

Dr. Luther Celebrates Holy Communion

Rev. Stephen Valleskey, Abiding Word Lutheran Church, Houston, TX

[Prepared for the Symposium on Holy Communion
Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary September 22-23, 2003]

The theological foment that erupted in the Reformation was not by any means to be contained, but overflowed into every area of the church's life and work, finding its way with a certain urgency also into the liturgy and worship of the church. You can't keep new wine in old wineskins. The new wine of the gospel, newly rediscovered and restored to its central place in the teaching of the church, demanded a new expression in the worship of God's people. The obscuring of the foundational principle of Christian theology—the justification of the sinner by grace through faith—had plunged the church into darkness and put a damper on its liturgical song. If liturgy is indeed the “sung doctrine of the church,” then massive doctrinal upheaval and correction must of necessity be accompanied by massive upheaval and correction in the liturgy.

Luther was a conservative force in liturgical reform. That changes in liturgy and worship must inevitably follow on his theological reforms was never a question. But Luther was inclined to give the gospel time to do its work in confidence that the necessary changes would come of their own without being forced. “As to the reform of the mass and the arranging of the worship of God,” Luther wrote in an unhurried way to the Bohemian Christians and the Senate in Prague late in 1523, at a time when his Latin mass, published in December 1523, must have been already underway, “either others may speak or I myself may say something some other time” (LW40,44).

The people should not be subjected to radical changes for which they were unprepared. “Therefore, I have undertaken nothing either by force or command,” Luther wrote from his pastoral heart, “nor have I changed old things for new, always being hesitant and fearful on account of those souls weak in the faith from whom the old and accustomed is not to be taken away suddenly or among whom a new and untried method of worshiping God is to be introduced.” The abomination Satan had set up in the holy place through the man of sin was to be “removed without violence” (PE6,84).

Luther's extended correspondence with his dear friend and unwavering supporter, Nicholas Hausmann, a few years his senior, who served eleven years as pastor in Zwickau, reveals much of the mind of the reformer as he moved toward liturgical change. Hausmann repeatedly and urgently pleaded with Luther to use his authority to establish a uniform evangelical service. “Everything has to be exposed to the Word,” Luther wrote Hausmann on March 17, 1522, “but hearts must be driven slowly, like Jacob's flock, so that first they take up the Word of God voluntarily, and when they have finally become strong, do everything” (LW48,401). Shortly before the appearance of his Latin mass he advised his friend in October 1523 to take a stepped approach to liturgical reform. “Meanwhile, abolish all private masses if you can, or as many [as possible]. As a next step I shall revise the Canon, and some of the ungodly prayers. But I do not see why we should alter the rest of the ritual, together with the vestments, altars, and holy vessels, since they can be used in a godly way and since one cannot live in the church of God without ceremonies” (LW49,56). Luther dedicated his Latin mass, the *Formula Missae* (December 1523), to Hausmann, and thereafter had to answer his friend's persistent pleas for an evangelical service in the vernacular. Hausmann's concerns for order were not without basis since he had succeeded Thomas Muenzer as pastor in Zwickau near the Bohemian border in late 1521 and had inherited from him Nicholas Storch and the Zwickau prophets who had had the favor and support of Muenzer. Luther assured Hausmann of his good intent, “I desire a German mass more than I can promise [to work on an order for it]. I am not qualified for this task, which requires both a talent in music and the gift of the Spirit” (LW49,90).

This latter remark reveals that Luther's delay in producing an evangelical service in the vernacular arose in part from his desire to do it right. Hausmann himself drew up a German mass with German words set over the Latin chant and sent it to Luther for his appraisal. Luther felt that German words needed to be set to German chant, but despite his own considerable musical talents did not consider himself adequate to the task. Ultimately

he succeeded in convincing the Elector to send his two leading chapel musicians, Conrad Rupsch and Johann Walter, to assist him.

Despite Luther's wishes to move slowly and carefully in liturgical reform, there was no holding back the overwhelming tide his theological ideas had unleashed. On September 22, 1521, while Luther was at the Wartburg, Melancthon celebrated the first evangelical Lord's Supper in Wittenberg in a semi-private setting. The pace quickened. On Christmas Day 1521 with Luther still at the Wartburg, Karlstadt, in defiance of the Elector's order, celebrated the Sacrament in both kinds in the Castle Church in Wittenberg. Two thousand people packed the church, "the whole town," according to one chronicler. Karlstadt officiated in a plain black robe, reciting the mass in Latin while omitting offensive passages on sacrifice. But when he came to the consecration, he switched to German. The people heard for the first time in a loud and clear voice what previously had been specified to be uttered by the priest in a low and almost inaudible tone, that the bread is the body of the Lord and the cup the blood of the New Testament. The communicants were directed to take the consecrated bread into their own hands. One communicant so trembled at the thought of holding God in his hands that he dropped the bread and could not by any means be persuaded to pick it up again. At the same time Gabriel Zwilling, under Karlstadt's tutelage, led an iconoclastic riot in Wittenberg, overturning images and smashing statues and paintings of saints. Karlstadt lumped religious music with religious art and pronounced that organs, trumpets, and flutes should be relegated to the theater. If matters were not bad enough already, three laymen from Zwickau came to Wittenberg as self-proclaimed prophets, claiming that God spoke directly to them and they had no need for the Bible. The Zwickau prophets repudiated infant baptism and announced the speedy coming of the kingdom of God through the physical slaughter of the ungodly. Melancthon was in a dither, and momentarily was even swayed by Storch's arguments against infant baptism, displaying the weakness in character that was to be catastrophic to the church in the years following Luther's death. He appealed to Luther for help.

Luther was aghast at the errors and abuses that were being foisted on the people in the name of the gospel. His pastoral heart was stirred to action and moved him to speed up his return from the Wartburg. In Wittenberg on *Invocavit*, March 13, 1522, in the fifth of his series of eight sermons preached on eight successive days, Luther addressed the matter of taking the Sacrament into one's own hands and under both kinds. "But you may say: We live and we ought to live according to the Scriptures, and God has so instituted the Sacrament that we must take it with our hands, for he said, 'Take, eat, this is my body.' The answer is this: though I am convinced beyond a doubt that the disciples of the Lord took it with their hands, and though I admit that you may do the same without committing sin, nevertheless I can neither make it compulsory nor defend it" (LW51,89). No sin was committed in touching the Sacrament with their hands, but it was not a good work "because it caused offense everywhere.Therefore no new practices should be introduced, unless the gospel has first been thoroughly preached and understood" (LW51,90). Regarding the two kinds Luther agreed that while this was necessary in keeping with the institution of the Lord, "nevertheless it must not be made compulsory nor a general law" or else it would become an outward work and hypocrisy. "For if you desire to be regarded as better Christians than others just because you take the Sacrament into your hands and also receive it in both kinds, you are bad Christians as far as I am concerned" (LW51,90-91). Zwilling, it should be said, yielded to Luther's correction and agreed to stop celebrating communion with feathers in his beret. He was assigned as pastor to Altenburg and later served for twenty years as pastor and superintendent at Torgau until he was deposed in 1549 for his opposition to the Interim. Karlstadt was given a congregation in neighboring Orlamünde, but his is a different story. Peace returned to Wittenberg.

The radical actions of men who in some cases were to become implacable foes on the left wing of the Reformation both sped and hindered the pace of Luther's liturgical reforms. On the one hand, Luther's friends pleaded with him to produce his own definitive divine service to bring to a halt the chaos that was resulting from everyone doing their own thing in worship. This impelled Luther to constructive action. But radical attitudes and activity could also produce a backlash of resistance in the reformer and his supporters, and make them take a stance on some liturgical issues that may appear Romanizing to some. Such was the case with the elevation of the host. Luther offers an extended reflection on the turnings of his mind in this matter in his *Brief*

Confession Regarding the Sacrament, published in September 1544, a good summary and overview of his teaching on the Sacrament. The elevation of the host was not abolished in Wittenberg until 1542 when Luther, bowing to the wishes of Bugenhagen, consented to its discontinuation although personally he would have had it retained. Luther allowed the elevation to continue “because it could in fact have a valid meaning,” not as a “sacrifice to propitiate God on account of sin,” but as “a sacrifice of thanks or thanksgiving” in response to blessings received. So the priest by elevating the host would do no more than highlight the words, “This is my body,” thus directing an admonition to men “to provoke them to faith.” But, as Luther recalls, “while I am thinking thus and abiding in my faith, Jack Absurdity, Dr. Karlstadt, comes blustering and jolting against me with his heavenly prophets and directs a book against us. In it he chides us Wittenbergers for being murderers of Christ, crucifiers of Christ, new papists, etc., and becomes very rude and repulsive. Yet he had no other reason than that we were elevating the Sacrament. This kind of elevating he interprets as offering a sacrifice.” Therefore in opposition to, in defiance of, and “to the chagrin of this same devil,” Luther wrote, “I would retain the elevation which I was nevertheless inclined to drop in opposition to the papists.” If anyone is going to try to give Luther a guilty conscience and make him feel like “a murderer, crucifier, and hangman of Christ,” then he would “still today not only retain the elevation but, where one would not be enough, assist introducing three, seven, or ten elevations.” However, as Luther concludes this discussion, “the sole reason why we are discontinuing the elevation is because nearly all of the churches have given it up for a long time already. Consequently, we wanted to agree with them and not practice something distinctive in a matter that in itself was open and could be retained or discontinued without endangering the conscience.” Luther particularly was ready to agree to this “because from the beginning I had been inclined to drop the elevation and certainly would have done so at that time if Karlstadt had not made such an abominable sin of it” (LW38,314-317).

I

But now we want to step back to consider Luther’s early thought on the Sacrament and how it developed as it impacted the sacramental practices of the churches of the Lutheran Reformation. It was only after Luther had resolved the issues of righteousness and justification in his mind, the authority of Scripture, and the universal priesthood of believers, that he turned his pen to the Sacrament. Thus it was not until the end of 1519 that his first detailed writing specifically on the Sacrament appeared, more than two years after posting the Ninety-five Theses, in a work entitled, *The Blessed Sacrament of the Holy and True Body of Christ and the Brotherhoods*. Here Luther does not yet take issue with the mass as sacrifice or the manner of Christ’s presence in the Sacrament. He appears to be content still to use the terminology of transubstantiation. “For just as the bread is changed (German: *verwandelt*) into his true natural body and the wine into his natural true blood, so truly are we also drawn and changed into the spiritual body, that is, into the fellowship of Christ and all saints...” (LW35,59). After a more careful exposition of 1 Corinthians 10:16-17 in the introductory section of his later *Adoration of the Sacrament* (1523), Luther distinguishes in a clearer way between the spiritual body of Christ and the body distributed in the Sacrament (LW36,282-3). But in the earlier treatise it may be seen that already Luther is well along the path to discarding Scholastic speculation about “accidents” and “substance.” His use of the terminology of transubstantiation here may be taken to show no more, and no less, than his affirming that Christ is truly present in the Sacrament.

More significant, perhaps, is Luther’s modest suggestion in this early treatise that the Sacrament would be better administered in both kinds, tempered still at this point by his allowance that one kind is acceptable: “Not because one kind is insufficient, since indeed the desire of faith is alone sufficient, as St. Augustine says, ‘Why do you prepare stomach and teeth? Only believe, and you have already partaken of the sacrament.’” (LW35,50). Despite Luther’s disclaimer that “one kind is sufficient,” Duke George of Saxony, who received an early copy of this writing just before Christmas 1519 and who had already identified Luther in his mind as a “Hussite” from the Leipzig debate, picked up on this passage to attack Luther, forwarded it to Leo X, and the matter was included in the papal bull of June 15, 1520, as one of Luther’s forty-one alleged errors. Luther is close here to identifying the withholding of the cup from the laity as the first captivity of the church, but that

was to await his *Babylonian Captivity of the Church* (October 1520), the second of the three great reformatory treatises of that year.

The first of the three great reformatory treatises, *To the Christian Nobility of the German Nation Concerning the Reform of the Christian Estate*, appeared in the middle of August 1520. This work makes only a slight reference to the Sacrament in connection with endowed masses which Luther believed should be abolished (LW44,180-1). However with this theological judgment Luther was to eliminate in one fell swoop a large industry of the celebrant's trade. These were the so-called hedge masses, private masses, endowed masses, including masses for the dead, which were done by the priest alone, and were a significant source of revenue in the church.

The reason for abolishing these private masses arose from Luther's growing conviction that the mass is pure sacrament and not sacrifice and good work. Here in *To the Christian Nobility* we have a taste of what Luther was to develop in a more full way later the same year as the third and greatest captivity of the church. But already the thought is coming clear: "It is also to be feared that the many masses which were endowed in ecclesiastical foundations and monasteries are not only of little use, but arouse the great wrath of God. It would therefore be profitable not to endow any more of these masses, but rather to abolish many that are already endowed. *It is obvious that these masses are regarded only as sacrifices and good works, even though they are sacraments just like baptism and penance* (emphasis mine), which profit only those who receive them and no one else. But now the custom of saying masses for the living and the dead has crept in, and all hopes are built upon them. This is why so many masses are endowed, and why the state of affairs we see around us has developed out of it" (LW44,191).

Thus for Luther the kernel of two Biblical truths that were to make a major impact on how the church celebrates the Sacrament, communion under both kinds and mass as sacrament, not sacrifice, which meant that the only proper use of the Sacrament was to be found in the context of the people of God assembled, eating and drinking—and perhaps also a third, the veering away from the use of the Aristotelian/Scholastic categories in the definition of the Sacrament in favor of simpler Biblical categories—were already in place by the end of summer 1520, nearly three months before the appearance of the *Babylonian Captivity*.

Sandwiched between the first two reformatory treatises was a little book entitled, *A Treatise on the New Testament, that is, the Holy Mass*, which though appearing in July 1520 was written sometime after the writing of the *Christian Nobility* in June and before the writing of the *Babylonian Captivity* in September. Here in more forceful language Luther goes to the very heart of the mass and discards decisively the notion that the Sacrament is a sacrifice and good work performed by God's people instead of a testament and promise of God to us sealed by the death of his Son. The *Treatise* is by no means an insignificant writing. This is Luther's first clear and public attack on the Roman idea of the mass as bloodless repetition of the sacrifice of Christ on Calvary, an offering that we make of Christ to God, instead of God's offering, promise, and testament to us.

When we speak of the mass as sacrifice, we will want to distinguish carefully. Luther does not flatly exclude the concept of sacrifice from the mass. It is true, he acknowledges, that when we come to the mass to receive the testament and promise of God, we bring to God our prayers and offerings. "But this work and prayer are quite another thing from the testament and sacrament, which no one can offer or give either to God or to men" (LW35,94). Just as I give God nothing in my Baptism, so here in the Sacrament proper "there is no *officium* but *beneficium*, no work or service but reception and benefit alone" (LW35,94). But since almost everyone has turned the mass into a sacrifice that we offer to God, "we must clearly distinguish here between what we offer and what we do not offer in the mass" (LW35,94). Luther correctly identifies the offertory as deriving from the ancient practice of the offertory procession when the people after the sermon would bring food and other gifts to the altar to be distributed to the poor and for the support of the clergy. From these gifts also would be taken the bread and wine for the Sacrament. He does not do as well with his etymology of "collect," which he appears to identify with these same "collections" brought forward by the people to the altar (LW35,95).

In what sense may we properly call the mass sacrifice? "And in this way it is permissible, yes, profitable, to call the mass a sacrifice; not on its own account, but because we offer ourselves as a sacrifice

along with Christ. That is, we lay ourselves on Christ by a firm faith in his testament and do not otherwise appear before God with our prayer, praise, and sacrifice except through Christ and his mediation. Nor do we doubt that Christ is our priest or minister in heaven before God. Such faith, truly, brings it to pass that Christ takes up our cause, presents us and our prayer and praise, and also offers himself for us in heaven. If the mass were so understood and for this reason called a sacrifice, it would be well. Not that we offer the sacrament, but that by our praise, prayer, and sacrifice we move him and give him occasion to offer himself for us in heaven and ourselves with him” (LW35,99).

When the *Babylonian Captivity of the Church* appeared in print October 6, 1520, it “struck a dagger in the heart of Roman sacramentalism” and marked Luther’s “final and irrevocable break with the church of Rome” (LW36,8). Although directed at the whole sacramental system of Rome, the treatise devotes more than half of its space to holy communion and baptism, with the majority of that going to the Lord’s Supper, the “Sacrament of the Bread,” as he called it and with which he begins the book. Luther calls this book a “prelude” (LW36,125), indicating that he views this as just an initial skirmish in the battle. But it was also the culmination and pulling together of his thought to this point on the Sacrament as may be seen in the fact that he transfers many passages and whole pages from his earlier writings on the Sacrament intact to this work. The three “captivities” of the Sacrament are three ways that the church has been held captive by the church hierarchy, as the people of God in the Old Testament were held captive in Babylon. The first captivity is the withholding of the cup from the laity. Here church tradition and practice must yield to the Scripture. In making allowance to “instruct men’s consciences,” Luther does not wish that “both kinds be seized by force.” He still holds out hope at this point “that a general council of the church might correct the error” (LW36,28). However, the obvious implication for the celebration of the Sacrament in evangelical churches is clear. The laity is not to be denied the cup. The second captivity is “less grievous as far as the conscience is concerned” (LW36,28) and pertains to the mode of Christ’s presence in the Sacrament and the error of transubstantiation. Luther could be tolerant in places of this error of attempting to explain philosophically what the Scriptures choose not to explain. Later he would write that “this error is not very important if only the body and blood of Christ, together with the Word, are not taken away” (LW36,287). The third captivity of the church is “by far the most wicked abuse of all, in consequence of which there is no opinion more generally held or more firmly believed in the church today than this, that the mass is a good work and a sacrifice. And this abuse has brought an endless host of other abuses in its train, so that the faith of this sacrament has become utterly extinct and the holy sacrament has been turned into mere merchandise, a market, and a profit-making business. Hence participations, brotherhoods, intercessions, merits, anniversaries, memorial days and the like wares are bought and sold, traded and bartered, in the church” (LW36,35-36).

After the appearance of the monumental *Babylonian Captivity*, Luther’s prolific writings on the Sacrament did not abate. However, what needed to be said theologically for the liturgical reform of the mass had now been said, and it was left only to reinforce, fine tune and clarify what he had written in response to the writings of his adversaries. In *The Misuse of the Mass*, written from the Wartburg in late 1521 and published in January 1522, Luther again repudiates the mass as sacrifice and rejects all private masses. Earlier in the year Luther had written with finality in a letter of August 1, 1521, to Melanchthon, “But I also will never say another private mass for all eternity” (LW48,281). Shortly after his return from the Wartburg and the preaching of his famous eight sermons in Wittenberg, Luther wrote *Receiving Both Kinds in the Sacrament*. In this treatise that somewhat reflects the eight sermons, published in April 1522, Luther advances in his thought over the *Blessed Sacrament* and the *Babylonian Captivity*, only in this that while then he still held out hope that a church council might restore the cup to the laity, now he views that as delusion. After his experience at the Diet of Worms, Luther no longer looked for help from human authority. The papists have despoiled the Sacrament and the people must be given back what is rightfully theirs. Yet he remains on the ground where he stood in his August 21 letter to Melanchthon, quoted above, in this that the laity, who have had no choice in the matter, do not sin in receiving only one kind: “Concerning ‘both kinds’ in the Eucharist, I am not arguing on the basis of the example [of the early church] but of the word of Christ. He did not show that those who receive only the ‘one

kind' either have or have not sinned" (LW48,279-280). In this he opposed the opinion of Karlstadt who taught that "he who eats only the bread sins, in my opinion" (LW48,279,fn18).

The stage was set for the appearance of Luther's two formal liturgical writings, the *Formula Missae*, published by December 1523 and the *Deutsche Messe*, introduced in the Parish Church in Wittenberg October 29, 1525, and, after revisions, published in early 1526. Something more of the historical background should be given here to help us assess the significance of these two writings that have made so profound an impact on Lutheran worship, faith, and life. Luther's liturgical reforms cannot be properly understood outside their historical context. Edmund Reim has an insightful study in the July 1948 *Quartalschrift*, "The Liturgical Crisis in Wittenberg, 1524." Seen against the backdrop of Karlstadt's and others radicals' disorderly excesses, what Luther accomplished, by God's grace was nothing short of a miracle of orderliness and moderation in worship. But there was another historical backdrop in Wittenberg, the ultraconservatism of the Castle Church, which to us today stands as a monument to the Reformation since it was there Dr. Luther posted his ninety-five theses, the hammer blows that were heard around the world.

However, then the Castle Church, All Saints, was a monument to the unreformed piety of Frederick the Wise. Regular services were not held there. The Augustinian chapel served the monks of the monastery and students of the university. The people of Wittenberg went to the Parish Church. Regular services were held in the Castle Church only when Elector Frederick was in town. But the Castle Church boasted a clergy of eighty-three men in the early years of the Reformation. All Saints was lavishly endowed with grants from Frederick's ancestors. It boasted 5005 relics in the catalog illustrated by Lucas Cranach. By 1520 the collection of holy bones had mounted to 19,013. Spalatin says that at this time the number of masses per year was 11,039. Thirty-five thousand pounds of candles were consumed annually. Those who viewed the whole collection of relics on the designated day and made the required contribution were eligible for an indulgence for reduction of time in purgatory for themselves or their loved ones of 1,902,202 years and 270 days.

It should not surprise us that Frederick was not happy when three times in 1516 the young priest Luther preached against indulgences. We have to marvel at the temerity of Luther in late 1521 to publicly label the Castle Church "Beth Aven," a House of Idols—"You also have a Beth-Aven among you, namely All Saints' Church, which Duke Frederick inherited from his ancestors and, deceived by the papists, has admirably enlarged and improved" (LW36,227)—and marvel as well at the good-natured indulgence of the Elector who tolerated this abuse of his person. However, in the vested clergy interests in the Castle Church Luther found a formidable adversary. While Luther was formulating his revised Latin and German services, he was keeping balance not only with the excesses of the radical reformation but also with the entrenched conservatism in his own backyard of All Saints and its clergy, supported by an Elector reluctant to break with the past. Luther did not mince words. In comments at the conclusion of his "*Formula Missae*" he calls the Castle Church "the idolatrous 'Topheth'" that "still continues as a shameless, ungodly source of revenue for the princes of Saxony." The Reformation had made its inroads, so that "there are scarcely three or four swinish gluttons left to serve mammon in that house of perdition. To all others and to the whole populace, it is a loathsome and abominable thing." The house of all saints would better be known as the house "of all devils." Repeatedly Luther called for the removal of the worship practices at All Saints that were contrary to the gospel, and prayed that "perchance God may give them repentance" (W53,39). Little by little victories for evangelical worship were won.

Things came to a crisis in the year 1524. One of the deans of the Castle Church reverted to withholding the cup from the laity. Luther protested immediately. The clergy backed their dean and appealed to the Elector who requested a statement in writing from Luther. Luther's response came in the form of *Concerning the Abomination of the Canon of the Mass*, a writing possibly based on a sermon he preached the First Sunday in Advent 1524. The lines were drawn. Luther reportedly told Spalatin on the day he preached the sermon that if the mass in the Castle Church were not reformed, he would leave Wittenberg. Four weeks later the clergy capitulated and all signed the "New Order of Worship for the Castle Church at Wittenberg." The new order was put in place on Christmas Eve 1524.

If Luther by the grace of God successfully resisted reverting to ritualism and formalism in overreaction to the excesses of the radical reformation, it took an equal measure of grace for him to resist the temptation to

yield to radical excesses in overreaction to the ultraconservatism of the entrenched clergy at All Saints who stubbornly fought the gospel's progress. This is a measure of the liturgical greatness of the man that Luther sought and found and held to the golden mean. Those who are unduly critical of Luther's liturgical work fail to properly credit this.

In 1526 Luther took up his pen against the Swiss and South German reformers who had been attacking his teachings on the Lord's Supper, publishing a series of sermons on the Sacrament under the title *The Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ—Against the Fanatics*. Other writings followed, culminating in his *Great Confession Concerning Christ's Supper* of 1528, the most thorough and exhaustive treatment by the reformer on the Sacrament, after which he apparently felt less a need to answer his opponents. As he had been slow to take up liturgical reform, so Luther initially was inexplicably slow to engage Zwingli and Oecolampadius and the others who were openly attacking him. Their first communications with each other were cordial. But there was a steady build-up from the Zwinglian side of increasingly direct and vitriolic writings against Luther with the charge that he was not fully "reformed" when it came to the Sacrament and had retained Romanizing tendencies. These things Luther absorbed in silence. We need to keep this in mind when Luther's intransigence on the question of the Sacrament is singled out as the sole impediment to agreement between the Lutheran and Reformed. He took as well as gave in this exchange.

A number of incidents finally drew Luther into the fray. Karlstadt was expelled from Saxony in summer 1524 and found his way down to Strassburg by the end of the year where he won adherents to his views on the Sacrament. Martin Bucer, reflecting this influence, injected sacramentarian views into volume four of his German translation of *Luther's Exposition of the Gospels and Epistles*, which he published in Strassburg. Luther was enraged. Zurich theologian Leo Jud produced a document in which he attempted to show that Luther really agreed with the Swiss view (LW36,332). Oecolampadius taunted Luther that "the Holy Spirit had departed from him" since he did not answer their writings, and finally enough was enough. The sleeping giant was stirred once again to action.

The Great Controversy with the Swiss and South German reformers, as intense as it was and as threatening to the very survival of the Church of the Lutheran Reformation, did not appreciably affect the outward celebration of the Lord's Supper in the churches in the way that the controversy with Rome had done, and therefore lies outside the scope of this essay. But this much we will say, that if in 1520 Luther could write that turning the mass into sacrifice and good work was "by far the most wicked abuse of all" (LW36,35), it is not at all clear that after the Great Controversy was in full swing a few short years later with its denial of the Presence of Christ in the Sacrament, he would have said the same thing. But in fact Luther was ambivalent in his dealings with the Swiss and South German theologians. Not that he ever wavered on the Real Presence of Christ in the Sacrament. This writer believes that what was happening was that Luther was loathe to attack these fellow reformers, but wanted to allow the gospel time to do its work also in them, and only with the greatest reluctance and in the interest of the truth drew up the battle lines with them. As late as May 6, 1538, Luther could write in a letter to Duke Albrecht of Prussia: "We are getting along well with the Swiss with whom we have been in disagreement on account of the sacrament.... This pleases us ... and disturbs the abomination at Rome; they [the papists] are very much frightened by this latest news...." (LW38,281). The great reformer himself tells us that he wept and could not sleep for two days when he received word that Zwingli had died in battle. Oecolampadius died less than two weeks after Zwingli's death, and Luther compassionately wrote that it must have been of a broken heart. Luther's grief was compounded when he noted that in a posthumous work Zwingli included Plato and other pagan moralists and philosophers in the list of the saints of God. While initially Luther had earnestly wanted to believe that Zwingli had joined the saints of God in glory, he no longer could do so with confidence.

If anything, the Great Controversy stiffened Luther's resolve to stay the middle course in worship. The retention of the host in the form of unleavened wafer in our services, a matter that Luther cared little about one way or the other, was the path the Lutheran Church followed because of the mockery of the sacramentarians, particularly Muenzer (Erlangen ed. 31,329), who attempted to force our consciences to accept that the fraction, or the breaking of the bread, belonged to the essence of the Sacrament. This of course would have required

regular bread, not sliced wafers, in the distribution. Freedom in nonessentials is the rule. Similarly in respect to the elevation “we are lords and will put up with no commandment, teaching, or prohibition. We have also done both here in Wittenberg. For in the cloister we observed mass without chasuble, without elevation, in the most plain and simple way which Karlstadt extols [as following] Christ’s example. On the other hand, in the parish church we still have the chasuble, alb, altar, and elevate [the host] as long as it pleases us” (LW40,130). Luther shows the absurdity of permitting incidental circumstances to become binding on conscience: Then there would be no Lord’s Supper except “in Jerusalem, in the upper room.” It would “only be observed by the disciples.” We must “previously in a Jewish manner have eaten the paschal lamb.” Since the text “does not state whether red or white wine was used, whether wheat rolls or barley bread were used,” we would have no choice but to refrain altogether from celebrating the Sacrament (LW40,133).

One other matter we may consider briefly here. The practice of self-communion was adopted uncritically by Luther from the existing practice of the church, as may be seen in the rubric in his *Formula Missae*, “Then, while the Agnus Dei is sung, let him [the liturgist] communicate, first himself and then the people” (LW53,29) Earlier he had written in the *Babylonian Captivity*: “Further, when a priest celebrates public mass, he should determine to do nothing else than to commune himself and others by means of the mass” (LW36,54). The only problem Luther had with self-communion was when it was done in connection with the abomination of the *private* mass, which he came to view as no Sacrament at all. He identified self-communion in the private mass as one source that had led to the corruption of the mass as sacrifice. “If they had retained this usage [the proper usage] of the sacrament it would never have become a sacrifice; just as one does not call it a sacrifice when the pastor administers and gives the sacrament to the sick or to others who ask for it. But when they substituted for the breaking and distribution of the sacrament the keeping and taking of it by one’s self, and called the minister a priest, that is when the sacrifice was invented” (LW36,172). For the reformers and the first two centuries of the Church of the Reformation, self-communion was an accepted practice. There are different theories as to what led the late 17th and 18th century Lutheran church orders to explicitly ban self-communion. One is that while the word “true” was added to the formula of distribution to distance us from the Zwinglians and Crypto-Calvinists, at the same time the prohibition of self-communion was set in place to separate us in the minds of people from the practice of Rome. Walther acknowledges and supports self-communion (“*Pastoraltheologie*, pp. 197ff).

One curious suggestion in the *Deutsche Messe* that appears not to have been followed by any of the church orders is to distribute each element of the Sacrament immediately after its consecration. “It seems to me that it would accord with [the institution of] the Lord’s Supper to administer the sacrament immediately after the consecration of the bread, before the cup is blessed; for both Luke and Paul say: He took the cup after they had supped, etc” (LW53,81).

II

Nowhere was the need for liturgical reform more glaring than in the canon of the mass, that fixed part of the liturgy that surrounded the consecration, immediately following the Sanctus and ending just before the Lord’s Prayer, together with the offertory prayers that followed the sermon, called, respectively, the “great canon” and the “lesser canon,” (PE2,215). “Canon” is a word that means “fixed rule” as in the canon of Scripture or canon law. The canon of the mass is the eucharistic or consecratory prayer of the Roman rite, the obligatory and unchangeable part consisting in the thanksgiving and the anamnesis or remembrance with the words of institution. Initially, the epiclesis, or invocation of the Holy Spirit, which in the Eastern Rite came to be associated with the moment of the Presence, was also a part of the Western eucharistic prayer. The epiclesis fell into disuse in the West in the fourth century. What the Romans call the canon, the Greeks with an older terminology call the anaphora. Chemnitz complained that the Romanists “labor much more for its [the canon’s] retention than about the canon of the Scripture itself” (Exam. II,508). The canon enshrined the mass as sacrifice in words of great antiquity, traces of which can be found as early as the first century, and therein lay the challenge to evangelical theology and liturgical practice. “What I am speaking of is the canon,” Luther wrote

with unsparing words, “that abominable concoction drawn from everyone’s sewer and cesspool” (LW53,21). The reason for the severity of the language is that through the words of the canon, sacrament had been turned into sacrifice. “The mass became a sacrifice” (LW53,21). God’s gift to us became our work by which propitiation for sin was made. The very gospel was at stake.

No less offensive than the canon were the offertory prayers (lesser canon), “that complete abomination, into the service of which all that precedes in the mass has been forced, whence it is called *offertorium*, and on account of which nearly everything sounds and reeks of oblation.... Therefore repudiating all those things which smack of sacrifice and of the offertory, together with the entire *canon*, let us retain those things which are pure and holy, and then we will order our mass in this fashion” (PE6,88-89). The central prayer of the Roman offertory read, “Receive, O holy Father, almighty and eternal God, this spotless host which I, your unworthy servant, offer to you, my living and true God, for my own countless sins, offenses and negligences, and for all here present; as also for all faithful Christians living and dead, that it may avail for my own and their salvation to life eternal” (Reed, 312). Originally, the offertory had been the ancient practice at the end of the sermon of the people coming forward, accompanied by Psalm verses, offering gifts to be distributed to the poor. As that tradition disappeared, the offertory degenerated into prayers that offered Christ anew as a bloodless sacrifice for the sins of the world. Of the sixteenth century rites only Mark Brandenburg (1540) retained the traditional offertory prayers.

Luther was fully aware of the massive weight of tradition and antiquity that the Roman canon carried. “I am attacking a difficult matter,” he wrote, “an abuse perhaps impossible to uproot, since through century-long custom and the common consent of men it has become so firmly entrenched that it would be necessary to abolish most of the books now in vogue, and to alter almost the entire external form of the churches and introduce, or rather reintroduce, a totally different kind of ceremonies” (LW36,36).

Since the canon of the mass, or eucharistic prayer, embodied the Roman doctrine of the mass as sacrifice and was fraught with prayers to Mary and the saints, it was to Luther an “abomination” whose only remedy was a radical excision. In late 1521 in an address to the brothers at the Augustinian monastery in Wittenberg, Luther actually had suggested that the offertory and canon might be replaced with materials of an evangelical character, but he proposed no form (Reed, 342). In both his *Formula Missae* of 1523 and his *Deutsche Messe* of 1526 Luther cut out the entire canon and left only the bare Verba, the words of institution in its place. This was the most controverted of Luther’s liturgical actions. Canon VI of the Council of Trent answered the Reformation by pronouncing its anathema on anyone who “says that the canon of the mass contains errors and should therefore be abrogated” (Exam. II,508).

Where did the idea of a special thanksgiving (eucharistic) prayer at this high point in the service originate, and how did the errors Luther confronted in the early 16th century of the mass as sacrifice come to be embedded to it? The canon of the mass was fixed in the form Luther found it in the 6th century under Gregory the Great. So for a millennium, at least, these errors had been entrenched in this central part of the liturgy. The eucharistic prayer, in fact, antedates Gregory’s canon by several centuries, and was a part of every celebration of the Sacrament as far back in the history of the church as we are able to trace. The use of the word “sacrifice” in connection with the prayer likewise goes back to the first century although it is not found in the Scriptural texts themselves. The word “host” is the Latin “*hostia*” which means “sacrificial animal,” “victim,” “sacrifice.” The older Greek word for the eucharistic prayer, “*anaphora*,” is the Greek word for “offering” or “sacrifice.”

This is not the same thing as to say that the eucharistic prayers in their early forms conveyed the idea of a propitiatory sacrifice for sins, which made the Roman canon in its Gregorian form so repugnant to the gospel. Indeed when we look at the earliest eucharistic prayers, it is by no means clear that the sacrifice spoken of is a sacrifice for sins. But let the reader judge for himself. The *Didache* in chapters 9, 10, and 14 describes early eucharistic practice without giving us a formal eucharistic prayer. From its Lucan cup-bread sequence and its Hebraic phrases one student of the liturgy argues that the eucharistic sections of the *Didache* were written prior to the Council of Jerusalem of 48-49 (Mazza 40-41), and thus purportedly would antedate the New Testament Scriptures themselves. This writer is less than convinced by the force of the argumentation, but in any case we will allow that the *Didache* depicts eucharistic observance of the greatest antiquity, and the word “sacrifice” is

prominent in the account. In chapter 14 we read: “On the Lord’s own day, gather together and break bread and give thanks, after confessing your transgression, so that your sacrifice may be pure. Let no one who has a quarrel with his comrade meet with you until they are reconciled, so that your sacrifice may not be defiled. For this is what was said by the Lord, ‘At every place and time offer me a clean sacrifice, for I am a great king, says the Lord, and my name is wonderful among the heathen’” (Goodspeed, 17).

Now it is certainly possible that lingering Jewish influence or the inroads of paganism had distorted Christian teaching at this early point, but one is not compelled to that reading. Is it not more natural to see here in the *Didache* a New Testament appeal, so close to the time of the original writings themselves, that we offer up our prayers of thanksgiving and offerings and our own selves as “living sacrifices” to God as our “spiritual act of worship” (Romans 12,1) in response to the grace and love of God in Jesus Christ. There is nothing explicit whatever in the *Didache* about a sacrifice of Christ on the altar for the sins of the world. And indeed the New Testament knows no other sacrifice for sins than the “once for all” sacrifice of Christ on Calvary (Hebrews 9:25-28). So while we may allow the possibility that the church deviated so quickly from the apostolic message, we find no reason to accede easily to that opinion.

Chemnitz, following Luther, offers a long list of reasons why the ancients may so commonly have called the Sacrament a sacrifice, without it being for them a propitiatory sacrifice for sins. In the early church bread and wine and other gifts were brought by the people to the altar for the poor and the support of the ministry, portions of which bread and wine were consecrated for sacramental use. So the sacrifice of gifts from our plenty may have lent its name to the entire accompanying sacramental action. Then the prayers that surround the Sacrament are sacrifices of a pure heart that also could give their name to this central part of worship. Here in celebration of the Sacrament properly belong also the sacrifice of our praises and thanksgiving. Likewise, Chemnitz notes, the exercises of true piety that come together at the Sacrament are called the spiritual sacrifices that we bring to God. Above all, the Lord’s Supper is done “in commemoration of the one and only sacrifice of Christ...who was once offered on the cross for our sins” (Examen II, 442-5, 483-7). The word “eucharist” itself (“thanksgiving”) as a name for the Sacrament is a sacrificial term that does not detract in the least from the purely sacramental nature of the meal itself. Christ’s sacrifice of himself once for all time may have led the church to speak of the Lord’s Supper as sacrifice. In all these ways we could not deny that the Sacrament might properly be called “sacrifice.” But let the reader be clear that when the Roman canon of the mass states that “we your servants, and also your holy people ... offer to your excellent majesty from your gifts and bounty a pure victim, a holy victim, an unspotted victim, the holy bread of eternal life and the cup of everlasting salvation,” it is not calling the Sacrament sacrifice in any of the above senses, but as a propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the world.

A connection may be drawn between the earliest eucharistic prayers and two ancient Jewish prayers, the *Kiddush* and the *Birkath Hammazon*. Since the Sacrament had its origins in the Passover meal in the Upper Room, it ought not be viewed in any way as exceptional that thoughts and phrases from the Jewish Passover prayers should have found their way in a Christianized form into the prayers of the early celebrations of the Sacrament. The third cup of the Passover, filled at the close of the supper, was in fact called by the Jews the cup of blessing, *kom habberakah*, which in high probability corresponded to Paul’s “cup of blessing” in 1 Corinthians 10:16. The Jewish *Kiddush* was prayed by pious Jews at the beginning of the meal on the Sabbath and feast days to dedicate those holy days to God. It comprised two blessings, one said over the cup and the other over the bread. Chapter 9 of the *Didache* shows influences in structure and phraseology of the Jewish *Kiddush* prayer (Mazza, 30-41). The *Birkath Hammazon* was a prayer said at the end of the meal, and contains an explicit reference to Deuteronomy 8:10, which is the basis of the *Birkath*, “When you have eaten and are satisfied, praise the Lord your God...” Chapter 10 of the *Didache*, which like *Didache 9* describes a eucharistic setting without providing us with a full eucharistic prayer, begins with the words: “And after you have had your fill, give thanks...” (*Didache 10:1*). The connection with Deuteronomy 8:10 is unmistakable. In this and other phrases and points of structure a connection between *Didache 10* and the *Birkath Hammazon* is established (Mazza, 16-30).

Justin Martyr in his *First Apology* (c.150 A.D.) relates the customary observance of the Sacrament in his day: “When we have ended the prayers, we greet one another with a kiss. Then bread and a cup of water and of mixed wine are brought to him who presides over the brethren, and he takes them and offers praise and glory to the Father of all in the name of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, and gives thanks at some length that we have been deemed worthy of these things from him. When he has finished the prayers and the thanksgiving, all the people present give their assent by saying, ‘Amen.’ Amen is Hebrew for ‘So be it.’ And when the president has given thanks and all the people have assented, those whom we call deacons give to each one present a portion of the bread and wine and water over which thanks have been given, and take them to those who are not present. And we call this food ‘thanksgiving’” (*Prayers of the Eucharist, 18-19*). Justin goes on to describe what appears to have been standard Christian practice from the earliest times of no one being permitted to partake of the Sacrament unless he assents to the faith, is baptized, and is perceived to live according to the faith. The institution narrative is included in Justin’s account of the Sacrament, but not directly as a part of his eucharistic prayer.

The Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus, dating from c.215 A.D. but thought to represent practice in Rome of as much as 50 years earlier since it openly professes to reflect “the tradition which has remained until now” provides us with the first complete eucharistic prayer, the *Anaphora of Hippolytus*. Here we see the content of the type of blessing and prayer of thanksgiving that Justin is describing above. The influence of the *Birkath Hammazon* remains strong. Given the conservative nature of the transmission of the faith, we have no difficulty envisioning phrases from the Jewish Passover prayers Jesus himself prayed as he instituted the Lord’s Supper in the upper room, surviving in the early eucharistic prayers. The type of prayer of thanksgiving we see in the *Anaphora of Hippolytus* characterized virtually every sacramental celebration from the time of Christ and his apostles to the time of the Reformation.

We are now at a place where we may ask: Does an extended prayer of thanksgiving and remembrance (eucharistic prayer) have a place in our discussions of the liturgy of the Sacrament in the church today? Or perhaps the question may better be phrased in two ways: Is the eucharistic prayer, free of its offensive and unscriptural elements, permissible, i.e., doctrinally acceptable? And, if permissible, is such a prayer advisable, i.e., is this the place and time, and would its reintroduction be of benefit or detriment to the worship and life of God’s people?

At the time of the Reformation Luther removed the entire *Anaphora* or canon of the mass together with the offertory prayers from his *Formula Missae* and *Deutsche Messe*. This was followed by virtually all the Lutheran orders with the exception of the Swedish rite of Olaf Petri (1531) which retained a eucharistic prayer divested of its offensive elements, and that is where matters stood until relatively recent times when the eucharistic prayer has begun to find its way cautiously back into certain Lutheran orders. It is not surprising that Luther did to the canon what he did. The canon carried with it an enormous weight of tradition that could not easily be dislodged. Only a radical action on Luther’s part could have broken through what was so deeply embedded in the canon and in the consciousness of the people, namely, that at the altar at each mass a propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the world was being made. Those who are critical of what Luther did at this point in the service fail to recognize that only by herculean effort was he able to achieve what he did in giving back to the church its Sacrament which it had lost.

What Luther did to the liturgy of the Sacrament gave a new prominence to the Verba which now were made to stand alone and be said aloud or chanted at this critical juncture in the service when the elements were set aside for holy use. Luther wanted the Word of God only to be heard at this high point of the consecration of the Sacrament, unhampered by or mingled with human words (Reed, 79), but he himself violated his own principle by introducing his paraphrase of the Lord’s Prayer at this place in his *Deutsche Messe*, a practice that does not appear to have been followed by any of the Lutheran orders. Luther’s innovation in moving the Lord’s Prayer to a position before the Words of Institution, followed by most Lutheran orders, may reflect his desire to have some prayer at this point in the absence of the eucharistic prayer, and what better prayer than the prayer our Lord himself taught us?

In favor of retaining in our churches the practice that we have received from Luther of the use of the bare Verba in the consecration is the strength that is given to these words when they are allowed to stand alone in their stark simplicity, as opposed to being buried in a lengthy prayer. And indeed the words of Jesus are the very words of consecration since we have no other words from God by which to consecrate the elements. As this writer noted in a 1986 essay on *The History and Use of the Eucharistic Prayer*: “If we allow for the gap of ninety years from the known practice in Corinth in 60 A.D. to the known practice in Rome in c.150, it can be said with certainty that the Words of Institution have been at the center of all Lord’s Supper observance from the very time of Christ and his apostles. Beginning with the Apostolic Tradition and on, I was able to find no instance of a eucharistic prayer that omitted the Verba. This is true of the rites of the Eastern and Western Church, as well as of the independent communion liturgies that developed among the Syriac (Nestorian) Christians in Edessa (the Anaphora of Saints Addai and Mari), the Coptic Euchologion of Sarapion and Liturgy of St. Mark, the Syrian Apostolic Constitutions, the Gallican Liturgy of northern Europe, and the Mozarabic Rite in use among the Visigoths in Spain. Although the wordings of the eucharistic prayers differed from area to area in the church, a binding uniformity is to be found in every place in the incorporating of the Words of Institution into the prayer” (Valleskey, 6).

The use of the bare Verba accords well also with the Western emphasis on the formula of Augustine, first applied by him to baptism, “Accedat verbum ad elementum, et fit sacramentum.” In Scholastic theology Augustine’s formula was given such weight that theologians got into wrangling over the question at which syllable of the Verba the consecration was effected. Since the priest read the Verba in an almost inaudible voice, it took the ringing of the sacring bell at the moment to announce the Presence to the congregation.

And therein lies one criticism that is leveled against the Lutheran use of the Verba alone in the consecration, namely, that it makes us “more Roman than the Romans” (Reed, 350). But in point of fact, the consecration is not at all for us what it is for Rome and never has been. We reject out of hand that any definable moment of the Presence can be found, or is to be sought. Confessionally, we state that it is in the context of a complete sacramental action or use, which includes the consecration or setting aside of the elements for holy use, Christ is truly and substantially present, but the precise moment of that Presence is not known (SD VII,83-84). We may allow that the recitation of the Verba standing alone, apart from all other words and prayers in the consecration in Lutheran churches, may develop in the minds of some a Romanizing idea of moment, but by no means is it certain that it does so. Surveys of what our people believe on the basis of our repeated liturgical action in the Sacrament would reveal the answer to that question. But it is truly amazing that a church that has consistently disavowed all questions regarding the how and when of the Sacrament should be embroiled to the degree that we have been in questions of this nature. Controversies surrounding the moment of the Presence do not properly belong to a study of the eucharistic prayer, yet can hardly be disregarded if we are to answer the charge that the Verba standing alone fix for us the moment.

It is not the minister’s recitation of the Verba that effects the consecration. Christ is the true consecrator of every sacramental meal. Here the words of Chrysostom loom perhaps even larger in Lutheran theology than Augustine’s famous formula. The Formula quotes Chrysostom favorably: “Christ himself prepares this table and blesses it; for no man makes the bread and wine set before us the body and blood of Christ, but Christ himself who was crucified for us” (SD VII,76). Chemnitz comments that just as God’s command once expressed at the beginning of time to his creation to “be fruitful and multiply” had no need to be repeated, but continues to create the fruitfulness of the earth to the present day, so also Christ’s words of institution of the Sacrament in the upper room effect once for all time every subsequent consecration until the end of time. So the Formula: “For the true and almighty words of Jesus Christ which he spoke 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, because of the power and efficacy of the words which Christ spoke at the first Supper” (SD VII,75).

Herman Sasse argues against the use of a eucharistic prayer in Lutheran worship on the grounds that it confuses sacrament with sacrifice, and reduces to a relative clause that which is a declarative (sacramental)

statement of Christ's presence. "It is no accident," he writes, "that the Words of Institution are fitted into the prayers of the Canon of the Mass in the form of a relative clause and thereby become part of a *human prayer*." However beautiful the ancient liturgies may be, "they remain human prayer and take the Words of Institution into human prayer." Sasse sees this "predominance of human prayer" as the reason why the epiclesis, or invocation of the Holy Spirit to change the elements, from the fourth century in the East "has been understood as the actual consecration in the place of the *verba testamenti*." The nearly inaudible praying of the canon and the hiding of the Verba among purely human prayers are why "Luther, when he began to reform the Mass, immediately made two liturgical changes; The *words of the Lord's Supper* were to be chanted *aloud* by the liturgist, and the framing of Christ's words with a whole series of prayers was completely set aside" (Sasse, "*We Confess the Sacraments*," 128-130).

Honesty compels us to say that Sasse's argument is less than fully convincing here. For after all, did not Luther himself in his Latin mass set the words of the institution narrative into a relative clause attached in prayer-form to the Preface? The exact words of Luther the celebrant in consecrating the elements in his Latin mass, in translation, were: "It is truly meet and right, just and salutary for us to give thanks to you always and everywhere, Holy Lord, Father Almighty, Eternal God, through Christ our Lord, who the day before he suffered, took bread, and when he had given thanks, broke it, and gave it to his disciples, saying, Take, eat; this is my body, etc.?" That so meticulous and careful a theologian as Sasse could have simply ignored Luther's "qui pridie" is hard to understand.

Additionally, in March 1525 Hausmann sent several German masses to Luther for his evaluation, including one produced by Kaspar Kantz of Nördlingen (1522) and a surprisingly solid service by Thomas Muenzer of Allstedt in (1523), both including the Verba in prayer-form. Luther replied that he had "no objection against having them sung in this manner" (LW53,54). The Muenzer mass was adopted in a slightly revised form at Erfurt and submitted to Luther, who gave it his stamp of approval at the end of October 1525. The Kantz German mass has, after the Sanctus, "O all-good Father, merciful, eternal God, help that this bread and the wine become for us and be the true body and the pure blood of your beloved Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, who on the day before his suffering took bread in his holy hands...." (*Through the Church*, 60). Olavus Petri, a student of Luther in Wittenberg in 1516, sometimes called the "Luther of Sweden," produced a eucharistic prayer, shorn of its unbiblical elements, that was published in his order of 1531. Luther approved of what he had done. Chemnitz made extensive use of it in drawing up the 1569 Brunswick order.

Therefore it is disingenuous to argue that Luther opposed the eucharistic prayer on the grounds that it was prayer or that it set the words of institution into a relative clause. This must be frankly said.

When the argument is advanced that the words of consecration of the Sacrament ought under no circumstances be set in sacrificial words of prayer lest we confuse sacramental and sacrificial elements of worship, we will stand with Luther as celebrant in recognizing that prayer can have in it strong elements of proclamation, as when we pray in the public assembly of God's people: "O Lord, almighty God, turn our hearts to repentance, and set our eyes on Jesus, the author and finisher of our faith, who for the joy that was set before him gave himself freely on the cross of Calvary to redeem us from sin and death, that all who put their faith in him might have forgiveness and eternal life." Who would deny that such a prayer has in it a strong proclamation of the gospel capable of turning hearts from unbelief to faith? This is not to confuse sacrament with sacrifice anymore than Luther's "qui pridie" destroyed the sacramental character of the Lord's Supper that he consecrated with those words.

Johann Gerhard in his *A Comprehensive Explanation of Holy Baptism and the Lord's Supper (1610)* lists as reasons why the celebrant must recite the words of institution in every consecration of the Sacrament: first, to show that it is not he but Christ who is administering this holy meal. Secondly, he sets aside bread and wine for holy use. Thirdly, *he inwardly prays that Christ would be present in this sacramental action according to his promise, and that along with the present bread and wine he distributes his body and blood* (emphasis mine). Fourthly, he testifies with Christ's words that the bread is the fellowship of Christ's body and the cup is the fellowship of Christ's blood (Gerhard, 224-225). Certainly, Gerhard was not suggesting that our prayer, and not Christ himself through his words, effects his presence in the Sacrament, but he has no problem with prayer

in this place. That this was not a momentary lapse by Gerhard may be seen in his repeating the instruction at a later place that in the consecration “he [the celebrant] prays that, in accordance with his institution and promise, Christ would be present in this action, and that by means of the consecrated bread and wine he might distribute Christ’s body and blood” (Gerhard, 301-302).

Therefore we may conclude that doctrinally there is no argument against the use of a greater thanksgiving and remembrance in connection with the consecration of the Sacrament such as may be found in a eucharistic prayer freed of the erroneous accretions that had accumulated through the centuries.

To say that the use of a eucharistic prayer in our services of holy communion is permissible is not the same thing as to say it is advisable. “Everything is permissible for me — but not everything is beneficial” (1 Co 6:12). Pastoral considerations will lead us always to weigh what the body can bear. God in his grace to this point has spared us in WELS the worship wars that have plagued Missouri over the past couple of decades. If the use of a eucharistic prayer would be deemed advisable in our churches, we would want to introduce it accompanied only by the most careful and patient instruction. To show how strong opinions can be in this area, listen to how one recent Missourian inveighs against the use of the eucharistic prayer: “The most significant theological error of a eucharistic prayer is that a prayer—any prayer—is a sacrificial act of man toward God, not a sacramental act of God toward man,” which is in harmony with Roman Catholicism, but in direct opposition to Lutheranism. “Second, the inclusion of the Words of Institution in a prayer violates the nature of those words” as testament and not request. “Third, the Sacrament is the *Lord’s* Supper, not the Christian’s supper,” such as Zwingli favored, a concept that must be rejected. “Fourth, the use of a eucharistic prayer violates the *sola scriptura* hermeneutic” by approaching liturgy and liturgical forms on the basis of history and tradition rather than starting from the standpoint of the Scriptures themselves. And “fifth, the use of a eucharistic prayer opens the door for a false ecumenism” (*Through the Church*, 53-54). These charges against the eucharistic prayer, even a revised and purified prayer, of theological error, Romanizing, and violation of *sola scriptura*, as ungrounded and imbalanced and invalid as they may be, carry a serious threat to the unity of a confessional Lutheran church body, which we will not want to minimize or make light of. But they underscore the confusion that can reign among confessional Lutherans on this controverted issue.

The concerns for a false ecumenism that our Missourian friend raises will resonate with us in light of the path the ELCA has followed in recent years in its relations with the Roman and other church bodies. Luther Reed wrote that one stated desire of those who framed the 1958 “Service Book and Hymnal” with its inclusion of the eucharistic prayer was “by the restoration of such a prayer or blessing to retrieve the Lutheran Liturgy from its isolation and to incorporate it again with the universal tradition” (Reed, 336).

We have established, we would hope in an adequate way, the permissibility of the use of the eucharistic prayer in our churches, but have not yet spoken to what, if any, may be its benefits. What reasons might be brought forward in its favor? What this writer sees, first of all, is that a greater thanksgiving for and remembrance of Christ’s sacrifice and death in the church is always “truly good and right . . . at all times and in all places.” An objective eucharistic prayer grounded in the work of Christ for us offers a good liturgical balance over against *ex corde* prayers of the church that may tend, given the temper of the times, more in the direction of subjectivity and contemporary concerns than the objective work of God in Christ. Good liturgy is always great for this purpose. Secondly, the ecumenical argument can run both ways. A true ecumenism ties us to the church of all times in a proper sense, which has always been a principle of the conservative Lutheran Reformation. It was a driving principle in Luther’s liturgical reforms. Thirdly, in times when there is the temptation for everyone to do his own thing liturgically, doubtless some also in WELS will be led to experiment with the eucharistic prayer. Is it not wisdom then that we ask those among us who are best qualified to craft such a prayer to do it for us and do it right, and offer it as an optional part of the liturgy for those who desire to use it?

Our recommendation in this matter is that we continue to look carefully at the eucharistic prayer in our liturgical discussions in WELS. While the use of a eucharistic prayer may be permissible and may commend itself in a number of ways to our worship practices, only the most careful study and evaluation would determine its suitability and advisability.

There is one additional matter that I would like to take up here. One cannot read the works of Dr. Martin Luther without being struck by the fact that over and again in many places the great reformer stresses the primacy of the Word in the worship and life of the church. In his *Explanations of the Ninety-five Theses* (1518) he writes that “nothing in the church must be treated with greater care than the holy gospel since the church has nothing which is more precious and salutary. Therefore it is the only single work which Christ enjoined upon his disciples at so many different times.... It is better to omit the Sacrament than not to proclaim the gospel. Therefore God has placed greater importance on the gospel than on the mass, for without the gospel man does not live in the Spirit, but he does without the mass” (LW31,210). In his 1523 *Concerning the Order of Public Worship* he writes that “first of all a Christian congregation should never gather together without the preaching of God’s Word and prayer, no matter how briefly” (LW53,11). “The daily masses,” he goes on to say, “should be completely discontinued, for the Word is important and not the mass. But if any should desire the Sacrament during the week, let mass be held as inclination and time dictate” (LW53,13). In 1533 he wrote that “the word of God is the greatest, most necessary, and most sublime part in Christendom (for the sacraments cannot exist without the word, but indeed the word can exist without the sacraments, and in an emergency one could be saved without the sacraments—as for example, those who die before receiving the desired baptism—but not without the word)” (LW38,189). “It is better to abandon everything else except the Word,” he writes. “Christ himself, also, says, Luke 10:42—One thing is needful, namely that Mary sit at the feet of Christ and hear his Word daily” (PE6,63-64).

Personally I have been an avid follower of the Liturgical Movement all my ministry which spans back to 1966. I have devoured and treasured the writings on the Sacrament by Hermann Sasse, truly one of God’s great gifts to the church. These helped me grow in my formative years in appreciation of the priceless treasure God has given us in the Holy Sacrament. Back in my early days in the ministry I participated in the annual liturgical conferences at Valparaiso University. Those were heady days when all the major Lutheran bodies were stirred by thoughts of liturgical renewal as we anticipated the production of new Lutheran books of worship, and sacramental renewal was at the heart of much of what was on the agenda. But through all this I hear also the voice of Luther, unmistakably, calling us to balance in our approach to worship.

Reim in his *Quartalschrift* article on the liturgical crisis in Wittenberg in 1524 notes an interesting sequel to the reform of the worship in the Castle Church. At the end of 1524 the college of clerics at All Saints had submitted to the principles of the Reformation in their worship. However, every service remained a mass. The agreement had stipulated that the Sacrament was to be observed only on Sundays and high festivals, and that only if there were communicants present. When on more than one occasion there was only one communicant recorded at the All Saints’ worship, it soon became evident that the chapter had put their heads together and connived to make sure one of them was present every Sunday to justify having communion at every service. Luther soon put a stop to that. This was obviously not meeting a need for the Sacrament but ritualism and formalism at its worst. The Sacrament thereafter was to be celebrated at All Saints only when the Elector or members of his court were present. At other times the All Saints’ clergy were to commune at the Parish Church with the Wittenberg congregation.

Reim remarks that this was not an indication of a petty, vindictive spirit on Luther’s part. “For Luther the very greatness of the Sacramental Gift presupposed a genuine, unfeigned demand for its administration. Our generation can learn much from this attitude of Luther. If the Liturgical Movement of our day will see its mission in reviving the interest of the Church in the Sacrament which has been entrusted to it, and in stimulating an increased desire in our congregations for the blessings which are thereby conferred upon us, and if the exponents of this movement will content themselves with patient Scriptural indoctrination and evangelical invitation and persuasion as their means for attaining this end, then they will certainly be rendering a service of the highest order. And if such efforts will lead to a situation where it becomes advisable to provide more frequent opportunities for communion, such steps will surely be welcomed by all concerned. But if the argument for a more frequent celebration of the Sacrament is to consist of attempts to discredit our present Sunday worship because it often is ‘merely’ a service of the Word, if the communion is treated as a liturgical

requirement which is needed either for the sake of completeness of the service or for the sake of ancient tradition, then we are on the way to the ritualism against which Luther protested so vigorously” (Reim, 174-5).

Reim quotes a Sasse article in *Una Sancta*: “It has nevertheless become more abundantly clear that there can be no worship revival without a rediscovery of the Real Presence. The worshippers must know what they receive in the Holy Communion before they can desire it again. It is not the beauty of the Communion Liturgy that can renovate the celebration of Holy Communion, which has fallen into desuetude even in some Lutheran churches. That can be accomplished only by a hunger and a thirst after that which is received at the Lord’s Table. Only faith in the Sacramental Gift to which the Catechism testifies can renovate our celebrations of Holy Communion and therewith our services. Everything else will remain mere fruitless religious estheticism which one can have in other religions as well” (quoted in Reim, 175).

As we assess the measure of the man deemed one of a handful of the most important personages of the last millennium, we cannot ignore the far-ranging impact of the liturgical contributions of Dr. Martin Luther. Those who set Luther’s two orders of divine service, his Latin and German masses, against each other miss the greatness of the reformer that shows itself brilliantly also in this area of his work. The *Formula Missae* is not Luther’s preferred way of worship, with the *Deutsche Messe* representing just an accommodation for the sake of the illiterate, uneducated masses, who when they have attained to a higher status will then be brought up to the level of the *Formula Missae*. Luther does not set high against low or low against high. Nor is the *Deutsche Messe* to be misconstrued as the culmination of Luther’s liturgical passage, with the *Formula Missae* a less than fully reformed stop along the way. Both services have their place, and taken together, they constitute the genius of the reformer also in his approach to Christian liturgy and worship, which is unity in diversity and diversity in unity, with nothing forced, and the Word of God thoroughly permeating and central to all. But if we wish to assess the greatness of Luther in the area of liturgy and worship, this writer can think of no better way to sum it up than in the single sentence: he gave the church back its Sacrament.

Bibliography

Apostolic Fathers, The. Edgar J. Goodspeed, trans. Harper & Bros., New York, 1950.

Bainton, Roland. *Here I Stand: A Life of Martin Luther*, Abingdon Press, New York, 1950.

Chemnitz, Martin. *The Lord's Supper*, CPH. St. Louis, 1979.

Chemnitz, Martin. *Examination of the Council of Trent, Part II*. Concordia, St. Louis, 1978.

Gerhard, Johann, *A Comprehensive Explanation of Holy Baptism and the Lord's Supper (1610)*, Repristination Press, Malone, Texas, 2000.

Jasper, R.C.D. & G.J. Cuning. *Prayers of the Eucharist*. Oxford University, New York, 1980.

Luther's Works. Concordia, St. Louis & Fortress, Philadelphia

Works on the Sacrament here arranged chronologically:

1519 The Blessed Sacrament of the Holy and True Body of Christ and the Brotherhoods (35,45-73)

1520 A Treatise on the New Testament, that is, the Holy Mass (35,75-111)

1520 The Babylonian Captivity of the Church (36-3-126)

1521 Abrogation of the Private Mass (Latin)/The Misuse of the Mass (German) (36,127-230)

1522 Receiving Both Kinds in the Sacrament (36,231-267)

1522 The Eight Sermons at Wittenberg (51,67-100)

1523 Concerning the Public Order of Worship (53,7-14)

1523 An Order of Mass and Communion for the Church at Wittenberg (53,15-40)

1523 The Adoration of the Sacrament (36,269-305)

1524 Letter to Christians at Strassburg in Opposition to the Fanatic Spirit (40,59-70)

1525 Against the Heavenly Prophets in the Matter of Images and Sacraments

1525 The Abomination of the Secret Mass (36,307-328)

1525 A Christian Exhortation to the Livonians Concerning Public Worship and Concord (53,41-50)

1525 An Exhortation to the Communicants (53,104-105)

1526 The Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ Against the Fanatics (36,329-361)

1526 The German Mass and Order of Service (53,51-90)

1527 That These Words of Christ, "This is my Body," Still Stand Firm Against the Fanatics (37,3-150)

1528 Confession Concerning Christ's Supper (37,151-372)

1529 The Marburg Colloquy and the Marburg Articles (38,3-89)

1530 Sermon on the Lord's Supper (51,182-188)

1530 Admonition Concerning the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Our Lord (38,91-137)

1533 The Private Mass and the Consecration of Priests (38,139-214)

1534 A Letter of Dr. Martin Luther Concerning His Book on the Private Mass (38,215-233)

1539 The Disputation Concerning the Passage: "The Word Was Made Flesh" (38,235-277)

1544 Brief Confession Concerning the Holy Sacrament (38,279-319)

Also some valuable materials from the three volumes of Luther's Works on the *Letters* (vol. 48,49,50), and some useful materials in the two volumes on the *Sermons* (vol. 51-52).

Lutheran Book of Worship. Augsburg, Minneapolis, 1978.

Lutheran Worship. Concordia, St. Louis, 1982.

- Manual on the Liturgy—Lutheran Book of Worship*. Augsburg, Minneapolis, 1979.
- Mazza, Enrico. *The Origins of the Eucharistic Prayer*, The Liturgical Press, Collegeville, Minnesota, 1995.
- Pieper, Francis. *Christian Dogmatics*. Vol. III, Concordia, St. Louis, 1953.
- Reed, Luther. *The Lutheran Liturgy*., Muhlenberg, Philadelphia, 1947.
- Reim, Edmund. *The Liturgical Crisis in Wittenberg, 1524*, in “Quartalschrift,” vol. 45, No. 3, October, 1948.
- Sasse, Hermann. *This Is My Body*. Augsburg Minneapolis, 1959.
- Sasse, Hermann. *We Confess the Sacraments*, CPH, St. Louis, 1985.
- Through the Church the Song Goes On: Preparing a Lutheran Hymnal for the 21st Century*, Commission on Worship, LC-MS, 1999.
- Valleskey, Stephen. *The History and Use of the Eucharistic Prayer*, unpublished essay, 1986.
- Works of Martin Luther*. Philadelphia Edition. Vol. 6: “Liturgy and Hymns.” Muhlenberg, Philadelphia, 1932.
- Worship Supplement*, Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, 1969.

Appendix 1

Jewish Prayers

Kiddush	Birkath Hammazon
<p>Blessed are you, Lord our God, Ruler of the Universe, who creates fruit of the vine.</p> <p>Blessed are you, Lord our God, Ruler of the Universe, who made us holy with the commandments, took pleasure in us, and with love and favor gave us the holy Sabbath as a heritage, a reminder of Creation. It is the first among our days of sacred assembly recalling the Exodus from Egypt. Thus you have chosen us, endowing us with the holiness, from among all peoples by granting us your holy Sabbath lovingly and gladly.</p> <p>Blessed are you, Lord, who makes Sabbath holy.</p>	<p><i>Blessing of him who nourishes</i> Blessed are you, Lord our God, King of the universe, for you nourish us and the whole world with goodness, grace, kindness and mercy. Blessed are you, Lord, for you nourish the universe.</p> <p><i>Blessing for the earth</i> We will give thanks to you, Lord our God, because you have given us for our inheritance a desirable land, good and wide, the covenant and the law, life and food.</p> <p><i>(On the feasts of Hanukkah and Purim, here follows an embolism.)</i> And for all these things we give you thanks and bless your name for ever and beyond. Blessed are you, Lord our God, for the earth and for food.</p> <p><i>Blessing for Jerusalem</i> Have mercy, Lord our God, on us your people Israel, and your city Jerusalem, on your sanctuary and your dwelling-place, on Zion, the habitation of your glory, and the great and holy house over which your name is invoked. Restore the kingdom of the house of David to its place in our days, and speedily build Jerusalem.</p> <p><i>(On the feast of Passover, here follows this embolism.)</i> Our God and God of our fathers, may there arise in your sight, and come, and be present, and be regarded, and be pleasing, and be heard, and be visited, and be remembered our remembrance and our visitation, and the remembrance of our fathers, and the remembrance of the Messiah, the son of your servant David, and the remembrance of Jerusalem, the city of your holiness, and the remembrance of all your people, the house of Israel: for escape, for prosperity, for grace, and for loving-kindness and merry, for life and for peace, on this day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread. Remember us on this day, Lord our God, for prosperity, and visit us on it for blessing, and save us on it for life. And by the word of salvation and mercy spare us, and grant us grace, and have mercy on us, and save us: for our eyes look to you, for you, O God, are a gracious and merciful king. Blessed are you, Lord, for you build Jerusalem. Amen.)</p> <p><i>Blessing of the good and beneficent</i> Blessed are you, Lord our God, King of the universe, God, our father, our king, our creator, our redeemer, good and beneficent king, who day by day is concerned to benefit us in many ways, and himself will increase us for ever in grace and kindness and spirit and mercy and every good thing.</p>

Appendix 2

Didache, c.60-125	The Mass of the Roman Rite, c.600		
<p>CHAPTER 9 Now about the Thanksgiving, give thanks thus: First about the cup, "We thank you, our Father, for the holy vine of your servant David, which you have made known to us through your servant Jesus. Glory to you forever." And about the piece of bread, "We thank you, our Father, for the life and knowledge you have made known to us through Jesus your servant. Glory be yours forever. Just as this piece of bread was scattered over the mountains, and then was gathered together and became one, so let your church be gathered together from the ends of the earth into your kingdom. For the glory and the power are yours through Jesus Christ forever." But let no one eat or drink of your Thanksgiving but those who have been baptized in the name of the Lord. For it was of this that the Lord said, "Do not give the dogs what is sacred."</p> <p>CHAPTER 10 After you are satisfied, give thanks thus: "We give you thanks, Holy Father, for your holy name, which you have made dwell in our hearts, and for knowledge and faith and immortality, which you have made known to us through Jesus your Servant; glory to you forever. You, almighty Master, have created all things for your name's sake, you have given men food and drink to enjoy, that they may give you thanks, but you have granted us spiritual food and drink and everlasting life through your servant. Above all we thank you that you are mighty; glory to you forever. Remember, Lord, your church, to save it from all evil and to make it perfect in your love, and gather it together in its holiness from the four winds, into your kingdom which you have prepared for it. For the power and the glory are yours forever. Let your favor come and this world pass away. Hosanna to the God of David! If anyone is holy, let him come; if anyone is not, let him repent. Lord, come quickly! Amen." But permit the prophets to give thanks as much as they please.</p>	<p>THE CANON <i>Priest:</i> The Lord be with you. <i>People:</i> And with your spirit. <i>Priest:</i> Up with your hearts. <i>People:</i> We have them with the Lord. <i>Priest:</i> Let to give thanks to the Lord our God. <i>People:</i> It is fitting and right. <i>Priest:</i> It is fitting and right, our duty and our salvation, that we should always and everywhere give you thanks, O Lord, holy Father, almighty eternal God, through Christ our Lord; through whom angels praise, dominions adore, powers fear, the heavens and the heavenly hosts and the blessed seraphim, joining together in exultation celebrate your majesty. We pray you, bid our voices to be admitted with theirs, beseeching you, confessing you, and saying: <i>People:</i> Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of Sabaoth. Heaven and earth are full of your glory. Hosanna in the highest. Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord. Hosanna in the highest. <i>Priest:</i> We therefore pray and beseech you, most merciful Father, through your Son Jesus Christ our Lord, to accept and bless these gifts, these offerings, these holy and unblemished sacrifices; above all, those which we offer to you for your holy catholic Church: vouchsafe to grant it peace, protection, unity, and guidance throughout the world, together with your servant <i>N.</i> our pope, and <i>N.</i> our bishop, and all orthodox upholders of the catholic and apostolic faith. Remember, Lord, your servants, men and women, and all who stand around (us), whose faith and devotion are known to you, for whom we offer to you or who offer to you this sacrifice of praise for themselves and for their own, for the redemption of their souls, for the hope of their salvation and safety, and pay their vows to you, the living, true and eternal God. In fellowship with, (<i>here a seasonal clause may follow</i>) and venerating the memory</p>	<p>above all of the glorious ever-virgin Mary, Mother of our God and Lord Jesus Christ, and also of your blessed apostles and martyrs Peter, Paul, Andrew, James, John, Thomas, James, Philip, Bartholomew, Matthew, Simon and Thaddaeus, Linus, Cletus, Clement, Xystus, Cornelius, Cyprian, Lawrence, Chrysogonus, John and Paul, Cosmas and Damian, and all your saints, by whose merits and prayers grant us to be defended in all things by the help of your protection; through Christ our Lord. Therefore, Lord, we pray you graciously to accept this offering made by us, your servants, and also by your whole family; and to order our days in peace; and to command that we are snatched from eternal damnation and numbered among the flock of your elect; through Christ our Lord. Vouchsafe, we beseech you, O God, to make this offering wholly blessed, approved, ratified, reasonable, and acceptable; that it may become to us the body and blood of your dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ our Lord; who, on the day before he suffered, took bread in his holy and reverend hands, lifted up his eyes to heaven to you, his almighty God and Father, gave thanks to you, blessed, broke, and gave it to his disciples, saying, "Take and eat from this, all of you; for this is my body." Likewise after supper, taking also this glorious cup in his holy and reverend hands, again he gave thanks to you, blessed, and gave it to his disciples, saying, "Take and drink from it, all of you; for this is the cup of my blood, of the new and eternal covenant, the mystery of faith, which will be shed for you and for many for forgiveness of sins. As often as you do this, you will do it for my remembrance." Therefore also, Lord, we your servants, and also your holy people, have in remembrance the blessed passion of your Son Christ our Lord, likewise his resurrection from the dead,</p>	<p>and also his glorious ascension into heaven; we offer to your excellent majesty from your gifts and bounty a pure victim, a holy victim, an unspotted victim, the holy bread of eternal life and the cup of everlasting salvation. Vouchsafe to look upon them with a favorable and kindly countenance, and accept them as you vouchsafed to accept the gifts of your righteous servant Abel, and the sacrifice of our patriarch Abraham, and that which your high-priest Melchizedek offered to you, a holy sacrifice, an unblemished victim. We humbly beseech you, almighty God, to bid them be borne by the hands of your angel to your altar on high, in the sight of your divine majesty, that all of us who have received the most holy body and blood of your Son by partaking at this altar may be filled with all heavenly blessing and grace; through Christ our Lord. Remember also, Lord, the names of those who have gone before us with the sign of faith, and sleep in the sleep of peace. We beseech you to grant to them and to all who rest in Christ a place of restoration, light, and peace; through Christ our Lord To us sinners your servants also, who trust in the multitude of your mercies, vouchsafe to grant some part and fellowship with your holy apostles and martyrs, with John, Stephen, Matthias, Barnabas, Ignatius, Alexander, Marcellinus, Peter, Felicity, Perpetua, Agatha, Lucy, Agnes, Cecilia, Anastasia, and with all your saints: into whose company we ask that you will admit us, not weighing our merit, but bounteously forgiving through Christ our Lord. Through him, Lord, you ever create, sanctify, quicken, bless and bestow all these good things on us. Through him and with him and in him all honor and glory is yours, O God the Father almighty, in the unity of the Holy Spirit, through all the ages of ages. Amen.</p>

Appendix 3

Eucharistic Prayers Ancient and Modern

Hippolytus, 215	Olavus Petri 1531	SBH 1958	LW 1982
<p>Thanks be to you, O Lord, because in these last days you did send to us your beloved Servant, Jesus Christ, to be our Savior and our Redeemer and the Messenger of your will;</p> <p>Who is your Word inseparable from you;</p> <p>Through whom you made all things and with whom you were well pleased;</p> <p>Whom you did send from heaven into the womb of the Virgin, and who, having been conceived within her, became flesh, and was manifested as your Son, being born of the Holy Spirit and a virgin;</p> <p>Who, when he was betrayed to his voluntary suffering, in order that he might abolish death, break the bonds of the adversary, tread hell underfoot, give light to the righteous, establish a memorial, and manifest the resurrection, took bread, gave thanks to you, and said:</p> <p>Take, eat; this is my body, which is broken for you.</p> <p>Likewise also the cup, saying:</p> <p>This is my blood, which is poured out for you. As often as you do this, you shall do it in remembrance of me.</p> <p>Therefore, having in remembrance his death and resurrection, we give thanks to you, because you have counted us worthy to stand before you and to serve you.</p> <p>Gather into one, we pray you, all your holy people who partake hereof; fill them with your Holy Spirit for the confirmation of their faith in the truth; and grant that we may praise and glorify you though your Servant, Jesus Christ,</p> <p>Through whom all honor and glory belongs to you, the Father and the Son with the Holy Spirit, in your holy Church, both now and forever. Amen.</p>	<p>Truly it is meet, right and blessed that we should in all places give you thanks and praise, holy Lord, almighty Father, everlasting God, for all your benefits; and especially for that benefit which you gave us when by reason of sins we were all in so bad a case that nothing but damnation and eternal death awaited us, and no creature in heaven or earth could help us. Then you sent forth your only-begotten son Jesus Christ, who was of the same divine nature as yourself; you suffered him to become a man for our sake; you laid our sins upon him; and you suffered him to undergo death instead of our all dying eternally. And as he has overcome death and risen again and now is alive for evermore, so likewise shall all those who put their trust in him overcome sin and death and through him attain to everlasting life. And for our admonition that we should bear in mind and never forget his benefit, in the night that he was betrayed, he celebrated a supper, in which he took the bread in his holy hands, gave thanks to his heavenly Father, blessed it, broke it, and gave it to his disciples, and said: Take and eat; this is my body which is given for you; do this in remembrance of me.</p> <p><i>Then the priest lifts it up, lays it down again, and takes the cup, saying:</i></p> <p>Likewise also he took the sup in his holy hands, gave thanks to his heavenly Father, blessed it and gave it to his disciples and said: take and drink all of this; this is the cup of the new testament in my book, which is shed for you and for many for the remission of sins; as often as you drink it, do this in remembrance of me.</p> <p><i>Then he lifts it up and sets it down again.</i></p>	<p>Holy art thou, Almighty and Merciful God, Holy art thou, and great is the Majesty of thy glory.</p> <p>Thou didst so love the world as to give thine only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him might not perish, but have everlasting life; Who, having come into the world to fulfill for us thy holy will and to accomplish all things for our salvation, in the night in which he was betrayed, took bread; and, when he had given thanks, he brake it and gave it to his disciples, saying, Take, eat; this is my Body, which is given for you; this do in remembrance of me.</p> <p><i>(a) Here he shall take the Bread in his hand.</i></p> <p>After the same manner also, he took the cup, when he had supped, and, when he had given thanks, he gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; this cup is the New Testament in my Blood, which is shed for you, and for many, for the remission of sins; this do, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me.</p> <p><i>(b) Here he shall take the Cup in his hand.</i></p> <p>Remembering, therefore, his salutary precept, his life-giving Passion and Death, his glorious Resurrection and Ascension and the promise of his coming again, we give thanks to thee, O Lord God Almighty, not as we ought, but as we are able; and we beseech thee mercifully to accept our praise and thanksgiving, and with thy Word and Holy Spirit to bless us, thy servants, and these thine own gifts of bread and wine, so that we and all who partake thereof may be filled with heavenly benediction and grace, and, receiving the remission of sins, be sanctified in soul and body, and have our portion with all thy saints.</p> <p>And unto thee, O God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, be all honor and glory in thy holy Church, world without end. Amen.</p>	<p>Lord of heaven and earth, we praise and thank you for having had mercy on those whom you created, sending your only-begotten Son into our flesh to bear our sin and be our Savior. With repentant joy we receive the salvation accomplished for us by the all-availing sacrifice of his body and his blood on the cross.</p> <p>Gathered in the name and the remembrance of Jesus, we beg you, O Lord, to forgive, renew, and strengthen us with your Word and Spirit. Grant us faithfully to eat his body and drink his blood as he bids us do in his own testament. Hear us as we pray in his name and as he has taught us.</p> <p><i>Lord's Prayer</i></p> <p><i>Words of Institution chanted or said</i></p>