

The Words of Distribution
As Used in the WELS:
Why We Use What We Use

Christopher K. Pratt
Senior Church History
Professor John Brenner
May 1997

The words which are spoken by the minister at the distribution of the Lord's Supper are no random words. Month after month in Wisconsin Synod Lutheran churches throughout the country the words of distribution are repeated countless times. In most cases they are the same time after time, yet they are not empty words spoken out of habit. The words of distribution are precise words spoken to clearly confess what the Bible, the Lutheran Confessions and the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod teach and proclaim. They state, in no uncertain terms, that in the Lord's Supper we receive the very body and blood of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ given and shed for us sinners that we might have "forgiveness of sins, life, and salvation. . . . For where there is forgiveness of sins, there is also life and salvation" (Triglot Concordia 557 SC VI §6).

The reason behind using the words of distribution as they appear in Christian Worship: A Lutheran Hymnal is the topic of this paper. The words of distribution used by the Wisconsin Synod churches are a product of history. They have their source in the synoptic gospels and Paul's first letter to Corinth. They have been handed down century after century and used in the liturgy of the Christian church at least since the time of Paul the Apostle. They have been shaped by conflict over what is actually present in the Lord's Supper, especially at the time of Luther. They have been closely studied and defended when others, outside of the Lutheran church, desired to change them, as is seen in the Prussian Union Agenda. They have been carefully chosen and prescribed by those who assembled The Lutheran Hymnal and Christian Worship: A Lutheran Hymnal.

I. The New Testament Sources of the Words of Distribution

The words of distribution have their source in the New Testament books of Matthew, Mark, Luke and First Corinthians in the accounts of the institution of the Lord's Supper. Appendix A contains a chart of the accounts of the institution for the bread, showing what words they have in common and where they diverge. Appendix B contains a similar chart of the accounts of the institution for the wine.

Although the words of institution for the bread are not identical in the accounts, it is interesting to note that they all contain the words *this is my body* which in Greek are *τοῦτό ἐστίν τὸ σῶμά μου* in that order or slightly varied from that order. It is clear from the use of the Greek word *ἐστίν* that Christ is stressing that the bread is, in a very real way, his body. Although, since all of Scripture is God-breathed (2 Timothy 3:16), it is not necessary for all four accounts to list these words of Christ for us to believe that he said them, it is interesting to note that these very words are identical in all four accounts. The other words of institution such as *Take, eat . . . given for you . . . broken for you . . . do this in remembrance of me* are not found in all four accounts. To be sure, such words are important. Not all words of distribution used in the Wisconsin Synod bear these words, yet all make direct reference to the words *this is my body* (Christian Worship: Manual 178 and The Lutheran Hymnal 29).

In the same manner, when looking at the chart in appendix B, it can easily be seen that the words *this is . . . my blood . . . the new covenant* are all used in one form or another in the NIV. The Greek words *τοῦτο . . . τὸ αἷμά μου . . . τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης* or other case forms of those words are used in all four accounts. The linking verb *ἐστίν* is used in three of the four accounts. Even though this word is lacking in Luke's account, the sense of it is seen in that the words *Τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη* which form a nominal sentence, as shown by the translation in the NIV, "This cup *is* the new covenant. . . ." As was stated above, it is clear that these words spoken by Christ are important to the celebration of the Lord's Supper, as is seen by their inclusion in all four accounts. The Wisconsin Synod churches make direct reference to these words *this is . . . my blood . . . the new covenant* in all the words of distribution set out in Christian Worship: Manual (178).

II. The Early Christian Liturgies and the Words of Distribution

Not only do the words of distribution which are used in the Wisconsin Synod churches have their source in the New Testament words of Institution of the Lord's Supper,

they are also a product of history, handed down from the early liturgies of the Christian church.

There are two problems when looking back to the early church to discover the words which they used for the distribution. The first is that the extant liturgies are few and far between. The second problem is that the few liturgies that have survived do not always include the rubrics for the celebration of the Lord's Supper, or they do not include the words used at distribution.

This second problem is shown in the earliest description of post-apostolic worship. That document is "the (First) *Apology* of Justin Martyr [written] about A.D. 155" (Cabaniss 1). Justin Martyr does include the words of institution but, although the rubrics for the celebration and distribution of the Lord's supper are present, the actual words of distribution are absent:

For the apostles, in their memoirs, which are called "gospels," handed down in the following manner what was enjoined upon them. Jesus took bread, gave thanks (made Eucharist), and said, "Do this for memorial of Me; this is My body." In the same way He took the cup, gave thanks, and said, "This is My blood." (Cabaniss 88)

When the "president" has finished and all the people have made reply [to the Thanksgiving prayer], those among us called "deacons" distribute to each of those present for their reception some of the eucharistic bread and wine-and-water. They also carry away some to those who are absent. . . . To each person there is distribution and reception of the eucharistic species; and to those who are absent it is sent by the "deacons." (Cabaniss 88-89)

The next description of the early liturgy is found in the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus. "This work, whose production goes back to 215, represents [by] far the richest source that we possess today for the understanding of the . . . liturgy at the beginning of the third century" (Deiss 32). This description of liturgy does contain the rubrics for, as well as the words of, distribution. The account of Hippolytus is the description of a "baptismal Eucharist" (Srawley 71):

Having broken the bread, he distributes each morsel saying: "The bread of heaven in Christ Jesus!" He who receives replies: "Amen". If there are not

sufficient priests present, let the deacons also offer the cups. They are to stand in an orderly manner and modestly, the first to present the water, the second the milk, and the third the wine. Those who are drinking take a little from each cup while the one presenting it says: "In God, the almighty Father. He who receives it replies: "Amen". "And in the Lord Christ, in the Holy Spirit and in the holy Church." He replies: "Amen". This is to be done for each of them. (Deiss 63)

The formula "In God, the almighty Father. And in the Lord Christ, in the Holy Spirit and in the holy Church" is explained by Srawley to be spoken one part for each cup: one for the water, one for the milk and one for the wine:

Each cup had its formula to be said by the person who delivered it, after which all taste of each cup, the formula in the first case being 'In God the Father Almighty', in the second 'and in the Lord Jesus Christ', and in the third 'And in the Holy Spirit in holy Church'. After each formula the communicant says 'Amen.' (71)

These words of distribution, especially for the bread, do not at all follow the accounts in Matthew, Mark, Luke and First Corinthians. They do bring to mind the Bread of Life discourse found in the Gospel of John. This does not imply that the early church denied the presence of the Lord's body and blood in the sacrament.

Those modern theorists who are fond of repeating that the so-called words of institution at the last supper are really words of administration find no support in the practice of the primitive church. On the contrary, that church in this the earliest full account of the eucharist places the words of institution as the central thing in the eucharistic prayer. For the words of administration it uses formulae which rather pointedly avoid the emphasis of the synoptic gospels on the Body and Blood of Jesus as such, in order to take up the Johannine allusion to 'That Bread which cometh down from heaven and giveth life unto the world . . . he that eateth of this Bread shall live forever.' (Dix 137)

That the early church did not deny the presence of the body and blood of the Lord in the sacrament is shown in their inclusion of the words found in the synoptic gospels and First Corinthians. The words of distribution will undergo change in the 160 years which come between this account and the next, and will approach a more recognizable form.

From these monuments of the primitive age [the *Apology* of Justin Martyr and the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus] we must come down at once to the fourth century. It is about the latter period that we encounter sufficiently numerous examples of the liturgical uses which, completed and varied later on, became eventually that which we see them to-day [sic]. (Duchesne 54)

The example of the early liturgy which follows the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus in history is found in the *Apostolic Constitutions* which "represent the largest liturgical-cannonical compilation of antiquity. It purports to give the decrees which Pope Clement of Rome received from the Apostles and sent out 'to the bishops and priests'" (Deiss 151). Deiss goes on to explain that the work is apocryphal, that the author has made use of documents already in existence and that the section which describes the celebration of the Lord's Supper is taken from the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus (151). Not all of the *Apostolic Constitutions* were taken from the *Apostolic Tradition*, since the words of distribution are profoundly different. The rubrics and words of distribution from the *Apostolic Constitutions*, book VIII:

The bishop then communicates, followed by the priests, the deacons, the subdeacons, the readers, the singers and the monks; then, among the women, the deaconesses, the virgins and the widows; then the children; then the rest of the people, in order, with reverence and devotion, without disturbance. As he gives the oblation, the bishop says: The Body of the Lord. He who receives it is to reply: Amen. On his part, the deacon takes the cup and says as he gives it: The blood of Christ, the cup of life. He who drinks is to respond: Amen. (Deiss 180)

The words of distribution, both for the bread and for the wine, are distinctly different ^{from} that the previous example and reflect an emphasis on the synoptic gospels and First Corinthians. A clear statement is made to what is being received, showing that it is the body and blood of Christ. At this early date the basis for the words of distribution used in the Roman Mass are set.

Even if the *Apostolic Constitutions* reflect what was done earlier than A.D. 380, it is clear from another source, which dates from this same period of time, that the words for the bread have changed from "the bread of heaven" to "the body of Christ."

For the history of the liturgy in north Italy there are no sources earlier than the writings of Ambrose, bishop of Milan († A.D. 397). To him may now safely be attributed the authorship of the treatise *de Sacramentis*, which supplies important liturgical forms belonging to this period. (Srawley 150)

"In . . . *de Sacramentis* Ambrose gives the words of administration of the consecrated bread in the form *Corpus Christi* [the body of Christ], and adds that the communicant responded, *Amen*" (Srawley 164). Although there is no record of the words of distribution previous to this time for the liturgy performed in Rome, there is a reference to the words:

Between the period of Hippolytus and the latter part of the fourth century we have practically no sources of information which enable us to trace the growth of the Roman liturgy. Eusebius quotes from a letter of Cornelius to Fabius of Antioch a story about a Novation to the effect that "when he had made the offerings and distributed a part to each man, as he gives it, he compels the wretched man to swear in place of the blessing. Holding his hands in both his own, he will not release him until he has sworn in this manner . . . 'Swear to me by the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ that you will never forsake me and turn to Cornelius.' And the unhappy man does not taste until he has called down imprecations on himself and instead of saying, *Amen*, as he takes the bread, he says, 'I will never return to Cornelius.'" (Srawley 166-167)

What is meant by the "blessing" as the time of communion it is . . . difficult to say. It was apparently spoken at the actual time of administration and may be simply the formula with which the consecrated elements were delivered to the communicants*. We may notice also the *Amen* with which the communicants responded at reception. (Srawley 167)

Srawley adds this note at the asterisk: "Probst . . . compares the words of administration in the Roman rite 'corpus domini custodiat animam'. There is a similar expansion (in the form of a blessing) of the words of administration in the Gnostic Acts of John . . . and of Thomas" (167 note 4).

The formula of distribution in the early church was simply "The body of Christ," "The blood of Christ," to each of which the communicant responded "Amen." By the time of Gregory the Great this had expanded into the prayer, "The body of Christ preserve thy soul." (The Lutheran Liturgy 375)

Here, as well as in the *Apostolic Constitutions* and in *de Sacramentis*, it is clear that the words of distribution included reference to the body of Christ. It is from these sources that the Common Roman Mass was formed.

III. The Common Roman Catholic Mass

The form of the liturgy used for the most part throughout the western Catholic church until the time of Luther was the Roman Catholic Mass.

We should not suppose, however, that the Western rite was everywhere the same. There were, in fact, two basic traditions: (1) the Roman type, which was used in the Eternal City [Rome] and perhaps in North Africa; and (2) the Gallic type, which prevailed at Milan and beyond the Alps. (Thompson 27)

The Gallic type could not withstand the tide of history. It tended to dissociate its churches from the papacy at the very moment when the great missionaries labored to bring the entire West into closer communion with Rome. . . . [It] had no regulating center and, consequently, no controlled development; but it spun out diverse forms that suffered by comparison to the sober and orderly character of Roman worship. (Thompson 29)

The source and history for the Roman type are lost in antiquity. "[We] are at some disadvantage of having no text of the [Roman] Mass after the time of Hippolytus until the appearance of the sacramentaries in the seventh century" (Thompson 32). Although there is no hard evidence, Thompson makes some assertions about the Roman type before the seventh century:

Only a few ideas can be entertained with confidence. There is reason to believe that the Roman rite evolved at Rome itself, although influences from abroad may have affected it. Its appearance coincided with the gradual transition of that community from Greek to Latin. . . . The core of the Roman Mass must have been fixed at the beginning of the fifth century, and certainly no later than the end of that century. And when it appeared, the liturgy no longer countenanced the primitive freedom of extempore prayer and unfixed forms, but presented a very definite shape and text. . . . (Thompson 32)

The form of the Roman Mass which was used from the time of, at the latest, the seventh century, remained unchanged until the time of Luther. The priest communes himself with both kinds, while the laity receives only the bread. As presented in Thompson's Liturgies of the Western Church, the rubrics are in italics, the actual words of distribution in regular type.

The celebrant crosses himself with the Sacred Host, saying: The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve my soul for everlasting life. Amen. He then receives the Host. . . . Crossing himself with the chalice, he says: The Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve my soul for everlasting life. Amen. He then drinks the contents of the chalice. (83)

The celebrant, taking the ciborium from the altar, holds up a consecrated Host. . . . He then goes to the altar rails and gives Holy Communion, saying to each communicant: The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve your soul for everlasting life. Amen. (Thompson 85)

These words of distribution clearly point back to the synoptic gospels and First Corinthians and are meant to demonstrate that what the lay communicant received was the body of Christ, and that the priest received the body and blood of Christ.

IV. Luther and the Reformed Battle over the Sacrament

Since Roman Catholic doctrine remained virtually unchallenged from the seventh century until the time of Luther, there were no significant changes in the Roman liturgy. Luther recast the Roman liturgy to reflect the change of doctrine that was the essence of the Reformation. Luther did not simply toss out the entire Mass, rather he used what he could from it in his *Formula Missae* (The Lutheran Liturgy 375).

We . . . first assert: It is not now nor ever has been our intention to abolish the liturgical service of God completely, but rather to purify the one that is now in use from the wretched accretions which corrupt it and to point out an evangelical use. We cannot deny that the mass, i.e., the communion of bread and wine, is a rite divinely instituted by Christ himself and that it was observed first by Christ and then by the apostles, quite simply and evangelically without any additions. But in the course of time so many human inventions were added to it that nothing except the names of the mass and communion have come down to us. (Luther's Works 53: 20)

This is clearly applied to the *Formula Missae* in which Luther describes the service in detail, showing what is to be deleted from the Roman Mass and what is to be retained. This applies as well to Luther's words of distribution.

Then, while the Agnus Dei is sung, let him (the liturgist) communicate, first himself and then the people. But if he should wish to pray the prayer, "O Lord Jesus Christ, Son of the living God, who according to the will of the Father," etc., before communing, he does not pray wrongly, provided he changes the singular "mine" and "me" to the plural "ours" and "us." The same thing holds for the prayer, "The body of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve my (or thy) soul unto life eternal," and, "The blood of our Lord preserve thy soul unto life eternal." (Luther's Works 53: 29)

Luther's *Formula Missae* is not the only liturgy composed by the reformer. He also composed a liturgy in German, the *Deutsche Messe*. This liturgy also followed the Roman Mass closely.

Where the people are perplexed and offended by these differences in liturgical usage, however, we are certainly bound to forego our freedom and

seek, if possible, to better rather than to offend them by what we do or leave undone. Seeing then that this external order, while it cannot affect the conscience before God, may yet serve the neighbor, we should seek to be of one mind in Christian love, as St. Paul teaches. . . . As far as possible we should observe the same rites and ceremonies, just as all Christians have the same baptism and the same sacrament (of the altar) and no one has received a special one of his own from God. (Luther's Works 53: 61)

It was not Luther's intention that the *Deutsche Messe* replace the *Formula Missae*, but rather that both services be used publicly, the former for the "unlearned lay folk," and the latter for the sake of the young (Luther's Works 53: 62-63).

In the *Deutsche Messe* the words of distribution are not listed (The Lutheran Liturgy 375), but communion is celebrated, Luther simply does not elaborate on those details of the liturgy:

It seems to me that it would accord with (the institution of) the Lord's Supper to administer the sacrament immediately after the consecration of the bread, before the cup is blessed; for both Luke and Paul say: He took the cup after they had supped, etc. (Luke 22:20; I Cor. 11:25). Meanwhile, the German Sanctus or the hymn, "Let God be Blest," or the hymn of John Huss, "Jesus Christ, Our God and Savior," could be sung. Then shall the cup be blessed and administered, while the remainder of these hymns are sung, or the German Angus Dei. Let there be a decent and orderly approach, not men and women together, but the women after the men, wherefore they should also stand apart from each other in separate places. (Luther's Works 53: 81-82)

Although Luther retained much from the Roman church's liturgy, especially the words of distribution in whole, he fought a fierce battle with the Reformed Church over the Real Presence. It is because of this battle that the words of distribution contain the word "true," since the Reformed denied the Real Presence in the Lord's Supper. The battle was not over the words which Christ used, but the meaning of those words. "It has already happened that six or seven sects have arisen over the sacrament, but all of them under the delusion that Christ's flesh and blood are not present" (Luther's Works 36: 337).

It is perfectly clear, or course, that we are at odds concerning the words of Christ in the Supper. And it is well known on both sides that these are Christ's or God's words. That is one thing. So we say, on our part, that according to the words Christ's true body and blood are present when he says, "Take, eat; this is my body." If our belief and teaching go wrong here, tell us, what are we doing? We are lying to God, and proclaiming that he did

not say this but said the opposite. Then we are assuredly blasphemers and liars against the Holy Spirit, betrayers of Christ, and murderers and seducers of the world. (Luther's Works 37: 25)

Our adversary says that mere bread and wine are present, not the body and blood of the Lord. If they believe and teach wrongly here, then they blaspheme God and are giving the lie to the Holy Spirit, betray Christ, and seduce the world. One side must be the devil, and God's enemy. There is no middle ground. (Luther's Works 37: 26)

While Luther and the churches of the Wisconsin Synod confess that the body and blood are truly there, neither confesses to fully understand how it is there. "[How] this takes place or how he is in the bread, we do not know and are not meant to know" (Luther's Works 37: 29). Yet Scripture is clear on the point that the body and blood of Jesus Christ is truly there.

Now, to come to grips with the subject, let us take up the saying of Christ, which Matthew and Mark record: "He took bread, and gave thanks, and broke it, and gave it to his disciples and said, 'Take, eat; this is my body which is given for you.'" As I have said, I wish at this time to take up this saying alone, in defiance of the devil and all his spirits, in order to prove that this single text is strong and mighty enough to stand against all their rotten, empty prattle. The other texts will come to their right in their own good time. Now, here stands the text, stating clearly and lucidly that Christ gave his body to eat when he distributes the bread. On this we take our stand, and we also believe and teach that in the Supper we eat and take to ourselves Christ's body truly and physically. . . . God's Word we should believe without setting bounds or measure to it. The bread we see with our eyes, but we hear with our ears that Christ's body is present. (Luther's Works 37: 28-29)

For we are not so simple-minded that we do not understand the words. If these words are not clear, I do not know how to speak German. Would I not understand, if someone were to place a roll before me and say: "Take, eat, this is white bread"? Or again, "Take and drink, this is a glass of wine"? Therefore, when Christ says: "Take, eat, this is my body," even a child will understand that he is speaking of that which he is offering. It is a natural way of speaking that when someone points to a thing, we know what he is saying. (Luther's Works 36: 337)

The various leaders and theologians of the Reformed Church looked at the words of institution by Christ each in a different way, yet all did so in order to back up their denial of the Real Presence. Luther presents the changes which Zwingli and Oecolampadius made

to the meaning of the clear words "This is my body." He then goes on to show how such a method of interpretation would destroy the meaning of all Scripture.

But listen, I ask you, how they remove our interpretation from this saying of Christ and bring in their own. They say, "The word 'is' must mean the same as the word 'represents,'" as Zwingli writes; and the expression "my body" must mean the same as the expression "sign of my body," as Oecolampadius writes. So Christ's word and meaning according to Zwingli's text would read, "Take, eat; this represents my body," or according to Oecolampadius' text, "Take and eat; this is a sign of my body." Ah, they are so certain about this meaning and they stand so firm in their hearts--like a reed that the wind blows to and fro, as has been pointed out. Then at once they boast that we have no passage from Scripture which says that Christ's body is in the Supper. Next they humble themselves again, would like to be instructed, and offer to follow if we can prove with Scripture that Christ's body is present. (Luther's Works 37: 30)

This is an extraordinary situation! It is just as if I denied that God had created the heavens and the earth, and asserted with Aristotle and Pliny and other heathen that the world existed from eternity, but someone came and held Moses under my nose, Genesis 1 (:1), "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth"; I would try to make the text read: "God" now should mean the same as "cuckoo," "created" the same as "ate," and "the heavens and the earth" the same as "the hedge sparrow, feathers and all." The word of Moses thus would read according to Luther's text, "In the beginning the cuckoo ate the hedge sparrow, feathers and all," and could not possibly mean, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." What a marvelous art this would be--one with which rascals are quite familiar! Or if I denied that the Son of God had become man, and someone confronted me with John 1 (:14), "The Word became flesh," suppose I were to say: Let "Word" mean "a gambrel" and "flesh" "a mallet," and thus the text must now read, "The gambrel became a mallet." And if my conscience tried to reproach me, saying, "You take a good deal of liberty with you interpretation, Sir Martin, but--but--" etc., I would press until I became red in the face, and say, "Keep quiet, you traitor with your 'but,' I don't want the people to notice that I have such a bad conscience!" Then I would boast and clap my hands, saying, "The Christians have no Scripture which proves that God's Word became flesh." But I would also turn around and, bowing in low humility, offer gladly to be instructed, if they would show me with the Scripture that I have just finished twisting around. Ah, what a rumpus I would stir up among the Jews and Christians, in the New and the Old Testaments, if such brazenness were allowed me! (Luther's Works 37: 30-31)

There is a third interpretation, apart from that of Zwingli and Oecolampadius, which does not change the meaning of the words themselves ^{but} by changes the meaning of the

entire institution of the Lord's Supper, and therefore points away from the Real Presence and toward the false doctrine of representationalism.

There are only three words: "This is my body." So the one (Karlstadt) turns up his nose at the word "this" and severs it from the bread, claiming that one should interpret it thus: "Take, eat,--this is my body"; as if I were to say: "Take and eat; here sits Hans with the red jacket." (Luther's Works 36: 346)

The effect of these three conflicts on the Lutheran liturgy and church was to move toward the inclusion of the word "true" in the words of distribution as a confessional statement.

The Nördlingen church order has this [the word "true"] already in 1522, when the factors that are usually suggested as prompting its inclusion were absent. As a translation it says with added clarity what had long been said when the body of Christ was given to be eaten, namely, "the body of Christ," that is, the *corpus verum*. Support for its use may later be found in the Small Catechism and in the confessional need. (Nagel 310)

Concerning this word *true*, the Small Catechism states, "It [the Sacrament of the Altar] is the true body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, under the bread and wine . . ." (Triglot Concordia 555 SC VI §2). The Augsburg Confession contains the word *true* as well when defining the Lord's Supper, "Of the Supper of the Lord they teach that the Body and Blood of Christ are truly present . . ." (Triglot Concordia 47 AC X §1). The Apology to the Augsburg Confession states:

The Tenth Article [of the Augsburg Confession] has been approved, in which we confess that we believe, that in the Lord's Supper the body and blood of Christ are truly and substantially present, and are truly tendered, with those things which are seen, bread and wine, to those who receive the Sacrament. This belief we constantly defend, as the subject has been carefully examined and considered. For since Paul says, 1 Cor. 10, 16, that the bread is the communion of the Lord's body, etc., it would follow, if the Lord's body were not truly present, that the bread is not a communion of the body, but only the spirit of Christ. (Triglot Concordia 247 Ap. X §54)

This word *true* is a clear confession against the Reformed idea that Christ's body and blood are only represented in the Lord's Supper by the bread and the wine. It is necessary that the Lutheran church make a clear confession of the Real Presence.

In the words spoken during the distribution the congregation confesses itself to the words of institution, The positive assertion, "Take, eat, this is the true body, etc.," expresses the conviction of the Lutheran faith in the real presence [sic]. Any wording which could raise doubt about this is unacceptable. (Schuetze 94)

The charge that the Lutheran Church [sic] added to God's word [sic] in the formula for distribution when it said, "This is the true body," rests on a confusion of the word of God which constitutes the sacrament and the church's confession in the celebration. "As the words of consecration are God's words which constitute the sacrament," Walther explains, "so the words of distribution contain the confession of the church." (Our Great Heritage 3: 287-288)

That the doctrine of the Real Presence and its clear declaration is not something to be overlooked, Luther states, "Now let every faithful Christian see whether this is a minor matter, as they say, or whether God's Word is to be trifled with" (Luther's Works 37: 26).

V. Other Words of Distribution Used prior to the Prussian Union Agenda

The effect of these faulty interpretations of the words of institution is seen in the liturgies of the Reformed and the rationalists, who changed the words to fit their particular false understandings of the Lord's Supper and their denial of the Real Presence (Precht 82). This is clearly seen in the words of distribution used between the time of Luther and the time of the Prussian Union Agenda. The first of the liturgies that appeared in this span of time is that of Zwingli, which is dated at 1525.

Zwingli's conception of the Eucharist in its liturgical setting is most clearly seen in the delivery of the elements. After the assistant had read the Words of Institution (I Cor. 11), there was no more speaking, and a profound stillness settled over the church. When the clergy had communicated, the assistants carried the elements to the people in wooden utensils. No Words of Delivery were spoken, no music sung or played; but the silence prevailed. The people remained in their places. They took the utensils in their hands, communicated, and passed them on to the rest. (Thompson 145)

Zwingli's rubrics speak not about the body and blood of Christ, but only of the bread and cup, offered in silence, giving honor not to the Real Presence of Christ's body and blood, but to the congregation of believers at this the supper of Christ, understood to be a subjective genitive.

Then the designated servers carry round the unleavened bread, from which each one of the faithful takes a morsel or mouthful with his own hand, or has it offered to him by the server who carries the bread around. And when those with the bread have proceeded so far that everyone has eaten his small piece, the other servers then follow with the cup, and in the same manner give it to each person to drink. And all of this takes place with such honor and propriety as well becomes the Church [sic] of God and the Supper of Christ. (Thompson 154-155)

Calvin, whose liturgy "The Form of Church Prayers" was written around 1524, also speaks nothing about the Real Presence of the body and blood of Christ, yet refers to the presence of Christ through "His Holy Spirit" in the believer's heart. In the words of distribution, it is even referred to that Christ is not present but is "at the right hand of the Father."

In giving the bread, which shall be without image, the Minister does not suffer it to be adored. As he distributes it into the hands of everyone, so that they may take it and eat, the Minister may say: "Jesus, the true Saviour [sic] of the world, who died for us and is seated in glory at the right hand of the Father, dwell in your hearts through His Holy Spirit, that you be wholly alive in Him, through living faith and perfect love." (Thompson 223)

Not all those who wrote liturgies followed in the path of the Reformed at this time. One who proclaimed the Real Presence in the Lord's Supper and who even examined the recipient beforehand is Olavus Petri, whose Manual served the Swedish church beginning in 1529.

Then the priest inquireth of the sick person concerning the sacrament: "Dost thou fully believe that this is the body and blood of Jesus Christ which thou dost receive?" Answer. "Yea." Thereafter he administereth to him and saith: "The body of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life. The blood of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life." (Yelverton 86)

In England King Edward VI commissioned two books of liturgy for the Anglican church. The first was written in 1549, and it means to proclaim that the body and blood of Christ is actually present. The first selection is from the prayer which precedes the distribution, the second is the rubrics and words of distribution themselves.

Graynt us therefore (gracious lorde) so to eate the fleshe of thy dere sonne Jesus Christ, and to drynke his bloud in these holy Misteries, that we may continuallye dwell in hym, and he in us, that our synfull bodyes may bee

made cleane by his body, and our soules washed through hys most precious bloud. Amen. (Thompson 261 sic)

And when he deliuereth the Sacramente of the body of Christe, he shall say to euery one these woordes. "The body of our Lorde Jesus Christe whiche was geuen for thee, preserue thy bodye and soule unto euerlasting lyfe." And the Minister deliuering the Sacramet of the bloud, and geuing every one to drinke once and no more, shall say. "The bloud of our Lorde Jesus Christe which was shed for thee, preserue they bodye and soule unto euerlasting lyfe." (Thompson 261 sic)

One year after the publication of this liturgy anti-Catholic forces in England, led by Gardiner, attempted to show that the Church of England was headed back to Roman Catholicism, and pointed to the above words of distribution stating, "that the Words of Administration made allowance for transubstantiation" (Thompson 238). Therefore in 1552 the words were changed to show a "concession to Geneva" (Webber 151), that is, to Calvin's understanding of Christ's spiritual presence.

And when he delyuereth the breade he shall saye. "Take and eate this, in remembraunce that Christ dyed for thee, and feede on him in thy hearte by faythe, with thankes geuinge." And the minister that delyuereth the cup, shall saye. "Drinke this in remembraunce that Christes bloude was shed for thee, and be thankfull." (Thompson 281 sic).

"In the 1661 revision, there is a decided improvement" (Webber 151), that is, "the Words of Administration in the 1549 Book were prefixed to those of 1552" (Thompson 243). This shows yet another concession to the struggle for understanding what is being presented in the Lord's Supper. In 1549 the words meant to proclaim that the body and blood of Christ were truly present. In 1552 there was a shift away from that and towards representationalism. The last shift, which stands "until modern times" (Webber 151), represents a desire to fuse the two parties into one church.

John Knox, after leaving the English church, wrote his own liturgy, and therefore his own rubrics on communion, in which he points to Christ's spiritual presence rather than the body and blood of Christ being truly present.

This done, the minister breaketh the breade and delyuereth it to the people, who distribute and deuide the same amongst them selves, accordinge to our sauour Christes comandement, and in likewise geueth the cuppe. Duriinge

the which tyme, some place of the scriptures is read, which doth lyuely set forth the death of Christ, to theintene that our eyes and senses may not onely be occupiede in these outwarde signes of bread and wyne, which are called the visible woorde; but that our hartes and myndes also may be fully fixed in the contemplation of the lordes death, which is by this holy sacrament representede. (Thompson 304 sic)

"The Middleburg Liturgy of the English Puritans," written in 1586, is very similar to the liturgy written by John Knox, especially in the reference to the reading of Scripture which would lead the communicant to reflect on the death of Christ. Yet in this liturgy, the words of distribution are clearly set forth, meaning to state definitively that what is received is the body of the Lord.

This done, the Minister comming to the Table, and the Table being furnished, is to break the breade and deliuer it to the people, saying: Take & eate, this breade is the body of Christ that was broken for us, Doo this in remembrance of him: who distribute and diuide the same among them selves according to our Sauioir Christes commaundement. Likewise he shall giue the Cuppe, saying: Drinke ye all of this: This Cuppe is the newe Testament in the bloud of Christ, which was shedde for the sinnes of manie: Doo this in the remembrance of him. During the which time, some place of the Scriptures is to be read, whiche doeth liuely set forth the death of Christe, to the intent that our eyes and senses maye not onely be occupied in these outwarde signes of bread and wine, whiche are called the visible worde, but that our heartes and mindes also may be fullie fixed in the contemplation of the Lordes death, which is by this holy Sacrament represented. (Thornpson 338-339 sic)

"The Westminster Directory" of 1644 takes a definite stance on the presence of the body and blood of the Lord Jesus Christ in the words of distribution, although it does allow for alternate words of distribution as long as they are the ones used by Christ or Paul (Thompson 370).

According to the holy Institution, command, and example of our blessed Saviour Jesus Christ, I take this bread, and having given thanks, I break it, and give it unto you (There the Minister, who is himselfe to communicate, is to breake the Bread, and give it to the Communicants:) Take yee, eat yee; This is the Body of Christ which is broken for you, Do this in remembrance of him. According to the Institution, command, and example of our Lord Jesus Christ, I take this Cup, and give it to you (Here he giveth it to the Communicants,) This cup is the new Testament in the Blood of Christ, which is shed for the remission of the sins of many; Drink ye all of it. (Thompson 370 sic)

When, in 1660, Charles II became the king of England and the monarchy was restored to power "The Westminster Directory" fell out of disuse. There was hope that the king would return to the 1552 Prayer Book, but instead reformed the liturgy once more, attempting to include some of the Puritans back into the church of England (Thompson 375). The resulting liturgical words of distribution varied not at all from "The Westminster Directory."

Then let the Minister deliver the Bread, thus consecrated and broken, to the Communicants, first taking and eating it himself as one of them, when he hath said: "Take ye, eat ye; this is the body of Christ, which is broken for you. Do this in remembrance of him." In like manner, he shall deliver them the Cup, first drinking of it himself, when he hath said: This cup is the New Testament in Christ's blood. (*or*, Christ's blood of the New Testament,) which is shed for you for the remission of sins. Drink ye all of it, in remembrance of him. (Thompson 401).

In America, John Wesley's "The Sunday Service," written in 1784, was used by the Methodist Church. This liturgy and the words of distribution point away from the Real Presence and toward a Calvinistic understanding of representationalism and spiritual presence.

And when he delivereth the Bread to any one, he shall say, "The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life. Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving." And the Minister that delivereth the Cup to anyone shall say, "The Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was shed for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life. Drink this in remembrance that Christ's Blood was shed for thee, and be thankful. (Thompson 432).

Although the words of distribution do speak of "the Body of our Lord Jesus Christ" and "the Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ," it nowhere comes out and says that this is what the communicant receives. Rather, it points to the crucifixion and death of Christ, the bread and wine being a commemorative feast rather than a participation in the body and blood of Christ.

It is clear from these few examples that the words of distribution from the time of Luther until the time of the Prussian Union Agenda vary greatly, depending on the theology

and politics of the area and of the times. Although such liturgies did not pose a threat, nor even much of a temptation, for Lutherans, they do show how the words of distribution are closely related to the accompanying theologies of the Lord's Supper. In the next section, the liturgy and words of distribution, which are a product of local theology and politics, do affect the Lutheran Church. They are a major cause for the staunch stand that the Wisconsin Synod takes on the words of distribution today.

VI. The Prussian Union Agenda and the Words of Distribution

As with most anniversaries of the Lutheran Reformation, the 300th anniversary in 1817 caused many to focus on Lutheranism, its theology, and therefore its liturgy. In the region of Prussia there was an attempt to unify the Reformed and Lutheran churches into one body. This union came about for a few reasons. The first was politically influenced:

During the reign of Albert, Margrave of Brandenburg-Anspach (1525-1568), Prussia became a Lutheran state; in 1603 the ruling prince, Sigismund of Brandenburg, joined the Reformed Church. Because rivalry and actual strife had broken out between the Lutheran and Reformed Churches, it was natural that the rulers, supreme heads of religion, should desire to put an end to the disquiet. (Meuser 14)

The second reason was external, whereas the first had been internal. The Union Agenda "was intended to help unify and strengthen Prussia after her collapse in 1806, which had been followed by a period of foreign domination and the resulting wars of liberation" (Camann 16).

The third reason for the union between the Reformed Church and the Lutheran Church was that the King, Frederick William III, was Reformed but his late Queen was Lutheran, and they had been unable to commune together (Camann 16).

He [King Frederick William III] wanted order, and he wanted unity among his Protestant subjects. Impressed by the dignity of Anglican rites which he saw in exile, he set about providing a unitive liturgy for the Old Prussian Union (of Lutherans and Reformed) within his realm. (The Study of the Liturgy 254)

Before the new liturgy and the resulting words of distribution were instituted by King Frederick William III, the words of distribution for the bread used by the Lutheran church

were, "Take, eat, this is the true body of our Lord Jesus Christ" (Nelson 132). In the new liturgy of the Prussian Union Agenda they were changed to, "Take and eat, Christ says, This is my body, etc" (Christian Worship: Manual 178) or "Christ, in the night in which he was betrayed, took bread, gave thanks, gave it to his disciples and said: Take and eat, etc" (Our Great Heritage 3:288). "[This] formula only served the cause of doctrinal indifference on which the Union was founded. To the unionists, the sense of the formula was: let each person interpret it according to his faith" (Our Great Heritage 3:288). The rationale for this not being an acceptable formula is given by Koelpin in Our Great Heritage.

In response to the use of this ambiguous formula, it should be stated: Christ's words "This is my body" at the original supper were a testimony in the Lord's mouth. Correspondingly, therefore, they must be a confession in our supper. As little as we baptize a child with the formula, "Go and baptize," so little do we distribute the bread and wine with the mere narrative formula: "In the night he was betrayed, etc." Such a formula only causes an indifferent attitude toward the sacrament (Hoenecke, IV, p 133) To be sure, there is no single prescribed formula for distribution. But a formula that does not confess that Christ's body and blood are present, distributed and received should be rejected. This is the case with the Union church's formula for distribution, "'Take and eat,' Christ said, 'This is my body.'" It is much like the Jews who could not abide the inscription on the cross, "This is the King of the Jews," because they did not believe this to be true. Therefore they wanted to have substituted the historical words, "He said, I am the King of the Jews" (Walther, *Pastoraltheologie*, p 183). (288)

The problem with the Prussian Union Agenda was not only that it denied the Real Presence but that it was eventually forced upon the Lutheran pastors. It did not start out as a forced edict:

"But though I must sincerely wish that the Reformed and Lutheran churches in my lands might share this my deep conviction, nevertheless, I am far removed from forcing the Union on them, because I respect their rights and liberties. Therefore I shall not order of command anything in this matter." [Rinn und Juengst, *Kirchenhistorisches Lesebuch*, page 347 -- translated by Sievert] Briefly stated, the decree was not to be introduced by use of force. (Sievert 6)

Most Protestant churches throughout Prussia initially responded to the King's merger proclamation. In 1817 they held a joint celebration of the Lord's Supper as officially directed. But they did so only that one time, after which each church again reverted to its own traditional practice. (Camann 16)

Whether the word *Protestant* refers to all non-Catholics or to the Reformed, as it usually does today is not able to be fully understood. This joint service was prior to the official release of the Prussian Union Agenda, and after this one service it is clear that the strict Lutherans objected to the Union Agenda. "This agenda met criticism chiefly because it was a part of the movement to unite the Lutheran and Reformed churches throughout Prussia" (The Lutheran Liturgy 153).

The strict Lutherans whose doctrine was clearly expressed in their own formula, "Take, eat, this is the true body of our Lord Jesus Christ," found the king's plan most objectionable. When attempts to secure general acceptance of the new liturgy by peaceful means had proved unsuccessful, the king in 1831 decreed that pastors who refused would be guilty of flagrant disobedience to their king. (Meuser 14)

This was a direct attack on the convictions and consciences of the confessional Lutheran pastors in Prussia.

Thus the Union was forced upon pastors and people, Lutheran convictions were disregarded, Lutheran consciences were violated, the Lutheran confessions were set aside, and in the 300th anniversary year of the Augsburg Confession the very use of the name "Lutheran" was forbidden. (Buehring 16)

[The] pastors who refused to adopt the Agenda were threatened with stiff fines as punishment for their non-compliance. The Lutherans who adhered to the Unaltered Augsburg Confession and continued to worship according to their traditional order of service, now faced a period of unrelenting persecution. (Camann 16-17).

Among the forms of persecution which the Lutheran Church endured were suspensions from the ministry and even exile, as in the case of Pastor Scheibel of Breslau, Silesia.

He [Scheibel] refused to use the new liturgy and to take part in any unionistic communion service. Soon he had gathered around him a large congregation of Lutheran Christians who like himself were determined to remain true to the Lutheran church. In vain did the kings and his government officials attempt to suppress this Lutheran movement. Persecution set in; Pastor Scheibel was suspended from office and exiled from the land. Other conscientious Lutheran pastors were imprisoned, their congregations were subjected to heavy fines. (Buehring 17)

Another example of persecution against the Lutheran pastors is that of J.A.A. Grabau. He became convinced that the Prussian Lutheran Agenda was "a sinful attempt to overthrow the Lutheran Confessions which he believed to be the correct interpretation of the Word of God" (Meuser 14-15). Grabau returned to using the *Kirchenordnung*, he and his congregation renounced their membership in the state church (Meuser 15). The government officials not only suspended him, but they imprisoned him so as to show that there was not a "lax attitude" in this matter (Meuser 15). "It was his very desire to continue to use the old Lutheran Church Agenda [*Kirchenordnung*] that resulted in his arrest and detention in jail" (Confessional Lutheran Migrations to America 95).

The king hoped that such persecution would break the Lutheran convictions, yet it served the exact opposite. For Grabau, it made him look closer at the Lutheran confessions (Meuser 14). For others it caused them to hold their onto their beliefs even more strongly.

In vain did the kings and his government officials attempt to suppress this Lutheran movement. Persecution set in. . . . But the story of the heroic steadfastness of the Silesian Lutherans spread like wildfire and served to arouse Lutheran consciousness and conscience in other sections of the Prussian kingdom. (Buehring 17).

The Lutherans held onto the *Kirchenordnung*, the German Lutheran liturgy which was based on Luther's liturgies which in turn were based on the historic Catholic Mass in the matters of the words of distribution.

The Lutheran *Kirchenordnung* generally did not depart much from the tradition in regard to the words spoken by the priest when the people received the Body and Blood of Our Lord. The traditional words in the Latin Rite of the day were: *Corpus Domini nostri Jesu Christi custodiat corpus tuum et animam tuam in vitam aeternum*, or words closely related to these. The Lutheran rites added the words *der für dich gegeben ist*, and since Communion was in both kinds, they added *des für deine Sünde vergossen ist*, when the chalice was administered. (Webber 151)

As is often the case in history, when the Christian church faces persecution it grows instead of fading away, contrary to the desire of its persecutor. Such ^{was} is the case here in Prussia. While the fines and imprisonments were underway, Lutherans were re-examining

the Scriptures and the confessions to see what is acceptable in the words of distribution and what is not. It is because of this period of history that the words of distribution are both cherished and guarded well in the Wisconsin Synod.

VII. The Words of Distribution in the WELS and ELS Churches

Three hymnals stand out in the recent history of the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod and the Evangelical Lutheran Synod: The Lutheran Hymnary of 1912, The Lutheran Hymnal of 1941 and Christian Worship: A Lutheran Hymnal of 1993.

The earliest of these, The Lutheran Hymnary makes a clear and confessional stance on the Real Presence in its words of distribution which echo the words of the German *Kirchenordnung*. "When the Minister giveth the Bread he shall say: 'Take and eat, this is the true Body of Christ given for thee.' When he giveth the Cup he shall say: 'Take and drink, this is the true Blood of the New Testament, shed for thy sins'" (32). This is clearly a confession in the Real Presence. Although there is no section in this hymnal for general rubrics as there is in The Lutheran Hymnal, note the use of the word "shall" in the rubrics for the use of the distribution words and compare that to the rubrics for the blessing, "In dismissing the Communicants, the Minister *may* say . . ." (32 emphasis added). According to the general rubrics of The Lutheran Hymnal, "The word 'shall' in the Rubrics makes the part of the Service so designated obligatory, while the word 'may' leaves it optional" (4). What was said at the distribution according to The Lutheran Hymnary is considered obligatory, and with good reason. The Lutheran Church had been through some difficult times over the words of distribution. The theologians had looked back to the Scriptures and the confessions, and were convinced that there was need for a definite wording of the words of distribution.

The committee which prepared this hymnal states the purpose for producing a hymnal for the Norwegian Synods:

The considerations which prompted the creation of the joint committee [to produce The Lutheran Hymnary] were, chiefly, the common need of an

adequate and satisfactory English hymn book; the fact that a common faith and confession as well as a common inheritance of Lutheran hymnody; the probability of getting a better hymn book through united endeavor than by separate effort; and finally, the desirability of a common hymnary, especially in the event of a union of the Church [sic] bodies concerned. (3)

Note that the reasons were not political in nature, nor do they attempt to unify where there is no unity, as was the case in the Prussian Union Agenda. Here the need for a good, sound hymn book and the already present unity of "faith and confession" top the list for the reasons for the creation of The Lutheran Hymnary.

The second hymnal mentioned above is The Lutheran Hymnal, produced in 1941 for the Synodical Conference and used by almost all Wisconsin Synod churches since then until the publication of Christian Worship: A Lutheran Hymnal. The committee entrusted with the production of The Lutheran Hymnal "has earnestly endeavored to produce a hymnal containing the best of the hymnodical treasures of the Church [sic], both as to texts and tunes, in accord with the highest standards of Christian worship" (2). Among "the highest standards of Christian worship" is a desire and aim to precisely state that Christ's body and blood are truly present at the celebration of the Lord's Supper. This is seen by the words of distribution:

When the Minister giveth the bread he shall say: "Take, eat; this is the true body of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, given into death for your sins. May this strengthen and preserve you in the true faith unto life everlasting!" When he giveth the cup, he shall say: "Take, drink; this is the true blood of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, shed for the remission of your sins. May this strengthen and preserve you in the true faith unto life everlasting!" (29).

These words also convey a proper declaration of the Real Presence of the body and blood of Jesus Christ in the sacrament. The words are assertive and clear. Note also the use of the word "shall" in the rubric as discussed above. Here as well, the clear words of distribution are to be said as they are printed and are not optional.

Although The Lutheran Hymnal was scripturally, confessionally and doctrinally sound, the time had come for a revision. The hymnal Christian Worship: A Lutheran Hymnal is that revision. "The phrase 'new/revised' in the synodical resolutions was

interpreted to mean a hymnal which preserved the Christian and Lutheran heritage of liturgy and hymns from The Lutheran Hymnal and at the same time improved and expanded it" (Christian Worship: A Lutheran Hymnal 8).

The overall intent of those who prepared Christian Worship: A Lutheran Hymnal was to produce a Lutheran hymnal that was at once forward-looking and also enriched by the faith and worship experience of the whole Christian church of the past. Specifically the goal was to deliver to the church a strongly Christ-centered book, bringing together liturgies and a large number of hymns celebrating the life and atoning work of Jesus. May the new book continue to proclaim the power of the Word of God and the foundation doctrine of forgiveness by God's grace through faith in Christ. (Christian Worship: A Lutheran Hymnal 9)

This hymnal presents three forms of the words of distribution, but this does not mean that just any words will do.

The words spoken during the distribution must, however, be an unambiguous confession [Schuetze 92]. It is best, therefore, to establish a definite pattern in what is to be said. At this crucial point, only these words should be spoken. Let the communicant concentrate solely on Christ and the gift of his body and blood in the Sacrament. (Christian Worship: Manual 178)

The first set of words which can be used is, "Take, eat; this is the true body of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, given into death for your sins. Take, drink; this is the true blood of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, poured out for you for the forgiveness of your sins" (178). This set of words of distribution are the longest of the three, they present a clear statement about the Real Presence and include assertive words of the forgiveness of sins won by Christ.

The second set is slightly shorter than the first. "Take, eat; this is the true body of Christ, given for you. Take, drink; this is the true blood of Christ, poured out for you" (178). Again, there is a clear statement about the Real Presence, using the word *true* in speaking about the body and blood of Christ.

The third set is the shortest of the three. "(spoken to each communicant) The body of Christ, given for you. The blood of Christ, poured out for you" (178). These words do not stress the Real Presence in the Lord's Supper, they do not include the word *true* nor do they

even contain the small yet important and assertive word *is*. Before condemning these words of distribution, note that they do not deny the Real Presence, they do state that what the minister is giving to each communicant is the body and blood of Christ. Not all liturgies of the present era contain such a strong emphasis on the Real Presence, yet they do not all deny the Real Presence either. Compare the modern Swedish words of distribution, "The Body of Christ, given for thee, . . . The Blood of Christ, shed for thee" (Worship: A Study of Corporate Devotion 326). The reason that the church of Sweden does not stress the Real Presence is that the controversies which have loomed over the German Lutherans were not a threat in Sweden.

In conclusion, it has been shown that the words of distribution used in the celebration of the Lord's Supper are not mere words, but they are a clear confession of what the Lutheran Church teaches and proclaims. The words of distribution have their source in the New Testament, they have been shaped by history and the need to keep a clear confession before the world. They are chosen with care by those who produce the hymnals used for worship in the Wisconsin Synod. In closing, the words of Professors Schuetze and Habeck speak to the importance of the words of distribution.

The words spoken during the distribution must, however, be an unambiguous confession. They are spoken to all communicants as they receive the elements. The pastor must take care lest they sound like a thoughtless, mechanical recitation, especially when they must be repeated several times to each group appearing at the altar. (Schuetze 94).

Appendix A The Words of Institution for the Bread as Found in Scripture

Matthew 26:26	Take it	and eat	this is	my body					
	λάβετε	φάγετε	τοῦτό ἐστιν	τὸ σῶμά μου					
Mark 14:22	Take it		this is	my body					
	λάβετε		τοῦτό ἐστιν	τὸ σῶμά μου					
Luke 22:19			This is	my body	given				do this in remembrance of me
			Τοῦτό ἐστιν	τὸ σῶμά μου	τὸ ... διδόμενον				τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἑμὴν ἀνάμνησιν
1 Cor. 11:24			This is	my body		which is [broken] ¹	for you		do this in remembrance of me
			Τοῦτό ... ἐστιν	μου ... τὸ σῶμα		τὸ ... [κλώμενον] ¹	ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν		τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἑμὴν ἀνάμνησιν

Note 1: The United Bible Societies' The Greek New Testament, third edition, (UBS) does not have the word κλώμενον in the text of 1 Corinthians 11:24, neither does the International Bible Society's The Holy Bible: New International Version (NIV) have the corresponding English word "broken" at this place. It is included here since, according to the textual apparatus included in the UBS text, the manuscript evidence which supports this reading is both early and widespread, as shown by the chart below. Metzger supports the committee's decision to follow the shorter reading by stating, "Attempts to explicate the meaning of the words resulted in the addition of various participles" (496). He goes on to state that the participle κλώμενον was "derived from the preceding ἔκλασεν" (496). According to Professor David Kuske in his book Biblical Interpretation: The Only Right Way, "The wording which is most ancient and most widespread is the one that retains the autograph" (54).

1 Cor. 11:24	ὑμῶν	ὑμῶν κλώμενον	ὑμῶν θρουπτόμενον	ὑμῶν διδόμενον
North Africa		it ^e		
Gaul & Italy		D ^{b,c} it ^d	D ^{g,r}	vg (<i>tradetur</i>)
Asia Minor		<i>Byz Lect goth</i>		
Syria	arm	<i>Byz Lect syr^{p,h}</i>		
Palistine				
Egypt	p ⁴⁶ N* A B C*	N ^c C ³		cop ^{sa,bo} eth
	6 witnesses in 2 regions	13 witnesses in 5 regions	1 witness in 1 region	4 witnesses in 2 regions

Appendix B

The Words of Institution for the Wine as Found in Scripture

Matthew 26:27-28	Drink from it Πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ	all of you πάντες	This τοῦτο γάρ	is ἐστίν	my blood τὸ αἷμά μου	of the [new] ¹ covenant τῆς [καινῆς] ¹ διαθήκης	which is poured out for τὸ περὶ ... ἐκχυννόμενον
Mark 14:24			This τοῦτό	is ἐστίν	my blood τὸ αἷμά μου	of the [new] ² covenant τῆς [καινῆς] ² διαθήκης	which is poured out for τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον ὑπέρ
Luke 22:20		you ὑμῶν	This τοῦτο	is ἐστίν	the new covenant ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη	in my blood ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου	which is poured out for τὸ ὑπέρ ... ἐκχυννόμενον
1 Cor. 11:25			This τοῦτο	is ἐστίν	the new covenant ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη	in my blood ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι	

Matthew 26:27-28	many πολλῶν		for the forgiveness of sins εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν				
Mark 14:24	many πολλῶν						
Luke 22:20		you ὑμῶν					
1 Cor. 11:25				do this τοῦτο ποιεῖτε	whenever you drink it ὁσάκις ἐὰν πίνητε	in remembrance of me εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν	

Note 1: The United Bible Societies' The Greek New Testament, third edition, (UBS) does not have the word καινῆς in the text of Matthew 26:28, neither does the International Bible Society's The Holy Bible: New International Version (NIV) have the corresponding English word "new" at this place. It is included here since, according to the textual apparatus included in the UBS text, the manuscript evidence which supports this reading is both early and widespread, as shown by the chart below.

Matthew 26:28	διαθήκης	καινης διαθήκης	novi et aeterni testamenti
North Africa		it ^h	
Gaul & Italy		D it ^{a,d} vg	it ^b
Asia Minor		W Byz Lect	
Syria	(SYT ^{palms})	W Byz Lect SYT ^{s,p,h,paalms} arm	
Palstine			
Egypt	μ ³⁷ N B cop ^{bo/ms}	A C cop ^{so,lo} eth	
	5 witnesses in 2 regions	21 witnesses in 5 regions	1 witness in 1 region

Note 2: The UBS text does not have the word καινης in the text of Matthew 26:28, neither does the NIV have the corresponding English word "new" at this place. It is included here since, according to the textual apparatus included in the UBS text, the manuscript evidence which supports this reading is both early and widespread. Although there is not an overwhelming majority of evidence for the fourth reading (της καινης διαθήκης) alone, there is ample evidence that it is the correct reading. It is obvious from all four readings that the words της διαθήκης are found on the autograph. The word τὸ is not found on the autograph since only 8 witnesses in 4 regions support it, while 14 witnesses in 3 regions show it not to be part of the original text. The word καινης is part of the original text since 14 witnesses in 4 regions support it while only 8 witnesses in 3 regions do not have that word.

Mark 14:24	της διαθήκης	τὸ της διαθήκης	τὸ της καινης διαθήκης	της καινης διαθήκης
North Africa				
Gaul & Italy	D ^b	D* it ^d	it ^b	it ^a vg
Asia Minor			Byz Lect	
Syria			Byz Lect	SYT ^{s,p,h} arm
Palstine		W		
Egypt	N B C cop ^{sa/ms,bo}			cop ^{sa,lo/ms} eth
	5 witnesses in 2 regions	3 witnesses in 2 regions	5 witnesses in 3 regions	9 witnesses in 3 regions

Bibliography

- Aland, Kurt, et al., eds. The Greek New Testament. 3rd ed. Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1983.
- Baumler, Gary, and Kermit Moldenhauer, eds. Christian Worship: Manual. Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 1993.
- Bente, F. ed. Triglot Concordia: The Symbolical Books of the Ev. Lutheran Church. St Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1921.
- Brenner, Karl, and Marie Brenner. "J.A.A. Grabau: The Restoration of Orthodox Worship." Confessional Lutheran Migrations to America: 150th Anniversary. Eastern District of the Lutheran Church - Missouri Synod, 1988.
- Buehring, P. H. The Spirit of the American Lutheran Church. Columbus, Ohio: The Lutheran Book Concern, 1940.
- Cabaniss, Allen. Pattern in Early Christian Worship. Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press, 1989.
- Camann, Eugene W. Uprooted from Prussia Transplanted in America. Buffalo, New York: Gilcraft Printing Company, 1991.
- Deiss, Lucien, ed. Early Sources of the Liturgy. Trans. Benet Weatherhead. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1967.
- Dix, Dom Gregory. The Shape of the Liturgy. Glasgow: The University Press, 1947.
- Duchesne, L. Christian Worship: Its Origin and Evolution. Trans. M. L. McClure. 2nd English ed. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1904.
- Intersynodical Committee on Hymnology and Liturgics for the Ev. Luth. Synodical Conference of North America, The. The Lutheran Hymnal. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1941.
- Joint Committee of the United Norwegian Lutheran Church, the Norwegian Lutheran Synod and Hauge's Lutheran Synod, The. The Lutheran Hymnary. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Augsburg Publishing House, 1913.

- Koelpin, Arnold. "The Sacramental Presence in the Theology of the Synodical Conference." Our Great Heritage. 3 vols. Ed. Lyle W. Lange. Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 1991.
- Kuske, David. Biblical Interpretation: The Only Right Way. Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 1995.
- Lehmann, Helmut T. ed. Luther's Works. 55 vols. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1965.
- Metzger, Bruce M. A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament. 2nd ed. Stuttgart: German Bible Society, 1994.
- Meuser, Fred W. The Formation of the American Lutheran Church: A Case Study in Lutheran Unity. Columbus, Ohio: The Wartburg Press, 1958.
- Nagel, Norman E. "Holy Communion." Lutheran Worship: History and Practice. Ed. Fred L. Precht, and James L. Brauer. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1993.
- Nelson, E. Clifford. et al. eds. The Lutherans in North America. Revised ed. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980.
- Precht, Fred L. "Worship Resources in Missouri Synod's History." Lutheran Worship: History and Practice. Ed. Fred L. Precht, and James L. Brauer. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1993.
- Reed, Luther D. The Lutheran Liturgy. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1947. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1985.
- Reed, Luther D. Worship: A Study of Corporate Devotion. Philadelphia, Muhlenberg Press, 1959.
- Schuetze, Armin W., and Irwin J. Habeck. The Shepherd under Christ: A Textbook for Pastoral Theology. Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 1974.
- Sievert, K. G. True Lutherans versus the Prussian Union: Encouragement in Practicing Confessional Lutheranism today in an Ecumenical Age. Conference Paper.
- Srawley, J. H. The Early History of the Liturgy. 2nd ed. Cambridge: University Press, 1949.

Thompson, Bard. Liturgies of the Western Church. Cleveland, Ohio: The World Publishing Company, 1961.

Tripp, D. H. "Protestantism and the Eucharist." The Study of Liturgy. Ed. Cheslyn Jones, Geoffrey Wainwright, and Edward Jones. New York: Oxford University Press, 1978.

Webber, F. R. Studies in the Liturgy. Erie, Pennsylvania: Ashby Printing Company, 1938.

Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod. Christian Worship: A Lutheran Hymnal. Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 1993.

Yelverton, Eric E. The Manual of Olavus Petri 1529. London: S.P.C.K., 1953.

Scripture taken from the *Holy Bible, New International Version*[®]. Copyright © 1973, 1978, 1984 by International Bible Society. Used by permission of International Bible Society.