

# The History and Use of the Eucharistic Prayer

[Presented to the South Central District Pastors' Conference, April 7-8, 1986.]

by Stephen Valleskey

Your conference agenda committee offers this study as a modest fill-in to replace the assigned essay on the subject which circumstances prevented from being presented to us. Recognizing that the use of the *Verba* in the consecration of the sacrament is of more than passing liturgical interest to us as we move toward the publication of a new hymnal for the WELS, and subscribing to the theory that in some instances less is better than nothing, we will attempt at least to define the areas of concern, even if in rough draft form. If the treatment is superficial in some parts, you must not conclude that the subject itself is of no weight or consequence.

The topic permits us to exclude from this discussion certain of the major controversial questions surrounding the sacrament that have been settled confessionally among us, such as the disputes with Rome on transubstantiation, the mass as sacrifice, and Communion *sub specie utraque*, and with the Reformed on the real presence, the blessings of the sacrament, and whether or not the unworthy communicant also receives the sacramental Christ.

The excluding of these questions does not in any way deprive us of material for our study. In discussing the history and use of the Eucharistic Prayer we will have place to ask: Was it the Savior's intent that the *Verba* be spoken over the sacrament as opposed to consecrating the elements with prayer? Does the recitation of the bare *Verba*, which was Luther's innovation, lead us into a magical view of the consecration? To whom is the consecration addressed: to God? to the elements? to the congregation? Can a valid sacrament be observed without the consecration? Can there be a valid consecration without the Words of Institution? Might we view as a sacrament that which used the *Verba* only in the distribution and not in the consecration? What essential elements (taking, blessing, thanking, breaking, giving, eating, drinking) belong properly to the sacrament? Can the sacramental union be fixed to a moment of time? How are the statements of Luther, Chemnitz, and the Formula to the effect that Christ is to be adored in the sacrament to be understood?

These questions survive in Lutheranism and possess a curious appeal in that they do not cut through the church along the customary "liberal-conservative" lines. *The Manual on the Liturgy of the Lutheran Book of Worship*, which may lay claim to be spokesman in the liturgical area for the forthcoming new Lutheran Church in America, discusses the place of the *Verba* in the consecration in a way that displays the pluralistic nature of that body:

Those who plan the service must not be led to choose the *Verba* alone simply because that will shorten the service. There are other ways of keeping the service within a reasonable time limit, and this central act of Christianity is not the place to make cuts. The options of the *Verba* alone and of prayer followed by the *Verba* are provided for those who find the traditional Eucharistic Prayer theologically unacceptable. If some are convinced that the *Verba* must not be set within a prayer, let them choose the prayer of thanksgiving followed by the *Verba*. If on theological grounds some find that unacceptable, let them use the *Verba* alone. Otherwise the Eucharistic Prayer should be used. (242-43)

While we may not agree with what they think is theological and what not, we will let that pass for the moment and simply note that what the *Manual* is saying is: **1)** They do not think that the sacrament should be consecrated by the minister's recitation of the bare *Verba*, which has been the general Lutheran usage since the Reformation. Elsewhere they say that if the bare *Verba* must be used, at least we should "consider chanting these words so that something of the spirit of praise be retained and so that this part of the Eucharist not pass by the congregation too quickly" (242). **2)** If the full Eucharistic Prayer is not to be used, then it is best to precede the recitation of the *Verba* with prayer (their suggested "Prayer of Thanksgiving"), which is the LC-MS Lutheran Worship solution. **3)** But to be preferred is the use of the historic Eucharistic Prayer, which incorporates the *Verba* into the prayer.

So it is clear that new Lutheranism in America has a problem with the use of the *Verba* in the consecration, and has resigned itself to a variety of practices (theologies?) regarding their use. To what degree this issue is also a concern to us is the focus of this paper.

### **The History**

The starting point for any discussion of the Lord's Supper must be the upper room in Jerusalem on the night in which our Lord was betrayed. Was there an action or words spoken there that we can identify in the gospels or in Paul as a consecratory act? The recitation of the *Verba*, which for us today constitutes the consecration, was done by Jesus in the distribution, as he gave (δοῦς, Matthew 26:26; ἔδοκεν, Matthew 26:27; Mark 16:22-23; Luke 22:19) the elements to the disciples.

Where does the idea of a separate blessing or consecration of the elements originate? The consecration is that which we find in the sacred text in the words εὐλογεῖν (Matthew 26:26; Mark 14:22) and εὐχαριστεῖν (Matthew 26:27; Mark 14:23; Luke 19:22; 1 Corinthians 11:24), both of which are generally translated into English throughout as "gave thanks." This action of our Savior of εὐλογεῖν or εὐχαριστεῖν took place after taking the bread and before breaking it and giving it to the disciples, and again after taking the cup and before offering it to the disciples. So here we have in the original institution of the sacrament an action of blessing or giving thanks that occurred apart from and before the distribution of the elements.

The apostle Paul presents us with special consideration when he writes to the Corinthians of "the cup of blessing which we bless" (1 Corinthians 10:16), which the NIV in the interest of uniformity translates: "the cup of thanksgiving for which we give thanks." The Greek reads, "the cup of εὐλογίας which we εὐλογοῦμενον." A variant reading not well attested has "the cup of εὐχαριστίας which we εὐλογοῦμενον." The NIV translation is inadequate and lends itself unduly to an understanding of a sacrament in which there is no consecration. Of the nine English versions in my library only the NIV excludes the idea of blessing from this passage. If the two verbs εὐχαριστεῖν and εὐλογεῖν are used almost interchangeably in the narratives of the institution of the Lord's Supper, which does in fact appear to be the case since both Matthew and Mark speak of the action of Christ after taking bread and before breaking it as the εὐλογεῖν, while Luke and St. Paul speak of the identical action as εὐχαριστεῖν, it by no means follows that εὐλογεῖν takes on entirely the meaning of εὐχαριστεῖν while the sense of εὐχαριστεῖν remains unchanged. εὐλογεῖν is the common word in the LXX and Greek New Testament for "to bless or consecrate."

When applied to table prayer, εὐλογεῖν ought no more to be limited to the thanksgiving element in that prayer than “asking the blessing” at table today would be construed as only a giving of thanks. If εὐλογεῖν taxes on some of the sense of εὐχαριστεῖν through their interchangeable use in the institution of the sacrament, then the other side must also be true that εὐχαριστεῖν taxes on some of the basic meaning of εὐλογεῖν in this context.

In what does the εὐλογεῖν consist? For Chemnitz it is axiomatic that for us today the εὐλογεῖν = the consecration = the Words of Institution, for we have no other word from God by which the sacramental presence is established. “This addition of the Word to the element in the sacraments is called ‘sanctification’ by the ancients. The common people call it ‘consecration.’ Paul, following the description of Mark, calls it ‘blessing’ when he says: ‘The cup of blessing which we bless’ (1 Corinthians 10:16)” (*Examen*, II,225). Any attempt to substitute human words for the divine word of institution, or to mix the human with the divine, is to be repudiated: “He acts wickedly who takes away the consecration of the Eucharist from the words of divine institution and transfers it to the prayers of the canon, which have been patched together by men... And surely this blessing or consecration is not to be divided between the Word of God and words handed down by men” (*Examen*, II,226).

But we must ask also in what the blessing or consecration of Christ consisted in the first celebration of the Lord’s Supper? This we cannot know with certainty. Since both Matthew and Mark record that the institution occurred “while they were eating,” we do not doubt that the blessing took place before the Passover supper was completed and was in all likelihood a part of that supper. Paul’s calling the cup “the cup of blessing” (1 Corinthians 10:16) supports this analysis, for the third cup of the Passover, which was filled at the close of the supper, bears the very designation “cup of blessing,” one of the ten essential rites of the Passover meal (Edersheim). Joachim Jeremias offers a substantial weight of evidence that the Lord’s Supper originated as part of the Passover meal, and that the institution of the cup took place in connection with the third cup of blessing (Jeremias, 41-84).

As to the host, Edersheim can find nothing in the historic Passover that corresponds with Jesus’ breaking of the bread and its blessing, but suggests that Jesus here “anticipates” the later Jewish practice of the *aphikomom* that was introduced after the destruction of the Temple when the paschal as well as all other sacrifices ceased. So long as the paschal lamb was still offered, he notes, it was forbidden to eat anything else after partaking of its flesh. But with the cessation of the sacrifice of the paschal lamb it has become the custom after the meal to eat the *aphikomom*, the half of the unleavened cake that was set aside at the beginning of the meal. Jesus did this very thing in the upper room “anticipating the later custom,” Edersheim believes, because in truth this was the last Passover (Edersheim, II,311).

If in fact it can be demonstrated that the eating of the bread of the Lord’s Supper corresponds to the *aphikomom*, this does not help us in our quest for Jesus’ words of blessing spoken over the bread since they would have been an addendum to the ordinary celebration of the Passover. The blessing of the cup, on the other hand, if we may identify it with the third cup of the Passover, can be traced with some certainty and minor variations to the second century in the *birkath hammazon* of the Passover which, with the exception of the fourth section that was added sometime after the fall of Jerusalem in 70 AD, is thought for the most part to have been at least contemporary with the lifetime of Jesus. Some scholars believe this prayer to be a possible

ultimate source of the Christian Eucharistic Prayer (Jeremias, 86). The text is from *Prayers of the Eucharist*, 9-10:

### **Birkath Hammazon**

#### ***Blessing of him who nourishes***

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.

#### ***Blessing for the earth***

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.

*(On the feasts of Hanukkah and Purim, here follows an embolism.)*

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.

#### ***Blessing for Jerusalem***

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.

*(On the feast of Passover, here follows this embolism:*

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.)

#### ***Blessing of the good and beneficent***

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.

It must be recognized that even if Jesus did speak the *birkath hammazon* over the cup, we do not know that he did not add also a specific blessing for the consecration of the cup of the

new Supper. And in fact he had to introduce a separate, non-Passover blessing for the bread of the sacrament since nothing corresponding to it existed in the Passover ritual. Finally it must be said that regardless of the particular form of blessing Jesus spoke over the bread and wine at the institution of the Supper, the consecratory power is not to be sought elsewhere than in the words that have come to us that effectively created the real presence of Christ in the first Supper and for all time wherever the true sacrament is observed, when Jesus said, "This is my body. This is my blood."

The earliest post-biblical record of a Communion celebration is found in the *Didache*. This includes instructions for a brief "thanksgiving" to be made over the wine and over the bread (Goodspeed, chap. 9, 15). The Words of Institution are not mentioned. Also Justin Martyr (c.150) speaks of the thanksgiving prayer that is made over the bread and the wine, and then makes separate reference to the Words of Institution to explain why Christians do what they do in the sacrament (*First Apology*, 65-66; in *Prayers of the Eucharist*, 17-20). The failure of the *Didache* and Justin Martyr to specifically mention the Words of Institution in their description of the Communion rite cannot be used to argue that the *Verba* were absent from Lord's Supper observance in the first century and a half of the Christian era. These are not detailed liturgical descriptions. That Paul includes the Words of Institution in writing of the Lord's Supper to the Corinthians (1 Corinthians 11:23-26) in almost identical words to those we find in the evangelists is strong evidence that from the beginning they were a known and accepted formula in the church.

And in fact the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus ( 223), thought to represent practice in Rome of possibly fifty years before its writing and therefore taking us back to about the time of Justin, includes a fully developed Eucharistic Prayer that features the *Verba* as a prominent part of its thanksgiving. Already at this early date this prayer displays the four elements in order of **1**) thanksgiving, **2**) institution narrative, **3**) *anamnesis* (remembrance), and **4**) *epiclesis* (invocation of the Holy Spirit) that were to characterize all later prayers. We give the text from *Prayers of the Eucharist*, 22:

### **The Apostolic Tradition**

*Then the deacon shall present the offering to him; and he, laying his hands on it with all the presbytery, shall say, giving thanks:*

The Lord be with you.

*And all shall say:*

And with your spirit.

Up with your hearts.

We have them with the Lord.

Let us give thanks to the Lord.

It is fitting and right.

*And then he shall continue thus:*

We render thanks to you, O God, through your beloved child Jesus Christ, whom in the last times you sent to us as saviour and redeemer and angel of your will;

who is your inseparable Word, through whom you made all things, and in whom you were well pleased.

You sent him from heaven into the Virgin's womb; and, conceived in the womb, he was made flesh and was manifested as your Son, being born of the Holy Spirit and the Virgin.

Fulfilling your will and gaining for you a holy people, he stretched out his hands when he should suffer, that he might release from suffering those who have believed in you.

And when he was betrayed to voluntary suffering that he might destroy death, and break the bonds of the devil, and tread down hell, and shine upon the righteous, and fix the limit, and manifest the resurrection, **he took bread and gave thanks to you saying, “Take, eat; this is my body, which shall be broken for you.” Likewise also the cup, saying, “This is my blood, which is shed for you; when you do this, you make my remembrance.”**

Remembering therefore his death and resurrection, we offer to you the bread and the cup, giving you thanks because you have held us worthy to stand before you and minister to you.

And we ask that you would send your Holy Spirit upon the offering of your holy Church; that, gathering them into one, you would grant to all who partake of the holy things (to partake) for the fullness of the Holy Spirit for the confirmation of faith in truth;

that we may praise and glorify you through your child Jesus Christ, through whom be glory and honour to you, to the Father and the Son with the Holy Spirit, in your holy Church, both now and to the ages of ages. (Amen.)

Thus if we allow for the gap of ninety years from the known practice in Corinth in 60 AD to the known practice in Rome in c. 150, it can be said with confidence 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 Edemas (*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.

In the East the Eucharistic Prayer came to be called the *Anaphora* (offering) and in the West the *Canon* (rule). A significant divergence between East and West occurred in the fourth century with the gradual replacing of Greek with Latin as the language of worship in the West. This was accompanied by the eventual dropping in the West of the *Epiclesis*, the invocation of the Holy Ghost that concluded the Eucharistic Prayer in the earlier liturgies. We mention this here because the *Epiclesis* in the East developed into a petition to the Holy Spirit to bless the elements of bread and wine, which in time came to fix the moment of the presence of Christ in the sacrament for Eastern Christianity at the *Epiclesis*. This is the understanding in the East to this day.

In the West the *Verba* of Christ remained the focus. The influence of Augustine’s statement, first applied by him to Baptism, was decisive: “*Accedat verbum ad elementum, et fit sacramentum.*” Some modern liturgical scholars have seen in Augustine’s choice of the singular “*verbum*” a reference to Christ rather than to the Words of Institution: “When the Word [Christ] comes to the element, it becomes a sacrament,” but this sounds suspiciously less like Augustine

than like modern-day demeaning of the written Word. Medieval theology had no such bias. Sasse shows that for the scholastic theologians, reaching their apex in Thomas, the Word reigned supreme in the sacramental rite, ultimately to the point of fixing an absolute “moment of consecration” in the recitation of the *Verba*. For Thomas the Words of Institution are effective because they are the words of Christ. Christ is the real Consecrator of the sacrament, as in our Lutheran understanding, although, as Sasse points out, the theoretical clarity of Thomas gave way in practice to the view that the consecratory power lay not only in the *Verba* but also in the power vested in the priest through his consecration and ordination (Sasse, 35-36, 136-37).

The Roman *Canon* came to its present fixed form at the end of the sixth century under Gregory the Great (590-604). The text below is based on the oldest manuscripts, none older than the eighth century (*Prayers of the Eucharist*, 120-124). Although the *Verba* are there, you will note that the prayer has gone awry in that it breathes the spirit of sacrifice and the veneration of Mary and the saints.

### **The Mass of the Roman Rite**

#### **THE CANON**

*Priest:* The Lord be with you.

*People:* And with your spirit.

*Priest:* Up with your hearts.

*People:* We have them with the Lord.

*Priest:* Let us give thanks to the Lord our God.

*People:* It is fitting and right.

*Priest:* 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:

*People:* 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.

*Priest:* 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 *N.* our pope, and *N.* 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, (*here a seasonal clause may follow*) and venerating the memory 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, 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 favourable 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 honour and glory is yours, O God the Father almighty, in the  
unity of the Holy Spirit, through all the ages of ages. Amen.

This is the situation as Luther found it in the church at the beginning of the sixteenth century. Luther's liturgical reform of the *Canon of the Mass* was radical. Because the *Canon* strongly inculcates the view of the Mass as sacrifice, Luther in both his *Formula Missae* of 1523 and his *Deutsche Messe* of 1526 eliminated the entire *Canon* (*Anaphora*, Eucharistic Prayer) from the service with the exception of the bare Words of Institution which he retained. This practice has generally prevailed in Lutheranism to this present day.

Luther was driven in his liturgical reform is in his theological reform by his absolute loyalty to the Word of God. When he looked at the *Canon of the Mass*, he saw the kernel of the Word in the Words of Institution. These became all-important to Luther as the words of consecration not merely because of the Western tradition but because they were the very Word of God. Just how much Luther's unshakable confidence in the power of the Word shaped his understanding of what happens in the consecration has come under scrutiny in our times. Since questions are raised in this connection that deal with the how and when of the sacrament to which the Scriptures do not speak, we might be inclined to dismiss the questions as "presumptuous and frivolous" (SD VII,16) in favor of limiting our discussion to the what of the sacrament as clearly given to us in the Words of Institution. This is not an entirely adequate response. When it is claimed in some quarters that Luther did not share Lutheran orthodoxy's insistency on the authority of every word of Scripture as the divinely inspired Word of God, but that what mattered for him was Jesus as the Word of God, we enter into the fray with gusto and bring solid Luther research to bear on the Reformer's high regard for the written Word as God's Word. No one with a low opinion of the written Word could have done what Luther did in the colloquy with Zwingli when he wrote the words "this is my body" secretly in chalk on the table under the table covering, later to display them with a flourish at a critical juncture in the colloquy as the position from which he would not budge. Likewise when Luther's remarks on the Jews are called into question, and he is made to be the author of the Nazi pogrom, we do not hesitate to bring some balance into the discussion, and to insist that Luther's statements be understood not as racial slurs but in the spiritual sense in which he intended them. And if Luther made intemperate remarks in the process, we do not feel conscience-bound to defend him in it.

Then it would seem that we ought not shy away either from what Luther had to say on the sacrament because of certain difficulties that can arise in connection with some of his comments. We will readily concede that talk about the how and when of the sacrament can lead to endless disputes and troubled consciences, but only when the attempt is made to make laws to burden people where Scripture itself has not spoken. The questions that trouble are those that surround the "moment of consecration" and the duration of the sacrament. Theologically the answer to these questions is quite simple... We do not know. But there are also liturgical answers, and by and large our people are going to gain their answers to these questions through our liturgical practice, repeated time and again. If we do not include the questions in our liturgical discussions, then we leave to chance and default the understanding that our people will come to.

For Luther the Words of Institution are decisive in making the sacrament (LW 36,341; 37,186). In this he stood squarely with the Western Church in holding that it is the Word joined to the element and not prayer (the *epiklesis* of the Eastern Church) that effects the sacramental union. "*Accedat verbum ad elementum, et fit sacramentum*" (Augustine) was a position on which

Luther did not waver. And who can doubt but that at the first institution of the Lord's Supper it was not the prayer of Jesus (the Passover *birkath hammazon*?) but his speaking of the powerful Word, "This is my body," that established the sacramental presence? And who can doubt further that it is the same powerful Word of Christ that consecrates the sacrament today and establishes his blessed presence? What other word do we have from God by which to consecrate the elements? Thus for us today as for Luther the Words of Institution are the words of consecration. The Words of Institution are effective because Christ commanded us to say them in the sacrament (LW 37,187). Therefore the Formula rightly says that the Words of Institution of Christ are in no way to be omitted, for they are the very words of blessing (1 Corinthians 10:16), "which indeed occurs in no other way than through the repetition and recitation of the words of institution" (SD VII,82; also Epit. VII,99).

Since the words that consecrate are the words of Christ, it follows that Christ himself alone is the true Consecrator of every sacramental meal. The Formula quotes favorably the statement of Chrysostom: "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). The true presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Supper is not produced by "the word or work of any man," whether the minister's recitation of the *Verba* or the communicant's faith, but solely by the word and institution of Christ (SD VII,74).

Nonetheless, to Luther as well as to our Lutheran Confessions, the consecration (i.e., the minister's speaking of the *Verba* over the elements) is essential to the sacrament. "All Christians are bound by the institution and command of Christ to say these words in the Supper" (LW 37,182). The "fanatics do not consecrate" (37,260). "When we follow his institution and command in the Supper and say, 'This is my body,' then it is his body, not because of our speaking or our declarative word, but because of his command in which he has told us so to speak and to do and has attached his own command and deed to our speaking" (LW 37,184, quoted in SD VII,78; cf. also SD VII,79; VII,121).

When Luther says regarding the Zwinglian practice that "our fanatics do not consecrate" (LW 37,260), he was not saying this because they omitted the Words of Institution, which in fact are to be found both as a part of the Eucharistic Prayer in Zwingli's *Epicheiresis* of 1523 and as a straight historical narrative in his *Action oder Bruch* of 1525 (*Prayers of the Eucharist*, 130-33). Nor is Luther denying the Zwinglian consecration on the grounds that the *Verba* were set in the form of a prayer since Zwingli in fact did it both ways, and the later, non-prayer form became standard among the Reformed. Luther never objected to the Eucharistic Prayer on the grounds that it was a prayer; his objection was to the unbiblical teaching in the prayer of the mass as sacrifice and the veneration of the saints. In fact in his *Formula Missae* (1523) Luther attached the *Verba* in prayer-form to the Preface. Luther's meaning in denying consecration to the Zwinglians, as well as the meaning of Sasse's remark that "none of the classic liturgies of the Reformed churches contains a consecration in the proper sense" (Sasse, 132), is to be sought rather in Zwingli's refusal to allow to the *Verba* any consecratory power as the very Word of God and his reduction of them to a mere historical narrative of what had happened at the first Supper.

When we say that for Luther the Words of Institution are the words of consecration, this does not mean that "the moment of consecration" was fixed for him as in the Roman understanding. This point has been in dispute in recent times, and indeed some passages in Luther might lend themselves to this interpretation. "For as soon as Christ says: 'This is my body,' his body is present through the Word and the power of the Holy Spirit...as soon as the

words are added they bring with them that of which they speak” (LW 36,341; cf. also LW 37,184). Luther’s statement to the effect that the bread we see and the bread we hold in our hand, and not only the bread we eat, is the body of Christ (LW 37,300) means at the very least that Luther was not prepared to limit the sacramental presence to the moment of the sacramental eating and drinking, a thought that first appeared in the Hunniuses, father and son, at the close of the sixteenth century, generally followed by Lutheran orthodoxy, and quoted favorably by Pieper (*Christian Dogmatics*, III,373). But Luther was not dogmatic on the point. As to when the real presence begins, Luther “never established a theory about this. The same is true of the question as to the precise moment when the body and blood of Christ cease to be present” (Sasse, 137-38). The Formula’s maxim, “*nullum sacramentum extra usum*” (S.D. VII,85-86), and its definition of the “use” of the sacrament as the entire visible action of taking, blessing, distributing, and the eating and drinking, does not imply a fixing of the “moment” in the Confessions, as if it could be stated categorically that Christ is not sacramentally present until we reach the final step of the action and actually eat and drink, but rather simply means that except in the context of a full sacramental “use” there is no sacramental presence, but precisely where that presence begins and ends it does not say, and rightly so, because the Scripture itself does not tell us this.

Also the attempt is made to establish the “moment of consecration” in Luther on the basis of his statements on the adoration of Christ in the sacrament. Since Luther never limited the real presence to the instant of the distribution and reception, he spoke freely about adoration in a way that we are not accustomed to speak. It is important to understand just what he meant. In writing against the Louvain theologians, a late writing (1545), Luther speaks of the Eucharist as a sacrament “deserving of honor and adoration” (LW 34,355). In 1523 Luther wrote a major treatise on *The Adoration of the Sacrament*. While one statement from this treatise could be taken in isolation to prove that Luther required the adoration: “He who does believe, as sufficient demonstration has shown it ought to be believed, can surely not withhold his adoration of the body and blood of Christ without sinning” (LW 36,294), the passage must be read in its context. The point is that Christ is to be worshiped wherever he is present. But he is present in the sacrament “not really because he wants to be worshiped there” (36,294). Whether or not we adore is not to be judged or condemned, “for there is no command to that effect and it is not for that purpose that Christ is present” (36,295). It may even be that while people busy themselves trying to figure out how to do Christ honor, “they never get around to considering what he does for them in the sacrament” (36,295). We have it backwards if we think only of our works in the sacrament, “and pay no attention to the works that the sacrament is supposed to do and accomplish for us” (36,295). Therefore since there is the danger that by occupying ourselves in externals we will neglect the Word and faith, Luther concludes, “I really think it would be better to follow the example of the apostles and not worship, than to follow our custom and worship. Not that adoration is wrong, but simply because there is less danger in not adoring than in adoring” (36,297) since human nature always turns to its own works and neglects God’s works “and the sacrament will not admit of that” (36,297).

Chemnitz says much the same. “Christ is to be worshiped always and everywhere” (*Examen*, II,277,1), and so also in the Lord’s Supper “should be worshiped in spirit and in truth” (279,3). But our worship dare not be “tied or affixed to the elements of bread and wine” lest “beside the Creator, we worship also the creature” since no personal union exists between these earthly elements and Christ such as leads us properly to worship the humanity and deity of Christ in one person (280,4). This then is how the matter found its way into our Confessions. We reject

and condemn as false and erroneous “that the external elements of the bread and wine should be adored in the Holy Sacrament” (Epit. VII,40). “However, no one, unless he be an Arian heretic, can and will deny that Christ himself, true God and true man, who is truly and essentially present in the Supper, should be adored in spirit and in truth in the true use of the same, as also in all other places, especially where his congregation is assembled” (SD VII ,126).

But these remarks on the adoration do not alter our basic understanding that here is no attempt to fix the “moment of consecration.” Luther and Chemnitz may have held personally to the real presence on the altar, and it is indisputable that they by no means would have restricted the presence to the moment of the sacramental eating and drinking. Chemnitz himself tells us that he found the presence of Christ in the “total action of the Supper,” in the blessing, the distribution, and the sacramental eating and drinking (*Examen*, II ,248,9). But there is no frenzied effort on his part to establish the precise moment when that presence begins. It is sufficient to know that the Words of Institution are the words of consecration, that the Word alone added to the element makes the sacrament, but precisely how or when this happens after the Word has been spoken we leave to God.

Questions pertaining to the duration of the sacrament lie outside the scope of this paper except insofar as they reinforce our conviction that all questions as to the when of the presence must yield before the supreme truth that Christ is present in the Supper in his true body and blood. All attempts to prove the sacrament extended in time outside its God-given use must prove futile. The two Wolferinus Letters (St. Louis-Walch, XX, 1604-9) sent by Luther to the pastor of his birthtown, Eisleben, upbraiding him for mixing consecrated with unconsecrated elements after the Communion, may be taken to show that Luther was as unwilling to sharply limit and define the moment when the presence ends as when it begins. The letters need also to be read in the light of Luther’s concern for the sensitivities of the people since Wolferinus’ action was causing scandal and tumult in the church and “added to the so much grief of my high old age” (XX, 1604). Chemnitz shares Luther’s approach. While he is unwilling to allow that the body is “perpetually joined to the bread” (*Examen* II,249,11), as if it would be in agreement with Christ’s institution and promise for us to distribute and eat the bread “some months or years” after the blessing, yet he does not wish to enter into disputation about “moment”: “Therefore after the use of the blessed bread and wine in the Lord’s Supper one ought not to dispute about the union of the bread and the body of Christ” (*Examen*, II,251,14).

In bringing to a conclusion this discussion of matters pertaining to the “moment of consecration” it needs also be said that though this may be an area of concern to us, it was much less a concern to Luther, Chemnitz, and the Confessions where scruples over the how and when of the sacrament are disavowed. That Christ is truly and substantially present in the Supper and gives his true body and blood to the communicant to eat and drink occupies their concern, and not how this can be or when this happens within the sacramental action.

Luther’s reforms of the *Canon* in his *Formula Missae* of 1523 and *Deutsche Messe* of 1526 show in him an almost blithe disregard for any question of “moment” or for anyone’s opinion of whether or not a “moment” could be found in him. What mattered was the real presence. Thus in reversing the historic order and placing the *Sanctus* after the *Verba* with the instruction that the elevation occur at that point in the service, Luther shows himself to be more concerned from a pastoral standpoint with establishing the truth of the real presence in the minds of the people than with any fears of a “moment of consecration” being fixed in their minds. But how could anyone in the congregation hear the Words of Institution intoned, and then as the host and cup are elevated heavenward sing of “the beams and lintels” trembling at the cry of the

*trisagion* which announces that the glory of God fills all the earth, without being drawn strongly to that as the “moment of the presence”? But Luther did not trouble himself with questions like this. The elevation, he said in the *Formula Missae* (P.E. VI,90), is to be retained “chiefly for the sake of the weak who might be greatly offended by the sudden change,” while in the *Deutsche Messe* he goes farther to even encourage it on the grounds that “it goes well with the German *Sanctus*” and helps us to “remember, elevate, confess, and adore” Christ though his body and blood “are not seen” in the sacrament (P.E. VI,183). The *Sanctus* has been returned to its original position among us as the conclusion of the Preface before the speaking of the *Verba*, and generally the elevation is omitted.

Also what must be taken as the common Lutheran expression of the real presence, “the bread is the body of the Lord” (LW 36,34-5; Large Catechism, Part V,12; Chemnitz *Examen* II,229,10; SD VII,19), which on the surface leaves the door open to the misconceptions of transubstantiation or consubstantiation, is not to be shied away from. If this is the biblical expression of the real presence, we cannot be uncomfortable with it. The famous “in, with, and under” formula in fact appears only once in the writings of Luther on the sacrament, as far as I can see, and there he uses it only to show how these expressions can be used to cloak the Sacramentarian view!

For if the text read, “Take, eat, in the bread is my body,” or, “With the bread is my body,” or, “Under the bread is my body,” it would immediately begin to rain, hail, and snow a storm of fanatics crying, “You see! Christ does not say, ‘This bread is my body,’ but, ‘in the bread, or with the bread, or under the bread is my body!’” ... Thus a thousand evasions and glosses would have been devised over the words “in, with, and under,” no doubt with greater plausibility and less chance of stopping it than now... Yet they are unwilling to believe when we prove more cogently that the bread is the body of Christ, which certainly expresses more forcefully and clearly that his body is present than such a text as, “In the bread is my body.” (LW 37,306)

Luther could even be tolerant of transubstantiation on occasion, in his early writings at least, and say that “this error is not very important if only the body and blood of Christ, together with the Word, are not taken away” (LW 36,287; cf. also LW 36,33). The Formula shows that only for the sake of repudiating the papistic transubstantiation “in addition to the expressions of Christ and St. Paul (the bread in the Supper is the body of Christ or the Communion of the body of Christ), also the forms: under the bread, with the bread, in the bread, are employed” (SD VII,35).

### **The Use**

We have seen that from the time of Christ and his holy apostles the church has centered its celebration of the Lord’s Supper around the Words of Institution as the words of consecration. Because of what Jesus did at the institution of the Supper in “giving thanks” and the injunction of Jesus to “remember,” the church very early set the Words of Institution into a prayer that had as its prominent features a thanksgiving to God and a remembrance (*anamnesis*) of the death and resurrection of Christ. The prayer was made Trinitarian by concluding it with an invocation of the Holy Spirit (*epiclesis*) upon the faithful.

We have seen that this Eucharistic Prayer became corrupted through the centuries by the accretion of sacrificial elements and saint-veneration, and that the *epiclesis* was turned in the

East into a prayer over the elements “that they may become the body of the Lord and the precious blood,” thus fixing for Eastern Christendom in practice, if not in theory, the “moment of consecration.” Yet through all this Christ’s Words of Institution of the sacrament were never lost to the church, east or west.

We have seen further that Luther’s reform of the *Canon of the Mass* (*Anaphora*, Eucharistic Prayer) was a radical action. Because the central error of the Mass of turning the sacrament into sacrifice permeated the *Canon*, Luther simply and incisively eliminated the entire *Canon* of thanksgiving, *anamnesis*, and invoking of the Holy Spirit (*epiclesis*), and retained only the bare *Verba* to be recited or chanted over the elements in the consecration. Liturgical scholars to this day debate whether this was really Luther’s mind and his final word on the subject, or if he acted under pressure of time or circumstance with the need for something to be produced, in the light of the otherwise conservative tone of his reforms. It appears to this writer that since Luther did what he did to the *Canon* twice, in the *Formula Missae* of 1523 and the *Deutsche Messe* of 1526, he knew what he was doing and was content with it.

In evaluating what Luther did to the *Canon* one needs to keep in mind the enormous weight of tradition that was bound up in the *Canon* that caused the doctrinal impurities to be deeply entrenched and that called for nothing short of radical action on the Reformer’s part, an action “eminently suited to the need of the German Reformation” (Reed, 344). Luther was motivated by the twin desire to rid the service of everything that was false and impure, and to feature nothing but the Word of God as opposed to the words of men at this critical point in the service where the real presence was to manifest itself.

The question before us now is whether the use of the Eucharistic Prayer among us is to be limited to a historical exercise such as we have engaged in here, or whether in whole or in part it deserves a place in our liturgical discussions in the preparation of a new hymnal for the WELS. We will not want to be moved by nostalgia for that which is ancient and venerable in the church to reintroduce a practice that has been out of our worship for 450 years. Nor will we want considerations of an ecumenical nature to be for us the deciding factor. That which the Scripture tells us of the sacrament and its consecration is what is important liturgically for us and what needs to be liturgically stressed. If the scriptural doctrine of the Lord’s Supper is best expressed in our current liturgical practice, we have reason to retain it. If ways can be shown by which we can better express the biblical doctrine through our liturgical practice, we will want to be open to change.

What are the scriptural concerns that bear on this issue? The task of the liturgy of the consecration is in the first place to make sure that we express the mystery of the real presence of the body and blood of our Lord, truly and substantially, in the bread and in the cup, and then as best as possible to leave as mystery that which must be mystery. Although we have given caution at length above against establishing a “moment of consecration” that goes beyond the Word of Scripture, the greater concern is that we do not slight the central mystery itself of the real presence in the interest of safeguarding the ambiguity of moment.

As noted above, the *Lutheran Book of Worship* recommends in their churches a full return to the Eucharistic Prayer with the institution narrative set into the prayer, with their second option being the use of a brief prayer of thanksgiving followed by the recitation of the *Verba*, and third option the retention of the old Lutheran practice of reciting the bare *Verba* over the elements. The LC–MS *Lutheran Worship* calls for a brief prayer of thanksgiving and *anamnesis* followed by the reciting or chanting of the *Verba*.

### **Lutheran Worship Prayer of Thanksgiving**

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.

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.

As I understand the hymnbook committee thinking, the intention at this point is to make the main service liturgy in the proposed new WELS hymnal essentially a reproduction of the page 5/15 liturgy of *The Lutheran Hymnal*, perhaps in combined form rather than separately as in the present hymnbook. I understand also that there is the possibility of the inclusion of a second main service liturgy in the book that will incorporate some liturgical change. If this approach is followed, it means that the traditional Lutheran order of consecration by recitation of the bare *Verba* will be retained in liturgy 1 and that the form of consecration in liturgy 2 would at this point be open.

What arguments can be brought for and against the use of a Eucharistic Prayer or Prayer of Thanksgiving in conjunction with the Words of Institution in the liturgy? In favor of our traditional Lutheran use, in the first place, is that it centers all thought and action on the words of Christ himself. This clearly was Luther's mind. Not only are the *Verba* made to stand in their stark strength and simplicity in Luther's order, but also (in the *Deutsche Messe*) Luther's moving up of the Lord's Prayer from its historic position after the consecration to immediately precede the Words of Institution secures that central point of Lutheran worship for the Word of God only unentangled with the words of men, which was Luther's stated intent of what he wanted to do with the *Canon*.

Also, if rightly understood, the use of the bare *Verba* in the consecration agrees well with the Lutheran view of the consecration. The effective consecration of every subsequent celebration of the Lord's Supper, according to our Lutheran theology, lies in the original institution. Christ is the real Consecrator of every sacramental meal. His institution once for all time established the real presence wherever and whenever his people would gather and "do this" in remembrance of him. By focusing solely on the Words of Institution in our liturgical rite of consecration we make clear to our people that here in the Institution of Christ is the effective power of what we do in the sacrament.

On the other hand it can be argued that the stripping down of the rite of consecration to the recitation of the bare *Verba* tends to fix unduly in the minds of our people a "moment of consecration," something that runs counter to the confessional dictum that "*nullum sacramentum extra usum*." Lutheran theology defines that "use" to comprehend the total action of the sacrament of taking, blessing, distributing, eating and drinking. In rejecting the category of space inherent in the Roman transubstantiation we reject also in theory the category of time inherent in the same concept, but it may be questioned whether the liturgical practice we follow at this point adequately supports our teaching.

Luther's liturgical mind, at any rate, was not fixed, as if he thought himself to be setting down strict liturgical formulae that were to be rigidly adhered to. The discrepancies between the Latin and German masses he produced cannot be accounted for simply on the grounds that the one was designed for the high city church and the other for the less cultured village church. Nor can it be said that the later (German) mass represents his more mature, developed thinking on the subject of worship. This must be frankly admitted. Some historic Lutheran orders followed the *Formula Missae* in retaining the Lord's Prayer after the consecration, while generally the *Deutsche Messe* innovation of placing the Lord's Prayer immediately before the consecration won out, possibly reflecting the desire, after the Eucharistic Prayer was removed, that there be some prayer prior to the Words of Institution, and the Lord's Prayer was entered at this point as the highest and best prayer coming from the lips of the Savior himself. But Luther's unfortunate paraphrase of the Lord's Prayer (*Deutsche Messe*), which runs counter to his stated principle of ridding the *Canon* of the words of men in favor of the Word of God, worked as it was into an admonition of the communicants that replaced the entire liturgical service between the sermon and the Words of Institution, has not been followed by any of the Lutheran orders, so far as I know. The admonition to the communicants has found its proper place among us in a separate confessional service that may be used in preparation for Communion. Contrary to the *Deutsche Messe* the *Formula Missae* retained the historic *Salutation*, *Sursum Corda*, and *Vere Dignum* of the Preface with the Proper Preface omitted. One thing that Luther apparently felt strongly about, strong enough to include it in both masses, the placement of the *Sanctus* immediately after the Words of Institution in both masses, with the elevation occurring precisely at this point, has not been followed in the Lutheran orders. Many of the liturgical ideas Luther proposed, such as putting the sermon at the beginning of the service, positioning the officiant behind the altar, a revision of the Epistles, he was never able to put into practice.

If this makes Luther out to be a liturgical bumbler, and he has been called that and worse, we miss the point of what makes Luther great also in the area of liturgical reform. Luther had a sure sense of the gospel in dealing with the liturgy although by no means was everything he did perfect. His radical treatment of the *Canon of the Mass* enabled the freshness of the gospel to blossom at this heart of the liturgical rite. He had a pastor's heart for the people and therefore shrank from any sort of innovation that would upset their faith and worship. While other reformers had already produced their reformed liturgies – Karlstadt, Zwingli, M nzer – Luther continued to worship with the old liturgical forms that had been received. Only when the issue was forced on him did he act. The nineteenth century romanticism that produces in modern liturgical scholars the longing for the ancient words and forms of the liturgy of the early church, and that makes them look askance at Luther for not being informed in these matters, was no more a part of Luther than it was of anyone else of his day. He occupied himself with what was there for worship and worked to improve and correct it. Even the call of the radical reformers like Zwingli and the Anabaptists to the return to apostolic worship forms was not at all our modern romantic yearning for the liturgical glories of the ancient past, but the attempt to abolish them altogether. We do injustice to Luther's liturgical sense if we fail to note the careful distinction he made between externals as such, on the one hand, as the necessary forms in which the gospel is conveyed to us in opposition to the fanatics who would have done away with all externals and forms as sin in themselves in favor of "spiritual" religion – surely an absurd and impossible concept – and externalism, on the other hand, that insisted on legalistic adherence to forms even when they suppressed and silenced the gospel. In his standing firm and denouncing equally the enthusiasts for their despising of the external Word and sacrament and the Romanists



for their un-Gospel-centered traditionalism, Luther has bequeathed to us a priceless liturgical heritage.

Now as to the questions we have raised in this paper: Was it the Savior's intent that the *Verba* be spoken over the sacrament as opposed to consecrating the elements with prayer? We cannot say. Does the recitation of the bare *Verba*, which was Luther's innovation, lead us into a magical view of the consecration? Possibly. It needs to be guarded against. To whom is the consecration addressed? To God, as an expression of our faith and praise; to the elements, applying the Word and promise of Christ to them; and to the congregation, to stir faith and trust in God's promise. Can a valid sacrament be observed without the consecration? No. Can there be a valid consecration without the Words of Institution? No. Might we view as a sacrament that which used the *Verba* in the distribution only and not in the consecration? We could not deny it, but would call it unwise and unwarranted by Scripture. What essential elements (taking, blessing, thanking, breaking, giving, eating, drinking) belong properly to the sacrament? Blessing, giving, eating and drinking. Can the sacramental union be fixed to a moment of time? No. How are the statements of Luther, Chemnitz, and the Formula to the effect that Christ is to be adored in the sacrament to be understood? The elements of bread and wine are not to be adored, but Christ wherever he is present, also in the sacrament, is to be adored in spirit and in truth.

As regards the chief question: What of the use of the *Verba* in the consecration?, I would answer in this way: There is adequate biblical warranty to introduce at the point of the consecration in the liturgy more than Luther's bare Words of Institution. This in no way detracts from the *Verba* or denies them their rightful place as the words of consecration. But if we acknowledge, as we do, that the "this do" of Christ comprehends the entire sacramental action, why ought it not include also a thanksgiving such as Jesus made in his blessing and a fuller remembrance of the death and resurrection of our Lord, enriching our worship and glorifying the risen Christ who comes to us in the bread and in the cup? Rather than diminish the real presence among, how could thanksgiving and remembrance do anything but increase our sense of his presence? To this God help us.

### **Bibliography**

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

Becker, Siegbert. "The Lord's Supper: Consecration and Moment." Unpublished paper, 1979.

Bornkamm, Guenther. *Early Christian Experience*. Harper & Row, New York, 1969.

Brunner, Peter. *Worship in the Name of Jesus*. Concordia, St. Louis, 1968.

Burton, Ernest, & Edgar Goodspeed. *A Harmony of the Synoptic Gospels in Greek*. University of Chicago, 1920.

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

Erlandsson, Seth. *The Danger of Presumptuous Questions About the Lord's Supper*. Unpublished paper, 1977.

- Guide to Introducing Lutheran Worship.* Concordia, St. Louis, 1981.
- Hardt, Tom G.A. *On the Sacrament of the Altar.* Concordia Seminary, Ft. Wayne, 1984.
- Jasper, R.C.D. & G.J. Cuning. *Prayers of the Eucharist.* Oxford University, New York, 1980.
- Jeremias, Joachim. *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus.* Fortress, Philadelphia, 1966.
- Kalb, Friedrich. *Theology of Worship in 17th Century Lutheranism.* Concordia, St. Louis, 1965.
- Luther, Martin. "Letters to Simon Wolferinus." St. Louis-Walch ed. Vol. XX, 1604-49.
- Luther, Martin. "Concerning the Sacrament of the Altar." *Tischreden.* St. Louis-Walch ed. Vol. XXII, 562-595.
- Luther's Works.* Vol. 34: "Against the Thirty-two Articles of the Louvain Theologists"; Vol. 36: "The Babylonian Captivity of the Church"; "The Adoration of the Sacrament"; "The Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ Against the Fanatics"; Vol. 37: "Confession Concerning Christ's Supper"; Concordia, St. Louis & Fortress, Philadelphia.
- Luther's Works.* Philadelphia Edition. Vol. 6: "Liturgy and Hymns." Muhlenberg, Philadelphia.
- Lutheran Book of Worship.* Augsburg, Minneapolis, 1978.
- Lutheran Worship.* Concordia, St. Louis, 1982.
- Manual on the Liturgy—Lutheran Book of Worship.* Augsburg, Minneapolis, 1979.
- Pieper, Francis. *Christian Dogmatics.* Vol. III, Concordia, St. Louis, 1953.
- Reed, Luther. *The Lutheran Liturgy.*, Muhlenberg, Philadelphia, 1947.
- Sasse, Hermann. *This Is My Body.* Augsburg Minneapolis, 1959.
- The Lutheran Hymnal.* Concordia, St. Louis, 1941.
- Triglot Concordia.* Concordia, St. Louis, 1921.
- Vogel's Cross Reference and Index to the Contents of Luther's Works,* Heinrich J. Vogel, Northwestern Milwaukee 1983.