

“Drink out of It All of You”

A Study of Christ’s Last Will and Testament

Jonathan G. Lange

Circumcision of our Lord, 2003

Maine saw them first. Tiny cups, one for each communicant, were distributed on a Sunday morning *ca.* 1890. Although introduced in a Reformed congregation they spread quickly through Free churches as well. Lutherans opposed the trend. The Pennsylvania Ministerium condemned their use as early as 1895.¹ In the century since, dozens of Lutheran authors have addressed the subject. Although some have defended their continued use and many have conceded their inevitability, none have ever urged their introduction; much less, shown a scriptural impulse for it.² And whether protesting or protecting their use, most agree that the chalice is ideal.

In spite of this unanimity, individual cups entered Lutheran congregations early on.³ By 1903 H. E. Jacobs mentions that the practice had spread into “a few [congregations] of our own name in this country.”⁴ By the close of the 20th century, it is difficult to find a Lutheran congregation in North America where the individual cups are not in use. In spite of their broad acceptance here, Lutherans world-wide continue to oppose their introduction.⁵ Outside of North America, there are few places where individual communion cups are common among those who confess the real presence.⁶ In view of both historical and geographical isolation, careful reconsideration is in order.

The Institution as Rule

Innovations in sacramental practice did not begin with individual cups. Over the centuries, the Church addressed numerous proposed changes—accepting some but rejecting many others. It is her mode

¹ Frank C. Senn, “The Cup of Salvation: Take and Drink” *Lutheran Forum*, Reformation 1986, 19.

² This is an historical first. For until the introduction of individual glasses, every aberration in sacramental usage had been driven by some theological consideration.

³ One of the earliest, Messiah Lutheran church in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania began using individual cups shortly after being influenced by the Philadelphia convention of the American Health Association (October 27, 1897). Luther De Yoe, A.M., “The Individual Cup in Use,” *Lutheran Quarterly*, Vol. XXIX, No. 2 (April, 1899), 249. Congregations of the L.C.M.S. held out for two decades until Christ Lutheran Church in Remsen, Iowa approved them on April 8, 1918. (Minutes of the Voters of Christ Lutheran Church, Remsen, IA). According to a 1969 letter written by a former pastor, Rev. Noack, “I am quite sure that Christ Lutheran at Remsen was the first church of our Synod to install individual cups.”

⁴ Henry Eyster Jacobs, “The Individual Communion Cup: Opinion of the Faculty of the Lutheran Theological Seminary at Philadelphia—At the request of the Evangelical Lutheran Ministerium of Pennsylvania and Adjacent States,” (Philadelphia, PA, 1903).

⁵ This assertion is based on numerous correspondances with Lutheran leaders in Europe, Asia, South America and Africa. *e.g.* “As to my knowledge churches in Russia do not use these cups. Only some missionaries from Europe and America occasionally try to introduce this practice in Russian congregations.” Daniel Burlakov, Pastor in Novosibirsk, Russia (private correspondence, July 11, 2002).

⁶ Roman Catholicism and Eastern Orthodoxy have never countenanced the practice.

of argumentation which can be most helpful. By identifying the way she addressed these issues historically, the Church of today can step outside of her own cultural milieu and evaluate the introduction of individual glasses with objectivity and consistency.

The primary early Church text on sacramental conduct is Cyprian's letter to Cæcilius against the Encratites (253).⁷ In it, he writes against certain people who, "in sanctifying the cup of the Lord, and administering it to the people, do not do that which Jesus Christ, our Lord and God, the founder of this sacrifice, did and taught."⁸ He then articulates the rule that, "when anything is prescribed by the inspiration and command of God, it is necessary that a faithful servant should obey the Lord, acquitted by all of assuming anything arrogantly to himself."⁹ Clarifying what is prescribed by the institution and command of God, he writes that, "in offering the cup, the tradition of the Lord must be observed, and that nothing must be done by us but what the Lord first did on our behalf."¹⁰

In the paragraphs that follow, Cyprian discusses a number of Old Testament types but then returns to the institution where Jesus Himself indicates the contents of the cup. From this he concludes, "the blood of Christ is not offered if there be no wine in the cup, nor the Lord's sacrifice celebrated with a legitimate consecration unless our oblation and sacrifice respond to His passion."¹¹ After showing from 1 Corinthians 11 how Paul both delivers and confirms exactly what Jesus did, he concludes "that we must not at all depart from the evangelical precepts, and that disciples ought also to observe and do the same things which the master both did and taught."¹² Finally, in a blanket condemnation of every possible departure, he writes:

That Christ alone ought to be heard, the Father also testifies from heaven, saying, "This is my well-beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; hear ye Him." Wherefore, if Christ alone must be heard, we ought not to give heed to what another before us may have thought was to be done, but what Christ, who is before all, first did.¹³

Thus Cyprian of Carthage first enunciates and defends the rule that the Church's conduct of the Sacrament is governed by what Christ did and taught. Apparently, this was sufficient to settle the issue.

⁷ *Epistle LXII: On the Sacrament of the Cup of the Lord*, Alexander Roberts & James Donaldson, eds., *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, [ANF] Vol. 5 (Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc., 1994), 358-64. The 2nd century Christian ascetics called Encratites (Abstinentes) together with the Ebionites, acquired the name of *Hydroparastatae* ("water supporters") and *Aquarii* ("water-carriers") due to their eucharistic practices. So strict was their asceticism that condemnation of the use of wine even extended to the substitution of water for wine in the eucharistic cup. Everett Ferguson, editor, *Encyclopedia of Early Christianity*, (New York & London: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1990), 287, 298.

⁸ ANF 5:359 §1

⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁰ *Ibid.* §2

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 361 §9

¹² *Ibid.* §10

¹³ *Ibid.*, 362 §14

For although there is mention of the Encratite error in the writings of other fathers,¹⁴ it had fallen off the scope by the time the first councils were convened in the early fourth century.

A second significant text for understanding the Church's rationale is the seventh decretal of Pope Julius I (340) wherein he addresses a number of sacramental alterations.

Although every crime and sin is blotted out by the sacrifices offered to God, what else will be given to the Lord in expiation, when the defects are committed in the very act of offering the sacrifice? For we have heard that some, occupied by ambition, contrary to the divine commands and apostolic custom, offer milk instead of wine at the divine sacrifice. Also others, for the fulfillment of communion, give the people Eucharist that has been intincted. And still others, in the Sacrament of the Lord's chalice, offer pressed wine; others even reserve linen rags soaked in fresh grape juice for an entire year and, in the time of sacrifice, dip a part of it in water and thus offer. That this is contrary to the evangelical and apostolic teaching and against ecclesiastical custom will be proven without difficulty by the very source from which the ordained sacramental mysteries themselves came forth. For when the Teacher of truth entrusts the true sacrifice of our salvation to His disciples, we know that he gave not milk, but only bread and chalice in this Sacrament. For the gospel truth says, "Jesus took bread and cup, and blessing them, gave them to his disciples (Matt. 26)." Therefore it is remiss to offer milk in the sacrifice because it makes sport of the manifest and evident example of evangelical truth which does not permit anything other than bread and wine to be offered. But their practice of giving the people intincted Eucharist for the fulfillment of communion is not received from the gospel witness, where, when he gave the apostles his body and blood, giving the bread separately and the chalice separately is recorded.¹⁵

Here Julius uses the same rationale that Cyprian had to condemn other substitutions for the liquid in the chalice.¹⁶ He considers Christ's institution enough to prove the "evangelical and apostolic teaching [and] ecclesiastical custom." Julius' rejection of intinction¹⁷ is especially noteworthy since he applies

¹⁴ cf. Irenæus, *Against Heresies* (ca. 185), ANF I:527.3; Clement of Alexandria, *The Stromata* (ca. 194), ANF II:322; Hippolytus, *The Refutation of All Heresies* (ca. 230), ANF 5:124; Chrysostom, *Homily on Matthew 26:29* (ca. 390), Philip Schaff and Henry Wace, eds., *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, [NPNF] (Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc., 1994) I:10:492.

¹⁵ "Decreta Julii Papae I decem Juxta Gratiam et Ivonem" Migne, *Patralogia Latinae*, Vol. 8, 969-70; (cf. *Examination*, 352-3, 363, 422.)

¹⁶ P. E. Kretzmann reports that brandy and raisin juice may also be added to this list, "When certain congregations of the Orient used a form of brandy, called *s...kera* or μέθυσμα, made of dates, fruit, grain and other ingredients, this action was decidedly condemned. It was chiefly on account of this practice that one of the early councils passed the resolution: 'Non licet in sacrificio divino MELLITUM, quod mulsum appellatur, nec ullum aliud proculum extra vinum cum aqua mixtum offerre.' The situation in the orthodox Church is brought about by the *Apostolic Constitutions*, which forbid 'strong drink' (σίκερα) and all substitutes (ἐπιτήδευστα) in the oblation. Among the less flagrant offenders against the accepted usage were the Syrian Jacobites and the Nestorians, who used the juice of either fresh or of dried grapes and sought therein a special significance and an extraordinary perfection. But their practise was also condemned by the Church." (P. E. Kretzmann, "The Archeology of the Sacraments," *Concordia Theological Monthly*, Vol. X, No. 5 (May, 1939), 328); Possibly also honey was used. cf. *The Apostolic Constitutions*, Canon III, (NPNF II:14.594). N.B. Compared to the many attempts to alter the *contents* of the chalice, it is profoundly telling that no party ever proposed a change in the vessel itself until 1890.

¹⁷ Due to fears that Christ's blood could be spilled by very small children or by the sick, some places introduced the practice of dipping the host into the chalice and thus distributing both kinds together (cf. *Excursus on Communing the Sick*, NPNF 14:31). In the centuries after Julius, what began as a questionable practice for infants and the sick was increasingly promoted for all people as the fears of spilling the blood of Christ became disproportionate. From the ninth century on, the evidence for communion via intinction becomes more consistent,

Cyprian's maxim beyond the material elements and extends it also to govern the mode of distribution. The approach shared by Cyprian and Julius I received conciliar imprimatur in 675 when the Fourth Council of Braga reiterated Julius' seventh decretal nearly verbatim.¹⁸

Several smaller sacramental controversies also were resolved in keeping with the rule. When a fourth century grass-roots movement led some to drink of the Lord's cup at the altar but to carry the host home for later consumption, it was prohibited at the Councils of Saragossa (380) and Toledo (400).¹⁹ Similarly, when priests from Thessalonika confected enormous quantities of the Sacrament, distributing baskets of it to everyone in case persecution kept them from the church, Pope Hormisdas (519) called them heretics.²⁰ Humbert of the Romans (1000-61) even stipulates the rationale when he criticizes a similar Greek custom: "We read that the Lord did not teach His disciples an imperfect but a perfect commemoration, blessing the bread and at once distributing it. For He did not just bless it and then reserve it to be broken the next day."²¹ What Christ did and taught according to the original institution remained the litmus test of orthodox sacramental practice throughout the ancient Church.

This test was applied by Gregory II (715-731) in answer to a question about how to deal with large numbers of communicants. Boniface asked: "whether...it is licet to consecrate two or three chalices at the same time."²² He answered that since Jesus "took the cup saying, 'this is the cup of the New Testament in My blood' (Luke 22) 'this do as often as ye take' (1 Co 11), it does not agree to place two or three cups on the altar while the solemn mass is being celebrated."²³ For Gregory, Jesus' use of a single cup was enough to establish the rule for every altar. Therefore, as an alternative to Boniface's suggestion of

especially in the East. For a history of its development, see: Robert F. Taft, S.J., "Communion via Intinction" *Studia Liturgica*, Vol. 26 (1996), 225 ff. and Martin Chemnitz, *Examination of the Council of Trent*, Part II, [Examination] Trans. Fred Kramer, (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1978), 421-3.

¹⁸ The only alteration to his text is an additional phrase which clarifies what he meant with the mention of *expressum vinum*, namely, he is rejecting certain others who "*non expressum vinum in sacramento dominici calicis offerre, sed oblativis uvis populos communicare* (do not offer pressed wine but communicate the people with the offered grapes instead)." Canon II of the *Fourth Council of Braga* (675), Johannes Dominicus Mansi, *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, Vol. 11, (Florentae: Antonii Zatta, 1765), 155-6; cited in Taft, 228.

¹⁹ Council of Sargossa, Canon III (Mansi, III:634); Concil of Toledo, Canon XIV (Ibid., II:1000). cf. Taft, 234; and *Examination*, 420.

²⁰ Pope Hormisdas: Epistle 102, (Andreas Thiel, ed., *Epistulae Romanorum Pontificum genuinae et quae ad eos scriptae sunt a S. Hilario usque ad Pelagium II*, vol. I, (Brunsbearge: Eduard Peter, 1868), 902). Ten centuries later Dr. Balduin similarly condemned the idea that a Lutheran preacher could consecrate elements beforehand for a layman to distribute in his absence (George Dedekennus, editor, *Thesauri Consiliorum et Decisionum*, (Jenae: In Verlegung Zachariao Hertels, Buechhandlers in Hamburg, Gedruockt bei Johann Nisio, 1671), 567-8.

²¹ *Examination*, 298. Note that Chemnitz approvingly cites Humbert's argument.

²² Martin Gerbertus, *Vetus Liturgia alemannica*, Vol. I (S. Blas. 1776), 221.

²³ "*In missarum solemnibus illud observandum est, quod Dominus noster Jesus Christus sanctis suis tribuit discipulis. Accepit namque calicem dicens: Hic est calix Novi Testamenti in meo sanguine (Luc. xxii), hoc facite quotiescunque sumetis (I Cor. xi). Unde congruum non est duos vel tres calices in altario ponere cum missarum solemnibus celebrantur.*" "*Epistola XIV: Gregorii Papae II ad Bonifacium Episcopum*" Migne, *Patrologia Latinae*, Vol. 89, 525; cf. George Drach, "Have Individual Communion Cups Any Historical Justification?" *Lutheran Church Review*, Vol. XXVI, No. 3 (July 1907), p. 572.

multiple chalices, Gregory championed the use of a *fistula*.²⁴ This silver tube was designed to assist in drinking out of a single, large chalice. Presumably, it was necessary only when either the vessel's size or the communicant's sickness made a direct drink difficult. Accordingly, the wide-spread use of the *fistula* indicates also the wide-spread acceptance of Gregory's answer to Boniface. In fact, the *fistula* was used in the Roman Church through the middle ages and at least to the threshold of this century.²⁵

What Christ said and did regarding the single cup was received and continued in the Lutheran Church as well. The *fistula* was discussed without contention at the Diet of Augsburg.²⁶ It continued to be used in Lutheran congregations even after it largely declined in Roman Catholic churches.²⁷ The Reformed were the first to depart from this ancient use.²⁸ As early as 1550, London's church order reintroduced the use of multiple chalices.²⁹ It is unclear exactly when multiple chalices entered Lutheran communion practice. However, it seems that in Altona and Brandenburg, at least, use of a single chalice continued into the eighteenth century. At that time, pietistic objections to the *fistula* prompted royal edicts against it.³⁰

While the continued use of the *fistula* implies a Lutheran acceptance of Cyprian's argument, Martin Chemnitz makes it explicit in his critique of Trent. In his *Examination*, he cites the epistle to Cæcilus more often and more extensively than any other writing of the fathers.³¹ By it, he demonstrates that, "the

²⁴ Also called: "canna, pugillaris, calamus, virgula, arundo, tubus, tubulus, sumptorius (suctorius?), canalis, canola, siphon [and] pipa." Julius Smend, *Kelchversagung und Kelchspendung in der abendländischen Kirche*, (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1898), 17. cf. Gerbertus, 224.

²⁵ The *fistula* was mentioned by Paschius Radbertus who was born in the eighth century and it was known in France as early as the ninth. "The calamus [*fistula*] was mentioned frequently in the *Ordines Romani*." Gerbertus, 226; Both Innocent III (1198) and Benedict XIV (1740) speak of it and it was still customary in the papal mass as recently as 1898. cf. Smend, 17-18.

²⁶ David Chytraeus, *History of the Augsburg Confession*, (Rosteck: Gedruckt durch Jacobum Lucium Siebenburger, 1576), 164.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 19. cf. Drach, 573. Apparently, after the cup was withdrawn from the laity, concelebrations which required a vessel large enough for a *fistula* were rare.

²⁸ Although the 1530 Church order for the Lutheran Church in Riga stipulates the use of three separate chalices, only one chalice was used on the altar at the Divine Service. The other two chalices were used for communing ordinary invalids and contagious invalids respectively. cf. Emil Sehling, *Die Evangelischen Kirchenordnungen Des XVI Jahrhunderts*, Vol. 5 (Leipzig: O. R. Reisland, 1913), 17.

²⁹ Aemelius Ludwig Richter, *Die Evangelischen Kirchenordnungen Des Sechszehnten Jahrhunderts*, Vol. II (Weimar: Verlag des Landes-Industriecomptoirs, 1846), 108. Ironically, several Lutheran theologians of the twentieth century cited the use of multiple chalices as a reason to approve individual communion cups. e.g. "In many churches two cups are used, why not more?" Fritz, 130.

³⁰ "Für Altona hat ein Edikt des dänischen Königs Friedrich IV. (18 September 1705), für Brandenburg noch später königlich preußische Orders der *fistula* den Geraus gemacht." Smend, 19.

³¹ Chemnitz' cites one passage of Cyprian's letter five times: "That Christ alone ought to be heard, the Father also testifies from heaven, saying, 'This is my well-beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; hear ye Him.' Wherefore, if Christ alone must be heard, we ought not to give heed to what another before us may have thought was to be done, but what Christ, who is before all, first did. Neither is it becoming to follow the practice of man, but the truth of God; since God speaks by Isaiah the prophet, and says, 'In vain do they worship me, teaching the commandments and doctrines of men.'" ANF 5:362.14 (*Examination*, 251, 294, 295, 362 and 374). Under Topics 4, 5 and 6 Chemnitz cites other parts of this epistle 8 more times. (*Ibid.*, 295-7, 342, 351-2, 367, 463, 538-9) with his longest citation of

fathers opposed the weightiest reasons from the example, instruction, precept, and command of the Lord.” Summarizing Cyprian, he writes:

In consecrating the cup of the Lord and administering it to the people the manner of evangelical truth and of the tradition of the Lord must be held fast; there is to be no departing through a human and new institution from what Christ, the teacher, both commanded and did. He declares that those err who, in consecrating the cup of the Lord and administering it to the people, do not do what Christ, the author and teacher of this sacrament, did and taught. He says that when men have fallen into this error, they must return to the guide and origin of the Dominical tradition so that nothing other is done by us than what the Lord did for us first.³²

Chemnitz quotes Cyprian extensively, especially those paragraphs which argue that the Lord’s Supper ought to be observed exactly as Christ taught and did.³³ However, he passes over other significant portions of the letter. Apparently, Cyprian’s arguments there are not solid enough to be repeated. It is not difficult to see why. The omitted arguments are not based on Jesus’ words but rather rest upon types and symbols. Chemnitz endorses only those arguments that are rooted in the words and actions of Christ. When the Church observes and does what Christ expressly taught and did, it is quite enough. Pious obedience demands no independent proof that these things are significant.

These he considers as “solid arguments (*solidae rationes*)” that are “general and universal.”³⁴ Even though penned in the midst of an altogether different controversy, he finds them appropriate to address every question of

what must be done in consecrating the cup of the Lord and administering it to the people in order that the tradition of the Lord may be preserved. Arguing from the lesser to the greater, these arguments of Cyprian are rightly applied to the present controversy. For if he battles so sharply with the weightiest arguments against the water-dispensers, who left the cup itself and the words about the cup (*ipsum calicem et verba calicis*) to the people, and only changed something of the element, how much more sharply, do you think, he would have risen up on the same basis if someone at that time had wanted to take away and forbid the whole cup of the Lord, and the words concerning the cup (*totum calicem Dominum, et verba calicis*), to the faithful people?³⁵

The general and universal arguments used by Cyprian apply to all questions of sacramental practice. It is never permitted to depart from Christ’s usage or His words about the usage.

Chemnitz also cites Julius’ seventh decretal to discuss the importance of determining sacramental usage on the proper grounds.

It is worth the effort to consider on what grounds he refutes [intinction]. He says that it is contrary to the divine order (*divinum ordinem*), contrary to the apostolic institutions (*Apostolicas institutiones*), likewise it is contrary to the evangelical and apostolic teaching (*Evangelicae institutiones*) and ecclesiastical custom (*consuetudini Ecclesiasticae*). He also shows (and this must be especially noted) from where the proofs in this matter must be sought and taken. For he

any material from the fathers being that on pages 351-2 of the *Examination*.

³² *Examination*, 351; cf. ANF 5:359.

³³ *Examination*, 352.

³⁴ *Examination*, 351-2; Preuss, ed., *Examini Concilii Tridentum*, [Examini] (Berolini: Sumptibus Gust. Schlawitz, 1861), 348.

³⁵ *Examination*, 352; *Examini*, 348-9.

says, “It will not be difficult to prove this from the fountain of truth itself, from which the ordained mysteries of the sacraments have come forth.”³⁶

These four grounds—divine order, apostolic constitutions, evangelical and apostolic teaching and ecclesiastical custom—all derive from one single source, namely, what Christ Himself did and taught.

The Lutheran Symbols use this same mode of argumentation.

Among us both kinds of the sacrament are given to the laity for the following reason (*aus dieser Ursach*). There is a clear order and command of Christ in Matthew 26: “Drink from it, all of you.” Concerning the cup Christ here commands with clear words that all should drink from it (AC XXII.1).³⁷

The *Augustana* argues for the use of both kinds with one singular reason: Christ did and taught it in the institution. After a brief rebutting of Roman arguments, it returns to the main point: “Now, it is obvious that this custom, introduced contrary to God’s command and to the ancient canons, is not right.” (AC XXII.10). This is the primary argument of the Apology as well. “There can be no doubt that it is godly and in accordance with the institution of Christ and the words of Paul to use both elements in the Lord’s Supper. For Christ instituted both elements...” (Ap XXII.1). Again, only one reason is offered: Christ instituted it thus. The remainder of the article rebuts the various arguments that the papists use for not following Christ’s institution.

This same reliance on what Christ did and taught remained the normative authority for sacramental conduct through the Post-Reformation era and up to the present. In August of 1655, the Leipzig theological faculty addressed the case of a priest who inverted the distribution and gave the cup before the host.³⁸ They wrote,

when we well consider such troublesome behavior and clumsy error we find that such an inverted *Administration* of the Holy Supper runs completely contrary to the institution of Christ... And we consider that the proper Sacrament can be given to the parish only so long as such a Holy Sacrament is distributed, not only in the *material* and *substantial parts*, but the *form*, *i.e.* the mode and arrangement, in which Christ has distributed it and that we, too, should and must *administer* it—namely, that the blessed bread must go first and the blessed cup follow thereafter to have its intended end as is the Lord’s desire.³⁹

The weight of their judgment rests upon the mode and arrangement of Christ’s institution. From this, they derive its intended end and even the Lord’s own desire.⁴⁰ This was not an isolated opinion. Almost

³⁶ *Examination*, 422; *Examin*, 376. “The reader notices that the Roman church at that time used far difference bases in controversies about the Communion of the Lord’s Supper than are used now. For the divine order, the apostolic institutions, the evangelical and apostolic teaching, and ancient ecclesiastical custom are named. To these we are now appealing. But opposed to us are the power of the church, later custom, and arguments from reason.” (*Ibid.*)

³⁷ Robert Kolb and Timothy J. Wengert, eds. *The Book of Concord: The Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*, (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000), 362. Unless otherwise noted, confessional citations are from this source.

³⁸ “*Wie sich zu verhalten wenn ein Priester ex errore den gesegneten Kelch vor dem gesegneten Brodt austheilet?*” Dedekennus, 409.

³⁹ *Ibid.* Italics indicate that the original switches from German to Latin.

⁴⁰ As a remedy for this error, the Leipzig faculty says that the people who received the Chalice before the host

a century earlier (March 10, 1557), Dr. Andreas Hyperius wrote virtually the same thing.⁴¹ Again, over a century later, Christoph Seidel's Pastoral Theology (1769) judged that such a reception of the Sacrament is invalid (*ungiltig*)—an opinion cited and approved in Walther's *Pastoral Theology* of 1872.⁴²

Still in this century, Lutheranism has maintained Pope Julius' position on intinction. In a decision of the Saginaw convention, the Missouri Synod resolved,

We definitely reject intinction, because while distributing the bread, the Savior said, "Take, eat!" Matt. 26:25; Mark 14:22; and while giving the wine, He said, "Drink ye all of it!" Matt. 26:27; Mark 14:23. Intinction would be a direct violation of the words of institution.⁴³

This 1944 convention action reiterates the historic position of the Lutheran Church on intinction and argues in the same way that Cyprian, Julius and all of Lutheranism had.

The most recent example of the use of Cyprian's maxim is seen in Lutheranism's response to grape juice.⁴⁴ Shortly after the invention of "Dr. Thomas Welch's Unfermented Wine," C.F.W. Walther, wrote:

It is an error...when the Reformed Beza, following Calvin, wanted to permit the holy Supper to be celebrated with any substituted elements similar to the bread and wine; or when the Gnostic Encratites from the second to the fourth centuries forbade wine and used only water in its place, even in the holy Supper, in which they have recently been followed in America by certain temperance fanatics (*Abstinenz-Schwärmer*).⁴⁵

In recent years, both seminaries of the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod have issued opinions against grape juice that argue nearly identically.⁴⁶ The meaning of *γέννημα τῆς ἀμπέλου* is not determined by etymology (i.e. what it might describe in modern, scientific categories) but by the way it was used by Jesus and understood in first century Palestine. Even though grape juice is squeezed from the fruit of the vine, Jesus' words do not mean grape juice, but wine. Pumpkins also grow on vines but pumpkin wine is

should receive the chalice again. "*und uns überschickte Frage unsere Meynung diese dass der Sachen hätte leicht können gerathen werden wenn der Pfarrer so bald er seines Irrthums inne worden den Kelch ferner zu reichen hätte nachgelassen es Gemeine angezeigt wie er wegen seines schwindelsüchtigen Kopffs geirret hätte und das gesegnete Brodt auszutheilen angefangen auch die 7. Personen so allbereit den Kelch empfahen dahin bescheiden das sie nochmals weil er mit anticipirung des Kelchs geirret hätte*" (*Ibid.*).

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 571

⁴² C.F.W. Walther, *Pastoral Theology*, (New Haven: Lutheran News, Inc., 1995), 143; C.F.W. Walther, *Americanish-Lutherische Pastoraltheologie*, (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1906), 187.

⁴³ Saginaw Convention Proceedings, 1944, 254-5. Note also: "We cannot but look upon this practice as an improper use of the Sacrament. If Christ took bread and gave it, no one has the right to change the procedure. If the church or the celebrant should decide how the Sacrament be used, Christ's "This do" may just as well be abolished entirely." A.E. Krause, "The Proper Use of Holy Communion" *The Abiding Word*, vol. III, (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1960), 499.

⁴⁴ Thomas Welch, prohibitionist minister and dentist invented "Dr. Welch's Unfermented Wine" in the 1870s and marketed it as a substitute for communion wine.

⁴⁵ *Pastoral Theology*, 130; *Pastoraltheologie*, 168-9. (cf. Franz Pieper, *Christian Dogmatics*, vol. III. (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1953), 354 note 94).

⁴⁶ cf. "Opinion of the Department of Systematic Theology: The Fruit of the Vine in the Sacrament of the Altar," *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 45:1/2 [Jan./Apr., 1981], 77-80; "Is 'Non-Alcoholic Wine' Really Wine?" (Theological Observer) *Concordia Journal* 17:1 [Jan. 1991], 4-6.

not what Jesus meant by γέννημα τῆς ἀμπέλου. It is simply not permitted to change the meaning of Jesus' words—even if such a meaning can be conveyed by using His very words.

In July of 2001, the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod incorporated these opinions into a formal resolution which reasons, “Since Christ used and sanctified no other element for this Sacrament;...therefore be it *Resolved*, That the congregations be encouraged to used only wine for the Sacrament.”⁴⁷ Contemporary opposition to grape juice employs the same universal argument of the historic Church. No departure is tolerated either from Christ's usage or His words about the usage.

The Institution as Limit

Proper conduct of the Sacrament is based solely on what Christ did and taught in the institution. Lutheranism has never based her sacramental practice either upon what Christ probably did or upon how he might have done it differently in a different context. Some fear that this posture could lead to a biblicistic legalism that demands the imitation of every historical circumstance. These fears are unfounded. In fact, legalistic trends to multiply ceremonial requirements in the Sacrament arise from *laxity* in the reading of Christ's words not *strictness*. Historical inferences and symbolic argumentation become the focus only when the actual words of Jesus are left behind. It is precisely a strict adherence to the words of Jesus that has prevented the Lutheran Church from allowing additional requirements to be laid on the institution of Christ.

One example of this is that, “the earliest churches used...ordinary leavened bread,” in the eucharist.⁴⁸ This might seem incongruous since the Lord's Supper was instituted on the Jewish Passover and there is virtual certainty that the bread which Jesus blessed, broke and gave to the twelve was unleavened, ἄζυμος. However, since Christ does not use the usual Greek term for unleavened bread but the generic word for bread, ἄρτος, the Western Church has never considered unleavened bread as necessary but has allowed either.

In the Great Schism (1054) Greek polemicists argued from history, etymology, philology and symbolism that *leavened* bread is not only allowed but required in the eucharist. Again, Cyprian's maxim trumped all of these arguments when the Latin Church rested her case in the kind of bread used by Christ

⁴⁷ “To Encourage Use of Only Wine in Administration of the Lord's Supper” *Convention Proceedings: 61st Regular Convention, The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod*, July 14-20, 2001, 141 (Res. 3-16). It is worthy of mention here that a substitute resolution, “To Encourage Use of Fruit of the Vine in the Lord's Supper” was defeated. Apparently this was seen an attempt to blunt the force of the resolution by allowing modern etymological interpretations of Christ's words.

⁴⁸ Joachim Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, (London & Philadelphia: SCM Press & Trinity Press International, 1966), 63. “Unleavened bread was hardly at hand in everyday life” (*Ibid.*, note 5). “The different customs that figured in the medieval debates between the eastern and western churches about the bread in the eucharist (leavened in the Orthodox church and unleavened in the Roman Catholic church) appear not to have been a matter of discussion in ancient Christianity” (Ferguson, 160).

at the institution. By this, she demonstrated that ἄρτος could mean either leavened or unleavened bread, thus forcing the Greeks back to Christ's institution. Although numerous Greek polemicists proposed ways to assert that Christ used leavened bread, their positions were varied and contradictory resulting in "the death of the argument."⁴⁹

Modern Lutheranism sides with the Western Church. Walther writes in his *Pastoral Theology*:

It is an adiaphoran whether the bread is leavened or unleavened; whether it is rye, wheat, [corn], barley, or oat bread, (*Roggen-, Weizen-, Korn-, Gersten- oder Haferbrod*) whether it has this or that form; as long as it is baked from water and the flour of some grain (*Getreidemehl*).⁵⁰

Ἄρτος includes every kind of grain bread and excludes only non-grain breads.

Just as unleavened bread is virtually certain, Jesus' use of *krama* (wine mixed with water) is also.⁵¹ For this reason, many insist with the Council of Carthage (397) that, "In the Sacrament of the body and blood of the Lord, nothing other is to be offered than what the Lord Himself handed down, that is, bread and wine mixed with water."⁵² Nevertheless, Lutheranism does not. In his *Examination of the Council of Trent*, Martin Chemnitz opposes the Tridentine insistence with Christ's institution: "the evangelists write expressly of the wine, or of the fruit of the vine, which was in the Dominical cup, but make no mention of water." This he writes even granting the probability that Christ used tempered wine.⁵³ Likewise, C.F.W. Walther writes in his *Pastoral Theology*:

It is also an adiaphoron whether the wine is red or white; whether it is totally pure (*ganz reiner / merum*) or is mixed with water (such as the Lord probably used according to the custom in that country); as long as it is from the fruit of the vine (γέννημα τῆς ἀμπέλου) according to Matt. 26:29. It is an error when the Greek and Roman churches want the holy Supper celebrated only with *Krama* (οἶνος ὕδατι κεκραμμένος—wine mixed with water).⁵⁴

Lutheranism refuses to prescribe anything in the conduct of the Sacrament which Christ's words themselves do not—even when the proposed rule has absolute historical certainty. Sacramental requirements are determined not only by what Christ *did*, but by what His words *teach* that He did.

From this, a number of other questions may be laid to rest. Must the Sacrament take place in an upper room, or with thirteen men around the table, or in the evening or in a reclining position? All of these historical circumstances are certainly true, but none of them is taught by Christ during His institution.⁵⁵ If

⁴⁹ John H. Erickson, "Leavened and Unleavened: Some Theological Implications of the Schism of 1054," *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly*, Vol. 14, No. 3 (1970), 173; cf. 155-176.

⁵⁰ *Pastoral Theology*, 130; *Pastoraltheologie*, 168.

⁵¹ cf. Ferguson, 940 and Jeremias, 110 and 221 n. 1.

⁵² "Ut in sacramentis corporis et sanguinis Domini nihil amplius offeratur, quam ipse Dominus tradidit, hoc est, panis et vinum aqua mixtum. Augusti lists five other councils which passed almost the same resolutions" Kretzmann, 328. cf. *The Council of Quinisext* (692) Canon xxxii (NPNF II:14.379-80) and *The African Code*, Canon xxxvii (NPNF II:14.460).

⁵³ *Examination*, 540.

⁵⁴ *Pastoral Theology*, 130; *Pastoraltheologie*, 168-9.

⁵⁵ The words, "while they were eating," and "after supper," are not those of Jesus during the institution but are historical circumstances noted by the evangelists. "There is a vast difference between the things that pertain to the

they had been, the Church would certainly have observed them. So writes, St. Augustine: “if the Lord had not prescribed it, but only admonished that the Eucharist should always be dispensed and received after supper, I believe that no one would have changed that custom.”⁵⁶

When, during the reformation, some began to argue that a valid celebration of the Lord’s Supper required the celebrant to break a single loaf into pieces, Christ’s institution remained the sole answer.⁵⁷ Both Chemnitz and Luther address the argument by denying that the word *κλᾶν* means “to break.” Rather, they hold that the verb properly “means to distribute bread”⁵⁸ and that

according to Hebrew custom it was not necessary in speaking about something being broken that it actually be torn to pieces or broken into small parts, but whatever was offered, distributed, obtained, and received at a meal (even if the action took place without any crumbling or breaking) was said to be “broken.”⁵⁹

They argued this, first, from the Scriptural use of the word when it is applied to food⁶⁰ and, second, from Paul’s use of *κλωμένον* as a synonym for Luke’s *διδόμενον* (given).⁶¹

Thus, Luther, Chemnitz and the early reformers denied the necessity of the *fractio panis* and affirmed the propriety of communion wafers (in use since the fourth century)—even refusing to fracture the host *in statu confessionis*. Far from ignoring the force of the Greek word *κλᾶν*,⁶² they insisted, rather, on the proper rendering of it.⁶³ The *verba* simply do not say that He broke the bread in the course of the action—He might or might not have done so. They say only that He distributed the bread during the

substance of the sacraments (*ea quae ad substantiam Sacramentorum pertinent*), which have the institution, precept, and command of God, and the external circumstances (*externas circumstantias*), which do not have the precept and command of God but are freely observed for the sake of edification. Such circumstance is whether this sacrament is to be received after eating or, indeed, by those who have fasted...For it is beyond debate that the substance of the sacraments consists in matter and form, that is, in the Word of God and the external element divinely instituted for this purpose (*substantiam Sacramentorum constare materia et forma, hoc est, verbo Dei, et externo elemento divinitus ad hoc instituto*.)” *Examination*, 363-4; *Examin*, 353.

⁵⁶ *Examination*, 391.

⁵⁷ The Reformed argument is not driven *primarily* by strict adherence to Christ’s words. Rather it is a liturgical expression of how the Reformed understood the words of Jesus, “This is my body broken for you” (1 Cor. 11:24). Here they saw a direct reference to the passion of Christ’s corporeal body so that the “broken body” was not understood of Christ’s sacramental distribution in the bread but of Jesus’ crucifixion. (cf. Martin Chemnitz, *The Lord’s Supper*, trans. J.A.O. Preus (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1979), 122 and *Pastoral Theology*, 130)

⁵⁸ *Great Confession Concerning Christ’s Supper*, AE 37:266.

⁵⁹ *Lord’s Supper*, 123.

⁶⁰ In fact, every single occurrence of the word in the New Testament clearly supports this understanding. (Matthew 14:19; 15:36; 26:26; Mark 8:6, 19; 14:22; Luke 22:19; 24:30; Acts 2:46; 20:7, 11; 27:35; 1 Corinthians 10:16 and 11:24).

⁶¹ *Lord’s Supper*, 123-4; *This Is My Body*, AE 37:43; *Great Confession Concerning Christ’s Supper*, AE 37:266, 332-3; *Against the Heavenly Prophets*, AE 40:177-8, 208-10.

⁶² They insisted upon its application against the Roman Private Mass which did not consider the distribution and giving as part of the Sacrament’s essence.

⁶³ cf. *Against the Heavenly Prophets*, AE 37:178. On these very same grounds, Chemnitz also argues against the necessity of submersion in baptism. (See, *Examination*, 394.)

course of the action. For this reason Reformed insistence on the *fractio panis* is a legalistic requirement foreign to Christ's institution.

The Lutheran argument proceeds from absolute deference to the words of institution. The reformers, like Augustine, give every reason to believe that if ἔκλασεν did, in fact, prove to mean that Jesus fractured a single loaf at the Supper's institution, they too, would have insisted on the fracture and disapproved of the wafers regardless of how old the practice. Cyprian's maxim, first articulated in 253, serves both to establish the Dominical usage and to guard against human additions. Nothing else is needed. By this one, steadfast rule, two millennia of questions over sacramental conduct were settled.

Confusion and doubt regarding the sufficiency of this rule was not introduced by the reformers but by later Lutheran dogmaticians who drifted from the solid Scriptural base. Conceding what Luther and Chemnitz do not, they allow that κλάω means "to break" but argue that it is nonetheless non-essential to the Sacrament.⁶⁴ This is recognizably the same argument that the Council of Constance (1415) used against Huss and the Council of Trent against the Lutherans. Both claimed that what Christ did and taught is not necessarily essential to the Sacrament.

The Institution as Essence

Whether the doing and teaching of Christ stands alone or is supported by other argumentation, it must always be understood as a complete argument that is valid in itself. Nothing more is required for it to be normative. Demanding further validation would nullify the solid and general argumentation universally used by the Church. Furthermore, what could possibly be required to make Christ's institution more sure? Shall proof be demanded that some usage is necessary or that it is essential? How could such things be proved? Take, for instance, the use of bread—one practice that has never been questioned by anyone. Apart from Jesus' naming it and saying, "this do," it cannot be proven that it is either necessary or essential. Who could prove that Jesus *needs* to use bread and cannot give His body under another food? Who will prove what aspects of bread make it *essential*? Is it the grain, the baking, the edibility, all of these or none? As soon as necessity and essence are isolated from the doing and teaching of Christ, the entire conduct of the Sacrament is clouded in a monstrous uncertainty.

It is hardly imaginable that anyone would have introduced a change in sacramental practice while admitting that he was altering an essential or necessary aspect. On the contrary, every innovation must

⁶⁴ e.g. "So breaking the bread is not an essential part of this action (*kein wesentliches Stück dieser Handlung*)."
Pastoraltheologie, 169. "They [the Reformed] insist that Jesus broke the bread and that we must do likewise. But Jesus simply broke the bread in order to give it to each of His disciples, and His injunction 'This do' does not include the *breaking* of the bread as an *essential* feature of the distribution." John H. C. Fritz, D. D., *Pastoral Theology*, (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1945), 122; cf. Johann Gerhardt, *A Comprehensive Explanation of Holy Baptism and the Lord's Supper*, trans. Elmer Hohle (Malone, Texas: Repristination Press, 2000), 314.

be introduced with the claim that it replaces something non-essential and unnecessary. Both negative and positive examples of this argumentation can be seen in sacramental controversies.

Beginning with Pope Julius I and continuing through the twentieth century, communion via intinction is consistently rejected as a direct violation of Jesus' words, "Drink out of it, all of you." This general condemnation is never dependent upon the secondary argumentation that intinction might negate the sacramental presence. Even its most strident critics, who were not above reminding their opponents that only Judas received an intincted morsel, shied away from making any such claim.⁶⁵ But this in no way blunted their application of Cyprian's maxim that there is to be no departing from what Christ, the teacher, both commanded and did.

While opponents of intinction have remained silent on whether Christ's sacramental presence is affected, the theological faculty at Leipzig directly addressed this point when they condemned the inverted order of distribution as "troublesome behavior and clumsy error." In that 1655 opinion, they wrote,

In [the inverted Sacrament], admittedly, the *essence of the Sacrament* is present but not according to such manner and in such arrangement as Christ ordained it and has prescribed it to be administered by us in the institution of the Holy Supper. Furthermore, we consider it no true Sacrament. And we consider that the proper Sacrament can be given to the parish only so long as such a Holy Sacrament is distributed, not only in the *material* and *substantial parts*, but the *form*, *i.e.* the mode and arrangement.⁶⁶

While freely admitting that the essence of the Sacrament (*substantalia Sacramenti*) is present, they still do not hesitate to condemn the practice in the strongest terms and deny that it is the true Sacrament.

It was the Tridentine theologians (following Constance) who most blatantly pitted what is deemed necessary and essential against Christ's deed and command. For they did not argue against both kinds by denying Lutheran assertions about the upper room. They openly admitted that Christ instituted the Sacrament in both kinds and gave it to His disciples that way. They admitted that St. Paul supported this use in the Corinthian congregation.⁶⁷ They even admitted that the ancient church communicated both laity and clergy in both kinds. This notwithstanding (*hoc non obstante*),⁶⁸ they went on to argue, as they

⁶⁵ Taft, 228-233.

⁶⁶ Dedekennus, 409. Italics indicate that the original switches from German to Latin.

⁶⁷ They did, however, assert that on other occasions the apostles celebrated in one kind. No one has ever asserted that the apostles sometimes used individual cups.

⁶⁸ In his *Examination* (361-382), Chemnitz returns almost a dozen times to lambaste this phrase from the Council of Constance, *hoc non obstante*. He then shows that although Trent dropped the phrase they still retained its force. "The Council of Constance...decreed that, the Dominical institution notwithstanding, recent custom must be considered as law." "[Trent asserts:] Although Christ instituted this sacrament and handed it down to the apostles under the forms of bread and wine, the lay people, and clergy who are not confecting, are bound by no divine precept to receive both kinds." Chemnitz calls it an excellent example of begging the question: "Although absolutely no reason has been shown, brought forward, and explained, they nevertheless declare and proclaim nakedly and simply...that although Christ instituted the use of both kinds, lay people are nevertheless obligated by no divine precept to receive both kinds." (*Examination*, 396-7.)

still argue now, that the mode of distributing Christ's body and blood—be it separately, in host and cup; or together, in the host alone—is adiaphorous.⁶⁹

It is from this posture that they assert, “[the synod] further declares that this power has always been in the Church, that in the dispensation of the sacraments, provided their essence is preserved (*salve illorum substantia*), she may order and change whatever she judges.”⁷⁰ Lutheranism has never denied the principal that the Church has the power to alter non-essentials.

We do not deny, I say, that with respect to such arrangements the church has power, namely, that all things may be done in orderly fashion, decently, and for edification. However, the papalists stretch this power beyond its proper bounds, as if the church could, by a similar power, change, mutilate, prohibit, and take away also those things which the Son of God instituted, ordained, prescribed, commanded, and taught in the institution of the Supper.⁷¹

Chemnitz flatly denies that the the essence is preserved when anything of what Christ taught in the institution is changed. This he does “because it cannot be proved.”⁷²

Underlying and supporting the Tridentine assertion that the cup is non-essential to the Sacrament, the synod likewise argues against its necessity: “Those who receive one kind only are not defrauded of any grace necessary for salvation.”⁷³ This claim is reiterated in the concluding canons the chapter. “If anyone says that by God's command, or because it is necessary for salvation, each and every believer in Christ ought to receive both kinds of the sacrament of the Holy Eucharist, let him be anathema.”⁷⁴ Before Trent was ever convened, Luther had forcefully answered this sophistry in the Smalcald Articles.

Nor do we need the lofty learning which teaches us that there is as much under one kind as under both. This is how the sophists and the Council of Constance teach. Even if it were true that there is as much under one kind as under both, one kind is still not the complete order and institution as established and commanded by Christ. (SA III.vi.2-3)

Not only are essence and necessity unprovable apart from the institution of Christ, they could not be pitted against Christ's institution in any case.⁷⁵ Simple obedience to Christ trumps every argument from human reason.

⁶⁹ “The fact that laypeople today can, in certain circumstances, receive the chalice in the Roman mass changes nothing in the controversy which has existed between Lutheranism and Roman Catholicism for centuries. The controversy has always been about the question of whether the chalice *has* to be distributed at mass, not if it *may* be distributed” (Tom G. A. Hardt, *On the Sacrament of the Altar: A Book of the Lutheran Doctrine of the Lord's Supper* (Fort Wayne: C.T.S. Press, 1984), 29, note 2). Trent even stipulated that the cup may be granted to the laity—as long as the people who receive it first admit that one kind is both laudable and in keeping with divine law. (“CONDITIONS UNDER WHICH IT SEEMS THE USE OF THE CUP COULD BE GRANTED,” *Examination*, 433.)

⁷⁰ *Examination*, 338; *Examin*, 342.

⁷¹ *Examination*, 412.

⁷² *Ibid.* “The church cannot assume to itself the liberty of making Christ's ordinances matters left to human choice (*res indifferentia*).” (Ap XXII.15). Attempting to do so, Chemnitz chides, is nothing more than an attempt “to be wiser than Christ.” *Examination*, 428.

⁷³ *Examination*, 338. (cf. p. 427 ff.)

⁷⁴ *Examination*, 338-9.

⁷⁵ Chemnitz points out that neither the cup nor the wine are necessary for their material or formal qualities. But he does not on this account set either one aside since both embrace the blood of Christ. “Christ says: ‘This cup is the

In the same way, Chemnitz does not rationalize about what good might or might not come about from partaking of the wine. What is at stake in this controversy is the integrity of Christ's institution. "The papalists say that the same thing is accomplished in the taking of the bread. But we know that the efficacy of the sacraments must be judged from the Word."⁷⁶ Whatever the reason that Christ did what He did, the Church's task is to receive it in simple faith.⁷⁷ An exploration of the reasons may serve to inform and edify, but it is the worst kind of rationalism when Christ's actions must be deemed essential or necessary before His institution is followed.

"The essence of the Supper (*ad substantiam coenae Dominicae*) must be learned and determined not from human argumentations but from the testamentary institution of the Son of God."⁷⁸ In this, Chemnitz approves of Lombard and the scholastics who "assert that the essential things in the sacraments are the matter and the form (*substantalia Sacramentorum affirmant esse materiam et formam*)."⁷⁹ In the *gutachten* of the Leipzig faculty noted above, *materiam* was defined as the substantial part of the Sacrament (bread and wine) while *formam* was defined as "the manner and arrangement in which Christ has dispensed it and by which it also should and must be administered by us."⁸⁰

This understanding of *essence* mirrors that of the Lutheran Symbols which mention the "essence of this Sacrament" in only one place, (LC V.20). There, what is essential to the Sacrament (*Wesen / substantiam*) are the words of institution. "For upon these words rest our whole argument, our protection and defense against all errors and deceptions that have ever arisen or may yet rise" (LC V.19). This corresponds also to the language of the Small Catechism which calls the Words of Institution "the chief thing (*häuptstück / caput et summa*) in the Sacrament" (SC VI.8).⁸¹ Furthermore, this manner of speaking

new covenant,' not because of the cup—either its material or its form (*vel materiam vel formam*), nor because its content was the fruit of the vine, but [because Jesus says,] 'in My blood'" (De Coene, 34; cf. *Lord's Supper*, 116)

⁷⁶ *Examination*, 429. The entire exchange here is useful (*Examination*, 428-9).

⁷⁷ Luther says the same about the institution of Baptism: "*Gottes Ordnung ist...welchs allein gnung wäre, ob es gleich ganz äußerlich Ding ist* (It is God's ordinance...which alone would be enough, even if it were entirely an external thing)." (BKS 698.41-3; LC IV.38)

⁷⁸ *Examination*, 413; *Examin*, 373.

⁷⁹ *Examination*, 413; *Examin*, 373.

⁸⁰ Dedekennus, 409. The Leipzig faculty departed from Chemnitz and the scholastics in admitting that the essence may be preserved where Christ's institution is not. Still, they continued to assert that under such conditions it is no true Sacrament. The 1944 Convention of the L.C.M.S. went further still by asserting that both the essence and the true Sacrament are present where Christ's expressed institution is not observed. When Rev. Theo. Hansen (*emeritus*) memorialized the Convention that, "According to Matthew 26:26-28, Mark 14:22-24, Luke 22:19, 20 (cp. 22:17, 18 of the Passover), 1 Cor. 10:16, 17, 21 and 1 Cor. 11:23-26 in the Lord's Supper a common, single cup is required, and therefore a number of individual cups is not permitted." The Floor Committee on Intersynodical and Doctrinal Matters (#7) replied: "Having considered Matthew 26:26-28; Mark 14:22-24; Luke 22:19, 20 (chap.[sic] 22:17, 18 of the Passover), 1 Cor. 10:16, 17, 21 and 1 Cor. 11:23-26, your committee finds nothing stated which would forbid the use of the individual communion cup. And we hold that the manner and mode of distributing the bread, be it by breaking or by distributing in the form of a host and the manner and mode of distributing the wine, be it in one or two or more cups, do not belong to the essence of the Sacrament." Saginaw Convention Proceedings, 1944, 254-5.

⁸¹ Triglotta. The Kolb/Wengert translation renders *häuptstück* as "essential thing."

is consistent with Luther’s treatment of Baptism. “All on account of the Word...also it derives its essence (*Wesen / essentiam*) as a Sacrament” (LC IV.18; cf. 22 and 59-60).⁸² Thus, the language of “essence” or “chief thing” designates the Words of Institution upon which all else is based—not only certain elements and actions distilled therefrom.

Thus Chemnitz simply says,

the one and only way of administering, dispensing, and using the sacraments—so far as their essence is concerned (*quod ad substantiam ipsorum attinet*), the best, most correct, and safest way—is the one which was taught by the Son of God Himself in the institution.⁸³

Here Chemnitz argues not only that the essence of the Sacrament cannot be determined apart from the institution, but also that the institution and the essence are coterminous. He thus avoids the temptation to sacramental fundamentalism which somehow boils down the institution to its fundamentals and relegates all else to the status of non-essential adiaphora.

As Luther puts it, every word of Christ’s institution “depends on each other and makes one sacramental essence.”⁸⁴ Thus the institution is a “golden chain”—each link of which has its own intrinsic value.⁸⁵ “Nothing is omitted that pertains to the completeness, the use, and the blessing of this sacrament; and nothing is included that is superfluous and not necessary for us to know.”⁸⁶ For this reason, the Church has settled every prior question of sacramental conduct by the same general and universal rule: what Christ did and taught in the institution is normative for her practice. If this rule does not suffice today, it was likewise insufficient for all the centuries past; and every question of sacramental conduct—from water to one kind—is again up for grabs. Continuity with the Church catholic demands that Cyprian’s maxim should be applied to the practice of individual cups with the same rigor as it was in every prior question.

The Text concerning the Cup

All three synoptics, together with the Apostle Paul, record Christ’s last will and testament. Each account is unique. Yet, there are not four upper room events but only one. When Matthew and Mark omit Christ’s command, “do this in remembrance of me,” it does not cast doubt on whether He indeed said it. Rather, it is only a difference of editorial emphasis.⁸⁷ Since every detail recorded in any of the accounts

⁸² Triglotta.

⁸³ *Examination*, 340; *Examin*, 343.

⁸⁴ “*in einander hangt und Ein sacramentlich Wesen ist*” (StL XX:1071.451). “For in that word, and in that word alone, reside the power, the nature, and the whole essence (*das ganze Wesen*) of the mass.” (StL XIX:31; cf. AE 36:36)

⁸⁵ *Lord’s Supper*, 117. Luther’s use of the “golden chain” concept comes from ancient Rome where chains of gold were worn around the waist as money belts. Goods were purchased by breaking off the required number of links to pay for the item.

⁸⁶ AE 36:37

⁸⁷ “For the words are used in the way they are so that they may show that either by repetition or by nuances of meaning or by the addition of material the Holy Spirit has wished by these very repetitions to demonstrate, teach, and

truly occurred, “the institution of the Lord’s Supper is to be determined by a comparison of the descriptions which are found in four places in Scripture.”⁸⁸ It is not possible to arrive at an accurate picture of Christ’s institution by distilling out only those aspects of the account which are common to all.

The only such common aspects are these: “He took bread, gave thanks and broke it, and gave it to them saying, ‘This is My body.’ Then He took the cup saying, ‘This is the new Testament in my blood.’” All other material is omitted by one or more of the accounts. If this were the only norm, the proper conduct of the Sacrament would be given so much latitude as to be virtually unrecognizable. The body need not be eaten, but only given to be used as the recipient wishes. The contents of the cup need not be wine—or even grape juice for that matter—the water of the Encratites fits these words as well as anything. Nor would the cup need to be given at all but only the host.⁸⁹ Such an approach to the significance of the *verba* squares neither with the Scriptures, the Lutheran Confessions, nor the history of the Church.⁹⁰ Clearly, there is more to Christ’s institution than handing out bread with no mandated purpose or taking a cup of just any liquid.

This does not displace the inspired texts and substitute a conflation. Rather, it recognizes that any one of the accounts, on its own merit, is normative for the Church’s doctrine and practice. As Norman Nagel put it:

The Words of Institution are a conflation of all four biblical accounts of the Last Supper. If, in the way of the Law and our having the say-so, we should measure a quantity, then one account would be enough. We are given four, and in the way of faith we would be given everything he gives. For the same reason we would not lose what is particular in each account.⁹¹

confirm the true, sure, and genuine interpretation and meaning.” *Lord’s Supper*, 93.

⁸⁸ *Examination*, 248.

⁸⁹ “Therefore, those act incorrectly who want to deduce from the description in Luke that Christ gave the bread to the disciples in such a way that they either might not use it at all or use it in any manner they chose.” *Ibid.* This, in fact, is the very tack taken by one Tridentine theologian: “Pighius takes the words of institution as they are recorded by Luke and Paul, and totally disregards the accounts of Matthew and Mark. With this artifice he makes sport of the institution of Christ. In the first part of the institution, he says, Christ commanded the apostles two things: I. ‘Take, eat’; II. ‘Do this (namely, what you have already seen Me do) in remembrance of Me,’ that is, He commands that in the future they shall take bread, give thanks or bless it, and distribute it to be received and eaten by others, with these words added: ‘This is My body,’ etc. But in the second part of the institution, about the cup, the account of Luke and Paul does not say that Christ gave the apostles the cup, nor that He said by way of precept or command: ‘Drink of it, all of you.’ Therefore when He adds: ‘Do this,’ He is not teaching that the apostles and priests should dispense the cup of blessing to be drunk. For He taught them to do in future only what they had seen Christ do in the first Supper. Now Christ, according to the account of Luke and Paul, did not dispense the cup at the first Supper, even to the apostle, with the added precept: ‘Drink of it, all of you.’” *Ibid.*, 400-1.

⁹⁰ Distilling the *verba* to only those words which are shared by all the synoptics alike can, however, serve a useful purpose. Namely, by this one can see clearly the emphasis that our Lord places upon the objective realities of body and blood as *things* and not upon the Eucharist as *action*. Still, the usefulness of such an approach ends as soon as it degenerates into a fundamentalism which claims that these words are the only words of Christ’s institution with lasting significance. (cf. Hardt, 34-5).

⁹¹ Norman Nagel, “Holy Communion” *Lutheran Worship: History and Practice*, (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1993), 300.

Therefore, when arguing the proper conduct of the Sacrament, the Lutheran Symbols draw material from any of the four institution accounts even if it stands completely alone. The Small Catechism’s statement that “The Sacrament of the Altar is... for us Christians to eat and to drink,” asserts a normative significance to eating and drinking even though these actions are not mentioned by Luke and Paul. The *Nihil Rule* of the Formula of Concord does the same.⁹² The Matthean imperative: “Drink out of it, all of you,” is set forth by the Augsburg Confession (XXII.1-2) to assert the necessity of both kinds even though this phrase is not repeated in *any* of the other institution accounts. Clearly, from the standpoint of the Lutheran Symbols, Matthew’s imperative is prescriptive for the Church. It cannot be regarded as a mere historical circumstance but is integral to the proper conduct of the Sacrament.

Lutheranism is not alone in this judgment. From the very beginning of the Church’s usage, the imperative phrase of Matthew 26:27 has been incorporated into her liturgy. There is a broad range of eucharistic texts in the eleven complete liturgies and seven liturgical fragments preserved from the first millennium.⁹³ Far from being a rigidly set liturgical formula, the variations on the *verba* are as many as the liturgies themselves. Since the Matthean imperative, πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες, is found in only one of four institution accounts it might reasonably be supposed that it would appear in the liturgy proportionally. Quite the opposite is true. The bulk of liturgical witnesses—including those most commonly used and wide-spread—use the entire Matthean imperative. Only two of the complete liturgies omit the Matthean imperative.⁹⁴ But these omit the imperatives of Luke, Mark and Paul as well.⁹⁵ This indicates not that the imperatives were unimportant but rather that they were taken for granted as is evidenced by the actual Sacramental usage.⁹⁶ In the final analysis, despite all of the known variations in

⁹² “Nothing has the character of a sacrament apart from the use instituted by Christ” (cf. SD VII.83-7).

⁹³ Complete Liturgies are: The Third Anaphora of St. Peter (*Sharar*), The Liturgy of St. Mark, The Egyptian Anaphora of St. Basil, The Liturgy of St. James, *The Apostolic Constitutions*: Book VIII, The Byzantine Liturgy of St. Basil, The Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom, The Gallican Rite, The Roman Rite, The Mozarabic Rite and *The Testamentum Domini*. Fragments are: The Deir Balyseh Papyrus, The Anaphora of the Twelve Apostles, Anaphora of Epihanius of Salamis, Non-Roman Versions of the Canon, The Prayers of Sarapion, The Louvain Coptic Papyrus and Hippolytus: *The Apostolic Tradition*.

⁹⁴ The *Testamentum Domini* and The Mozarabic Rite.

⁹⁵ Of eighteen liturgical witnesses, only two obscure fragments exist where the imperative “drink” is found in the *verba* without the prepositional phrase, “out of it.” The *Euchologion*, attributed to Sarapion of Thmuis (c. 359), contains one such prayer: “We offered also the cup, the likeness of the blood. For the Lord Jesus Christ after supper took a cup and said to his disciples, ‘Take, drink; this is the new covenant, which is my blood that is shed for you for forgiveness of sins.’ Therefore we also offered the cup, presenting the likeness of the blood.” (R.C.D. Jasper and G.J. Cuming, *Prayers of the Eucharist: Early and Reformed*, Third revised edition, (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1990), 77). Whether and to what extent this prayer was actually used, however, is problematic. Johannes Quastens concludes that, “although precious for the history of the liturgy, [it] represents only a second class witness to tradition.” (Johannes Quastens, *Patrology*, Vol. III, (Allen, Texas: Christian Classics, n.d.), 83). In the collection at Louvain a fragment of an unidentified Coptic papyrus provides the second example of such a prayer: “Likewise after supper he took the cup also, gave thanks over it, and gave it to them, saying: ‘Take, drink, for this is my blood which will be shed for many for forgiveness of sins.’” (Jasper and Cuming, 81). It is questionable whether this fragment represents a liturgy which was used to any great extent or even whether it was ever actually used at all.

the consecratory formulae of the early church, the Matthean imperative comes as close as anything to being used everywhere and always.

The Imperative about the Cup

Πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες is a simple subject–verb construction modified by a prepositional phrase. The inflection of the verb (second person plural), indicates the subject as “you all”; namely, the hearers of Jesus’ words. The adjective, πάντες (all), is nominative and thus modifies the subject. Adding no new thought to what the verb inflection has indicated already, it instead underscores its inclusive scope. The imperative mood of πίετε (drink) expresses Jesus’ direct appeal to the will of his hearers.⁹⁷ The verb, πιεῖν looks for its direct object in the accusative case, but finds none in this phrase. What Jesus wants His hearers to drink is left unstated but plainly implied.

Although the direct object is omitted, the verb is modified further by the phrase ἐξ αὐτοῦ (out of it) consisting of a preposition–pronoun combination. Under normal circumstances, the referent for the pronoun will be sought prior to its use in the sentence. Ποτήριον (cup) is the nearest—and indeed, the only—antecedent that fits the regular usage. Although it is not impossible that an antecedent might come after the pronoun, it is unusual. If such a construction is assumed, the next possible referent is αἷμά. But this is ruled out since it would result in a tautology (i.e. this blood is My blood). The next to agree in number and case is, τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου (the fruit of the vine). This is not very likely the referent of αὐτοῦ for three reasons. First, it is far removed from the pronoun. Second, it is not before but after the pronoun. Third, it must leapfrog over the next nearest noun. The obvious antecedent, ποτήριον, should not be displaced by such a shakey candidate. Jesus Himself confirms this by saying, “this cup is the New Testament in My blood.”⁹⁸ Here He specifies that ποτήριον is the referent.

The antecedent to αὐτοῦ is the cup that Jesus holds in His hands. Ποτήριον is “a wine cup or drinking vessel.”⁹⁹ It “serves a drink and contains a drink, sometimes only potentially and sometimes actually.”¹⁰⁰ Jesus indicates (v. 29) that this particular cup actually contains the fruit of the vine. In fact He takes it for the sake of its contents. However, this does not mean that the fruit of the vine is the object of the preposition. On the contrary, the object of ἐκ remains—both grammatically and logically—“cup.”

⁹⁶ Henry Percival describes the practice of all known early liturgies as follows: “The bishop places the consecrated bread in the right hand, which is open, and supported by the left; the deacon holds the chalice—they drink out of it directly.” *Excursus on the Worship of the Early Church*, NPNF II:14.138.

⁹⁷ H. E. Dana, and Julius R. Mantey, *A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, (New York: Macmillan, 1927), 174f.

⁹⁸ Luke 22:20 and 1 Corinthians 11:25.

⁹⁹ Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, Revised and Augmented by Henry Stuart Jones, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940), 1454.

¹⁰⁰ *The Lord’s Supper*, 97.

The cup is identified with its contents only by virtue of what is contained in the actual cup named. If this is figurative, it is a grammatical figure and not a rhetorical one. Krauth writes:

The distinguishing difference between the *rhetorical* figure and the *grammatical* is that the rhetorical is based upon an *ideal* relation, the grammatical upon a *real* one...To say, He keeps a good table, this purse is gold, this cup is coffee, this bottle is wine, is to use a *grammatical* figure; for the relation of the subject to the predicate is that of *real* conveyance. There is a real purse and real gold, a real cup and real coffee, a real bottle and real wine; the figure turns simply upon the identification of the thing conveying with the thing conveyed, both being real.¹⁰¹

Without the real cup it is no longer a grammatical figure but a rhetorical one. "Cup" no longer includes both cup and contents but is purely metaphorical for drink. Lutheranism eschews the introduction of any metaphor into the *verba*¹⁰² and refuses to grant her opponent's claims that she is inconsistent here.

We do not interpret the word "cup" to mean "sign," "symbol," or "figure" of a cup; but because a literal cup actually contains and conveys its literal contents, so that you cannot receive the contents without receiving the cup, nor the cup, without receiving the contents; they are so identified, that, without dreaming of a departure from the prose of everyday life, all the cultivated languages of men give the name "cup" both to the thing containing and the thing contained.¹⁰³

Martin Luther underscores this same conclusion in his discussion of synecdoche.

This mode of speaking about diverse beings as one the grammarians call "synecdoche." ...For instance, if I point to or hand over a bag or purse and say, "This is a hundred gulden," both the gesture and the word "this" refer to the purse. But since the purse and the money in some degree constitute one object, one lump, my words apply at the same time to the money. In this manner, I lay my hand on the cask and say, "This is Rhine wine; this is red wine; this is Italian wine." Again, I take a glass and say, "This is water; this is beer; this is ointment." In all these expressions you see that the word "this" refers to the container, and yet because the liquid and the container in some degree are one, it applies also and indeed principally to the liquid.¹⁰⁴

Synecdoche hinges upon the *inclusion* of one substance with the other and does not allow the *substitution* of one substance for the other.

For this reason, when Luther also understands the Sacramental Union as synecdoche,¹⁰⁵ he opposes simultaneously the sacramentarians who deny the existence of the body as well as the papists who deny

¹⁰¹ Charles Porterfield Krauth, *The Conservative Reformation and Its Theology*, (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1963), 701.

¹⁰² "Our Church does not believe, as the alleged inconsistency would involve, that there is a *rhetorical* figure in the words, 'This is my blood,' or, 'This cup is the New Testament in my blood.' ...We do not interpret any word of the 'second' part of the formula metaphorically, and therefore cannot be inconsistent with our denial of metaphor in the 'first.'" *Ibid.*, 778.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁴ *Great Confession Concerning the Sacrament*, AE 37:301-2.

¹⁰⁵ Luther also calls the Personal Union by the same name: "For example, as in Christ God and man constitute one personal being, grammarians thus speak of two beings: 'He is God; he is man.' Likewise... 'This is bread; this is my body.' On the other hand, occasionally each substance is called the other: 'Man is God, God is man'; 'This bread is my body, my body is the bread.' Here one must not speak of the beings as diverse and distinct in themselves, as Wycliffe and the sophists misuse logic, but in terms of the nature of the union, according to the fact that the diverse beings have become one single being, each in its own fashion. It is in truth the case that these diverse natures which thus have united have truly acquired a new, unique being by this convergence, whereby they are rightly and properly called a single being, even though each has its own particular, unique nature" (*Great Confession Concerning the Sacrament*, AE 37:301).

the existence of the bread. “As they become one, they are called and designated one object. It is not necessary, meanwhile, that one of the two disappear or be annihilated, but both the bread and the body remain.”¹⁰⁶ It is precisely with this understanding of synecdoche that Luther calls the cup synecdoche. “Since cup and blood and new testament are sacramentally united, the cup is ‘shed’ by virtue of this unity, in the sense of *synecdoche*, whereas only the blood is shed, as we mentioned above.”¹⁰⁷ It does violence to Luther when his application of synecdoche to the cup is interpreted as though the sole referent is to the liquid without the concurrent reference to the actual vessel.¹⁰⁸

Although Martin Chemnitz questions Luther’s definitions of the figures involved he maintains the substance of his conclusions.

Luther calls this method of predication synecdoche... But this is not the usual synecdoche of the rhetoricians, for it does not agree with the descriptions or examples treated in the rules of the rhetoricians and thus cannot be judged on this basis. However, what Luther calls synecdoche is the union of two things which are understood as being present and distributed at the same time (*simul adesse & exhiberi*), one of which is predicated of the other,... But it does not matter by what name it is called as long as the heart of the matter as it is taught in Scripture remains unimpaired.¹⁰⁹

Chemnitz’ larger agenda here is the absolute rejection of *any* tropes in the *verba testamenti*.

Here the adversaries immediately raise the cry that we must admit figures of speech (*tropos*) into the words of the Supper, namely, that in the word “cup” that which contains is used in place of that which is contained... They make a point by saying that only the cup is mentioned and at the same time the wine contained in the cup is to be understood. Therefore I ask whether the word “cup” (ποτήριον) refers only to the contents or also to the outward form of a container (*significet solam materiam aut formam vasis*).¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁶ *Great Confession Concerning the Sacrament*, AE 37:303.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.* “He [the Holy Spirit] may call the cup a ‘testament,’ by virtue of the fact that it is now not only a cup but has become one sacramental object with the testament and blood of Christ” (AE 37:334). “Observe once more that the cup cannot be understood here as ordinary silver or wood—for who can drink silver or wood?—but since the cup has become one object with the drink, the drink here is also called the cup. Thus you see that this mode of speech is common to all languages...where two things become one object, this one object retains both names, as the Holy Spirit is the dove and the dove is the Holy Spirit” (AE 37:338).

¹⁰⁸ cf. Leigh Jordahl, “The Cup and Common Sense” *Lutheran Forum*, Reformation, 1987, 6.

¹⁰⁹ *Lord’s Supper*, p. 55; Martin Chemnitz, *Fundamenta Sanæ Doctrinæ, De Vera et Substantiali Præsentia, Exhibitione, et Sumptione Corporis & Sanguinis Domini in Coene, [De Coene]* (Francofurti & Wittebergæ: Sumptibus Hæredum D. Tobiaë Mævii, & Elerdi Schumacheri, 1663), 11.

¹¹⁰ *Lord’s Supper*, 97; De Coene, 26-7. N.B. Chemnitz’ rejection of figures in the *verba*, is not limited only to the interpretive words (this is My body; this is My blood). Rather, “in the case of all the words, if we consider them individually, they possess and retain, without any figure of speech, their own proper meaning” (*Lord’s Supper*, 96). What is stated as a general rule is applied to several particular words like ἄρτος (p. 46), εὐχαριστεῖν, (p. 95), and πειν (p. 104) all of which fall outside of the interpretive words. Some later Lutheran dogmaticians did permit figures to be introduced into the *verba* and thus limited the application of the Formula of Concord (SD VII.45, 92) to only the interpretive words. Hollazius writes: “We must not depart from the obvious meaning of the words of the Holy Supper, but they are to be understood most simply and literally as they stand. Note: We do not here speak of all the words of institution, but of the substantial and constitutive words: ‘This is my body, this is my blood.’” (Heinrich Schmid, *Doctrinal Theology of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*, trans. Charles A. Hay and Henry E. Jacobs, (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1899), 558). This was clearly not the understanding of Chemnitz, who, after all, was one of the Formula’s authors. cf. Ep VII.7; SD VII.44-53, 80-84 and 113.

In answer to this question, Chemnitz argues that the word ποτήριον in the context of the supper “possesses and retains its proper and natural meaning (*habet & retinet propriam suam & nativam significationem*)—a vessel containing a drink (*sit vas contens potu*).”¹¹¹

Although Krauth, Luther and Chemnitz approach the word from different angles and call its usage by different names, they all agree on its meaning: ποτήριον refers both to the contents and also to the outward form of the container without a substitution of one for the other. This should come as no surprise since it is the normal use of ποτήριον elsewhere in the Scriptures.

Nowhere else in Scripture is ποτήριον used as a circumlocution for a literal drink. It always denotes either a literal drinking vessel¹¹² or else it is wholly metaphorical—meaning neither a literal cup nor a literal drink.¹¹³ Even in the two sacramental passages where ποτήριον must be understood as the grammatical figure, synecdoche,¹¹⁴ it is the accusative object of πιεῖν. Nowhere else in all Scripture, either in the New Testament or in the Septuagint, do we find a case where ποτήριον, as the object of the preposition ἐκ, must be taken figuratively. Thus, a figurative interpretation of ποτήριον in Matthew 26:27 not only departs from its simplest and most common definition, it also posits a use of the word that has no precedent elsewhere in Scripture.

When ποτήριον is understood as a circumlocution for its contents, the most common meaning for the word ἐκ is also displaced.¹¹⁵ Instead of denoting source from which the drinking takes place, the phrase must be understood as a periphrastic for the partitive genitive (some of this drink)—a less usual meaning for the preposition.¹¹⁶ While it is true that, after verbs of consumption,¹¹⁷ ἐκ with the genitive sometimes takes this meaning, the determinative factor is whether or not the preposition’s object is consumable. Where the object of ἐκ is consumable, the phrase is always understood in the partitive sense. But where its object is not consumable, the preposition always designates motion out of or forth from. There are no exceptions to this in biblical usage. In the case of the sacramental discourses, the object of ἐκ is not consumable.

Moreover, if the phrase were indeed a periphrasis for the partitive genitive, one would expect to find other examples where ποτηρίου without the preposition were used in the partitive sense. But there are no

¹¹¹ De Coene, 7; cf. *Lord’s Supper*, 97.

¹¹² e.g. Genesis 40:11, 13, 21; 44:2, 12, 16-17; Matthew 10:42; 23:25-6; Mark 7:4, 8; 9:41, etc.

¹¹³ e.g. Psalm 11:6; 16:5; Zechariah 12:2; Matthew 20:22-23; 26:39, 42; Mark 10:38-39; 14:36, etc. Apocalyptic literature often uses it in the literal sense even while the entire passage is metaphorical. e.g. Revelation 14:10.

¹¹⁴ 1 Corinthians 10:21 and 11:26-27.

¹¹⁵ “I. OF PLACE, the most freq. usage, variously modified: 1. of Motion, *out of, forth from...ἐκ χρυσῶν φιαλῶν πίνειν* ib.5.3.3;” Liddel-Scott-Jones, 498.

¹¹⁶ e.g. Pieper, 345.

¹¹⁷ Πίνω, τρώγω, ἐσθίω, κατεσθίω, θάγομι, ἀναλίσκω and ἀναλόω.

such examples in the Scriptures—either when ποτήριον itself is in the genitive or when a pronoun referring to ποτήριον is in the genitive. It is difficult to assert a periphrastic form for a usage that does not appear in the first place! The partitive interpretation of this phrase is not required by the grammar but runs contrary to every grammatical convention. Luther’s warning is still *apropos*: “It simply won’t do to play around with tropes in the Scriptures. One must first prove that particular passages are tropes before one uses them in controversies.”¹¹⁸ Unless the grammar or the analogy of faith demands otherwise, each word of the prepositional phrase should be rendered according to its simplest and most natural meaning.

Not only should the individual words be taken objectively, but the sentence as a whole should as well. The connection between the preposition and the imperative verb that it governs must be maintained. For instance: when Jesus says, “I will not drink of the fruit of the vine (Matt. 26:29),” He does not say that He will drink absolutely nothing, but that He will not drink *of that particular liquid* until He drinks it anew in the kingdom. Likewise, in Mark 14:20, the betrayer is identified not only by dipping his bread, but by dipping it *with Jesus* (ὁ ἐμβάπτόμενος μετ’ ἐμοῦ). So also here, πίετε cannot be understood to command only the act of drinking without any reference to the source vessel but its imperative force includes also the prepositional phrase. Accordingly, Jesus not only commands them to drink, but to drink out of the cup.¹¹⁹

The Matthean imperative πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες is clear all by itself but it does not stand by itself. Where Matthew reports the directive of Jesus as an imperative, Mark reports the apostolic response as indicative (ἔπιον ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες). Apart from a mood change, they are identical. Everything said about Matthew’s account applies equally to Mark’s. Both are intensified by the addition of πάντες. Both lack a direct object. Both verbs are governed by the same prepositional phrase. Both refer to ποτήριον naturally and properly construed. And in both, this prepositional phrase is integral to the meaning of the sentence. In short, what Mark indicates is precisely what Matthew commands and *visa versa*.¹²⁰

¹¹⁸ *The Great Confession Concerning the Supper*, AE 37:209. “Lutheran teachers call to mind the following hermeneutical rule...: Every word must be taken in its first, that is, its proper meaning, until circumstances contained in the context or the express declaration of the writer compel one to substitute the figurative or symbolic meaning for the natural.” (Pieper, 317).

¹¹⁹ “Sharing the cup of wine is the action that the New Testament indicates. It is implied in Jesus’ command ‘Drink of it [the cup] all of you...’” Philip H. Pfatteicher & Carlos Messerli, *Manual on the Liturgy*, (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1979), 244. “The point is that Jesus instituted the sacrament with the use of one cup, that bade all the disciples drink out of this one cup (Matthew), and that “they all did drink out of it” (Mark).” R.C.H. Lenski, *The Interpretation of St. Mark’s Gospel*, (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1961), 623.

¹²⁰ “Matthew is the only one who writes, ‘Drink of it, all of you,’ and since Mark is the only one who writes, ‘And they all drank of it,’ these words are written because the two evangelists wished to indicate that the disciples all drank of this cup together, not from thirst as perhaps it was done in other instances when the cup would have had to be filled more than once before it had gone around, but that they had to pass the cup on this round drinking moderately so that they all might receive some.” *The Great Confession Concerning the Supper*, AE 37:311.

The apostolic response, indicated by Mark, is not mere happenstance, but in direct obedience to Jesus' imperative.

Not only does [Mark] show that the apostles obediently did what they were commanded to do (*quod jussi erant*) but he also shows clearly what Christ had in mind (*quid Christus voluerit*) in the institution of the Supper when He used the word 'drink'... He says that all the apostles drank from this one cup (*Apostolos omnes ex uno illo poculo bibisse*) when it was passed around among them, that is, they took by mouth or drank something from it.¹²¹

The shape of the disciples' obedience, says Chemnitz, indicates "what Christ had in mind." This point is important for emphasizing that Jesus' teaching "is not the sound of the words contained in holy Scripture; rather [it is] the meaning expressed by them."¹²² While it is grammatically possible to recite Jesus' words while investing them with different meaning,¹²³ this is neither doing as Jesus did nor teaching as Jesus taught.¹²⁴

The words of institution make clear what Jesus did and taught. What He did was to take one cup from among several. What He taught was that all should drink from this one cup. Mark's account shows that the apostles understood Jesus' intent in exactly this way. And through the centuries this has remained the unchallenged understanding of the Church catholic.¹²⁵

The Emphasis on the Cup

The common cup is more than an historic certainty. Jesus both teaches and emphasizes its use by two distinct grammatical devices: 1) by the prepositional phrase of source, and 2) by an ellipsis of the direct object. Both are used elsewhere in the Scriptures with a consistent, emphatic intent. In biblical literature, there are fourteen passages where the prepositional phrase, ἐκ with the genitive of a vessel, governs the verb πινειν. The bulk of these are from the Septuagint. Water from certain sources, like the bloody Nile (Ex. 7:21) and the bitter Marah (Ex. 15:23), was undrinkable. Moses promised the king of Edom that

¹²¹ *Lord's Supper*, 104; De Coene, 29. In the face of this, the assumption of the Missouri Synod's C.T.C.R. that we are absent any specific Scriptural mandate is untenable. (Commission on Theology and Church Relations, "Theology and Practice of the Lord's Supper" (1983), 31).

¹²² *Pastoral Theology*, 93. "If it depended on the sound, only the words of the Hebrew and Greek original text would be God's Word. But the words of a Bible translation contain God's Word, as long as they represent the meaning of the original text. And one is not preaching God's Word if he uses the words, signs, and sounds that are in the Bible but explicitly uses them in a different sense than they are used in the Bible" (*Ibid.*). It is for this very cause that Lutheranism has historically rejected the baptism of Unitarians and Arians, the Lord's Supper of the Sacramentarians, and the Romanist private Mass and Corpus Christi parade (SD VII.87; cf. Pieper, 263 and 370-1).

¹²³ Where a single cup is not held in the celebrant's hands nor proffered to the people the words about the cup are no longer uttered according to Jesus' original intent. Where Jesus taught his hearers to drink out of His cup, the celebrant now teaches the congregation to drink some of the liquid offered.

¹²⁴ cf. *Examination*, 352. In this context, Chemnitz cites Cyprian's advice: "Therefore if one of our predecessors, either from ignorance or from simplicity, did not observe and keep what the Lord by His example and teaching taught us to do, forgiveness may be granted his simplicity by the indulgence of the Lord, but it cannot be ignored in our case, who have now been admonished and instructed by the Lord" (*Ibid.*).

¹²⁵ "There is no doubt that the words of Luke and Paul, 'This cup is the New Testament in my blood,' can have no other meaning than that which St. Matthew and Mark give [Matt. 26:28; Mark 14:24], 'This (namely, what you are drinking through the mouth from this cup) is my blood of the New Testament...'" (SD VII.53).

they will not drink water from his wells (Num. 20:17 and 21:22). God promised to supply Elijah with water¹²⁶ from the brook Cherith (1 Kings 17:4-6). In 2 Kings 18:31, the king of Assyria promises to let every deserter from Hezekiah’s army drink “waters of his own cistern” (i.e. go home). Finally, while at war with the Philistines, King David longs to drink not just any water but “water from the well of Bethlehem.” His longings were overheard by three of his mighty men who, at great personal risk, went to Bethlehem and fought through the Philistine garrison in order to draw some water out of Bethlehem’s well for David to drink (1 Chronicles 11:17-18). Every place where this prepositional phrase is used to govern $\pi\alpha\iota\tilde{\nu}$, the source of the liquid is emphatic.

While these passages have a similar construction to Christ’s words, they are not identical. The difference is that Matthew 26:27 also has an ellipsis in place of a direct object while all of the passages cited from the Septuagint have ὕδωρ (water) as the object of $\pi\alpha\iota\tilde{\nu}$. The ellipsis is a rhetorical device wherein

the omission arises not from want of thought, or lack of care, or from accident, but from design, in order that we may not stop to think of, or lay stress on, the word omitted, but may dwell on the other words which are thus emphasized by the omission.¹²⁷

In the New Testament, the direct object of $\pi\alpha\iota\tilde{\nu}$ is elliptical over half of the time.¹²⁸ Thirty-one times $\pi\alpha\iota\tilde{\nu}$ is used alone with neither a direct object nor a governing preposition.¹²⁹ All of these put such an emphasis upon the activity of drinking that the actual drink is indiscernible.¹³⁰ Five times the direct object is elliptical and the verb is governed by the preposition ἐκ with the genitive of a vessel. Three of these are the eucharistic passages under discussion.¹³¹ The other two provide objective insight into the construction’s force.

The first of these is John 4:12. In conversation at the well the Samaritan woman asks Jesus: “Are You Yourself greater than our father Jacob, who gave us the well, and drank thereof (ἐξ αὐτοῦ) himself?” That he drank water is wholly irrelevant to the woman’s point. What is emphatic is that Jacob drank out of the self-same well that she and the towns-people now share. According to the rule of

¹²⁶ In the Hebrew, the word water (מַיִם) is omitted. But the Septuagintal translation supplies the ellipsis with ὕδωρ.

¹²⁷ Ethelbert W. Bullinger, *Figures of Speech Used in the Bible, Explained and Illustrated*, 6th reprint of the 1898 ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1978), 1.

¹²⁸ 43 times out of 73 occurrences. Seven times $\pi\alpha\iota\tilde{\nu}$ is governed by the preposition τῷ with the genitive of a drink—clearly in the sense of a partative genitive: “Fruit of the vine,” (Matthew 26:29; Mark 14:25; Luke 22:18); “water,” (John 4:13, 14); and “wine,” (Revelation 14:10 and 18:3).

¹²⁹ Matthew 11:18, 19; 24:38, 49; 27:34; Mark 2:16; Luke 5:30, 33; 12:19, 45; 13:26; 17:8 (twice), 27, 28; 22:30; John 4:7, 9, 10; 7:37; Acts 9:9; 23:12, 21; 1 Corinthians 9:4; 10:7; 11:22, 25, 29 (twice) and 15:32.

¹³⁰ Three of these are called *ellipses of repetition* since their direct object can be found earlier in the sentence as the object of $\pi\alpha\iota\tilde{\nu}$ (cf. Bullinger, 70-81). Several of them do imply an alcoholic drink of some sort.

¹³¹ Matthew 26:27; Mark 14:23 and 1 Corinthians 11:28.

ellipses, the direct object is intentionally omitted in order to dwell more intently on the prepositional phrase of source.

The second instance is found in St. Paul's discussion of the common lot of all the children of Israel. "All drank the same spiritual drink, for they drank of a spiritual rock which followed [them] (ἐκ πνευματικῆς ἀκολουθούσης πέτρας): (now the rock was the Christ)" (1 Corinthians 10:1-5). The "spiritual drink" is never exactly defined except that it comes from one common source—namely Christ. The emphasis is upon Christ, the Rock from which they drank, and not upon the elliptical direct object.

The Septuagint also has two examples of this construction. Psalm 110:7 says of the Messiah: "He shall drink of the torrent in the way (ἐκ χειμάρρου ἐν ὁδῷ πίεται)." Luther, who interpreted drinking as feeling God's wrath, commented that it

is intended to show that He will not feel ordinary or small pains and misery; but He will bear or endure the greatest, the most bitter and cruel pain and torture, and will die a most contemptible death. For this word "torrent" refers to a strong and fast flowing stream or brook, which, when it is swollen from heavy rains, tears irresistibly onward in full flood.¹³²

What exactly the Messiah will drink is elliptical but the torrent (ἡρῆ / χειμάρρος) of it is emphatic.

Nathan's confrontation of David contains the passage which is the closest parallel to Jesus words. In the parable of the poor man's beloved lamb he says of it: "it grew up together with him, and with his children; it did eat of his own meat, and drank of his own cup (ἐκ τοῦ ποτηρίου αὐτοῦ ἔπινεν), and lay in his bosom, and was unto him as a daughter" (2 Samuel 12:3). Πιῖν is governed by ἐκ with the genitive of cup while the direct object is elliptical. It is both indeterminate and unimportant what the lamb drank; but it is emphatic that she drank out of his own cup. By this emphasis, Nathan contributes to the picture of familial intimacy that is central to the parable's thrust.¹³³

All four of the above passages combine an ellipsis with the prepositional phrase to heighten its emphasis even more. Nathan, David, Paul and a common, Samaritan woman all employ this same construction with the same intent. When Christ, the Word of God Himself, omits the direct object while instituting the Sacrament, it is, of course, supplied in the mind of the reader—the disciples drink the contents of the cup. But by the ellipsis, Jesus intentionally directs the hearer to "dwell on the other words which are thus emphasized," πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ. Jesus Himself emphasizes the sharing of the vessel both by naming the source from which to drink and by saving mention of its contents for the next sentence.

Not only does Jesus employ the ellipsis in the institution, but the same device is also preserved in Mark's account of the Lord's Supper. A description of the disciples' response could easily have supplied the direct object of their drinking without compromising an accurate description of the event. Mark,

¹³² *Commentary on Psalm 110*, AE 13:346.

¹³³ Nathan's description of the beloved lamb affords an excellent place to begin understanding what Jesus wants to communicate by having all drink out of His own cup.

inspired by the Spirit of Christ, preserves not only an accurate record of the disciples' response but he also preserves the very same emphasis upon their action that Jesus taught with His command.

As noted above, every author of the past century admits that the use of the common cup is to be preferred. But this preference invariably remains in the passive voice and rarely does anyone go on to say exactly who prefers it. Instead, the discussion has remained mired in subjective and inconclusive arguments about the degree of emphasis.¹³⁴ All such arguments are rendered irrelevant by the observation that Christ Himself is the One who emphasizes it. For where the Lord emphasizes the Chalice—even a little bit—who can call it indifferent?

Not only *did* Jesus intentionally choose to institute the Sacrament with a single cup¹³⁵ but He emphatically *teaches* it as well. He commands that His disciples “drink out of it.” By deliberately omitting the direct object He thus emphasizes the prepositional phrase. Moreover, Christ's emphasis is reinforced also by the Holy Spirit who, in every direct discourse on the Sacrament, describes the second element as ποτήριον never once calling it οἶνος, πόσις, or by any other name.¹³⁶ And, He Himself inspired Mark to retain Jesus' own emphasis in describing the disciples' action. If Jesus had, indeed, wanted all generations to receive His blood out of a common cup, how could He possibly have done and taught it more clearly?

Conclusion

The maxim, first articulated by Cyprian in 253, has endured the test of time: What Christ did and taught in instituting the Sacrament ought to be done at its every celebration. Through two millennia this was the principal argument—if not the only argument—used to oppose every departure from the Lord's institution. It mattered not whether the change involved the material elements (*materia*) or the form of distribution (*forma*). Substitutions for the wine—from water to grape juice—were opposed on the same grounds as were different modes of distribution—from multiple chalices to none at all. Likewise, demands for unleavened bread, wine mixed with water, and the fracture were opposed on the very same grounds. Regardless of whether the change involved a departure from the institution or an addition to it, only what Christ did and taught was normative.

No arguments from human reason were needed to validate the maxim and certainly no such argument could invalidate it. Neither the strict piety of the ascetics, nor fear of potential sacrilege could override

¹³⁴ Some fear that too much emphasis on the cup will distract attention from Christ's blood. But few worry that insistence on grape wine will cause a similar distraction.

¹³⁵ “The single, common cup, so essential to the symbolism, may not have been contemporary custom, but Jesus' own idea (Schürmann, *Concilium*, col. 10, p. 64 and note).” (Cheslyn Jones, Geoffrey Wainwright, Edward Yarnold SJ, and Paul Bradshaw, eds. *The Study of Liturgy*, revised ed. (London: Oxford University Press, 1992), 195.

¹³⁶ Matthew 26:27-28; Mark 14:23-24; Luke 22:20; 1 Corinthians 10:16, 21; 11:25-28. Note that τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου (Matthew 26:29; Mark 14:25 and Luke 22:18) does not designate the second element of the Sacrament as such, but specifies that wine was used in the cup.

Christ's words.¹³⁷ When Rome argued that the cup was unnecessary, Luther answered, "even if it were true...[it] is still not the complete order and institution as established and commanded by Christ" (SA III.VI.3). When they asserted that it was non-essential, orthodoxy answered that what is essential is what Christ did and taught in the institution. For Luther, the entire institution forms a golden chain and the command of Christ embraces it all: "in the cup, it lays hold of the wine; the wine, by virtue of the words of Christ, embraces the blood of Christ; the blood, the covenant because it is the blood of the testament; the testament, the forgiveness of sins."¹³⁸ From cup to wine to blood to covenant to forgiveness, each link of the chain is golden.

The proper mode of distributing Christ's blood hangs entirely on His words: πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πᾶντες. Since their natural, literal meaning is contradicted neither by grammar or the analogy of faith, there is no reason to depart from it. As Luther says, Christ can and should

be understood as saying that each of the apostles had a cup before him on the table, or at least that there were more cups than one. But now, when Christ gives a new, special drink of his blood, he commands them all to drink out of this single cup.¹³⁹

For nineteen centuries, this clear scriptural mandate led the Church to use the common cup always and everywhere. The last will and testament of Christ is no less clear today: "Drink out of it, all of you."

¹³⁷ Still less are John Gerson's reasons for using one kind only fit to overthrow the institution: "4. In the long beards of the men. 6. It might, as it were, become unappetizing for many to drink, when many others had drunk before. 7. In what kind of vessel would the consecration of such an amount of wine be made as would be required at Easter for several thousand persons? 11. People would think that the Communion of the cup had always been, and that it is necessary. Thus all the clergy, doctors, and prelates would have sinned who had not opposed a different custom both orally and in writing. 13. It would follow that the Roman church does not hold rightly concerning the sacraments and that it is not to be followed in this. 14. It would follow that the Council of Constance had erred with respect to faith and good practice. 15. It would be an occasion for schisms in Christendom" (*Examination*, 368-9).

¹³⁸ De Coene, 34. cf. *The Great Confession Concerning the Sacrament* (1528): "The words are the first thing, for without the words the cup and bread would be nothing. Further, without bread and cup, the body and blood of Christ would not be there. Without the body and blood of Christ, the new testament would not be there. Without the new testament, forgiveness of sins would not be there. Without forgiveness of sins, life and salvation would not be there. Thus the words first connect the bread and cup to the sacrament; bread and cup embrace the body and blood of Christ; body and blood of Christ embrace the new testament; the new testament embraces the forgiveness of sins; forgiveness of sins embraces eternal life and salvation...Now since this all constitutes one sacramental reality, one can truly and properly say of each part, as for example the cup, 'This is Christ's blood; this is the new testament; there is forgiveness of sins; there is life and salvation'" (AE 37:338).

¹³⁹ AE 37:311.