

*A LIVELY LEGACY:
ESSAYS IN HONOR OF
ROBERT PREUS*

Co-editors:

Kurt E. Marquart

John R. Stephenson

Bjarne W. Teigen

The cover design is a reproduction of the Preus family coat of arms.

Library of Congress Catalog Number 85-73168
ISBN# 0-9615927-0-2 (hardbound)
ISBN# 0-9615927-1-0 (paperback)
Copyright by Concordia Theological Seminary
Fort Wayne, Indiana 1985
Printed by Graphic Publishing Co., Inc.
Lake Mills, Iowa 50450

The Holy Eucharist: At the Center or Periphery of the Church's Life in Luther's Thinking?

12

While competent scholars unanimously agree that the doctrine that the consecrated elements are the very Body and Blood of the Incarnate Son of God was a constant component of Luther's understanding of the Eucharist, much secondary literature in this area might nevertheless lead its unsuspecting readers to suppose that, until 1523 at any rate, the Real Presence of our Lord's Sacred Body and Blood stood at the periphery, not the center, of the Reformer's sacramental theology. Hans Grass summed up a widespread perception of the overall balance of the young Luther's eucharistic theology when he urged that, in *The Venerable Sacrament of the Holy and True Body of Christ* of 1519 and *The Treatise on the New Testament, that is, the Holy Mass* of 1520, the Real Presence stood "at the margin" of the Reformer's appreciation of the Holy Supper. Grass rightly states that the chief focus of Luther's concern in the first of these writings is the notion of "communion" with Christ and His saints, and that in the second his attention fastens chiefly on the *verba* understood as Jesus' "testament" bequeathing forgiveness of sins to His people. Questionable is his view that the present and distributed Body and Blood play no instrumental role in the bestowal of these benefits.¹ The correctness or otherwise of Grass's assessment is not of interest merely to the professional Luther scholar immersed in the immensity of the Weimar Edition, for, if Grass is correct, there existed a Luther for whom the eucharistic doctrine of the *Book of Concord* was not crucial, and therefore a Lutheran Reformation prior to the composition of the Confessions for which the Real Presence might just possibly be a disposable part of the Church's dogma. In the mid-1980's, nominally Lutheran church bodies might find such a conception of the young Luther highly useful as they fall over each other to negotiate our Lord's Body and Blood away from His altars in order to extend the fruits of the Prussian Union across the globe. The purpose of this essay in honor of Dr. Robert Preus is to re-examine

Grass's conclusions respecting the function of the Real Presence in Luther's earliest eucharistic publications, and, more particularly, to demonstrate that the Reformer's conception of the Sacred Body and Blood as instruments of spiritual (including bodily) blessings in *That These Words "This is My Body etc." Still Stand Firm* of 1527 and in the *Large Catechism* of 1529 represents a continuation, and not a break, with his position at the outset of the decade.

Medieval theology had followed St. Augustine in defining a sacrament as the sign (*signum*) of a sacred reality (*res*),² identifying the former with the outward appearances of bread and wine, and urging that the latter is of twofold nature. The first reality, namely the Sacred Body and Blood, is both signified and contained by the bread and wine, which signify but do not contain the second reality, namely the mystical union of Christ and His Church.³ Should we suppose that the young Luther uncritically employed this scheme, and thereupon unreflectively race through his early sacramental writings, then we shall undoubtedly concur with Grass's conclusions. For example, in the opening paragraph of his sacramental Sermon of 1519 Luther distinguishes between the "sacrament, or sign" (*tzeychen*) and its "significance" (*bedeutung*).⁴ The second paragraph states that "the . . . external sign consists in the form or appearance of bread and wine," while the fourth alleges that "the significance or effect of this Sacrament is fellowship with all the saints," which occurs through incorporation into Christ's spiritual Body.⁵ Should Luther's distinction between "sign" and "significance" be perfectly congruous with the customary medieval distinction between "sign" and "reality," then we should be faced with the embarrassing discovery that, both here and in his other early sacramental writings, the Reformer conspicuously fails to list the Real Presence under the rubric of the "reality" of the Sacrament of the Altar. And, if the Sacred Body and Blood do not pertain to the "reality" of the Holy Supper, then they are surely expendable and may without a qualm be calmly negotiated away from our altars!

Should the "sign" in the eucharistic sermon of 1519 denote nothing more than mere bread and wine, then we may marvel at the glorious results which Luther ascribes to the eating and drinking of these ordinary mundane elements. What Grass has overlooked in his treatment of this writing is that the Reformer is here moving towards a definition of "sign" which embraces the Sacred Body and Blood, so that, if we are to compare his scheme with that of the Middle Ages, we are bound to conclude that what the medieval Church listed under the

first dimension of the "reality" of the Sacrament is brought by Luther under the heading of "sign," and that what the antecedent tradition considers as the fruit of the primary "reality" is now treated under the rubric of the "significance" of the Sacrament, that is, as the salutary effect of the Sign, viz. the present and distributed Body and Blood. In paragraph sixteen, the Reformer teaches that the "sign" is completed and perfected by the presence of Jesus' "true natural Flesh in the bread" and of His "natural true Blood in the wine."⁶ Application of this definition of "sign" to other occurrences of this term in this writing opens up a rich conception of the function of the Sacred Body and Blood in the most intimate of the Means of Grace. Thus, when we read that the Sacrament "signifies the complete union . . . of the saints,"⁷ we should err gravely by understanding "sign" as a Zwinglian *nudum signum*; rather, the "sign" that we have here is *signum efficax*, an "efficacious sign," and we shall not go far wrong by translating *bedeutet* not with "signifies," but with "effects." The key is already given in paragraph four, whose quotation of I Corinthians 10:17 conspires with the account of "sign" advanced here to make it unmistakably clear that the Mystical Body is constituted through participation in the eucharistic Body and Blood.⁸ In paragraph fifteen, the agent which effects union with Christ can be nothing other than the sacred Body and Blood, and Luther here conceives this union as geared to and consummated in our conformity with Christ in the life of the world to come. A careful reading of this paragraph leads to the inescapable conclusion that the Reformer did not begin only in 1527 to present the Sacrament of the Altar as the "medicine of immortality."⁹

Our interpretation of "sign" is secured by the exposition given this concept in the writings of 1520, *The Treatise on the New Testament, that is, the Holy Mass and On the Babylonian Captivity of the Church*. In the first of these works, the Body and Blood appear as the "sign and seal" attached to the Words of institution which impart forgiveness of sins to believers.¹⁰ Luther stresses that the eucharistic gift is the living Body and Blood of Christ, urging that, when the host is elevated, the Body of the Lord is held before the people as "the seal and sign of the testament in which Christ has bequeathed to us the remission of all sins and eternal life."¹¹ The Reformer's understanding of "sign" as equivalent to Real Presence is continued in *Babylonian Captivity*, where the Body and Blood are designated as the "sign and memorial" or "memorial sign" of Jesus' enduring promise.¹² In both treatises, Luther's reticent manner of expression makes it difficult to

determine precisely the relationship between the present and distributed Body and Blood and the forgiveness of sins, which is highlighted as the chief spiritual gift imparted through the Sacrament. But, since in his eucharistic writing of the previous year the Reformer had understood the Body and Blood to be the sign which effects the unity of Christians with Christ and each other, it is hardly likely that by 1520 Luther has relegated the Body and Blood to the role of an impotent and therefore disposable decoration. In fact, the *Treatise on the New Testament* portrays the "true Flesh and Blood" as a "powerful (*krefftig*s) and most noble seal and sign";¹³ and it is reasonable to suppose that the "powerful sign" plays an instrumental role in effecting the blessings of the Supper. With all desirable clarity, the *Large Catechism* depicts the Body and Blood as "a great treasure, through and in which we obtain the forgiveness of sins," stressing how the Word here uncovers the blessings latent in the Sacrament.¹⁴ Word and Real Presence here operate in harmony, the Word instructing the soul so that both it and the body may profit from the bodily communication of the lifegiving Flesh of Christ. While, in 1520, chief stress is placed on the Word as the transmitter of the forgiveness of sins, only subliminal Zwinglian prejudice would cause one to sever the Body and Blood from the Word, thus excluding them from the divine salutary action. That the instrumentality of the Body and Blood in the bestowal of forgiveness was not an insight vouchsafed only to the Luther of the sacramental conflict is proved by the occurrence of this teaching in the Reformer's Maundy Thursday sermon of 1521: "I am to have forgiveness of all sins through Thy Body and Blood, which I eat and drink in this Sacrament."¹⁵

The Reformer begins the third paragraph of the *Treatise on the New Testament* by stating that "Christ abolished the whole Law of Moses, and, so that He might give no further cause for sects and divisions, He instituted in return for His own people no more than one custom or law, that is, the holy Mass."¹⁶ While Baptism occurs "but once," the Mass is to be "observed throughout one's life" (*ein Übung des gantzen lebens*),¹⁷ so that "henceforth there is to be no other outward mode of worshipping God than the Mass."¹⁸ Should we ponder the full import of these words, and understand them in the context of Luther's proposal to transform the Mass from a propitiatory sacrifice offered by the officiating clergyman into the Communion of the people and of the appeals made in these early writings for frequent reception of the Body and Blood,¹⁹ then the Reformer's advice to Lazarus Spengler in 1528, in which he recommends at least weekly celebra-

tion of the Sacrament,²⁰ will strike us as the unforced corollary of Luther's understanding of the Supper. The viewpoint expressed in the letter to Spengler is taken into *CA* and *AP XXIV*, where at least weekly eucharistic celebration is proposed as normative, a position which, since Pietism and Rationalism exerted their destructive effect on the worship life of our Church, has represented a sadly unfulfilled *desideratum* of the Lutheran Confessions.

While the Reformer can enjoin weekly celebration of the Sacrament on the clergy, he noticeably refrains from ordering the laity to commune weekly. His reticence here perfectly parallels his softly-softly approach towards accustoming the laity once again to receive the Supper in both kinds. Age-old custom can be overcome only gradually, and just as it would take time for the laity to get used to receiving the Chalice, so likewise gentle pastoral care and unremitting instruction would be needed in order to make inroads into the medieval habit of communing only once or thrice a year. But Luther's refusal to dragoon the laity to the altar must not be so interpreted that we fail to mark his clear longing for frequent Communion to be the rule and not the exception of congregational life. His statement, in the preface to the *Small Catechism*, that the clergy should so preach that the laity will not only desire the Sacrament but even compel its administration,²¹ is matched by the stipulation made in some of the early *Church Orders* that the weekly celebration of the Sacrament be supplemented by weekday celebrations following the daily offices, whenever the people so desire.²²

The Reformer's longing for frequent Communion to be restored to the heart of the Church's life proceeds directly from his understanding of the Person and Work of Christ, which is the central theme of his whole theology.²³ It is a great pity that the *Catalog of Testimonies* has become a largely unread appendix in original language editions of the *Book of Concord*, and that it has been regarded as so irrelevant for American Lutheranism as to warrant its total exclusion from the Tappert edition. In fact, the *Catalog* represents Chemnitz' consummation of Luther's reappropriation of the rich Christology of Holy Scripture and the ancient Greek fathers; and, since this Christology is not merely an occasional vein in the *Book of Concord*, but rather the ontological foundation for all that our Symbols teach concerning the restoration of fallen mankind through Christ, there would be ample justification for printing the *Catalog*, as a commentary on the ancient Creeds, at the very outset of the confessional writings. Nowhere is the fruitfulness of Luther's Christology more apparent than in his

reply to the blasphemy of Karlstadt and Zwingli, who could ridicule our Lord's bodily presence in the Sacrament because they included His Flesh under His own statements that "That which is born of the flesh is flesh" (Jn. 3:6), and "the flesh is of no avail" (Jn. 6:63). On the contrary, urges Luther, Christ's Flesh, which is "the most holy Thing,"²⁴ is the "bodily dwelling place of the Spirit, through Which the Spirit comes into all others";²⁵ it is "a God's Flesh, a Spirit's Flesh."²⁶ Since it unrestrictedly receives the very life of God through the hypostatic union, our Lord's Flesh can impart this life to those who participate in it.²⁷ This perception, which is brim full of rich implications for our appreciation of the Supper, echoes the eleventh Canon of the Council of Ephesus of 431, to which allusion is made in *SD VIII, 76*,²⁸ and which is explicitly quoted in *Catalog III*, whose purpose is to demonstrate that "the human nature has in deed and in truth received, and uses, this [divine] Majesty."²⁹

When establishing the essence of the Sacrament of the Altar, the Reformer permits his mind to be shaped solely by the *verba testamenti*, but, since "Sacred Scripture is its own interpreter," he freely ranges through the Gospels for the purpose of indicating the benefits that accrue to believing participation in the Sacred Body and Blood. Our Lord's physical presence is shown to have benefited the Blessed Virgin Mary, the shepherds of Bethlehem, the woman with the flow of blood, and Simeon in the Temple;³⁰ and in the third of these cases, the spiritual benefit clearly included a physical effect. These saints were benefited in a variety of ways because their physical touching or other contact with Incarnate God took place in the setting of their faith in Him. The Mother of God's physical and spiritual pregnancy with the same Fruit thus makes her the paradigm of the worthy communicant, who partakes both sacramentally and spiritually in the Body of Christ. While John 6 speaks directly of the "spiritual eating," since "the same Flesh" is the subject of both the "spiritual" and the "sacramental" eating,³¹ and since the Supper is meant to be the point at which the "spiritual" and the "sacramental" eating coincide,³² the mature Luther was able to interpret John 6 as shedding light on the Eucharist.³³

Nowhere does the Reformer restrict the benefits of believing participation in the Sacred Body and Blood to the forgiveness of sins; but, if forgiveness is not the sole benefit of the Supper, it is certainly the matrix of all benefits as the life of Incarnate God is here imparted to His indigent brothers and sisters. "Union with Christ" is the rubric under which we might subsume Luther's view of the benefits follow-

ing forgiveness which are given to the believing communicant.³⁴ But we should be wrong if, in reaction to some theologians' restriction of eucharistic benefits to forgiveness alone, we were to take the Reformer to propose a series of disconnected benefits, supposing perhaps that, in the *Large Catechism*, Luther teaches in turn a "justification," "sanctification" and "glorification" benefit (LC V, 21-22, 23-27, 68). Rather, he maintains that what is given in the Supper through the present and distributed Body and Blood is a reality known to faith but hid from the world until the Last Day, namely, the forgiveness of sins and the full conformity to the Risen Jesus which flows from it: Absolution as the renewal of the life of Christ within us (LC V, 21-22), Absolution as the driving force of the life of Christ within us which triumphs over temptation (LC V, 23-27), and Absolution whose bodily corollary is the resurrection of the dead (LC V, 68), in virtue of the "secret power and benefit which flows from the Body of Christ in the Supper into our body."³⁵

The Reformer's delight in following the ancient Fathers by witnessing to the eschatological, bodily benefits of the Holy Supper has not been emulated by many modern students of his thought. While frankly acknowledging the existence of this strand of Luther's eucharistic theology, Hans Grass has maintained that its upshot is to "set us at odds with the reformational principle that God's revelatory action upon us occurs in a strictly personal mode—*streng personhaft geschieht*."³⁶ For Grass, then, the "personal" rules out the "ontological" and the "substantial" aspects of God's saving dealings with us. One may justly doubt whether Grass's "strictly personal mode" is actually rooted in the Lutheran Reformation, for his self-distancing from the Reformer would seem to owe much to Martin Buber's I-Thou philosophy and to Karl Barth's loathing of the *analogia entis*. In fact, Luther's whole understanding of the ongoing communion of the natures within the hypostatic union both presupposes and crowns the notion of an *analogia entis* between divine and creaturely being, utterly refusing to be accommodated within the deficient framework of the tritely reductionist Ritschlian-existentialist scheme into which Paul Althaus, for example, sought to set his account of the Reformer's Christology.³⁷ Luther's "ontological-substantial" Christology is the parent of a similarly "ontological-substantial" understanding of the formation of the new man in Baptism, and of his continuing nourishment through the Holy Communion. Here, supremely, Christ unites Himself with His brethren not only "personally" but also "by nature." In his great eucharistic work of 1527,

Luther quotes the fourth-century St. Hilary of Poitiers to this effect;³⁸ and the same doctrine is expressed through the lips of St. Cyril of Alexandria in *Apology X*.³⁹ Refusal to follow the Reformer and the Confessions at this point must ultimately proceed from a defective Christology. For what we have in Luther's conception of the blessings of the Holy Supper is the flower of a whole theology of the Incarnation which is sorely needed by the whole of Christendom, and which has been bestowed by Almighty God on His Lutheran children, not to be hidden under a bushel, but to be pondered, preserved and proclaimed.

Endnotes

¹*Die Abendmahlslehre bei Luther and Calvin* (2nd ed., Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann Verlag, 1954), pp. 19-29. The late Dr. Hermann Sasse seems, but only seems, to say something similar in *This is My Body. Luther's Contention for the Real Presence in the Sacrament of the Altar* (rev. ed., Adelaide: Lutheran Publishing House, 1977), p. 83. According to Sasse, what was implicit prior to 1523 becomes explicit thereafter.

²The definition "Sacramentum est sacrae rei signum" is found in Peter Lombard: *Sententiarum libri quattuor* IV, dist. 1, 2 (MPL 192, 839). It builds on such statements of St. Augustine as are found in *Sermo* 272 (MPL 38, 1247), *de civ. Dei* X, 5 (MPL 41, 282), and *EP.* 138, 7 (MPL (33, 527).

³Peter Lombard: *Sententiarum libri quattuor* IV, dist. 8, 4 (MPL 192, 857).

⁴WA 2. 742, 7-8. cf. LW 35, 49.

⁵WA 2. 742, 15-16; 743, 7-8. cf. LW 35, 49-51.

⁶WA 2. 749, 7-10. cf. LW 35, 59.

⁷WA 2. 742, 33-743, 1. cf. LW 35, 50.

⁸WA 2. 743, 7-26. cf. LW 35, 51.

⁹WA 2. 748, 27-749, 6. cf. LW 35, 59.

¹⁰WA 6. 358, 22. cf. LW 35, 85.

¹¹WA 6. 359, 18-25. cf. LW 35, 86f.

¹²WA 6. 515, 24; 518, 10-11. cf. LW 36, 40 & 44.

¹³WA 6. 359, 4-6. cf. LW 35, 86.

¹⁴*Die Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche* (8th ed., Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979), p. 711, 38-712, 5; 713, 1-23). cf. *The Book of Concord* (tr. & ed. T. G. Tappert, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979), p. 449f.

¹⁵WA 7. 695, 6-7.

¹⁶WA 6. 354, 18-22. cf. LW 35, 80.

¹⁷WA 6. 354, 22-24. cf. LW 35, 81.

¹⁸WA 6. 354, 24-25. cf. LW 35, 81.

¹⁹WA 2. 747, 4-6; 6. 354, 18-25; 358, 32-34; 372, 22-373, 5; 373, 9-25. cf. LW 35, 56; 81; 86; 104; 105.

²⁰"Should anyone request my counsel in this way, then I would give this advice: . . . Secondly, that you should celebrate one or two Masses in the two parish churches on Sundays or holy days, depending on whether there are few or many

communicants. Should it be regarded as needful or good, you might do the same in the hospital too. Thirdly, you might celebrate Mass during the week on whichever days it would be needful, that is, if any communicants would be present and would ask for and request the Sacrament. This way we should compel no one to receive the Sacrament, and yet everyone would be adequately served in an orderly manner. If the Ministers of the Church would fall to griping at this point, maintaining that they were being placed under duress or complaining that they are unfitted to face such demands, then I would demonstrate to them that no merely human compulsion is at work here, but on the contrary they are being compelled by God Himself through His Call. For because they have the Office, they are already, in virtue of their Call and Office, obliged and compelled to administer the Sacrament whenever people request it of them, so that their excuses amount to nothing; just as they are under obligation to preach, comfort, absolve, help the poor, and visit the sick as often as people need or ask for these services" (WABr 4. 534, 14-533, 34; Aug. 15th, 1528). Günther Stiller's study of *Johann Sebastian Bach and Liturgical Life in Leipzig* (tr. Herbert J. A. Bouman, Daniel F. Poellot, and Hilton C. Oswald, ed. Robin A. Leaver; St. Louis, MO: Concordia Publishing House, 1984), which tells the heartening story of a liturgical revival in 18th century Leipzig that ran counter to the Pietistic tide, focuses vigorously on "the fundamental importance the Sacrament had in the life and thought of the evangelical Christians in the age of orthodoxy. The Lutheran Church was then still the church of Word and Sacrament. Beside the proclaimed Word stood the Sacrament of the Altar at the very center of the Sunday and festival day main service as 'the most sacred mystery of the body and blood of Christ' and the 'true source of grace and inexhaustible fountain of mercy' " (*op.cit.*, p. 138).

²¹*Bekenntnisschriften*, p. 506, 4-7; cf. *Tappert*, p. 340f.

²²See, e.g., Emil Sehling, ed.: *Die evangelischen Kirchenordnungen des XVI. Jahrhunderts* (Leipzig: O. R. Reisland, 1902-1913; 4 vols.) I, p. 429 (Church Order of Augustus, Duke of Saxony, 1586); and Emil L. Richter, ed.: *Die evangelischen Kirchenordnungen des sechszehnten Jahrhunderts, Urkunden and Regesten zur Geschichte des Rechts und der Verfassung der evangelischen Kirche in Duetschland* (Weimar: Verlag des Landes-Industriecomptoirs, 1846; 2 vols.) I, p. 44 (Johann Brenz's Church Order of 1526 for Schwäbisch-Hall).

²³The foundational "chief article" of Smalcald Articles II, 1 cannot stand without the Trinitarian and Christological affirmations of Part I, which are no mere formality for the Reformer, but rather the ontological basis of everything asserted in Parts II and III; just as CA IV is simply the appropriation of the content of CA III through the Means specified in CA V. cf. the sage judgments of the late Dr. Wilhelm Maurer: "Die Einheit der Theologie Luthers," *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 75 (1950), pp. 245, 251.

²⁴"Das doch das aller heyligst ist": WA 18. 193, 3-4. cf. LW 40, 203.

²⁵WA 23. 192, 4-5. LW 37, 95 understands the masculine pronoun "er" personally as a reference to our Lord Himself, but the "er" of the German text can just as easily be taken as referring back to the antecedent "*Christus leib—Christ's Body.*"

²⁶WA 23. 242, 36. cf. LW 37, 124.

²⁷WA 23. 242, 36-244, 2. cf. LW 37, 124f. see also WA 23. 250, 20-23; cf. LW 37, 129f.; and WA 23. 150, 13-24; cf. LW 37, 68f.

²⁸*Bekenntnisschriften*, p. 1042, 39-1043, 6; *Tappert*, p. 606.

²⁹Canon XI is cited in *Bekenntnisschriften*, p. 1119, 36-41; see *Concordia Triglotta*, p. 1129.

³⁰WA 23. 172, 21-174, 22; 184, 7-186, 22. cf. LW 37, 82-83; 89-91.

³¹WA 23. 202, 31-33. cf. LW 37, 100.

³²WA 23. 178, 7-16. cf. LW 37, 85.

³³WA 23. 154, 35-156, 2. cf. LW 37, 71. This is the first time in the work of 1527 that Luther picks up the "medicine of immortality" motif, and one wonders whether his assertion will stand without a perception of a eucharistic dimension in John 6. In WA 23. 202-204 (cf. LW 37, 100), one cannot but be struck by the ease with which Luther passes from John 6:27, 51 to sacramental participation in the Body of Christ. Again, in WA 23. 236, 32-238, 6 (cf. LW 37, 121), Luther approvingly quotes St. Hilary's eucharistic application of John 6:55. For a wholehearted eucharistic interpretation of John 6 in the Orthodox period, see the XVIIIth and XIXth of Johann Gerhard's *Sacred Meditations* (tr. C. W. Heisler; Philadelphia: Lutheran Publication Society, 1896), pp. 98-107.

³⁴See, e.g., Luther's Maundy Thursday sermon of 1525, in which he can use John 6 to hammer home the eucharistic union with Christ: "I most certainly have the Body and Blood of Christ through the Word of God: 'This is My Body, which is for you,' 'This is My Blood, which is shed for you' etc. The reason why Christ thus gives me His Body and His Blood is so that I may have them for ever. If this then be true, and likewise this, that the righteousness of Christ and all that He has are mine, and if this is much more certain than that my body and blood are my own, then it is necessary that I believe that the Body was given for me and the Blood shed for me. And this is what Christ is saying in John 6: 'Whoever eats My Flesh and drinks My Blood abides in Me and I in him.' For Christ and I are being baked into each other in such a way that my sin and death become His and His righteousness and life become my own. In short, a most blessed exchange is taking place here" (WA 17 I. 174, 21-175, 10).

³⁵WA 23. 258, 6-7. cf. LW 37, 134.

³⁶*Die Abendmahlslehre bei Luther and Calvin*, p. 109.

³⁷see his *The Theology of Martin Luther* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966), pp. 179-198.

³⁸WA 23. 236, 10-16. cf. LW 37, 120.

³⁹*Bekennnisschriften*, p. 248, 21-33; Tappert, p. 179.