

tury." And Luther, who in his tremendous struggle with Rome felt compelled to assume so independent an attitude toward tradition, yet felt that the concurrent testimony was here too overwhelming, and so, speaking of the Real Presence, he gives this conclusion: "This article has been unanimously believed and held from the beginning of the Christian Church to the present hour, as may be shown from the writings of the fathers both in the Greek and Latin languages, which testimony of the entire Holy Christian Church ought to be sufficient for us, even if we had nothing more."\*

As to the NATURE or manner in which the Lord's body and blood are in the Eucharist—and very much here depends on precise definition—we define it by the phrase *Real Presence*. Presence is used to distinguish from the Roman view of a change, as transubstantiation, impanation, consubstantiation, or any other error grounded on a confusion of the earthly and heavenly elements; and Real distinguishes from a merely figurative presence. That the bread and wine are not changed into or carnally confused with the body and blood is manifest from the evidence of our senses, and also because the Scripture still calls them in the sacrament by their natural names, viz., "cup" and "bread." But while they are not changed into, neither are they separated from, the Lord's body and blood. But the earthly elements are so connected with the heavenly elements that the one can only be secured through the medium of the other. This, in theological parlance, is called the sacramental union. Its parallel is found in the rule of God's economic dealings with men. It is the Divine order that the spiritual is mediated through the material—the Kingdom of Grace through the kingdom of nature. The most conspicuous example of this is found in the Incarnation. In this "the Logos was made flesh." But the Son of God was not thereby changed into the flesh; the Divine was not confused with the human, but the two natures were blended into an inseparable but unmixed union. Bishop Ellicott thus defines it: "In the unity of the person of Christ two whole and perfect natures are *indivisibly, yet unconfusedly*, united and co-existent." Precisely such is the sacramental union. In it two "whole and perfect" elements, the one the bread and wine, the other the body and blood of Christ, are "united and co-existent," without being "confused" with or "separable" from one another.

The bread and wine thus are not mere symbols, but means of grace. What they signify they also offer and convey. In, with, and under,—the phraseology of the Augsburg Confession,—the bread and wine, are the body and blood of Christ. To receive the heavenly "treasure" there must be used the "earthen vessel." In this sense the reception of Christ in the sacrament is an oral one, viz., by means of the mouth; that is, the bread and wine must be taken, eaten, and drank. If the reception be not oral, but mental, *i.e.*, through faith

\* Letter to Albert of Prussia, 1532.