

**CONCORDIA
THEOLOGICAL
QUARTERLY**

Volume 50, Number 2

CTQ

APRIL 1986

Catholicity and CatholicismAvery Dulles 81

**The Sacramental Presence
in Lutheran Orthodoxy**..... Eugene F. Klug 95

**Toward a New Lutheran
Dogmatics**Lowell C. Green 109

**The Curious Histories of the Wittenberg
Concord**James M. Kittelson with Ken Schurb 119

Theological Observer 139

Book Reviews 145



The Sacramental Presence in Lutheran Orthodoxy

Eugene F. Klug

For Luther the doctrine of the Real Presence was one of the crucial issues of the Reformation. There is no way of understanding what went on in the years following his death, particularly in the lives and theology of the orthodox teachers of the Lutheran church, unless the platform on which Luther stood is clearly recognized. Luther had gone to the Marburg colloquy of 1529 with minimal expectations. In later years he reflected on the outcome of that discussion with Zwingli, noting that in spite of everything there had been considerable convergence except on the presence of Christ's body and blood in the Sacrament. These thoughts are contained in his *Brief Confession concerning the Holy Sacrament* of 1544. "With considerable hope we departed from Marburg," Luther comments, "because they agreed to all the Christian articles of the faith," and even "in this article of the holy sacrament they also abandoned their previous error" (that it was merely bread), and "it seemed as if they would in time share our point of view altogether."¹ This result was not to be, as history records.

With all the might that was in him Luther protested loudly throughout his life against any diminution of Christ's body and blood in the Sacrament.² Probably none of Luther's works played as large a role as did his famous "Great Confession" of 1528, the *Confession concerning Christ's Supper*. Herman Sasse, like many others, is duly impressed by this work and by the ardor and absolute fixedness with which Luther remained glued throughout his life to the words of Christ, "This is my body." Sasse notes how Luther emphasizes unquestioning dependence on Christ's words. Not even an angel from heaven should be allowed to divert us from the simple meaning which they have. They "are the words of life and blessedness" to everyone who receives Christ's body and blood with trusting faith.³ Held by Scripture's absolute clarity in all references to the Supper, Luther argues that, when Christ instituted the Holy Supper, He clearly did not have a figurative purpose in mind. "If Christ had intended to institute a Supper in which, not his body and blood, but a likeness of his body and blood were present, he would properly have left us the old Mosaic supper with the paschal lamb," observes Luther, for such a lamb would quite wonderfully, almost automatically, represent His sacrifice of Himself for sinners.⁴

How clearly Christ had taught the doctrine of the Real Presence! This is Luther's stance, "See, then, what a beautiful, great, marvelous thing it is, how everything meshes together in one sacramental reality," states Luther in humble viewing of the whole sacramental action which Christ has commanded for His church. Luther had little concern for the precise "moment" of the Real Presence. Neither the so-called consecrationists, nor the distributionists, nor the receptionists, nor any other such breed, can claim him for their side. "The words are the first thing," Luther says simply, "for without the words the cup and bread would be nothing. Further, without bread and cup, the body and blood of Christ would not be there. Without the body and blood of Christ, the new testament would not be there. Without the new testament, forgiveness of sins would not be there. Without forgiveness of sins, life and salvation would not be there." So this is the issue, the hinge on which all things turn, "since all this constitutes one sacramental reality," says Luther.

Luther's teaching on the Sacrament is the platform on which his spiritual heirs stood. Among the foremost of these was Martin Chemnitz who, even before he made his contribution to the Formula of Concord, had already written definitive studies dealing with the Lord's Supper. Most significant was a book devoted entirely to the Supper, *De Coena Domini*.⁶ Martin Chemnitz stands in the gap between the time of Luther and the so-called orthodox Lutheran fathers or theologians of the seventeenth century. This year, 1986, marks the four hundredth anniversary of the death of the indisputable champion of Lutheran theology in the generation after Luther.⁷ Without Chemnitz's hand on the rudder it is hard to imagine how the good ship of Lutheran theology (and the Lutheran church itself) could have survived.

In the dedicatory introduction to *The Lord's Supper* Chemnitz pinpoints what he considers to be the main issue in the sacramentarian controversy. Nobody should be allowed to tamper with a person's last will and testament, specifically Christ's! "For we must not believe," says Chemnitz, "that the testator willed anything other than what he expressed in his words," and "men often err" when they attempt "to read the mind of the testator," instead of what he actually said.⁸ The plain and irrevocable rule ought to be "what the doctors of the law teach should be done in the case of the will and testament of any good man" and specifically and especially "in the case of the last will and testament of the very Son of God!"⁹

For Chemnitz the reality of Christ's body and blood in the Sacrament is beyond quibble for the reason that the words of institution "are the words of the last will and testament of the very Son of God and not a game or place for exercising the mind by dreaming up unending interpretations that depart from the simplicity and proper meaning of the words."¹⁰ "Even the civil laws regard such a will as so sacred that they have determined that those who have made any profit at all from the will for themselves shall be deprived of it, and their inheritance. . . taken away from them as being unworthy, on the grounds that they have departed from the will of the testator."¹¹ "Scripture itself uses this argument," says Chemnitz, that the rule which applies in civil law ought surely hold all the more, with highest respect, in the case of Christ!¹² No one dare "to depart from the meaning of the words in one direction, when it is perfectly clear that the testator held to another" This is how the law reads. "For to what purpose are the words used except to demonstrate the will of the speaker?"¹³

"The heart of the whole controversy," says Chemnitz, "the question at issue," is this: "What is it which is present in the Lord's Supper which is distributed to those who eat, which we are commanded to take and receive, not just in the way it seems best to each individual, but by eating and drinking?" "Is it only common bread?" "The real truth of the matter" is that Christ affirms clearly the special gift, under the visible elements of bread and wine, of His body and blood. "For in regard to what is present in the Lord's Supper, what is distributed, what those who eat receive orally, He has pronounced and affirmed: 'This is My body, which is given for you. This is My blood, which is shed for you for the remission of sins.'"¹⁴ "The question," says Chemnitz, "is not what the power of God can do and what kind of presence and communication seems more outstanding and effective to us, but the question concerns the words of the last will and testament of the Son of God, which words. . . in their proper and natural meaning speak clearly and explicitly of the Supper which is observed among us here on earth."¹⁵

According to Chemnitz, the words of institution manifest a threefold eating (and drinking) in the Lord's Supper!¹⁶ First, there is simple physical eating, and it is manifest "that the substance of the bread in the Eucharist is eaten in this natural way." Secondly, there is the sacramental eating of Christ's body, not in a visible, perceptible manner, but truly and substantially nonetheless. This

is the very heart and nub of Christ's testament, and it is not in any way suggested by the Savior that this eating is figurative or imaginary. True, "we are not able to demonstrate or understand how this takes place," but that it takes place "in a manner in which is known to Him alone" is hinged to Christ's solemn words. It is a truth made especially plain in the *manducatio indignorum* or *impiorum*, the fact that the unbelieving and unworthy communicants are guilty of the body and blood of Christ, for they do not receive it worthily, that is, by faith, failing to discern Christ's body and blood.

Thirdly, there is "the spiritual eating of the flesh and blood of Christ," says Chemnitz, something that "can take place either outside of or within the celebration of the Lord's Supper" as "our faith embraces and lays hold of Christ" and "applies to itself His benefits which He merited for us by the giving of His body and the shedding of His blood." This spiritual eating and drinking, however, must not divert us from the truth of the other two kinds of eating, the physical and sacramental, into a mystical reverie that leaves the elements behind. "In the Lord's Supper," says Chemnitz, "the spiritual eating must not so turn our mind and faith away from this celebration of the Supper which is taking place in the gathering of the congregation that in our meditations we are carried beyond the heaven of heavens," for the fact simply is "that the Son of God Himself in this distribution and reception of His body and blood is also giving, applying, and sealing to you all those benefits He gained for us by the giving of His body and the shedding of His blood." This is Christ's solemn seal!

The instituting word of Christ was for Chemnitz the linchpin holding everything together. How Christ could effect the giving of His body and blood in the Sacrament was of no concern. "We on our part simply believe this presence because it has the testimony of the Word of God," and no one "ought to dispute about the mode of the presence."¹⁸ Like Luther he believed "that the ground for the presence of the body of Christ in the Supper" was to be found simply and fully "in the truth of the words of institution."¹⁹

Chemnitz always maintained that the words of institution should be repeated each time that the Sacrament is observed. But he rejected the notion that the officiating clergyman by mere reci-

tation of the necessary syllables and letters had "such power and energy" to cause the body to be present.²⁰ "This ground is very firm," that "what is not consecrated, though it be bread and cup, is food for refreshment, not a religious sacrament."²¹ But the consecration harks back to Christ's empowering word, "even as Paul asserts that in the preaching of the Gospel Christ Himself speaks through the mouth of His ministers" and "in the same manner . . . brings it about that the Baptism is a washing of regeneration and renewal."²²

Chemnitz, like Luther, retained a very high regard for the act of consecrating the elements, but never apart from the use of the Sacrament, distributing and receiving the elements as Christ had ordained. It was abhorrent to both of these giants of the Reformation to think that they, or anyone for that matter, could effect some sort of change in the bread and the wine by the liturgical repetition of words. Hermann Sasse is quite correct when he observes that "nowhere do dogmatics and liturgics affect each other more profoundly than in the question of the nature and function of the consecration."²³ The Lutheran church is a liturgical church, but it is also the church that knows that God's Word prescribes no specific form of worship as necessary. The enabling word and power in the Sacrament is Christ's. When the pastor consecrates the bread and wine in the midst of his congregation he is setting aside these elements for the use which Christ commanded. The questions of when the Real Presence begins, when it ends, what happens when a wafer is dropped or wine spilled are really irrelevant. "For the whole action of the institution hangs together" with the offering, receiving, and eating, says Chemnitz.²⁴ "When therefore the bread is taken, blessed, divided, offered, and received according to the institution, this action is not rightly said to be either before or apart from the use of the Supper, which has its bounds in the entire action of the institution."²⁵ Therefore, Chemnitz regards as "revolting disputes," triggered by scholastic pettiness, such questions as these: "what about those particles to which the use has not yet come, that is, which have not been distributed, received, and eaten?"²⁶ or what is it that "a mouse which gnaws the bread is eating?"²⁷

We know the high reverence that Luther had for the consecrated elements.²⁸ But in no way can we conclude that either he or Chemnitz held extremist views concerning the *reliquiae*, the elements that remained when the Supper was over. The conclu-

sion simply is that, where the whole action was not complete, the elements that remained or were dropped or spilled were to be viewed as natural bread and wine only, nothing more. To state more than this would border on reservationism, the idea that the elements retain their divine character as hosts of Christ's body and blood. Neither Luther nor Chemnitz may be claimed for this misguided, albeit pious, notion that has persistently cropped up within Lutheran theology, usually as a result of so-called liturgical renewal.

Therefore, it is claiming too much to attach extremist views to Chemnitz and to say that he had the mind of Luther in so thinking. This is, however, the claim of Bjarne W. Teigen. In connection with Article VII (paragraph 126) of the Formula of Concord Teigen has concluded that the reason why Chemnitz is urging a proper veneration of the Sacrament is that "the consecration effects the Real Presence." According to Teigen, "there can be no question that Chemnitz believes that the consecration in a valid observance of the Supper achieves the Real Presence, and he could not for theological reasons accept the position that we cannot fix from Scripture within the Sacramental *usus* when the Real Presence of Christ's body and blood begins."²⁹ Teigen asserts that "throughout all his writings he [Chemnitz] assumes that the consecration effects the Real Presence" and that this consecration is the repetition of the *verba*, "the powerful creative words of Christ,"³⁰ "The end result of this doctrine is that the consecration has achieved the sacramental union."³¹

What Luther and Chemnitz refuse to try to do, that is, fix the moment of Christ's presence in the Sacrament, Teigen presumes to do for them. It is certainly asserting too much to say that Chemnitz "in all his writings assumes that the consecration effects the Real Presence." The only point in *The Lord's Supper* which remotely approaches such a claim is the passage in which Chemnitz states that "when the word or institution of Christ comes to these elements, then not only one substance is present as before, but at the same time also the very body and blood of Christ."³² The context, however, does not support Teigen's assertion, nor does the rest of Chemnitz's beautiful treatment of the Sacramental Presence, which he, like Luther, always sees as running straight back to the Lord's instituting word, as the Formula of Concord states.³³

No doubt Teigen is correct in stating that Article VII: 126 of the Formula "is placed at the end of the Sacramentarian antitheses only to disavow the charge that the true Lutherans were guilty of artoiatry," or bread worship.³⁴ But it may rightly be questioned whether he has caught the concern of the confessional writers for the proper veneration of the Lord who gave the Sacrament when he places all who disagree with his own consecrationism into the same bundle with "the Sacramentarians and the Melancthonians who did not believe that the consecration effected the sacramental union."³⁵

It is an unfortunate dispute, one which undoubtedly ought not have arisen in our day. To attach Luther's and Chemnitz's names to the standard is even more unfortunate. They consistently refrained from attempting to explain how or when Christ effected the sacramental union, though the fact of it in every proper celebration of the Supper they defended tooth and nail. This has always been the stance of the Lutheran church since the time of Luther. In his dogmatics notes W. H. T. Dau wrote: "Since the bread and wine in the Eucharist, owing to the institution of Christ, are sacramentally united with His body and blood, every communicant receives the body and blood of Christ, and it is impossible for any communicant not to receive them."³⁶ Charles Porterfield Krauth in his monumental work, *The Conservative Reformation and Its Theology*, concurs: "When He [Christ] speaks, we know it is done. The mathematical point need not concern us. We know the sacramental moment."³⁷ In attestation Krauth quotes the passage already cited from the Formula of Concord (VII: 74,75.), and he states in conclusion:

In a word, unless the sacramental action is entire, as Christ ordained it, His sacramental presence will not be vouchsafed; if it be entire, His presence is given from its beginning to its end . . . Christ Himself knows the end from the beginning. At the beginning, middle, and end of the Supper, the minister need not fear to assert, nor the people to believe, the very words of Christ, in their simplest literal force. It is not *going to be* but *is*, when Christ says it is.³⁸

In his concise, helpful *Enchiridion*, a handbook of Christian doctrine written for the laymen as well as the clergy, Chemnitz directly addresses the question of whether the body and blood of Christ are to be thought of as present if the consecrated elements are

neither distributed nor received. His answer zeroes in on the complete action ordained by Christ in the Sacrament: "Therefore, when the bread is indeed blessed but neither distributed nor received, . . . it is surely clear that the whole word of institution is not added to the element, for this part is lacking, 'He gave it to them and said, Take and eat.' And when the word of institution is incomplete there can be no complete Sacrament."³⁹ Chemnitz thereupon cites an analogous situation in baptism: "In the same way it is also not true Baptism, if the Word is indeed spoken over the water, but if there is no one who is baptized."⁴⁰

Chemnitz never entertained any doubts about the power of Christ to effect the Real Presence of His true body and blood—simply because it was the Lord of heaven and earth Himself who had spoken the words of a solemn testament. Like Luther Chemnitz sensed that God was too small in people's minds when they found a logistical problem in trying to explain how Christ, who ascended to the right hand of God, could give His body and blood at many places and times on earth in the Sacrament. Such people were putting a lid on Christ's almighty power and denying "that He did not know or have at His disposal another, heavenly mode, by which He might be present in the Supper in His body and blood."⁴¹ Was Christ according to His human nature perched in a heavenly pear tree? "The articles of our faith," says Chemnitz, "declare that Christ ascended to heaven in His body not as little birds, leaving the surface of the earth, sit in the top of a tree, nor as Elias was taken up into heaven, but in such a way that He sat down at the right hand of God the Father Almighty." We need to remember that "the right hand of God is not a circumscribed place or a particular seat or region in heaven by which Christ is limited, circumscribed, and enclosed," for "Scripture calls it the right hand of the majesty and power of God."⁴² Let God be God, Chemnitz is implying in the vein of Luther. "Should He, then, not be able to do with His body and blood what He declared and ordained in express words in His testament?"⁴³

The orthodox theologians to a man followed Luther and Chemnitz in their teaching on the sacramental presence. John Gerhard, for example, like his forebears, held that the instituting words of Christ are to be taken *kata to reeton*, "according to their genuine, literal, and natural meaning." These words point to "the true, real, and substantial presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Supper."⁴⁴ We call this presence *sacramental*, states Gerhard,

“because the celestial object in this mystery is bestowed and presented to us through the medium of external sacramental symbols; it is called *true* and *real* to exclude the figment of a figurative, imaginary, and representative presence; *substantial* to exclude the subterfuge of our opponents concerning the merely efficacious presence of the body and blood of Christ in this mystery; *mystical*, *supernatural*, and *incomprehensible*, because in this mystery the body and blood of Christ are present in a worldly manner;’ nor “in a corporeal and quantitative manner.”⁴⁵

Leonhard Hutter stresses the point that Christ’s intention is obviously to present His body and blood as the seal of His will in the Sacrament and that He indeed has the power so to do.⁴⁶ John Quenstedt underscores the presence of “the very substance of the body of Christ” in the Sacrament at the same time that he dismisses any consideration of the body of Christ being present in a gross “physical, local, and circumscriptive” manner, much as Luther had done before him.⁴⁷ David Hollaz notes that there is a distinction to be observed “between the general and special presence” of Christ in this world.⁴⁸ The first has to do with His promise to uphold all things by the might of His power and omnipresence; the second has to do with His specific promise to give His body and blood in the Supper. Moreover, Hollaz distinguishes carefully between the spiritual eating of Christ by faith, which “is common to all times;” and the sacramental eating of Christ’s body and blood which “is peculiar to the New Testament.”⁴⁹

John Gerhard devoted a major portion of his treatment of the Lord’s Supper to the consecration, but he did not allow it to be set apart and above that which Christ had also commanded, that the elements be distributed and that they be eaten and drunk.⁵⁰ Quenstedt saw the consecration as consisting first in the “separation of the external elements from a common and ordinary use;” secondly, in “setting them apart for sacred use, as appointed in the Holy Supper, by solemn prayers and thanksgiving;” and thirdly, “in the sacramental union of the bread and wine with the body and blood of Christ.”⁵¹ One might wonder, in view of the last point, whether Quenstedt, after all, was supportive of the view dismissed above that by the consecration the Real Presence is effected. The fact, however, is that he concurred fully with the position which his uncle, John Gerhard, had expressed in his treatment of the meaning of the consecration. Gerhard rejected the

idea that the mere "recitation of the words of institution" had "such power as to make the body and blood of Christ present." Instead, Gerhard (and so Quenstedt) believed "that the presence of the body and blood of Christ depends entirely upon the will and promise of Christ depends entirely upon the will and promise of Christ, and upon the perpetually enduring efficacy of the original institution."⁵² It is by virtue of that word, Christ's promise, that the nature of the Sacrament is what it is, the true body and blood of the Lord; and neither unbelief nor, for that matter, faith plays any role in the Real Presence, according to Gerhard.⁵³

It was the work of John Baier, the *Compendium Theologiae Positivae*, that Walther edited, re-published, and then used for the teaching of his dogmatics classes. Baier identified Christ Himself as the *causa efficiens principalis* which made the Sacrament what it is. It was the Lord's great love and kindness towards us which occasioned His institution of the Supper. Thus, Christ's institution must be seen as the impelling principal cause when one seeks the reason of the Real Presence; and in relation to this ordaining word of Christ the consecration, which is used in the celebration of the Supper ever since that time, must be seen as the lesser impelling cause, tied as it is to Christ's command and promise.⁵⁴

"We could multiply testimony," says Krauth after quoting at some length from the Lutheran theologians whom we have cited and several others in addition.⁵⁵ But Krauth chooses not to continue, having shown convincingly that "no great dogmatician of our Church, who has treated of the Lord's Supper at all, has failed to protest in some form against the charge we are considering."⁵⁶ The "charge" to which he refers is that the Lutherans taught consubstantiation. This accusation Krauth lays to rest as absurd, and the same for any charges of transubstantiation or impanation. No Lutheran theologian worth his salt ever taught anything other than the true sacramental presence of Christ's body and blood.

The matter of the Real Presence, as we have shown, was very dear to Luther. It is dear to every earnest Christian to this day. Christ's enabling word is always the key to this great article of faith. Luther consistently led simple hearts to look in the right direction for the source of the Sacrament's power. In his treatise on *The Private Mass and the Consecration of Priests* of 1533 he wrote: "So, it is not by our doing, speaking, or work that bread

and wine become Christ's body and blood, much less is it by the chrism or consecration; rather, it is caused by Christ's ordinance, command, and institution."⁵⁷ Therefore, when we come to the Sacrament, "we hear these words, 'This is my body,' not as spoken concerning the person of the pastor or the minister but as coming from Christ's own mouth, who is present and says to us, 'Take, eat, this is my body.'" Then, as regards the officiant, Luther explodes in his somewhat impetuous style: "For our faith and the sacrament must not be based on the person, whether he is godly or evil, consecrated or unconsecrated, called or an imposter, whether he is the devil or his mother, but upon Christ, upon his word, upon his office, upon his command and ordinance."⁵⁸ It is because of the treasure which Christ in His love and kindness left us in the Sacrament that Luther shouted out from the bottom of his heart and soul in a later letter that directly reflected on the foregoing treatise: "I love it with all my heart, the precious, blessed Supper of my Lord Jesus Christ, in which He gives me His body and blood to eat and drink also orally with the mouth of my body, accompanied by the exceedingly sweet precious words, 'Given for you, shed for you.'"⁶⁰

ENDNOTES

1. LW 38, 301.
2. LW 35, 45ff. cf. e.g., *The Blessed Sacrament of the Holy and True Body of Christ* (1519).
3. H. Sasse, *This Is My Body*, p. 109.
4. LW 37, 264.
5. *Ibid.*, 338.
6. This book which was first published in 1570 has recently been translated into English by J. A. G. Preus and published by Concordia Publishing House (1979). It itself was the fruit of Chemnitz's early *Gutachten* in the Albert Hardenberg case. Chemnitz had written this theological opinion for Joachim Moerlin, his close friend and supervisor of the Brunswick church territory. Together with Tilemann Heshusius, Moerlin demonstrated Hardenberg's deviation from Augsburg X on the Lord's Supper; his views were those of Zwingli and the Calvinists. The result was Hardenberg's dismissal from his pulpit in Bremen.

7. In recent years there has been a considerable revival of interest in Chemnitz and his works. His study on the Lord's Supper has already been mentioned. In addition, now nearing completion is an English translation of his rightly famous *Examen Concilii Tridentini* as *An Examination of the Council of Trent*, translated by Fred Kramer and published by Concordia Publishing House. Two volumes are presently in print in this *magnum opus*. Individual studies on the theology of Chemnitz are also available, e.g., E. F. Klug's *From Luther to Chemnitz on Scripture and the Word*, originally released by J. H. Kok in the Netherlands and now available from Concordia Theological Seminary Press, Ft. Wayne.
8. *The Lord's Supper*, p. 19.
9. Ibid.
10. Ibid., 27.
11. Ibid.
12. Ibid., 83.
13. Ibid.
14. Ibid., 39.
15. Ibid., 43.
16. Ibid., 58
17. Ibid., 58-64 *passim* for this whole paragraph. Chemnitz was well prepared for the sterling chapters he wrote on the Lord's Supper in his answer to Trent (*Examen Concilii Tridentini*, completed during the years 1565-1573) through the work which he had done in the Hardenberg case and on his book, *The Lord's Supper*. With obvious reference to that book Chemnitz states in his *Examen*: "We have explained all this in a repetition of the sound doctrine of the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Supper in an adequate treatise." (*Examination of the Council of Trent*, II, 223.)
18. *Examination of the Council of Trent*, II, 224.
19. Ibid.
20. Ibid.
21. Ibid., 225.
22. Ibid., 229.
23. Hermann Sasse, *We Confess the Sacraments* (St. Louis: Concordia, 1985), p. 113.
24. *Examination of the Council of Trent*, II, 248.
25. Ibid.
26. Ibid., 252.
27. Ibid., 256.
28. Cf. Sasse, *We Confess the Sacraments*, p. 134, for the report concerning Luther's somewhat dramatic behavior after spilling the chalice's contents on the floor of the church at Halle.
29. *A Lively Legacy*, edited by Kurt Marquart, John Stephenson, and Bjarne W. Teigen (Concordia Theological Seminary Press, Ft. Wayne, 1985), p. 167.

-
30. Ibid., 168.
 31. Ibid.
 32. *The Lord's Supper*, p. 156.
 33. FC VII: 75: "For the true and almighty words of Jesus Christ which he spake at the first institution were efficacious not only at the first Supper, but they endure, are valid, operate, and are still efficacious. . . . For where His institution is observed and His words are spoken over the bread and cup, and the consecrated bread and cup are distributed, Christ Himself, through the spoken words, is still efficacious *by virtue of the first institution*, through His word, which He wishes to be there repeated."
 34. *A Lively Legacy*, 170.
 35. Ibid.
 36. *Doctrinal Theology*, II, 74.
 37. Krauth, *op. cit.*, 822.
 38. Krauth, *op. cit.*, 824.
 39. *Ministry, Word, and Sacraments*, trans. Luther Poellot (St. Louis: Concordia, 1981), p. 121.
 40. Ibid.
 41. Ibid., 125.
 42. Ibid.
 43. Ibid.
 44. Quoted in H. Schmid, *Doctrinal Theology of the Lutheran Church*, p. 561.
 45. Ibid.
 46. Ibid., 562.
 47. Ibid., 563.
 48. Ibid., 565.
 49. Ibid., 567.
 50. Ibid., 572.
 51. Ibid.
 52. Ibid., 574.
 53. Ibid., 576.
 54. J. Baier, *Compendium Theologiae Positivae*, III, 491f.
 55. Cf. Krauth, *op. cit.*, 771.
 56. Ibid.
 57. *LW* 38, 199.
 58. Ibid.
 59. Ibid., 200
 60. Quoted in F. Pieper, *Christian Dogmatics*, III, 374. Pieper's translation is more vivid than that which is found in the American Edition, *LW* 38, 227.