

Contemporary Questions Concerning The Moment Of The Real Presence In The Lord's Supper

[Northern Wisconsin District Pastoral Conference : Immanuel Ev. Lutheran Church : Greenville, Wisconsin : The Festival of the Reformation of the Church : October 31, 1995]

by Guy R. Purdue

It's entirely appropriate—even vital—for confessional Lutherans to study the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. Doctor Martin Luther reminds us, "This is the Gospel."ⁱ

Yes, orthodox Lutheranism has been blessed with a unique treasure. We possess God's undeserved gift of his saving Word, proclaimed and practiced among us in its truth and purity. We possess the twin gems of Christ's Bath and his Supper, celebrated among us according to the Savior's original institution.

In recent years a controversy has arisen within our WELS/ELS fellowship regarding the moment of the Real Presence of Christ's body and blood in the Lord's Supper. The issue centers on Christ's words of institution, on the purpose for using those words in the Consecration, and on the question of the immediate efficacy of the divine Word.

Before we examine this controversy more thoroughly, it's fitting that we recognize at the outset that both sides in this controversy agree on what the Lord's Supper is. Both sides believe in the Real Presence. Both sides sincerely desire to be faithful to the Word of God and to the Lutheran Confessions.

A doctrinal controversy can benefit the Church. It can make us think and speak again about matters we haven't considered much. It can drive us back *ad fontes*, to the Scriptures.

1. The Scriptures

Yes, back to the Scriptures. As confessional Lutherans, let's recognize that *Sola Scriptura* is the hermeneutical principle we shall seek to follow—a hermeneutical principle given to us by our Confessions themselves.

In the Smalcald Articles Luther writes: "For it will not do to frame articles of faith from the works or words of the holy Fathers; otherwise their kind of fare, of garments, of house, etc., would have to become an article of faith, as was done with relics. The rule is: The Word of God shall establish articles of faith, and no one else, not even an angel."ⁱⁱ

The Formula of Concord states:

Doctor Luther himself in the Latin preface to his published works has given necessary and Christian admonition concerning his writings, and has expressly drawn this distinction, namely, that the Word of God alone should be and remain the only standard and rote of doctrine, to which the writings of no man should be regarded as equal, but to which everything should be subjected.ⁱⁱⁱ

In keeping with this Confessional hermeneutic, then, we shall draw our answers to the question of "the moment of the Real Presence in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper" from an exegesis of the pertinent Scripture passages. Those passages are the four accounts of Christ's institution of the Supper, found in the Gospels of Matthew, Mark and Luke, and in St. Paul's First Letter to the Corinthians, chapter 11.

Matthew 26:26-28

Ἐσθιόντων δὲ αὐτῶν λαβὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἄρτον καὶ εὐλογήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ δούς τοῖς μαθηταῖς εἶπεν· λάβετε φάγετε, τοῦτο ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμα μου. καὶ λαβὼν ποτήριον καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων· πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες, τοῦτο γὰρ ἐστὶν τὸ αἷμα μου τῆς διαθήκης τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυννόμενον εἰς ἄφεςιν ἁμαρτιῶν.

²⁶As they were eating, Jesus, after taking bread and after speaking a blessing broke, and after giving (it) to the disciples said, “Take, eat, this is my body.” ²⁷And after taking a cup and after giving thanks he gave (it) to them as he said, “All drink out of it, ²⁸for this is my blood of the covenant, which is being poured out concerning many for forgiveness of sins.”

NIV: ²⁶“While they were eating, Jesus took bread, gave thanks and broke it, and gave it to his disciples, saying, “Take and eat; this is my body.” ²⁷Then he took the cup, gave thanks and offered it to them, saying, “Drink from it all of you. ²⁸This is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many for the forgiveness of sins.”

In connection with the consecration of the bread and the wine, the four accounts use two words to describe Jesus’ actions: εὐλογέω and εὐχαριστέω.

The Bauer-Arndt Gingrich lexicon defines εὐλογέω in this context: “upon things, which are thereby consecrated τι bless, consecrate.... In the language of the Eucharist 1 Cor 10:16. Perhaps Mt 26:26; Mk 14:22 also belong here....”^{iv}

In this context BAG defines εὐχαριστέω as: “give thanks, render or return thanks.”^v Each of the accounts uses these words. We will examine the significance of the consecration a bit later.

Mark 14:22-24

Καὶ ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐλογήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς καὶ εἶπεν· λάβετε, τοῦτο ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμα μου. καὶ λαβὼν ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἔπιον ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· τοῦτο ἐστὶν τὸ αἷμα μου τῆς διαθήκης τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν.

²²And as they were eating, after taking bread, after speaking a blessing, he broke (it) and gave (it) to them and said, “Take, this is my body.” ²³And after taking a cup, after giving thanks he gave it to them, and they all drank out of it. ²⁴And he said to them, “This is my blood of the covenant, which is being poured out on behalf of many.”

NIV: ²²While they were eating, Jesus took bread, gave thanks and broke it, and. gave it to his disciples, saying, “Take it; this is my body.” ²³Then he took the cup, gave thanks and offered it to them, and they all drank from it. ²⁴“This is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many,” he said to them.

Mark records essentially the same points as Matthew: Jesus blessed and gave thanks for the bread and the wine (εὐλογήσας ... εὐχαριστήσας). Jesus told the disciples to receive and consume the elements, and why they should do so: “λάβετε, τοῦτο ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμα μου ... τοῦτο ἐστὶν τὸ αἷμα μου τῆς διαθήκης τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν.”

And again, Mark says nothing more and nothing less.

Luke 22:19-20

καὶ λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων· τοῦτο ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμα μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον· τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὡσαύτως μετὰ τὸ δειπνήσαι, λέγων· τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἢ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματι μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον.

¹⁹And after taking bread, after giving thanks he broke (it) and gave (it) to them, saying, “This is my body which is being given on your behalf; keep doing this to my memory.” ²⁰And the cup likewise after they dined, saying, “This cup (is) the new covenant in my blood which is being poured out in your behalf.”

NIV: ¹⁹And he took bread, gave thanks and broke it, and gave it to them, saying, “This is my body given for you; do this in remembrance of me.” ²⁰In the same way, after the supper he took the cup, saying, “This is the new covenant in my blood, which is poured out for you.”

Luke again tells us that Jesus spoke a thanksgiving over the elements. (Luke uses εὐχαριστήσας where Matthew and Mark use εὐλογήσας; he also uses the participle only once, rather than applying it to both elements).

Luke omits Jesus’ command regarding the reception, but he includes Jesus’ “incentive” as to why they should partake: “τοῦτο ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμα μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον.”

Luke adds that Jesus provided an additional “incentive” by saying: “τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.”

1 Corinthians 11:23-25

Ἐγὼ γὰρ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου, ὃ καὶ παρέδωκα ὑμῖν, ὅτι ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ἧ παρεδίδοτο ἔλαβεν ἄρτον καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ εἶπεν τοῦτο μοῦ ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν· τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. ὡσαύτως καὶ τὸ ποτήριον μετὰ τὸ δειπνήσαι λέγων· τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἢ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι· τοῦτο ποιεῖτε, ὡσάκις ἐὰν πίνητε, εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.

²³For I myself received from the Lord, that which I also passed on to you, that the Lord Jesus in the night in which he was betrayed, took bread ²⁴and after giving thanks he broke (it) and said, “This is my body which (is) for you. Keep on doing this to my memory.” ²⁵In a similar way also the cup after they dined while saying, “This cup is the new covenant in my blood; keep on doing

this as often as you drink (it) to my memory.”²⁶For as often as you eat this bread and drink this cup, you thoroughly announce (καταγγέλλετε) the death of the Lord until he comes.

NIV: ²³For I received from the Lord what I also passed onto you: The Lord Jesus, on the night he was betrayed, took bread, ²⁴and when he had given thanks, he broke it and said, “This is my body, which is for you; do this in remembrance of me.” ²⁵In the same way, after supper he took the cup, saying, “This cup is the new covenant in my blood; do this, whenever you drink it, in remembrance of me.” ²⁶For whenever you eat this bread and drink this cup, you proclaim the Lord’s death until he comes.

In 1 Corinthians Paul is addressing a problem in the Corinthian congregation. The members were bitterly divided into factions (1 Cor 1:10-17). Those factions became apparent in an ugly, offensive way when the members came to the Lord’s Supper:

In the following directives I have no praise for you, for your meetings do more harm than good. In the first place, I hear that when you come together as a church, there are divisions among you, and to some extent I believe it. No doubt there have to be differences among you to show which of you have God’s approval. When you come together, it is not the Lord’s Supper you eat, for as you eat, each of you goes ahead without waiting for anybody else. One remains hungry, another gets drunk. Don’t you have homes to eat and drink in? Or do you despise the church of God and humiliate those who have nothing? What shall I say to you? Shall I praise you for this? Certainly not! (1 Cor 11:17-22)

Paul uses his apostolic authority (Ἐγὼ) to remind the Corinthians how precious the Lord’s Supper is. It is a holy gift from Christ, intended to be used by Christians until their Lord returns to take them home. The Sacrament grants and seals the forgiveness of sins. It gives the Church the opportunity publicly to “proclaim the Lord’s death until he comes.”

The four accounts of the institution of the Lord’s Supper were all written to comfort our hearts. We live in a world which is at war with our Christ and with us. The Lord’s Supper comforts us with forgiveness for our sins. It grants us strength to continue fighting the good fight of faith until we gain the final victory in Christ.

Scripture, therefore, declares that what is distributed and received in the Lord’s Supper is the true body and blood of Christ: “Is not the cup of thanksgiving for which we give thanks a participation (κοινωνία) in the blood of Christ? And is not the bread that we break a participation in the body of Christ?” (1 Cor 10:16).

What then is the role of the consecration?

According to the Scripture references concerning the institution of the supper, the consecration itself consists of three distinct actions: setting apart the elements (the separation); blessing the elements by designating them for use in the supper with festive prayer and petition (the benediction); and the sacramental union, that is, effecting the union of bread and wine with Christ’s body and blood, so that the bread offered is a communion of the body and the wine a communion of the blood. This union occurs through the words of institution and only in connection

with the distribution. The words of Christ indicate this when he says: “Take, eat, this is my body.” For this reason the uniting which occurs in the consecration is called preclusive, that is, its result first takes place in connection with the action of eating and drinking.^{vi}

Historically, four opinions have existed within Lutheranism as to “when” the Real Presence is effected.

Consecrationism states that at, or immediately after, the speaking of the Verba, the Body and Blood of Jesus are present. This view has been promoted in modern times by Tom Hardt of Sweden, and by Bjarne W. and Erling T. Teigen of Bethany Lutheran Theological Seminary in Mankato (ELS). We will examine the position of Hardt and the Teigens in a later portion of this essay.

Receptionism states that the Body and Blood of our Lord are present only when the elements are eaten and drunk.

A third view states that the Real Presence is effected some time during or following the consecration; but we should not attempt to “fix the moment” with “mathematical precision.”

A fourth view holds that the entire matter is an open question. Since Holy Scripture does not answer the question, “When,” we should not make any attempt to do so. This fourth view is the position which this paper will take.

II. The Lutheran Confessions

Our Lutheran Book of Concord expresses the same doctrine as that of Scripture: What is distributed and received in the Sacrament is the true body and blood of Christ:

Of the Supper of the Lord they teach that the Body and Blood of Christ are truly present, and are distributed to those who eat in the Supper of the Lord; and they reject those that teach otherwise.^{vii}

... We believe, that in the Lord’s Supper the body and blood of Christ are truly and substantially present, and are truly tendered, with those things which are seen, bread and wine, to those who receive the Sacrament.^{viii}

Of the Sacrament of the Altar we hold that bread and wine in the supper are the true body and blood of Christ, and are given and received not only by the goodly, but also by wicked Christians.^{ix}

No matter whether you are worthy or unworthy, you have here His body and blood by virtue of these words which are added to the bread and wine. Only note and remember this well; for upon these words rest all our foundation, protection, and defense against all errors and deception that have ever come or yet may come. Thus we have briefly the first point which relates to the essence of this Sacrament. Now examine further the efficacy and benefits on account of which really the Sacrament was instituted; which is also its most necessary part, that we may know what we should seek and obtain there. Now this is plain and clear from the words just mentioned: This is My body and blood, given and shed FOR YOU, for the

remission of sins. Briefly that is as much as to say: For this reason we go to the Sacrament because there we receive such a treasure by and in which we obtain forgiveness of sins. Why so? Because the words stand here and give us this; for on this account He bids me eat and drink, that it may be my own and may benefit me, as a sure pledge and token, yea, the very same treasure that is appointed for me against my sins, death; and every calamity.^x

But those that are sensible of their weakness, desire to be rid of it and long for help, should regard and use it only as a precious antidote against the poison which they have in them. For here in the Sacrament you are to receive from the lips of Christ forgiveness of sin, which contains and brings with it the grace of God and the Spirit with all His gifts, protection, shelter, and power against death and the devil and all misfortune.^{xi}

Shortly before the time of the Formula of Concord, a controversy arose within the Lutheran Church about the “moment” of the real presence. (We shall have much more to say about this controversy a bit later).

As always happens at a time of confession, the Church had to examine its position carefully and to speak with precision. As we listen to the Formula of Concord, listen not only to what is said; but also to what is NOT said! The confessors did not write carelessly. They knew what should be said and what should be left unsaid:

Now, as to the consecration, we believe, teach, and confess that no work of man or recitation of the minister produces this presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Holy Supper, but that this is to be ascribed only and alone to the almighty power of our Lord Jesus Christ.

But at the same time we also believe, teach, and confess unanimously that in the use of the Holy Supper the words of the institution of Christ should in no way be omitted; but should be publicly recited; as it is written 1 Cor. 10, 16: The cup of blessing which we bless, etc. This blessing occurs through the recitation of the words of Christ.^{xii}

We unanimously reject and condemn ...That not the omnipotent words of Christ's testament, but faith, produces and makes (*causam esse*) the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Holy Supper.^{xiii}

For apart from the use (*extra usum*), when the bread is laid aside and preserved in the sacramental vessel, or is carried about in the procession and exhibited, as is done in popery, they do not hold that the body of Christ is present.^{xiv}

For the Word, by which it became a sacrament and was instituted, does not become false because of the person or his unbelief.^{xv}

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, so that in all places where the Supper is

celebrated according to the institution of Christ, and His words are used, the body and blood of Christ are truly present, distributed, and received (*vere praesentia distribuuntur et sumantur*), because of the power and efficacy of the words which Christ spoke at the first Supper. 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 (*virtute primae institutionis*), through His word, which he wishes to be there repeated (*quod repeti vult*) ...^{xvi}

Now, in the administration of the Holy Supper the words of institution are to be publicly spoken or sung before the congregation distinctly and clearly, and should in no way be omitted in order that obedience may be rendered to the command of Christ: This do, and that the faith of the hearers concerning the nature and fruit of this Sacrament may be excited, strengthened, and confirmed by Christ's Word, and that the elements of bread and wine may be consecrated or blessed for this holy use, in order that the body and blood of Christ may therewith be administered to us to be eaten and to be drunk, as Paul declares: The cup of blessing which we bless, which indeed occurs in no other way than through the repetition and recitation of the words of institution.

However, this blessing, or the recitation of the words of institution of Christ alone does not make a sacrament if the entire action of the Supper, as it was instituted by Christ, is not observed (as when the consecrated bread is not distributed, received, and partaken of, but is enclosed, sacrificed, or carried about), but the command of Christ, This do (which embraces the entire action or administration in this Sacrament, that in an assembly of Christians bread and wine are taken, consecrated, distributed, received, eaten, drunk, and the Lord's death is shown forth at the same time) must be observed unseparated and inviolate (*totum et inviolatum observandum est*), as also St. Paul places before our eyes the entire action (*totam actionem*) of the breaking of bread, or of distribution and reception, 1 Cor. 10, 16.^{xvii}

Let's take a look now at some of the private opinions on the issue of the "moment" which have been expressed by some of the fathers of confessional Lutheranism. As we read these, however, let's again be reminded of our confessional, hermeneutical principle: "... it will not do to frame articles of faith from the works or words of the holy Fathers....The rule is: The Word of God shall establish articles of faith, and no one else, not even an angel."

When it came to the matter of "establishing the moment," Luther refused to do so. In a letter to Carlstadt in 1528, Luther wrote:

Perhaps you are recalling for us that old question about the instant of consecration, where the papists teach that it is at the last syllable and not before that the Body of Christ is present. We put little value on these thoughts, and we do not designate for God moments or times; we are simply content to believe with certainty that whatever God say happens or exists does happen.... And so here we say that bread is the Body of Christ, because Christ said, "This is my Body," and we stay away from the other idle arguments, when they dispute about moments

and syllables. For we are commanded to believe that the Words of God are true, but not to investigate at what instant or how the Words are true and how they are fulfilled.^{xviii}

Some consecrationists have laid a great deal of weight on two letters written by Luther to Pastor Simon Wolferinus in the 1540s. Luther scolded Wolferinus for his practice of placing the leftover consecrated hosts back into the same container with the unconsecrated wafers. But was Luther trying to say something about the moment of the Real Presence, or was he expressing a pastoral heart toward members of the congregation who would be needlessly offended by Wolferinus' practice? In my opinion the latter seems to be the case, for Luther was concerned that if Wolferinus continued in his practice, it might lead some members of the congregation to wonder whether their pastor was a crypto-Zwinglian who denied the Real Presence entirely.

In a letter to Wolferinus in 1543 Luther wrote: "We shall define the time of the sacramental action, in this way: that it starts at the beginning of the Our Father and lasts until all have communicated, have emptied the chalice, have consumed the hosts, until the people have been dismissed and (the priest) has left the altar."

According to former WELS pastor Rick Curia: "... it is clear that Luther himself believed that the Sacramental Union took place before the eating and drinking, from the time of the consecration, although he would not quibble as to the exact moment."^{xix}

Hermann Sasse, however, comments:

In a similar way, Luther and the early Lutheran church avoided forming any theory about the "moment" when the Real Presence begins, and the "moment" when it ceases. Some later orthodox theologians advanced the theory that Christ's body and blood are present only at the "moment" when they are being received. This is frequently regarded as the genuinely Lutheran doctrine both within, and without, the Lutheran church. Actually, this view is only another attempt to determine a time that only "he knows who knows all things."^{xx}

Some consecrationists also have stressed an incident which occurred toward the end of Luther's life. When Luther celebrated Holy Communion for one of the last times, his aged hands shook and he spilled some of the wine. Luther set the chalice down on the altar, got down on all fours and licked up the spilled wine.

Again, let us remember: "It will not do to frame articles of faith from the works or words of the holy Fathers.... The rule is: The Word of God shall establish articles of faith, and no one else, not even an angel." Where would we be if we had to follow every practice that had ever been done by someone—even an orthodox "someone"—somewhere at some point in the history of Christendom?

We now need to comment on the sad shift in the doctrinal position of Philipp Melancthon, Luther's right-hand man and the author of the Augsburg Confession.

In the Unaltered Augsburg Confession of 1530, Melancthon stated: "Of the Supper of the Lord they teach that the Body and Blood of Christ are truly present, and are distributed to those who eat in the Supper of the Lord; and they reject those that teach otherwise (*De coena Domini docent, quod corpus et sanguis Christi vere adsint et distribuuntur vescentibus in coena Domini; et improbant secus docentes.*")."

Ten years later, however; Melancthon published his *Variata* edition of the Augsburg Confession. Melancthon always regarded the Augsburg Confession as his personal property, free to be “tinkered with” as he saw fit, and not as the catholic Confession of the Church. Melancthon watered down the Augsburg Confession (particularly the article concerning the Lord’s Supper) so badly that even John Calvin subscribed to it, “in the sense in which it has been explained to me by its author.”

As his own theology of the Supper developed more fully, Melancthon tended to prefer the word *exhibere* to express his understanding of the dynamic of the Lord’s Supper and the relationship of Christ’s body and blood to the physical elements of bread and wine. One of his most famous uses of the word was in the 1540 “*Variata*”-edition of the Augsburg Confession, where it replaced the earlier *distribuere*. A very flexible term, *exhibere* can carry a wide range of meanings, from “to exhibit or show forth,” through “to offer or hold forth,” all the way to “to give or distribute.” This imprecision of meaning had its uses for those who, like Melancthon, sought to build a broad-based consensus on the Supper, but it also increased the likelihood of either accidental or deliberate misinterpretation. Within the context of his own theology, Melancthon seems to have used *exhibere* in the sense that Christ’s body and blood are truly “set forth” and “offered” to a person together with the signs of bread and wine accompanying them, as it were, according to the trustworthy promise of Christ’s words, but not necessarily contained in them.^{xxi}

The second Martin, Martin Chemnitz, Lutheranism’s great systematic theologian, wrote a magnum opus on the Lord’s Supper, *De Coena Domini*. He also wrote the four-volume *Examination of the Council of Trent*, whose English translation devotes more than 300 pages to the subject of the Lord’s Supper.

Chemnitz wrote:

It is not our opinion that the blessed bread which is distributed, offered, and which the Apostles received from the hand of Christ, is not the Body of Christ, (it is not our opinion) that it is first made the Body of Christ at the moment when it begins to be eaten. For the whole action of the institution is connected together, and these words: “This is my Body,” pertain to this total action. Therefore, it is concerning this bread which is blessed, which is broken or distributed, which is offered, which is received and eaten—concerning this bread, I say—that Christ says: “This is my Body.”^{xxii}

In his *Ministry, Word and Sacraments: An Enchiridion*, Chemnitz writes:

Christ says of that which is blessed, which is offered, received, eaten and drunk: This is my Body, this is my Blood. Therefore when the bread is indeed blessed but neither distributed nor received, but enclosed, shown and carried about, 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.^{xxiii}

The Lutheran dogmaticians of the 17th century uniformly taught “receptionism.”^{xxiv}

Aegidius Hunnius states: “As the bread is the communion of the body of Christ only in the act of eating and not before, so too, the bread is not sacramentally united with the body till this communion and this reception takes place.”^{xxv}

Leonard Hutter writes: “The purified church ... teaches that no sacramental union takes place until the external use is added, which consists in eating and drinking.”^{xxvi}

John Gerhard: “The repetition of that primeval institution, made by the minister of the Church, is not merely historical and doctrinal, but also consecratory; by which, according to the appointment of Christ, the external symbols are truly and efficaciously set apart to sacred use, and in the very act of distribution become the communion of the body and blood of Christ.”^{xxvii}

Quenstedt: “This sacramental union itself does not take place except in the distribution; for the elements, bread and wine, do not become portative media of the body and blood of Christ, until during the distribution they are eaten and drunk.”^{xxviii}

III. The Saliger Controversy

In the 1560s Johann Saliger, a pastor in Luebeck and later in Rostock, became the center of a controversy about the moment of the Real Presence in the Sacrament. Saliger insisted on the presence of the Sacramental Union from the moment of consecration on.^{xxix}

Saliger said, “that the true body and the true blood of the Lord Christ is present in the Supper already before the use, distribution and reception, so that he publicly denounced all who do not teach this as Sacramentarians.”^{xxx}

Saliger’s temperament became an issue in the controversy. When his brother pastors tried to deal with him, they concluded, “We have never found such a hard head” (“*Wir haben noch niemals einen so sfeiften-Kopf gefunden.*”).^{xxxi}

The issue was not that Saliger held to the judgment he did. Others in the Lutheran Church at, before and after his time held to the same private judgment, that Saliger held.

But Saliger’s problem was that he went beyond Scripture. He insisted that anyone who did not share his opinion was not a confessional Lutheran, but a “Philippist” or “Melanchthonian.”

The Saliger controversy was resolved by the Mecklenburger diet (also called the “Wismar Recess”) of 1569. This document has been attributed to David Chytraeus.

The Edict states:

... now in this whole unbroken action of the Holy Supper, which also is called the Sacrament of the Holy Supper, Christ is truly and essentially present and with bread and wine offers and gives his true body and blood, just as the true presence of Christ’s body and blood in the Supper also before the sumption will not be denied, but is confessed with phrases which are customary and used in these churches.^{xxxii}

Saliger refused to accept the Mecklenburger Edict.^{xxxiii} There are varying opinions of why he refused. Tom Hardt claims that Saliger refused to accept the Edict because “it was likely [sic] that Saliger saw that his opponents in a Melanchthonian way used equivocation even in the settlement.”^{xxxiv}

Seth Erlandsson, however, holds to the opinion that “since the Edict described such questions as to ‘how and when and in what manner the bread in the Supper is the body of Christ’

as being ‘unnecessary, presumptuous, confusing disputes and quarrels about words’ it became impossible for Saliger to accept it.^{xxxv}

As a postscript to this controversy, let’s note that “Saliger’s doctrine was never adopted by the orthodox Lutheran theologians as a matter of confession.”^{xxxvi}

If the authors of the Formula of Concord had wanted to enshrine Saliger in our Confessions and/or to give approval to his position, they easily could have done so. Portions of the wording of the Mecklenburger Edict were incorporated into the Formula of Concord, but Saliger is never referred to with approval.

Quite the contrary. It’s likely that the confessors had the Saliger controversy in their minds when they wrote:

We reject and condemn also all presumptuous, frivolous, blasphemous questions and expressions which are presented in a gross, carnal, Capernaitic way regarding the supernatural, heavenly mysteries of this Supper. Other and additional antitheses, or rejected contrary doctrines, have been reproved and rejected in the preceding explanation, which, for the sake of brevity, we will not repeat here, and whatever other condemnable opinions or erroneous opinions there may be still, over and above the foregoing, can be easily gathered and named from the preceding explanation; for we reject and condemn everything that is not in accordance with, but contrary and opposed to, the doctrine recorded above and thoroughly grounded in God’s Word.^{xxxvii}

IV. The Synodical Conference Fathers

It will be helpful for our historical perspective to have some understanding of the doctrine of the Synodical Conference fathers concerning the Lord’s Supper and, specifically, concerning the consecration.

Hoenecke, the WELS’ great dogmatician, states:

The words of institution should not be left out for three reasons: 1) In obedience to the mandate of Christ, “This do”; 2) To stir, strengthen, and assure the faith of the audience concerning the essence and benefit of this sacrament through Christ’s words; 3) To sanctify and bless the elements, so that with them through the recitation of the words of institution Christ’s body and blood are offered for eating and drinking.^{xxxviii}

Hoenecke also declares:

This union occurs through the words of institution. Quenstedt however adds immediately that the sacramental union occurs only in the distribution. Bread and wine are not bearers of the body and blood of Jesus Christ, before they are eaten and drunk. The word of Jesus proves this to be right: Take, eat, this is my body. The dogmaticians for this reason call the union which occurs in the consecration a “preclusive” union, that is, its result first takes place in connection with the action of eating and drinking.^{xxxix}

And: “As far as reference to the exact moment from which Christ’s body and blood are present under the earthly elements and united with the bread and wine is concerned, Baier says that it is not necessary that it be fixed.”^{x1}

C. F. W. Walther expanded on the reasons for the consecration. Following the 17th century dogmatician John Gerhard, Walther says that the recitation of the words is not a mere historical repetition of what Christ did. No, what happens in the consecration is:

- 1) **A testimony.** “By means of the festive repetition of the words of institution, the public servant openly attests that he wishes to celebrate the most holy testament of Christ according to his institution, ordinance and command, and therefore not according to his own devising, but as a caretaker of God’s mysteries.”
- 2) **A separation.** “By this very action, he separates the external symbols of bread and wine from their common use, so that they are no longer mere bread and wine but instruments, carriers and means through which Christ’s body and blood are to be distributed.”
- 3) **An invocation.** “The minister earnestly prays that Christ might be present in the sacramental action by virtue of his promise, and, by means of these external symbols, himself distribute his body and blood to the communicants.”
- 4) **A witness.** “The minister gives testimony that, by virtue of the ordinance and institution of the truthful and almighty Christ, the consecrated bread is the communion of his body and the consecrated wine is the communion of his blood.”
- 5) **An admonition.** The minister admonishes all participants to come forward in true faith and repentance, true fear and reverence and with an earnest desire to amend their life.^{xli}

In his *Pastoral Theology*, Walther sharpens the consequences of the relationship between the original institution and our celebration of the supper. He points out that, although the recitation of the words of institution is not magical, yet it is necessary to satisfy Christ’s command, “This do,” and to complete the action by which Christ promised the sacramental presence of his body and blood. But it would be incorrect to conclude that the sacrament is realized by the mere recitation of the words, for the sacrament is not yet realized until there is added to the consecration the distribution and partaking of the blessed elements. Both axioms must be taken together and not torn apart: “The word is added to the element, and it becomes a sacrament” indicates the importance of the consecration. “Nothing has the character of a sacrament apart from the use instituted by God” indicates the importance of the entire action of consecration, distribution and reception.^{xlii}

V. The Current Issues

In 1971 Dr. Tom Hardt, pastor of a small unaffiliated Lutheran congregation in Sweden, published his doctoral thesis, “Venerabilis et Adorabilis Eucharistia.” Hardt basically agrees with Saliger’s position of 1569. Hardt claims that Melancthonian errors have crept into Lutheranism.

Hardt states: “John Saliger ... only set forth what all old Lutherans of the 16th century believed.... Saliger was “doctrinally right” in his various pronouncements on the subject.”^{xliii}

Based on his research into the writings of Martin Chemnitz, ELS Professor Bjarne W. Teigen published *The Lord's Supper in the Theology of Martin Chemnitz* in 1986. In this book he states emphatically:

Chemnitz does not hesitate to draw the inevitable conclusion that after the consecration the elements are no longer merely bread and wine, but much more. Through the words of Christ, spoken by the officiant, the sacramental union has been achieved so that the body and blood of Christ are present on the altar before the distribution and consumption. The presence of Christ, God and Man, in the definitive mode, is extended in time and limited to that of which Christ in the consecration has declared to be His body and blood. Some Lutherans, even of the conservative stripe, have here broken with Luther, Chemnitz and the Book of Concord.

(Chemnitz) believes, teaches, and confesses that after the consecration the body and blood of Christ are present in sacramental union with the bread and the wine.^{xliv}

Bjarne-Teigen's view, however, has come under fire from the chairman of his own Synod's Doctrine Committee. In an article reviewing Teigen's book, Pastor Gaylin Schmeling writes:

In his eucharistic writings, Chemnitz defends the truth that the Words of Institution effect the presence against the Sacramentarians, but like Luther, he develops no dogma concerning the time of the presence. One should not assume that Chemnitz did not face this issue. In the Saliger Controversy in which Chemnitz participated, some of the main topics under discussion were the efficacy of the Words of Institution, and the duration of the sacramental union of Christ's body and blood under the bread and wine in the Lord's Supper. While this was the case, in article seven of the Formula of Concord, a statement which was to bring peace among Lutherans on these issues, Chemnitz maintains that this is sufficient for confessional agreement: "That in the Lord's Supper the body and blood of Christ are truly and essentially present and are truly offered with the visible elements, the bread and the wine, to those who receive the sacrament" (FC SD VII. 10-11). This statement and others like it in the Formula do not teach that Christ's body and blood must be present immediately after the Words of Institution are recited. Nor do they limit the presence to the eating and drinking as some of the seventeenth-century dogmaticians and synodical conference fathers unfortunately did. It is not that Christ's body and blood can be present only at the eating and as a result of the same. Such a view would call into question the efficacy of Christ's almighty Word and open the door to synergistic ideas. Rather, Chemnitz teaches that Christ's body and blood are distributed by the minister, indicating that Christ's body and blood are present in the minister's hand, so that they may be offered to the communicant to be eaten and drunk. All confessional Lutherans today should agree that the Words of Institution by virtue of Christ's original command effect the presence in the Holy Supper. Teigen, however, will not accept this statement as sufficient unless one at the

same time declares that presence begins immediately after the consecration is said. This implies that the Words of Institution can only be efficacious if they are instantaneously effective. Here a demand is made which has no basis in the Scripture and the Lutheran confessions.^{xlv}

In my opinion, Teigen should be commended for his zeal to defend the power and efficacy of God's Word. In a time when the Lutheran Church is under attack by the Reformed Church Growth Movement, which reduces the ministry to the use of sociological and marketing techniques, we all need reminders of the power of the Gospel Word.

But, we cannot defend the truth by going beyond Scripture. That would be legalism. And legalism is just as much a danger, and an evil, as liberalism.

Bjarne and Erling Teigen wish to argue that because the words of institution are a divine word, they must immediately produce the effect they call for. Is this argument Scriptural?

Well, when God created the animals, he gave them the divine command: "Be fruitful and increase in number and fill the water in the seas, and let the birds increase on the earth" (Genesis 1:22). When God created Adam and Eve, he gave them the command: "Be fruitful and increase in number; fill the earth and subdue it. Rule over the fish of the sea and the birds of the air and over every living creature that moves on the ground." Did these commands produce instant world population?

When the angel Gabriel came to the virgin Mary with the news that she would become pregnant and bear a child by the power of the Holy Spirit, did Mary conceive at the first syllable of the angel's greeting? We are not told this in Scripture!

When the Lord Jesus told his Church; "Therefore go and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit," (Matthew 28:19) did this command receive its fulfillment instantly? Isn't this commission still being carried out by the Christian Church today, nearly 2000 years later? We are NOT trying to say that a divine command cannot have an immediate result; we are simply saying that it's going beyond Scripture to insist that it has to. The fathers of our Synodical Conference used the term "preclusive union" to describe the effects of the consecration. That is, the Real Presence of Christ's body and blood is effected by the words of consecration, but the Presence is there when the elements are eaten and drunk. **WITHOUT THE ENTIRE *USUS SACRAMENTALIS* (CONSECRATION, DISTRIBUTION AND SUMPTION) THERE IS NO SACRAMENT!**

Our Lutheran Confessions expressly bring this out with the so-called "Nihil Rule":

To maintain this true Christian doctrine concerning the Holy Supper and to obviate and eliminate many kinds of idolatrous misuse and perversion of this testament, the following useful rule and norm has been derived from the words of institution: Nothing has the character of a sacrament apart from the use instituted by Christ, or apart from the divinely instituted action (that is, if one does not observe Christ's institution as he ordained it, it is no sacrament). (*Nihil habet rationem sacramenti extra usum a Christo institutum seu extra actionem divinitus institutum*).^{xlvi}

The WELS and the ELS have held discussions about these issues for several years now. Permit me to give you a brief review of the issue at present.

In 1989 the ELS Doctrine Committee approved the following “Theses on the Lord’s Supper”:

On the basis of the Words of Institution (Matthew 20:26,27; Mark 1:4:22, 24; Luke 22:19,20; 1 Corinthians 11:23-25) and other Scripture passages concerning the Lord’s Supper (1 Corinthians 10:16,17 and 11:26-29),

1. We hold with Luther that “(the Sacrament, of the Altar) instituted by Christ himself is the true body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, under the bread and wine, given to us Christians to eat and to drink” (Small Catechism VI, Tappert Edition).

2. We hold that “in the Holy Supper the two essences, the natural bread, and the true natural body of Christ, are present together, here on earth in the ordered action of the sacrament, though the union of the body and blood of Christ with the bread and wine is not a personal union, like that of the two natures in Christ, but a sacramental union ... ” (Formula of Concord, Solid Declaration VII 37,38).

3. We hold that this sacramental union is in effect during the *usus* or *actio*: “Nothing has the character of a sacrament apart from the divinely instituted action (that is, if one does not observe Christ’s institution as he ordained it, it is no sacrament). This rule dare not in any way be rejected, but it can and should be profitably urged and retained in the church of God. In this context ‘use’ or ‘action’ does not primarily mean faith, or the oral eating alone, but the entire external and visible action of the Supper as ordained by Christ: the consecration or words of institution; the distribution and reception, or the oral eating of the blessed bread and wine; the body and blood of Christ” (SD VII 85,86).

4. We hold that “it is the institution of this sacrament; performed by Christ, that makes it valid in Christendom; and that it does not depend on the worthiness or unworthiness of the minister who distributes the sacrament or of him who receives it, since, as St. Paul says, the unworthy receive the sacrament too. Therefore (we) hold that, where Christ’s institution and command are observed, the body and blood of Christ are truly distributed to the unworthy, too, and that they truly receive it” (SD VII 16).

5. We hold that it is the almighty Word of Christ ‘which distinguishes it from mere bread and wine and constitutes it a sacrament which is rightly called Christ’s body and blood’ When (if) the Word is joined to the external element; it becomes a sacrament.’ ...The Word must -make the element a sacrament; otherwise it remains a mere element” (Large Catechism V 10).

6. We hold that “No man’s word or work, be it the merit or the speaking of the minister, be it the eating and drinking or the faith of the communicants, can effect the true presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Supper. This is to be ascribed only to the almighty power of God and the Word, institution and ordinance of our Lord Jesus Christ” (SD VII 74).

7. We hold that the Words of consecration repeated by the minister in a proper celebration of the Sacrament are the effective means by which the real presence of Christ’s body and blood is brought into being. “For wherever we observe his institution and speak his words over the bread and cup and distribute

the blessed bread and cup, Christ himself is still active through the spoken words by the virtue of the first institution, which he wants to be repeated.... ‘No human being, but only Christ himself who was crucified for us, can make of the bread and wine set before us the body and blood of Christ. The words are spoken by the mouth of the priest, but by God’s power and grace through the words that he speaks, “This is my body,” the elements set before us in the supper are blessed.’ ... ‘This his command and institution can and does bring it about that we do not distribute and receive ordinary bread and wine but his body and blood, as his words read, “This is my body,” etc., “This is my blood,” etc. Thus it is not our work or speaking but the command and ordinance of Christ that, from the beginning of the first Communion until the end of the world, make the bread the body and the wine the blood that are daily distributed through our ministry and office.’ Again, ‘Here, too, if I were to say over all the bread there is, “This is the body of Christ,” nothing would happen, but when we follow his institution and command in the Lord’s Supper and say, “This is my body,” then it is his body, not because of our speaking or of our efficacious word, but because of his command in which he has told us so to speak and to do and has attached his own command and deed to our speaking” (SD VII 75-76).

8. We hold that “the words of institution are to be spoken or sung distinctly and clearly before the congregation and are under no circumstances to be omitted. Thereby we render obedience to the command of Christ, ‘This do ... ’ And thereby the elements of bread and wine are hallowed or blessed in (for) this holy use, so that therewith the body and blood of Christ are distributed to us to eat and to drink, as Paul says, ‘The cup of blessing which we bless,’ which happens precisely through the repetition and recitation of the words of institution” (SD VII 79-82).

9. We hold that we cannot fix from Scripture the point within the sacramental usus when the real presence of Christ’s body and blood begins, yet we knew from Scripture and we acknowledge in the Confessions that what is distributed and received is the body and blood of Christ.^{xlvii}

In May of 1989 a six-point statement was added to Thesis Nine:

We understand Thesis Nine in the light of the following statements:

a) The words of consecration effect the real presence of Christ’s body and blood in a valid administration of the Lord’s Supper (consecration, distribution and reception).

b) Because of this consecration Christ’s body and blood are present in the elements of bread and wine before the reception of the elements by the communicants.

c) We reject any attempt to fix the mathematical point or exact moment when the real presence begins.

d) We reject the teaching that the presence of Christ’s body and blood is in any way effected by the eating and drinking of the elements by the communicants.

e) We reject the doctrine of transubstantiation, i.e., that the earthly elements cease to exist when the real presence of Christ’s body and blood begins.

f) We reject any celebration of the Lord's Supper without communicants.^{xlvi}

The "sticking point" is evidently subpoint "b" in the six points added to Thesis Nine. It is going beyond Scripture to state that the bread and wine are present in the elements before the reception. We have seen that this is an open question.

The ELS has continued to discuss this matter in its General Pastoral Conferences and in its synodical Conventions. In 1995 the ELS Doctrine Committee proposed a revision to the Theses, stating that: "The minister who consecrates shows forth (tenders) the body and blood of Christ to the people, that they are truly offered with the visible elements, and that they are really present in the Supper ... under the form of bread and wine."

At this point the Teigen position becomes rather muddy. In June of 1995 fourteen ELS pastors presented an unpublished memorial to the ELS convention:

WHEREAS issues which were to be discussed according to the 1994 Convention resolution (Doctrine Resolution No. 3, SR 1984, p. 85), have not yet been resolved, therefore

BE IT RESOLVED that the convention decline to accept the Doctrine Committee's proposed change in Thesis 9;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED That the Doctrine Committee and the Pastoral Conference continue to seek consensus in our synod on this issue.^{xlix}

The fourteen pastors contend that their position has been misrepresented by the Doctrine Committee.

Now, on the one hand, Teigen rejects the charge that he teaches "that it is necessary to believe that the Words of Institution effect the Real Presence instantaneously and immediately"¹ (as Schmeling stated in his review of Bjarne Teigen's book on Chemnitz). Teigen attempts to draw a distinction between the word "immediate" and the word "instantaneous" (?). He defines "immediate" as "without the intervention of another object, cause, or agency."^{li}

Teigen expressly states:

Johannes Saliger, quoting the words of Johannes Wigand in the struggle leading up to the Formula of Concord speaks for us, when he says, "Of the moment, that is of the time of the consecration, or when and at which time under which syllables the body and blood of Christ are present, one certainly ought not frivolously ask; but as soon as the word of the Lord Christ has been spoken and sounded, the simple faith accepts such plain, clear, words of Christ and believes."^{lii}

But again, note what we have found in our exegesis of Scripture. The Bible wants to comfort our hearts with the assurance of what we receive in the Lord's Supper and why our Lord gives it to us. We receive Jesus' true body and true blood for the forgiveness of our sins. The Scriptures, and the Lutheran Confessions, are not interested in answering the "when."

Doctor Siegbert W. Becker became involved in this controversy when it arose in Sweden. Becker wrote an excellent review of this entire issue, which was published in the Spring 1986 issue of the *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly*. His comments are worthy of quoting at length:

In the same way one ought not to allow statements of Luther or the Confessions that could be interpreted as being in harmony with a certain view of the consecration or the moment to be used as proof which establishes that view as a doctrine of the church or of Scripture. This is particularly important since Luther seems nowhere to discuss directly the significance or the effect of the consecration, and, except for the letter which he addressed to Pastor Wolferinus, there seems to be no passage in Luther's voluminous writings where he expressly deals with the question of the moment.

It should not be necessary to say these things, and yet the complete disregard of the words of institution as the *sedes doctrinae* of the Lord's Supper, which characterizes Dr. Tom Hardt in the controversy that has arisen on these points, makes it necessary to repeat what ought to be obvious to every Lutheran theologian.

If we look at the communion liturgy and compare what we do there with what Jesus and his disciples did in the night in which he was betrayed, we must realize that much of what we say and do when we celebrate the Lord's Supper is not an essential part of this sacred meal. We would be doing what was done that night if we would take bread, speak a blessing over it (the wording of which is not prescribed, and we do not know what Jesus said), distribute it and say the words that Jesus said during the distribution. Because of the context, we cannot say, "This is my body," but we would be expressing the divine thought if we said, "Jesus said, 'This is my body' or 'This is the body of Christ.'" The consecration, or the words of institution, clearly and definitely set aside this bread for the sacred use to which it is put when it is distributed and received, and the words, because they are true divine words, actually tell us what is being eaten and drunk. In this sense it is a "real consecration...."

We do not wish to be drawn into a controversy over the question of when the presence begins. This is a dead-end street that can lead only to confusion among God's people. The words of institution and all the other passages of Scripture dealing with the Holy Supper give us no warrant for the conclusion that the bread and wine become the body and blood of Christ in the very moment that the words are first spoken. We know only that the words of Christ spoken at the first supper will be true and efficacious until the end of time. To say, therefore, that the body of Christ lies on the altar is to say more than the Scriptures say. And we will be mindful of the prophet's words, "Do not add to his words, or he will rebuke you and prove you a liar" (Pr 30:6).

On the other hand, the Scriptures also do not make it possible for us to assert dogmatically that the body and blood of Christ are not present prior to the reception. This, too, goes beyond the words, and those who insist that the body and blood are not present until the elements actually touch the lips also raise profitless and presumptuous questions which have no place in the holy sacrament. Nor do the words of institution in any way indicate that the consecrated elements continue to be the body and blood of Christ even after all have consumed. To say, therefore, that the reliqua must be consumed before the liturgy is concluded is also an addition to the clear teaching of Scripture and is to be condemned. Even to say that they should be consumed because they might still be the body and blood

of Christ is to raise doubts and disputes that can only trouble concerned consciences. Moreover, to recommend that they be consumed in order to emphasize the real presence implies that conviction regarding the real presence is not worked only by the Holy Spirit through the word but that somehow “the words and works of the fathers” help to establish articles of faith. So long as men believe that in the Supper the true body and blood of Christ are truly present and eaten and drunk with the mouth by both believers and unbelievers justice will have been done to the words of institution. And what more do we or any other Christians need to know and believe?^{liii}

We hold, then, that the questions, “When does Christ’s body and blood become present in the Lord’s Supper?” and “When does the Real Presence end?” are open questions, not answered in Scripture. We are free to hold our private judgments on these questions, but we cannot maintain our private judgments as the teaching of Scripture or the Lutheran Confessions, or as the established doctrine of the Lutheran Church.

WELS Pastor Paul E. Kelm provides what is perhaps the best summary of this entire issue. In answer to a *Northwestern Lutheran* reader’s question, “In our communion service, when does the bread and wine become the body and blood of Christ—at the consecration or the distribution? What is the purpose of the consecration? When may we say that Christ’s body and blood are truly present?” Kelm replies:

Scripture doesn’t provide the precise answer you seek. Scholarly speculation is no more than that. We can say with assurance that Christ’s body and blood are truly present when we do what he urged, namely, to eat and drink the bread and wine which have been consecrated by his word for that sacramental purpose.

The words of consecration are not an incantation to transform bread and wine into body and blood. The fact that Matthew and Luke do not provide a “transcript” of the institution of the sacrament (their inspired accounts differ slightly in wording, as a complement to each other) and the fact that Jesus apparently spoke the words we use in consecration as he was distributing the elements should keep us from turning the consecration into mere mystical ritual. Not when bread and wine become Christ’s body and blood but that we receive with bread and wine Christ’s body and blood for our forgiveness is what Scripture wants us to know.

The consecration applies Jesus’ word to physical elements for sacred purpose. Thereby we obey the Savior’s words to “do this in remembrance of me.” The words of consecration are spoken also for communicants, that they be assured of what the sacrament is and be confirmed in their faith to receive the sacrament worthily. We emphasize that purpose by repeating Jesus’ words during the distribution. Jesus accomplishes his purpose of giving us the body and blood he offered for our salvation.

It may be a weakness of theological minds that we deflect our focus from spiritual gifts to the exploration of mysteries. I don’t know the precise point in the celebration of the sacrament when Christ’s body and blood are truly present. I do know they are. And I also know that apart from communicants’ reception of the bread/body and wine/blood, there is no sacrament.^{liv}

Endnotes

-
- ⁱ Hermann Sasse, *This is My Body* (Adelaide: Lutheran Publishing House, March 1977), p. 328.
- ⁱⁱ The Smalcald Articles, Part II, Article II, *Concordia Triglotta* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1921), p. 467.
- ⁱⁱⁱ Formula of Concord, Thorough Declaration, Comprehensive Summary, *Concordia Triglotta*, pp. 853-855.
- ^{iv} Bauer, Walter, Arndt, William F., and Gingrich, F. Wilbur, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979), p. 322.
- ^v *Ibid.*, p. 328.
- ^{vi} Arnold Koelpin, "The Sacramental Presence in the Theology of the Synodical Conference," in *Our Great Heritage*, Volume III (Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 1991), p. 283.
- ^{vii} Augsburg Confession X, *Concordia Triglotta*, p. 47.
- ^{viii} Apology, X:54, *Concordia Triglotta*, p. 247.
- ^{ix} The Smalcald Articles, Part III, Article VII, *Concordia Triglotta*, p. 493.
- ^x The Large Catechism, "The Sacrament of the Altar":18-22, *Concordia Triglotta*, p. 757.
- ^{xi} The Large Catechism, "The Sacrament of the Altar":70, *Concordia Triglotta*, p. 769.
- ^{xii} The Formula of Concord, Epitome, VII:3-4, *Concordia Triglotta*, p. 811.
- ^{xiii} FC, Epitome, VII:14, *Concordia Triglotta*, p. 815.
- ^{xiv} FC, Thorough Declaration, VII:15, *Concordia Triglotta*, p. 977.
- ^{xv} FC, Thorough Declaration, VII:25, *Concordia Triglotta*, p. 981.
- ^{xvi} FC, Thorough Declaration, VII:75, *Concordia Triglotta*, p. 999.
- ^{xvii} FC, Thorough Declaration, VII:79-84, *Concordia Triglotta*, p. 1001.
- ^{xviii} Quoted in Rick Curia, "The Controversy Surrounding the Question of the Moment of the Real Presence in the Lord's Supper and the Proper Scriptural Attitude," Senior Dogmatics Paper, (Mequon: Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary Essay File), Palm Sunday, 1978, p. 12.
- ^{xix} *Ibid.*
- ^{xx} Hermann Sasse, op. cit., p. 139.
- ^{xxi} Keith Killinger, "Domesticating an Untamed Sacramental Rule," *Lutheran Quarterly*, Winter 1993, pp. 408-409.
- ^{xxii} Curia, op. cit., pp. 12-13.
- ^{xxiii} Martin Chemnitz, *Ministry, Word and Sacraments: An Enchiridion* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1981), p. 121.
- ^{xxiv} Thomas P. Nass, "The Moment of the Real Presence in the Lord's Supper," paper presented to the Mankato Pastoral Conference, New Prague, Minnesota, October 3, 1989, p. 7.
- ^{xxv} *Ibid.*
- ^{xxvi} *Ibid.*, pp.7-8.
- ^{xxvii} *Ibid.*, p. 8.
- ^{xxviii} *Ibid.*
- ^{xxix} Curia, op. cit., p. 13.
- ^{xxx} *Ibid.*
- ^{xxxi} *Ibid.*, p. 14.
- ^{xxxii} *Ibid.*, pp. 14-15.
- ^{xxxiii} *Ibid.*, p. 16.
- ^{xxxiv} Quoted in Seth Erlandsson, "The Danger of Presumptuous Questions About the Lord's Supper," (Mequon: Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary Essay File), May 1977, p. 4.
- ^{xxxv} *Ibid.*, pp. 7-8.
- ^{xxxvi} Curia, op. cit., p.16.
- ^{xxxvii} FC, Thorough Declaration, VII:127-128, *Concordia Triglotta*, p. 1015.
- ^{xxxviii} Adolph Hoenecke, *Ev.-lutherische Dogmatik*, quoted in Koelpin, *Our Great Heritage*, p. 283.
- ^{xxxix} *Ibid.*
- ^{xl} *Ibid.*
- ^{xli} *Ibid.*, pp. 283-284.
- ^{xlii} *Ibid.*, pp. 285-286.
- ^{xliii} Erlandsson, op. cit., p. 4.
- ^{xliv} Bjarne W. Teigen, *The Lord's Supper in the Theology of Martin Chemnitz* (Brewster, MA: Trinity Lutheran Press), 1986, pp. 98ff.

^{xlv} Gaylin R. Schmeling, "Review Essay: The Lord's Supper in the Theology of Martin Chemnitz," in *Lutheran Quarterly*, Autumn 1993, pp. 324-325.

^{xlvi} FC, Solid Declaration, VII:85, *Concordia Triglotta*, p. 1001.

^{xlvii} ELS Doctrine Committee, 1988.

^{xlviii} ELS Doctrine Committee, May 1989.

^{xlix} Erling T. Teigen, et al., Unpublished Memorial to the 1995, ELS Synod Convention, p. 4.

^l Ibid.

^{li} Ibid.

^{lii} Ibid.

^{liii} Siegbert W. Becker, "The Lord's Supper: Consecration and Moment," *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly*, Volume 83, Number 83 (Spring 1986), passim.

^{liv} Paul E. Kelm, *I Would Like to Know* (Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 1991), pp. 62-63.

Bibliography

All Scripture quotations are taken from *The Holy Bible: New International Version*. Colorado Springs: International Bible Society, 1984.

Becker, Siegbert W. "The Lord's Supper: Consecration and Moment." *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly*. Volume 83, Number 2. Spring 1986.

Chemnitz, Martin. *Ministry, Word, and Sacraments: An Enchiridion*. Translated by Luther Poellot. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1981.

Chemnitz, Martin. *The Lord's Supper*. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1979.

Concordia Triglotta: The Symbolical Books of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1921.

Curia, Rick. "The Controversy Surrounding the Question of the Moment of the Real Presence in the Lord's Supper and the Proper Scriptural Attitude." Mequon: Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary. Final Senior Dogmatics Paper. Palm Sunday, 1978.

Erlandsson, Seth. "The Danger of Presumptuous Questions About the Lord's Supper." Translated by S. W. Becker. *Biblicum*, April/May 1977.

Kelm, Paul E. *I Would Like to Know*. Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 1991. Pages 62-63.

Killinger, Keith. "Domesticating an Untamed Sacramental Rule." *Lutheran Quarterly*. Oliver Olson, editor. Winter 1993. Pages 401-421.

Koelpin, Arnold. "The Sacramental Presence in the Theology of the Synodical Conference" in *Our Great Heritage*. Volume III. Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 1991. Pages 270-283.

Nass, Thomas P. "The Moment of the Real Presence in the Lord's Supper." Mankato Pastoral Conference: New Prague, Minnesota. October 3, 1989.

Olson, Oliver K. "Comment." *Lutheran Quarterly*. Volume IX, Number 1. Spring 1995. Pages 101-107.

Sasse, Hermann. *This is My Body*. Adelaide: Lutheran Publishing Company, March 1977.

Sasse, Hermann. *We Confess the Sacraments*. Translated by Norman Nagel. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1985.

Schmeling, Gaylin R. "Review Essay: The Lord's Supper in the Theology of Martin Chemnitz." *Lutheran Quarterly*. Autumn 1993. Pages 321-327.

Teigen, Bjarne Wollan. *The Lord's Supper in the Theology of Martin Chemnitz*. Brewster, MA: Trinity Lutheran Press, 1986.

Teigen, Bjarne Wollan. "The Nihil Rule Revisited." *Lutheran Quarterly*. Autumn 1994. Pages 269-283.

Teigen, Erling T. Letter to President George Orvick. Mankato, Minnesota. June 13, 1995.