

# **A Study in the Augsburg Confession: Article XXII: Both Kinds in the Sacrament Article XXIV: The Mass**

*By: David Krueger*

To the laity are given Both Kinds in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, because this usage has the commandment of the Lord in Matt. 26,27: Drink ye all of it, there Christ has manifestly commanded concerning the cup that all should drink.

And lest any man should craftily say that this refers only to priests, Paul in 2 Cor. 11:27 recites an example from which it appears that the whole congregation did use both kinds. And this usage has long remained in the Church, nor is it known when, or by whose authority, it has changed; although Cardinal Cusanus mentions the time when it was approved. Cyprian in some places testifies that the blood was given to the people. The same is testified by Jerome, who says: The priests administer the Eucharist, and distribute the blood of Christ to the people. Indeed, Pope Gelasius commands that the Sacrament be not divided (dist. II, *De Consecratione*, cap. Comperimus). Only custom, not so ancient, has it otherwise. But it is evident that any custom introduced against the commandments of God is not to be allowed, as the Canons witness (dist. III., cap. *Veritate*, and the following chapters). But this custom has been received, not only against the Scripture, but also against the old Canons and the example of the Church. Therefore, if any preferred to use both kinds of the Sacrament, they ought not to have been compelled with offense to their consciences to do otherwise. And because the division of the Sacrament does not agree with the ordinance of Christ, we are accustomed to snit the procession, which hitherto has been in use.

The Roman Catholic doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, as they usually call the Lord's Supper, freely acknowledges that communion is to be celebrated in both kinds for this sacrament to be effective as Christ instituted it. However, the Catholic Church carefully divides the Eucharist into two parts and two uses, namely: sacrifice and sacrament. As a sacrifice, the use of both bread and wine in the Lord's Supper is insisted upon, upon pain of mortal sin by the priest if only one kind is used. As a sacrament, however, the Catholic Church has charged both Christ's institution and the rules of the Church, and insists on distribution of the sacrament to the laity in one kind only.<sup>i</sup>

How the Roman Church can insist so strongly upon such opposite views and uses of the same institution of Christ and sacrament in the Church, is somewhat of a mystery. The Lutheran reformers complained that if they could find a rational Roman theologian, then they could argue the use of only one kind in the sacrament with him, and win purely on the basis of reason, besides having the Word of God and the history of the Christian Church on their side. The problem was, and still is, that the Roman Church does not take even a rational approach to the use and reception of the Lord's Supper as a sacrament. This led Luther to complain:

“I am much amazed by their assertion that the priests may never receive only one kind in the mass under pain of mortal sin; and that for no other reason except (as they unanimously say) that the two kinds constitute one complete sacrament which may not be divided. I ask them, therefore, to tell me why it is lawful to divide it in the case of the laity, and why they are the only ones, to whom the entire sacrament is not given? Do they not acknowledge, by their own testimony, either that both kinds are to be given to the laity, or that the sacrament is not valid when only one kind is given to them? How may it be that the sacrament in only one kind is not complete in the case of the priests, yet in the case of the laity it is complete?”<sup>ii</sup>

The standard Roman Catholic argument for withholding the cup from the laity in the use of the sacrament is their doctrine of “concomitance.” Alexander of Hales<sup>iii</sup> had originated the phrase, and the doctrine was developed by Thomas Aquinas<sup>iv</sup> to the form in which it was accepted by the Council of Trent.<sup>v</sup> The Roman Church argues in this doctrine that, since every living body must contain blood, then Christ’s blood must also be present in His body, which is the host received in the Holy Eucharist.<sup>vi</sup> In fact, the Roman Church goes even further in their argument:

“Rome believes that the charge of sarcophagy (eating of flesh) would be in place if any one asserted that in the Eucharist merely the flesh and the blood of Christ were received. Rume admits that by virtue of the words of consecration only the body and the blood are present, but claims that by reason of a natural concomitance there is simultaneously present all which is physically inseparable from the body and the blood, namely, the soul and the humanity of Christ and, by virtue of the personal unions also His divinity. Christ, whole and entire, with his flesh and blood, His body and soul, His deity and humanity, is present.”<sup>vii</sup>

Thus, although Christ clearly separated the bread and the cup when He instituted the Lord’s Supper, and said of the bread, “This is my body,” and of the cup, “This cup is the new testament in my blood,” the Roman Church insists on throwing both together and declaring of the host: “This is Christ’s body and His blood.” And they also add, totally on their own, “This is also Christ’s soul, and His humanity, and His deity.” They have clearly gone overboard in their attempts to explain to the laity of their church why they should be satisfied with less of a sacrament than Christ instituted for them, and less than the priests receive.

The development of the argument for giving the laity only one kind in the Eucharist of the Roman Church is fairly easy to trace historically, the development of the practice is not. The *Augsburg Confession* mentions that Cyprian, the Bishop of Carthage, who died in 258, and St. Jerome, who translated the Vulgate for the Roman Church, and who died in 420, mentioned that it was celebrated with both kinds at their times. Since the time of the reformation, the *Didache*, a widely used manual for the early Christian Church which dates to 80 - 120, has been rediscovered. The *Didache* directs that baptized Christians should be admitted to eat and drink of the Supper.<sup>viii</sup>

The first mention of any other practice than administering the sacrament in both kinds, is by Pope Gelasius, who was the Bishop of Rome from 492 to 496. Gelasius opposed the use of only one kind in the sacrament, as an error of the Manichean sect.<sup>ix</sup> Gelasius ordered the sacrament celebrated in both kinds to reveal secret Manichaeans in the Church. Even Pope Paschalis II, who died in 1113, protested against any withholding of the cup from the laity in the celebration of the Eucharist. This is why the Augsburg Confession states that “only custom, not so ancient, has it otherwise.”

The first mention, of any regular use of communion in one kind, and defense of withholding the cup from the laity, is by Cardinal Nicolas of Cusa, who died in 1464. He reported that the Fourth Lateran Council, of 1215, was the first to prescribe the use of the host only in communing the laity. They expressly acknowledged that Jesus had instituted the use of both kinds in the sacrament. Yet “this notwithstanding” they ordered the mutilated form.<sup>x</sup>

The later Councils of Constance, held in 1415, and of Basel, held in 143, enacted ordinances to this effect.<sup>xi</sup>

The reason advanced by the Roman Church for the practice of giving only one kind to the laity in the Eucharist is that “in administering the cup some of the wine is liable to be spilt, and that therefore ordinary prudence requires us not to administer it lest offense should be given by the occurrence of such an accident.”<sup>xii</sup> This however, is not the real reason for the invention of this practice, and their insistence on maintaining it even today.

The real reason for the withholding of the cup froth the laity in the Roman Church is to create an unscriptural distinction between the clergy and the laity in the Church.<sup>xiii</sup> Only the clergy is supposedly fit to touch the vessels which contain the body and blood of Christ. This idea is possible to enforce only if the laity is

not allowed to touch the chalice by drinking from it. This argument for withholding the cup from the laity is not usually cited by the Romanists in their attacks on the Scriptural doctrine of the Lord's Supper, because they use the fact that the cup is given only to the clergy as a main argument in their contention that the clergy is superior to the laity; in spite of the Scriptural evidence to the contrary. Even the Romanists can see that it is clearly illogical to argue both that the cup should be withheld from the laity to show the superiority of the priesthood, and that the priests are superior because they receive the cup and the laity does not.<sup>xiv</sup>

The importance of this distinction between the clergy and the laity in the celebration of the Eucharist in the Roman Church is shown by their treatment of John Huss and his followers. Huss had reinstated the distribution of the Lord's Supper in both kinds in Bohemia. It was in reaction to Huss and to John Wycliff before him, who had also argued against communion in one kind, that the Council of Constance sanctioned the withholding of the cup from the laity. They then posthumously declared Wycliff a heretic, and burned Huss at the stake for objecting to the decision of the Council. Again because, of the Hussites, which did not give up their beliefs or their resistance to the Roman position, the Council of Basel granted the right to use the sacrament in both kinds to "the Bohemians" but refused this privilege to all other Christians under the rule of Rome.<sup>xv</sup>

Ten years before the writing of the Augsburg Confession, Luther declared that forcing those who wished to commune in both kinds, to use only one kind in the sacrament is a sin perpetrated by the priests of the Church.<sup>xvi</sup>

The Catholic Church today maintains the same practice it has in the past, and for exactly the same reasons. Some flexibility is given to the priests to allow the use of both kinds in the Eucharist to the laity, but only for very special occasions, and with limited use: Vatican II has upheld both the doctrinal position and the practices established by the Council of Trent in 1562.<sup>xvii</sup>

The Lutheran response in the Augsburg Confession to this abuse of the sacrament by the Roman Church was an appeal to Scripture and the institution of Christ Himself. They further appealed to the use of the sacrament throughout most of the history of the Christian Church. These arguments the Romanists could not and did not try to refute. So the Lutherans appealed to Emperor Charles V to recognize that taking the cup away from the laity in the Church for so little reason, and insisting on it with such force, was illegal. The doctrinal arguments involved may have been, beyond the full comprehension of Charles, but the Lutheran princes presenting the Augsburg Confession to their Emperor had no doubts that Charles could fully understand the legal principles involved, and they appealed to him to uphold their right to the full sacrament, and to counter the illegal and unjust forcing of the sacrament in one kind only upon them.<sup>xviii</sup>

The reference to the Corpus Christi Festival; at the very end of this article in the Confession, was added after the Lutheran princes had arrived at Augsburg. It was no doubt included in the article because a Corpus Christi Festival was held in Augsburg the day after Charles arrived, and the Lutherans were ordered to participate in the festival. They refused to do this, and the Saxons prepared a statement for Charles defending their position.<sup>xix</sup>

The practice of having Corpus Christi Festivals grew out of the Roman doctrine of 'the Mass, especially their doctrine of transubstantiation. Pope Honorius III, who was pope from 1216 to 1227, had ordered the adoration of the host which remained from the celebration of the Mass.<sup>xx</sup> The idea was to give honor to Christ by worshipping his presence in the form of the host on the altar. This idea led to the practice of genuflecting when passing the altar, and to the establishing of "Perpetual Adoration Societies" in the Roman Church, whose purpose it was to have someone continually giving worship to the host on the altar.<sup>xxi</sup> This in turn led to the establishment of the Corpus Christi Festival by Pope Urban IV, in 1264, so that the laity would have the chance to especially honor Christ by such worship at these times. The Roman Church, following the neo-Platonic philosophy on which it builds its theology, has declared that such worship of the Christ present in the host can only be *hyperdulia*, the same type of worship which is given to Mary and to the saints, because His physical presence in the host is not worthy of *latreia*, the full worship of the heart; which is accorded to God and to Christ in heaven.<sup>xxii</sup>

The practice of the Corpus Christi Festival has fallen into disuse in many Catholic churches today, but its use is still encouraged, as well as special displays plays of the host in the churches for the laity to come and worship inside.<sup>xxiii</sup>

#### **Article XXIV: The Mass**

Falsely are our churches accused of abolishing the Mass; for the Mass is retained among us, and celebrated with the highest reverence. Nearly all the usual ceremonies are also preserved, save that the parts sung in Latin are interspersed here and there with German hymns, which have been added to teach the people. For ceremonies are needed to this end alone that the unlearned be taught (what they need to know of Christ:) And not only has Paul commanded to use in the church a language understood by the people, 1 Cor. 14,29, but it has also been so ordained by man's law. The people are accustomed to partake of the Sacrament together, if any be fit for it, and this also increases the reverence and devotion of public worship. For none are admitted except they be first examined. The people are also advised concerning the dignity and use of the Sacrament, how great consolation it brings anxious consciences, that they may learn to believe God, and to expect and ask of Him all that is 'good. (In this connection they are also instructed regarding other and false teachings on the Sacrament.) This worship pleases God; such use of the Sacrament nourishes true devotion toward God. It does not, therefore, appear that the Mass is more devoutly celebrated among our adversaries than among us.

But it is evident that for a long time this also has been the public and most grievous complaint of all good men that Masses have been basely profaned and applied to purposes of lucre. For it is not unknown how far this abuse obtains in all the churches, by what manner of men Masses are said only for fees or stipends, and how many celebrate them contrary to the Canons. But Paul severely threatens those who deal unworthily with the Eucharist when he says, 1 Cor. 11:27: Whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. When, therefore, our priests were admonished concerning this sin, Private masses were discontinued among us, as scarcely any Private Masses were celebrated except for lucre's sake.

Neither were the bishops ignorant of these abuses, and if they had corrected them in time, there would now be less dissension. Heretofore, by their own connivance, they suffered many corruptions to creep into the Church. Now, when it is too late, they begin to complain of the troubles of the Church, while this disturbance has been occasioned simply by those abuses which were so manifest that they could be borne no longer. There have been great dissensions concerning the Mass, concerning the Sacrament. Perhaps the world is being punished for such long-continued profanations of the Mass as have been tolerated in the churches for so many centuries by the very men who were both able and in duty bound to correct them. For in the Ten Commandments it is written, Ex. 20,7: The Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh His name in vain. But since the world began, nothing that God ever ordained seems to have been so abused for filthy lucre as the Mass.

There was also added the opinion which infinitely increased Private Masses, namely, that Christ, by His passion, had made satisfaction for original sin, and instituted the Mass wherein an offering should be made for daily sins, venial and mortal. From this has arisen the common opinion that the Mass takes away the sins of the living and the dead by the outward act. Then they began to dispute whether one Mass said for many were worth as much as special Masses for individuals, and this brought forth that infinite multitude of Masses. (With this work men wished to obtain from God all that they needed, and in the mean time, faith in Christ and the true worship were forgotten.)

Concerning these opinions our teachers have given warning that they depart from the Holy Scriptures and diminish the glory of the passion of Christ. For Christ's passion was an oblation and satisfaction, not for original guilt only, but also for all other sins, as it was written to the Hebrews, 10,10: We are sanctified through the offering of Jesus Christ, once for all. Also, 10,14: By one offering He hath perfected forever them that are sanctified. (It is an unheard of innovation in the Church to teach that

Christ by His death made satisfaction only for original sin and not likewise for all other sin. Accordingly, it is hoped that everybody will understand that this error has not been reprov'd without due reason.)

Scripture also teaches that we are justified before God through faith in Christ, when we believe that our sins are forgiven for Christ's sake. Now if the Mass take away the sine of the living and the dead by the outward act, justification comes of the work of lasses, and not of faith, which Scripture does not allow.

But Christ commands us, Luke 22,19: This do, in remembrance of Me; therefore the Mass was instituted that the faith of those who use the Sacrament should remember what benefits it receives through Christ, and cheer and comfort the anxious conscience. For to remember Christ is to remember His benefits, and to realize that they are truly offered unto us. Nor is it enough only to remember the history; for this also the Jews and the ungodly can remember. Wherefore the Mass is to be used to this end, that there the Sacrament (Communion) may be administered to them that have need of consolation; as Ambrose says: Because I always sin, I am always bound to take the medicine. (Therefore this Sacrament requires faith, and is used in vain without faith.)

Now, forasmuch as the Mass is such a giving of the sacrament, we hold one communion every holy-day, and, if any desire the Sacrament, also on other days, when it is given to such as ask for it. And this custom is not new in the Church; for the Fathers before Gregory make no mention of any private Mass, but of the common Mass (the Communion) they speak very much. Chrysostom says that the priest stands daily at the altar, inviting some to the Communion and keeping back others. And it appears from the ancient Canons that someone celebrated the Mass from whom all the other presbyters and deacons received the body of the Lord; for this the words of the Nicene Canon say: Let the deacons, according to their order, receive the Holy Communion after the presbyters, from the bishop or from a presbyterian term. And Paul, 1 Cor. 11:33, commands concerning the Communion: Tarry one for another, so that there may be a common participation.

Forasmuch, therefore, as the Mass with us has the example of the Church, taken from the Scripture and the Fathers, we are confident that it cannot be disapproved, especially since public ceremonies for the most part like those hitherto in use, are returned; only the number of Masses differs, which, because of, the very great and Manifest abuses, doubtless might be profitably reduced. For in olden times, even in churches most frequented, the Mass was not celebrated every day, as the *Tripartite History* (Book 8, chap. 33) testifies: Again in Alexandria, every Wednesday and Friday the Scriptures are read, and the doctors expound them, and all things are done, except the solemn rite of Communion.

“The Eucharist shows itself to be the source and the apex of the whole work of preaching the gospel . . . Thus the Eucharistic Action is the very heartbeat of the congregation of the faithful over which the priest presides. So priests must instruct them to offer to God the Father the divine Victim in the sacrifice of the Mass, and to join to it the offering of their own lives.”<sup>xxiv</sup>

With these words the last official Council of the Roman Catholic Church summarizes the importance of the Mass in the life and thought of that Church. Put another way, the Romanists state: “The existence of the local or the universal Church would be unthinkable without the Eucharist. ‘No Christian community can be built up unless it has its basis and center in the celebration of the Most Holy Eucharist.’”<sup>xxv</sup> It is little wonder that the papal legate at Augsburg, Lorenzo Campeggio, stated to Emperor Charles V, that he would suffer himself to be torn to pieces before he would give up the Mass.<sup>xxvi</sup>

The importance of the Mass in the Catholic Church stems from two false doctrines which were popularly held. The first of these is that Christ's death on the cross made satisfaction before God for original sin only. This “original sin” is supposedly the loss of a “golden bridal” which allows sensuality to be controlled without much effort.<sup>xxvii</sup> The second false teaching is that Christ's human nature is confined to a specific

location in heaven since his ascension.<sup>xxviii</sup> These false teachings have led to a multitude of false and even ridiculous teachings about the Eucharist, and the service of which it is a part, the Mass.

As the Mass is the heart of the Catholic Church, so the doctrine of transubstantiation is the heart of Roman teaching about the Mass. As F. E. Mayer explains:

“Rome argues for a conversion where the substances of bread and wine (i.e., the elements which actually make bread, bread and wine, wine) cease to exist in order to make room for the body and blood of Christ. All that remains of the bread and wine are their accidents, such as color, taste, smell, form. Trent defines the doctrine as follows: ‘By the consecration of bread and wine a conversion is made of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the body of Christ, and of the whole substance of the wine into the substance of His blood; which conversion is by the Holy Catholic Church suitably and properly called transubstantiation.’ The theologians are not agreed as to the manner in which the body and the blood enter into the species of bread and wine. According to the Thomists, the glorified body of Christ is reproduced in such a way that the change “has something, in common with creation and transmutation.” Transubstantiation is virtually both an annihilation and creation, and the only reason why it does not actually create the body of Christ is that the body already exists. Bellarmine explains transubstantiation as a conversion which does not cause the body to begin to exist, but to begin to exist under the species of bread and wine. While the theologians today usually avoid the term “creation,” they nevertheless believe that the power inherent in the words of consecration is so great that, if the substance of the Eucharistic body did not already exist, these words would as surely call it into being, as the fiat of the Almighty created the universe.”<sup>xxix</sup>

Thus the priests of the Roman Church claim to have the power to bring Christ into the world when and where they choose. This Christ they declare to be the same Christ that sits at the right hand of God in heaven.<sup>xxx</sup>

Christ is not brought into the world by them to commune with His believers, however. They claim to bring Him into the world to sacrifice him on their altars in the “unbloody Sacrifice of the Mass,” which they term a “Eucharistic Sacrifice.” The reason for this continual sacrificing of Christ on Roman altars is the supposed limited nature of Christ’s original sacrifice on the cross. Thomas Aquinas agrees, “The body of the Lord once offered on the cross for the original debt, is daily offered on the altar for daily offenses so that in this the church might have a service that reconciles God.”<sup>xxxi</sup>

Other reasons for the necessity of the Sacrifice of the Mass are also given: 1) Man as a creature of body and soul owes God both mental and physical adoration. The latter can only be rendered through a physical sacrifice. 2) As a sinner before the Judge, man must appease God’s wrath 3) As a recipient of God’s many blessings, man has the obligation to thank God for His past favors and implore Him for future helps 4) Christianity requires a sacrifice offered to God by man, or it would be inferior to Judaism and to all pre-Christian ethnic religions, since they all had sacrifices.<sup>xxxii</sup> Anyone with a knowledge of the New Testament can see the obvious fallacies of the above reasons for needing the Mass as a sacrifice.

Although the Roman Church teaches that the Mass is both a sacrament and a sacrifice, the sacramental element of the Mass was so neglected in Roman theology that it was almost overlooked entirely. The sacramental effects of the Mass were defined by the Council of Trent chiefly negatively, for example: “that the principal fruit of the most holy Eucharist is not the remission of sins.”<sup>xxxiii</sup> The sacrament of the Mass, said to unite the recipient in a mystical union with Christ which conveys the power to avoid sin and to perform good works. It also unites the believers in a bond of charity between the faithful.<sup>xxxiv</sup>

With this downplaying of the sacramental element in the Mass, it became essentially a sacrifice and a service to God, not a supper, in which God gives His love and its gifts to us.

Some Roman dogmatists have taught that an altar, or at least an altar stone must be present to celebrate the Mass, and a crucifix must be erected, because the Sacrifice which is made in “the Mass is the same as that made on the cross on Calvary.”<sup>xxxv</sup> This sacrifice is supposedly so beneficial that some Romanists have declared that hearing the Word cannot compare with hearing the Mass, for in the Mass “heaven bows down to

earth.”<sup>xxxvi</sup> It is no wonder that the Lutheran Reformers called the Mass one of the most vile forms of idolatry ever invented.

According to Roman theology, the sacrifice of the Mass works *ex opera operato*, or just by the act of performing it. Its benefits are not appropriated by faith on the part of the recipient, but are applied to him by the priest. This application is nothing more than the intention of the priest to convey specific blessings to a specific person or persons, living or dead, present or absent, Catholic or non-Catholic. The blessings of the Mass are not limited to spiritual matters, either. The Mass is said to be efficacious for every possible contingency and condition in life, for success in business, for health, the gaining friends, or for anything else; and the recipient does not even have to tell the priest the purpose for which he is ordering a Mass!<sup>xxxvii</sup> Thus the Mass has become the ultimate good luck charm. As a spiritual benefit, the soul is said to find “in the visible creation a ladder to heaven.”<sup>xxxviii</sup>

With such extravagant claims made for the Mass; it is no wonder that abuses by the hundreds quickly attached themselves to it. The most despicable of these abuses to the Lutheran princes at Augsburg was the sale of Masses for money. The Roman Church insisted and still does, that private Masses do no good at all for anyone if they are not paid for with material wealth.<sup>xxxix</sup> Catholic catechumens are instructed today that private Masses are supposed to be paid for when they are ordered.<sup>xl</sup> The Roman Church usually does not extend credit for Masses.

The other flagrant abuse of the Mass was its application to the dead. This had become, and still is, the most common use for private Masses, and since there are many more private Masses celebrated than public Masses, it is the usual use of the Mass. This is totally opposite of those Christ instituted the sacrament for, and the way He intended it to be used.

The Lutheran princes argued that the Lutherans had reinstated the true mass, using the sacrament the way Christ has intended. Thus, they argued that the Mass was used more often and in a better way among them, than among the Roman churches. Their use of the term Mass for the Lord’s Supper may cause some confusion.. Although the etymology of the Latin word “*missa*” from which the English word “mass” comes, is in doubt; the Apology to the Augsburg Confession traces it to the Hebrew *missath* in Deut. 16:10, which means “freewill offerings.”<sup>xli</sup> In the New Testament era it came to denote a worship service, and was used for any worship service, whether the Lord’s Supper was celebrated at it or not. The Lutheran reformers used the term in this way throughout the Lutheran Confessions. Unfortunately for the sake of clarity, the term Mass had also come to be intimately associated with the Roman doctrine and practices of the Eucharist, and all their attendant abuses. At times, the reformers also used the term in this connection. Their use of the term must therefore be determined from the context.

The reformers were willing to concede that the Mass, as a whole, could be considered a Eucharistic Sacrifice as the Romans claim it is. However, then the liturgy is, the sacrifice, in which we thank and praise God for His blessings to us. This part of the worship service is properly a sacrifice of thanksgiving from God’s people to their Lord. However, as the Romans viewed the Mass, the sacrifice took place when the priest, using the “mystical two-edged sword” of the words of consecration, divided Christ’s body and blood, and so offered Him in sacrifice to God on the altar.<sup>xlii</sup> There is not one shred of Scriptural evidence to support this misuse of the sacrament.

In the *Torgau Articles* the Lutheran princes had called for an abolishing of the Roman Mass, and its replacement with the true sacrament of the Lord’s Supper as they practiced it in the Lutheran Church.<sup>xliii</sup> They argued also that the whole Church was responsible for the sacrament, and not just the priests, and that God would hold all Christians responsible for the abuses of the Mass which went unprotested and unchecked, as St. Paul warned, the Corinthians would happen to them because of the abuses they allowed in their celebration of the sacrament.

The Lutheran position on the use of the sacrament is that it is a means by which God offers, gives, and seals to believers the gifts of His love which Christ has purchased for us by His death on the cross. It is also a communion of those present at its celebration through their sharing of Christ’s own body and blood. Therefore, any private use of the sacrament is a sacrilege and sin because the sacrament was meant by Christ to be shared

by believers.<sup>xliv</sup> This does not prevent its private use under special circumstances, when communion is given to those who cannot come to the normal communion service. Since the purpose of the liturgy in the worship service connected with the sacrament is to instruct and edify the participants, all unnecessary and repetitious parts of the Mass were dropped or changed. Parts in the ordinary language of the people were introduced, and hymns were sung which taught the worshippers what the sacrament was all about.

These changes in the Lutheran service and use of the sacrament were not well received by the Roman Church, and were strongly condemned. However, after 450 years, many of them have been adopted in that Church. Vatican II ordered the Mass to be used in the language of the people, the liturgy is to be revised to make it more meaningful and superfluous parts discarded, the Bible is to be used much more in the service, and the laity was to participate in the service, both spiritually and actually.<sup>xlv</sup> The sacramental aspect of the Mass is given much more importance today than at the time of the Reformation, and the sacrificial aspects of Roman teachings are being played down today, but not renounced.

Although the Roman Church cannot give up the Mass and remain what it is, it seems to have learned, and implemented some beneficial things from the confession of the Lutheran princes at Augsburg 450 years ago.

### Bibliography

- Abott, Walter M., S. J. *The Documents of Vatican II*. Racine, Wis: The American Press, 1966.
- Allbeck William D. *Studies In the Lutheran Confessions*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968.
- Krauth, C. P. "The Evangelical Mass And the Romish Mass." *The Evangelical Review*. Vol. 12, No. 47, (January 1861). pp. 263-319.
- Lawler, R. L.; Wuerl, D. W.; Lawler, T. C.; editors. *The Teaching of Christ (A Catholic Catechism for Adults)*. Huntington, In.: Our Sunday Visitor, Inc., 1976.
- Loy, Prof. M. *The Augsburg Confession*. Columbus, Oh.: Lutheran Book Concern, 1908.
- Luther, Dr. Martin. "The Babylonian Captivity of the Church." Tappert. *Selected Writings of Martin Luther*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967, Vol. I, pp. 355-
- Mayer, F. E. "The Roman Doctrine of the Lord's Supper." *Concordia Theological Monthly*. Vol. 10, No. 11, (November 1939), pp. 801-81 .
- Meyer, Prof. John P. *Studies In the Augsburg Confession*.: Mequon: The Seminary Mimeo Company, 1965.
- Tappert, Theodore G. "Smallcald Articles." & "Apology of the Augsburg Confession." *The Book of Concord*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1959.
- Triglote Concordia*. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1921.

---

<sup>i</sup> Walter M. Abbott, *The Documents of Vatican II*, p. 157.

<sup>ii</sup> Dr. Martin Luther, "The Babylonian Captivity of the Church", Tappert, *Selected Writings of Martin Luther*, Vol. I, p. 374.

<sup>iii</sup> Alexander of Hales, died in 1245. He was an English theologian who wrote a set of theology books at the request of Pope Innocent IV.

<sup>iv</sup> Thomas Aquinas, 1225-1274. He was a Dominican, and the greatest of the Scholastic theologians, still regarded as the foremost doctrinal authority in the Roman Catholic Church.

<sup>v</sup> Danzinger, Council of Trent , Session 13, Canon 3. Quoted from William D. Allbeck, *Studies in the Lutheran Confessions*, p. 120.

<sup>vi</sup> Professor John P. Meyer, *Studies in the Augsburg Confession*, p. 116.

<sup>vii</sup> F.E. Mayer, "The Roman Doctrine of the Lord's Supper", *Concordia Theological Monthly*, Vol. 10, No. 11, p. 805.

<sup>viii</sup> Meyer, op. cit. p. 120.

<sup>ix</sup> Prof. M. Loy, *The Augsburg Confession*, p. 899.

<sup>x</sup> Meyer, op. cit. p. 116.

<sup>xi</sup> Ibid.

<sup>xii</sup> Loy, op. cit. p. 901.

<sup>xiii</sup> Meyer, loc. cit.

<sup>xiv</sup> Loy, op. cit. p. 900.

<sup>xv</sup> Luther, op. cit. p. 379 footnote.



- 
- xvi *Ibid.*
- xvii Abott, op. cit. p. 157.
- xviii Allbeck, op. cit. p. 121.
- xix *Ibid.*
- xx Loy, op. cit. p. 903.
- xxi Layer, op. cit. p. 809.
- xxii *Ibid.*
- xxiii R. Lawler, D. Wuerl, T.C. Lawler, editors. *The Teaching of Christ*, p. 437.
- xxiv Abott, op. cit. p. 542.
- xxv Lawler, op. cit. p. 420.
- xxvi Theodore G. Tappert, “Smalcald Articles”, *The Book of Concord*, p. 294.
- xxvii Meyer, op. cit. p. 121.
- xxviii Meyer, op. cit. p. 803.
- xxix *Ibid*, p. 804.
- xxx *Ibid*, p. 808.
- xxxi Thomas Aquinas, *Opuscula*, 58: “The Venerable Sacrament of the Altar”, c. 1., quoted in Tappert, “Apology of the Augsburg Confession”, *The Book of Concord*, p. 260.
- xxxii Mayer, op. cit. p. 812, 813.
- xxxiii *Ibid*, p. 811.
- xxxiv *Ibid.*
- xxxv *Ibid*, p. 814.
- xxxvi *Ibid*, p. 815.
- xxxvii *Ibid.*
- xxxviii *Ibid*, p. 810.
- xxxix Meyer, op. cit. p. 122.
- xl Lawler, op. cit. p. 427.
- xli Tappert, op. cit. p. 265.
- xlii Mayer, op. cit. p. 814.
- xliii C.P. Krauth, “The Evangelical Mass and the Romish Mass,” *The Evangelical Review*, Vol. 12, No. 47, p. 288.
- xliv Meyer, op. cit. p. 120.
- xlvi Abott, op. cit. p. 155, 156.