

a paper:

ON THE NATURE OF CHRIST'S PRESENCE IN THE EUCHARIST

Robert Baral
12/28/2006 AD, r-6/08/2007 AD

PREFACE

Can we as mere men fully penetrate The Mystery of The Eucharist? What is purpose of The Eucharist? What is the exact nature of CHRIST's Presence in The Elements of The Holy Communion? What exactly do The Holy Scriptures say of The Sacrament of The Holy Communion? What are the various views within Christendom on This Mystery? What did The early Church Fathers declare of This Great Sacrament? And what are we to conclude after seeking the answers to these many questions?

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I. A PROPOSITION
- II. A SCRIPTURE - MATTHEW 26:26-28 - THIS IS MY BODY AND BLOOD
- III. INTRODUCTION
- IV. HOW BEST TO APPROACH THIS ISSUE
- V. THE PURPOSE OF THE EUCHARIST
- VI. THE ROOTS OF THE EUCHARIST IN THE PASSOVER MEAL
- VII. THE INSTITUTION OF THE LORD'S SUPPER
- VIII. THE EUCHARIST UNCHANGED, MAN'S UNDERSTANDING DEEPENS
 - A. IN THE EARLY CHURCH
 - B. IN THE TIME OF THE EMPEROR CONSTANTINE
 - C. IN THE CHURCH OF THE MIDDLE AGES
 - D. IN THE REFORMATIONS & COUNTER-REFORMATION
 - E. IN THE AGE OF MODERN CHRISTIAN ECUMENICALISM
- IX. OVERVIEW OF VIEWS ON CHRIST'S PRESENCE IN THE EUCHARIST
- X. TRANSUBSTANTIATION – PHYSICALLY & SPIRITUALLY PRESENT
 - A. WHAT THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH DECLARES
 - B. REFORMATION OBJECTIONS TO THE ROMAN CATHOLIC VIEW
 - C. THE ROMAN CATHOLIC VIEW RESTATED
- XI. CONSUBSTANTIATION – SPIRITUALLY & PHYSICALLY COPRESENT
 - A. LUTHER'S REAL PRESENCE OF CHRIST IN THE EUCHARIST
 - B. LUTHER AND ZWINGLI HELD IRRECONCILABLE VIEWS
 - C. LUTHER ON I CORINTHIANS 11:24
- XII. MEMORIAL – NEITHER PHYSICALLY NOR SPIRITUALLY PRESENT
 - A. ZWINGLI ON I CORINTHIANS 11:24
 - B. OBJECTIONS TO ZWINGLI'S MEMORIAL ONLY VIEW
- XIII. DYNAMIC – SPIRITUALLY PRESENT, PHYSICALLY ABSENT
 - A. THE CORE OF CALVIN'S EUCHARIST THEOLOGY
 - B. CALVIN'S OBJECTION TO THE ELEVATION OF THE HOST
 - C. SACRAMENTS AS SIGNS OF GRACE AND SEAL OF COVENANT
 - D. DANGER OF RECEIVING THE EUCHARIST WITHOUT FAITH
 - E. ANGLICAN REFORMATION VIEWS SHARE MUCH WITH CALVIN
 - F. ANGLICAN EUCHARIST THEOLOGY AS STATED BY CRANMER
 - G. ANGLICAN EUCHARIST THEOLOGY AS STATED BY LITTON
- XIV. TRANSIGNIFICATION – A RELATIONAL PRESENCE ONLY
- XV. SELECT EARLY CHURCH FATHERS & A REAL PRESENCE OF CHRIST
 - A. IGNATIUS HELD TO A REAL PRESENCE IN THE EUCHARIST
 - B. JUSTIN MARTYR HELD TO A REAL PRESENCE IN THE EUCHARIST
 - C. IRENAEUS HELD TO A REAL PRESENCE IN THE EUCHARIST
- XVI. FROM THE MIDDLE AGES TO THE COUNCIL OF TRENT
- XVII. THE DANGERS OF RECEIVING THE EUCHARIST UNWORTHILY
- XVIII. THE BLESSINGS OF RECEIVING THE EUCHARIST WORTHILY
- XIX. IN CONCLUSION
- XX. REFERENCES

ABSTRACT

The early Church understood in The Sacrament of The Eucharist a real Presence of JESUS CHRIST. Early Church Fathers such as Ignatius, Justin Martyr and Irenaeus all held the institution of Holy Communion of our Lord recorded in Sacred Scripture to be sacramentally His Blood and Body. The early Church Fathers were however not overly encumbered, as were many men in The Church during the age of the Reformations, with a need to so exactly quantify That Presence in The consecrated Elements. The debate over the nature of CHRIST's Presence in The Reformations ranged on a scale to one side that held a real physical and spiritual Presence, to the opposite side that held to neither a physical nor a spiritual Presence of The Lord in The Eucharist. In the middle ground was found those who denied a physical Presence, but admitted to a real spiritual Presence.

So on one side we find both the Roman Catholic Counter Reformation - spelled out in the Council of Trent - and Martin Luther. Although the Catholics hold to a doctrine of "transubstantiation" and the Lutherans to "consubstantiation," both hold to a real physical and spiritual Presence of CHRIST in the consecrated bread and wine at the Lord's Table. On the other side we find Zwingli and his modern day Protestant Evangelical descendants who deny both a real physical and spiritual Presence, but rather admit The consecrated Elements to be only symbolically memorial of CHRIST's Body and Blood shed for the saints. In the middle may be found John Calvin and the Reformed Churches, as well as Anglicans, who hold to a "dynamic" Presence of The Saviour in The Lord's Supper, who deny a physical Presence of CHRIST's Body and Blood, but admit to a spiritual Presence of The Lord in The Eucharist.

Having examined the often deeply contradictory views of many godly men of the Reformations versus the Counter-Reformation, one may be left wondering if – in trying to decide which view to select as the best match to the blessed Gospels on The Saviour's Presence in The Eucharist – we are asking the right questions. Beyond what The Holy Bible declares, and what is evident from The early Church Fathers in their own words, is it entirely profitable to debate deeper still, relying upon our mere human intellect, into the nature of His Presence in The consecrated Host? If we divorce our understanding of the nature of The Eucharist from Holy Scripture and the early Church Fathers, are we not in danger of loosing sight of the Precious Gift Itself and the reason why The Son of GOD suffered, died, rose again and ascended into Heaven?

Let us listen carefully to The Words of Holy Scripture, and to The early Church Fathers, for they hold the key to understanding – within our human limits – how our Lord is truly Present in The Holy Communion! And let us accept what has been so revealed of The Great Mystery of The Eucharist and be thankful! Let us then rejoice in His love which, by His sacrifice for us, has redeemed us from darkness, death and damnation back to Himself now and forever! Let the faithful Christian man - joyfully submitting to The Commands of CHRIST - be in humble communion with The Almighty and loving fellowship with the brethren, that we not receive The holy consecrated Bread and Wine of The Eucharist unworthily! So we shall see! AMEN.

DEDICATION

To John Calvin, who in a fleeting moment of honestly brilliant Divine insight, said of The Holy Eucharist, “Now if anyone should ask me how this takes place, I shall not be ashamed to confess that it is a Secret too lofty for either my mind to comprehend or my words to declare. And, to speak more plainly, I rather experience than understand it!”¹

EPIGRAPH

MATTHEW 26:26-28, “And as they were eating, JESUS took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is My Body. And He took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; For this is My Blood of The New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins.”
(KJV)

¹ John Calvin as Teacher, Pastor and Theologian, quotes John Calvin, Inst. 1.14.21, p 98, paragraph

I. A PROPOSITION

The Holy Scriptures declare, and The early Church Fathers confessed, that our Lord JESUS CHRIST is truly Present - spiritually and physically - in The Sacrament of The Holy Eucharist. Let us receive The Holy Communion worthily in faith, accept It humbly with joy, partake of It reverently with awe, learn of It eagerly with honesty and leave what remains enshrouded within The Cloud of His Presence in The Hands of The Almighty! AMEN.

II. A SCRIPTURE – MATTHEW 26:26-28 – THIS IS MY BODY AND BLOOD

26 And as they were eating, JESUS took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is My Body.

27 And He took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it;

28 For this is My Blood of The New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins.²

III. INTRODUCTION

Recall that the cloud covered The Mystery of The holy Presence of The LORD before the ancient Israelites at Mount Sinai, that His people might come before Him in worship and fellowship. That Cloud protected the impenetrable mystery and holiness of The Almighty from the prying eyes of fallen and sin-laden of men, that the ancient Israelites might enter into communion with Him from a distance. The Israelites - through their physical senses, faith and obedience - knew they were in The Presence of GOD, but understood Who He is only superficially and from a distance. They understood within their human limits GOD's love, grace and nature through The Special Revelation revealed to them through the appointed mediator, "Moses the man of GOD," who spoke The Almighty's Words to them.³ They understood GOD by the mighty works of deliverance and protection that he wrought on their behalf by His hand, rescuing them from their physical damnation in Egypt. They understood GOD by the signs He showed to the ancient Israelites – such as His Shekinah Glory - which reinforced GOD's Special Revelation given to them through Moses.

² 1, KJV, MATTHEW 26:26-28.

³ 1, KJV, DEUTERONOMY 33:1.

Even so, The Mystery of The Presence of The Lord JESUS CHRIST in The Eucharist is covered with as it were a Cloud, that we His people The faithful Church might come before Him in worship and fellowship. This “Cloud of Mystery” surrounding the holiness of The Saviour’s Presence in The consecrated Elements of The Lord’s Supper allows the faithful Christian man, a sinner made righteous by The Grace of JESUS CHRIST, to enter into intimate communion with Him. We as Christians – through our physical senses, faith and obedience – know we are in The Presence of GOD The Father through our communion with GOD The Son.

And though we more fully know Who GOD is as Christians than the ancient Israelites could ever have imagined, we also in this life still only understand Who He is superficially and from a distance. We understand within our human limits GOD’s love, grace and nature through The Special Revelation revealed to us through The Mediator JESUS CHRIST, of Whom Saint John declares in JOHN 1:29, “Behold, The Lamb of GOD, which taketh away the sin of the world!”⁴ We understand JESUS CHRIST by the signs He gives to us – most particularly The Eucharist – which reinforce GOD’s Special Revelation given to us by our Lord and His Apostles, and preserved for us by The faithful Church down through the ages.

For man has, since his creation in The Garden, sought to understand Who The Creator is and His nature. He is The One Who reveals Himself to man in both creation and in Holy Scriptures, The Most High Who walks with us through life when we are His in CHRIST, His HOLY SPIRIT dwelling about and within us, and His strong arm upholding and delivering us. We know GOD The Father by knowing GOD The Son. We know of Him also then by His great mercy, love and Grace bestowed upon us at The Cross. But The Mystery of GOD – Who He is in His being – we only glimpse and comprehend through our limited mortal capacities. Just so, though Christian men have carefully considered and piously attempted to pierce Who CHRIST is and the nature of His Presence in The Eucharist for two millenniums, there still remains The Holy Mystery itself. Where The Saviour Himself and His Apostles speak in The Scriptures, The holy Word of GOD is there for us to understand within the limits of our mortal minds and, guided by the teachings of The faithful Church, to accept. And while we find that our

⁴ 1, KJV, JOHN 1:29.

understanding can not penetrate The Mystery of The Eucharist completely, yet it is enough that we believe.

IV. HOW BEST TO APPROACH THIS ISSUE

It seems then a simple statement of Special Revelation, yet encased in deepest Mystery, that CHRIST is in some manner present both physically and spiritually in The Eucharist which we receive as part of His Body The Church on earth. Any view which does not in some way accept both natures is thus immediately suspect. But of the specific natures of the Lord's Presence in This Most Precious Sacrament – both Divine sign and work given to us via The Church with the intention of uniting all Believers in Christian charity, love and peace – there is sadly much dispute and disagreement.

There seems to be two major schools of thought on the nature of The Lord's Supper regarding CHRIST's Presence: In the first camp are those who, as the early Church widely if not universally held, that The risen and glorified Saviour has a real Presence in The Eucharist. Some hold this to be a physical Presence, either in the substance of or with the substance of the consecrated bread and wine, with also a spiritual Presence. Others deny a Physical Presence of The Lord in The consecrated Elements, but admit to a spiritual Presence of CHRIST. In the second camp are those who exclude any real Presence of The Saviour in The Lord's Supper whatsoever - physical or spiritual - but rather hold The Eucharist to be only a symbolic memorial of CHRIST's sacrifice on behalf of the saints.

As we consider the various divergent opinions of many godly men down through the ages, we shall see in the major Church camps that emerged from The Reformations and The Counter Reformation a range of disagreement within the parameters just described. One may well come to wonder, as we consider these competing understandings of the nature of The Eucharist, if the divergence of views themselves suggest that the blanket of Mystery which surrounds This Sacrament is not to be fully understood in this life by the minds of mere men. It may well be that the general formulas of the early Church Fathers and Councils, accepting both the Scriptural simplicity and yet respecting the incomprehensible Mystery of the nature of The Lord's Presence in The Eucharist, may offer the most reasonable, humble and pious ground on

which to stand. This is the ground upon which The Roman Catholic Church has stood for two millenniums, that CHRIST has - as The Scriptures proclaim – a real Presence in The holy Communion, and that This Presence may be somewhat understood from The clear Words of Scriptures and The early Church Fathers and Councils.

But with this understanding, there still remains The Cloud of Mystery surrounding The consecrated Elements of The Lord’s Supper, beyond which the wise and pious man need not and does not seek to dissect in futile attempts to as it were usurp the very Throne of GOD! Here too The Roman Catholic Church has stood on solid ground for two millenniums, declining to tear apart The Church on earth, refusing to place needless stumbling blocks before men’s souls and guarding against the bringing of any shame upon The very Body and Blood of The One Who Redeems His saints before GOD and man! So we shall see.

V. THE PURPOSE OF THE EUCHARIST

The word “Eucharist” comes from the Greek word “Eucharistia” and means “Thanksgiving.” This word “Eucharist” is found in the writings of early Church Fathers such as Ignatius, Justin and Irenæus.⁵ Can The Eucharist be understood for the wondrous Divine Gift that It is by human reason? Only to a limited degree as GOD has condescended to reveal It, for it is a Mystery of GOD’s Grace to mankind that transcends the limited minds of men! And here is the key: faith. Without Faith, Its value, nature and purpose can not be apprehended by the race of Adam. For The Eucharist is a Sacrament, The most holy Rite of The Church, instituted and commanded by CHRIST Himself at the occasion of The Last Supper. Within Its precious folds is The Sacrifice – CHRIST Himself – Who gave up Himself at Calvary to secure the souls of those elected unto salvation. The Eucharist is further The Real Presence of CHRIST Himself with His people in all times and places that His loving labours for us His saints is rightly celebrated and received to all the four corners of the earth.

Saint Matthew records in MATTHEW 26:26-28, “And as they were eating, JESUS took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is My Body. And He took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them,

⁵ 3, New Advent Encyclopedia, entry for “Eucharist,” paragraph 1, retrieved 12/06/2006.

saying, Drink ye all of it; For this is My Blood of The New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins.”⁶ As the faithful worldwide Anglican Communion confesses and professes in “Article XXV. Of The Sacraments” in its Thirty Nine Articles of Religion, “The Christian Eucharist is a Sacrament, a sacred command ordained by CHRIST Himself.”⁷ When we rightly receive in humbleness of heart – not take in the pride of vanity – the Elements of Communion, “Article XXVIII. Of The Lord’s Supper” declares that “the Bread which we break is a partaking of The Body of CHRIST; and likewise the Cup of Blessing is a partaking of The Blood of CHRIST.”⁸ Though we may not understand The Mystery fully, the work which The Bread and the Cup of CHRIST effect in our souls is “after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean[s] whereby the Body of CHRIST is received and eaten in The Supper is Faith.”⁹

For what purpose then does The Almighty give us Communion with Himself in The Eucharist? The English Church’s “Article XXVIII. Of The Lord’s Supper” puts it well: The Sacraments are 1) “badges or tokens of Christian men’s profession” of faith; 2) “certain sure witnesses and effectual signs of grace, and GOD’s good will towards us;” 3) holy means by which GOD “work[s] invisibly in us” to draw us to Himself; 4) a sure means by which GOD “strengthen[s] and confirm[s] our Faith in Him.”¹⁰ Receiving The Eucharist is then 5) “a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another;” 6) that when taken in earnest and thankful faith and with a penitent and humble soul, “is a Sacrament of our redemption by CHRIST’s death” and resurrection. But herein is the required state in which The Lord’s Supper is to be received by faithful Christian men: “rightly” in reverence within the confines of The faithful Church; “worthily” with humility and confession of sins before GOD; “with faith” in full belief of This Work of The Redeemer on our behalf, even though we can not fully understand such a Great Mystery of GOD as This!¹¹

The Catechism of The Roman Catholic Church correctly sees receiving Communion as the completion of full Christian initiation into The Church, after the

⁶ 1, KJV, MATTHEW 26:26-28.

⁷ 4, Anglican 39 Articles, Article XXV. Of the Sacraments, paragraph 2.

⁸ 4, Anglican 39 Articles, Article XXVIII. Of the Lord’s Supper, paragraph 1.

⁹ 4, Anglican 39 Articles, Article XXVIII. Of the Lord’s Supper, paragraph 3.

¹⁰ 4, Anglican 39 Articles, Article XXV. Of The Sacraments, paragraph 1.

¹¹ 4, Anglican 39 Articles, Article XXVIII. Of the Lord’s Supper, paragraph 1.

completion of Baptism and Confirmation: “At the Last Supper, on the night he was betrayed, our Savior instituted The Eucharistic sacrifice of His Body and Blood.” Why? “To perpetuate the sacrifice of The Cross throughout the ages until He should come again.” Entrusted to whom? “to His beloved Spouse, The Church.” For what purposes? To be 1) “a memorial of His death and resurrection;” 2) “a sacrament of [Divine] love” unto mankind; 4) “to be a sign of [Christian] unity;” 5) “to be a bond of charity” between fellow Believers.” How so? The Eucharist is the ultimate, perfected and completed Passover feast for The Faithful “in which CHRIST is consumed, the mind is filled with grace, and a pledge of future glory is given to us!”¹²

There is thus a fathomlessly deep sea of Mystery in The Eucharist into Which we in this life may grasp only to a certain depth with our minds, and which requires that we rightly accept in our hearts with faith. In our receiving Communion, CHRIST draws us into intimate fellowship with Himself and with fellow Believers on earth and in Heaven. In receiving of This blessed Sacrament, the Christian man is called to dwell humbly upon the awe-inspiring memorial for which it should bring to our minds. This is “The Anamnesis” of The Eucharist which, as Davies puts it, is the “...recalling of the life, ministry, passion, sacrificial death, resurrection and Second Coming of CHRIST.”¹³ And while the mere human mind of the unbeliever can not understand with its limited and unredeemed comprehension such Mysteries of CHRIST’s Works on our behalf, the Believing man may apprehend these things more deeply through the eyes of Faith and enlightened by The HOLY SPIRIT!

VI. THE ROOTS OF THE EUCHARIST IN THE PASSOVER MEAL

Let us take careful note that our Lord came as GOD Incarnate in prophetic history to the Jewish nation first, in fulfillment of the Jewish Messianic Scriptures. It was at the last Passover meal that JESUS CHRIST instituted The Lord’s Supper. It then behooves us to look at the Old Testament roots of The Eucharist. We as Christians may better understand The Eucharist celebration of The New Testament by looking at The Passover celebration of The Old Testament. Remember that The Almighty chose to come to earth

¹² 5, Catechism of The Catholic Church, Article 3, The Sacrament of The Eucharist, # 1323, p 368.

¹³ 6, Bread of Life, Cup of Joy, page 260, definition of The Anamnesis of CHRIST.

as fully GOD and fully Man - but without sin - to first The Jewish nation, as first The Jewish Messiah, in fulfillment of The Jewish messianic prophecies of The Jewish Scriptures. On the first Passover meal in Egypt, the soon to be freed Israelites sacrificed an unblemished lamb unto GOD and consumed it in their communal meal. The blood of the sacrificed lamb was placed on the doorposts of the dwellings of The Jews, that the angel of death might pass over their souls and spare their earthly lives. So Moses conveyed GOD's directive to Israel in EXODUS 12:23, "For The LORD will pass through to smite the Egyptians; and when He seeth the blood upon the lintel, and on the two side posts, The LORD will pass over the door, and will not suffer the destroyer to come in unto your houses to smite you." ¹⁴

The Passover meal was eaten in a state of preparedness to exit the land of slavery and death under the leadership of Moses the man of GOD. So the sacrifice was consumed with unleavened bread. To this is added "the cup of blessing" at the end of the Passover meal, the messianic expectations of The Jewish people of the coming of The Saviour and the establishment of His Kingdom on earth. Thus, of CHRIST's Body and Blood as the means of salvation from bondage, darkness and death, Saint Paul declares in I CORINTHIANS 10:16-17, "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of The Blood of CHRIST? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of The Body of CHRIST? For we being many are one bread, and one body: for we are all partakers of That One Bread." ¹⁵

VII. THE INSTITUTION OF THE LORD'S SUPPER

It was therefore no mere coincidence, but rather the Divinely ordained flow of prophetic history, that The Lord chose to institute The Eucharist at the last Jewish Passover meal He shared with His Apostles - The Last Supper - before He Himself became The sacrificial Lamb of GOD given to redeem the world and men from sin and separation from Himself! The Roman Catholic Catechism observes, "JESUS' passing over to His Father by His death and Resurrection, the new Passover, is anticipated in the

¹⁴ 1, KJV, EXODUS 12:23.

¹⁵ 1, KJV, I CORINTHIANS 10:16-17.

Supper and celebrated in The Eucharist, which fulfills the Jewish Passover and anticipates the final Passover of The Church in the glory of The Kingdom.”¹⁶

Davies observes that, in The Gospel accounts of The Last Supper, The Apostles raised many anxious questions and objections when The Lord announced His coming Passion on The Cross. “But when JESUS made the striking pronouncement – ‘This piece of unleavened bread is My Body’ - the disciples apparently accept His Words without further explanation.” What does this suggest? Recall that, in the time and place in which The Almighty chose for The Incarnation, there was a palpable messianic expectation in the Passover among the Jews. Recall that Israel was occupied by a foreign Gentile power, oppressed within their own land, slaves to the ruling whims of the brutal pagan Roman Empire, their entire society groaning under the contaminated heathen heels of an unclean enemy. The Apostles were well prepared for CHRIST’s pronouncement, as Davies calls it, for “the equation of the unleavened bread with His Body.”¹⁷

Davies thus observes the stage was well set for the change from Passover to Eucharist at The Last Supper. The Apostles would have well understood the messianic expectations in the Passover celebration of both “...the fifth cup prepared for Elijah the forerunner of The Messiah” and the Afikoman, the “...piece of unleavened bread hidden and disclosed as a sign of The Messiah.” Both would have been clear symbols to The Apostles at The Last Supper that “CHRIST was The Messiah, and they would apprehend this not as a prophecy, but as a fulfillment” of their messianic expectations.¹⁸

It is little wonder then, that as The Lord JESUS CHRIST entered Jerusalem as the Passover feast approached, He was joyously acclaimed as The Messiah by the messianic-hungry people. Thus we read in MATTHEW 21:8-9, “And a very great multitude spread their clothes on the road; others cut down branches from the trees and spread them on the road. Then the multitudes who went before and those who followed cried out, saying: "Hosanna to the Son of David! 'Blessed is He who comes in The Name of The LORD!' Hosanna in the highest!"¹⁹

¹⁶ 5, Catechism of The Catholic Church, The Institution of The Eucharist, # 1340, p 373.

¹⁷ 6, Bread of Life, Cup of Joy, p 10.

¹⁸ 6, Bread of Life, Cup of Joy, p 13, The Change from Passover to Eucharist, paragraph 1.

¹⁹ 1, KJV, MATTHEW 21;8-9.

Indeed, the people were repeating the messianic expectations of PSALM 118:26, “Blessed is He who comes in The Name of The LORD!”²⁰ The expectation was that JESUS as The Messiah would miraculously deliver occupied Israel from under the hand of the Romans, restore the nation to and even above the glory of the undivided Kingdom under Solomon and make Israel by royal messianic decree the true light to the Gentiles and a glory to the people of GOD. They were sadly mistaken in discerning the will of The Almighty and the reason for The Advent of JESUS CHRIST.

VIII. THE EUCHARIST UNCHANGED. MAN’S UNDERSTANDING DEEPENS

GOD’s Special Revelation to mankind being progressive as His prophetic purposes unfold on the stage of redemptive history, so man’s understanding of The Eucharist has deepened through the ages, yet The Eucharist itself remains unchanged. Horton Davies, in “Bread of Life & Cup of Joy – Newer Ecumenical Perspectives on The Eucharist,” sees the understanding of The Eucharist in The Church as having gone through at least five phases. While his classifications of time periods of Eucharistic history within The Church may at different points be disputed, he does offer many significant observations. So we shall consider his study briefly as further background for the issue at hand, of the nature of CHRIST’s Presence in The Lord’s Supper.

A. IN THE EARLY CHURCH

Davies observes that The very early Church, which existed within the lifetimes of the Apostles, was under great persecution and looked for the immediate return of The Lord. The Church, first localized in The Holy Land and consisting mostly of Jews, was beginning to spread throughout the known world and taking within her ranks increasing numbers of Gentiles. This was an age when Christians suffered great persecution, sometimes unto death. Their worship form was as a result simple, mobile and often out of the public eye. Thus they “celebrated The Eucharist as a meal at home with joy, enthusiasm, and the belief in the immediacy of their transport with CHRIST to the heavens.”²¹

²⁰ 1, KJV, PSALM 118:26.

²¹ 6, Bread of Life, Cup of Joy, p 264, paragraph 4.

Here The Scriptures themselves provide us with the record of first resort. We see the nature and practice of the early Church at the first Pentecost in ACTS 2:36-47. After Saint Peter's sermon in Jerusalem - that JESUS The Messiah promised of GOD was crucified by Israel - those listening "were pricked in their heart, and said unto Peter and to the rest of the Apostles, Men and brethren, what shall we do? Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in The Name of JESUS CHRIST for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of The HOLY GHOST." ²²

Therefore The Church came into being: the believing were baptized; multitudes of souls were added to The Body of CHRIST daily; they continued faithfully in the teachings of The Apostles; they kept fellowship one with another; they prayed together; they continued daily to break bread together; signs and wonders by GOD's power were poured out upon them; they praised with joyous fear The Almighty; they ministered to and provided for one another's needs. And there emerged The Eucharist as a continual communal Passover celebration, as in ACTS 2:46-47: "And they, continuing daily with one accord in The Temple, and breaking bread from house to house, did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart, Praising GOD, and having favour with all the people. And The Lord added to the Church daily such as should be saved!" ²³

B. IN THE TIME OF THE EMPEROR CONSTANTINE

Secondly, by the age of Emperor Constantine, Christianity had not only become publicly tolerated in The Roman Empire, but emerged as the State sanctioned religion. Christian worship displaced pagan religions. The Church became organized as an open public institution and developed hierarchy. But, as Davies observes, "...they still used the vernacular tongue, and all shared in the rite [of The Eucharist] Itself." ²⁴ Here we may resort to the early Church Fathers who led The early Church after the close of Special Revelation. We may begin with Justin Martyr, Ignatius and Irenaeus and ending with such men as Augustine. Their statements on The Eucharist we will examine at a later point.

²² 1, KJV, ACTS 2:37-38.

²³ 1, KJV, ACTS 2:46-47.

²⁴ 6, Bread of Life, Cup of Joy, p 264, paragraph 5-p 265.

C. IN THE CHURCH OF THE MIDDLE AGES

Thirdly, as The Middle Ages approached, Davies notes the emergence of many significant changes effecting the celebration of The Eucharist. Here we find such men as Thomas Aquinas. It was in this period that holy Communion took a more involved form: 1) in place of a communal meal emerged complicated ritual; 2) the vernacular tongues of worshippers was displaced with “a learned and remote language familiar only to the Priests;” 3) worshippers lost their place as participants and became more mere spectators of the rites of Christian worship, most especially The Eucharist. “On rare occasions they took a wafer, but no consecrated wine.” 4) the prayers of the Christian laity became more private and less corporate. Among these and other profound changes in the mode of Christian worship in that age, the reverence and awe for the mysteries of The Faith in the eyes of the laity grew and became increasingly profound, though often probably less well understood.²⁵

D. IN THE REFORMATIONS & COUNTER-REFORMATION

Fourthly, Davies next sees the age of the Protestant Reformations and the Roman Catholic Counter-Reformation as the fourth phase of Eucharistic celebratory evolution. Here we find Luther, Calvin, Zwingli and Cranmer. And here we find the Roman Catholic reply solidified in the Council of Trent. Davies asserts that the Anglican, Lutheran, Reformed and related Protestant movements were marked by a return to some central hallmarks of early Church worship: 1) the return of the celebration of The Liturgies to the peoples’ vernacular tongues allowed again the laity to understand what was being said and performed; 2) “...hymns [in the common tongues] gave the people a response of gratitude that the complexities of Gregorian chanting made impossible for the laity in Catholicism.”²⁶ Further, there were varying degrees in Protestant Churches of the laity again receiving both the bread and wine in the celebration of The Eucharist.

²⁵ 6, Bread of Life, Cup of Joy, p 265, paragraph 1.

²⁶ 6, Bread of Life, Cup of Joy, p 265, paragraph 2.

E. IN THE AGE OF MODERN CHRISTIAN ECUMENICALISM

Fifthly, we enter into our present distressed modern age, of which Davies observes that, with the rise of scientific study of Church liturgies, "...the combination of the ecumenical and liturgical movements [have] made the production of trans-denominational Eucharistic canons... possible and desirable."²⁷ There has been a great movement of The Church towards a reuniting in ecumenical understanding of the nature of and celebration of The Eucharist since World War II. The central issue is a common agreement on The Mystery of CHRIST's Sacramental Presence in The Eucharist which, if resolved, remove a major obstacle to the reuniting of The Church on earth under the ecumenical umbrella. This has indeed been the case between major Branches of The Church, at least in the Protestant world, where there is a common denial of a true physical Presence of CHRIST in The Eucharist. But between those denominations that deny His physical Presence and those that confess It, this is an insurmountable obstacle to communion fellowship and Church reunification.

However, even between those denominations that have for example split away from The mother Roman Catholic Church and The Roman Church herself, there is still great common ground for some ecumenical cooperation outside of the celebration of The Mass. So Davies observes that modern Christian ecumenicalism is also marked by other central common themes of worship: the centrality in worship of thanksgiving to GOD for His many blessings; a memorial of CHRIST's works on The Cross; the mission of GOD's redemptive love to all mankind; celebration of and common labouring in The present Kingdom of CHRIST on earth through The universal Church; the Lordship of CHRIST in The Eucharist.²⁸ Such things Bible-believing Catholics, Protestants and other denominations can and are indeed participating in together in our present age.

IX. OVERVIEW OF VIEWS ON CHRIST'S PRESENCE IN THE EUCHARIST

Edward Brown, in "An Exposition of The [Anglican] Thirty Nine Articles of Religion," opens discussion on Article XXVIII - Of The Lord's Supper - with the

²⁷ 6, Bread of Life, Cup of Joy, p 265, paragraph 2.

²⁸ 6, Bread of Life, Cup of Joy, p 258, paragraph 2, selected ecumenical points of agreement on the nature of The Eucharist between the French reformed Church and the Roman Catholic Church contained in "The Dombes Agreement."

observation that there are generally four views on the nature of CHRIST's Presence in The Eucharist: "1, Transubstantiation; 2. Consubstantiation; 3. The [Dynamic] real spiritual Presence; 4. The [Memorialistic] denial of any special Presence altogether."²⁹ "Transubstantiation" is the doctrine of The Eucharist held by the Latin Roman Catholic Church, which is in substantial agreement with the Eastern Orthodox Churches. "Consubstantiation" is the doctrine of Luther and his legacy in The Lutheran Churches. A Memorial view characterizes those Churches that deny both a physical and spiritual Presence of The Lord in the Eucharist, classically best presented by Zwingli. Thus, the classification of "Memorialistic." The "Dynamic" view holds to a real spiritual Presence, but absent a physical Presence, of CHRIST in The consecrated Elements. This view is generally found in Calvinist theology common to Reformed Churches, as well as most Anglican Churches.

These four major views on This Mystery do not preclude hybrids in various forms down through the ages and into our own time, but this division offers us a reasonable means to approach to understanding the various views on the nature of The Saviour's Presence in The Elements of The Communion. To these four major views we may add an interesting example of modern Western Christian ecumenicalism - "transignification" - which calls for all other Christian views of The Eucharist to put aside their particular issues on the nature of CHRIST's Presence in The holy Communion and unite in a view of a "relational" Presence of The Lord in The Eucharist.

Keith Mathison, in "Given For You, Reclaiming Calvin's Doctrine of The Lord's Supper," makes the profound observation that although "Roman Catholics, Lutherans and Calvinists debated the mode of CHRIST's real Presence [in The Eucharist], ...they agreed that He was present in some unique way." Indeed, as Mathison pointedly laments that, "...although there were always disagreements among Christians concerning the precise mode of CHRIST's Presence in The Sacrament, that fact of That Presence was not doubted until the rise of symbolic memorialism" as it emerged from the mind of Zwingli.³⁰ It is the departure of many today within Christendom, in fact, from any view of a real Presence of The Lamb of GOD in The Lord's Supper that has lead to reducing

²⁹ 7, Exposition of 39 Articles, Article XXVIII, Section I, p 683, paragraph 1.

³⁰ 8, Given For You, The real Absence of CHRIST, p 263.

The holy Eucharist to a mere “subjective act of mental recollection” of CHRIST’s sacrifice for us on The Cross! ³¹

If in The Eucharist, the sign of CHRIST’s sacrifice for us of Himself is seen in the symbols and ceremonies of The Lord’s Supper, then the Thing Signified is the crucified, risen and glorified JESUS The Messiah Himself. Mathison therefore sees the views of transubstantiation and consubstantiation on the one hand as a veering into an overly literal extreme as “virtual equation of the sign with the Thing Signified,” while symbolic memorialism he sees as an erroneous veering into the opposite extreme which artificially divorces the sign from The Thing signified. ³² Calvin and the view of a “Dynamic” spiritual Presence only of The Lord in The consecrated Elements is then best understood on this spectrum as a middle category between Roman Catholic and Lutheran doctrines on the one hand and Zwingli on the other.

X. TRANSUBSTANTIATION – PHYSICALLY & SPIRITUALLY PRESENT

Since The Western Reformation Churches emerged from The Roman Catholic Church, it seems proper to begin with That Mother Church’s view of The Eucharist as existed at the time when The Protestant Reformations emerged. As we have noted, this view is the view of “Transubstantiation,” which holds that when The Elements of bread and wine are consecrated by the Priest, they in fact become on a molecular level changed in their substance into The actual physical Body and Blood of The Lord, yet retain the outward appearance to men’s senses as the same form of bread and wine they were before being consecrated. Noah Webster thus defines transubstantiation as “Change of substance. In the Romish theology, the ...conversion of the bread and wine in The Eucharist, into the Body and Blood of CHRIST.” ³³

As Davies observes of transubstantiation, “...what looked like bread and wine had, in its underlying substance, become The Body and Blood of CHRIST as the institution narrative was pronounced by the Priest.” ³⁴ The key to understanding the Roman view lies with the preposition in transubstantiation, which is “trans” – through

³¹ 8, Given For You, The Sign and the Thing Signified, p 262, paragraph 1.

³² 8, Given For You, The Sign and the Thing Signified, p 262, paragraph 1.

³³ 9, Noah Webster’s 1828 Dictionary, entry for “transubstantiation,” p TRA – TRA.

³⁴ 6, Bread of Life, Cup of Joy, p 220, paragraph 2.

the substance of the bread and wine, their essence becoming in fact CHRIST's Body and Blood. But there is much more to this view: according to the Council of Trent, in receiving The Eucharist we receive CHRIST in His entirety – His Body and His Blood, His Soul and His Divinity, which rests in what is called "...the indissolubility of the 'hypostatic union' of CHRIST's Divinity and Humanity" as declared by Councils of The early undivided Church.³⁵

A. WHAT THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH DECLARES

The Catechism of The Catholic Church, in quoting The Council of Trent, explains in transubstantiation that CHRIST is being re-presented into the present time and place of worshippers in its consecration in a real sense. This does not deny the memorial sense of The Eucharist celebration to be observed in remembrance of The Lord's sacrifice for us - to be recalled regularly by the faithful Christian until either he dies from this world or until he might see the Second Coming of CHRIST - but is simultaneous with the first view: "CHRIST, our Lord and GOD, was once and for all to offer Himself to GOD The Father by His death on the altar of The Cross, to accomplish there an everlasting redemption." Note then that the sacrifice of CHRIST at Calvary was in this view once and sufficient. "But because His priesthood was not to end with His [earthly] death, at the Last supper... He wanted to leave to His beloved spouse The Church a visible sacrifice (as the nature of man demands) by which the bloody sacrifice which He was to accomplish once for all on The Cross would be re-presented, its memory perpetuated until the end of the world, and its... [salvation] power be applied to the forgiveness of the sins we daily commit."³⁶

This view rests in part on ROMANS 6:8-9, "Knowing that CHRIST being raised from the dead dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over Him. For in that He died, He died unto sin once: but in that He liveth, He liveth unto GOD."³⁷ The Lord having been raised from the dead, and ascended into Heaven, He in His Humanity lives

³⁵ 3, New Advent Encyclopedia, entry for Eucharist, Real Presence of CHRIST, Section II, paragraph 1.

³⁶ 5, Catechism of The Catholic Church, The Sacrificial Memorial of CHRIST, # 1366, p 380-381.

³⁷ 1, KJV, ROMANS 6:8-9.

with His fully alive Body, Blood and Soul. But CHRIST also being fully GOD The Son, He also exists in His full Divinity. The glorified CHRIST exists in full union between His Perfect Humanity and Divinity. Therefore this view offers that “CHRIST is present in The Sacrament [of The Eucharist] with His Flesh and Blood, Body and Soul, Humanity and Divinity.”³⁸

The definitive understanding of The Eucharist in The Roman Catholic Church however remains as defined by the Council of Trent, which declarations were formulated as a response to what many Protestant Christians during the Reformations rejected. Specifically, “many of the reformers rejected the sacrificial nature of The Mass and disbelieved in the true Presence of JESUS in The Eucharist.”³⁹ This was stated in Sessions XIII, XXI and XXII by the Council of Trent (1545-1563 AD), which focused on the Eucharistic doctrines of The Sacrifice, The Sacrament and The Real Presence of CHRIST there present. The New Advent Encyclopedia offers this overview: “...that in The Eucharist The Body and Blood of the GOD-man are truly, really, and substantially present for the nourishment of our souls, by reason of the transubstantiation of the bread and wine into The Body and Blood of CHRIST, and that in this change of substances the unbloody Sacrifice of The New Testament is also contained.”⁴⁰

B. REFORMATION OBJECTIONS TO THE ROMAN CATHOLIC VIEW

Mathison however summarizes the Reformation objection found in Calvin against the view of transubstantiation, which centers on what he saw as the danger of idolatry: The Council of Trent defined a Sacrament as “a symbol of a sacred thing.”⁴¹ A common Reformation objection to the Roman doctrine is that the signs of The Eucharist contained within The Sacrament, the bread and wine, can not when consecrated become The physical Blood and Body of The Saviour and still remain as signs. Such criticism says that The Elements must be one or the other, but not both. Thus Mathison states, “If the bread and wine are signs of the Reality [JESUS CHRIST] and not the very Reality Itself,

³⁸ 3, New Advent Encyclopedia, entry for Eucharist, Real Presence of CHRIST, Section II, paragraph 1.

³⁹ 10, RCIA Participant’s Book, Part II Special Topics, History of The Mass, paragraph 2, p 2.

⁴⁰ 3, New Advent Encyclopedia, entry for “Eucharist,” paragraph 5.

⁴¹ 8, Given For You, The Definition of Sacrament, p 244. Mathison quotes Council of Trent, Session XIII, Chapter 3 which defines a Sacrament as “a symbol of a sacred thing.”

then such worship is nothing more or less than idolatry. [But] ...if the consecrated Elements actually are the Body and Blood of The Lord JESUS CHRIST... then They cannot [also] be signs or symbols of The Body and Blood of CHRIST. [Therefore]... if They are not signs or symbols of The Body and Blood of CHRIST, then They are not Sacraments according to Rome's own definition of a Sacrament." Mathison summarizes this criticism, "If the consecrated Elements are Sacraments (signs of The Body and Blood), then the worship offered to Them is idolatrous. If the worship offered to Them is not idolatrous, then They are not Sacraments. [For] to worship a Sacrament is to worship a sign, and to worship a sign is idolatry."⁴² But if this is a valid criticism, The early Church Fathers did not see it. Or if they did, then are we to believe that they somehow conspired to hide it?

C. THE ROMAN CATHOLIC VIEW RESTATED

Though the Roman Church has not amended the declarations of the Council of Trent, She today and over the years since the Reformations has opened the doors to an understanding of The Eucharist that embraces a wider base of theology that offers good ground to answer such concerns as those of Calvin. There is, in this expanded view, no contradiction with what has been established down through the ages and maintained by The Roman Catholic Church. This expanded view of The Eucharist includes the emphasis that The Eucharist brings the one completed sacrifice of CHRIST at Calvary into the presence in time and space of The Faithful who receive This Sacrament, a most sound emphasis common and central to many High Protestant Churches as well.

The Association for Catechumenal Ministry declares that "more than anything else, The Mass [i.e. Eucharist] is a sacrifice that re-presents (makes present again) the one single sacrifice of JESUS on The Cross as a memorial of His Passover... The Sacrifice of The Mass."⁴³ Faithful Jews are called to recelebrate the historical Passover event at the Passover table every year in remembrance of Israel's physical deliverance by The Lord from the physical bondage of sin and damnation in Egypt. Even more so, faithful Christians are called to recelebrate the transcendent Eucharistic event at holy

⁴² 8, Given For You, The Definition of Sacrament, p 245, paragraph 1.

⁴³ 10, RCIA Participant's Book, Part II Special Topics, History of The Mass, paragraph 3, p 1.

Communion in remembrance – and in The Divine Presence – of The Church’s spiritual deliverance by The Lord from the spiritual bondage of sin and damnation this fallen world!

GENESIS 22:11-12 recalls GOD The Father’s satisfaction with Abraham’s willingness to offer up his only son in full obedience, “But the Angel of the LORD called to him from heaven and said, ... ‘Do not lay your hand on the lad, or do anything to him; for now I know that you fear GOD, since you have not withheld your son, your only son, from Me.’”⁴⁴ So when The Incarnate CHRIST is baptized at the hands of John The Baptist in MATTHEW 3:16-17, we read “...JESUS came up immediately from the water; and behold, the heavens were opened to Him, and He saw The Spirit of GOD descending like a dove and alighting upon Him. And suddenly a voice came from heaven, saying, "This is My beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.”⁴⁵ Therefore, when GOD The Son in perfect obedience to GOD The Father stood on the edge of death on The Cross, He utters in fulfillment of The Divine Plan of redemption for fallen men of Himself as The Perfect and Complete Sacrifice. And so He spoke These Words in JOHN 19:30, “...It is finished!”⁴⁶

A current day understanding from within The Roman Catholic Church thus offers that CHRIST’s Body and Blood is not magically being recreated and re-sacrificed by the Roman Catholic Priest at the Church altar. Rather, celebrating The Eucharist is said by The Catholic Church to “...remind us of the perfect offering of JESUS, The only Son of The Father, on The Cross. The once-for-all sacrifice of JESUS is re-presented (made present) every time we celebrate The Mass.”⁴⁷ For as GOD The Father was well pleased with Abraham for standing on the painful precipice of sacrificing his only son Isaac, so GOD The Father is well pleased with JESUS CHRIST - His only begotten Son - for actually sacrificing Himself to redeem sinful men back to Himself!

And though this teaching is most clearly held in The Roman Catholic tradition, all Christian traditions that recognize both a physical and spiritual Presence of The Lord in The Eucharist may be so blessed with this view. Quoting The Council of Trent, The

⁴⁴ 1, KJV, GENESIS 22:11-12.

⁴⁵ 1, KJV, MATTHEW 3:16-17.

⁴⁶ 1, KJV, JOHN 19:30.

⁴⁷ 10, RCIA Participant’s Book, Part II Special Topics, History of The Mass, paragraph 5, p 1.

Catechism of The Catholic Church explains, "...In the most blessed sacrament of The Eucharist, The Body and Blood, together with the soul and divinity, of our Lord JESUS CHRIST, and, therefore, the whole CHRIST is truly, really, and substantially contained. This presence is called 'real' - by which is not intended to exclude the other types of Presence as if they could not be 'real' too, but because it is Presence in the fullest sense... a substantial Presence by which CHRIST - GOD and man - makes Himself wholly and entirely present" with us His people at the Communion table!⁴⁸

XI. CONSUBSTANTIATION – SPIRITUALLY & PHYSICALLY COPRESENT

In truth, Luther had questioned the Roman Catholic mother Church of his age on many issues. Mathison observes that in his "The Babylonian Captivity of The Church," Luther challenged the Biblical validity of the seven Sacraments of The Roman Church, being certain of only Baptism and Communion. He also argued that Rome overemphasized the human Priest in The Eucharist and underemphasized CHRIST, specifically "the idea that, in The Eucharist, the Priest performs a good work or sacrifice on behalf of the people." He questioned "the withholding of the [Communion] cup from the laity." And as we have of course noted, he objected to the "doctrine of transubstantiation."⁴⁹ It is on this last objection that we shall consider here most closely.

A. LUTHER'S REAL PRESENCE OF CHRIST IN THE EUCHARIST

Most interesting is Martin Luther's view of CHRIST's real spiritual and physical Presence in The Elements of The Eucharist, which is termed "Consubstantiation." In spite of his militant antipathy to The Roman Catholic Church, he was an isolated voice among the Reformers of his day who held to a real physical and spiritual Presence of CHRIST in The Eucharist, which though not identical to transubstantiation, remains close to the Roman Catholic view. Consubstantiation is defined by The New Advent Encyclopedia as "the coexistence of the substance of the bread with The true Body of CHIST" in The Eucharist.⁵⁰ Noah Webster observes that consubstantiation proclaims

⁴⁸ 5, Catechism of The Catholic Church, The Presence of CHRIST, # 1374, p 383-384.

⁴⁹ 8, Given For You, John Calvin's Doctrine of The Lord's Supper, p 4.

⁵⁰ 3, New Advent Encyclopedia, entry for Eucharist, real Presence of CHRIST, Section IV, paragraph 1.

“...a union of the Body of our blessed Savior with [and not through] the sacramental Elements. ...after consecration of The Elements, The Body and Blood of CHRIST are substantially present with [and not through] the substance of the bread and wine...”⁵¹

The key to the Lutheran view of consubstantiation lies in the preposition “con” - with the substance of the bread and wine, which themselves remain in essence bread and wine, while CHRIST’s Body and Blood surround the consecrated Elements.

Luther’s doctrine makes possible the view of CHRIST’s physical Presence in The Eucharist then, not by a change of the inward substance of the consecrated bread and wine, but by in effect a calling down from Heaven of CHRIST to cause His Blood and Body to be physically present with and around - not in - The Elements. So Luther rejected the Roman Catholic view of a change in the substance of the physical elements that yet retained the outward properties of bread and wine to the senses of men. For Luther, CHRIST’s corporeal Presence in The consecrated elements was not in changed substance of the bread and wine, but with them. In this way orthodox Lutherans hold that CHRIST is bodily present in The consecrated Elements of The Eucharist “in, with, and under [the forms of] the bread and the wine,” while the bread and wine themselves remain in their substance bread and wine.⁵² Orthodox Lutheranism therefore confesses a real corporeal, as well as spiritual, Presence of The Lord at the consecration of The Elements. This is evident in Article X of The Lutheran Augsburg Confession in Article X: “1] Of the Supper of The Lord they teach that The Body and Blood of CHRIST are truly present, and are distributed 2] to those who eat The Supper of the Lord; and they reject those that teach otherwise.”⁵³

In The Smaller Catechism by Martin Luther we find his view of a real physical Presence of CHRIST spelled out clearly: “What is the Sacrament of the Altar? It is The true Body and Blood of our Lord JESUS CHRIST, under the bread and wine, for us Christians to eat and to drink, instituted by CHRIST Himself.”⁵⁴ Note also that Luther rejects the error of viewing the receiving the bread and wine of The Eucharist as

⁵¹ 9, Noah Webster’s 1828 Dictionary, entry for “consubstantiation,” p CON – CON.

⁵² 11, article, Zwingli and Luther, CHRIST in Communion, p 33, paragraph 1.

⁵³ 12, Lutheran Book of Concord, Augsburg Confession of 1530, Article X, The Lord’s Supper, p 27.

⁵⁴ 12, Lutheran Book of Concord, The Small Catechism by Martin Luther, The Sacrament of The Altar, 1] What is The Sacrament of The Altar? And 2] Answer, p 251.

imparting a mechanical and magical remission of sins in the same section: “How can bodily eating and drinking do such great things? It is not the eating and drinking, indeed, that does them, but The Words which stand here [from Scripture], namely: Given, and shed for you, for the remission of sins. Which words are, beside the bodily eating and drinking, as the chief thing in The Sacrament; and he that believes These Words has what they say and express, namely, the forgiveness of sins.”⁵⁵

B. LUTHER AND ZWINGLI HELD IRRECONCILABLE VIEWS

Comparing Luther with Zwingli here is most profitable. John Payne, in his article “Zwingli and Luther: The Giant versus Hercules,” offers these observations: Martin Luther was of course the father of The Lutheran continental Reformation movement, while Ulrich Zwingli and then John Calvin were the fathers of The Reformed traditions of The Church in the continental Reformations. Though Luther and Zwingli agreed on much, they were divided by their views on The Eucharist. Their failure to make common cause at the Colloquy of Marburg over The Eucharist brought about the first split in the Protestant Reformation movement. Payne observes that both Luther and Zwingli agreed about many essential issues: “They both rejected the authority of the Pope and held to the authority of Scripture alone; they both agreed to the principle of justification by faith alone; they both rejected the sacrifice of the Mass.”⁵⁶

Payne notes that, while Luther held to a view of CHRIST being bodily present in The Eucharist, Zwingli rejected such a view. Luther viewed Zwingli for this reason as a fanatic, a false prophet and an instrument of the devil. It is little wonder that these two men could not make common cause in the Protestant Reformation. And though Luther rejected the Roman Catholic view of transubstantiation in The Eucharist, he maintained a doctrine of a real Presence of CHRIST in This Sacrament. As Payne puts it, Luther “...continued to maintain that The Body and Blood are present ‘in, with and under’ the bread and the wine, a view called later ‘consubstantiation.’ Luther rested his argument on a literal reading of the words of institution: ‘This is My body.’”⁵⁷ This statement we

⁵⁵ 12, Lutheran Book of Concord, The Small Catechism by Martin Luther, The Sacrament of The Altar, 7] How can bodily eating and drinking do such great things? and 8] Answer, p 252.

⁵⁶ 11, article, Zwingli and Luther, Where They Differed, p 33, paragraph 1.

⁵⁷ 11, article, Zwingli and Luther, CHRIST in Communion, p 33, paragraph 1.

find in MATTHEW 26:26, MARK 14:22 and LUKE 22:19, where The Lord at The Last Supper makes this pronouncement in the upper room with His Apostles as He breaks the Passover bread and institutes The blessed Sacrament of The Holy Communion.

C. LUTHER ON I CORINTHIANS 11:24

Zachman looks at how Luther understood The Lord's words in I CORINTHIANS 11:24, "And when He had given thanks, He brake it, and said, Take, eat: this is My Body, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of Me." ⁵⁸ Luther says of "this is My body" that "GOD was able to do what He had promised... [ROMANS 4:21], and with GOD no word is impossible... [LUKE 1:37]. Since he says here, then, "This is My body," He certainly can and does make it so." So Luther proclaimed of The Eucharist, "The bread we see with our eyes, but we hear with our ears that CHRIST's Body is present." ⁵⁹

Luther thus held that, though we see only bread and wine at The Communion Table, The Word of GOD declares that they are The Body and Blood of The Lamb of GOD. We as mere men in this life see the physical world with our physical senses. But when Holy Scripture declares a deeper Mystery - as here of The Elements of The Eucharist - the pious Christian man will accept as Divine Truth in humble Faith what he can not hope to fully understand with his intellect. Therefore ROMANS 4:21 says of Abraham's faith in believing all that GOD had said to him, "And being fully persuaded that, what He had promised, He was able also to perform." ⁶⁰ And as in LUKE 1:37, "For with GOD nothing shall be impossible." ⁶¹

For Luther, it was clear: it is not understandable by the human mind as it perceives the physical bread and wine that, in receiving Them in faith, the Christian man is both receiving the actual consecrated bread and wine in its essence and at the same also literally receiving in The Eucharist The Body and Blood of CHRIST. As Zachman puts it, for Luther "the reality being conveyed to us in The Supper is The Word of absolution, and its confirming sign is not the bread and wine that we see, but The Body and Blood of

⁵⁸ 1, KJV, I CORINTHIANS 11:24.

⁵⁹ 13, John Calvin as Pastor, Teacher, Theologian, p 184, paragraph 1.

⁶⁰ 1, KJV, ROMANS 4:21.

⁶¹ 2, KJV, LUKE 1:37.

CHRIST [that] we eat and drink, which are hidden in and under the bread and wine.”⁶² Mere symbols of bread and wine, no matter how reverently contemplated upon, can not themselves deliver forgiveness for our sins in CHRIST. The Absolution must be in the real Sacrifice of CHRIST for us, thus requiring a real Presence of His Body and Blood in The Elements of The Communion. Indeed, is this not exactly why the Catholic Church has been so steadfast and firm in defending the doctrine of the real physical, as well as spiritual Presence of The Messiah in The Eucharist?

XII. MEMORIAL – NEITHER PHYSICALLY NOR SPIRITUALLY PRESENT

Here we enter into the Eucharistic territory of Zwingli and many Protestant Evangelical Churches today. This is what may be called the “symbolic” or “memorial” view of The Eucharist, where The Elements duly consecrated are a memorial only of CHRIST’s sacrifice of His Body and Blood to redeem The Faithful. The marked split of Zwingli with other Reformation Fathers of his time on the nature of CHRIST to The Eucharist may be seen in the failure of Luther and Zwingli to make common cause in the “Colloquy of Marburg in 1529” over this very issue. As Mathison observes, “...although the participants were able to come to agreement on fourteen articles, they were unable to agree on one [central] point of the fifteenth article, namely, whether The true Flesh and Blood of CHRIST are bodily present in the bread and wine of The Eucharist.” Indeed, as we have noted, Luther’s view that The Lord is physically present in the consecrated Elements can not be reconciled with Zwingli’s total rejection of any real presence of CHRIST in Holy Communion, but is “...present only in the hearts of believers.”⁶³

A. ZWINGLI ON I CORINTHIANS 11:24

How striking that two so deeply passionate clergymen as Luther and Zwingli could look at The same Scripture verse and come away each with an understanding of CHRIST’s Presence - or absence thereof - so diametrically opposed in their most basic interpretation! But this should come to us as no surprise, for this is what happens when individual Christian men declare their own understanding of The Bible over, above and in

⁶² 13, John Calvin as Pastor, Teacher, Theologian, p 185, paragraph 2.

⁶³ 8, Given For You, Calvin’s Doctrine on The Lord’s Supper, p 4, paragraph 3 – page 5.

spite of the accumulated wisdom of The faithful historic Church. The proofs of this danger may be seen in the literally tens of thousands of Protestant Church denominations in the world today. Zwingli's epitaph for The Church may well be found in the word "confusion," of which Saint James speaks to in JAMES 3:16-18, "For where envying and strife is, there is confusion and every evil work. But the wisdom that is from Above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, and easy to be intreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocrisy. And the fruit of righteousness is sown in peace of them that make peace." ⁶⁴

Divorced from the teachings of The early Church Fathers and the accumulated understanding of The Catholic Church, The same Words of I CORINTHIANS 11:24 which Luther read were understood by Zwingli to mean the exact opposite, that a real Presence of CHRIST in both physical and spiritual form in The consecrated Elements are not possible! So Zwingli rejected out of hand the idea of CHRIST's physical Presence in The Eucharist as "...crass materialism which he saw as little different from the papist doctrine." Zwingli cited the words of CHRIST in JOHN 6:63: "It is The Spirit Who gives life; the flesh profits nothing. The Words that I speak to you are Spirit, and they are life." ⁶⁵ Zwingli further cited of CHRIST ACTS 1:9: "Now when He had spoken these things, while they watched, He was taken up, and a cloud received Him out of their sight." ⁶⁶ It might be well said that Christianity, divorced from a real Presence of The Saviour in The Holy Communion, finds itself being "taken up" into the clouds of unsure doctrine and blown away by the slightest breezes of the trials of life!

None the less, Payne summarizes the logic of the memorial view of The Eucharist offered by Zwingli: "...according to ACTS 1:9, CHRIST ascended into Heaven and now sits at the right hand of GOD, and since it is characteristic of a body to be limited by space, CHRIST cannot both be in Heaven and in the elements of The Eucharist. Therefore, the words of institution, 'This is My body' must be interpreted in a figurative manner as 'This signifies My body.'" Such a memorial view of The Eucharist a la Zwingli then sees The Eucharist as "a sacred feast at which CHRIST's death was commemorated and contemplated in faith, and in which Christians enjoy a transforming

⁶⁴ 1, KJV, JAMES 3:16-18.

⁶⁵ 1, KJV, JOHN 6:63.

⁶⁶ 1, KJV, ACTS 1:9.

fellowship with one another.” The Lord is thus not either physically or spiritually present in The Eucharist, but rather spiritually present in the hearts of The Faithful, The Eucharist becoming a mere symbolic memorial upon which Christian men are to meditate as they receive Holy Communion.⁶⁷

Interestingly, memorialists often resort to the same Scripture passage that has traditionally been cited by The Church down through the ages in support of a real Presence of The Lord in The Eucharist, namely I CORINTHIANS 11:23-26. There Saint Paul records The Words of institution of CHRIST: “For I have received of The Lord that which also I delivered unto you, That The Lord JESUS the same night in which He was betrayed took bread: And when He had given thanks, He brake it, and said, Take, eat: this is My body, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of Me. After the same manner also He took the cup, when He had supped, saying, This cup is the New Testament in My Blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of Me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew The Lord's death till He come.”

⁶⁸ The memorialist view holds that, until CHRIST returns at his Second Coming, we are thus to receive Communion only in memory of Him.

Zwingli and his theological descendants thus offer that, since The risen, ascended and glorified CHRIST is now in Heaven, The faithful Church should celebrate His atoning sacrifice for our souls in The Eucharist only as symbolic signs, and not signing what they symbolize! But if Christians venerate a mere symbol that has no real Presence of The glorified Saviour, is this not merely another form of idolatry? Have we not then made an idol of The blessed Sacrament of The Lord's Supper, covered by a superficial veneer of pseudo-righteousness? The prophet Isaiah says in ISAIAH 45:16, “They shall be ashamed, and also confounded, all of them: they shall go to confusion together that are makers of idols!”⁶⁹ Such confusion can not possibly be of GOD, but rather of the devil! As Saint Paul writes in I CORINTHIANS 14:33, “For GOD is not the author of confusion, but of peace, as in all Churches of the saints!”⁷⁰

⁶⁷ 11, article, Zwingli and Luther, CHRIST in Communion, p 33, paragraph 2.

⁶⁸ 1, KJV, I CORINTHIANS 11:23-26.

⁶⁹ 1, KJV, ISAIAH 45:16.

⁷⁰ 1, KJV, I CORINTHIANS 14:33.

B. OBJECTIONS TO ZWINGLI'S MEMORIAL ONLY VIEW

Does then JESUS The Messiah speak in vain about Himself in JOHN 6:33 as "...The bread of GOD is He which cometh down from Heaven, and giveth life unto the world?"⁷¹ Does The Son of GOD speak merely symbolically when He declares in JOHN 6:51, "I am the living bread which came down from Heaven: if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever: and the bread that I will give is My flesh, which I will give for the life of the world?"⁷² Why then does Saint John record how the unbelieving Jews who, upon hearing The Lord's Words here, recoil from Him, crying out as in JOHN 6:52, "...How can this man give us his flesh to eat?"⁷³ If The Saviour desired to convey only a symbolic meaning here, and all who heard His Words that day supposedly understood Him speaking only figuratively, then why do we find some of the Jews in an uproar over CHRIST's statement that men must eat and drink of His Body and Blood in order to receive eternal life? And if a symbolic meaning was what JESUS meant, why did He not simply say so? Why not something like, "I am as a kind of living bread which came down from Heaven: if any man symbolically eats of this kind of representative bread, he shall live forever: and the symbolic meaning of the bread that I will give is representative of My flesh, which I will give for the life of the world?"

Does Saint Paul speak in vain in I CORINTHIANS 10 of the Christian man's "union and communion with CHRIST by means of partaking of The Lord's Supper?"⁷⁴ Does The Apostle here jest that our being one with The One Who Redeems our souls, of which is declared every time we receive The Eucharist, to be a mere intellectual exercise of mental gymnastics? Why then does The HOLY SPIRIT inspire Saint Paul to write for us in I CORINTHIANS 10:16, "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of The Blood of CHRIST? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of The Body of CHRIST?"⁷⁵ If the meaning is merely symbolic, meant only for the human mind to digest, then why does not Paul simply declare, "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not representative of the symbolic communion of The

⁷¹ 1, KJV, JOHN 6:33.

⁷² 1, KJV, JOHN 6:51.

⁷³ 1, KJV, JOHN 6:52.

⁷⁴ 8, Given For You, The Sign and the Thing Signified, p 263.

⁷⁵ 1, KJV, I CORINTHIANS 10:16.

Blood of CHRIST? The bread which we break, is it not as a kind of picture depicting for us the communion of The Body of CHRIST?”

Now we see why such men as Calvin and Luther rejected such Zwinglian memorial symbolism theology of The Eucharist! The Scriptures themselves warn us against the absurd blasphemy of artificially separating the signs of The Lord’s Supper and The One Who those signs represent. And here is the greatest danger of such low views of The Eucharist, to which we have already alluded to, which Mathison sums up so well: “By superimposing a modern concept of signs on the Biblical teaching, proponents of symbolic memorialism have emptied the Sacrament of any real significance!⁷⁶ ...The language of Scripture does not lend any support to the idea that The Sacraments are mere empty signs that produce a subjective state of mental recollection [of CHRIST]!”⁷⁷ When we divorce CHRIST as He is in reality and from The Scriptures by denying His real Presence in The Lord’s Supper, we open the door to making JESUS completely dependant on what suits the fancies of fallen men in their own darkened minds! And indeed, entering into many such memorialistic Protestant Churches today, one is left wondering if one is entering a Church sanctuary or an entertainment auditorium!

XIII. DYNAMIC – SPIRITUALLY PRESENT, PHYSICALLY ABSENT

Calvin offers what the Roman Catholic New Advent Encyclopedia sees as an artificial synthesis on CHRIST’s Presence in The Eucharist between Luther’s modified Real Presence view of Consubstantiation and Zwingli’s no Presence symbolic view with CHRIST’s Presence only in the hearts of the Faithful: that in the faithful and believing Christian man, “...at the moment of reception, the efficacy of CHRIST’s Body and Blood is communicated from Heaven to the souls of the predestined and spiritually nourishes them.”⁷⁸ Zachman observes that Calvin looked at I CORINTHIANS 11:24 as did Luther and Zwingli, but instead saw “the self-manifestation of GOD in living images, in which the invisible GOD renders Godself somewhat visible to us. When CHRIST says, ‘This is My Body,’ He is employing a sacramental way of speaking, [by which] The LORD

⁷⁶ 8, Given For You, The Sign and the Thing Signified, p 262, paragraph 1.

⁷⁷ 8, Given For You, The Sign and the Thing Signified, p 262, paragraph 2.

⁷⁸ 3, New Advent Encyclopedia, entry for Eucharist, Real Presence of CHRIST, Section I, paragraph 8.

applies to the sign The Name of the reality signified.”⁷⁹ The Bread and Wine of The Eucharist being holy signs instituted by The Messiah and not by mere men, they therefore fully represent the reality which they signify. How can this be? Because, as Calvin explains, “Augustine calls a Sacrament a ‘visible sign’ for the reason that it represents GOD’s promises as portrayed in a picture and sets them before our sight, portrayed graphically and in the manner of images.”⁸⁰

A. THE CORE OF CALVIN’S EUCHARIST THEOLOGY

Calvin then sees The Eucharist in the bread and wine as a self representation of CHRIST to men, which He condescends to give us, since we are creatures who perceive the physical world by our physical senses and understand concepts with our minds. The connection between the physical signs and the spiritual reality of CHRIST in The Sacraments in the Christian man are instruments given by GOD to strengthen our faith. So we find Calvin saying, “Since, however, This Mystery of CHRIST’s secret union with the devout is by nature incomprehensible, He shows its image and figure in visible signs best adapted to our small capacity. Indeed, by giving guarantees and tokens He makes it as certain for us as if we had seen it with our own eyes.”⁸¹ This is the heart of Calvin’s “Dynamic” Presence theology of CHIST in The Eucharist. Matheson summarizes Calvin, in that “...believers can not partake of the Flesh and Blood of CHRIST [in The Eucharist literally] when CHRIST’s [physical] Body is locally present in Heaven.”⁸² The partaking and effectual working, a la Calvin, is held to be only spiritual.

In other words, Calvin’s Eucharist theology rests upon how he viewed the relationship between the signs and seals of The Sacraments and their relationship to the Spiritual Realities with which they are connected. As Zachman puts it, Calvin says that we must “attend to the relationship between the image or symbol that we see, and the invisible reality that is represented therein.” This concept of Calvin - that The infinite

⁷⁹ 13, John Calvin as Pastor, Teacher, Theologian, summary commentary on Calvin’s view of Sacraments, p 185, paragraph 3 – p 186.

⁸⁰ 13, John Calvin as Pastor, Teacher, Theologian, quotes John Calvin, Inst. 4.14.6, p 186, paragraph 1.

⁸¹ 13, John Calvin as Pastor, Teacher, Theologian, quotes John Calvin, Inst. 4.17.1, p 186, paragraph 2.

⁸² 8, Given For You, Calvin’s Doctrine on The Lord’s Supper, p 33, paragraph 2.

Almighty Who is both Creator of and beyond all physical things, condescends to help man understand His Revelations by connecting the signs and symbols of The Word of Scripture with physical representations of His Truths as in The Sacraments – many also be called “Accommodation.” GOD Who is Spirit, condescends to accommodate man’s limited understanding within the physical world in which He has placed us by using physical signs and symbols that represent spiritual realities of Himself to us.⁸³

B. CALVIN’S OBJECTION TO THE ELEVATION OF THE HOST

Therefore Calvin rejected transubstantiation and consubstantiation as diverting men’s worship from CHRIST, Who is truly represented by the symbols to worship, but is not the symbols themselves. So in Calvin’s eyes, adoration and worship before the symbols of The Eucharist draws men into what he saw as idolatry. Calvin’s fear was that men would adore the consecrated Elements of The Eucharist elevated physically by the hands of the priest, rather than adore the True CHRIST Himself in the sacrifice of His Blood and Body given for us, and Whose Body is now enthroned only in Heaven by the hand of GOD The Father.

So Calvin says, “While the Sacraments ought to have been a means of elevating pious minds to Heaven, the sacred symbols of the Supper were abused for an entirely different purpose, and men, content with gazing upon them and worshipping them, never once raised their minds to CHRIST!”⁸⁴ It is not likely however that any pious Catholic, Orthodox or Lutheran Christian would agree with Calvin’s blanket condemnation in this regard. But it is well taken that, when The Church does not properly catechize her children in a full and proper understanding of The Sacraments, men are much more prone to misunderstanding of the meaning of Them.

Zachman summed up his understanding of Calvin this way: “Human beings come to know GOD by following the intended analogy between the visible images and the invisible reality that they represent and by holding to the proper elevation [of the signs]

⁸³ 13, John Calvin as Pastor, Teacher, Theologian, on Calvin’s theology of Accommodation of GOD to men, p 209, paragraph 1.

⁸⁴ 13, John Calvin as Pastor, Teacher, Theologian, quotes Calvin on dangers of idolatry inherent in view of transubstantiation [from “The Necessity of Reforming The Church,” Calvin: Theological Treaties, 204.], p 210, paragraph 3-p 211.

from the temporal, earthly images to the eternal, heavenly realities they depict. Conversely, all idolatry comes about by seeking to know the invisible GOD apart from the visible self-portraits of GOD, or by seeking GOD in the images themselves and binding GOD to them, rather than being led to GOD by the analogy of the sign to the thing signified and elevating one's mind and heart to Heaven."⁸⁵ So Calvin pronounced the Roman and Lutheran views of The Eucharist as idolatrous worship of the consecrated Elements, which he said should be directed directly to JESUS CHRIST directly. This is the logical necessary theological result of denying any real physical Presence of The Lord in The consecrated Elements. And as we have noted, neither could he abide the crass rejection of any Presence of CHRIST whatsoever in Zwingli's memorialism.

C. SACRAMENTS AS SIGNS OF GRACE AND SEAL OF COVENANT

Calvin held The Sacraments are both signs of GOD's promises to us of His grace and seals of the blessings which He vows to men in The New Covenant. Of The Old Covenant, let us recall how Joshua warned the ancient Israelites of the awful danger of vowing themselves in Covenant to The Almighty, and then turning from Him! So we read in JOSHUA 24:19-20, "And Joshua said unto the people, Ye cannot serve the LORD: for He is an holy GOD; He is a jealous GOD; He will not forgive your transgressions nor your sins. If ye forsake The LORD, and serve strange gods, then He will turn and do you hurt, and consume you, after that He hath done you good!"⁸⁶ And what did the people reply? As in JOSHUA 24:21, "...Nay; but we will serve The LORD!"⁸⁷ Of The New Covenant, Saint Paul warns the Christian man of the awful danger of vowing himself in Covenant with CHRIST, and then turning from Him! So he says in I CORINTHIANS 11:29, "For he that eateth and drinketh [The Blood and Body of CHRIST in The Eucharist] unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning The Lord's Body!"⁸⁸

⁸⁵ 13, John Calvin as Pastor, Teacher, Theologian, summary of Calvin's concern that men worship CHRIST Himself and not His signs & symbols, p 210, paragraph 1.

⁸⁶ 1, KJV, JOSHUA 24:19-20.

⁸⁷ 1, KJV, JOSHUA 24:21.

⁸⁸ 1, KJV, I CORINTHIANS 11:29.

For Calvin, the faithful Christian man eats and drinks CHRIST spiritually in the receiving of Holy Communion as The Spirit of GOD enters into the soul of the communicant. So Calvin states, "...The Lord calls His promises 'Covenants' [GENESIS 6:18; 9:9; 17:2] and His Sacraments 'Tokens' of the Covenants... The Sacraments... are exercises which make us more certain of the trustworthiness of GOD's Word." ⁸⁹ Mathison understands Calvin as picturing GOD's Sacraments as "mirrors in which we may contemplate the riches of GOD's grace, which He lavishes upon us." ⁹⁰ From this understanding of The Sacraments, Calvin crusaded against what he saw in Roman and Lutheran worship as a magical view of receiving forgiveness and salvation mechanically by simply receiving Holy Communion. First: the power of CHRIST in The Eucharist as a reassurance of grace and a means of ministering to men's souls is absolute, not dependant upon men, but only dependant upon - as Calvin says - "The Spirit, that inward Teacher, [Who] comes to them [who receive], by Whose power alone hearts are penetrated and affections moved and our souls opened for The Sacraments to enter in." ⁹¹

D. DANGER OF RECEIVING THE EUCHARIST WITHOUT FAITH

CHRIST works in men's souls to purify draw them closer to Himself only when men receive The Elements in true and proper faith. Therefore Calvin warns, "...it is one thing to offer, another to receive, [and] nothing prevents the symbol[s] [of bread and wine] consecrated by The Lord's Word [in The Eucharist] from being actually what It is called, and from keeping Its own force. Yet this does not benefit a wicked or impious man." Here Calvin quotes Saint Augustine, "If you receive carnally, It does not cease to be spiritual, but It is not for you!" ⁹² If a man dares to receive Holy Communion with a heart hardened by the sins of the world, the flesh and the devil, with a mind darkened by unbelief and with a soul sullied by mortal sin, The Spirit of GOD working therein is not arrested. But neither does it bring that foolish man any relief from his sins, nor healing of his soul, nor salvation unto eternal life! On the contrary, if such a one dies in an unrepentant state - having unworthily taken for himself The Sacrament of Holy

⁸⁹ 8, Given For You, Calvin's Doctrine of The Lord's Supper, p 9, quote 2.

⁹⁰ 8, Given For You, Calvin's Doctrine of The Lord's Supper, p 9, paragraph 2.

⁹¹ 8, Given For You, Calvin's Doctrine of The Lord's Supper, p 10, third quote - p 11.

⁹² 8, Given For You, Calvin's Doctrine of The Lord's Supper, p 12, second quote - p 13.

Communion, remaining in enmity with GOD and being estranged from The faithful Church - his soul will most certainly receive its just reward of eternal damnation!

Calvin objected to the Roman Catholic view that “The Sacraments of the New Law (those now used in the Christian Church) justify and confer Grace, provided we do not set up a barrier of mortal sin.” Matheson summarizes Calvin’s concern here, that The Sacraments do not, in and of Themselves, impart automatic mechanical Grace, no matter what the state of the communicant’s soul is, by somehow forcing The Lord to forgive and save if there is no confession and repentance and in the absence of true and living faith!⁹³ So Calvin stressed that The Eucharist is to be received in proper faith, yet It’s power to work in men’s souls is not dependant upon men themselves. The Eucharist is a sign and seal of covenantal blessing upon the righteous Christian man, but a sign and seal of damnation upon the unrighteous unbeliever. It’s power of ministry and working in men rests upon The HOLY SPIRIT.

E. ANGLICAN REFORMATION VIEWS SHARE MUCH WITH CALVIN

We have from Matheson what is the common Anglican view of CHRIST’s Presence in The Eucharist, who quotes from Calvin’s commentary on I CORINTHIANS 11. This was and is the common “Middle Way” view of The English Reformation Church - of a spiritual Presence of CHRIST, absent a physical Presence - in Holy Communion. Calvin expands his Eucharistic doctrine this way: “The sharing in The Lord’s Body, which, I maintain, is offered to us in The Supper, demands neither a local Presence, nor the descent of CHRIST, nor an infinite extension of his Body, nor anything of that sort; for, in view of the fact that The Supper is a heavenly act, there is nothing absurd about saying that CHRIST remains in Heaven and is yet received by us [in The Eucharist]. For the way in which he imparts Himself to us is by the secret power of The HOLY SPIRIT, a power which is able not only to bring together but also to join together thing which are separated by distance, and by a great distance at that!”⁹⁴

So we find in The Anglican Communion this view of The Eucharist, in common with Calvin as holding to CHRIST being really present spiritually but not physically, in

⁹³ 8, Given For You, page 11, paragraph 3.

⁹⁴ 8, Given For You, Matheson quotes Calvin on I CORINTHIANS 11, p 33.

The Anglican “Thirty Nine Articles of Religion.” Article XXVIII, “Of The Lord’s Supper,” specifically rejects the Roman Catholic view of transubstantiation: “Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of Bread and Wine) in The Supper of The Lord, cannot be proved by Holy Writ; but is repugnant to The plain Words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions.”⁹⁵

The Anglican Fathers declare that CHRIST’s Presence in The Eucharist is spiritual only, and not corporeal, thus holding to Calvin’s view of The Sacraments as physical signs of the realities of Faith. The English Church’s Article XXIII, “Of The Lord’s Supper,” continues: “The Body of CHRIST is given, taken, and eaten, in The Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby The Body of CHRIST is received and eaten in The Supper is Faith.”⁹⁶ The Anglican Church Father Thomas Cranmer held that GOD accommodates man’s need of Sacraments that employ physical elements discerned through our physical senses, that we may increase in our faith by His spiritual nourishment, but that we do not literally consume the actual physical Body and Blood of CHRIST. So as Cranmer says, as surely as we perceive the physical consecrated bread and wine through our five physical senses, “...so assuredly ought we to believe that CHRIST is a spiritual life and sustenance of our souls, like as the said [common] bread and wine is the [physical] food and sustenance of our bodies.”⁹⁷

Therefore orthodox Anglicanism sees the physical elevation of the Priest at consecration of The Elements in the Roman Catholic Church as an object of worship as an enticement of Christian men towards idolatry. Thus The Church of England’s Article XXVIII ends by stating “The Sacrament of The Lord’s Supper was not by CHRIST’s ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up or worshipped.”⁹⁸ Indeed if The Elements remain in the substance as in their appearance after the consecration, then worship of Them would be a perversion This Sacrament. This is why we find in that part of The Anglican Communion which remains faithful to its Fathers why The Elements of The Eucharist are treated as they are, so as to avoid the perceived possible sin of idolatry on

⁹⁵ 4, Anglican 39 Articles of Religion, Article XXVIII, Of The Lord’s Supper, paragraph 2.

⁹⁶ 4, Anglican 39 Articles of Religion, Article XXVIII, Of The Lord’s Supper, paragraph 3.

⁹⁷ 14, Love’s Redeeming Work, Thomas Cranmer, The Purpose of Sacraments, p 31, paragraph 1.

⁹⁸ 4, Anglican 39 Articles of Religion, Article XXVIII, Of The Lord’s Supper, paragraph 4.

the part of worshippers. In The faithful Anglican Communion, The Eucharist Elements are always treated with the utmost dignity, perhaps venerated and may even be adored. But having broken with the Catholic view on the nature of The Eucharist, Anglicanism makes a point of reserving worship, not towards The consecrated Elements, but in abstracto towards The risen and exalted CHRIST in Heaven. Therefore we find this central theme in pure Anglican worship, that the physical signs of The Elements - The Sacraments - are to draw men to The Eternal One Who has redeemed the souls of the faithful and not themselves to become the object of men's worship.

F. ANGLICAN EUCHARIST THEOLOGY AS STATED BY THOMAS CRANMER

The Anglican Church Father Thomas Cranmer offers four key effects of The Eucharist in his theology: First, GOD accommodates our need of physical signs of CHRIST's sacrifice for us as analogies of the spiritual realities represented in The Eucharist to increase our faith: The Lord gives us "...the visible Sacrament of spiritual nourishment in bread and wine, to the intent, that as much as is possible for man, we may see CHRIST with our eyes, smell Him at our nose, taste Him with our mouths, grope Him with our hands, and perceive Him with all our senses. For as The Word of GOD preached putteth CHRIST into our ears, so likewise these elements of water, bread, and wine, joined to GOD's Word, do after a sacramental manner put CHRIST into our eyes, mouths, hands, and all our senses."⁹⁹ Second, the reality behind the physical signs of The Eucharist is the exalted CHRIST Himself [in Heaven] Who feeds us spiritually: "...our Saviour CHRIST (Whose Flesh and Blood be represented by the mystical bread and wine in The Lord's Supper) doth give Himself unto all His true members, spiritually to feed them, nourish them, and to give them continual life by Him."¹⁰⁰

Third, CHRIST's Presence in The Communion with faithful men is real enough, but in a spiritual and not corporeal manner, coming to dwell with and in those who earnestly and rightly receive the Sacramental signs of His sacrifice for our souls: "And the true eating and drinking of The said Body and Blood of CHRIST is, with a constant and lively faith to believe, that CHRIST gave His Body, and shed His Blood upon The

⁹⁹ 14, Love's Redeeming Work, Thomas Cranmer, The Purpose of Sacraments, p 30, paragraph 2.

¹⁰⁰ 14, Love's Redeeming Work, Thomas Cranmer, The Symbolism of Holy Communion, p 31, paragraph 2.

Cross for us, and we His members... having Him dwelling in us, and we in Him.”¹⁰¹

Fourth, as a memorial that assures men of their salvation in CHRIST and imparting the joy of GOD’s forgiveness for sin: “...in This Sacrament, (if it be rightly received with a true faith,) we be assured that our sins be forgiven, and the league of peace and the testament of GOD is confirmed between Him and us, so that whosoever by a true faith do eat CHRIST’s Flesh, and drink His Blood, hath everlasting life by Him!”¹⁰²

But there is a fifth effect of The Eucharist which Cranmer gives us that we must visit, in which lies a key to what The Church herself is! For The Lord’s Supper, in drawing the faithful into communion with CHRIST Himself, also draws the faithful into communion with one another! CHRIST is The Head of The Church, as is stated in EPHESIANS 5:23, “For the husband is the head of the wife, even as CHRIST is The Head of The Church: and He is The Saviour of The Body.”¹⁰³ And we, the many saved in CHRIST, are The Body of The Church, as we find in ROMANS 12:4-5: “For as we have many members in one body, and all members have not the same office: So we, being many, are one Body in CHRIST, and every one members one of another.”¹⁰⁴ This is why Cranmer declares so well that when we receive The Lord’s Supper faithfully and rightly, “...all faithful Christians [are] spiritually turned into The Body of CHRIST, and so be joined unto CHRIST, and also together among themselves, that they do make but one mystical Body of CHRIST.”¹⁰⁵ Saint Paul declares in I CORINTHIANS 10:16 of The Eucharist, “The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of The Blood of CHRIST? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of The Body of CHRIST?”¹⁰⁶ Therefore Cranmer next quotes I CORINTHIANS 10:17, “For we being many are one bread, and one body: for we are all partakers of that one bread!”¹⁰⁷

¹⁰¹ 14, Love’s Redeeming Work, Thomas Cranmer, Spiritual Communion, p 32, paragraph 2.

¹⁰² 14, Love’s Redeeming Work, Thomas Cranmer, Assurance Through Communion, p 33, paragraph 3.

¹⁰³ 1, KJV, EPHESIANS 5:23.

¹⁰⁴ 1, KJV, ROMANS 12:4-5.

¹⁰⁵ 14, Love’s Redeeming Work, Thomas Cranmer, The Symbolism of Holy Communion, p 31, paragraph 2.

¹⁰⁶ 1, KJV, I CORINTHIANS 10:16

¹⁰⁷ 1, KJV, I CORINTHIANS 10:17.

G. ANGLICAN EUCHARIST THEOLOGY AS STATED BY A. E. LITTON

E. A. Litton may be taken as concisely stating mature orthodox Anglican Eucharistic theology closer to our own day. He concludes from Scripture “that CHRIST is, in some sense, present in The Eucharist... A Church from which CHRIST were, in every sense, absent, would be no Church, or only as a dead body..., an organization from which The animating Spirit had fled!”¹⁰⁸ Indeed, CHRIST Himself declares this in MATTHEW 18:20, “For where two or three are gathered together in My Name, there am I in the midst of them.”¹⁰⁹ And again in MATTHEW 28:20, “...and, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world. Amen.” And again in JOHN 14:18, “I will not leave you comfortless: I will come to you.”¹¹⁰ Since The Sacrament of The Eucharist is to be an ongoing celebration received by faithful Christians until CHRIST Himself returns to this earth, His Presence must indeed in some way be spiritual in The Elements.

Therefore Litton states that CHRIST’s Presence in The Eucharist must in some way be a “real Presence.” But we return to the central controversy: This Presence of CHRIST in The Elements must in some form be both physical and spiritual. For CHRIST had a physical body both before His sacrifice at The Cross and also after His resurrection before His ascension into Heaven. Returning again to The Words of Institution by our Lord at The Last Supper, we read in MATTHEW 26:26-28, “And as they were eating, JESUS took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is My Body. And He took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; For this is My Blood of The New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins.”¹¹¹

Litton concurs with Calvin and Cranmer that The Almighty offers men The Sacrament of Communion with Him through The Son as a spiritual reality, mediated by The HOLY SPIRIT, working within the hearts, souls and minds of the Faithful. The Reformation view here is that The physical signs of The Sacramental Elements are not in themselves, but fully represent, this spiritual reality. By partaking of the physical signs held in The Eucharist, we better apprehend their spiritual reality in us within our limited

¹⁰⁸ 15, Introduction to Dogmatic Theology, 96. The Real Presence, paragraph 1, p 471.

¹⁰⁹ 1, KJV, MATTHEW 18:20.

¹¹⁰ 1, KJV, JOHN 14:18.

¹¹¹ 1, KJV, MATTHEW 26:26-28.

human minds in this physical world. Litton therefore also cautions against “an overly literal reading” of The Words of Institution by CHRIST. This to deny any physical Presence of CHRIST in The Elements of The Lord’s Supper.

So it is not surprising that Litton asks, “Can we suppose that our Lord, sitting at the table, meant to deliver to the Apostles a duplicate of Himself, so that two bodies of CHRIST, in His proper humanity, were present there at the same time?” Or was there, Litton rhetorically asks, “an invisible spiritual Body... so connected with the bread and wine by The Words of CHRIST that, though but one CHRIST could be seen, heard and handled, another CHRIST, Who could not be perceived by the senses, was under the material elements delivered to the Apostles...” Litton points out that both the bread and wine which CHRIST passed to His Apostles, though spoken of as His blood shed and His Body broken for the remission of sins, had in earthly time not yet happened on The Cross. Thus Litton remarks, noting a complete absence of surprise to the contrary by the Apostles or correction by The Lord Himself, that “...it could never have occurred to the assembled guests to put a literal construction on their Master’s words.”¹¹²

This does not mean that Litton holds The Eucharist is a memorial only of CHRIST’s sacrifice for us. Litton asserts that CHRIST has a Presence in The Eucharist, but which is spiritual only and not corporeal in nature: “Since These Words give to The Sacrament... its form, they never can be omitted... CHRIST was present in His human nature when they were uttered; He must, therefore, be present, and in His human nature, at every celebration [of The Eucharist], otherwise there would be no continuity of the ordinance.” If CHRIST is not somehow present in The consecrated Elements, then The Apostles would not have been able to transmit to all later generations of Christians this Holy Gift! But since CHRIST “...gave Himself to the first communicants; He must give Himself to their successors to the end of time and in the same sense as at the first.”¹¹³ But this line of reasoning seems to require us to add, “Well, yes, CHRIST must then also be physically Present in The consecrated Elements too!”

¹¹² 15, Introduction to Dogmatic Theology, 95. Eucharist – Institution, p 467.

¹¹³ 5, Introduction to Dogmatic Theology, 96. The Real Presence, paragraph 2, p 471-472.

XIV. TRANSIGNIFICATION – A RELATIONAL PRESENCE ONLY?

Transignification proposes that CHRIST's real Presence in The Eucharist is to be seen primarily as "relational," in that it establishes a new relationship of communion between the faithful Christian man and The Lord. And though this certainly has always been part of Christian understanding of This Sacrament – and indeed the very reason why GOD Incarnate came to do His work on The Cross: that men might be reconciled to Him – this view proposes to focus on this aspect of The Lord's Supper alone for the purpose of ecumenical reunification of Christendom. Born of modern Christian ecumenicalism, this school seeks to reconcile and unify all four of the preceding views of the nature of The Eucharist – and The Churches that hold to those views – by displacing them with "transignification."

To those who hold to a physical and spiritual Presence of CHRIST in The Eucharist – transubstantiation and consubstantiation – but who disagree with those who hold to only a spiritual dynamic Presence, transignification offers somewhat of a common ecumenical bridge. And between all those who hold some form of a real Presence of CHRIST in The Eucharist – transubstantiation, consubstantiation and dynamic – but who are opposed to those who hold The Lord's Supper to be merely a symbolic memorial of CHRIST, transignification also offers a partial format for ecumenical common ground. But though proponents of this school claim otherwise, the means of common worship at The Lord's Table requires all schools to surrender their particular view of The Son's Presence in The consecrated Elements and adopt a common "relational" view of CHRIST in the consecrated bread and wine.

Somewhere between the realms of Zwingli's memorial view of The Eucharist and the Calvin-Anglican view of a spiritual Presence absent a physical Presence may be placed this view of "transignification" and its doctrine of a strictly relational Presence of CHRIST in The Eucharist. Schoonenberg and Schillebeeckx propose a shift from the Roman and Lutheran view of CHRIST's real Presence in The Eucharist from the spatial realm to what they see as a new perspective of the personal relationship realm. The consecration of The Bread and Wine is, this doctrine claims, not meant to challenge that The Elements are changed by The hand of GOD in The Eucharist, but rather proposes "to remove this change and presence from the purely physical level to the... inner meaning

of ritual and liturgical language [which] is the content of the power of The Sacrament... contain[ing] the grace which they signify.”¹¹⁴

These men propose that the true consecrated meaning of The Elements is not in a physical change in or around The Eucharist, but rather in the new relationship of the redeemed sinner to The Saviour CHRIST Himself: “[the] bread is the symbol of life and [the] wine is the symbol of the joy of life” in CHRIST.¹¹⁵ But has this not always been contained within all orthodox Christian views of The Lord’s Supper down through the ages, that in The Eucharist we are renewed in our communion with The Father through The exalted Son? We are brought back to the central stumbling block against reunification of Christendom, which is the question of the nature of The Eucharist Itself. We will have to look elsewhere.

XV. SELECT EARLY CHURCH FATHERS & A REAL PRESENCE OF CHRIST

Of the many great and holy Fathers of The early Church and their writings on Holy Communion, we will consider here three well known representatives: Ignatius, Justin Martyr and Irenaeus. When The early Fathers speak of The Blood and Body of CHRIST simultaneously and interchangeably with the consecrated wine and bread of The Eucharist, the various theories of CHRIST’s Presence of later ages were not in mind. But that none of The Fathers denied a real Presence of CHRIST in The Elements was apparently universal and without question. As Browne observes, “The whole primitive Church evidently believed in a Presence of CHRIST in The Eucharist. All spoke of feeding there on CHRIST; eating His Body and drinking His Blood.”¹¹⁶

Browne continues, “They may have believed in a spiritual presence. They may have thought, that The Eucharist convened CHRIST really [i.e. physically], and yet [also] spiritually...; they may have taught, that the soul was truly nourished by spiritually feeding on His Flesh and Blood, as truly as the [human] body is nourished by carnally feeding upon the bread and wine.”¹¹⁷ But if we can not take at face value the clear words of The early Church Fathers on the most central issue of The Church, the nature of The

¹¹⁴ 6, Bread of Life, Cup of Joy, p 222, Schillebeeckx clarifies meaning of transignification.

¹¹⁵ 6, Bread of Life, Cup of Joy, p 223, paragraph 1.

¹¹⁶ 7, Exposition of 39 Articles, Article XXVIII, Of The Lord’s Supper, p 685, paragraph 1.

¹¹⁷ 7, Exposition of 39 Articles, Article XXVIII, Of The Lord’s Supper, p 685, paragraph 2.

Eucharist, what else can we not trust from them? It is however an easy step down from denying The clear Words of Holy Scripture to then denying the clear words of The early Church Fathers. But Browne continues, “Whichever they held, a carnal or a spiritual Presence, they may easily have used language which would sound like the carnal Presence.”¹¹⁸ We must keep in mind however that these early Church leaders were not focused on forming detailed Eucharist theologies that explained exact modes and mechanisms of His Presence in The Lord’s Supper, but on countering blatant heretics and reinforcing basic Christian doctrines of CHRIST and The Apostles.

A. IGNATIUS HELD TO A REAL PRESENCE IN THE EUCHARIST

W. B. Frankland, in “The Early Eucharist (A.D. 30-180),” offers the Latin and Greek texts and translations into English of several early Church fathers on this subject. As Bishop Ignatius stood at the edge of his martyrdom, he wrote to exhort The Church on what needed reinforcement, but not on what was well established. One such issue was the nature and celebration of The Eucharist. Therefore Frankland comments, “At the opening of the second century [A.D.] there were already some to deny that the bread and cup were The Flesh and Blood of CHRIST; and there were those who forgot that these sacred Gifts might not be dispensed except by The Church... [Ignatius] sees in The Eucharist, with its one bread which is The Flesh of CHRIST, the true and only bond of union, the true and only food for the soul.”¹¹⁹

So one problem Saint Ignatius was dealing with was that some Christians were giving and receiving The Sacrament of Holy Communion outside of the duly established Church on their own. The other problem was that some Christians refused to receive or take part in The Sacrament of The Eucharist because they denied the Incarnation of CHRIST, holding that The Saviour only appeared to have a physical body, but in fact was a Divine spiritual apparition during His earthly ministry. They therefore denied the substitutional atoning death of CHRIST on The Cross and all orthodox Christian theology of salvation that followed. These were indeed the hallmarks of pseudo-Christian Gnosticism, which was very prevalent in and around The early Church.

¹¹⁸ 7, Exposition of 39 Articles, Article XXVIII, Of The Lord’s Supper, p 685, paragraph 3.

¹¹⁹ 16, The Early Eucharist, Analysis of Evidence, comments on Ignatius’ view of The Eucharist.

So in Bishop Ignatius' Epistle to the Church at Smyrna, he chastises those Christians who refuse The Eucharist because they deny a corporeal Presence of CHRIST in The Elements: "They absent themselves from thanksgiving and prayer because they do not confess The Eucharist to be Flesh of our Saviour JESUS CHRIST, Which suffered on behalf of our sins, and Which of His goodness The Father raised."¹²⁰ While not speculating on mechanisms and details, Ignatius clearly states that The early Church's orthodox Eucharist theology held to a real physical Presence of our Lord therein. For Ignatius, the consecrated Elements of Holy Communion are not merely bread and wine, but contain in some manner a real Presence in substance of The Body and Blood of The Lord.

Now it must be observed that what Ignatius was stating was not meant to declare a particular treatise on how CHRIST was present in The consecrated Elements, but instead a chastisement against the Gnostics. So Brown observes of Ignatius that he "allude to certain sects of the Gnostics or Docetae, who not believing that The Saviour had ever taken real human flesh, refused to receive The Eucharist, because they would not acknowledge it to be The Body of CHRIST."¹²¹ But the intended audiences of this Church Father's words do not detract from the words themselves, in that he clearly writes of the common early Church understanding that CHRIST is corporeally Present in This Sacrament.

B. JUSTIN MARTYR HELD TO A REAL PRESENCE IN THE EUCHARIST

Also from The early Church, though less forcefully stated, Frankland documents the words of Saint Justin Martyr from his Apology, that is explanation and defense, of the Christian order of celebration of The Eucharist: "...For we do not take these as ordinary bread and ordinary drink, but, as by Word of GOD, JESUS CHRIST our Saviour became incarnate, and had both flesh and blood for our salvation, so also the food made Eucharist by prayer of Word from Him – food by which our blood and flesh are by a change nourished – is both Flesh and Blood, we have been taught, of that incarnate JESUS..."¹²² Browne remind us the context of Martyr's words is that he is explaining the customs and

¹²⁰ 16, The Early Eucharist, S. Ignatius' Epistles, Smyrn 6:2, in Greek English, p 15.

¹²¹ 7, Exposition of 39 Articles, Article XXVIII, Of The Lord's Supper, Ignatius, p 692.

¹²² 16, The Early Eucharist, Justin Martyr, I Apol 13, lines 504-512, in Greek and English, p 21.

meaning of the celebration of Holy Communion to a then reigning pagan Roman Emperor. One of the major criticisms of that time was that the Christian Eucharist involved cannibalism, a seeming affront to pious Jews and civilized pagan Romans and Greeks.

The purposes of Justin's words in their historical context are these: the affirmation that our Lord's Incarnation was as real; that The Lord Himself instituted The Eucharist; that The Elements by the Word of GOD Incarnate - JESUS CHRIST - take common and ordinary bread and wine and transform them into uncommon and extraordinary Bread and Wine; that this consecration is brought about by praying The Words of CHRIST over the bread and wine; that as bread and wine nourish our physical bodies, so the consecrated Bread and Wine nourish our souls. Browne however offers two contradictory conclusions: first, that Justin Martyr "...held no change in the elements, but a Sacramental Change; [second,] although he undoubtedly declares, that in The Eucharist the Christians were taught that there was a reception of The Body and Blood of CHRIST."¹²³

We may concluded from Justin's words his message to the Roman Emperor: The bread and wine, though now no longer common when consecrated, are become sacred Bread and Wine. But by describing The Eucharist with the words "bread" and "wine" before and after the consecration, the charge against Christians of literal cannibalism that had come to the ears of the Roman Emperor was refuted. At the same time, Martyr instructed this same pagan ruler that in The Eucharist CHRIST nourishes the faithful by a real Presence in His Flesh and Blood! These words of this early Church Father are very much in line with what Ignatius declared, that The Saviour has a corporeal Presence in The Holy Communion Elements.

C. IRENAEUS HELD TO A REAL PRESENCE IN THE EUCHARIST

Saint Irenaeus declares that, if one is to confess CHRIST as The Son of GOD, then he must also confess that the consecrated bread and wine as The Body and Blood of CHRIST: "And how will they be assured that this bread over which thanks have been given, is The Body of their Lord, and that the cup contains His Blood, if they do not say

¹²³ 7, Exposition of 39 Articles, Article XXVIII, Of The Lord's Supper, Justin Martyr, p 693.

that He is Son of the Creator of the world...?”¹²⁴ And then Irenaeus adds, “...Either they must change their views, or renounce the said oblations.”¹²⁵ Why did Irenaeus declare in such language what The Lord and The Apostles had presumably already declared to The Church that CHRIST has a real Presence in The Eucharist? The simplest answer is because they did!

But searching for other explanations, Browne offers that “Irenaeus had to contend with the Gnostics, who denied the reality of the Body of CHRIST. In more than one place he argues, from the real substantial character of The Eucharistic elements, that The Flesh and Blood of CHRIST, of which they were the representatives, must be substantial and real.”¹²⁶ And indeed, this is most correct! Our hope of earthly blessing and eternal life lies only in the real physical Sacrifice of CHRIST at Calvary and not on an illusion sent to teach us how to die nobly!

Browne observes that Irenaeus confronts the heretics of his day directly: if you deny that JESUS as The Son of GOD came as GOD Incarnate with a real and living and human body to give His life for us, then you deny the consecrated bread and wine as The Body and Blood of CHRIST in The Eucharist, thus nullifying your hope for reconciliation to GOD and of salvation! But the reverse is just as true: If you deny the consecrated bread and wine as The Body and Blood of CHRIST in The Eucharist, then you deny that JESUS as The Son of GOD came as GOD Incarnate with a real and living human body to give His life for us, thus nullifying your hope for reconciliation with GOD and of salvation! If a-b-c is true here, is not b-a-c is also true? But this does not detract from the direct meaning of the words of Irenaeus themselves, which concur with Ignatius and Martyr, in that CHRIST has a corporeal Presence in The Eucharist.

Therefore Irenaeus says, “For as bread from the earth when it receives the invocation of GOD is no longer common bread, but Eucharist, consisting of two things, both an earthly and an heavenly, so also our bodies, partaking of The Eucharist, are no

¹²⁴ 16, The Early Eucharist, Irenaeus, Haereses IV, xviii, 1-4, lines 741-745, in Latin and English, p 27.

¹²⁵ 16, The Early Eucharist, Irenaeus, Haereses IV, xviii, 1-4, lines 753-754, in Greek and English, p 27.

¹²⁶ 7, Exposition of 39 Articles, Article XXVIII, Of The Lord’s Supper, Irenaeus, p 694.

longer corruptible, but have the hope of the resurrection to eternity...”¹²⁷ The true Presence of The Lord in The Communion Elements is without doubt in this Church Father’s view. Irenaeus boldly proclaims that The Flesh and Blood of CHRIST consist of “both an earthly and an heavenly.” Irenaeus says then that our hope in this life and the next in CHRIST lies in the physical reality of The Lord’s real Incarnation and real Passion, Death and Resurrection at The Cross and not in any Gnostic fantasy of The suffering and exalted Messiah as a Divine apparition! Does this not mean that CHRIST delivers our earthly lives to His care and our souls to the resurrection of the saints in Eternity Above? But does this not also clearly mean to say that The consecrated Elements are both the bread and wine themselves and also the exalted Body and Spirit of CHRIST?

Since CHRIST’s sacrifice for us in His Body and Blood was a physical sacrifice, and since we as Christians are one in body with Him, and since we in this life have physical bodies, it is therefore His Body and Blood that nourishes the salvation of our physical body and blood as well as our soul. So Irenaeus says, “...the cup from the creation He declared to be His Own Blood (outpoured), from which He impregnates our blood; and the bread from the creation He confirmed to be His Own Body, from which He nourishes our bodies.”¹²⁸

Does Irenaeus mean to declare here a stark duality in that, while CHRIST’s Spiritual Essence feeds our human spiritual essence, only CHRIST’s Physical Essence can feed our human physical essence? “When therefore both the mixed cup and the made (broken) bread receive The Word of GOD, and The Eucharist becomes Body of CHRIST, and from these the essence of our flesh is nourished and sustained; how can they assert that the flesh is not receptive of The Gift of GOD, Which is life everlasting, seeing that it is nourished from The Body and Blood of The Lord, and is a member of Him?”¹²⁹

Again Irenaeus seems clear in declaring a real spiritual and physical Presence of CHIRST in The Eucharist.

¹²⁷ 16, The Early Eucharist, Irenaeus, Haereses IV, xviii, 1-4, lines 759-763, in Greek and English, p 27.

¹²⁸ 16, The Early Eucharist, Irenaeus, Haereses V, ii, 1-3, lines 794-799, in Greek and English, p 28.

¹²⁹ 16, The Early Eucharist, Irenaeus, Haereses V, ii, 1-3, lines 799-807, in Greek and English, p 28

Or does Irenaeus mean that the duality is first, that The Presence of CHRIST in The Eucharist nourishes and sustains us as a member of His Body The Church on earth in this mortal life, and second, that The Presence of CHRIST in The Eucharist also nourishes and sustains us with the sure hope of the gift of eternal life for our souls in the next life? Or why not both? Regardless, CHRIST's real Presence in The Eucharist declared here most forcefully by Irenaeus in no way requires us to commit him to a particular doctrine of the mode and mechanics of how CHRIST is really present in The Elements of The Holy Communion. But his thrust of a real Presence of our Lord in This Sacrament seems clear.

We should also inquire into how does Irenaeus mean, in rightly receiving The Eucharist, the faithful Christian man is part of CHRIST's Body? Irenaeus answers that question by next quoting Saint Paul in EPHESIANS 5:30, "For we are members of His Body, of His flesh, and of His bones."¹³⁰ Note how Irenaeus employs This Bible verse, "As the blessed Paul says in the Epistle to the Ephesians, "for we are members of His Body, out of His flesh, and out of His bones.' ...[Saint Paul] does not state this of any spiritual and invisible man; for the spirit has neither bones nor flesh; but concerning the truly human system, which consists of flesh and muscles and bones; which is nourished both from the cup which is His Blood, and from the bread, which is His Body."¹³¹

Is not The Body of CHRIST The Church? Is not The Lord The Head of His Church, and we truly its Members? Was not CHRIST's sacrifice to redeem our souls from sin and death back into communion with Himself made as GOD Incarnate – perfect Man but without sin and fully GOD – in His actual human flesh and bones? Did not The Son of GOD actually live, die, raise again from the dead and ascend to Heaven to sit at the very right hand of The Father? And through the consecrated bread and wine, are not our actual physical lives and eternal souls nourished when we in proper faith receive The Holy Communion? And do not these things require a real Presence of The Saviour in The Holy Communion?

¹³⁰ 1, KJV, EPHESIANS 5:30.

¹³¹ 16, The Early Eucharist, Irenaeus, Haereses V, ii, 1-3, lines 808-814, in Greek and English, p 28-29.

XVI. FROM THE MIDDLE AGES TO THE COUNCIL OF TRENT

In about 1079 AD, Hildebert De Lavardin, the Arch Bishop of Tours introduced the actual term of “transubstantiation” into The Western Church’s vocabulary, following which the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215 AD used this term to describe the change in inward substance but not in outward form that is held to occur when the bread and wine are duly consecrated.¹³² It is of great significance, as J. David Lawrence notes in his article “Theology on The Edge...,” that Saint Thomas Aquinas vigorously defended this Council’s understanding of the nature of The Eucharist. Lawrence summarizes Aquinas here in that “he taught that consecrated Communion bread and wine were changed in very substance [in their essence] into the Body and Blood of CHRIST, while retaining the “accidental” appearance [in their external appearance to men’s senses] of bread and wine.”¹³³ So Aquinas contended that, while the internal substance of the bread and wine at consecration was transfigured in its essence into The very Body and Blood of The Lord, “the elements retained the appearance and taste of bread and wine.”¹³⁴

Thus, when the Council of Trent met between 1545 to 1563 to clarify where Roman Catholic Church doctrine stood in opposition to The Reformations, they reiterated what they saw as the traditional Church views, as on The Eucharist.¹³⁵ This was necessary because many of The Reformation leaders had come to reject “...the sacrificial nature of The Mass” and “disbelievd in The true Presence of JESUS in The Eucharist.” These Council Fathers therefore “found it necessary to define the sacrificial nature of the Celebration and to emphasize the Catholic teaching that JESUS is truly present in The Eucharist - body, blood, soul and divinity - under the appearance of bread and wine.”¹³⁶

It is not necessarily true that The entire Church since her birth as recorded in The Scriptures has universally held at all times and in all places to the exact doctrine of transubstantiation. We have however seen here a small sample of the undeniable evidence in the words of the early Fathers that the orthodox teaching in The Church from

¹³² 3, New Advent Encyclopedia, entry for “transubstantiation,” The Real Presence of CHRIST in The Eucharist, III, Transubstantiation, paragraph 1.

<http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/05573a.htm> Retrieved 12/10/2006.

¹³³ 17, Theology on The Edge, Transubstantiation, p 32, paragraph 1.

¹³⁴ 17, Theology on The Edge, Transubstantiation, p 32, paragraph 2.

¹³⁵ 10, RCIA Participant’s Book, Part II Special Topics, History of The Mass, p 3, paragraph 1.

¹³⁶ 10, RCIA Participant’s Book, Part II Special Topics, History of The Mass, p 3, paragraph 2.

its earliest days was of a real spiritual and physical Presence of CHRIST in The Eucharist. Lawrence quotes from the Council of Trent, “Since CHRIST our redeemer said that that which He offered under the appearance of bread was truly His Body, it has therefore always been held in The Church of GOD, and this holy Synod now declares anew, that through consecration of the bread and wine there comes about a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of The Body of CHRIST our Lord, and of the whole substance of the wine into the substance of His Blood. And this conversion is by the Holy Catholic Church conveniently and properly called transubstantiation.”¹³⁷

XVII. THE DANGERS OF RECEIVING THE EUCHARIST UNWORTHILY

Having examined the earnest convictions of so many pious Christian men down through the ages here, what shall all this profit us? We must not lose sight of the great mercy of GOD, that The King of The Universe Incarnate gave Himself at The Cross to redeem fallen men from sin, death and separation from Himself. For we can not honestly consider the nature of The Eucharist without also considering how it is to be received by the faithful Christian man. This is even more incumbent upon us, having reviewed the overwhelming case made before our eyes that our Lord JESUS CHRIST is both spiritually and physically Present in The consecrated Elements of The Lord’s Supper!

Should then The Sacrament of The Eucharist, which both represents and is That loving Sacrifice of Divine Mercy made on our behalf, be received lightly or profanely? GOD forbid! What does Saint Paul say in II CORINTHIANS 11:27-29? “...whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of The Lord, unworthily, shall be guilty of The Body and Blood of The Lord. But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup. For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning The Lord's Body!”¹³⁸ The English Church’s Article XXV, “Of The Sacraments,” declare that, if in receiving Holy Communion we “worthily receive” The Body and Blood of Our Lord, then “they have a

¹³⁷ 17, Theology on The Edge, Transubstantiation, p 32, paragraph 3. See Council of Trent, Session XIII, chapter IV, canon II.

¹³⁸ 1, KJV, II CORINTHIANS 11:27-29.

wholesome effect or operation” upon our entire being. But, GOD forbid, “they that receive them unworthily, purchase to themselves damnation!”¹³⁹

Here we do well to note the Anglican Communion’s Article XXIX, which is entitled “Of the Wicked, which eat not the Body of CHRIST in the use of The Lord’s Supper:” If a wicked man, devoid of a true and living faith in CHRIST, receives The Holy Communion, even though “they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth... The Sacraments of The Body and Blood of CHRIST; yet in no wise are they partakers of CHRIST!” Such wicked and unbelieving men, though they may physically eat and drink The consecrated Elements themselves, do not receive as a result blessing and forgiveness from GOD. Nor do they suddenly automatically and mechanically become part of The Body of CHRIST on earth or in Heaven, which is The Church. Nor are their souls magically vouched safe from the terrors of hell. But more than this, in so profaning the precious sacrifice of The Lord in this way, such wicked and unbelieving men – in daring to “eat and drink the sign or Sacrament of so great a Thing” – bring upon their own heads “their [own] condemnation” of their sins before The Almighty!¹⁴⁰

Therefore The Order for Holy Communion of the orthodox Anglican Church warns us, “...ye who mind to come to The Holy Communion of The Body and Blood of our Saviour CHRIST, must consider how Saint Paul exhorteth all persons diligently to examine themselves, before they presume to eat of That Bread, and drink of That Cup. For as the benefit is great, if with a true penitent heart and lively faith we receive That holy Sacrament; so is the danger great, if we receive the same unworthily! Judge therefore yourselves, brethren, that ye be not judged of The Lord.”¹⁴¹

How is the faithful Christian man accomplish this, that he does not receive The Eucharist “unworthily?” The Communion Order cries out to us, 1) “...repent you truly for your sins past;” 2) “have a lively and steadfast faith in CHRIST our Saviour;” 3) “amend your lives;” 4) “...be in perfect charity with all men.”¹⁴² 5) “Above all things ye must give most humble and hearty thanks to GOD, The Father, The Son, and The Holy

¹³⁹ 4, Anglican 39 Articles, Article XXV, Of The Sacraments, paragraph 4.

¹⁴⁰ 4, Anglican 39 Articles, Article XXIX. Of the Wicked, which eat not the Body of CHRIST in the use of The Lord’s Supper.

¹⁴¹ 18, Episcopal BCP, Order for The Administration of the Lord’s Supper, paragraph 6, p 94-95.

¹⁴² 18, Episcopal BCP, Order for The Administration of the Lord’s Supper, paragraph 6, p 94-95.

Ghost.” For what Most Precious Gift? “for the redemption of the world by the death and passion of our Saviour CHRIST, both GOD and man... that He might make us the children of GOD, and exalt us to everlasting life!”¹⁴³ How then can any man of humble and pious faith before The Almighty dare to receive The holy Eucharist in vain?

XVIII. THE BLESSINGS OF RECEIVING THE EUCHARIST WORTHILY

We have seen from Holy Scripture and The early Church that it is most reasonable and pious, even urgently incumbent upon the faithful Christian and The faithful Church, to realize and confess a real Presence - spiritual and physical - of CHRIST in The Eucharist. This was the doctrine of The early Church and the early Fathers, held widely – if not universally – in The Church until the age of The Reformations. But in seeking to understand the exact physical and spiritual nature of The consecrated Elements of The Eucharist too deeply, there is the terrible danger of losing our due thankfulness for The Eucharist itself. For beyond a certain point, it may well be that we are asking the wrong questions and with the wrong attitudes!

For The Lord’s real Presence in The Eucharist is, like JEHOVAH enshrouded on Mount Sinai by The Cloud of The Presence, impenetrable to our mere human minds past a certain depth and beyond the beholding of our mere human eyes past a certain point. The great divergence of opinions of so many Christian men from the Protestant Reformations are evidence of this danger. Having cut themselves off from the accumulated knowledge and understanding of the Catholic Church, and interpreting The Words of Institution of our Lord at The Last Supper on their own, the result has been great confusion within The Church over the nature of The Eucharist. And as a result, much of The Church today has come to lose sight of the great Divine Mercy of GOD in CHRIST, the humble thankfulness due Him for our salvation, the real Presence of CHRIST Himself in The Eucharist and thus the real Presence of CHRIST in The Church and in the lives of we His saints.

Returning again to “Moses the man of GOD,”¹⁴⁴ we again observe that he was so close in communion with The Almighty in this life that he was as the very friend of

¹⁴³ 18, Episcopal BCP, Order for The Administration of the Lord’s Supper, paragraph 1, p 95.

¹⁴⁴ 1, KJV, DEUTERONOMY 33:1.

GOD, being permitted to dwell before the theophany of The LORD on Mount Sinai to receive The Law. But we as Christians now have the greater gift of communion with The Almighty! For we do not merely behold Him from afar as did the ancient Israelites, but we may behold Him as GOD-Incarnate up close - we in Him and He in us - by The Blood and Body of our Lord JESUS CHRIST! O what wondrous Grace is this which brings us in grateful humility to our knees before The Holy Communion! Is this not why The Church employs the Greek word for Thanksgiving – The Eucharist – for The Sacrament of The Lord’s Supper?

Calvin, in a fleeting moment of honestly brilliant Divine insight, said of The Communion which CHRIST offers to The Faithful in The Eucharist these most excellent words: “Now if anyone should ask me how this takes place, I shall not be ashamed to confess that it is a Secret too lofty for either my mind to comprehend or my words to declare. And, to speak more plainly, I rather experience than understand it!”¹⁴⁵ What exactly should the faithful Christian man be experiencing in the receiving of The Eucharist? Here is a good start from the Anglican “Order for The Administration of The Lord’s Supper:” 1) “for that Thou dost vouchsafe to feed us, who have duly received these Holy Mysteries, with the spiritual food of the most precious Body and Blood of Thy Son our Saviour JESUS CHRIST;” 2) “and dost assure us thereby of Thy favour and goodness towards us;” 3) “and that we are very members incorporate in The Mystical Body of Thy Son, which is the blessed company of all the faithful people,”¹⁴⁶

Further, 4) “and are also heirs through hope of Thine everlasting Kingdom, by the merits of the most precious death and passion of Thy dear Son;” 5) thus giving us the joyous hope, that we may always continue to “...most humbly beseech Thee, O heavenly Father, so to assist us with thy grace;” 6) “that we may continue in that holy fellowship, and do all such good works as Thou hast prepared for us to walk in.” All this we receive when we with humble faith rightly receive The Elements of The blessed Eucharist “through JESUS CHRIT our Lord, to Whom, with Thee [O GOD The Father] and The HOLY GHOST, be all honour and glory, world without end. Amen!”¹⁴⁷

¹⁴⁵ 13, John Calvin as Teacher, Pastor and Theologian, quotes John Calvin, Inst. 1.14.21, p 98, paragraph 2-p 99.

¹⁴⁶ 18, Episcopal BCP, Order for The Administration of the Lord’s Supper, paragraph 1, p 103.

¹⁴⁷ 18, Episcopal BCP, Order for The Administration of the Lord’s Supper, paragraph 1, p 103.

For in MICAH 6:8 it is declared, “He hath shewed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth The LORD require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with Thy GOD!”¹⁴⁸ As Saint Paul declares in ROMANS 10:9, here is The Gift which CHRIST JESUS, GOD Who became Perfect Man for our sakes, offers: “That if thou shalt confess with thy mouth The Lord JESUS, and shalt believe in thine heart that GOD hath raised Him from the dead, thou shalt be saved.”¹⁴⁹ Let the faithful Christian man then accept The Elements of The holy Eucharist in humble faith, knowing that receiving The Lamb of GOD earnestly in Communion is salvation unto both his earthly life and eternal soul.

The same “Order for The Administration of The Lord’s Supper” closes with these words of gratitude: “Almighty and everliving GOD, we most heartily thank Thee!”¹⁵⁰ Within our human limits, let us give thanks for GOD’s love, grace and redemption given to us by He Who is The Mediator of our salvation, JESUS CHRIST. For whenever we rightly receive The Body and Blood of our Lord in The Eucharist, let us confess with Saint John as in JOHN 1:29, “Behold, The Lamb of GOD, which taketh away the sin of the world!”¹⁵¹

XII. IN CONCLUSION

Here then is a lesson for The Church today from The early Church: Frankland comments that “in the Didache [teaching manual of The early Church], the first words, before receiving The Cup and The Bread [in The Eucharist], and after reception, are in all three cases words of thankfulness. For The Cup: “We give thanks to Thee, our Father...;” for The Bread: “We give thanks to Thee, our Father...;” and afterwards for Both: “We give thanks to Thee, holy Father...!”¹⁵² Let the faithful Christian man be content with recognizing, confessing and rightly receiving The real Presence of our Lord JESUS CHRIST in The Eucharist within the bounds of Holy Scripture, as declared by

¹⁴⁸ 1, KJV, MICAH 6:8.

¹⁴⁹ 1, KJV, ROMANS 10:9.

¹⁵⁰ 18, Episcopal BCP, Order for The Administration of the Lord’s Supper, paragraph 1, p 103.

¹⁵¹ 1, KJV, JOHN 1:29.

¹⁵² 16, The Early Eucharist, comments on The Didache’s teachings on The Eucharist, p 100, paragraph 3 – p 101.

The early Church and as administered by The faithful Church today, the fullest of Which truth resides in The Roman Catholic Church. And let him be thankful!

Let us receive GOD's Grace in This Great Gift of Divine Mercy humbly and with joy, to the saving of our earthly lives and eternal souls! Of a certainty, the minds of mere men can never fully penetrate The Mystery of The Eucharist. But of this we may be sure: our Blessed Redeemer has ordained This Holy Sacrament as a sign and a seal of our salvation in His loving sacrifice for us; as a means of Grace to us; of His real Presence with us in The Eucharist! These blessings are contained within and through the receiving of The Holy Communion because CHRIST is truly Present both spiritually and physically therein. And when we rightly receive This most blessed Sacrament, He is then at work within us His saints. The Holy Scriptures declare, and The early Church Fathers confessed, that our Lord JESUS CHRIST is truly Present - spiritually and physically - in The Sacrament of The Holy Eucharist. Let us receive The Holy Communion worthily in faith, accept It humbly with joy, partake of It reverently with awe, learn of It eagerly with honesty and leave what remains enshrouded within The Cloud of His Presence in The Hands of The Almighty!

Therefore, as our Lord JESUS CHRIST commands us in MATTHEW 26:26-28, let us trust in and obey His Words: "And as they were eating, JESUS took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is My Body. And He took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; For this is My Blood of The New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins!"¹⁵³ Let us worthily so receive His Divine Mercy in The Eucharist and be thankful! In The Name of GOD The Father, GOD The Son and GOD The Holy Ghost! AMEN.

¹⁵³ 1, KJV, MATTHEW 26:26-28.

XX. REFERENCES

1. "King James Version [Bible]." Bible Works 6. Bible Works, LLC. Norfolk, Virginia. 2003.
2. "Hebrew Old Testament." Deluxe Bible Collection. ValuSoft. Waconia, Minnesota. 2002.
3. "New Advent Encyclopedia." Kevin Knight. 2006. <http://www.newadvent.org/>
4. "Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion." Anglicans Online. Society of ArchBishop Justus. 2007. http://anglicansonline.org/basics/thirty-nine_articles.html
5. "Catechism of The Catholic Church – Revised in Accordance With The Official Latin Text Promulgated by Pope John Paul II." 2nd Edition. Doubleday of Random House, Inc. New York, London, Toronto, Sydney, Auckland. 1995.
6. "Bread of Life & Cup of Joy – Newer Ecumenical Perspectives on The Eucharist." Horton Davies. William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company. Grand Rapids, Michigan and Leominster, England. 1993.
7. "An Exposition of The Thirty Nine Articles of Religion – Historical and Doctrinal." Edward Harold Browne, D.D. and edited by J. Williams, D.D.. First American [Edition], from the Fifth English Edition. H. B. Durand, New York, USA. 1865. Reprinted by Classical Anglican Press, 1998.
8. "Given For You – Reclaiming Calvin's Doctrine of The Lord's Supper." Keith A. Mathison. P & R Publishing Company, Phillipsburg, New Jersey. 2002.
9. "Noah Webster's [1828] First Edition of an American Dictionary of The English Language." Ninth Facsimile Edition. Foundation for American Christian Education. San Francisco, California. 1996.
10. "Right of Christian Instruction for Adults - Participant's Book." The Association for Catechumenal Ministry. Clinton, Maryland. <http://www.acmrcia.org/index2.html>
11. "Zwingli and Luther: The Giant versus Hercules." John B. Payne. Christian History Magazine, volume 3, number 1, page 8-11, 33-35. 1984. Christian History Institute, Worcester, Pennsylvania.
12. The [Lutheran] Book of Concord. "Triglot Concordia - The Symbolical Books of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, German-Latin-English, Published as a Memorial of the Quadricentenary Jubilee of the Reformation anno Domini 1917 by resolution of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States." <http://www.bookofconcord.org/pdf/TrigBOC.pdf> Downloaded 12/17/2006.

13. "John Calvin as Teacher, Pastor and Theologian – The Shape of His Writings and Thought." Randall C. Zachman. Baker Publishing Group. Grand rapids, Michigan, 2006.
14. "Love's Redeeming Work – The Anglican Quest For Holiness." Geoffrey Rowell, Kenneth Stevenson and Rowan Williams. Oxford University Press, Inc. New York, USA. 2001.
15. "Introduction To Dogmatic theology on The Basis of The Thirty-Nine Articles." E. A. Litton. Classic Anglican Press, Houston, Texas. 2000.
16. "The Early Eucharist (A.D. 30-180)." W. B. Frankland, M.A. C. J. Clay and Sons, Cambridge university Press Warehouse. London, England. 1902.
17. "Theology on The Edge – When Competing ideologies Had Fragmented Christian Thought, Thomas [Aquinas] Forged a Solution." J. David Lawrence. Christian History Magazine, issue 73 (volume 21, number 1), page 28-32., 2002. Christianity Today, Inc. Carol Stream, Illinois.
18. "The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of The Sacraments and Other Rites and Ceremonies of The Church, According to The use of The Reformed Episcopal Church in North America." 3rd Edition. The Standing Liturgical Commission of the Reformed Episcopal Church. 2003.