

Concordia Theological Quarterly



Volume 77:1-2

January/April 2013

Table of Contents

In Memoriam: Harold H. Zietlow (1926–2011)	3
Epistles before Gospels: An Axiom of New Testament Studies David P. Scaer	5
Moses in the Gospel of John Christopher A. Maronde	23
Rectify or Justify? A Response to J. Louis Martyn’s Interpretation of Paul’s Righteousness Language Mark P. Surburg	45
The Eucharistic Prayer and Justification Roland F. Ziegler	79
The Reception of Walther’s Theology in the Wisconsin Synod Mark E. Braun	101
Righteousness, Mystical Union, and Moral Formation in Christian Worship Gifford A. Grobien	141
Theological Observer	165
God’s Word, Three Views, One Bible	
The Mission of the Church in an Age of Zombies	
One Nation under God: Thoughts Regarding “Patriotic Services”	

Book Reviews	184
Books Received	191

The Eucharistic Prayer and Justification

Roland F. Ziegler

The formulation of this topic is a very Lutheran one. The Eucharistic Prayer is an ecumenical phenomenon, but to ask about its relationship to justification is something distinctly Lutheran. For an Eastern Orthodox or Roman Catholic theologian, this likely would not be a topic that readily comes to mind. But for Lutherans, justification is the center of the Christian faith. And therefore it is natural to ask about the relationship between the Eucharistic Prayer and justification.

Since this is a distinctly Lutheran approach, the suspicion could arise that this is a parochial question, that once more, Lutherans sit in their corner hedging traditional petty concerns, instead of embracing “the fullness” of “the great tradition.” Therefore, before we commence our study, it is not inappropriate to justify the topic by explaining why justification has this central position in Lutheranism—unlike in Roman Catholicism or in the theology of the reformed theologian Karl Barth.

I. Justification as the Central Article

When we talk about justification—and here I mean subjective justification—it is helpful to distinguish between the act of justification and the doctrine of justification. The act of justification is God’s action: God acquits sinful man and thereby man is righteous, not because of a quality inherent in him, but because of the alien righteousness of Christ. Justification happens through the gospel, because the gospel is “strictly speaking, the promise of the forgiveness of sins and justification on account of Christ” (Ap IV, 43)¹ as our Confessions say. God acts on us in this salvific way through the gospel, which is a verbal communication that is nevertheless not divorced from an earthly element: not only in the sacraments, in which promise and an element are united, but also in a purely verbal gospel

¹ “. . . evangelium, quod est proprie promissio remissionis peccatorum et iustificationis propter Christum.” See *Die Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche*, 5th ed. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963), 168,40–42. This edition is subsequently abbreviated as “BSLK.” All English citations of the Book of Concord are from Robert Kolb and Timothy J. Wengert, eds., *The Book of Concord: The Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*, tr. Charles Arand, et al. (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000).

Roland Ziegler is Assistant Professor of Systematic Theology at Concordia Theological Seminary, Fort Wayne, Indiana.

communication, in which language, a created, earthly means, is necessary. The forms of the gospel are manifold, as Luther explains in a familiar passage in the Smalcald Articles:

We now want to return to the gospel, which gives guidance and help against sin in more than one way, because God is extravagantly rich in his grace: first, through the spoken word, in which the forgiveness of sins is preached to the whole world (which is the proper function of the gospel); second, through baptism; third, through the holy Sacrament of the Altar; fourth, through the power of the keys and also through the mutual conversation and consolation of brothers and sisters. Matthew 18[:20]: "Where two or three are gathered . . ." (SA III, 4).

The Lord's Supper is thus a gospel communication. In it, God justifies, forgives sins, without man's work or doing, by grace alone, which is received through faith alone. Therefore, the way in which the Lord's Supper is celebrated can either be consonant with its character as a gospel communication, or it can be antagonistic to it, in the worst case scenario, destroying the Lord's Supper as a gospel communication.

When we investigate whether or not the way we celebrate the Lord's Supper is consonant with its being a gospel communication, the doctrine of justification is necessary. The doctrine of justification is the reflection on this act of justification. Such a reflection is not some ivory tower enterprise. In Paul's letters we find a deep reflection on justification because the proclamation and practice of his adversaries were destroying the gospel. Thus, Paul is the great teacher of the doctrine of justification. The doctrine of justification is therefore not a mere human reflection. After all, Paul is the divinely inspired apostle. Therefore, the doctrine of justification is also divinely revealed. In it, the content and the implications of the content of the gospel are reflected for the purpose that, in the practice of the church, its proclamation of the gospel and administration of the sacraments are done in such a way that they are acts of justification and not acts of the law (e.g., acts to improve the moral fiber of society, or acts to help a person become a better self, or acts of family entertainment). The doctrine of justification is therefore no luxury, nor is it abstract. The doctrine of justification provokes continued theological reflection through the centuries and is thus the way in which the Holy Spirit works in the church and keeps her preaching and her administration of the sacraments faithful to God's mandate.

II. Some Definitions

So, what is the Eucharistic Prayer? On a most basic level, it is a prayer of thanksgiving at the celebration of the Lord's Supper. Of course, we are not talking about the collect of thanksgiving after communion. Rather, it is a prayer that contains thanksgiving, remembrance, petition, and sometimes other elements as the central liturgical act of the Lord's Supper.² The resurgence of the Eucharistic Prayer in its importance for theology and the introduction of Eucharistic Prayers in churches that did not have them historically are 20th-century phenomena.

What is the theology of the Eucharistic Prayer? Obviously, there are differences between the ways in which Lutherans, Presbyterians, Eastern Orthodox, Methodists, or Roman Catholics explain the meaning of the Eucharistic Prayer and also in the way these different traditions write such prayers. Dennis Smolarski, a Jesuit, whose main occupation is teaching computer science in a Jesuit school, but who also wrote a study of the Eucharistic Prayer, summarizes the results of the liturgical movement in the 20th century up to 1982 in this way:

The Eucharistic Prayer is the central verbal formulation of the Sacrament of the Eucharist. Its purpose is to be the prayer of blessing corresponding to the prayers of blessing used by Jesus at the Last Supper. As that prayer of blessing, its composition can be and is influenced by different theological positions, for example, positions regarding the "moment of consecration," or the mode of the presence of Christ in the elements of bread and wine. Yet, in any case, the Eucharistic Prayer should perform its function as the main contextualizing formulation, or sacramental "form," of the Sacrament of the Eucharist as well as possible.³

The Eucharistic Prayer is addressed to the Father and commences with the introductory dialogue and the proclamation, in which the reason for thanks and praise is given (the Preface). Then follows the Sanctus, followed by a prayer that continues the enumeration of the great deeds of God, leading into the institution narrative as part of the retelling of the story of Jesus as an act of God. Smolarski emphasizes that the institution narrative was connected by a relative pronoun with the antecedent prayer. Though he admits that the relative pronoun in Latin can have the force of a

² Cf. the list of elements in *Baptism, Eucharist & Ministry, Faith and Order Paper No. 111*, Eucharist, §27 (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1982; reprint St. Louis: Association of Evangelical Lutheran Churches, n.d.) 25-26.

³ Dennis Smolarski, *Eucharistia. A Study of the Eucharistic Prayer* (New York: Paulist Press, 1982) 47-48.

demonstrative, he states: "Nevertheless, it is also interesting to note that what has become the primary, all-important section of the Eucharistic Prayer in the piety of many Catholic priests and laity was only (linguistically) a secondary section in prayers written in Latin and Greek."⁴ We find here, very typical for many of the proponents of the Eucharistic Prayer, the effort to show that the institution narrative is not *the* central act of the celebration of the Lord's Supper. This means also that the doctrine that it is the Words of Institution that consecrate the bread and wine is rejected. In the light of the definition as the *forma* of the sacrament by the councils of Florence-Ferrara and Trent, the shift in the view of the Words of Institution is quite remarkable:

The Eucharistic Prayer can be considered a prayer of consecration only because it is first a prayer of thankful praise and remembrance. The Institution Narrative plays an important role because it is part of this remembrance and (as mentioned in Chapter 5) it helps [!] to contextualize the action and the elements present. Yet it must itself be seen in the context of the entire Eucharistic Prayer.⁵

Edward J. Kilmartin, another Jesuit, writes even more emphatically in his posthumously published book *The Eucharist in the West*:

Traditional Catholic theology of the second theological millennium with its dominant Christological orientation has promoted the idea that the eucharistic moment of consecration represents a unique case as regards the shape of celebration of a Christian sacrament. In this erroneous idea the words of consecration, while pronounced by the human minister of Christ, are in reality words spoken by the risen Lord in and through his minister.⁶

Again,

Likewise, when the Eucharistic Prayer is recognized precisely as a performative form of the act of faith of the Church, the traditional emphasis on the Words of Institution as the sacramental formula appears misdirected However, this theology of the moment of consecration in which the words of Christ are identified as the essential form of the sacrament holds true only within the splinter theology of the Western scholastic tradition.⁷

⁴ Smolarski, *Eucharistia*, 60.

⁵ Smolarski, *Eucharistia*, 103

⁶ *The Eucharist in the West: History and Theology* (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1998) 348.

⁷ Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 350. The Benedictine Burkard Neunheuser defends the thesis that the entire Eucharistic Prayer consecrates. See "Das eucharistische

Smolarski continues with the “memorial acclamation or proclamation of faith,” as it has been added in the Roman rite, following the example of certain eastern liturgies. Then follows the memorial or anamnesis, offertory, and invocation or epiclesis. “Since this section is the explicit statement that the community is fulfilling the command of Christ to perform the Eucharist in his memory, this section is, liturgically, the central section (in relative importance) of the Eucharistic prayer.”⁸ In the anamnesis, the command “do this in memory of me” is implemented. The memorial or anamnesis is not a mere mental act. “In our ‘remembering’ we are actually making the event remembered present because of our action of remembering. This is a significant part of the meaning of *zikkaron* or anamnesis.”⁹ Since the Eucharist is about remembering the sacrifice of Christ, “our remembering is connected to an action of offering, so we word our prayer, ‘As we remember, we offer the Body and Blood of Christ,’ or, ‘As we remember, we unite ourselves to Christ’s perfect offering of himself.’”¹⁰ Then, what is offered? “To this question we reply: ‘Christ.’”¹¹ Christ is here not only the person of the God-man, it includes also the mystical body of Christ, the church, so that the offering of Christ’s body and blood and the self-offering coincide.

The epiclesis is the “petition for the divine response to the Church’s obedience to Christ’s command, an obedience which was expressed in the anamnesis-offertory.”¹² Thus, it contains a petition for the Spirit, a description of his work as the changing of bread and wine, and the statement of the fruit of the invocation, the unity of all who believe in Christ.¹³ The Eucharistic Prayer concludes with the intercessions, a “logical consequence” of the prayer for unity in the epiclesis, and the doxology.¹⁴

Taking this as a kind of typical theology of the Eucharistic Prayer, let us look at some of the issues that might be problematic from a Lutheran perspective. There is first the identification of the content of the “do this in

Hochgebet als Konsekrationsgebet,” *Gratias Agamus: Studien zum eucharistischen Hochgebet: Für Balthasar Fischer*, ed. Andreas Heinz and Heinrich Hennings (Freiburg, Basel Wien: Herder, 1992), 315–326. For a Lutheran advocate of the Eucharistic Prayer who rejects the consecratory nature of the Words of Institution, see Edgar S. Brown, Jr., “Accedit verbum. . . , The Word or words?” *Ecclesia, Liturgia, Ministerium: Studia in Honorem Toivo Harjunpää* (Helsinki: Loimaan Kirjapaino, 1977) 19–27.

⁸ Smolarski, *Eucharistia*, 65.

⁹ Smolarski, *Eucharistia*, 68.

¹⁰ Smolarski, *Eucharistia*, 65.

¹¹ Smolarski, *Eucharistia*, 72–73.

¹² Smolarski, *Eucharistia*, 80.

¹³ Smolarski, *Eucharistia*, 80.

¹⁴ Smolarski, *Eucharistia*, 84–90.

remembrance of me." Does this mean that one should say a prayer of thanksgiving and remembrance, in which the sacrifice of Christ is made present? Is it our commemoration that makes the sacrifice of Christ present? And does the offering naturally flow out of the remembrance? If yes, what exactly is offered? Not surprisingly, in the ecumenical discussion between Lutherans and Roman Catholics, this question, if it is in any way appropriate to speak of the offering of Christ's body and blood, was one of the points where a consensus could not be reached.¹⁵

The position and function of the institution narrative in the Lord's Supper is another point. Is it just a secondary thought in the prayer, which praises the whole account of God's salvific action? And what makes the sacrament the sacrament, the entire Eucharistic Prayer or the Words of our Lord? Finally, should we have an invocation of the Holy Spirit in the celebration of the Lord's Supper? If yes, what is the function of such a prayer? Since the goal of this paper is not to give an exhaustive discussion of the Eucharistic Prayer, but to relate it to justification, not all of these questions can be addressed. Our task is to answer this question: is the Eucharistic Prayer compatible with an understanding of the Lord's Supper as an act of justification? Does the prayer reflect the theology of justification: the monergism of God in providing and communicating salvation; the sufficiency of Christ's work; that God acts with us graciously in the promise alone; that faith alone receives the gospel?

¹⁵ More surprisingly, though, might be the fact that among Roman Catholic theologians there are also objections to this language, even though it is enshrined in Eucharistic Prayer I of the Missal and in the decrees of Trent. Eucharistic Prayer I says in the Anamnesis, after the Words of Institution and acclamation, "we, your people . . . offer to you, God of glory and majesty, this holy and perfect sacrifice: the bread of life and the cup of eternal salvation . . ." See *The New St. Joseph Weekday Missal*, vol. 1: Advent to Pentecost (New York: Catholic Book Publishing Company, 1975), 631. See also the formulation in the fourth Eucharistic Prayer, ". . . and, looking forward to his coming in glory, we offer you his body and blood . . ." (644). Finally, pertinent is the remark by the Roman Catholic theologian Reinhold Meßner on the fourth Eucharistic Prayer: "Christ's action, which solely reconciles, and the action of the church, which receives the reconciling action thankfully, are not distinguished. From that follows the theologically impossible thought that the church offers the sacrifice of reconciliation," *Die Meßreform Martin Luthers und die Eucharistie der Alten Kirche: Ein Beitrag zu einer systematischen Liturgiewissenschaft* (Innsbruck, Vienna: Tyrolia Verlag, 1989), 211.

III. Eucharistic Prayer and Lord's Supper as an Act of Justification

Our investigation begins, therefore, with the question of sacrifice and the Lord's Supper, since the anamnestic, Eucharistic Prayer is proposed as a correct expression of the relationship between Christ's sacrifice and our sacrifice and as the way in which his sacrifice is mediated to us.

The first controversy on the Lord's Supper in the time of the Reformation was on the question of whether or not the Lord's Supper was a good work and a sacrifice.¹⁶ Traditionally, both were asserted by the Roman side.¹⁷ On the Lutheran side, these views were rejected. The Lord's Supper was defined as Christ's body and blood for the forgiveness of sins, "for us Christians to eat and to drink" (SC VI, 2). This could neither be a sacrifice nor an act of man. Melancthon could, however, speak of a sacrifice that is attached to the Lord's Supper as a consequence, namely, the thanksgiving of the Christians and other acts (Ap XXIV, 25).¹⁸ But the difference is that these are not parts of the sacrament; they are not constitutive for the sacrament but are, rather, consequences of the Lord's Supper.¹⁹ Thus, the language of the liturgy that spoke about the priest or the church offering a sacrifice was excised from the service of the sacrament. The Canon of the Mass, formerly regarded as the holiest part of the mass, clothed with apostolic dignity, was, except for the Words of Institution, completely abolished.

¹⁶ These two aspects are not the same (cf. Wisloff, *The Gift of Communion*). See David N. Power, "The Anamnesis: Remembering, We Offer," in *New Eucharistic Prayers. An Ecumenical Study of their Development and Structure*, ed. Frank C. Senn, (New York: Paulist Press, 1987), 146-168, especially his remark on pg. 151: "It will be remembered that the Reformers repudiated the notion that offering or sacrifice belonged to the essence of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, especially if this was to be understood as propitiatory, or an offering for sins."

¹⁷ The language of the Lord's Supper as a sacrifice had a long history, originating probably from an understanding of the prayers as sacrifice. At the eve of the Reformation, it was the common opinion that in the mass the church sacrifices Christ's body and blood to God as a propitiatory sacrifice to obtain forgiveness of sins. Hence, private masses were a valid option, since communion was only one aspect of the celebration of the Lord's Supper.

¹⁸ However, the reception of the Christians could be called a thank-offering, since it is the result of an act of faith, and every act of faith is a thank-offering. Similarly, there is also some (not very common) talk during the Reformation about Christians offering themselves in the celebration.

¹⁹ "Both the sacrifice of thanksgiving and the self-offering of the faithful were, however, seen more as the fruit of communion than as acts that belonged to the essence of the remembrance of Christ's death or sacrifice," Power, *Anamnesis*, 152.

In 20th-century theology, the divergence between Roman Catholics and Lutherans in the time of the Reformation is often seen in a deficient theology of sacrifice in Roman Catholic theology.²⁰ The problem, it is said, was that both sides had no concept of the Lord's Supper as an effective representation of Christ's sacrifice, and that they did not see the connection between the self-sacrifice of the Christian and the sacrifice of Christ.²¹

This connection has, however, received widespread attention in the 20th century. The thought that in the Lord's Supper not only the body and blood of Christ are present, but that in the sacrament the event of the cross itself is present and that, therefore, it is a sacrifice—the same sacrifice offered at Golgotha—has become widely accepted. One of the most famous proponents was the German Benedictine monk Odo Casel. Joseph Ratzinger called his approach “probably the most fruitful theological idea of our century.”²² Casel's ideas were also positively mentioned in the “Ways of Worship,” a study of the Commission on Faith and Order of the World Council of Churches and have also influenced Lutheran theologians.²³ Casel stated that salvation is mediated through participation in the anamnesis, that is, the liturgical representation, the making present of the paschal mystery, which is the death and resurrection of Christ. This representation is what makes the sacrament a sacrament. It happens in the liturgical celebration, the holy drama or holy game, in which man is God's co-player. Man is not merely passive, but rather he is taken into salvation as a co-agent. And since the liturgical celebration, in which man is a co-agent, is the making present of the sacrifice of Christ, man participates in the sacrifice of Christ.

²⁰ While considerable efforts were spent on the discussion on the mode of the presence of Christ's body and blood in the Lord's Supper in the Middle Ages, there was not the same effort expended on the issue of how the sacrifice of Christ on the cross and the sacrifice of the mass relate. Roman Catholic theology was, therefore, somewhat unprepared for the onslaught of the Reformation, and modern Roman Catholic theologians concede that the apologetics of someone like Johannes Eck were less than adequate.

²¹ “What eluded those on both sides of the controversy was the connection between the sacrifice of thanksgiving and the self-offering of the faithful on the one hand, and the efficacious representation of Christ's sacrifice on the other,” Power, *Anamnesis*, 152.

²² Joseph Ratzinger, *Die sakramentale Begründung christlicher Existenz*, 5, quoted according to Arno Schilson, *Theologie als Sakramententheologie: Die Mysterientheologie Odo Casels* (Mainz: Matthias-Grünwald-Verlag, 1982), 22.

²³ *Ways of Worship: The Report of a Theological Commission of Faith and Order*, eds. Pehr Edwall, Eric Hayman, and William D. Maxwell (Rochester, UK: SCM Press, 1951). Wilhelm Averbek, *Der Opfercharakter des Abendmahls in der Neueren Evangelischen Theologie, Konfessionskundliche und Kontroverstheologische Studien 19* (Paderborn: Verlag Bonifacius-Druckerei, 1967), 781.

The concept of representation and anamnestic presence of the sacrifice of Christ in the Lord's Supper has been quite influential in ecumenical dialogues. Thus, the final report of the ecumenical group of evangelical (*evangelischer*) and Catholic theologians in Germany states: "Execution and celebration of the Lord's Supper connect in the New Testament in a sacramental manner the execution of a fellowship meal with the memorial representation (*memoria, repraesentatio*) and participation (*participatio*) of the historically unique sacrificial death of the Lord."²⁴ Thus, it is not surprising that some think that a consensus on the Lord's Supper as a sacrifice has been reached. Gail Ramshaw (ELCA) wrote: "Granting the agreements reached in the Lutheran-Roman Catholic dialogues on the eucharist, and granting current scholarship on the metaphoric use of the word 'sacrifice' in the Christian tradition, it is no longer defensible for Lutherans to continue their eccentric refusal to speak the language of offering and sacrifice in the eucharist."²⁵

The Lord's Supper is a sacrifice because in the anamnestic prayer the sacrifice of Christ is present, as is everything else he did. The consensus does not extend to the question if one can speak of the church participating in the sacrifice of Christ or even offering Christ's body and blood. In the Lutheran-Roman dialogue in Germany, this topic was approached first by stating the agreement: "The eucharist is the great sacrifice of praise in

²⁴Das Opfer Jesu Christi und seine Gegenwart in der Kirche: Klärungen zum Opfercharacter des Herrenmahles, eds. Karl Lehmann and Eduard Schlink (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983), 222.

²⁵ Gail Ramshaw-Schmidt, "Towards Lutheran Eucharistic Prayers," in *New Eucharistic Prayers: An Ecumenical Development and Structure*, ed. Frank C. Senn (New York: Paulist Press, 1987), 74-79, 77-78. Similarly, in his essay "The Anamnesis: Remembering, We Offer" in the same volume, the Roman Catholic theologian David N. Power, professor at Catholic University of America, stated: "Recent dialogues between churches have largely resolved this problem [of the eucharistic sacrifice] by use of the biblical image of *anamnesis* or memorial, and by rediscovery of the great prayer of thanksgiving as a memorial proclamation of the salvific works of God," 146. This ecumenical consensus has been summarized in *Baptism, Eucharist, Ministry*: "The eucharist is the memorial of the crucified and risen Christ, i.e. the living and effective sign of his sacrifice, accomplished once and for all on the cross and still operative on behalf of all humankind," §5. In this, we have a summary of the ecumenically standard theology on sacrifice as it has been reached in the third quarter of the 20th century. Again, "Christ himself with all he has accomplished for us and for all creation (in his incarnation, servanthood, ministry, teaching, suffering, sacrifice, resurrection, ascension and sending of the Spirit) is present in this *anamnesis*, granting us communion with himself. The eucharist is also the foretaste of his *parousia* and of the final kingdom," §6.

which the church speaks in the name of the entire creation."²⁶ Furthermore, "In this way also the congregation celebrating the Lord's Supper participates in the sacrifice of Jesus Christ, in the commemoration of his death and in the prayer for his Spirit."²⁷ Thus, anamnesis and epiclesis are the liturgical forms in which the congregation participates in Christ's death. The objects of sacrifice are "Jesus Christ and his Sacrifice," namely, the congregation "puts his merit before the Father's eyes."²⁸ "Sacrifice of the church means therefore not the offering of a sacred gift standing opposite of us at the altar through the hand of the human priest, but the entering of the church in the devotion of Jesus Christ, i.e., the offering of ourselves through, with, and in Jesus Christ as a living sacrificial gift."²⁹

Eucharistic prayer and sacrifice are intimately connected; it is the prayer through which the church effects the representation of Christ's sacrifice. The meaning of the offering clause in the Eucharistic Prayers of the early church implies that "the praise and thanksgiving which is made to God for the death and resurrection of Christ is a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving. It is through this act that the salvific mysteries of Christ are represented and rendered efficacious, in the power of the Holy Spirit."³⁰

Such an understanding of the Eucharistic Prayer means that the function of the Words of Institution is redefined. Against the concentration on the Words of Institution in the West as the consecratory formula, the entire prayer is emphasized.³¹ Many liturgiologists propose that the insti-

²⁶ *Das Opfer Jesu Christi*, 235. This quotation is from the document "Towards One Eucharistic Faith" (1971) by the Dombes Group. Agreement is also in the fact that the offering of the church is not by a self-subsisting subject besides Christ, a misunderstanding that has been already excluded in Trent. See *Das Opfer Jesu Christi*, 236, reference to *Enchiridion symbolorum definitionum et declarationum de rebus fidei et morum: Kompendium der Glaubensbekenntnisse und kirchlichen Lehrentscheidungen*, ed. Heinrich Denzinger and Peter Hünermann, 40th ed. (Feiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 2005), no. 1743. The reformation did not understand sacrifice as an inclusion of those who sacrifice into the act of the sacrifice of Christ, but as an act added to it. But even the sacrifice of praise can only be correctly understood as a sacrifice of faith, i.e., as a participation in the praise of Christ, which only then is a participation in the self-giving of Christ on the cross.

²⁷ *Das Opfer Jesu Christi*, 236; emphasis in original.

²⁸ *Das Opfer Jesu Christi*, 236.

²⁹ *Das Opfer Jesu Christi*, 237; emphasis in original.

³⁰ Power, *Anamnesis*, 163. Power himself is rather critical of the sacrificial terminology as a later development, since he does not think that the concept of "sacrifice" is central as a description for the death of Christ. See Power, *Prayer*, 243.

³¹ "In any case, these various hypotheses allow us to move firmly away from attaching a consecratory power to the words of Jesus in the eucharist, while at the same time grasping the import and importance of including the story and the memorial

tution narrative is not original to the Eucharistic Prayer but a later addition; some even suggest that the Words of Institution are not a necessary part of the celebration of the Lord's Supper.³²

IV. The Eucharistic Prayer and Justification on Collision Course

So, is there an issue with justification? I believe there is. First, the thesis that the Lord's Supper is a making-present of the sacrifice of Christ is wrong. The biblical concept of anamnesis does not mean such a making-present, nevermind the conceptual difficulties of what is meant by this present "sacrifice of Christ." This theology of representation is a platonizing approach that ultimately destroys history and therefore is incompatible with the biblical worldview. Second, the command "do this" does not mean "say a Eucharistic Prayer." Rather, the Formula of Concord is a correct interpretation of this passage when it says that this mandate of Christ "includes the entire action or administration of this sacrament: that in a Christian assembly bread and wine are taken, consecrated, distributed, received, eaten, and drunk, and that thereby [*dabei*; better translated as "there"] the Lord's death is proclaimed" (FC SD VII, 84).

Beyond these objections, one must consider the problems with the concept of anamnetic representation when examined through the lens of justification. First, there is the idea that man receives the benefit of Christ's

command in the anaphora," Power, *Prayer*, 242. Furthermore, Enrico Mazza writes, "It is the anaphora that 'eucharistifies' the bread and wine, even though it is entirely addressed to the Father and not to the sacred gifts Even the Words of Institution are part of the anaphora and are addressed to God, not to the bread and wine. It is in our dialogue with God, a dialogue that sanctifies us because he freely enters into it, that the bread and wine become a sacrament. There is no need of directing any words to the bread and wine so that these may be sanctified and become a communion in the body and blood of Christ," *The Eucharistic Prayers of the Roman Rite* (New York: Pueblo Publishing Company, 1986), 266.

³² See the overview in Linards Jansons, "Consecration, Thanksgiving and the Missing Institution Narrative: the Nature of Eucharistic Praying in the Early Church," *Lutheran Theological Journal* 45 (2011), 34-50, and the statement by Edgar J. Brown Jr., "Why, for example should not remembrance of the event at the supper in Emmaus accomplish the same end? Why cannot a rehearsal of the words from John 6 with their powerful imagery of Jesus as the Bread of Life who gives eternal life affirm man's faith in what Jesus did both in the upper room and on Calvary? Perhaps even the miracle of the wine at Cana affords the kind of remembrance that lifts hearts and engenders dedication and devotion. The Word is active in all these, as He is in so many other occasions," in "Accedit verbum . . . , The Word or words?" 25-26.

cross and resurrection through a making-present of the “paschal mystery.” In *Against the Heavenly Prophets*, Luther explicitly rejected this approach as he encountered it in the person of Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt—albeit in a more mystical, less liturgical form—in which man through spiritual exercises made himself contemporaneous with the cross. Luther writes:

Our teaching is that bread and wine do not avail. I will go still farther. Christ on the cross and all his suffering and his death do not avail, even if, as you teach, they are “acknowledged and meditated upon” with the utmost “passion, ardor, heartfeltness.” Something else must always be there. What is it? The Word, the Word, the Word. Listen, lying spirit, the Word avails. Even if Christ were given for us and crucified a thousand times, it would all be in vain if the Word of God were absent and were not distributed and given to me with the bidding, this is for you, take what is yours.³³

It is necessary therefore, to distinguish between how forgiveness has been won and how it is distributed. Again, Luther:

Christ has achieved it on the cross, it is true. But he has not distributed or given it on the cross. He has not won it in the supper or sacrament. There he has distributed and given it through the Word, as also in the gospel, where it is preached If now I seek the forgiveness of sins, I do not run to the cross, for I will not find it given there But I will find in the sacrament or gospel the word which distributes, presents, offers, and gives to me that forgiveness which was won on the cross.³⁴

This is, of course, not just a private opinion of Luther. Paul distinguishes in 2 Corinthians 5 the reconciliation in Christ from the word of reconciliation, through which the individual receives this reconciliation. And this view has found its way also into the Lutheran Confessions: “Although the work took place on the cross and forgiveness of sins has been acquired, yet it cannot come to us in any other way than through the Word. How should we know that this took place or was to be given to us if it were not proclaimed by preaching, but the oral word?” (LC V, 31).³⁵ A

³³ Martin Luther, *Luther's Works*, American Edition, 55 vols., ed. Jaroslav Jan Pelikan, Hilton C. Oswald, and Helmut T. Lehmann (Philadelphia: Fortress Press; St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1955–1986), 40: 212–213.

³⁴ *AE* 40: 213–214

³⁵ The words are not just deictic in the Lord's Supper: “That is to say, in brief, that we go to the sacrament because there we receive a great treasure, through and in which we obtain the forgiveness of sins. Why? Because the words are there and they impart it to us! For this reason he bids me eat and drink, that it may be mine and do me good as a

theology of representation and anamnesis, if accepted by Lutherans, is a fundamental shift in the view what the gospel is—for it is no longer the promise, namely, a *verbal* communication, but rather a making-present of Christ through a liturgical action. And it changes also how man receives forgiveness of sins; it is no longer received by faith in that promise but by participation in the liturgical representation of the sacrifice of Christ.

The second problem with the concept of anamnestic representation is the idea that the Lord's Supper is somehow essentially our sacrifice. At the very least, this makes the Lord's Supper ambiguous; it is no longer a pure gospel communication. The Swedish theologian Ragnar Bring put it in stronger words: "The sacrament, then is a gift of God. If the gospel is to be expressed through the sacraments, we must wholeheartedly adopt the conception of God as giver. If there is the slightest thought that the communion is an offering to God, a sacred act in God's direction, then the gospel is rendered null and void."³⁶ The thought that somehow the Lord's Supper is an action that operates on God, making him gracious or averting his wrath, is deeply problematic. Unfortunately, even Peter Brunner proposed this. For him, Holy Communion releases the "remembering of God" and therefore

Holy Communion, too, is not a passive, static "mystery" given us for "contemplation," but it is a dynamic event, a kingdom-of-God movement in the heavens, yes, even in the heart of God. In this deeply hidden event, which penetrates all the heavens and actualizes Christ's victory on the cross over all antigodly powers, the end-time mystery of Holy Communion is completed.³⁷

However, the true point of the Lord's Supper is that God is ours, that he is reconciled to us in the death of his Son Jesus, and that is what the promise and the body and blood of Christ attached to this promise tell and give to us. To say that in this celebration we need to "present" Christ before God in order to reconcile him is to take a standpoint outside the gospel. We do not need to put anything between God and us to shield us from his wrath; rather, through the gospel we are outside of the wrath of God and inside his love and forgiveness.

sure pledge and sign—indeed, as the very gift he has provided for me against my sins, death, and all evils," LC V, 22.

³⁶ Ragnar Bring, "On the Lutheran Concept of the Sacrament," *World Lutheranism of Today: A Tribute to Anders Nygren, 15 November 1950* (Rock Island, Illinois: Augustana Book Concern, 1950), 54.

³⁷ Peter Brunner, *Worship in the Name of Jesus* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1968), 192-193.

What about our self-offering, which is taken into the sacrifice of Christ? The self-offering has its place; it happens in the *logike latreia*, the reasonable service, in which our bodies are presented as an acceptable sacrifice to God (Romans 12). But this does not happen in the Lord's Supper. It happens in the sacrificial service of Christians who serve their neighbors in works of mercy. Of course, there is a connection between the Lord's Supper and ethics. It is the same as the connection between the gospel or justification and good works. The gospel has as its consequence good works. Once forgiven, the Christian not only forgives, but loves his neighbor. The post-communion collect has it right:

We give thanks to Thee, Almighty God, that Thou hast refreshed us through this salutary gift; and we beseech Thee that of Thy mercy Thou wouldst strengthen us through the same in faith towards Thee and in fervent love toward one another; through Jesus Christ, our Lord, who liveth and reigneth with Thee and the Holy Ghost, ever one God, world without end.³⁸

V. Anabatic and Katabatic: Man's Action and God's Action

Two common terms in the field of liturgics are *anabatic* and *katabatic*. Acts in worship can be described as acts of men directed toward God or acts of God toward the congregation, similar to the earlier distinction between sacramental and sacrificial acts. Prayer is an anabatic act; it is directed toward God. Proclamation is a katabatic act; in it, God speaks to us. In discussions about the Eucharistic Prayer, Lutheran opponents of the prayer have used this distinction to maintain that the Lord's Supper is purely a katabatic act, an act from God toward man in which God is the author and man the recipient. Proponents, on the other hand, reject that there are liturgical acts that can be neatly distinguished as katabatic and anabatic. Rather, the Eucharistic Prayer is an example in which katabatic and anabatic are united: it is the church that prays to God the Father (anabatic), but it does so empowered by the Holy Spirit and in this action God acts (katabatic). There are two questions here. First, can one distinguish anabatic and katabatic acts? Second, what does it mean for justification if this distinction is denied?

Gail Ramshaw described the question of proclamation and prayer for Lutherans thus:

³⁸ *The Lutheran Hymnal* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1941), 30; cf. *Lutheran Service Book* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 2006) 201.

The Reformation stress on the word had developed into an elaborate distinction between proclamation and prayer, the first God's action and the second the assembly's action, which even dictated the posture of the presider, facing toward the people or "toward God." The Eucharistic Prayer then, with its Hebraic combination of proclamation and prayer, did not fit neatly into this distinction. Prayer as human action had been downplayed in Lutheran circles: thus the massive efforts to find appropriate Eucharistic Prayers were unsettling to those for whom the Lord's Supper is solely God's gift.³⁹

It is certainly true that those for whom the Lord's Supper is solely God's gift—gospel, and not a work—have problems with a Eucharistic Prayer. The distinction between prayer and proclamation in the Lord's Supper, or to say it differently, between God speaking to us and our speaking to God, is certainly fundamental for a Lutheran understanding of the Lord's Supper. As Luther puts it in *The Babylonian Captivity*:

Therefore these two things—mass and prayer, sacrament and work, testament and sacrifice—must not be confused; for the one comes from God to us through the ministration of the priest and demands our faith, the other proceeds from our faith to God through the priest and demands our faith, the other proceeds from our faith to God through the priest and demands his hearing. The former descends, the latter ascends. The former, therefore, does not necessarily require a worthy and godly minister, but the latter does indeed require such a one, for "God does not listen to sinners" [John 9:31].⁴⁰

This is not only Luther's view in 1520. In the Apology, Melancthon discusses the distinctions between sacrament, sacrifice, and the sacrifice of thanksgiving and confesses the same thing: "The Sacrament is a ceremony or work, in which God presents to us that which the promise connected to the ceremony offers" (Ap XXIV, 18) On the other hand, a sacrifice is a ceremony or work which we give to God so that we honor him. The eucharistic sacrifice does not give forgiveness of sins, but is done by those who already are reconciled and give thanks for the received forgiveness. Only when the "entire mass"—the ceremony with preaching of the gospel, faith, invocation and thanksgiving—is in view can it be called a daily sacrifice, as the Romanists claim when they say that the mass is a the fulfillment of Malachi 1:11. This means that even though the entire Divine Service can be called a sacrifice because there are sacrificial (anabatic) acts in it, this does not invalidate the fact that it also contains sacramental

³⁹ Ramshaw-Schmidt, "Toward Lutheran Eucharistic Prayers," 75.

⁴⁰ AE 36:56

(katabatic) acts, in which God acts and reconciles, and furthermore that these latter are to be distinguished from the former.

A different attack on the distinction between anabatic and katabatic was leveled by the German theologian Helmut Schwier. In 2000, his monograph on the reform of the agenda of the German Lutheran and United Churches was published.⁴¹ In it he documents the discussions that led to modifications of the liturgy of the Lord's Supper, inaugurated to a great extent by the chairwoman of the Theological Commission of the United Evangelical Lutheran Church, Dorothea Wendebourg, who is also well-known because of her criticism of the "Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification." One of the main points of evaluation was the emphasis on the Words of Institution as *vox Christi*, which he calls the "concentrate of katabasis" (*Konzentrat der Katabasis*).⁴² Schwier rejects the criticism as a "restitution of theological formulae with exclusively understood sequences . . . which are, on the foundation of elemental critical linguistical reflexions, no longer tenable."⁴³ Here, he follows the systematician Dietrich Ritschl, who defined the Divine Service as "the place of speaking to and about God."⁴⁴ Schwier states: "Just as the 'object' of theology is not God, but 'God-talk,' thus dogmatically the Divine Service can no longer be seen as God's service towards us while ignoring our speaking and doing."⁴⁵ If I understand Schwier here correctly, then he is saying that the fundamental reality of all theology, and also of the Divine Service, is that men speak about God. Only in that speaking *of* men then can one conceptualize of God speaking *to* men. Therefore, there is no such thing as a "pure" speech of God.

Phenomenologically, Schwier is certainly right. What one hears is men speaking. But the dogmatic question remains: is it correct to identify certain speech acts of men as God's speech acts, certain words as God's word in contrast to man's word? Lutherans say, yes! Even though God's speaking is mediated, it is nevertheless real, and therefore certain words or certain speech acts are said to come from God or to be said by God. Thus, when the gospel is preached, it is not to be received as man's word, but rather as God's word.

⁴¹ Helmut Schwier, *Die Erneuerung der Agende: Zur Entstehung und Konzeption des Evangelischen Gottesdienstbuches* (Hannover: Lutherisches Verlagshaus, 2000).

⁴² Schwier, *Die Erneuerung der Agende*, 360.

⁴³ Schwier, *Die Erneuerung der Agende*, 360.

⁴⁴ Schwier, *Die Erneuerung der Agende*, 133, citing Dietrich Ritschl, *Zur Logik der Theologie* (München: Chr. Kaiser, 1984), 130.

⁴⁵ Schwier, *Die Erneuerung der Agende*, 133.

But what is meant by that? It is not immediate authorship, obviously, since most of the time when we talk about God's word we do not mean that there is a non-human audible phenomenon we attribute to God's direct causation, like a voice from heaven. This is certainly possible and has happened, but it is rather the exception. And it is certainly not necessary to limit "word of God" to such occasions. Rather, when we say "word of God," we are saying that these words have God as their ultimate author in regard to content (the *forma* of the words). The concept "word of God" therefore presupposes inspiration: that God causes men to say or to write down his word in pure instrumentality.⁴⁶ "Pure instrumentality" means here that what is said or written is completely the word of God in human language, that there is no possibility to separate the human and the divine, the shell and the nut.⁴⁷ This identity of human and divine speech continues in the church when that which is mandated in Scripture is spoken: the law and the gospel are preached in baptism, absolution, and the Lord's Supper. Thus, there must be an identity between that which is spoken (content) and a mandate and promise from God. Whatever is spoken outside of the content of the word of God and without mandate is not the word of God. To level everything as "man's speech" is to deny the gospel as God's address to man, with catastrophic consequences. To quote Luther:

And we say that the word, the absolution, the sacrament of the human preacher is not the work of man, but the voice of God, a cleansing and operation of God, but we are only instruments and joint laborers through which God acts and works. We do not want to concede this metaphysical distinction: man preaches, the Spirit works, the servant baptizes, absolves, but God cleanses and works. In no way! But we conclude: God preaches, baptizes, absolves. "For it is not you who speak, who hears you, hears me, whatever you loose on earth" (Mt 10:20; Lk 10:16; Mt 18:18). Therefore I am certain that, when I ascend

⁴⁶ I am not discussing the question whether it is not enough to say that word of God is possible because of the incarnation, so that word of God is what comes from Christ or proclaims Christ, so that there is no need to appeal to another miracle, namely, that of inspiration. It is, of course, true, that in Christ as the enfleshed word, and in everything he says, we have the supreme exemplification of Word of God in this world. Without going into the relationship between incarnation and inspiration, to reduce the origin of the word of God to the speaking of the incarnate Son in his earthly life is problematic, because the Old Testament is not the speaking of the incarnate Son. Furthermore, if one rejects inspiration, which for the New Testament depends on the action of the exalted Christ, then what the word of God is can only be discerned by historical reconstruction from the sources that have been transmitted to us. Any identification of Scripture—or even only the New Testament—with word of God is then impossible.

⁴⁷ Pure instrumentality does not mean that God does not use the personality of the individual author, without thereby diminishing that the words are God's own.

into the pulpit, I will preach and read what is not my word, but my tongue is the pen of a ready writer (Ps 42:1). For God speaks in the holy prophets in men of God. There man and God are not to be metaphysically separated, but I should simply say: this man, prophet, apostle, true preacher speaking is the voice of God. There the hearers are to conclude: now I hear not Peter, Paul, etc., or some other man, but God is speaking, baptizing, absolving. Great God, which consolation can the weak conscience receive from a preacher, if it does not believe that these same words are the consolation of God, word of God, opinion of God?⁴⁸

Why is this distinction important? It is important because the ground of faith and the fruits of faith have to be distinguished. Not only has God accomplished salvation alone in Christ, but salvation is also mediated by him alone. It is not our thankfulness or thanksgiving that brings about or constitutes in the least the sacrament. It is not man's faithful turning toward God that brings about God's gracious action. Synergism cannot be avoided when it is stated that the Eucharistic Prayer has been elicited by the Spirit and is therefore a work of God. For then, again, since all prayer presupposes faith (just mouthing words is not a prayer), God's grace comes through the faith of the officiant or the congregation or the individual, and faith rests on faith. But faith does not make the sacrament, it *receives* the sacrament.⁴⁹ Therefore, proclamation and prayer, sacrament and sacrifice have to be distinguished in order to avoid any kind of synergism and a faith that depends on faith. This is also important to safeguard the certainty of salvation. Only when the forgiveness distributed depends solely on Christ's institution—and not in any way on the spirit-filledness of the pastor or the congregation as a precondition of a good work—can one be certain that this celebration of the sacrament is the sacrament. Whenever works are included—and, by the way, all good works are spirit-filled and done in the power of the Holy Spirit—uncertainty remains. Only the gospel as God's work can give certainty of faith and thus a comforted conscience. The Christian needs the continued assurance of forgiveness, for he is always afflicted: "Therefore we must always go back to the promise. This must sustain us in our weakness, and we must firmly believe that we are accounted righteous on account of

⁴⁸ Martin Luther, *Luthers Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe* [Schriften], 65 vols. (Weimar: H. Böhlau, 1883–1993), vol. 4: page 671.

⁴⁹ Cf. FC VII, 121. Among the rejected articles: "Likewise, when it is taught that not the words and omnipotence of Christ alone but also faith make the body of Christ present in the Holy Supper."

Christ, 'who is at the right hand of God, who intercedes for us' (Rom. 8:34)" (Ap IV, 165).⁵⁰

Thus, since the Christian never becomes the coauthor of his faith, so also the Lord's Supper as the promise—as Gospel communication—is never his act in any way, even though it produces and provokes acts of thanksgiving. And thus, it is not just a Lutheran idiosyncrasy to distinguish between proclamation and prayer, between sacrament and sacrifice, but it is at the very heart of the gospel. Finally, as always, it is good to follow the example of our Lord Jesus Christ. He gave thanks, and then he gave them the gifts with the verbal promise, distinguishing in his institution between prayer and promise. We cannot improve on his way of celebrating his supper.

VI. The Words of Institution

This leads us to the final point of our discussion. In the theology of the Eucharistic Prayer, there is a downplaying of the Words of Institution. The Words of Institution are just an appendix, a relative clause, in the narration of the acts of God in the Great Thanksgiving. Even among Roman Catholics, the exclusive consecratory power of the Words of Institution is no longer maintained. Rather, it is the Eucharistic Prayer that consecrates, as we have heard from Smolarski. This is also the position of the Anglican theologian G.D. Kilpatrick:

The Eucharist is an example of the charter-ritual pattern where the Institution Narrative is present because it is the charter story. It takes its place in the Eucharistic Prayer because it appears there in its chronological place in the saving acts of the Lord. This explanation of the presence and position of the words of Institution in the liturgy undercuts the doctrine about these words which has been dominant in Western Christendom since the fourth century AD, the doctrine that these words are present as constituting the factor of consecration and that the Eucharistic Prayer is built round this story, providing a theological and devotional structure enshrining the act of consecration.⁵¹

⁵⁰ See Theodore G. Tappert, ed. and trans., *The Book of Concord: The Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*, (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000), 129. This passage is not found in Kolb-Wengert, but see also BSLK, 193,53-194,2.

⁵¹ G.D. Kilpatrick, *The Eucharist in Bible and Liturgy*, The Moorhouse Lectures 1975 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 79–80. Cf. the statement of the Roman theologian Enrico Mazza, "This means that the explanatory words over the bread and wine [sc. 'This is my body; This is the new testament in my blood'] do not enunciate and

It is therefore not accidental that the German Lutheran theologian Hans-Christoph Schmidt-Lauber characterized Luther's liturgical reform, with its very high view of the Words of Institution and its reduction of the Canon of the Mass, as "going the wrong way of Rome to its end."⁵² But Luther did not go the way of Rome to its end. Rather, he drew his liturgical conclusions from his understanding of the Words of Institution as living and acting words, an understanding of the word of God that is deeply rooted in his study of Scripture. If one wants to connect Luther's understanding with a city in church history, it has more in common with the Milan of Ambrose than the Rome of Leo X.

The Words of Institution are giving words, not just the charter story of what we do. The Words of Institution, spoken at the eve of Christ's death, are still effective and, when spoken in the celebration of his meal, are the reason why the communicants receive Christ's body and blood. Hear Luther, as quoted in the Formula of Concord:

Here, too, if I were to say over all the bread there is, "This is the body of Christ", nothing would happen, but when we follow his institution and command in the Supper and say, "This is my body," then it is his body, not because of our speaking or our declarative word, but because of his command in which he has told us to speak and to do and has attached his own command and deed to our speaking (FC SD VII, 78).

Thus, according to the Formula of Concord, the Words of Institution are not to be omitted, because they are commanded by "do this," because they will strengthen and confirm faith—that is, they are gospel—and because they sanctify and consecrate the elements, effecting the sacramental union (FC SD VII, 80–82). It is Christ's word that does all this, not our thanksgiving. Any liturgical form that pushes the words of Christ to the side and elevates man's thanksgiving is a *de facto* exchange of subjects in the Lord's Supper. Instead of Christ, it is the church, and that means man, that at least

bring about the sacramental effect produced in the bread and wine on our altars here and now. The reason is simple: the words refer not to the bread and wine on our altars, but to the bread and wine Jesus took into his hands in the upper room two thousand years ago," *The Eucharistic Prayers of the Roman Rite* (New York: Pueblo Publishing Company, 1986), 257.

⁵² Cf. Hans-Christoph Schmidt-Lauber, "Die Eucharistie," *Handbuch der Liturgik*, 3rd edition (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003), 207–246. Against Schmidt-Lauber's position, cf. Dorothea Wendebourg "Traveled the Full Extent of Rome's Erroneous Path?" *Lutheran Forum* 44 (Winter 2010), 18–33.

partially effects the sacrament through its thanksgiving.⁵³ That is why I am less than convinced that we should use the term “Eucharist.” Of course the word itself is not the problem, but since it has been connected with a very problematic theology, I prefer to speak of the Lord’s Supper.

A final word, then, on the liturgical form. What has been called the isolation of the Words of Institution in the Lutheran service is, rather, a liturgical expression that Christ alone is the master of this meal. He speaks to us; we listen and receive. Our prayers are not on the same level as his speaking, and surely our prayers are not more important than his words, which should not be shoved into a relative clause.⁵⁴ The traditional Lutheran liturgy is not impoverished. It needs not to be enriched by the introduction of the Eucharistic Prayer, because the richness of any service is not the richness of our speaking, or our actions, or our celebration. The richness of the Divine Service is the richness of the gospel, in which our Lord Jesus Christ gives us his righteousness—the forgiveness of sins—for “where there is forgiveness of sins, there is also life and salvation.” In the Lord’s Supper, Christ gives us his riches by saying through his instrument, the pastor, “Take, eat, this is my body, given for you. Drink of it, all of you, this cup is the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you for the forgiveness of sins.” And so we believe his promise, we eat and drink his body and blood, given and shed for us. This is what the Lord has mandated. This has his promise. Thus we are justified.

⁵³ Cf. Enrico Mazza, *Eucharistic Prayers*, 26: “When read during the anaphora or, better, when narrated to the Father, the account [sc. the institution narrative] shows our fidelity to the mandate that established the Eucharist. It shows God that the community intends to do precisely that which Christ left to it as his legacy, and to do it with the same meaning and values that he associated with it. In repeating the account of God, the *ecclesia* repeats to itself the form of the celebration. It repeats it to actualize it successfully, that is, to render the reality present and active. This successful actualization is a gift for which it petitions God.” The problem here lies in the fact that the Words of Institution show what the church does, not what her Lord does, and in the relationship between the church rendering the reality present and active and its being a gift from God. This is at least a synergistic understanding of the cause of the sacramental union.

⁵⁴ Although several essays in *Through the Church the Song Goes On* (St. Louis: The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod), which was edited by the Commission on Worship of the LCMS in preparation for the publication of *Lutheran Service Book (LSB)*, were heavily slanted towards a full Eucharistic Prayer, no such prayer was included. *LSB* did not integrate the Words of Institution into a prayer, thereby maintaining liturgically the distinction between prayer and the Words of Institution; neither did the prayers include representation theology or an epiclesis in which the Holy Spirit is asked to effect the sacramental union.