τοῦτο* in Jesus' words *τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμα μου* pointed not to the bread in His hand, but to the action of breaking the bread into pieces, and this breaking of the bread, they believe, symbolized the breaking of Jesus' body, and thus was an image of His death. Jesus wanted to tell His disciples: Just as I have broken this bread, so my body is about to be broken in death. We concede that such an interpretation would fit into the context, for this last supper of Jesus was surrounded by sayings concerning His imminent death. According to Matthew and Mark the prediction of the betrayal through Judas immediately precedes the account of the Lord's Supper, and the prediction that He from now on will no longer drink with them of the fruit of the vine until He drinks it with them new in His Father's kingdom follows this account. This is likewise true according to the account of Luke, although the order is there changed. The words spoken about the bread and the wine would only repeat what was said before, with this difference, however, that this time the words were accompanied by the sign-language of breaking the bread. But three facts exclude what the context would permit: (1) The act of breaking the bread, although mentioned in all four accounts, was a rather subordinate element in the celebration of the Passover meal as well as in the last supper of Jesus, necessitated only by the shape of the bread and preparing for what was no doubt the principal act, the eating of the bread. Is it not strange to single out this one unimportant fact and make it the principal feature of the whole act? The exponents of this form of symbolical interpretation concede this, but they maintain, nevertheless, that in apostolic times much emphasis was laid on this feature, because the term "breaking of the bread" was a common designation for the Lord's Supper. We answer: (1) In the New Testament the terminology "breaking the bread" is not yet firmly fixed; the term is used in a wider and in a more specific sense. Compare, on the one hand, Matt. 14:19; 15:36; Luke 24:30, 35; Acts 2:42, 46; 27:35, and, on the other, I Cor. 10:16; 11:24; Matt. 26:26; Luke 22:19; Acts 20:11. There is only one passage in which the term "to break the bread" can scarcely mean anything else than the celebration of the Lord's Supper, and that is Acts 20:11. We answer: (2) It is true, this is changed in the post-apostolic age,

beginning with the usage of our term in the *Didache* and in the epistles of Ignatius; but this change took place with the introduction of the *disciplina arcani*; here the term "the breaking of the bread" was welcomed, because it indicated to Christians what was meant and to non-Christians it at the same time veiled its real nature. It is very possible that even the usage of this term in Acts 20:11 for the Lord's Supper already was influenced by the same *disciplina arcani*.

The second reason that does not permit us to take the breaking of the bread as a symbol of the breaking of Christ's body in death is this: in none of the original texts do we find the word "broken" when they refer to the body of Christ. While all four mention the breaking of the bread, none mentions the breaking of Christ's body. That *κλώμενον* in I Cor. 11:24 is not original we have already seen. Then Jesus would not have told the disciples of what the breaking of the bread should be a symbol; that is, the principal thing, without which the whole act was meaningless would not have been told them. And we can understand quite well why *κλώμενον* is not used in the genuine texts. It would not fit, because the body of Christ was not broken in the same sense in which the bread was broken. The breaking of the *mazzoth* of the Passover meal consisted in this that a whole was broken into its individual parts. The body of Christ was not so broken; and yet, if the genuine text offered *κλώμενον*, it would have to have this and no other meaning, since it would be impossible to give to the same word in the same sentence two different meanings.

And there is a third reason why this first symbolical interpretation is untenable. If it were correct, then only the first part of the last Supper of Jesus would mean anything; why Jesus then also took the cup and distributed it saying: "This is the blood of the New Testament" would be past finding out. In order to escape this absolutely logical consequence, we are told, no, also this second part of the celebration is of a symbolical character: the pouring out of the wine from the pitcher into the cup symbolized the shedding of the blood of Christ. But how is that possible? When the blood of Jesus was shed, its drops fell upon the cross and the ground; when, however, the wine is poured out into the pitcher, this is done in order to preserve it and distribute it for the purpose of drinking. To state this difference suffices as proof for the impossibility of this whole assumption. And still more: not a single account mentions this outpouring of the wine into the cup! Certainly this outpouring took place,

but how can we ascribe to it any symbolical character if it is not at all mentioned? Jeremias points to still another fact that excludes the symbolical interpretation of both, the breaking as well as the outpouring, especially however the latter: between the outpouring of the wine into the cup and the passing of the cup to the disciples the closing table prayer was spoken, and that consisted in the elevation of the cup (Mark 14:23), the admonition to the participants of the meal to pray, the prayer itself consisting of several benedictions and the "Amen" of the participants. How should it have been possible that the *τοῦτο* of the now following *τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου* over this prayer referred back to the outpouring of the wine from the pitcher into the cup? These are all impossibilities! No, not the action of the breaking of the bread nor the action of the outpouring can be understood as symbols. If there must be a symbol, then bread and wine must be considered symbols.

This leads us to the second form of symbolical interpretation which maintains that the bread and wine distributed by Christ were symbols of Christ's body and His blood. To him who is acquainted with the details of the Passover meal this proposition does not sound entirely impossible, because when the Jewish head of the house lifted up the bread saying: "This is the bread of misery that our fathers ate in Egypt," this bread was certainly not more than a symbol or a representation of the bread eaten by their fathers and not this bread itself. Whether, however, the text permits this symbolical interpretation as far as this new supper is concerned is another question. Of it might be true what Paul says in Col. 2:17 and what is emphasized in Heb. 8:5 and 10:1, that the time of the shadow is over and the reality has come, the more so, since the deliverance that the Lord's Supper recalls to our mind is of an entirely new and real nature. At least, it was not founded well at all when the exponents of this second form of symbolical interpretation pointed to the fact that Jesus spoke Aramaic and in this language there would be no equivalent for the Greek *ἐστίν* in such connections, therefore Jesus only said: "This my body" and "This my blood." This we know just as well as our critics, but it does not disquiet us for a moment. For two reasons: (1) The mere absence of the *copula* does not change the sense at all nor prevent us from understanding Jesus' words as a *synecdoche* (in eating this bread you at the same time eat with it my body); we rather believe, if there is a difference at all, it is in favor of the Lutheran and not the symbolical interpretation. We believe Luther was right

when he wrote: "Some texts, they say, omit the word 'is,' just as Luke omits it in connection with the cup (22:20). Granted. The Holy Spirit would thereby only strengthen our belief that the body of Christ is actually in the bread, for although the two statements: 'This *is* my body' and 'This my body,' are identical, the presence of the body is still more plainly and certainly expressed when I say: 'This my body' or 'Here my body'; and these words cannot so easily be misinterpreted by the fanatical enthusiasts as the words: 'This is my body.'" "If I were so well learned in Greek as Carlstadt and Zwingel, I should regard this as the strongest proof that Christ's body is eaten in the bread. For Erasmus shows that in the Greek the word 'is' is absent and that the text reads: 'Eat, this my body.' I would translate thus: 'Take and eat this my body which is broken for you.' But since I am not so well learned I will have to forgo this, lest I confound article and pronoun or manufacture an ἀλλοίωσις or use one case for another." That we can't base the symbolical interpretation on the absence of the copula is made evident by a second factor: the disciples must have understood their Master's words in the sense: "This is my body," because when they give them in Greek, they all write the copula; no genuine account is without the ἐστίν.

Others concede, yes, the ἐστίν is genuine; but they add, just this ἐστίν demands or at least permits the symbolical interpretation of bread and wine. The ἐστίν shows that Christ used parabolic or figurative speech; therefore it must be either translated or at least understood as "it signifies." But Zahn was right when he answered: This is impossible because, in that case, we would have a figure of speech applied here that we find nowhere in all the parables of Christ. In all parabolic discourses of Christ that which is to be pictured is the subject of the sentence, and that with which it is to be compared, the predicate. Jesus does not say: "The vine am I, but I am the vine"; He does not say: "The hidden treasure is like unto the kingdom of God," or "The grain of mustard is like to the kingdom of heaven," but: "The kingdom of heaven is like unto a treasure hid in the field; the kingdom of heaven is like to a grain of mustard." According to this way of speaking Jesus would have said: "My body is like to this bread; my blood is like to this wine." Since he, however, says: "This bread is my body, this wine is my blood," He shows that he does not apply figurative or parabolic speech, that we have to take His words as realistically as they are spoken: "This bread is my body, take and eat it, by taking and eating

the bread you are taking and eating my body; this wine is my blood by means of which I am establishing the new relation between God and man, by drinking the one you are drinking the other." But does not Jesus say: "The seed is the Word of God" (Luke 8:11), and do we not read in the Old Testament (Gen. 41:26): "The seven good kine are seven good years," and is not here also that which signifies or symbolizes the subject of the sentence and that which is symbolized the predicate, just as in the *Verba Testamenti*, and no one for a moment doubts that we here have a parabolic figure of speech; why then should it be impossible to take the *Verba Testamenti* likewise as a figurative speech? Answer: no, here we have no figurative or parabolic speech. Here we have rather an explanation of a preceding parabolic speech. By saying: "The seven good kine are seven good years," Joseph does not make a general statement and does not speak of any good kine but of those that were mentioned before in the dream of Pharaoh, and Joseph interprets the significance of these certain definite kine. And again by saying: "The seed is the Word of God," Jesus does not speak in a general way either, but He points back to the seed of which He had spoken in the preceding parable: This certain seed of which He spoke in the parable is the Word of God. Thus these and similar modes of speech can be used as an argument in favor of the symbolical interpretation of the *Verba Testamenti* only then if these likewise point back to a preceding parable, and just this is not the case. When Zwingli proclaimed his doctrine at Zuerich by referring to this word: "The seed is the Word of God" as proof for the correctness of his parabolic explanation, the city clerk arose and said: "But, Magister, where is the preceding parable?" Only in explanation of a preceding parable does the Biblical way of speaking permit us to take the *Verba Testamenti* in a symbolical way. And there is another factor that prohibits such an interpretation: If bread and wine were symbols of Christ's body and blood, why did Jesus go on and urge the disciples to eat and drink them? Symbols are to be observed, examined and understood, but they are not to be eaten or drunk.

Recognizing this fact, considering that it was a meal at which the words of Jesus were spoken, and that this eating and drinking was apparently the principal action, others came and conceded: Indeed, neither the breaking of bread nor the bread and wine were symbols, but the eating and drinking thereof. The eating and drinking of bread and wine is a symbol of ap-

appropriating Christ's body and blood. Jesus' body and blood are considered to be in heaven, shut up *tamquam in arresto*, for Christ according to His human nature does not participate in the omnipresence of the divine nature, but faith lifts itself up to heaven and participates in all the fruits of Christ's death and resurrection. According to His divine nature He is, of course, present at the Lord's Supper and can be made one's own as this can be done when we hear His Word, but participation in His body and blood can be accomplished only if we lift ourselves up to Him into heaven. This ascending by faith and appropriating Him in His human-divine totality together with all the fruits of His death and resurrection is symbolized by the eating of bread and the drinking of wine. But even this is hardly a correct construction, even if we now do not take into consideration the doubtful christology lying behind it with its philosophical maxim, *Finitum non est capax infiniti*. It is hardly correct, for the decisive element is supplemented from other sources, because Jesus in His *Verba Testamenti* in no wise indicated whereby the appropriation of His body and blood, symbolized by eating and drinking, is accomplished. This thought is brought in from John 6; it is not drawn out of the *Verba Testamenti*. Jesus did not tell the disciples what they were to understand by the breaking of the bread and the drinking of the cup, or by bread and wine, or by eating the bread and drinking the wine, but simply what they should *do*, namely that they should eat and drink, and what the bread is which they are to eat, and what the wine is which they are to drink. They could not understand Jesus' words otherwise than in this sense that by eating and drinking the proffered bread and wine, which they could see with their eyes and taste by their tongues, they were eating and drinking the body and the blood of Christ which were about to be given into death for them. A wondrous union must have taken place between the bread and Jesus' body, between the wine and Jesus' blood.

No wonder these words of Jesus caused the disciples to wonder. How was it possible that Jesus, sitting before them as their human-divine redeemer, could give them with bread and wine His own body and blood that He was about to give into death for their salvation? If it had not been Jesus who spoke, they would have turned away disgusted by such an unreasonable demand as once many disciples did when Jesus in the synagogue of Capernaum said: "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink His blood, ye have no life in you." But they knew

their Master so well that they did not doubt His words or believed that He would speak of things not possible for Him to do. And Zahn in his *Grundriss der neutestamentlichen Theologie* rightly reminds us of an event such as that recorded in Mark 6:48 and John 6:19 where Jesus walked upon the sea or of experiences such as those related in Luke 6:19; 8:46; Mark 5:30 where Jesus repeatedly said that power has gone out from Him by the mere touching of His garment. Such events and experiences, writes Zahn, might have assured the disciples that already before His final glorification Jesus possessed a power over His own body and over material nature which guaranteed the effectiveness of His words at the institution of the Lord's Supper.

So much at least is true: This Lutheran interpretation of the *Verba Testamenti* harmonizes best with the situation in which Christ instituted the Holy Supper. The hour of parting from His disciples had arrived, and Jesus was fully conscious of it. The note of leave-taking rings through the final discourses of Jesus as recorded by John; and in the closest connection with the Words of Institution the idea is mentioned more than once that this is the last meal (Matt. 26:29; Mark 14:25; Luke 22:18). For the last time He is united with them on such a solemn occasion; henceforth He will not commune with them in this manner until the consummation of all things. But will His disciples, during the long interval between His ascension to the Father and His return in glory, be left alone? Will they, aside from the Word and the Spirit (John 14:16, 17), have no pledge of the future spiritual and physical communion with their Lord and Master? Yes, indeed, Christ will give Himself to them, not only in the Word which is Spirit and life, but also by means of the sacramental miracle, He will give them the fullness of His spiritual-physical personality, so that there is no part of His human-divine person in which He did not let them share.

When His disciples go to His Supper, they will ascend, so to say, the top of a mountain from which they look back into the past and forward into the future. When under the bread and the wine they receive Christ's body and blood, they must turn their thoughts toward the cross where God on the basis of the sacrifice of Christ's body and blood has established a new relation between Himself and mankind. But with hopeful hearts they are also to turn to the future where they see Him face to face, sit at His heavenly table and rejoice in body and soul in His blessed communion. Between this past and this

future they are not left alone, but possess in this Holy Supper a substitute for His visible spiritual and physical presence. Here He is present not only according to His divine nature, but also with His human nature according to which alone we can speak of His body and blood. By means of eating and drinking Christ's body and blood the believing disciple gets hold of His whole human-divine personality, and this again enters into His whole spiritual and bodily life with all its sin-forgiving and life-transmitting powers. Therefore the celebration of the Lord's Supper is such a high point in the life of the disciple. He is nowhere so closely linked with the Risen and Exalted One as in the Lord's Supper, since nowhere else the human-divine life of the Exalted enters so unreservedly his entire physical-spiritual being, even his bodily organism. And yet, every celebration of the Lord's Supper only increases the longing of the disciple's heart for the visible communion with his Lord in the time of eternal consummation, of which the Lord's Supper is a prefiguration. It was especially Schweitzer who emphasized the eschatological character of the Lord's Supper, and we do well to stress this feature more. It was alive in the Ancient Church as the communion prayers of the Didache with their longing cry "Marana Tha" show, for "Marana Tha" means "Our Lord, come," and it found its place in the earliest liturgies.

For good reasons we limited our investigation so far to the question of the nature of the first celebration of the Lord's Supper held on the evening before His death; we have only incidentally touched upon the nature of the Holy Supper as we have it today. We shall now take up this subject in detail. It should be evident that, since it was Christ's intention to institute a perpetual ordinance, whatever pertains to the original celebration also pertains to the repetition of the same, provided that the repetition takes place in complete harmony with the institution. The only difference imaginable would be that at the original celebration Christ, by virtue of His omnipotent power over Himself, gave to His disciples His body and His blood which were about to be given unto death, while He, the exalted and glorified God-man, now gives us His body and His blood which have been given into death and now share His glorification. The word which Christ spoke at the institution will be efficacious until He returns no less than the creative word: "Be fruitful and multiply and replenish the earth" (Gen. 1:28). By virtue of this word the body and the blood of Christ are joined with the bread and the wine for the purpose of manducation wherever

the Holy Supper is celebrated according to His institution. But we have more than this merely logical conclusion, we have the explicit statements of Paul, because what he wrote in I Cor. 10 and I Cor. 11:26-34 does not refer to the first celebration, but to the repetition as it was in use in Paul's congregations.

We first take up I Cor. 10:3, 4. Here the apostle does not mention the Lord's Supper directly, but when he wrote of the πνευματικὸν βρῶμα and the πνευματικὸν πόμα, he intentionally used these terms in order to remind his readers of the gift of the Lord's Supper, as in the immediately preceding verses he had formed his statement so that they could not do otherwise than to think of their baptism. Why does he call the gift of the Lord's Supper a πνευματικὸν βρῶμα and a πνευματικὸν πόμα? Does this not prove that they are right who maintain that the body and blood of Christ can be eaten only in a spiritual way, by the faith which ascends up to heaven? By no means. Paul, it is true, speaks of a spiritual bread and a spiritual drink, but he does not say that they are taken and appropriated by spiritual eating and drinking. The comparison with the manna is evident. The manna was a spiritual food, because its source was not the sphere of natural life and its laws, it is called "bread from heaven." So the food offered to us in the Lord's Supper likewise does not originate in this natural world, but is a heavenly gift, the gift of the Exalted Christ. But as this manna was orally eaten, so also the heavenly gift of the Lord's Supper is orally eaten and orally drunk. And as *all* Israelites had eaten the manna, so all Corinthians received the spiritual meat and the spiritual drink distributed in the Lord's Supper. Here Paul, in speaking of the repetition of the Supper, presupposes the real presence of the body and blood in bread and wine, the *manducatio oralis* and the *communio indignorum*. Still more directly do we find these three shibboleths of the Lutheran doctrine expressed in I Cor. 10:16, 17, for there can be no doubt that the ποτήριον εὐλογίας and the ἄρτος ὃν κλῶμεν mentioned here refer to the Lord's Supper. The cup is termed κοινωνία τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ and the bread κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ. That can mean nothing else than that the communicants "have a share or part" in the blood, that is, the body of Christ. This understanding is demanded by the usage of κοινωνία. When used with a *genitivus objectivus*, κοινωνία always denotes actual sharing or participation, no matter whether it is a personal or impersonal object. In Phil. 3:10 Paul speaks of κοινωνία παθημάτων, in I Cor. 1:9 of the κοινωνία τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. So κοινωνία τοῦ αἵματος and

κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος means sharing, having part in Christ's blood, and body. It is immaterial whether the phrase means that those who drink the cup partake of the blood of Christ, or that the cup itself has part in the blood of Christ; so much is clear that the statement applies to the cup only in so far as it is drunk by the communicants. Whoever drinks of the cup partakes in and with it of the blood of Christ. This sense is also demanded by the context, because Paul wishes to prove to his readers that by taking part in feasts in honor of idols they enter into real fellowship with demons. Where there is κοινωνία of the bread and body of Christ, and where there is κοινωνία of the wine and blood of Christ, there both bread and body, wine and blood, must be *realiter* present, and the one must be united with the other (*unio sacramentalis*); and again, where the body of Christ can only be received in and with the bread, there must be *manducatio oralis*, this necessary consequence of the *unio sacramentalis*. And if we pay closer attention to the context, we observe that also the *communio indignorum* is implied here, for it is Paul's opinion that *all* who come to the Table of the Lord partake of the body and the blood of Christ, no matter what ideas they have in their minds. He intends to show his readers that their participation in heathen festivals cannot be defended on the plea that they regard the idols as non-existent. In this matter, Paul declares, one's ideas and concepts are irrelevant; the person who takes part in these heathen festivities is most assuredly brought into real communion with the powers of darkness — just as he who communes at the Table of the Lord thereby actually partakes of the body and the blood of Christ. And note that Paul, far from feeling the need of proving this actual participation in the body and blood of Christ, here actually bases his argumentation concerning the communion with the powers of darkness upon the participation or communion that exists in the Lord's Supper between bread and body, wine and blood, as upon a premise which everyone of his readers will unconditionally accept. What they know to be unassailably correct about the Lord's Supper (the real communion of bread and body), ought to show them the truth of what they had so far overlooked (that the participation in those heathen festivities places them in communion with demons). Not the κοινωνία of bread and body does he need to prove to his readers; this is so absolutely certain to them that he can use it as proof for something else! Do we need any further proof as to what unquestioning certainty about the nature of the Lord's Supper existed in the apostolic con-

gregations? The same Corinthians who had nearly forgotten that the Lord's Supper was a memorial of Christ and his death and the establishment of the New Covenant, were absolutely sure that the bread of the Lord's Supper was inseparably linked together with Christ's body and the wine with His blood! We understand why Luther thought so highly of our passage. He wrote: "Here, I think, is a passage that crushes Carlstadt and all his fanatical host. For me it is true medicine whenever my heart is assailed by doubts concerning this Sacrament. Yes, if there were no other text beside this one, there would be enough to strengthen our conscience and to confound our adversaries." Or: "This text I have praised and will ever praise as the joy and crown of my heart."

Finally, I Cor. 11:27-32 shows once more that the real presence of Christ's body and blood, the *manducatio oralis* and the *communio indignorum* were elements of the faith commonly held in Paul's time. When the apostle declares that those who unworthily eat the bread and drink the cup shall be "guilty of the body and of the blood of the Lord," he shows that those who partake of the earthly element also partake of the body and the blood of the Lord, for we can become guilty of the body and the blood only in case they are actually present; if they were absent, the apostle could at most say that we become guilty of Christ's person. Paul also states here that *every one* who eats and drinks receives Christ's body and blood whether he eats in a worthy manner or not; otherwise he could not assert that those who eat unworthily eat and drink judgment unto themselves, but would state that they by their unworthiness deprive themselves of receiving the body and the blood of Christ.

Thus Paul speaks of the repetition of the Lord's Supper exactly what Jesus said about its first celebration. And yet the number of those is growing even in Lutheran circles who think that the Lutheran doctrine is no longer tenable, although in what they want to substitute for it there is no agreement whatever among them. In 1905 Reinhold Seeberg published in *Biblische Zeit- und Streitfragen* his view concerning the Lord's Supper in the New Testament. In many ways a good brochure, it opened the gate to various deviations from the strict Lutheran doctrine. Seeberg did not doubt the real presence of the body nor of the blood of Christ, but he understood the word $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$ in a way other than the usual interpretation. He said $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$ is the Greek translation for the Aramaic *guf*, and *guf* designates the whole person, not only the visible organism of the individual;

and the sense would be: whenever the bread of the Lord's Supper is distributed, Jesus with His whole human-divine personality is present and enters communion with those who take and eat the bread. We do not doubt that *guf* may be a designation for the whole person, and it would be easy to prove that *σῶμα* was used in the same sense in the Koine as well as in classic Greek, but the question is whether it can be taken in this sense in the *Verba Testamenti*. To begin with, when Plato and Xenophon use *σῶμα* as a designation of the whole person, they do not want to emphasize the fact that this person is a thinking, feeling, willing being, as Seeberg assumes, but the emphasis is entirely on the bodily element of man. That is perhaps the reason why in classical Greek, as well as in the Koine, *σώματα* means slaves, beings that are primarily considered as bodily tools, as for the same reason they are sometimes called "hands" in English. Furthermore, the terms "body" and "blood" are apparently two conceptions that belong together, one demands the other, and only when they are taken together, do they form a whole. According to Seeberg, however, the word concerning the body is complete in itself and does not need any complement. "The institution of the Lord's Supper was completed with the word concerning the bread," he says. Therefore he finds some difficulty when he has to explain the word concerning the cup. Thirdly, the New Testament also outside of the *Verba Testamenti* speaks of the *σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, as in Rom. 7:4; Heb. 10:5, 10; I Pet. 2:24; Col. 1:22, and it is nowhere the designation for His personality in the sense of Seeberg, but for the body given into death. Therefore, it is to be taken in this sense also in the *Verba Testamenti*; the more so, since the Pauline *τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν* plainly points in the same direction.

Fourthly, in I Cor. 10:20 Paul writes *κοινωνοὺς τῶν δαιμονίων*; therefore we ought to expect him, if Seeberg's equation of *σῶμα* with *Χριστός* would be correct, all the more to speak in v. 17 of *κοινωνία τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, but he writes *κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος* and *κοινωνία τοῦ αἵματος*. Finally, it is hardly honest that Seeberg quotes the concluding words of the tenth article of Melancthon's Apology to show the Lutheran character of his own conception, for while it is true that Melancthon here speaks of "the presence of the living Christ" in the Lord's Supper, he speaks in the same article again and again of the eating of the body of Christ in the very sense which Seeberg rejects.

Seeberg, however, had followers, and not all thought of the presence of the human-divine Christ as Seeberg did, but spoke

only of the presence of Christ without defining it and thus more and more paved the way for Calvinistic beliefs, because any Calvinist can speak of the presence of the living Christ in the Lord's Supper. In 1920 Carl Stange published a study under the title *Die Lehre von den Sakramenten*. Here he likewise declares that at least Luther's formulation of our doctrine is no longer tenable. Instead of saying that in and with bread and wine we receive Christ's body and blood he advises us to say: In the Lord's Supper Christ established table-fellowship with Himself and gives those who come to His Table forgiveness of sin wrought on the cross by giving His body and blood for mankind. So the nature of the Lord's Supper is again reduced to the presence of the living Christ, and since Stange does not adopt Seeberg's interpretation of $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$, we all the more wonder why Jesus spoke the words: This bread is my body, this cup is my blood. The question is evaded by Stange and not answered. Althaus in 1931 wrote: *Die lutherische Abendmahlslehre in der Gegenwart*. He likewise rejects Luther's formulation. He adopts the thought of Seeberg and Stange as far as the presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper is concerned, for we read p. 41: "Faith may rest assured that in the Sacrament as in all other acts of the church performed at His command the Exalted Lord is present according to His divinity and humanity, because we never have the first apart from the second." When he then answers the question regarding the meaning of the *Verba Testamenti* he says: "The whole action is first Jesus' last parable: In the form of a symbol together with an explaining word He announces His imminent death; by using bread and wine as symbols of His sacrificial death He puts the importance of His death for the life of mankind before the eyes of the disciples: 'You live because I die.' But the last meal of Jesus is not only the proclamation of the blessing of His death in the form of a symbolical action; it is, in the form of symbolical action, itself an act, a deed. By using bread and wine as symbols of His death and by giving them to eat and to drink as such, He gives them in and with this symbolical pledge a share in the fruit of His death. The Lord's Supper is a real gift, but in parabolic action." But what is here said of the symbolical character is already refuted above; and does Althaus really make clear how bread and wine, being symbols of Jesus' sacrificial death, can give a share and part in the fruit of His death?

It is just this question that Jeremias tries to answer in his *Die Abendmahls Worte Jesu* of 1935. Also to him the Lord's

Supper is at the same time both symbol and gift. The gift consists in this that here Jesus gives His disciples "a share in the expiating power of His death," and the symbol in this is that not the action of breaking, but the broken bread is the symbol of Christ's broken body, and the red color of the wine — it was red wine that was used at the Passover meal — is the symbol of the blood. The question, however, how bread and wine can impart a share in the expiating effect of Christ's death, he answers by recalling the fact that to the Orientals eating and drinking transmit divine gifts. If that is always the case, why then should the eating and drinking in the Lord's Supper be an exception?

We are certainly glad to note that all these theologians hold to the conviction that the Lord's Supper is a means of grace, although they agree neither with Luther nor among themselves as soon as they have to define what gift of grace the Lord's Supper imparts. We are furthermore glad that they all reject the Calvinistic idea that it is only the divine nature according to which Christ is present at the Lord's Supper and rather emphasize: it is the whole Christ, His whole human-divine personality.

This latter fact distinguishes these theologians from those who in 1937 framed the Halle Confession. The Confessional Synod (*Bekennnissynode*) of the Evangelical Church of the Old-Prussian Union met at Halle May 10 to 13, 1937. Here it accepted this statement: "Jesus Christ, our Lord and Savior who came into the flesh for our sake, who offered Himself once upon the cross for us and who bodily rose from death, He Himself is the gracious gift of the Supper of His congregation instituted by Himself." The following paragraphs apply this statement to the question of fellowship in the Sacrament of the Altar. Here we read: "The differences existing between us (the members of the Lutheran, the Reformed and the Union Churches) in the doctrine of the Lord's Supper concern the *mode of self-communication* of the Lord in the Supper, and do not concern the fact whether the Lord Himself is the gift of the Lord's Supper. Therefore affiliation with the Reformed Church is no reason for being excluded from the Supper celebrated by a congregation of the Lutheran Confession, nor is affiliation with the Lutheran Church a reason for being excluded from the Supper celebrated by a Reformed congregation; therefore members of the Lutheran, Reformed and Union Churches can celebrate the Lord's Supper together without coming in conflict with the

Scriptural administration of the holy Supper" (*Abendmahlsgemeinschaft*, Muenchen, Kaiser, 1937, p. 220). The position taken here was based upon essays written by Hans Asmussen (*Abendmahlsgemeinschaft?*), Wilhelm Niesel (*Vom heiligen Abendmahl Jesu Christi*), Ernst Kaesemann (*Das Abendmahl im Neuen Testament*), and Helmut Sollwitzer (*Luthers Abendmahllehre*) that had been the subject of former meetings at Essen and Frankfurt (Main) and were later published by E. Wolf under the title *Abendmahlsgemeinschaft*.

The most important of them was Kaesemann's essay. He starts with the assumption that the transmitted accounts of the *Verba Testamenti* are the result of a later development, especially Paul's account in I Cor. 11. He believes that the short form of Luke takes us farther back to the original words of Jesus than any other account if we consider vv. 21-28 as a later interpolation and connect v. 19 a immediately with vv. 29, 30. Then the eschatological character of the Supper maintained by Albert Schweitzer in 1901 (*Das Abendmahl*, Tuebingen), Franz Dibelius in 1911 (*Das Abendmahl*, Leipzig), Lietzmann in 1926 (*Messe und Herrenmahl*, Bonn), and before them by Fr. Spitta, although in a different way, (*Zur Geschichte und Literatur des Urchristentums: Die unchristlichen Traditionen ueber Ursprung und Sinn des Abendmahls*, Goettingen, 1893) comes into its own, and the first Supper was an anticipation of the Supper in the time of consummation. At the first Supper Jesus gave Himself to the disciples under the sign of the bread and so He will give Himself in the time of consummation.* We do not deny this

*Since the essay of Kaesemann is hardly accessible to most of our readers, we quote him *in extenso* (p. 64ff.): "Die herausgestellte originale Lukas-Tradition erhaelt ihre Eigenart einmal dadurch, dass sie nur die Brot-Spendeformel besitzt und einen Kelch bloss als Eroeffnungsbecher kennt; sie wird zum andern dadurch bestimmt, dass in ihr der auch Mark. 14:25 sich findende eschatologische Ausblick durch die Doppelung in Vers 16 und 18 besonders stark hervortritt. Es ist nunmehr zu fragen, ob der umstrittene V. 19a nicht etwa aus diesem seinem urspruenglichen Zusammenhang verstaendlich werde und verstanden werden muesse. Dazu muessen wir diesen Zusammenhang jedoch vorher analysieren. Wie er sich bei allen Synoptikern, bei Markus und Matthaues (26:29) allerdings nur abschliessend, findet, so empfaengt er auch bei ihnen allen sein Gepraege aus zwei Momenten: Einmal aus der Feststellung Jesu, dass er irdischen Abschied nimmt. Er wird hienieden die Speise nicht mehr essen, den Trank nicht mehr trinken. Zum andern aus dem Hinweis auf das offenbar unmittelbar bevorstehend gedachte Hereinbrechen der Gottesherrschaft. Beide Momente gehoeren

proleptical or typical character of the Lord's Supper; we already conceded that it should be emphasized more than is usually done; but here we are primarily interested in the question as to what the gift of the first Supper was and what it still is today.

Here we find that Kaesemann follows in the footsteps of Seeberg and takes $\sigma\omicron\mu\alpha$ in the sense of "person." "This is my body" means nothing but: "This is I." We showed above why

zusammen: Der Einbruch der Gottesherrschaft bestimmt Jesu letzte Stunde im Verkehr mit den Seinen. Und umgekehrt ist das die Sicht der hereinbrechenden Gottesherrschaft, dass diese in irgend einer Weise mit solcher letzten Stunde Jesu zusammenhaengt. Der Meister trennt sich von seinen Juengern, nicht wie man sich irdisch, sondern eben wie man sich vor Einbruch der Gottesherrschaft vom Irdischen trennt. Und diese bricht herein, wie Jesu irdisches Ende hereinbricht, ja weil Jesu irdisches Ende hereinbricht, wenn beides nicht bloss aeusserlich und sinnlos nebeneinander steht. Und das hat ja im Zusammenhang der Gesamtgeschichte Jesu einen guten Sinn. Gottes Basileia ist mit Jesus und seinem irdischen Kommen den Menschen nahegerueckt und verborgen schon mitten unter sie getreten (Mark 1:15; Luk. 17:21). Was liegt naeher, als in Jesu Abschied von der Erde auch ein neues Stadium dieser Basileia zu erwarten, naemlich das Datum ihres sichtbaren Einbruchs in die Welt? So wird Jesu letztes Mahl hier unter rein eschatologischem Aspekt gesehen, naemlich als Vorwegnahme des Mahls der Seligen, wie es auch sonst im Neuen Testament bezeugt wird, und zwar an der Wende des gegenwaertigen und des kommenden Aeons. Es ist Hinweis auf die kommende Tischgemeinschaft in der Gottesherrschaft und bei der Naehel dieser Zukunft zugleich ihre Einleitung. Wie immer man sonst zum historischen Befund der synoptischen Abendmahlsberichte steht, diese Linie bleibt auf jeden Fall unuebersehbar vorhanden, ihr Ernstnehmen wird von allen Evangelisten geboten, ihre Interpretation duerfte heute als gesichert betrachtet werden."

"Und wie fuegt sich jetzt der Vers 19a in diesen eschatologischen Rahmen? Diese Frage scheint mir fuer den lukanischen Textbestand einleuchtend nur von der durch Franz Dibelius zuerstentwickelten und von Rudolf Otto (*Reich Gottes und Menschensohn*, 1934) dann durchgefuehrten These loesbar, V. 29f. bildet mit V. 19a einen urspruenglichen Zusammenhang. Die dazwischen liegenden Verse 21-28 sind von Otto mit guten Gruenden als redaktioneller Einschub das Lukas charakterisiert. Dann wuerden die Worte "Das ist mein Leib" ihren Fortgang derart finden: "Und ich vermache ($\delta\iota\alpha\theta\epsilon\mu\alpha\iota$) euch, wie mir mein Vater vermacht hat, eine Basileia, dass ihr esst und trinkt an meinem Tisch und sitzen werdet auf Thronen, richtend die zwouelf Staemme Israels." In dieser sehr altertuemlichen Verheissung, die sich ja nur an die Elfe wendet und die Zukunft mit den Farben palastinensischer

this is impossible and do not have to repeat that here. Only in one point Kaesemann fares better than Seeberg. Seeberg cannot explain for what reason the second part of the Lord's Supper follows the first, if $\sigma\acute{\omega}\mu\alpha$ alone means the person of Christ in its completeness. Kaesemann does not need to explain this for the simple reason that he declared the second part as not original, it is only the result of a later development! But there is an-

Apokalyptik malt, haetten wir die Fortfuehrung des eschatologischen Ausblicks von V. 15-18 mit dem gleichenden beherrschenden Thema des Essens und Trinkens in der Gottesherrschaft. Hier haetten wir weiter in dem Terminus $\delta\iota\alpha\tau\acute{\iota}\theta\epsilon\mu\alpha$ den fuer Markus, Matthaeus, Paulus so bedeutsamen und urspruenglich anmutenden $\delta\iota\alpha\theta\acute{\eta}\chi\eta$ = Gedanken. Hier sind endlich beide genannten Momente so verbunden, dass das Deutewort ueber dem Brot eine zentrale Schluesselstellung erlangt. Denn V. 19a zu streichen, waere reine Willkuer. "Das ist mein Leib"—auf diesem Grund erhaelt die Diatheke Sinn, dass Jesu Juenger an seinem Tisch in Baelde auch sein himmlisches Mahl teilen werden. Wie und weil sie jetzt teilhaftig werden, sollen sie mit ihm auch der eschatologischen Tischgemeinschaft teilhaftig sein. Sie werden jetzt seiner teilhaftig, denn $\sigma\acute{\omega}\mu\alpha$ kann ebenso wie das dahinterstehende "gufi" soviel bedeuten als "ich selber." Sich selber, seine Person, gibt Jesus unter dem Zeichen des Brotes, und zwar, wie er in dieser Abschiedsstunde ist, als Sterbenden. Indem er sich aber als Sterbenden gibt und sein Sterben, wie wir sahen, den Einbruch der Gottesherrschaft herauffuehrt, mag er mit der Darreichung des Brotes, das gebrochen seinen gebrochenen Leib repraesentiert, die Einstellung einer Diatheke im Blick auf die kommende Basileia verbinden. Wer an ihm, dem Sterbenden teilbekommen hat, soll auch an der durch sein Sterben eingeleiteten eschatologischen Zukunft, naemlich der Tischgemeinschaft der Seligen, teilbekommen. Was an der Wende der Aeone symbolisch geschieht, findet seine Bestaetigung, sobald der himmlische Aeon sich endgiltig realisiert hat. Das letzte irdische Mahl ist somit beides, eine so altertuemliche Vorstellung (vergl. bes. V. 30 and seine nur die Prolepse und Einleitung der zukuenftigen Tischgemeinschaft. Damit ist Elf erfassende Verheissung) gewonnen, dass ein noch weiteres Zurueckgehen in den historischen Ursprung des Abendmahls unmoeglich erscheint. Lukas bietet uns in den Versen 15-19a und 29, 30 das letzte historisch feststellbare Datum im Ganzen der synoptischen Abendmahlsberichte. Eine Ableitung dieser lukanischen Version aus Markus und Matthaeus duerfte kaum zu bewerkstelligen sein. Wohl aber kann man von hier aus eine Ueberleitung zu den Versionen des Markus und Matthaeus finden, wie R. Otto besonders klar dargetan hat. Wenn naemlich die unchristliche Gemeinde die ihr uebertragene Diatheke nicht fallen lassen wollte, dann musste zunaechst die Verheissung von den Elf auf alle Juenger uebertragen werden. So

other matter that surprises us. In the same connection in which he maintains that $\sigma\acute{\omega}\mu\alpha$ means Christ's person, he writes (p. 66 f.) that the broken bread represents the broken body. In what sense is "body" to be taken here? Is it the broken personality of Christ or is it his broken physical body? Furthermore, Kaesemann maintains that the Lord's Supper is a real Sacrament, that the living Christ is the gift that is here given to the believer. That is commendable. But it is not so commendable that he does not define whether it is Christ only according to His divine side, or also according to His human side. We understand why he is silent on this point. If he would decide for Christ in His whole, human divine personality, the *formula* "Christ Himself is the gift of the Lord's Supper" could not be the unifying factor for Lutherans and Reformed. But there is another question. Kaesemann calls the bread a "sign" or "representation" of the living Christ. How can Christ be given to us by eating bread, if the bread is only a sign and not the bearer of Christ? This is a

verlieren V. 29, 30 mit ihrer speziellen Anrede an die Elf ihr urspruengliches Gewicht zurueck bleibt einzig der Diatheke = Gedanke, jetzt als fuer "viele" gueltig gekennzeichnet. Der Kelch war bei Lukas ein Eroeffnungsbecher, von dem eschatologischen Ausblick begleitet. Aber die Stunde dieses eschatologischen Augenblicks ging vorueber und gewann bloss noch historische Bedeutung; das ihr Charakteristische verblasste und trat zurueck. So findet sich der eschatologische Ausblick bei Markus und Matthaueus auch nur noch am Schluss. Entweder musste dann aber auch der Eroeffnungsbecher, als seiner ihn erst hervorhebenden Begleitrede beraubt, in Bedeutungslosigkeit geraten und vielleicht sogar ganz verschwinden. Oder man gab ihm einen neuen Sinn, indem man ihn als Analogie zur Brotpende verstand und dieser anglich. Wenn man $\sigma\acute{\omega}\mu\alpha$ mit "Leib" uebersetzte, lag es nahe, nach seiner Ergaenzung des "Leibes" durch das Blut zu suchen, und der ueberkommene Eroeffnungsbecher bot die Moeglichkeit zu solcher Ergaenzung und Angleichung. Da aber vom "Blut" erst nach Erwaenung das gebrochenen "Leibes" zu sprechen war, rueckte der Kelch an den Schluss und verband sich dort mit dem bereits vorhandenen Diatheke = Gedanken. So waere der Uebergang zu der uns gelauefigen Abendmahlsversion erreicht."

Kaesemann himself calls that a "construction," and indeed, it is a "construction," a horrible human construction, as unbelievable as possible. It shows what imagination is able to do in order to point out the "development" of our present Biblical text. It is nothing else but an awful abuse of the transmitted text. And Kaesemann belongs to the "Confessional Synod," and his investigation was one of the bases for the Halle-resolution!

question that is much like the one raised above concerning the view of Althaus. Do we make the object itself our own by making our own the sign that merely represents the object? I know that when we ask this question, we are reminded *dass die Antike noch nicht unsern vergeistigten und abgeblassten Symbolbegriff kennt, dass sie noch keine Spannung zwischen Symbol und Symbolisiertem zulaesst, dass fuer sie jedes Bild als Abbild eben auch von der Wirklichkeit und inneren Kraft des Abgebildeten erfuehlt ist* (p. 71). But if that was so in the eyes of Jesus and the Synoptics, then, according to our occidental or more modern way of speech, the bread and wine is more than a mere sign, then it is the real bearer of Christ and all the fruits of His death. Kaesemann concedes that at least according to Paul the elements are "bearers of a heavenly substance" (p. 90), that they *nach ihrer Beschaffenheit nichts mehr symbolisieren, sondern realiter Christuskraft und Christussubstanz uebermitteln*, but he sees in this conviction of Paul's only an apparent influence of Hellenistic ideas.* It suffices us that even Kaesemann is forced to make this concession, and we register it as we did before with similar statements of Heitmuehler and others as a proof for the correctness of our Lutheran doctrine. It is at least in full agreement with Paul.

A year later Walther von Loewenich published his "historic-systematic investigation concerning the problem of the Lord's Supper in our present time" under the title *Vom Abendmahl Christi*. It appeared 1938 in the *Furche-Verlag* at Berlin whose *spiritus rector* is Dr. Lilje, the General Secretary of the Lutheran World Convent (!). W. von Loewenich is a member of the Lutheran Church of Bavaria and "Dozent" at the University of

*"Wenn der Auferstandene im Abendmahl seiner Gemeinde seine Gabe gewaehrt und diese Gabe im Genuss der Elemente ergriffen wird, liegt es nahe, bereits die Elemente als der himmlischen Natur des Auferstandenen teilhaftig vorzustellen. Dieser Versuchung konnte man im hellenistischen Zeitalter wohl kaum entrinne. Auch Paulus ist ihr erlegen, insofern er die Elemente "pneumatisch," d. h. Traeger himmlischer Kraftsubstanz, sein laesst. Mag in 1 Kor. 10:17 die Einheit des Brotes noch die Einheit des Christusleibes symbolisieren, die Elemente nach ihrer Beschaffenheit symbolisieren nichts mehr, sondern uebermitteln *realiter* Christuskraft und Christussubstanz. Hier sind offensichtlich die religionsgeschichtlichen Einfluesse am staerksten in die Abendmahlslehre des Apostels eingedrungen. Es ist nicht wenig kennzeichnend, dass weder im Zusammenhang der Tradition von Kap. 10 noch in dem von Kap. 11 das Wort "Glaube" faellt" (*Abendmahlsgemeinschaft*, p. 89f.)

Erlangen. He can hardly reiterate often enough that Luther's understanding of the *Verba Testamenti* was wrong, that bread and wine are symbols, and that $\sigma\omicron\mu\alpha$ is only another word for "person" or the personal pronoun I. He uses even the epitheta *primitiv* and *pedantisch* and applies them to those that still today cling to Luther's way of proving his doctrine: *Der Sinn des Doppelgleichnisses ist der: "Ich muss sterben, und dies Sterben kommt euch zugut." "Leib" und "Blut" bezeichnen ja nichts Verschiedenes oder gar von einander Getrenntes. Es handelt sich um zwei Aussagen ueber ein und dasselbe. "Das ist mein Leib" und "Das ist mein Blut," das heisst beides soviel wie: "Das bin ich." Alle Irrwege, die zu einem dinglichen Missverstaendnis der Segensformal fuehren, lassen sich vermeiden, wenn man statt "Leib" und "Blut" die personhafte Aussage "Das bin ich" einsetzt. Jesus will seinen Juengern klar machen: "So wie hier Brot und Wein dahingegeben werden, so werde ich dahingegeben, und diese Dahingabe geschieht um euretwillen und kommt euch zu gute"* (p. 28). If this is correct and the whole content of the *Verba Testamenti*, then the first Lord's Supper was nothing more than a parabolic prediction of Christ's imminent death and gave nothing at all to the disciples, then we should stop even to say, the person of Christ was the gift of the first Supper and is its gift today. But von Loewenich is not willing to draw this conclusion, because he again writes: *"Das Abendmahl im neutestamentlichen Sinn ist kein blosses Gedaechnismahl, sondern ein Sakrament. Es erschoeft sich nicht in einer tiefsinnigen Symbolik, sondern es stellt zugleich in eine Wirklichkeit hinein. Der Streit um das "Ist" ist sinnlos. Die Spendeformal ist ein Gleichnis; aber mit diesem Gleichnis ist damals wie heute eine Wirklichkeit verbunden. Das Wesen erscheint im Bilde, und im Bilde haben wir das Wesen"* (p. 47). We are happy to note this fact but must repeat that his interpretation of the *Verba Testamenti* does not furnish the necessary foundation for this assumption, because according to his interpretation they only predict what Christ was going to do on the cross and indicate in no way that Christ was going to give something to his disciples, and if the eating of the bread and the drinking of the wine should symbolize the appropriation of Christ, then we again raise the question, how can the appropriation of a symbol assure us of the appropriation of the symbolized object?

In his book *Coena Domini, die alllutherische Abendmahlslehre in ihrer Auseinandersetzung mit dem Calvinismus dar-*

gestellt an der lutherischen Fruehorthodoxie (Muenchen, Kaiser, 1937) Helmut Gollwitzer says: "It cannot be a matter of indifference to Lutheran theology that New Testament scholars of today—including those in the Lutheran Church—take a position concerning the Lord's Supper that in four cardinal points contradicts the position of the old Lutheran theology." He enumerates these four points. Present-day New Testament scholars maintain: (1) The *Verba Testamenti* are not to be taken literally; (2) they do not speak of the receiving of the physical body of Christ with the mouth; (3) the ascension of Christ was not only His entrance into the invisible realm, but a real going away of Christ; (4) even I Cor. 11 does not teach that the unbelievers receive the body of Christ (p. x and p. 109). It is true, this is the position of most of the present-day New Testament scholars, even of those who call themselves Lutherans. But since when is the majority the deciding factor in such questions? There is still a minority that holds to the old, confessional doctrine of the Lord's Supper, even in Germany. I mention Hermann Sasse and his excellent brochure *Kirche und Herrenmahl* (Muenchen, Kaiser, 1938);* Ernst Sommerlath and his *Luthers Lehre von der Realpraesenz im Abendmahl* (Leipzig, 1929) and *Der Sinn des Abendmahls nach Luthers Gedanken 1527-29*, Leipzig, 1930; and *Sakrament und Gegenwart*, Leipzig, 1930;† Adolph Koeberle and his *Wort, Sakrament und Kirche im Luthertum* (Guetersloh, 1934);‡ Christian Stoll and his *Vom Abendmahl Christi* (Muenchen, Kaiser, 1935); Friedrich Wilhelm

*R. Riensche translated it into English, and I hope he will find a publisher; it certainly deserves to be read by our English-speaking Lutheran people.

†*Sakrament und Gegenwart* closes with these words: "Das Verstaendnis des Sacraments bei Luther ist nur Ausdruck des Verstaendnisses, das er von der Offenbarung ueberhaupt hatte. In seiner Lehre vom Sakrament wird, wie vielleicht sonst nirgends, deutlich, worum es ihm in seinem Verstaendnis des Lebens und Werkes Jesu ging. Wer aber weiss, wie seine Sacramentalehre die Irrtuemer der roemischen wie der Zwinglischen Lehre meidet und doch die Wahrheitsmomente beider in ihrer Weise bewahrt, der kann von der Hoffnung nicht lassen, dass Luthers Verstaendnis des Sacraments noch einmal die konfessionelle Mitte abgeben koennte und dem zur Vereinigung dienen werde, was sich zertrennt hat. *Luthers Kirche hat jedenfalls gerade heute allen Grund, bei den Katechismussaetzen Luthers ueber das Sakrament als einem ernststen verantwortungsvollen Vermaechtnis zu bleiben*" (p. 45f.).

‡"Taufwasser, Brot und Wein im Altarsakrament sind nicht nur Gleichnis, Symbol und Zeichen fuer etwas anders Gemeintes, sie sind

Hopf and his *Die Abendmahlslehre der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche* (*Abendmahlsgemeinschaft*, pp. 122-173) and his collection of sermons on the Lord's Supper by 24 Lutheran ministers; L. Ihmels and his *Das Lutherische Verstaendnis des Abendmahls* (Leipzig, 1928); W. Laible and his *Sind die Aussagen des Kleinen Katechismus ueber die Sakramente heute noch zu halten* (Leipzig, 1929); Werner Elert and his *Morphologie des Lutheriums* (Muenchen, 1st vol. 1931, pp. 263-280).* But I hear someone say: all these are systematic or practical theologians and not exegetes. This is true, and we know that we must reckon with the pride of the "Zunft" or "profession." But it would be ridiculous to believe that only professional exegetes could read and understand their Greek Testament correctly. And after all Gollwitzer and all his followers should not forget that not only such an excellent New Testament scholar as Theodor Zahn, although coming from a non-Lutheran home, was an uncompromising exponent of the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper as his commentaries on Matthew, Luke and John and his *Grundriss der Neutestamentlichen Theologie* (Leipzig, 1928) make evident; but that several decades ago also all those "liberal" New Testament scholars such as Heitmueller, Bousset and others who assumed deep going influences upon Paul from the pagan religious world were convinced that the *Verba Testamenti* as we find them in Paul (and even in the Synoptics) demand the view that the elements of bread and wine were considered bearers of the heavenly gift, that is, that the Lutheran doctrine is in agreement with them. So the reference to the "present New Testament scholars," although we find ourselves obliged always to refer to them, does not impress us very much.

die Hand selbst, mit der uns der lebendige Christus anruehrt und ergreift. Das Wasser, im Auftrag Jesu auf das Kindlein gesprengt, bedeutet nicht nur Reinigung von Suenden, es bewirkt sie, weil Gott auch die Elemente zu Dienern in seinem Reich machen kann und will. Das dargereichte Brot meint nicht nur einen Erinnerungsakt an den gebrochenen Leib auf Golgatha, es bringt die Vergebungs—und Erloesungskraft des gekreuzigten und auferstandenen Herrn selbst zu uns, weil der Mensch nicht nur Ohr, sondern auch Mund ist und Gott viele Weisen hat, uns aus dem Tod zu erretten. Wir duerfen das Wirken Gottes nicht einschraenken und verkuerzen nur weil uns eine Jahrtausende alte falsche hellenistische Psychologie gelehrt hat, die Leiblichkeit der Wege Gottes zu missachten" (p. 28f.).

"Die lutherische Lehre vom Sakrament des Altars wurde gehasst, verleumdet, verspottet von den Gegnern. 'Sie luegen, dass die Balken krachen' musste schon Luther von den Gegnern seiner Abendmahlslehre

In looking back upon all these attempts to introduce a new understanding of the Lord's Supper by Seeberg, Stange, Althaus and Jeremias on the one hand, and by Kaesemann, Gollwitzer, the Confessional Synod and von Loewenich and many others on the other, we must confess that none of them permits the words of Jesus: "This is my body," "This is my blood" really to come into their own, and none of them harmonizes so well with them as that of Luther. Therefore we cling to Luther's interpretation summarized in these three shibboleths: *unio sacramentalis*, *manducatio oralis* and *communio indignorum*. When we also hold to the last of these three, our interest is not by all means to assure the unworthy guest of the receipt of the body and blood of Christ or even the coming of the judgment upon him on account of his unworthiness. Our interest is only to suppress nothing of that which God taught us in the Scriptures. In submission to the Biblical text we still cling to all of these shibboleths.

If the possibility of the real presence of Christ's body and blood is questioned, we answer that our exalted Lord is omnipresent also according to his human nature and therefore able to offer His body and His blood where- and whenever He desires to do so. His marvelous power is unlimited. If the dogma of the *unio sacramentalis* is stigmatized as unreasonable or contra-rational, we reply that, measured by this criterion, every mystery of faith would ultimately have to be surrendered.

feststellen (WA 26, 565, 27). Sie wurde mit Ernst und Sorgfalt begründet und gepflegt von unserer alten Theologie. Sie ist in ihrem entscheidenden Anliegen volkstümlich geworden wie sonst vielleicht nur die Rechtfertigung allein durch den Glauben . . . Das Abendmahl ragt wie ein nicht zu uebersehender Fels auf schon aus den aller-aeltesten Dokumenten des Christentums. Er steht schon im ersten Korintherbrief vollkommen vor uns, keines weiteren Wachstums faehig noch beduerftig. Er spottet jeder Spiritualisierung. Stuede er der Rechtfertigungslehre wirklich hindernd im Wege, so waere noch sehr die Frage, ob sie nicht eher an ihm scheitern muesste als das sie im Stande waere, ihn beiseite zu draengen. Bestuende hier wirklich ein Widerspruch, so waere unverstaendlich, dass ihn der erste Dogmatiker der Rechtfertigungslehre, Paulus nicht sollte bemerkt haben. Und wer immer auf dem Boden des Luthertums steht, wird ueberzeugt sein, dass unsere Theologie wie unsere Kirche mit ihrer Praxis hier am getreuesten in den von Paulus gewiesenen Wegen gewandelt ist" (p. 279f.). All the investigations of the last ten years concerning the Lord's Supper did not change Elert's conviction, as his *Christliche Glaubenslehre* of 1940 proves beyond a doubt.

Luther said: "I see here the plain, clear, mighty words of my God which compel me to confess that Christ's body and blood are in the Sacrament. That ought to put a stop to all questioning and scoffing. In what manner Christ is brought into the Sacrament I do not know; but I well know that God's Word does not lie, and God's Word says that Christ's body and blood are in the Sacrament." If it is objected that bread and wine, being earthly and transitory substances, could not serve as vehicles for the body and the blood of Christ, we would refer to the incarnation of Christ as the plainest proof that the finite may comprehend the infinite. If we are told that it is unworthy of God that we orally receive His body and blood, we praise Him who in grace has condescended to our level in order to assure us of our salvation. We close with the word of Luther: "Summa Summarum: See to it that you heed the Word of God and dwell in it; let it be your cradle. If but for a moment you lose sight of the Word, you are falling away. That is what the evil One desires: he would lead us away from the Word and bring you to the point when you measure His will and His work according to your own reason."

Bibliography

- H. Usener, *Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen*, 1889.
 G. Anrich, *Das antike Mysterienwesen in seinem Einfluss auf das Christentum*, 1894.
 E. Rohde, *Psyche*, 1894.
 Fr. Cumont, *Die Mysterien des Mythra*, 1899 and 1903.
 A. Dieterich, *Eine Mythrasliturgie*, 1903.
 R. Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*, 1904.
 Fr. Cumont, *Die orientalischen Religionen im roemischen Altertum*, 1909-10.
 R. Reitzenstein, *Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen*, 1910.
 P. Wendland, *Die hellenistische roemische Kultur in ihren Beziehungen zu Judentum und Christentum*, 1907.
 J. Geffken, *Der Ausgang des griechisch-roemischen Heidentums*, 1920.
 J. Geffken, *Der Ausgang der Antike*, 1921.
 J. Geffken, *Religioese Stroemungen im ersten Jahrhundert nach Christus*, 1922.
 Pres. Smith, *A Short History of Christian Theophagy*, 1922.
 K. Holl, *Urchristentum und Religionsgeschichte*, 1925.
 C. Schneider, *Einfuehrung in die Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, 1934.
- * * *
- H. Gunkel, *Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Verstaendnis des Neuen Testaments*, 1903.
 M. Brueckner, *Der sterbende und auferstehende Gottheiland in den orientalischen Religionen*, 1908.
 A. Schweitzer, *Geschichte der Leben Jesu Forschung*, 1906.

- W. Wrede, *Paulus*, 1905.
 A. Juelicher, *Paulus und Jesus*, 1907.
 C. Clemens, *Die religionsgeschichtliche Erklärung des Neuen Testaments*, 1909.
 W. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, 1913.
 E. Norden, *Agnostos Theos*, 1913.
 E. Norden, *Die Geburt des Kindes*, 1924.

* * *

- R. Rocholl, *Realpraesenz*, 1875.
 A. Juelicher, *Zur Geschichte der Abendmahlsfeier in der aeltesten Kirche*, 1892.
 A. Schweitzer, *Das Abendmahlsproblem auf Grund der Forschung des 19. Jahrhunderts*, 1901.
 Fr. Spitta, *Die urchristlichen Traditionen ueber Ursprung und Sinn des Abendmahls*, 1893.
 Fr. Schultzen, *Das Abendmahl im Neuen Testament*, 1895.
 A. Eichhorn, *Das Abendmahl im N. T.*, 1898.
 E. Grape, *Die neuesten Forschungen ueber die urchristliche Abendmahlsfeier*, 1895.
 W. Heitmueller, *Taufe und Abendmahl bei Paulus*, 1903.
 D. Chwolson, *Das letzte Passamahl Christi*, 1908.
 Fr. Graebke, *Die Konstruktion der Abendmahlslehre Luthers*, 1908.
 R. Seeberg, *Das Abendmahl im Neuen Testament*, 1909.
 W. Heitmueller, *Taufe und Abendmahl im Urchristentum*, 1911.
 K. Dunkmann, *Das Sakramentsproblem*, 1911.
 Franz Dibelius, *Das Abendmahl*, 1911.
 M. Schreiner, *Die Sakramente u. Gottes Wort*, 1914.
 C. Stange, *Die Lehre von den Sakramenten*, 1920.
 G. P. Wetter, *Altchristliche Liturgien: Das christliche Mysterium*, 1922.
 H. Lietzmann, *Messe und Herrenmahl*, 1926.
 A. Oepke, *Ursprung und Sinn des Abendmahls*, 1926.
 W. O. E. Oosterley, *The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy*, 1925.
 G. Bail, *Die Haupttypen der neueren Sakramentslehre*, 1926.
 K. L. Schmidt, *Das Abendmahl in: Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart²*, 1927.
 A. Loisy, *Les origines de la cène eucharistique*, 1928.
 H. Strack and Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, 1922-28.
 W. Laible, *Sind die Aussagen des Kl. Katechismus ueber das Abendmahl heute noch haltbar? (Festschrift fuer Ihmels)*, 1928.
 Y. Brilioth and Hebert, *Eucharistic Faith and Practice, Evangelical and Catholic*, 1930.
 E. Sommerlath, *Luthers Lehre von der Realpraesenz im Abendmahl (Festschrift fuer Ihmels)*, 1928.
 E. Sommerlath, *Der Sinn des Abendmahls*, 1930.
 E. Sommerlath, *Sakrament und Gegenwart*, 1930.
 A. Schweitzer, *Die Mystik des Apostels Paulus*, 1930.
 P. Althaus, *Die lutherische Abendmahlslehre in der Gegenwart*, 1931.
 W. Elert, *Morphologie des Luthertums*, 1 vol. 1931.
 P. Althaus, *Grundriss der Dogmatik*, 1932.
 H. Lietzmann, *Geschichte der alten Kirche*, I, 1932.
 Ad. Koeberle, *Wort, Sakrament und Kirche im Luthertum*, 1934.
 R. Hupfeld, *Die Abendmahlsfeier, ihr urspruenglicher Sinn und sinn-gemaesse, Gestaltung*, 1935.

- Joachim Jeremias, *Die Abendmahlsworte Jesu*, 1935.
 Aug. Arnold, *Der Ursprung des christlichen Abendmahls im Licht der neueren liturgie-geschichtlichen Forschungen*, 1937.
 E. Wolf (editor), *Abendmahlsgemeinschaft*, 1937.
 Helmut Gollwitzer, *Coena Domini*, 1938.
 H. Sasse, *Kirche und Herrenmahl*, 1938.
 W. von Loewenich, *Vom Abendmahl Christi*, 1938.
 W. Elert, *Der Christliche Glaube*, 1940.
 Fr. Delekat, *Die heiligen Sakramente und die Ordnungen der Kirche*, 1940.
 H. Sasse (editor), *Vom Sakrament des Altars. Lutherische Beitræge zur Frage des heiligen Abendmahls. Unter Mitarbeit von sieben Theologen (Procksch, Sasse, Sommarlath, Strasser, Preuss, Hopf, Froelich) herausgegeben von Prof. D. Dv. H. Sasse*, Leipzig, 1941.
 Simon Schoeffel, *Offenbarung Gottes im heiligen Abendmahl*, 1941.
 Textbooks on Dogmatics. Thomasius, Philippi, Frank, Oettingen, Rohnert, Pieper, etc.
 Textbooks on New Testament Theology: Holtzmann, Weiss, Feine, Zahn, etc.
 Commentaries on Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, 1. Corinthians by Zahn, Wohlenberg, Bachmann, Schniewind, Rengstorff, Buechsel, Hauck, Wendland, Klostermann, etc.
 Herzog-Hauck, *Realencyclopaedie*.
Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart, 2d edition 1927-1931.

* * *

- Daniel, *Codex Liturgicus*, 4 vols.
 F. E. Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, 1896.
 H. Lietzmann, *Liturgische Texte*.
 Theo. Schermann and R. Storf, *Griechische Liturgien*, 1912.