



NORWEGIAN  
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

# The Eucharist as Sacrifice

**Herman Nikolai Reimers Massen**

**Supervisor**

Professor Asle Eikrem



MF Norwegian School of Theology, 2018, spring

AVH5010: Master's Thesis (60 ECTS)

Master in Theology

Word count: 35 495 words

## CONTENT

<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>03</b>
1.1: Research question	04
1.2: The use of concepts	04
1.3: Method	06
1.4: Limits of the Assignment	13
<b>2. Historical background</b>	<b>14</b>
2.1: The Sacrificial celebration of the communion	14
2.2: The role of the priest	17
2.3: The Moment of Consecration	20
2.4: The Efficacy of the Eucharist	22
<b>3. A Critique of the Eucharistic sacrifice</b>	<b>23</b>
3.1: The Communion	24
3.1: The concept of sacrifice in the mass	27
3.2: The hierarchical institution	28
3.3: The teaching on Consubstantiation	31
<b>4. The response on a mass as sacrifice</b>	<b>29</b>
4.1: The Sacrifice of the Eucharist	33
4.2: The transubstantiation	35
4.3: The scriptural reading in Trent	39
4.4: The priesthood	40
<b>5. Discussion: The Eucharistic Sacrifice</b>	<b>42</b>
5.1: The Lords' supper	43
5.2: Remembrance or repetition	51
5.3: The presence of Christ	56
5.4: The ministry of communion	73
<b>6. Summary</b>	<b>81</b>
<b>7. Outlook</b>	<b>84</b>

# 1. INTRODUCTION

I was a Lutheran student for many years in Oslo before I converted in 2009. During the last three years, I studied Catholic Theology at Beda College Seminary and the University of Angelicum in Rome. This has brought me more closely to Ecumenism, especially to the study and research of Martin Luther from both Catholic and Lutheran perspectives.

In 2016 I studied the theme of the Eucharist in Rome. We discussed the document on the Doctrine of Justification.<sup>1</sup> The teacher concluded that this document did not talk about agreement or only a common understanding. It was focused on that both sides agreed to still disagree in a much clearer way than before. How has the Lutheran understanding of the Eucharist been understood today? From my studies, I have always been aware that Catholics and Protestants are not able to celebrate communion together because they understand the Eucharist differently. I wanted to find out in what way and why Catholics and Lutherans end up with two different conclusions on this matter.

The assignment is divided in three parts with seven chapters. The first part is an introduction in chapter one. The second part presents an historical background of the Eucharistic sacrifice from the Church Fathers to the Reformation. I will consider the third chapter in the light of the Lutheran tradition and Luther's critique of the sacrifice of the mass is highlighted from a Lutheran point of view. Chapter four gives a Catholic response to Luther's critique on the Eucharist as a sacrifice. The discussion between Catholics and Lutherans on the Eucharistic sacrifice will be highlighted in chapter five. I will link it to how the Eucharist as sacrifice has been understood from a Catholic point of view. The discussion will be picked up from the Lutheran and the Catholic teaching and tradition. The two last chapters will sum up a conclusion and an outlook of the thesis. The Eucharist is still a central issue within the ecumenical reports. In the second chapter.

The final chapter deals with the ecumenical discussions and documents between both denominations and discuss what possibilities there are for Catholics and Lutherans to draw nearer to one another from a theological and practical level on the issue of the Eucharist today. The Eucharist is a sacrifice from a Catholic perspective, which is not the case in the Lutheran tradition.

---

<sup>1</sup> This document contains the final report of the ecumenical dialogue between Catholics and Protestants

## 1.1 Research question

I discovered through the documents, books and sources that the Eucharist as sacrifice has been evaluated on a much more profound level than was unknown to me. There were a lot more reflections about the Eucharist than just bombastic conclusions and logical arguments. This raised my interest to study more about Luther and how he has been understood among Catholics, especially among theologians and teachers at the Catholic universities. When I read the teaching of Luther at the university, there was much about the teaching of Luther, and less about ecumenical conversations. There was a lot of Lutheran spirituality and theology behind the Eucharist and less philosophy, which is more profound in the Catholic teachings on this theme. This topic has been discussed in the Lutheran/Roman Catholic Joint Commission.<sup>2</sup> It was from this point that I wanted to discover more and decided to write about the Eucharist. From a Catholic position, Christ instituted the Eucharist at the Last Supper with Christ saying "This *is* my body...This *is* my blood..." The Body was broken, and the blood was poured out. This points to His death on the Cross. Yet the apostles are told to "Do this in memory of Him". A memorial in Jewish tradition was not just a mental re-imagining, the rekindling of an intellectual act. It was a concrete re-presentation. It is a ritual remembrance where the person is made present again. This is why Catholics favour the Eucharistic sacrifice. Lutherans believe that Christ is present but not as a sacrifice because there is no need for Christ to be a sacrifice which was done once and for all. They are reluctant to conclude that there is a Eucharistic sacrifice or to speak of transubstantiation or the role of the priest the representation of Christ. Is there any biblical proof for that? They do not find evidence in the scripture for this. In this thesis, I discuss why Catholics and Lutherans disagree on the question of the Eucharist as a sacrifice. I will compare their different point of view. In the end, I will critical discuss their validity.

## 1.2 The use of Concepts

The term Eucharist derives from the Greek word *Eucharistia*, which literally means 'thanksgiving'. The word refers often to the celebration, thanksgiving and the worshipping which is the central part of the sacrament.<sup>3</sup> . This sacrament is given to all the members as a family in union with Christ (1.Cor 10, 17).

---

<sup>2</sup> Lutheran/Roman Catholic Joint Commission, "The Eucharist.", from 1978  
[http:// www.prounione.urbe.it/dia-int/l-rc/doc/e\\_l-rc\\_eucharist.html](http://www.prounione.urbe.it/dia-int/l-rc/doc/e_l-rc_eucharist.html). Accessed 22 March 2018.

<sup>3</sup> Gudmund Waaler, *Nattverden som offer* (Bergen: Eide Forlag, 2012),26.

This term comes from Didache where the meal is called *Eucharistia*, which means thanksgiving.<sup>4</sup> However, the Church under its twofold dimensions as sacrament and sacrifice uses various other names. These includes: Holy Communion, the Lord's Supper, the Mass, the Paschal Sacrifice, the Blessed Sacrament, the Table of the Lord, Holy of Holies, Breaking of Bread, Corpus Domini ('Lord's Body'), Bread of Heaven, Agape ('love-feast'), Eulogia ('blessing'), Synaxis ('assembly') and others.<sup>5</sup> It is also important to acknowledge that Communion (Eucharist) as a sacrament and/or re-enactment of Christ's Last Supper is not exclusively Catholic, but is an essential feature of the liturgical celebrations of many Christian communities.

This includes Roman Catholic, Eastern Orthodox, Eastern Catholics, Anglicans, Lutherans, Methodist, Reformed Calvinist, Baptist and Evangelical Churches. However, major differences exist between the Eucharistic theology and rites of many of these Christian denominations, especially on the issue of the Divine presence. While Catholics and Orthodox Christians recognise Christ as being fully present in the form of the bread and wine, and that the actual Paschal sacrifice on Calvary has been entered into, many of the other Christian denominations reject the concept of sacrifice and believe Christ to be only partially or symbolically present in the elements and the ritual action.<sup>6</sup> From this we can see that Eucharist is subject to an array of interpretations and understandings within the global Christian community. This also makes it clear why Communion became a pivotal concept for the Church: the Communion of Saints, the 'people of God', or the 'mystical body' of Christ as St Paul emphasised in his letters (1 Cor 12:12-27, Eph 5:21-32). It is a key to helping the faithful understand what the Eucharist signifies for us and what Christ 'accomplished' for the world through His life, death and resurrection two thousand years ago, bringing to fulfilment God's plan of redemption. The word Eucharist literally means «supper» and is linked to the institution of this sacrament (Matt 26.20ff). The word Eucharist is Greek which means «thanksgiving» and refers to the old prayer of giving thanks before the celebration of the sacrament

The Lutheran priest Gudmund Waaler presents different aspects to define sacrifice because he contends that we have a challenge in coming to a proper understanding of the word *sacrifice*.

---

<sup>4</sup> A.B. McGowan, *Ancient, Christian worship. Early Church Practices in Social, Historical and Theological Perspective*. (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2014), 33.

<sup>5</sup> J. Pohle, "Eucharist." *The Catholic Encyclopaedia*. Vol. 5. New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1909. <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/05572c.htm>. Accessed 15 November 2017.

<sup>6</sup> Chemnitz, M et al. "Eucharist.", from *New World Encyclopaedia* 15 December 2015. <http://www.newworldencyclopedia.org/entry/Eucharist>. Accessed April 2018.

Amongst the many possible meanings that can be given to sacrifice, Waaler draws out five primary meanings.<sup>7</sup> A common understanding is fraught with negative baggage such as “giving up what we love, destruction of a victim, doing something we’d rather not have to do. This does more to veil than unveil its proper meaning. Another understanding of sacrifice, which in general means giving up something of at least some value in order to get something of greater value. There is usually some sadness or misfortune connected with it.

Also, a certain amount of calculation in that the good being obtained is worth more than the good being given up. It can refer to innocent people that suffer from something, which is not linked to their guilt too. This understanding of sacrifice, generally negative, is pervasive and deep and inevitably, it influences all other uses of the word. Waaler states that from a general religious understanding of sacrifice, it refers to something valuable to God often in a ceremony in which an external gift is consumed or destroyed. It is first of all connected with fulfilling covenant requirements of justice and mercy. The Catholic author and theologian Kevin Barr wrote that justice promotes healing in terms of building up the world towards salvation.<sup>8</sup> A general Christian understanding of sacrifice can range from something transcendently precious as the heroic, self-giving dedication of one’s life to the service of God, all the way down to something quite small like giving up some trivial pleasure for Lent. In the Christian history, it goes back to the Scripture where Christians gathered food, money, gifts in the connection of the mass. (Acts 4:34). As Christians we are reminded that the value of the offering does not depend on its size but how much it is an aspect or expression of personal self-giving in union with Christ.

### 1.3 Method

In this chapter, I will clarify two main points. The first point is to define and explain the method I use. The understanding of this method can be defined narrowly as rules for conducting scientific work in its entirety or broader as a more comprehensive reflection of how theology is shaped between the church, its traditions, academia and the influence of contemporary culture.<sup>9</sup> Theology does not refer to only one method, but picks up methods within history, philosophy and science. Critique of texts should always be accompanied with critical reflections.

---

<sup>7</sup> Gudmund Waaler, *Nattverden som offer*, 27.

<sup>8</sup> Kevin Barr, *Let’s change the world* (Suva: Chevalier Publication, 1994), 11.

<sup>9</sup> Carl-Henric Grenholm. *Att förstå religion: metoder för teologisk forskning* (Lund: Studentlitteratur, 2006), 50.

The methodological questions are related to scientific criteria such as good reasonableness, which is to convince that there is no other better understanding of the interpretation. Secondly is consistency, which links to the connection between sources and methods. Thirdly, is coherency where there are clear arguments that are connected with an inner, logical context. The last criterion is verifiability where the results are widely available and open to new testing. Torleiv Austad, explains method as a relationship between the methodological measures that points to the research, the case that shall be investigated and the materials that are available.<sup>10</sup>

In an idealistic world, the historical books should be an objective presentation over the materials that I use. However, it is still my subjective choices, which define what kind of data is used, left behind and how the sources have been interpreted too. The readers will always find information and interpretations that do not exist in this theme. It is logical that I can never put myself into a neutral position. What would be the textual strategies? My intention behind this subject is, in a best way, to give a presentation of these sources in a way which describes the theme. I have mainly chosen to present the written sources as normative and descriptive materials. What is the reading genre? There are normative sources that deal with the content of the Eucharist. There are also descriptive sources referring to the biblical texts that describe how the situation was and how this sacrament was celebrated. Even if it is true that the arguments that I use is to learn something new in a normative way, the method that I use has other purposes too. The literature can be used for prayer and meditation to increase the faith to the people that we serve in everyday life. There is also a missionary aspect behind the ecumenical dialogues. The purpose is to be open and understand more of each other as well. In that way it is possible to discover a bigger truth.

The aim for this thesis is not only study for the sake of study but learning more and teaching what I have learnt to others in a world with many different Christian denominations. The ecumenical discussion is not to proclaim a new faith or a new Church but more to love Christ and teach people how to be at the service of others in the churches. It is also true that it is important to look at other aspects to broaden and learn from other traditions with different theories and cultures and traditions to prevent a narrow mind of issues. It is important for Christian to study for the sake of the truth, which the chaotic world needs to know.

---

<sup>10</sup> Torleiv Austad, *Tolkning av kristen tro. Metodespørsmål i systematisk teologi* (Kristiansand: Høyskoleforlaget, 2008), 50.

At the same time, if it is the truth one seeks, the facts that we find will always be our truth.<sup>11</sup> This kind of hermeneutic method deals with interpretation of the sources and searching for links and parallels between the materials and compare them. The texts are open to reflection in a creative way even if they are historical and literary texts. I will consider the reading genre as both religious and critical. At the same time, in the text genre there are implications that points the genre to a narrative genre deception.<sup>12</sup> Due to clarify the textual strategies, there is a combination where the texts are narrative. They show a historical development and it is being used to argue their position in a pragmatic dimension of reading.<sup>13</sup>

Hermeneutics has its root in Greek, which means theory of interpretation or acts of understanding. It is based upon how meaning and understanding is possible. Everything that we are able to grasp depends on cultural belonging, individual biography, our system and beliefs, our cognitive abilities and the context and the situation we are in. The root of hermeneutic refers to the doctrine of interpretation and this method has a science-based foundation within understanding and interpretation.<sup>14</sup> What kind of hermeneutic model do I see most suitable for the texts? There are six different models for text reading to see the relation between the text and the reader<sup>15</sup>. The first hermeneutic model is an objectivist position from E.D. Hirsch where I endeavor to present supporting textual evidence. The potential weakness: It disregards the fact that different readers employ different reading-strategies. Alternatively, another model is a subjectivist position from Roland Barthes. This is where my interpretation is governed by the imagination and the aesthetic preferences of me as an individual reader. This means that my understanding of a text is different from others and we can agree to disagree about truth claims. A potential weakness of this hermeneutic model is that it underestimates the determining agency of a text. The third model called reader-response criticism where I focus on how I react to the text, and on clarifying why I react as I do. It focuses on the communication and the openness between the text and me. A fourth option is to adopt a “theory of aesthetic effect” where I focus on analyzing how the text invites me to participate in the production of sense. It is the fruit of the text, which I get through feelings and passion.

---

<sup>11</sup> Asle Eikrem (Associate Professor at the Lutheran faculty of theology, Oslo) Lectures, September 2017.

<sup>12</sup> W.G Jeanrond, *Theological Hermeneutics*, Development and significance (London: SCM Press Ltd, 1994), 88.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*,91.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*



The fourth model of Ricoeur's dialectical hermeneutics is based on the insight that I cannot understand myself except through communicating with other people and they cannot understand themselves except through understanding me (1. Corinthians 14:11). For textual hermeneutics, this means that you cannot understand yourself except through a two-way communication with texts. He emphasizes that a critique of texts should always be accompanied by self-critique. One should always presuppose that the text may teach me something I do not know, and has the potential of transforming (aspects of) my worldview. Ricoeur felt that it was possible to explain a text and its meaning, even though one did not fully know the author's original intention. On one hand, he distinguished between the meaning and structure of the text, that is, the "will" and the meaning of the text I want. On the other hand, the meaning of the text as triggered by the reader's frame of reference with its linguistic universe, which can be a religious community.<sup>16</sup>

The hermeneutic key must therefore be looked for along two lines. First, I ask the extent to which the interpretation may appear to be within the meaning of the text. It triggers a text-internal criticism while at the same time subjecting the tradition to critical light. Along the second line, we find the reader and his frame of reference, which, with his readers' traditions, often has a metaposition that must be tested in relation to what can reasonably be said to be within the context of the text's horizons. The last model is to adopt a post-structuralism theory of the relation between me and the text : The meaning of a text is impossible to determine absolutely. The meaning of a text is infinite because its context is infinite. A text may be read by an infinite number of readers under an infinite number of conditions, and in relation to an infinite number of other text from which it differs. In Foucault this theoretical framework is worked out in political terms as a program of ideological critique against any attempt to determine the meaning of texts by use of authority, be it civil, economic or clerical ones. Any totalitarian control of interpretive processes such as for instance in the case of Salman Rushdie's Satanic verses, or as in Hans Küng's theological text *Infallible*?

I can sympathize a subjectivist approach and the model of Barts. The meaning of theology is to search and seek the truth with openness and curiosity. I agree with St Paul when he says that I cannot know myself before I know the other. From philosophic tradition, we are always related to the other in order to grow. Therefore, the dialectic position is important.

---

<sup>16</sup> Bakke, Kai Tore, "Tekstintern og tekstekstern hermeneutikk som basis for en vurdering av Åge Åleskjær's nye reformasjon" from *Baptist, Tidsskrift for baptistisk historie, teologi*, 2008, 13-25.

Since there is no objective understanding, it has been important for me to be conscious of my own role and to see how my own acknowledgement, attitudes and previous experiences can affect questions and interpretations to the philosophical and theological texts. My aim is to have deep relation to the materials I use. I also would like to deepen my acknowledgement to understand better the texts. In that way it will help me to show more openness to theological points of view. God is a mystery and we have only become to know certain things about God. He is still a mystery and that is why we have to continue to listen to different perspectives about the Christian faith. The truth about God can be justified not only for the ear of faith, but also for all who acknowledge history as an expression of God's reality (Romans 1, 19-20).

For the same reason, theology can be a critical science of its own subject: The church does not run any risk through open research methods. The faith is strong enough to still search for the reality the nature of God. However, I still believe there are certain normative aspects about the faith that are unchangeable such as the teaching on trinity and on how to understand the Eucharist as a sacrifice.

My metaposition may sound like absolutism but in this assignment, the aim is not to ignore other positions but to compare different positions on the Eucharist and then critically evaluate the different claims. Jenson describes systematic theology where reflections and hermeneutical considerations are normative beliefs of the church, expressed as communication, prayer and worship.<sup>17</sup> He says that we speak false about God if we were to portray him in any other way than when we tell the stories he himself has given us through Christ. Traded and traded to later generations. Theology of revelation has its goal to hand over what one has received. Theology cannot end up with total relativism and I am therefore reluctant to adopt a subjectivist position or model of these texts. I will therefore adapt an objectivistic hermeneutic model. What distinguishes the subjectivist and objectivist theories of Hirsch and Barthes, is that both theories are dialectic in nature. They are interested in the interaction between the text and me as a reader.

In terms of reading strategy, is this coloured by a foundationalism reading strategy or a coherentist reading strategy? As already mentioned, systematic theology involves many other disciplines. I would place myself closer to foundationalism where the Eucharist must be linked to the catholic teaching where the Eucharist is to be understood as a sacrifice in the discipline of sacramental theology.

---

<sup>17</sup> Robert W. Jenson, *Systematic Theology. Vol. 1. The Triune God.* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), 15f.

The main problem of foundationalism is the lack of criticism of the faith and that faith becomes irrational. My understanding of the catholic discipline on Foundation of theology is rather the opposite. The reading strategy is a sacramental and ecclesial enterprise of faith seeking understanding. It aims to equip tradition, history and me with reflective skills to explore the critical dialogue between faith and reason, Scripture and culture that form the horizon of Christian belief, which invite theological reflection on such themes as mystery, revelation, faith, sacramentality, and Church. This kind of strategy is close to coherentist reading strategy of being self-critical through a critical reading of diverse theologians from a global perspective too.

The reason why I am closer to a reading of foundationalism is that I believe that it is possible to be self-critical, without giving up fundamental truths about the Christian faith.

The second point is to describe of the role of systematic theology in this thesis. Systematic theology is a discipline within theology, which deals with dogma, ethics and moral theology. Other relevant subjects in my thesis will be fundamental theology, sacramental theology and ecumenism. Why do we need systematic theology? One of the main tasks of the systematic theology is to describe and summarize the Christian doctrine and faith in the light of our worldview today.<sup>18</sup> The methodological interventions shall facilitate the functioning of systematic theology in relation to its synthetic, critical, apologetic, creative and normative character. The contemporary-historical orientation requires that the systematics be able to interpret the pulse of the time. Good theology speaks to the present day. The present-day perspective expresses both its current relevance, but also that it must be read in the light of new recognitions and integrating human life experiences. Austad underlines the deep connection between history, social life, culture and understanding of God. He states that the systematic theology must always be said to be historical systematic theology.<sup>19</sup> Theology, history and culture were different during the time of reformation. The reflection on what is the truth had other perspectives than what I have learnt in modern time. These ongoing processes and developments are necessary to deal with and to see that there have been different ways of understanding systematic theology.<sup>20</sup> Neither systematic nor sacramental theology, which is my theme, can be presented as neutral. The unique nature of systematic theology is therefore to disclose openly its own premises, reasoning and conclusions.

---

<sup>18</sup> Jan. O. Henriksen, *Guds Virkelighet. Kristen dogmatikk* (Oslo: Luther Forlag, 1994), 17.

<sup>19</sup> Torleiv Austad, *Tolkning av kristen tro. Metodospørsmål i systematisk teologi*, 50.

<sup>20</sup> Jan. O. Henriksen, *Guds Virkelighet*, 27.

Luther can either be seen as a hero who protested against a corrupted Catholic Church or a symbol of heresy against the Holy Catholic Church. The aim is not to publish a common faith but rather use this thesis as a source for further discussions within this theme.

To think and reflect about the truth from different perspectives is central for a systematic theologian to understand, discuss and clarify. Time and history are not static but dynamic and different forms of truth emerge and disappear. This does not mean that Systematic theology is relativistic. Some interpretations are closely related to how things were.

A good systematic interpretation is the ability to explain how all the sources and materials are connected together based on facts through technology, archaeology and science.<sup>21</sup> In other words, to understand Luther and Aquinas, I must be ready to believe things that I do not believe in. There are many different presentations of the Eucharist throughout history and it is impossible to give one sole common universal true doctrine. The truth about this doctrine changes because different times regard different things as being the truth. To avoid relativism, it has to be a consensus where for instance the Church fathers and the apostolic tradition may give a better explanation than others to present the Eucharist through what has been told and understood within the tradition. In the first century of the church, the Christian dogmas were understood as standards that attached the apostolic faith to the Church's mission. The apostolic instructions to share bread and wine received a confessional response from the individual believer.

Robert W. Jenson describes the systematic theology as a proclaiming and worshipping community. In that way, the systematic theology can be described as prescriptive grammar - as the prescribing grammar and language of faith. The church speaks "Christian" and the church-anchored theology therefore becomes the semantic syntax of this language<sup>22</sup>. The most central dogmas are the established positions of the interrogation and as historically been established through ancient circles, confessions and traditions. The systematic theology happens in a context of ecclesiological and Christian context and the empirical sources that has been interpreted can used as acknowledgement as well as for discussions.

The normativity of systematic theology is linked to the message character of the Christian faith.

---

<sup>21</sup> Ibid.,30.

<sup>22</sup> Robert W. Jenson. *Systematic Theology*, 23.

The preaching and teaching tasks are exercised by the church, but these may in turn be informed by the open theological discussion that contributes to giving the positions the highest possible level of well-being. The systematics outline positions that, in dialogue with the ecclesiastical environments, can be developed to a normative character.<sup>23</sup>

Despite that there has been a development on the understanding of the truth, the systematic theology has its goal to clarify and critically evaluate truth claims where some of the truth are still valid and unchangeable today in the Catholic faith.

#### 1.4 Limits of the Assignment

This subject has many challenges. There are not a lot of primary sources that describes an early Christian Eucharist. There exist several later documents from the Christian tradition where one can find how the Eucharist has been celebrated in Didache and the Apostolic Tradition. In terms of secondary sources concerning the Eucharist as a sacrifice, there exists a huge amount of research literature, which is a challenge in itself. Due to this theme, I have chosen literature and research from this late century, which shows openness to different interpretations and understanding of different traditions. The doctrine of Justification and the ecumenical dialogues discuss all the sacraments such as baptism, confirmation, the Eucharist and the Church in general.

There exist many interesting materials to view the link between the Eucharist and the sacraments of initiation as part of the debate of looking at the Eucharist. The sources that I have used are some declarations and documents from the dialogue between Catholics and Lutherans. The sources have a goal to proclaim their point of view as normative. I have also used other literature with a character of science and religion as a narrative and descriptive reading without showing my personal opinion. These sources point to a general description of the Eucharist throughout history. The online articles combine textual strategies of argumentation to highlight both sides. The books contain a lot of information about the Eucharist in Scripture and history within the Catholic and Lutheran tradition. Authors who wish to mark their point of view, to convince their theological doctrines, influence the evaluations among the different arguments and faith. My focus will only concern the Eucharist itself within the Catholic and Lutheran tradition.

I will not give a huge presentation of the Eucharist but only refer to some biblical text in my arguments where Catholics and Lutherans have a different interpretation and approach. I will

---

<sup>23</sup> Hegertublogg.org (blogg) 16.02., 2016 <http://www.hegertublogg.org/2016/02/mellom-historie-og-dogmer-metodesprsmal.html> Accessed 16.March 2018.

refer to Luther's understanding in his catechism and *Confessio Augustana* to highlight the Lutheran position.<sup>24</sup> Therefore, I will only refer to other Lutheran theologians rather than pick up examples from the different protestant denominations, which will make this thesis too large. It is natural that I will refer to documents and dialogues, which only concerns Catholic and Lutherans as well.

## 2. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The Eucharist signifies a celebration of salvation, freedom, and eternal life that is given by Christ through his suffering, death and resurrection. The Holy Communion binds Christians together. It is a community meal and a memorial meal in the Kingdom of God. There are some differences in understanding of the Eucharist and the way it has been interpreted. This is for instance the understanding of the mass as a sacrifice, the content of the consecration, and the fruit of the sacrament. In this section, I will give an overview of the history of the Eucharist from the first century to the reformation. It will be outside the task to go into depth of all the research found on this topic. In this chapter I will give a short presentation of the history of the Eucharist based on how it has been looked at in the light of sacrifice. Even if the presence of Christ were discussed among the Latin fathers, there is little writing on the Mass as sacrifice in the fourteenth and the fifteenth century, indeed until the sixteenth century when the sacrificial character of the Eucharist became crucial.<sup>25</sup>

### 2.1 The sacrificial celebration of the communion

The Church fathers described the liturgical celebration as an *amanuensis* where you think about what God has done through his ministry and the Paschal Mystery. The word sacrifice was already used in the time of Greek-Roman tradition.<sup>26</sup> Cyprian of Alexandria (378-444), maintains sacrificial language in the sense that not just anyone could offer sacrifice at the Jewish temple or likewise in Christian sacrifice of holy food or even the body and blood of Jesus.<sup>27</sup> Assembly and gathering was a part of the Eucharistic nature, which is to be found in the apostolic constitution from the fourth century.<sup>28</sup> The celebration of the Eucharistic was for

---

<sup>24</sup> Leif Grane. *Confessio Augustana* (Frederiksberg: Forlaget ANIS, 1994), 99+192.

<sup>25</sup> Robert C. Croken, *Luther's First Front. The Eucharist as Sacrifice* (Ottawa:University of Ottawa Press,1999),114.

<sup>26</sup> Dennis E. Smith, *From Symposium to Eucharist. The Banquet in the Early Christian World* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2009),1.

<sup>27</sup> Edward J. Kilmartin, *The Eucharist in the West. History and Theology* (Collegeville Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1994), 43.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*,54.

Augustine (354-430), a memorial of the sacrifice of the cross where Christ offers himself as a priest and a victim to his Father.<sup>29</sup>

In the book *De Civitate Dei* Augustine states that we offer him as a sacrifice of humility and praise.<sup>30</sup> He is the mediator who is present on the altar where the community are brought close to the redemptive sacrifice of Christ. They offer themselves to God as the body of Christ through Christ, the high priest.<sup>31</sup> By the end of the sixth century, western theology distinguished between the historical sacrifice on the cross and the Eucharistic sacrifice where Christ in the holy sacrifice is offered for us again.<sup>32</sup> In the Middle Ages, it was essential for every Christian to receive the sacraments.<sup>33</sup> Each Mass was a propitiatory sacrifice that had a definite value before God; therefore, two Masses were worth twice as much as one.<sup>34</sup> Why was the mass one sacrifice with the cross? Origen, (184-254), taught that Christ is the chief celebrant and the host of the sacrificial meal. He is the high priest who offers the sacrifice on the cross.<sup>35</sup> Anselm of Canterbury (1033-1109) supports this teaching by saying that Christ offered his humanity to his divinity as a sacrificial act which happened in the Eucharist.<sup>36</sup> Thomas Aquinas OP (1225 –1274) distinguished between oblation and sacrifice (ST II:II, q.85 a.3 ad.3): A sacrifice, properly speaking, requires that something be done to the thing which is offered to God and it is truly a sacrifice because a man does something sacred (*facit sacrum*). An oblation is properly the offering of something to God even if nothing can be done.<sup>37</sup> Hence, not every sacrifice is an oblation, but conversely. For the philosopher and the theologian John Scotus (1265-1308), the sacrifice of the mass is offered indirectly by Christ and directly by the Church<sup>38</sup>. According to Aquinas, the Sacrifice that is offered in the Eucharist is Christ's own sacrifice which he made only once on Calvary for the salvation of the world<sup>39</sup>. There is but one victim, namely that which Christ offered.

This latter sacrifice is the pattern of the former. Just as what is offered everywhere is one body, and not many bodies. In the same way, there is only one sacrifice for Thomas. The

---

<sup>29</sup> Ibid.,23.

<sup>30</sup> Ibid.,24.

<sup>31</sup> Ibid.,23.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid.,253.

<sup>33</sup> Asle Eikrem, *God as Sacrificial Love* (London: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc,2018),10.

<sup>34</sup> Michael Davies. *A short History of the Roman Mass* (Rockford, IL: Tan Books, 1997),185f.

<sup>35</sup> Asle Eikrem, *God as Sacrificial Love*, 12.

<sup>36</sup> Ibid.,23.

<sup>37</sup> Ibid.,25.

<sup>38</sup> Edward J. Kilmartin, *The Eucharist in the West*, 250.

<sup>39</sup> Ibid,187.

victim that was present on Calvary is substantially present at the altar.<sup>40</sup> For Thomas's philosophical point of view, that means that we assent to the presence of the substance of the body of Christ because we accept the words of Christ "this is my body." (Luke 22:19).

He talks about a substantial presence of the very same victim where the accidents are the bread and wine. This goes back to Beranger's initiation of the sacramental presence of Christ and became later the doctrine of transubstantiation.<sup>41</sup> The altar is then representative of the cross itself upon which Christ was sacrificed in his proper species (ST III, q.83, a 1, ad 2). The bread and wine is the matter of the sacrament and the form is the words spoken by the priest (*quasi ex persona Christi*).<sup>42</sup> This was the key for the unity of the Mass and the cross. There was a distinction between the teaching of Christ, sacrificed once and for all, and the sacrificial act of Christ during the celebration. Cyprian neither employs the concept of the actual presence of the once-for-all historical sacrifice of the cross nor gives a systematic theology on the sacrifice.<sup>43</sup>

The teaching of Aquinas is that it is not to be seen as Christ suffering each time the mass is celebrated because he is impassable in his glorified state in heaven. He recognizes that the consecration of the gifts signifies in a sacramental way Christ's once-for-all sacrifice of the cross.<sup>44</sup> For Aquinas, the mass gives an external sign of the cross. The reality of the cross is present during the mass. The sign do not remind us what happened in the past. They signify and make the victim present through signs and gestures. The body of Christ on the altar is his glorified body<sup>45</sup>. We do not hurt Christ again as mentioned above. There is a principle that Thomas applies that Jesus is present on the altar as he is now in his own state, which means glorified, resurrected and ascended<sup>46</sup>. This is why the body is not just the body and divinity. This includes also the blood and soul. Everything that is united to the body in heaven is also united in his presence on the altar.<sup>47</sup> It makes present the very power of the Cross too. It is therefore an organic link between the historical sacrifice on the cross and the Eucharistic sacrifice.<sup>48</sup>

---

<sup>40</sup> Ibid.,253.

<sup>41</sup> Ibid.,97.

<sup>42</sup> Ibid.,249.

<sup>43</sup> Ibid,10.

<sup>44</sup> Asle Eikem, *God as Sacrificial Love*, 27.

<sup>45</sup> Edward J. Kilmartin, *The Eucharist in the West*, 120.

<sup>46</sup> Asle Eikrem, *God as Sacrificial Love*, 27.

<sup>47</sup> Edward J. Kilmartin, *The Eucharist in the West*, 253.

<sup>48</sup> Ibid.,250.



Before, this power was hidden in the cross, and now it is hidden in the sacred species. As Aquinas sees it, we need the faith to see and realize this<sup>49</sup>. The concept of representation links the sacrifice of the mass to the sacrifice of the cross. The Eucharist is called a sacrifice insofar as it represents the very passion of Christ (III, q 73 a, 1. ad3). He insists on the mass being memorial in nature thus serving the uniqueness of the sacrifice of the cross. Jesus's human acts are the instruments of divine action. His actions are temporary so the acts of suffering on the cross that happened once.<sup>50</sup> Therefore, the cross cannot be an eternal event since it was a human event that occurred in human history. The human acts of Jesus communicate the divine power and the instrument of his humanity serves as a filter or a living trace of itself in the act. The Eucharist is for Thomas both a sacrament and a sacrifice.<sup>51</sup> Dom Anscar Vonier OSB (1906-1938), interpreted the teaching of Aquinas on his Eucharistic theology of the sacrifice.<sup>52</sup> He states that the content of the sacraments is known through the signs that constitute the sacrament, and these signs signify the sacrifice. The words work sacramentally according to the power of signification (ST III, q 78 a4ad3). The Church is also offering because every valid mass gives fruits, which have an influence on the graces that flows from the sacrifice on the cross.

## 2.2 The role of the priest

In order to celebrate the manifestation of the mystery, the gifts were presented on the altar by a bishop or a priest who represented Christ as priest and victim (*in persona Christi*). The Eucharistic prayer supports that the sacrificial act of the Church was made in union with the Church and Christ as victim and priest.<sup>53</sup>

How does the priest represent Christ at Mass? Irenus of Lyon, (125-203), claims that the one who presides over the Church also presides at the Eucharist. Cyprian states that Christ the High Priest who was related to the new sacrificial act on the part of the Church. He also states that only a priest may celebrate the Eucharist. That is because the last supper serves as the model for the Eucharist. A priest was needed because he is conformed to Christ in a special way.<sup>54</sup> For Cyprian, the priest can initiate the role of Christ because he has received a special outpouring of the spirit of Christ.

---

<sup>49</sup> Ibid.,259.

<sup>50</sup> Ibid.,252.

<sup>51</sup> Ibid.

<sup>52</sup> Ibid.,252.

<sup>53</sup> Ibid.,4.

<sup>54</sup> A.B.Mcgowan, *Ancient, Christian worship*, 54.

The action of the priest becomes therefore the action of Christ. The priest is a “vicar of Christ” and the power of Christ takes action in the mass. The Latin Father Ambrose (340-397) had a different approach where Christ is the high priest in the Eucharistic sacrifice.<sup>55</sup> The members partake in his priestly life where his body is offered as priest. Ambrose continues to teach that the *anamnesis* is to recall the Paschal Mystery of Christ as priest and king is offered to the Christians. They are at the same time active participants of the Eucharistic sacrifice.<sup>56</sup> To be part of this royal and priestly sacrificial offering is something everybody is invited to receive. The priest had a central role where he said all the prayers and readings. He represented Christ on the altar as all his words, actions and gestures symbolized the mystery of Christ death and resurrection. The priest on behalf of the people offered the mass as a sacrifice to God. This led to the celebration of private Masses<sup>57</sup>.

Sicard of Cremonia (1150-1215), distinguished between the spiritual power exercised by Christ at the last supper and the relation to the words of Christ spoken by the priest in the Mass.<sup>58</sup> The high priest is acting through the human instruments, that is, the bishop or a priest. Later in the twelfth century, it became a common practise that the priest presided the Eucharist in communion with the Church. The Irish theologian and philosopher John Scotus (1265-1308), claims that the priest represents the Church in the sacrificial offering and has the authority to present Christ, the victim of the cross, through the changing of the gifts in the name of the Church. This was how Scotus developed a systematic theology of the Eucharistic sacrifice.<sup>59</sup> Cardinal Cajetan (1468-1534), was a follower of Aquinas. He says that it is not the content of the sacrament that makes it a sacrifice but the role of the priest who offers the body and blood.<sup>60</sup> The Eucharistic sacrifice is being mentioned with “Receive the power of offering sacrifice in the Church.”<sup>61</sup> The priest spoke in the person of Christ (In persona Christi). Aquinas had a strong influence during the thirteenth century on his teaching of the Eucharist as a sacrifice, which has been accepted by the Roman Magisterium today.<sup>62</sup> According to Aquinas, it is not anyone who has the authority to say, "this is my body" and then bread becomes the body (Q 82, art 1).

---

<sup>55</sup> Ibid.

<sup>56</sup> Ibid.,19.

<sup>57</sup> Together At One Altar. "The Middle Ages.", form 2011

<https://www.togetheratonealtar.catholic.edu.au/explore/dspcontent.cfm?loadref=64i>. Accessed March 2018.

<sup>58</sup> Edward J. Kilmartin, *The Eucharist in the West*, 130.

<sup>59</sup> Ibid.,160.

<sup>60</sup> Ibid.,164.

<sup>61</sup> Ibid., 129.

<sup>62</sup> Ibid.,247.

For Aquinas, there is a change in the priest whereby he becomes an effective instrument of Christ and representative of the church especially in the Eucharist.<sup>63</sup> He writes that character is all about having an ontological relation to Christ. To understand the role of the priest and the sacraments, one must understand Christ's mode of acting in his humanity.

The priest can perform the acts of God because Christ's divinity and humanity acts through him. For Aquinas, the priest has an ontological mark that is a disposition to be moved by Christ and to perform acts of transmitting saving power.

The priest represents the whole Church where Christ is the head and the action of Christ and the priest become one.<sup>64</sup> The dignity given to the priest at ordination is a new form of subordination to Christ. The minister must follow Christ's intention and the Church's intention to be Christ in act. The priest speaks in first person because Christ is the principle cause and the instrumental cause through whom Christ is speaking, working and affecting the reality of the presence of the victim. Thomas claims that the minister must receive communion in order to consummate the sacrifice (ST III, q 82, a 4). Consuming the offering is a sign of the priest's interior offering. He offers himself to God by taking part of the victim that was offered wholly to God. The victim will enter into the body of the priest. This shows that the priest is one with the victim making his own life suffering. According to Aquinas, this completes the sacrifice.

The people offer their sacrifices with the priest and his communion completes the sacrifice.<sup>65</sup> He represents Christ and his reception of communion represents perfect communion with Christ. The act of the priest manifests the source that is Christ and unity to Christ.<sup>66</sup> The priest represents the whole Church because the Eucharist is the sacrament of the universal Church too (ST III, q 2, a.2ad2). The question was if the priest is the instrumental cause, or does God parallel the priest's words. Another question was about which part of the words effects the change. Some argue that one must have the introductory words such as "on the night before" to have a change in the gifts. Thomas argued by saying they should be said, but they are not necessary for the transformation because not every rite uses them. Aquinas stated that the priest's gesture, the gifts on the altar and the prayers over the elements effects the very flesh and blood of the one represented. By the celebration of the passion, God makes the victim present. The words of the priest are effective because he is an instrument of the one high priest. In the human words of Jesus, there is a divine word acting.

---

<sup>63</sup> Ibid.,248.

<sup>64</sup> Ibid.,249.

<sup>65</sup> Ibid.

<sup>66</sup> Ibid.,248.

### 2.3 The moment of consecration

The teaching of the Church fathers gave a basic teaching on the Eucharistic elements due to the gifts of receiving the body and blood of Christ.<sup>67</sup> Ireneus specifies that the word of prayer is his body and blood. This happens through the ritual offering by saying; "Now we make offerings to him."<sup>68</sup> He has also a prayer of consecration centered in the institutional narrative because he attributes the coming of Christ as flesh and blood over the altar through the prayer, which is made possible through the power of the one who utters it.<sup>69</sup> Cyprian favoured that the bread and wine are the true body and blood of Christ as well. Ambrose, the bishop of Milan (337-397), supports the earlier Church fathers theology on presence of Christ but on the sacrificial identity of the Eucharist. He ignores the Antiochene tradition from the Greek Fathers of the fourth-century saying: "*And having taken the bread, having pronounced the blessing, he broke it and gave it to them, and he said: This is my body which is for you. Do this in memory of me.*"<sup>70</sup> Jesus's identification of the bread and wine as his body and blood was essential to this form of the cultic tradition<sup>71</sup>.

Why are the gifts on the altar changed by the words of institution? The presbyter Sedulius (425-450) goes back to the event when Christ consecrated the gifts as a sacrificial act and dedication of Christ himself. The Church leader and scholar St Caesarius of Arles (470-542), describes this consecration as a divine sacrifice, expressed from the human and divine person of Christ through his words, gestures and sacrificial action of the Eucharistic gifts.<sup>72</sup> The deacon Florus of Lyons (810-860), says that the sacrificial offering takes place through the priest in the name of the Church and is related to the bread and wine.<sup>73</sup> It is a real offering of the change of the gifts where Christ is present. The same sacrifice that was offered before remains also on the altar. Ambrose spoke of a precise moment of consecration. The words of Christ have a different function than the other prayers of the liturgy. He explained which words are those of Christ used by the priest. He recites an account of the last supper and the words of institution. He then speaks of the words of the evangelist and the evangelist cites the word of Jesus.

---

<sup>67</sup> Ibid.,108.

<sup>68</sup> Ibid.

<sup>69</sup> A.B.Mcgowan, *Ancient, Christian worship*, 45.

<sup>70</sup> Edward J. Kilmartin, *The Eucharist in the West*, 18.

<sup>71</sup> Asle Eikrem, *God as Sacrificial Love*, 16.

<sup>72</sup> Edward J. Kilmartin, *The Eucharist in the West*, 75.

<sup>73</sup> Ibid.,96.

Before the phrase “take and drink” the evangelist speaks and then Jesus speaks. He makes the same distinction with the bread. Ambrose continues to teach that before the consecration, there is bread but these are not yet the words of Christ. Jesus’s words must be added for the bread to become the body. Ambrose identifies the moment within the prayer that effects the change of the gifts.

Pope Innocent III (1161-1216), supported the teaching of Ambrose. He adds that it is greater to create from nothing than to change something that already exists.<sup>74</sup> The High Scholastic Eucharistic theology did not take for granted to combine the unity between consecration of the gifts and the sacrificial dimension of the Eucharist. The distinction between the consecrations of the gifts by the priest acting in persona Christi from the offering of the Eucharistic sacrifice in the name of the Church was accepted at this time. The consecration of the gifts was an image of the past historical sacrifice of Christ. The consecration serves not only to recall that sacrifice which could no longer be repeated but also to promote devotion.<sup>75</sup> In this way, it led to a separation between the sacraments itself and its sacrificial aspect which is developed through Scotus. He holds that the consecration takes place in the person of Christ.<sup>76</sup> The Eucharistic sacrifice is explained as an offering of the change of the gifts by the presider. Furthermore, Scotus says that Christ is offered in the light of the change of the gifts, which truly becomes the body and blood of Christ<sup>77</sup>. It is a kind of an explanation of how God works in the manifestation of the transformation of the gifts which enriches the words of transformation. The church offers in the light of recalling (amanuensis) of what Christ once did on the cross and which is applied to the merit of the Church.

Thomas Aquinas will not argue against those who say that it is the epiclesis alone that effects the change, but he is aware of the link between the epiclesis and the transformation of the gifts. . Thomas wanted to say, despite the diversity of the rites, there must be a common core that signifies the change of the gifts. However, this is not sufficient for him because all the rites he knows have epiclesis before the consecration. The various last supper accounts do not refer to an epiclesis. He says that Jesus could have instituted the Eucharist without saying a word but he is showing how to bring about the Eucharist (ST III q 78 a 2). He continues to say that the core of the prayer effects what is signifies.

---

<sup>74</sup> Edward J. Kilmartin, *The Eucharist in the West*, 133.

<sup>75</sup> Ibid.

<sup>76</sup> Ibid.,160.

<sup>77</sup> Ibid.

The mass is not just a faint copy of the passion, it is also the reality.<sup>78</sup> The separate consecration of the bread and wine are images of the death of Jesus who is a separation of body and blood. (ST III, q 80, a. 12, ad3).

#### 2.4 The efficacy of the sacrament

The Eucharist was a manifestation of the unity of the members of the Church and Christ as he offers his body and blood in the Eucharist. Being in the unity of Christ and the Church is the essence of the Church's sacrifice. Christ is the sacrament himself who offers himself to the community every time they receive the communion. Augustine underlines that the unity with Christ and the Church is based on love which is the nature of Christ as sacrifice. He points out that every act of love is the Christian sacrifice.<sup>79</sup> Therefore, the content of this sacrament is Christ and the Church and the Eucharistic food signify the presence of the whole Christ body and blood. He leans on the Scripture as well due to that we as many members partake of the one bread (1 Cor 10:17). The bread is for Augustine the image of the whole Christ and through this sacrament, Christians get a closer relationship to Christ. They participate more deeply as followers of him towards salvation<sup>80</sup>. Christ takes the initiative for us to encounter him by drawing us closer to him.<sup>81</sup> Eucharistic elements are the sacrament of the body. Christ is by his nature a true sacrament, which represents the unity of Christ and the Church as Eucharistic food.<sup>82</sup>

The theology of Pope Gelasius 1, (492-496), on the Eucharist as a sacrifice is similar to the approach of Augustine with some differences.<sup>83</sup> The unity of the church is not the fruit of the communion, but rather a presupposition to achieve it. He underlines the importance of integration with the rest of the faithful and the reception of the holy body and blood. First, according to Pope Gelasius, it is not only a personal relationship to Christ, but you receive his sacrifice in communion with Christ and the faithful. Second, the Eucharist has an approach of salvation where baptism and the Eucharist are necessary for salvation (John 3:5+6;53). Gelasius understands this text as a unity and a relationship between Christ and the people. He states that without the Eucharist, they cannot have life in themselves.<sup>84</sup>

---

<sup>78</sup> Asle Eikrem, *God as Sacrificial Love*, 26.

<sup>79</sup> Asle Eikrem, *God as Sacrificial Love*, 24.

<sup>80</sup> *Ibid.*, 15.

<sup>81</sup> Edward J. Kilmartin, *The Eucharist in the West*, 25.

<sup>82</sup> *Ibid.*, 23.

<sup>83</sup> *Ibid.*, 33.

<sup>84</sup> *Ibid.*, 33.

The teaching on Christ as “newly” offered was supported by Pope Gregory and it became important proof that the sacrifice of Christ is repeated each Mass. He reflects on this Roman theology of the Eucharist.<sup>85</sup>

Cajetan emphasised the priest’s instrumental action and power account for the unity of the sacrifice of the cross and of the mass.<sup>86</sup> He referred to the mass as a sacrifice and efficacious because it is united to Calvary, which cannot be separated. The victim is the same and the same priest who offers the sacrifice on the cross, offers it in the mass too. The principle priest and the instrument have one action and one effect. Cajetan’s view on this unity is the radical subordination of the priest’s act to the act of Christ. Christ is truly the main celebrant, and the mass becomes the same offering laid down on the cross. Scotus thought that the priest was offering the Church’s sacrifice to God. Christ is not the immediate offer of the sacrifice for Scotus. Cajetan grounds the sacrificial character of the mass with the identity of the victim of once-for-all sacrifice on the cross.<sup>87</sup> The whole sacramental economy in the life of Jesus culminates in the Eucharist. In this way the consecration is, for Aquinas, crucial for the unity of the sacrifice.<sup>88</sup> He used the word image to speak about the deep unity or correspondence between the cross and the mass.<sup>89</sup> It is called a sacrifice because it is an image of the sacrifice of Christ on the cross and because it conveys the effects fruits or the passion of the lord (ST III, q 83 a.1).

### **3. A CRITIQUE OF THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE**

Martin Luther, (1483-1546), writes that the sacrament is a gift from God and the Eucharist has a central part in the liturgy.<sup>90</sup> Luther’s Eucharistic theology was partly the product of late medieval Catholic nominalist theology. Luther supports the importance of the signification of this sacrament. He favors the Eucharistic theology of Augustine where the celebration of the Eucharist is a memorial of the sacrifice of the cross and a sign of praise. He also agrees with Aquinas and the church fathers on the doctrine of the real presence, even if he emphasized the meaning in the light of Scripture rather than metaphysics and philosophical perspectives. The Eucharistic concept of sacrifice is therefore difficult for Luther to accept since there is no direct evidence from the Bible.

---

<sup>85</sup> Edward J. Kilmartin, *The Eucharist in the West*, 31.

<sup>86</sup> Edward J. Kilmartin, *The Eucharist in the West*, 164.

<sup>87</sup> Ibid.

<sup>88</sup> Ibid., 248f.

<sup>89</sup> Edward J. Kilmartin, *The Eucharist in the West*, 251.

<sup>90</sup> Ibid., 188.

Still, he had a strong reaction based on how the mass was being abused in the local churches at his time. Consequently, the mass was devoutly assured of the remission of sins.

Benefits were used if one often attended mass, one paid to approach closer to salvation and the clergy were paid to celebrate the number of masses.<sup>91</sup> What is the meaning of the sign and the elements of bread and wine as the body and blood of Christ and is it in relation to the promise of the forgiveness of sin? Luther's reaction was that the mass was a sign of work rather than faith.

In dealing with such questions, I will focus his theology of the Eucharist as a sacrifice and what its relation with his doctrine of faith and works. It will be an analysis of Luther's interpretation of the sacrificial dimension of the Eucharist and the exercise of the priesthood. It underlines the principle reasons for Luther's opposition to the Mass as a sacrifice. In order to understand the Lutheran sacramental theology, it is necessary to understand Martin Luther's Eucharistic doctrine.

### 3.1 The Communion

Luther acknowledged that his view on Eucharist was widely embraced by the early Church Fathers. His definition of the Eucharist is adapted from the Antiochene version at the time from the Church fathers. The Eucharist was a meal instituted by Jesus the night before he was crucified saying "*Take and eat of it, all of you, this is the cup of the new and eternal testament in my blood, which is poured out for you and for many for the forgiveness of sins.*"<sup>92</sup>

According to Luther, faith is the source of the sacrament.<sup>93</sup> The Holy Communion is for Luther not an atoning sacrifice but an offer from Christ who invites the faithful to the forgiveness of sins.<sup>94</sup> By accepting his offer, one believes that the Word of God is true. The one, who rejects the communion, will also reject the faith because he has nothing.

It is possible to become holy without communion but not without the Word which is the gospel due to the word and the sign as the matter and form in the Eucharist.<sup>95</sup> The Communion would therefore most benefit believers in the means of grace and faith rather than reason. Consequently, all persons were cordially invited to the table if they truly and earnestly repented their sins.

---

<sup>91</sup> Robert C. Croken, *Luther's First Front. The Eucharist as Sacrifice*, 109f.

<sup>92</sup> Martin Luther, "A Treatise on the New Testament, that is, the Holy Mass," in *Word and Sacrament*, ed. I.E.T. Bachmann (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 35, 1960), 82.

<sup>93</sup> Leif Grane, *Confessio Augustana*, 104.

<sup>94</sup> F.W.Bugge,ed., *Luthers Store Katekisme*, (Gjøvik: Mariendals Boktrykkeri,1952), 194.

<sup>95</sup> Paul Althaus, *The Theology of Martin Luther* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966), 346.



This implies a new life made possible to them by God through Jesus Christ. Luther wrote that the fruit of receiving communion is - namely, the promise of forgiveness of the past sins, the present strengthening and refreshing of the faith.<sup>96</sup>

The key of Luther's critique is his revolutionary principle that one is saved by faith alone, not works.<sup>97</sup> Good works do not merit grace. Christ alone merits grace for us. The good works manifest that grace is already given, but do they not merit it. Good works are signs of grace, not ways to obtain grace. Luther further states that the word of Christ in the Eucharist is the gospel which only points to the faith and not works.<sup>98</sup> The liturgy presents words and symbols that point to the Passion and we receive that message with trust. We should do nothing except believe. To give God a sacrifice other than a sacrifice of praise would be an attempt to merit grace, which contradicts Paul's teaching as understood by Luther. It seems evident that Luther understood the communion as a bridge towards the justification by faith. The Eucharist points to repentance and change of life. He consistently uses signs, faith and grace as a reference frame in the theological reflection around the Eucharist. He assumes that instrumental causality does not work. He further writes that Christ has instituted the Eucharist in his memory instead of a sacrifice (1.Corinthians 11:24).

Hence, the Eucharist must involve a passive reception of the sign of Jesus's Passion, and that reception occurs by faith alone. Our works are the acts of God within us that make them more pleasing to him. Luther states that work cannot achieve anything, only faith alone and the words of Christ who is the Lord and life of all works.<sup>99</sup> Christ alone is therefore, the only sacrifice. He continues to say that Christ did not offer himself to God or perform good works on behalf of others, but gave his testament to his disciples and completed his mission.

Therefore, it is not necessary to offer the mass as sacrifice because the sacrament is being received and not offered at the same time.<sup>100</sup> Christ himself is the sacrament and that is why the mass is nothing more than a testament.<sup>101</sup> The objective presence of Christ cannot be seen as a static being, but as a dynamic presence of the fact that the living Christ himself acts through his grace.<sup>102</sup>

---

<sup>96</sup> Martin Luther, *Luthers Store Katekisme*, 191-192.

<sup>97</sup> Martin Luther, "The Misuse of the Mass," in *Word and Sacrament II*, ed. A.R. Wentz (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 36, 1936), 169.

<sup>98</sup> Paul Althaus, *The Theology of Martin Luther*, 348.

<sup>99</sup> Martin Luther, "The Babylonian Captivity of the Church," in *Word and Sacrament II*, ed. A.R. Wentz (Philadelphia, Fortress Press, 36, 1936), 47.

<sup>100</sup> *Ibid.*, 52.

<sup>101</sup> Martin Luther, "A Treatise on the New Testament, that is, the Holy Mass", 87.

<sup>102</sup> Paul Althaus, *The Theology of Martin Luther*, 202.

Luther wrote that a person, who seeks grace and comfort, should receive the sacrament<sup>103</sup>. Communion becomes necessary for everybody because human beings depend on God alone and his grace. For this reason, Luther emphasizes the communion both as a "repentant" and "affirmative" grace. Luther describes communion as "the great channel" for the experience of God's grace.<sup>104</sup> He says that the mass is a symbol of the cross and a memory of what Christ did for us. He interprets the term "*anamnesis*" in the more modern sense of "recollection" instead of making present the saving power of God. Luther appreciates the symbolism of the mass and Christ's true presence and offering of self.

Another key to understand the Lutheran Eucharistic liturgy was the juridical category of a testament.<sup>105</sup> A testament involves a promise and an inheritance that a dying person leaves us. Jesus leaves us with a promise to receive the forgiveness of sins through the Cross. This is our inheritance that Jesus promises to leave us through his death.

Christ is the chief who offers, gives blessing and who is the witness of the sacrament (John 4). There is nothing to sacrifice in the mass and the Eucharist is instituted by God alone which is documented in the Holy Scriptures.<sup>106</sup> Those who follow him must not forget that the fruit of the Eucharist is the faith, the word of God's promises and the testament.<sup>107</sup> We receive this inheritance by faith. The Last Supper is thus essentially an event of the Word. It is a promise signified through the prayers of the Last Supper celebration and through material things, namely, bread and wine. The Christian celebration of the Last Supper recalls this promise: Luther interprets memorial through the confession that the Church makes of Christ's promise.<sup>108</sup> "Do this in the remembrance of me" refers for Luther to the promise of his own body and blood (Luke 22:19).

The Eucharistic liturgy elicits faith. For this reason, the Eucharistic liturgy does not benefit those who are not present. It is not offered for others, for faith is a personal act made in response to the Promise that is remembered by those who participate in the liturgy<sup>109</sup>. Luther cuts off the Last Supper from the Paschal Meal. He does not reduce memorial to a mere act of calling to mind past saving events. He refocuses the Eucharistic doctrine on the power of God's word.

---

<sup>103</sup> Martin Luther, *Luthers Store Katekisme*, 201.

<sup>104</sup> Martin Luther, "The Misuse of the Mass", 190.

<sup>105</sup> Martin Luther, "The Babylonian Captivity of the Church", 38.

<sup>106</sup> Martin Luther, "The Misuse of the Mass", 148.

<sup>107</sup> Paul Althaus, *The Theology of Martin Luther* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966), 348.

<sup>108</sup> Leif Grane, *Confessio Augustana*, 107.

<sup>109</sup> *Ibid.*, 104.

The priest in the Words of Institution pronounces the promise of God. The word is active today as it addresses to the sinner directly.<sup>110</sup> The slaughtered lamb has only a place insofar as the signs point to the true lamb. Other things such as vestments, candles, clothing and gestures are just work of men. The mass is not to be transformed as a sacrifice but the identity is to distribute the sacrament to the faithful rather being robbed by the clergy.<sup>111</sup> He often refers to the letters of St Paul to claim that the mass has never been understood as a sacrifice but as faith (Romans 4). The identity of the mass is the memory of what Christ did on the cross. The clergy was identified as abusers who only tried to save themselves through private masses and good works. Luther seems to focus more on communion than the sacrifice.<sup>112</sup> Luther uses the term “*significance*” of the sacrament, which is the effect, based on the fellowship and Christ’s members in communion. He did not see any link between the Scripture and the celebration of the mass as sacrifice.

### 3.2 The concept of sacrifice in the mass

Luther uses the New Testament when he speaks about sacrifice. What kind of sacrifice is Luther talking about? Luther looks at a sacrifice as something that must be killed. This makes a memorial sacrifice impossible.<sup>113</sup> Christ is not the same lamb of sacrifice as it is to be repeated in the Catholic Mass. The theologian defender of Luther and of the Augsburg Confession, Philip Melancthon, wrote that the Eucharistic sacrifice must not be interpreted as reconciliation, but rather an expression of humility and gratitude for having received the forgiveness of sins.<sup>114</sup> When Christ offers himself for the sake of our sins is what Luther calls an atoning sacrifice.<sup>115</sup> This points to a sacrifice that has already been done once and for all (Heb.10:4). He uses again the scripture to justify his arguments. The sacrifice of Christ was done once and for all as a sacrificial victim who is offered to conciliate the wrath of God (Rom 8:3). Luther also refers to the letters of Saint Paul where one gives nothing to Christ, but only receives from him in order to nourish and strengthen the faith (1 Corinthians 11). According to Melancthon, Scripture does not talk about any sacrifice other than Christ.

---

<sup>110</sup> Martin Luther, "A Treatise on the New Testament, that is, the Holy Mass", 86.

<sup>111</sup> Gudmund Waaler, *Nattverden som offer* (Bergen: Eide Forlag, 2012),78.

<sup>112</sup> Leif Grane, *Confessio Augustana*, 109.

<sup>113</sup> Gudmund Waaler, *Nattverden som offer*, 69.

<sup>114</sup> Philip Melancthon, "Apology of the Augsburg Confession: The Book of Concord," in *The Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*, ed R. Kolb and T.J.Wengert (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000), 261.

<sup>115</sup> *Ibid.*,262.

He explains that the rest of the Eucharistic sacrifices are called sacrifices of praise (1Pet 2:5) which include grace, prayer, preaching of the gospel, confession, faith, blessing, mercy, and thanksgiving.<sup>116</sup> The gifts, which are given, are lifted up to praise and give thanks (1 Tim 4.4). God is the spirit and the one who will be worshipped (John 4:23).

Luther reads this passage as a condemnation the opinion about *ex opere operato* when it rejects sacrificial victims.<sup>117</sup> He refers to the Old Testament too where God does not desire any sacrifice or offering (Palm 40+51). The collection of food, money and gifts has only one purpose that is thanksgiving with grace, mercy and faith.<sup>118</sup>

They thanked God, blessed with the word of God the food that had been gathered in the same manner Christ used during the Lord's Supper. What has being offered to God is not the sacrament, but only the gifts that had been distributed.<sup>119</sup> There is no offering because it is not about what one offers Christ, but what Christ offers us. This mass is according to Luther a sacrament and a testament, which cannot refer to be a sacrifice.<sup>120</sup>

### 3.3 The hierarchal institution

Luther is quite clear when he talks about the role of priest in relation to sacrifice. He describes the priests as papist who make a sacrifice and commercial business to forgive sins.<sup>121</sup>

According to Luther, the priest is an ordinary person and what comes out of him is not a sacrament of sacrifice because he has nothing more or better in the Eucharist than the laity.

Luther refuses the notion that the priest or the Church can be Christ's instruments whereby the Sacrifice of the Cross is made present today. That is the reason why Luther is against private masses because the mass will point to a celebration of the priests own sake and good works.<sup>122</sup> He rejects any scholastic notion of priestly instrumental power being a means whereby God effects the transformation of the gifts on the altar. When the priest elevates the consecrated host and cup, he does not act in persons Christi and he does not say a word about the sacrifice.

---

<sup>116</sup> Ibid.,262.

<sup>117</sup> Ibid.,263.

<sup>118</sup> Martin Luther, "Admonition Concerning the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our Lord," in *Word and Sacrament II*, ed. M.E. Lehmann (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 38, 1971), 115.

<sup>119</sup> Martin Luther, "A Treatise on the New Testament, that is, the Holy Mass", 95.

<sup>120</sup> Marc Lienhard, *Luther: Witness to Jesus Christ* (Eugene, Oregon: Wipf & Stock Publishers,2004),127.

<sup>121</sup> Martin Luther, "Admonition Concerning the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our Lord.", 110.

<sup>122</sup> Robert C. Croken, *Luther's First Front.*, 118.

Luther explains that Christ did not raise the gift as an offering to God. He gave it to the disciples as they received the gifts.<sup>123</sup>

Christ elevates the gifts towards us, and not God as a sacrifice. He supports that the priest may offer prayers for himself and others, as long as he does not presume to offer the mass.<sup>124</sup>

There is no need for priests to be mediator since Christ in is the only mediator and chief of the sacrament . The people are all incorporated in Christ as receivers of his gifts. He also refers to the teaching that all Christians are equally priest to witness, teach, instruct and proclaim the Good News.<sup>125</sup> To separate and rank the priest and laity would be for Luther to divide and split up the Christians with the goal to destroy Christ, his words and his Church.<sup>126</sup> This goes back to Luther's teaching on the royal universal priesthood.<sup>127</sup> Logically, there is no need for a mediator but Christ the high priest. Luther interprets Romans 12 as a priestly office and a rational sacrifice due to worship and not offering anything else.<sup>128</sup>

Luther claims that if one talk about a sacrifice, then it must be linked to of the remembrance of Christ by thanksgiving and faith rather than works, merits and masses. Christ has instituted the Eucharist in remembrance in order to teach, believe, love and praise his grace.<sup>129</sup>

He describes the priest in the Catholic Church as abusing the Eucharist by hiding the word, sign and the significance for themselves instead of sharing these words of testament to the laity.<sup>130</sup> By reducing the liturgy to God's promise, the Real Presence and our response of faith, he sidesteps any discussion of Christ working through the minister. He sharply distinguishes between the prayers offered and the power of Christ's Word active in the liturgy, which is taken from his work of the Babylonian Captivity of the Church.<sup>131</sup> Thus, Luther says that Christ is the only priest at Mass where the mass is identified with the testament of Christ.<sup>132</sup> Luther thinks that confession is an act of faith, professing one's sin to a minister, and the faith of the penitent becomes the means to receive God's forgiveness on confessing his sins. He therefore rejects the notion of the priest being the minister of Christ at the mass because Christ is the only priest.

---

<sup>123</sup> Martin Luther, "The Misuse of the Mass", 170f.

<sup>124</sup> Martin Luther, "The Babylonian Captivity of the Church", 54.

<sup>125</sup> Gudmund Waaler, *Nattverden som offer*, 82.

<sup>126</sup> Martin Luther, "The Misuse of the Mass", 159.

<sup>127</sup> Paul Althaus, *The Theology of Martin Luther*, 328.

<sup>128</sup> Martin Luther. "The Misuse of the Mass", 145.

<sup>129</sup> Martin Luther, "Admonition Concerning the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our Lord", 119.

<sup>130</sup> Martin Luther, "A Treatise on the New Testament, that is, the Holy Mass" ,90.

<sup>131</sup> Leif Grane, *Confessio Augustana*, 105.

<sup>132</sup> *Ibid.*, 105.

Luther does not believe that priests can be instrumental causes.<sup>133</sup> The mass is totally an act of God. He states that if we do something at all we take away all from the work of Christ.

Luther's theology seems to be rooted in univocity:

If God acts in the mass, one receives, and so one does not act. If one acts, then God does not act. It is the word of Christ that makes the change of the gifts.<sup>134</sup> Like Luther, Melanchthon underlined the importance of justification by faith alone. The forgiveness of sin in the Communion is given because of the faith in Christ. He further wrote that it is false to believe that any work from humans requires justification by Christ.<sup>135</sup> No human acts lead to justification and no other sacrifice from priest or others are required except from the one sacrifice of Christ. The Scripture and the Church fathers are used to underline these arguments. The root is the faith in Christ no matter how many goods one has done (Gal 5+11). Justification is all about the personal relationship one has to Christ through love and worship. Faith in Christ justifies while good works are to be done because God requires them.<sup>136</sup>

The priest are only ministers of the Word. It is not because of who they are, in persona Christi, that the ministry of the Eucharist is important but because of what they do.

Luther criticized the hierarchic Catholic structure in the light of the Scripture too. In John 6, Christ goes up to provide food for the people to be healed. He is prophet, King, priest and the living bread as he multiplies the bread according to each need (John 6:51). God will give the bread to eat and in the Eucharist the bread is Christ himself who became flesh for the life of the world, reminding us that the bread of life is also the true flesh of Christ (John 6:3). Christ himself distributes the bread after he has given thanks speaking of the faith in the incarnate word to believe whom he has sent.<sup>137</sup> Luther refers to the word of Christ himself, which is his words, spirit and life (John 6:63). Luther does not agree that this is the theological reason to accept the Catholic version where the sacrament in one kind belongs to the clergy. Luther says that Christ is speaking only of the laity and not of the priests alone.<sup>138</sup> For Luther, it is not about eating the sacrament but rather receiving the word of God and growing in faith. He writes that the Scripture does not talk about Eucharistic sacrifice performed by the clergy.<sup>139</sup> He therefore rejects any notion of the Eucharist as a Sacrifice.

---

<sup>133</sup> Robert C. Croken. *Luther's First Front: The Eucharist as Sacrifice*, 65.

<sup>134</sup> Martin Luther, "The Misuse of the Mass", 169.

<sup>135</sup> Philip Melanchthon. "Apology of the Augsburg Confession", 124.

<sup>136</sup> *Ibid.*, 127.

<sup>137</sup> Leif Grane, *Confessio Augustana*, 105.

<sup>138</sup> Martin Luther, "The Babylonian Captivity of the Church", 15.

<sup>139</sup> Martin Luther, "The Misuse of the Mass". *Word and Sacrament II*. A. R. Wentz. (Philadelphia,

### 3.4 The teaching of Consubstantiation

Luther's teaching of the sacrament is grounded in the sign, which is the sacrament itself that consists in the appearance of bread and wine. He teaches that Christ is really and fully present and is given for those who receive the Eucharist.<sup>140</sup> This doctrine of real presence became an important issue in discussion with other reformers such as Zwingli and Calvin.

Luther denies any notion of a symbolic understanding of the Eucharist where the body and blood are just a symbol of Christ. For Luther, the whole Christ is truly present in the sacrament (in coena Domini).<sup>141</sup> He emphasizes the power of the word, and because of who Christ is, the power of the divine word (logos) has the power to transform and change the reality to be present on the altar as the body and blood of Christ. The word of God is creative to constitute the reality and should be a proof enough that Christ is present in the Eucharist.<sup>142</sup> In fact, he condemns those who deny his teaching on real presence at the same time as he underlines that the right understanding of the Eucharist is to visualize the sacrament in the Word rather than speculations on the doctrine of real presence.<sup>143</sup> The sacrament is subordinated to the Word and the gospel. The Eucharist is not a necessary part of the Christian life. He says that Christ's real flesh and real blood are present. He gives an example like fire and iron are one substance, so is the body and blood one in Christ.<sup>144</sup>

To the doctrine of transubstantiation, based on the theory of Aquinas, is rejected by Luther as well as the Sacrifice of the Mass.<sup>145</sup> Throughout his life, Martin Luther firmly maintained a kind of Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist, that is, a corporeal presence. He believed that the faithful eat Christ's flesh and drink his blood. For Luther, the words of institution need to be taken literally. He points to the Scripture which does not say "in the bread there is" (1 Corinthians 10:16). Luther explains that God is the only one who institutes the sacrament itself with nothing more of the transformation after the act of the consecration and the word of institution.<sup>146</sup> The consecration works independently from the ecclesiastical office. On behalf

---

Fortress Press: 36, 1963),142.

<sup>140</sup> Leif Grane, *Confessio Augustana*, 106.

<sup>141</sup> Paul Althaus, *The Theology of Martin Luther*, 376.

<sup>142</sup> Gudmund Waaler, *Nattverden som offer*,54.

<sup>143</sup> *Ibid*,45.

<sup>144</sup> Martin Luther, "The Babylonian Captivity of the Church", 32.

<sup>145</sup> Leif Grane, *Confessio Augustana*, 104f.

<sup>146</sup> Paul Althaus, *The Theology of Martin Luther*, 386.

of this consequence, the consecration works independently from the right intention of the priest.

Furthermore, Luther saw a hindrance to acceptance of this doctrine because of the rejection of distributing the sacrament and not focus on reading the word.<sup>147</sup> Luther did not want to speculate about metaphysics and spiritual speculations on the Eucharist and how the bread and wine became the Body and Blood of Christ either.<sup>148</sup> Luther seems to focus more on the Eucharist as a sign of a community and a fellowship between God and his people<sup>149</sup>.

Receiving the Eucharist is the same as to be united with God.

However, Luther believed in the miracles of the literal presence of Jesus' Body and Blood "alongside" the bread and wine. Luther holds for what can be called "con-substantiation."<sup>150</sup> This means that Christ is present beside the elements as the word "con" refers to Christ as being with the bread and wine of the sacrament of communion as supposed to transubstantiation. He maintains that the bread and wine wholly abide, while the body and blood become present to us in and through the bread and wine. Luther justified this in two ways. Luther also appeals to Paul's language in 1 Corinthians 11:26: "As often as you eat this bread and drink the cup, you proclaim the Lord's death until he comes." He appeals to Cyril of Alexandria as he argues that, as the divinity is joined to the humanity and the latter becomes life-giving, so bread and wine become life-giving by their conjunction with the body and blood.<sup>151</sup> At the same time, Luther refused to explained how they are joined and did not wanted to verify this through metaphysical and Aristotelian theories since theology is the source to understand the Scripture.<sup>152</sup> He added and explains that the gifts of the altar are offered before the blessing due to the sanctification by the word and prayer (1. Tim: 4.5). The gifts are no longer offered after the blessing and the consecration, but received as a gift from God.<sup>153</sup>

---

<sup>147</sup> Gudmund Waaler, *Nattverden som offer*, 50.

<sup>148</sup> Martin Luther, "The Babylonian Captivity of the Church", 34.

<sup>149</sup> Ibid.

<sup>150</sup> Paul Althaus, *The Theology of Martin Luther*, 376.

<sup>151</sup> Marc Lienhard, *Luther: Witness to Jesus Christ*, 129.

<sup>152</sup> Gerhard Ebeling, *Luther: En innføring i hans tenking* (Oslo: Gyldendal Norsk Forlag, 1978), 73.

<sup>153</sup> Martin Luther, "The Babylonian Captivity of the Church", 54.



## 4. THE RESPONSE ON THE MASS AS SACRIFICE

The Contexts of Trent's pronouncements are important. The ecumenical Council of Trent was between 1545 and 1563 in Trent. The Council did not intend to offer a complete theology of the Eucharist – rather to respond to the errors of the reformers. In looking at Trent it is useful to recall the liturgical life and piety of the time. What was the response from Trent? The Catholic Church has always taken the Bible as a norm and key of the faith but it is not only the Scripture alone, which is the main source to understand the Christian doctrine on the sacraments. The Church leans on the Tradition through the Church fathers as well. The word “Tradition”, contains all that the Church believes that is handed out from the time of the Apostles and the Latin fathers until the last Ecumenical Synods and Councils through history and all generations.<sup>154</sup>

In the following section, I will bring together the some of the arguments of Luther and supplement them with the interpretations that were given in Trent and from other theologians at that time. The response from Trent has been based upon the Council of Trent. The Decree on the Ecumenical Councils at the time of reformation.

### 4.1 The sacrament of the Eucharist

By the time the Council of Trent met and took up the question of the Eucharist as sacrifice, it found itself faced with stinging Protestant critiques.<sup>155</sup> The Council reached back to the Scripture, the Fathers and the High Scholastics for inspiration. One of the scholastic theologians, who defended the Catholic doctrine, was John Eck (1486-1543). He wrote altogether 404 articles as a response to the teaching of Luther. He sees Luther as being too narrow in his understanding of the Eucharist as if it only contains forgiveness of sin.<sup>156</sup> In order to respond to Luther and his followers, Trent and other theologians at that time, he had to offer a clear teaching on the unity of the Sacrifice of the Mass and the Sacrifice of the

---

<sup>154</sup> Jfr. Didache (14); Klemens (Ep. ad Cor. 44); Ignatius (som omtaler nattverdsbordet som et ”slaktofferalter” – Fil. 4; Ef. 5; Trall. 7); Justin (Dial. c. Tryph. 41); Ireneus (Adv. haer. 4, 17, 5), Tertullian (De pud. 9; Ad uxor. 2, 9); Kyprian (Ep. 63 og 16); Origenes (In Jes. Nave 2, 1; Lv. 13, 3); Kyrillus av Jerusalem (Cath. myst. 5, 8); Gregor av Nazianz (Ep. 171); Gregor av Nyssa (In christi resurr. or. 1); Ambrosius (De off. min. 1. 48, 238; Enarr. in Ps. 38, 25); Augustin (De civ. Dei 10, 20; Ep. 98, 9; Tract. adv. Jud. 9, 13)

<sup>155</sup> Robert C. Croken, *Luther's First Front.*, 92.

<sup>156</sup> Robert C. Croken, *Luther's First Front.*, 76.

Cross.<sup>157</sup> It had to show how the Catholic tradition stood against the multiplication of sacrifices.

Such multiplication implies either that Christ still suffers or that the Cross was insufficient to save us. In the canons of Trent's Decree on the Sacrifice of the Mass, Trent answers that the mass is not just a "pure commemoration," that is, a matter of calling to mind Christ's death (canon 2, DS 1751). It is a "true and proper sacrifice" (canon 1, DS 1751). Trent declares in the Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils that the Mass is a visible sacrifice that "represents" the historical sacrifice of the Cross.<sup>158</sup> The point is not to disagree that Christ died once at that time, but he emphasized that Christ is being sacrificed through the consecration. This phrase alludes to the ritual of the Mass as an efficacious sign. Furthermore, it is a memorial wherein the saving power of the Cross is applied (DS 1740). The language of application denotes that the spiritual power of the Mass is wholly derived from the Cross. We know the language of application from Thomas doctrine of sacramental causality.

Trent leaves open the exact mode of representation and the precise nature of the memorial by Christ's own words of doing this in remembrance of Him.<sup>159</sup> The decree states that, in the Mass, the same Christ is contained and immolated in a bloodless manner. This goes back to the notion of representation, for the term, "bloodless manner" invokes the sacramental presence of the victim.<sup>160</sup> Neither the Council document nor the Council debate that led up to this document shows that this doctrine evokes time travel back to the Cross, or that Christ's act of dying on the Cross is somehow taken into eternity as an act. Trent appeals to a biblical and patristic understanding of memorial. The language of immolation and memorial show that Trent deliberately read the Last Supper as the fulfillment of the Passover. The Council identifies that the sacrifice of expiation is central because Christ the high priest that enables the Church to participate in his action. This Thomistic doctrine favored this and that is why Aquinas himself stated the necessity of good works rather than leaving everything up to Christ. The Council underlines that the heart of the atoning sacrifice is central since it expresses adoration prayer, and worshipping of God.<sup>161</sup> For example, Pope Urban IV established the feast of Corpus Christi in 1264.

The desire of the people to see the Eucharist came to outweigh the value of the Mass. In

---

<sup>157</sup> Robert C. Croken, *Luther's First Front. The Eucharist as Sacrifice*, 84.

<sup>158</sup> Norman P. Tanner, ed. *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils – Volume II: Trent to Vatican II*. (Vatican City: Sheed & Ward and Georgetown University Press, 1990), 695+793.

<sup>159</sup> *Ibid.*, 733.

<sup>160</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>161</sup> *Ibid.*, 695+734.

many ways in some people's minds, the ideas of real presence and communion were separated.

Trent is responding to the Lutheran denial that the mass is anything more than a sign of faith in the redeeming power of God. Trent's Decree on the Sacrament of Holy Orders states that the Old Testament priesthood passes into Christ's priesthood.<sup>162</sup> Therefore, at the Last Supper, Jesus institutes the new sacrifice and the new priesthood in continuity with the old sacrifices and the old priesthood. There is no rupture with the Covenant of Israel, contrary to Luther's strong opposition between Law and Gospel. Trent thus affirms the sacrificial value of the Last Supper. This last point was not part of Church dogma before Trent. Trent teaches that the moment in which the Eucharist is instituted should already be a sacrificial ritual. Christ does not just give Communion to the apostles and command them to celebrate a sacrifice, he also celebrates that sacramental sacrifice with them on Holy Thursday. Christ institutes the Mass by doing and saying: he offers the sacrifice and he commands his disciples to do so themselves. He also enables the twelve to celebrate the sacrifice by transmitting the priestly power to them, when he says, "Do this in memory of me." He transmits an instrumental power whereby Christ acts in the ordained minister in a new, more powerful way.<sup>163</sup>

#### 4.2 The transubstantiation

The Council of Trent met in the middle of the 16th century in response to the Reformation, as an effort to clarify Catholic doctrine for the faithful and as a means to reform the life of the Church. Trent followed up on Lateran Council IV (as well as the Councils of Constance and Florence) in teaching about the transformation of the Eucharistic gifts and the Real Presence. Trent set out to counter a number of Protestant claims about the Eucharist. It began work on the Decree on the Sacrament of the Eucharist in 1547, in Bologna. The Council was interrupted, but took up work again back in Trent in the year 1551. In that year, the Fathers took up eight canons or dogmatic decisions that had been composed by theologians and bishops in Bologna. The document includes chapters that give a positive teaching of the faith, and more importantly, canons that express the doctrine of the Church that must be confessed.<sup>164</sup> Canon one in Trent's Decree on the Sacrament of the Eucharist (from the year

---

<sup>162</sup> Ibid.,732.

<sup>163</sup> Ibid..

<sup>164</sup> Ibid., 695 +733.

1555) teaches that Christ's body and blood are "really, truly and substantially contained" (DZ 1651).

Chapter three distinguishes between Christ's presence in his natural mode of existence in heaven and his sacramental presence in the Eucharist. Properly speaking, Christ is in one place (in heaven), yet he is substantially present in the Eucharistic hosts and cups throughout the world (DZ 1636). Chapter 3 invokes what Aquinas calls concomitance, namely, that Christ's blood is also in the host and his flesh also in the cup. Chapter 4 goes on to teach that the substance of bread is converted into Christ's body, and the substance of wine into his blood. The Council calls this the constant teaching of the Church (DZ 1642). It is an appeal to Tradition. The conversion of the substance excludes Luther's consubstantiation, since nothing is left of the substance of bread and wine after the consecration. Canon 2 of the Decree on the Sacrament of the Eucharist makes the refusal of consubstantiation clear. The same canon also states that the conversion of the substance is fittingly called transubstantiation (DZ 1652). Here, the argument given is biblical: Christ identified the food in his hands at the Last Supper as his body. He said: "This is my body", not "here is my body."

The second phrase would have opened the door for the presence of another substance such as bread substance. Trent does not take up Aquinas' metaphysical argument against consubstantiation. This is because the theological schools represented at Trent did not agree on this metaphysical argument. Trent also does not directly take up Luther's argument for consubstantiation. Canon 3 rejects the notion that the whole Christ is not contained both under the species of bread and under the species of wine too (DZ 1653). Canon 4 rejects the idea that Christ is only present during the sacrament's use or celebration, meaning, the position that he is no longer present when the Eucharist is reserved in the tabernacle (DZ 1654), against Luther. Canon 8 excludes the doctrine that Christ is only eaten spiritually, not sacramentally and really (DZ 1658), in contradiction to Calvin.

All this can be summed up on three foundations;<sup>165</sup> 1) the Mass makes the victim substantially present; The first asserts that in the sacrament of the Eucharist the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ are contained "truly, really and substantially...together with the soul and divinity. " He is not present only as in a sign or figure. The sign and figure may be used but they must be understood to bear the weight of the value of the terms "truly, really, substantially."

---

<sup>165</sup>Ibid.

The second canon, chapter four, refers to the ‘substance of the bread and wine, with the change of the whole substance of the bread and wine into the body and blood, while only the appearance of bread and wine remains which lead to the doctrine of transubstantiation. A final canon on this point is n. 8, which asserts that when one consumes the Eucharist one consumes it ‘sacramentally and really. 2) The Mass applies the fruits of the sacrifice of the Cross and 3) Christ himself makes an offering in the Mass through the ministry of the priest.

Finally, Trent does not appeal to the separate consecration of bread and wine to argue for the sacrificial character of the mass. The priesthood of Christ does not pass away with His death, nor does our need for visible sacrifice cease after Good Friday. Already on Holy Thursday, the Lord provided a representation of the sacrifice of the cross, by which under the signs of bread and wine he offered, are His body and blood. It makes the same body and blood truly present under those signs. According to Trent, the mass is a true and proper sacrifice, which is offered to God through the priest who represents Christ. It is also one with the sacrifice of the cross. The victim and the one offered are the same, namely Jesus Christ. On the cross, Jesus offered himself in a bloody manner, but on the altar, it happened in a bloodless manner.<sup>166</sup> For this reason, the mass re-presents the sacrifice on the cross but there is a crucial distinction. Trent appealed to a notion of substance that transcends the limits of Aristotelian philosophy. In this sense, the kind of con-substantiation theory that Trent rejected also includes Luther’s theory, and the use of the term “substance” is appropriate to describe Luther’s theology: he held that the deep-down being or core reality of bread and wine remained, and that is what Trent means by substance. The word primarily refers to the essential being of the thing, which is the aspect of things, which is beyond the appearances. The mass is efficacious because the victim is substantially present, the fruits are applied and is all about an offering of the High Priest. A victim is the same who is now offering by the ministry of priests, who then offered Himself on the Cross. The victim is present in power through the eternal priesthood. The fruits indeed of which oblation, are received most plentifully through this un-bloody one. As in the Old Testament, the separation of blood from body indicated the death of the animal being offered. Likewise, with the offering of Christ on the cross, the separation of his blood from his body indicated the complete offering of himself for humanity.

---

<sup>166</sup> Ibid., 733.

Trent thus seeks to prevent the canonization of a specific school of theology. By avoiding the term "accidents," the Council avoids giving the impression of canonizing Aristotelian philosophy. The language of "substance" could be found in conciliar texts since Lateran IV. Various theologians whose categories were not primarily Aristotelian used such terminology in the 12th century. The language of the conversion of the gifts is patristic in its origin, for we already find it in Ambrose. The acts of the Council debates clearly state the intention to avoid medieval theological disputes and to ground all doctrine in Scripture, Tradition of the Fathers, the Councils, the Popes, and the consensus of the Church. The language of species is more directly related to the economy of signs than is the language of accidents. The fact that half the drafting committee considered the terms "accident" and "species" synonymous is irrelevant, because this may not represent the majority of the bishops.<sup>167</sup> Trent does not define its terms, though its way of using "substance" or "species" gives us strong indications of their meaning. Clearly, substance and species are distinct. Substance refers to the concrete being of Christ's body, while species refers to what appears to our senses.<sup>168</sup> The use of the term "transubstantiation" is highly nuanced.

Trent does not say that the Eucharistic change at Mass is transubstantiation, but rather is fittingly called transubstantiation. The prudence and reticence of Trent on the theme of transubstantiation has another motive: it needed to respond to Luther and the Protestant theologians. Trent appealed to the consensus of the Fathers and the medieval.

The language of conversion has a broad enough sense to include Church Fathers like Ambrose, Fathers who never pondered precisely how God transforms the gifts on the altar. Second, Trent's qualified way of employing the term "transubstantiation" signals that the Council's main objective was not the imposition of a particular language about the Eucharistic change, but a key conviction that such language expresses, namely, that a radical, corporeal and metaphysical change takes place in the host and cup during the consecration. The language of transubstantiation should be used insofar as it is the most adequate linguistic means to communicate this conviction about the metaphysics of the Eucharist. The Council specifically wants to say that Jesus really gives his body and blood, and not just signs thereof.

---

<sup>167</sup> Samuele Sanghali (Professor Beda College) Lectures, February, 2017.

<sup>168</sup> William B. Monahan, *St. Thomas Aquinas on the Eucharist* (London: Trinity Press, 1940), 73f.

### 4.3 The Scriptural reading of Trent

For Luther, the sacrifice of the Mass must be separate from the Cross and separate from the action of Christ the High Priest. Trent links the Sacrifice of the Mass with the teaching of the Letter to the Hebrews on Christ's perpetual priesthood. Trent does this in chapter 1 of the decree, when it defines the Last Supper as an offering made by Jesus (Luc 22.19). This presumes that Jesus already acts as High Priest at the Last Supper.

The Council reads the Last Supper as essentially a Passover meal that was celebrated by the eternal Priest due to the consecration of bread and wine to His body and blood.<sup>169</sup> That is, Trent reads the Gospel accounts in light of their essential Old Testament setting and in connection with the Letter to the Hebrews 5:9-10 and the Gospel of John 6. In the Passover context, we have an act of communal memory that regenerates those remembering. The Passover memorial is about covenant. It is a discourse on the relationship between two covenant partners. It involves, first, God's remembering and reminding, and then Israel's remembering and reminding, with all that implies on both sides. Psalm 111 reflects well the dynamism at work: God has caused his wonderful works to be remembered and God "is ever mindful of his covenant. There is great complexity in the relationship between Jewish and Christian liturgical forms.

They had to follow him and he provides them with food from heaven. This makes sense in a Passover setting. Jesus indicates that this body will undergo a sacrificial death. The Pharisees wanted visible signs and proofs, but Jesus points to Manna as the bread from heaven given by God and not Moses! To eat and drink is linked to belief in Jesus (Joh 6.51). He nourished them through his words and wisdom, which are the permanent effect of growing and become stronger in Christ. It brings you into the eternal life given by the son of man. Whoever drink and eats will be hunger for more to seek Christ as the truth life and the way to eternal life. Furthermore, Eucharist is given to those who believe and to those who have faith. The faith of Christ is the basic element for believing that you share his body and blood in communion with the faithful. It is not just a pleasant meal for everybody to grab. Jesus echoes the last supper with the words of institution. Jesus is the source of eternal life by eating his flesh and drinking his blood.

---

<sup>169</sup>Norman P.Tanner,ed. *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, 695.

The food remains unto eternal life. By coming to him, see, smell, and observe listen and being present with him in faith transforms them, as their hunger will be satisfied. For Trent theologians it was crucial that all three elements come together: The Old Covenant Passover, the Last Supper accounts of the New Testament and the teaching of the Hebrews and John. In other words, Trent answers Luther with a biblical doctrine that he had overlooked.

#### 4.4 The priesthood

According to Trent, Christ's action at the Last Supper is of priestly character. There was a clear shift toward emphasizing the role of the priest and his power to consecrate the species. That is, here and only here, do one finds him making an offering of bread and wine to the Father. Precisely at the Last Supper, Jesus demonstrates the act of a priest in the line of Melchisedek, who offered bread and wine, not animals. All of this raises the following question: When did Christ become a priest? The Passion, Resurrection and Ascension are the supreme enactment and revelation of Christ's priesthood, but not its beginning.

The Resurrection and Ascension manifest that the Father has accepted Jesus' sacrifice. In fact, the Father already accepted the offering of Jesus' life on the Cross. The moment of manifestation is not always identical to the moment of realization. The teaching of Trent has influence on the relation between Christ as the priest and the role of the priest today. At the altar, the priest pronounces the words of consecration in Christ's place (in persona Christi), not just on behalf of Christ, but in his person. Since the sacrifice of the sacrifice is the same victim of crucifixion, this is the most perfect sacrifice Catholics can offer to God. The act of the Messiah is that Christ, as "eternal priest" and "eternal sacrifice" in heaven. Christ sacrifices to God the Father's cross on the cross. God will then hear the prayers of the believers and give them the necessary gifts.<sup>170</sup> The faithful take part in this sacrifice because they are part of the Church.

Christ sacrifices himself on the altar, while the congregation sacrifices itself as the mysterious body of Christ, and in practice, this sacrifice is a surrender of the life of the individual and the will of God's disposition.<sup>171</sup> Particularly in one of the priest's prayers during the mass, the Catholic Eucharistic theology is expressed very clearly: "*Receive, Holy Father, almighty eternal God, this sacrifice,(...) so that this sacrifice for me and for them may be for salvation and eternal life.*"<sup>172</sup>

---

<sup>170</sup> Ibid., 732.

<sup>171</sup> Ibid., 733.

<sup>172</sup> Missale Romanum, (Oslo: Oslo Katolske Bispedømme 1961), 449.



Through his priesthood, the priest has been pointed out to represent the sacrifice, Christ, who is called the greatest high priest and mediator.<sup>173</sup> Therefore, a priest is always the presider of the Eucharist. The liturgical vestments are a sign that he represents Christ, and not himself. The question that has been raised is if Luther's interpretation for the ministry should be called institutional or sociological.<sup>174</sup>

Luther thinks that we 1) offer to God a sacrifice of praise, 2) passively receive the fruits of Christ's sacrifice, and 3) intercede for others. However, the only active sacrifice that the faithful make is that of praise. Their intercession for others is not by way of sacrifice, but simply a prayer of petition. The Catholic theologian and Professor Karl Rahner argues by claiming that masses for the dead are intercessory as they depend on God's mercy alone. It enables the former to assist the latter through the mediation of the sacrificial action of Christ.<sup>175</sup> This derives from Luther's univocal philosophy: if man is acting and making sacrifice, then God is not acting. The activity of Christ at Mass enables us to be more than passive recipients of grace and forgiveness. Christ the high priest enables the Church to participate in his action, without competition. Because we can actively offer a sacrifice with Christ through the Mass, the Eucharistic sacrifice is celebrated for others, not just for those who are present. Because of Christ's activity as principal agent, the Church has a sacrifice to give to the Father. This augments the communal character of the liturgy: it is not just for me to grow in faith, it is for the whole Church, indeed, for all of humanity. The Sacrifice of the Mass is not to be seen as only an offering of praise and thanksgiving, or simply a memorial of the sacrifice on the Cross. It is a propitiatory sacrifice, which is offered for the living and dead, for the remission of sins and punishment due to sin, as satisfaction for sin and for other necessities. The Sacrifice of the Mass in no way detracts from the sacrifice, which Christ offered on the Cross.<sup>176</sup> Trent left some questions open. It did not define whether each Mass has an infinite value or is of limited value. Rather, it simply refers to the "most abundant fruit" of the oblation of the Mass.<sup>177</sup> The consecration as the central aspect of sacrifice is not defined either. However, the theologians' consensus settled the issue that the heart of the sacrifice is the separate consecration of bread and wine.<sup>178</sup>

---

<sup>173</sup> Robert C. Croken, *Luther's First Front*, 104.

<sup>174</sup> *Ibid.*, 99.

<sup>175</sup> *Ibid.*, 93.

<sup>176</sup> Norman P. Tanner, ed. *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, 693.

<sup>177</sup> Robert C. Croken, *Luther's First Front. The Eucharist as Sacrifice*, 81.

<sup>178</sup> *Ibid.*, 103.

The councils declare that the Eucharist is a true and unique sacrifice that must be preached and proclaimed to the faithful.<sup>179</sup> The priest does not speak in private with the intention to be saved because the mass has always by its nature been recognized as a public celebration no matter how many are present. Trent did not make much contribution to solve the tension that was going on between the Catholics and the Lutherans.<sup>180</sup>

## **5. DISCUSSION: THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE**

In the centuries that followed, the theological differences between the two denominations increased, with regard to the ecclesiology, and the interpretation of the sacraments. Before the Second Vatican Council, there was a more hostile approach to other Christian doctrines. From the time of the Reformation, the Roman Catholic and the Evangelical Lutheran Church have stood in a double-sided relationship with each other. On the one hand, the goal was to clarify their different approaches. On the other hand, there have been theological debates and dialogues where they have come to a closer understanding of their different aspects of the faith. Today the relation between Catholics and Lutherans has shown openness for an ecumenical approach especially after the Second Vatican Council (1962-65). Still, the division between them had its cause in profound theological differences concerning the Eucharist.

Based on the historical background that I have presented it is important to find out how the two churches now stand in relation to each other in relation to the Eucharistic sacrifice.

In this thesis, I will look at what possibilities there are for Catholics and Lutherans to draw nearer to one another from a theological and practical level on the issue of the Eucharist.

I want to clarify the differences of the understanding of sacrifice and why the Catholic Church favours a Eucharistic sacrifice while the Lutherans are more sceptical to this approach. How did this theological discussion develop after the Reformation? At the end of the thesis, I will also present some aspects where opportunities may exist for the future, given the differences that exist between the two Churches, and what could possibly be done in the next step. In this chapter, I have picked up the different arguments from Professor Roch A. Kereszty to present the Catholic approach together with Phillip McCosker.

---

<sup>179</sup> Norman P. Tanner, ed. *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, 732.

<sup>180</sup> Robert C. Croken, *Luther's First Front.*, 139.

From the Lutheran position, I will pick numerous examples from the theologians Carl F. Wisloff, Regin Prenter and Gustav Aulén. Wisløff wrote a doctoral thesis on arguments against the Catholic understanding of the sacrifice while. The Lutheran Bishop Gustav Aulén seems to have a positive approach to the Catholic Eucharistic theology. Regin Prenter was a Lutheran priest and professor in theology. Other sources will be from Thomas Aquinas and Luther himself because their teaching and arguments are still discussed today.

## 5.1 The Lords' supper

There is a common Christian understanding that the institution of the Eucharist began at the Last Supper and ended on Calvary. It began when Christ, surrounded by the Twelve, where he shared the bread and wine by saying this is my body and this is my blood. In this chapter, I want to find out what is behind the meaning the sacrifice in the Eucharist. In some ways there seems to be a common understanding among Catholics and Lutherans that Jesus sacrificed himself for human beings. It gets a bit more complicated if I ask if and how the Mass is a sacrifice. I will first present some perspectives and explanations from Catholics and Lutherans on the nature of the sacrifice. Different definitions and interpretation of the sacrifice will first be given. In the final section, I want to explore if the Eucharist is a propitiatory sacrifice in relation to the Scriptures. The context will depart from Paul's letter to the Hebrews, since Lutherans highlight the Bible as the only authority. I will discuss the following arguments: Lutherans claim that there is no scriptural evidence that there is a propitiatory sacrifice present in the Eucharist. The second argument is that if that was the case, it will signify that Christ's attempts to save sinners if we cooperate well with Christ. Does the Eucharist talk about a sacrifice at all? Lutherans also struggle to find any scriptural proof for this. These are the arguments I want to discuss in the next section.

### **5.1.1 The nature of sacrifice**

Before I start the debate, it is necessary to explain the meaning of sacrifice, in order to understand the Eucharistic sacrifice. This question is important because the sacrificial part of the Catholic Eucharist is what separates it from the Lutheran teaching. One must understand the root and history behind the Eucharistic sacrifice before one can understand why this aspect is so vital today. Sacrifice is known in Christian history. Communion with God by offering something to him has played a great role from the time of the Old Testament.

Roch A. Keretszty wrote that the Old Testament employs many sacrificial images in reference to the cross such as Yom Kippur.<sup>181</sup> Yom Kippur means the Day of Atonement. It is the holiest year in Judaism. Yom means "day" in Hebrew and Kippur comes from a root that means to "atone." The blood of sacrificial animals symbolizes the human life given to God.<sup>182</sup> In purification offerings, the greater the offense was, the closer the blood was brought to the inner sanctuary and the holiest place of the Ark of Covenant. The blood was sprinkled on the altar outside the sanctuary for individual sins. For the sins of the community or of the priests, the blood was sprinkled on the veil in front of the inner sanctuary. On the day of Yom Kippur, the high priest enters the inner sanctuary and sprinkled blood on the mercy seat of the Ark of the Covenant. This was a sign that God has made this blood the means of forgiveness. In the same ritual of Yom Kippur, the high priest places two hands on the goat as he confesses the sins of Israel and sends the goat out to the wilderness. This event signifies that the animal has carried out the sins of the people of God out of his sight.

The blood from purification offerings removes the stain of sin or impurity from the sanctuary, understanding that God would remain in the sanctuary (Leviticus 15:31, Numeri 19:13). In the New Testament, Jesus Christ replaced the sacrificial animal. It was through his suffering and death that Jesus offered himself to the Father and carried out the sin for his people. This is also stated by John the Baptist who says behold the lamb of God, who takes away the sins of the world (John 1:29).

Christ takes the role of the sacrificial animal. Christ freely sacrificed himself to save human beings, which expressed God as sacrificial love. In what way is this connected to the Eucharistic sacrifice? According to Catholic teaching, it is the distance in time and place between the event on Calvary and the altar where the Eucharist is celebrated that is brought to an end. The communion between God and his people is present on the altar. That is why one talks about a Eucharistic sacrifice.<sup>183</sup> It is not just a pleasant meal, but a sacrificial meal too. Christ sacrificed himself by his body and blood on Calvary. The same action happens in the Eucharist through the sign of transformation from the bread and wine into his body and blood. It is through the sacrament of ordination that a priest represents Christ the high priest.

---

<sup>181</sup> Roch A. Keretszty. *Wedding Feast of the Lamb: Eucharistic Theology from a Historical, Biblical and Systematic Perspective* (Chicago: Hillenbrand Books, 2004), 10.

<sup>182</sup> Ibid.

<sup>183</sup> Den Katolske kirke, "Nattverden.", from 10 January 1998 from <http://www.katolsk.no/tro/tema/sakramenter/artikler/noter#n27>. Accessed 10 October 2017.

This is the reason that only a priest or bishop can celebrate the Eucharist and his vestments are a sign that he does not represent himself but Christ. From a Lutheran point of view, it is true that Christ is the new lamb who takes away the sins of the world. He is present in the Eucharist because of his own words saying "This is my body and blood" (Luke 22:9) This is not problematic because they have support from the Scripture. They agree that the nature of the sacrifice of the cross in the New Testament is a new covenant from the Old Testament. Catholics and Lutherans agree that Christ became the victim and a sacrifice because of humanity's rejection of God.<sup>184</sup> God's honor was damaged by their sin. To open up a new relation to God, He demanded a blood sacrifice to pay for this sin. Jesus became the victim who paid the guilt and the shame that lay upon the humans. The Lutheran Theologian Albrecht Ritschl distinguished between a biblical understanding and a judicial interpretation of the nature behind sacrifice.<sup>185</sup> He defined the death of Jesus as a sacrifice because he participated in his suffering death and resurrection freely and consciously by not giving up his service and mission from his Father.

### 5.1.2 The Sacrifice of Christ

There is no doubt for Lutherans that Christ was the perfect sacrifice that fulfilled the promises from the Old Testament.<sup>186</sup> Christ is the new lamb from the Passover and one finds a typology between the sacrifice in Yom Kippur and Christ who fulfils his mission on the cross. There was no longer the need for any sacrifice after the death and resurrection of Christ. The question is in what way shall the sacrifice of Christ be interpreted as a Eucharistic Sacrifice in the mass?

When the Liturgy represents Christ's death, the power of his death comes to us today is what makes the Eucharistic Sacrifice. In the words of *Sacrosanctum Concilium* from the Second Vatican Council, "*Our Saviour instituted the Eucharistic sacrifice of His Body and Blood. He did this in order to perpetuate the sacrifice of the Cross throughout the centuries until He should come again.*"<sup>187</sup> The Masses that are daily celebrated around the world connect all the faithful with the timeless sacrifice of Christ. As the Catechism states: "*The whole Church is united with the offering and the intercession of Christ.*" (CCC 1369). Number 7 of

---

<sup>184</sup> Lutheran/Roman Catholic Joint Commission, "The Eucharist.", from 1978

[http:// www.prounione.urbe.it/dia-int/l-rc/doc/e\\_1-rc\\_eucharist.html](http://www.prounione.urbe.it/dia-int/l-rc/doc/e_1-rc_eucharist.html). Accessed 22 March 2018.

<sup>185</sup> Asle Eikrem, *God as Sacrificial Love*, 41.

<sup>186</sup> Donald Guthrie, *Hebrews: Tyndale New Testament Commentaries* (Michigan: Grand Rapids,1983),198.

<sup>187</sup> Fredrik Hansen, red. *Det Annet Vatikankonsil-dokumenter* (Oslo: St Olav Forlag,2013),57.

Sacrosanctum Concilium begins by stating "Christ is always present in his Church, especially in its liturgical celebrations."<sup>188</sup>

The text continues: "*He is present in the sacrifice of the Mass, not only in the person of His minister, "the same now offering, through the ministry of priests, who formerly offered himself on the cross", but especially under the Eucharistic species.* Kereszty believes that the sacrifice provides us with the paradigm to see the ultimate source of the Eucharist in the heavenly Father's total gift of himself to us.<sup>189</sup> The Passover highlights the Eucharist as liberation from sin through the sacrifice of the true Passover Lamb, the Innocent Servant, who takes upon Himself the guilt for all human beings. He says that it is not just a representation of the cross or the presence of the glorified Jesus. It also makes present the very power of the cross.<sup>190</sup>

Wilsløff thinks that such practice will change the character of the sacrament. The sacrifice will then turn into something we offer to God rather than a gift as a sign of forgiveness.<sup>191</sup>

He supports the teaching of justification where Christ sacrifices himself for the guilt of human beings. He believes that there is no really proper recipient of the Sacrifice of Christ or of the sacrifice of the Mass. Nothing is being offered.<sup>192</sup> Vonier had a different approach to Christ as sacrifice and argued that the Mass is the sacrament of the sacrifice of Christ such as a "sacrament-sacrifice."<sup>193</sup> The sacrament of the Mass re-presents the reality of Calvary in terms of the sign. The signs of the Eucharist are linked to the sacrifice of Calvary, which corresponds to the teaching of Aquinas. It is not a question of a historical Passion of Christ, but it is made present in the sacramental order.<sup>194</sup> Schleiermacher states that this event was more a re-action, something he underwent to build a bridge between God and human beings.<sup>195</sup>

Philip McCosker writes that one can find sacrifice in the mass related to the Scripture and the tradition.<sup>196</sup> The sacrifice happened far away outside the walls of the temple. The death of Christ was then only a brutal crucifixion by the Roman Empire. The death of Christ became the supreme sacrifice. This must be seen in the teaching of the apostles (1. Corinthians 5:7).

---

<sup>188</sup> Ibid.

<sup>189</sup> Roch A. Kereszty, *Wedding Feast of the Lamb*, 184.

<sup>190</sup> Ibid., 173.

<sup>191</sup> Gudmund Waaler, *Nattverden som offer*, 297.

<sup>192</sup> Ibid., 42.

<sup>193</sup> Phillip McCosker, "Sacrifice in Recent Roman Catholic Thought: From paradox to polarity and Back Again?": in *Sacrifice and Modern Thought*, ed. Julia Mezaros and Johannes Zachhuber, (Oxford: University Press, 2013), 134.

<sup>194</sup> Ibid.

<sup>195</sup> Asle Eikrem, *God as Sacrificial Love*, 39.

<sup>196</sup> Phillip McCosker, "Sacrifice in Recent Roman Catholic Thought.", 132.

Kereszty reads this passage that Christ is the Passover and the lamb that has been sacrificed.<sup>197</sup>

He described the feast as the holy Eucharist where Christ is the Passover that has been sacrificed. On Holy Thursday he celebrated the Passover, he also transformed the old into the new covenant. This is my body given for you. This is the cup of my blood the new covenant. He meant what he said by fulfilling the Passover into the new by the institution of the Eucharist. In the end, Easter Sunday transforms that sacrifice into a sacrament. The Theme of the 2005 Synod of Bishops was entitled “Eucharist-The Source and Summit of the Life and Mission of the Church.”<sup>198</sup> This document has a classical Catholic understanding in that the Mass is to be understood as one sacrifice with the cross. That is especially supported by Thomas Aquinas, the council of Trent and the apostolic tradition. The challenge has been to connect Christ as sacrifice in the mass from a biblical point of view.

Prenter states that the bread is the same gift of sacrifice that was given to God through the sacrifice of the Cross.<sup>199</sup> The Eucharist and the sacrifice of Christ make a “bridge” for human beings to be in closer relation to God. He continues by saying that the Eucharist is also about our participation as one and is transformed by receiving the sacrifice from God and becomes acceptable to Him as a gift.<sup>200</sup> Pope Benedict XVI was well aware of the Lutheran rejection of the mass as sacrifice. He has some positive aspects for the Lutheran arguments. For instance, he favors that the sacrifice on the cross was done once and for all. In terms of the salvation, he agrees that the gifts must be received with faith, gratitude and praise in order to be fruitful.<sup>201</sup> At the same time, he stresses the teaching that the sacrifice of Christ truly becomes present on the altar. Luther’s distinction between the sacrament of praise and expiation cannot be possible for him.<sup>202</sup>

### 5.1.3 A propitiatory sacrifice?

Catholics and Lutherans agree that the sacrifice has its background in Jesus who offered himself on the cross as the perfect sacrifice for human beings. For Catholics this sacrifice continues to be present on the altar while Lutherans believe that the Eucharist is not a sacrifice but a community meal.

---

<sup>197</sup> Roch A. Kereszty, *Wedding Feast of the Lamb*,17.

<sup>198</sup> Mary Ann Claraham, “Baptizing a Child: Whose faith is it?” *Furrow* 57:1, 30-38, January 2000.

<sup>199</sup> Gudmund Waaler, *Nattverden som offer*, 102.

<sup>200</sup> *Ibid.*,169.

<sup>201</sup> Phillip McCosker, "Sacrifice in Recent Roman Catholic Thought",140.

<sup>202</sup> *Ibid.*,142.

Statements from Popes and cardinals do not convince many Lutherans. Why? That is because Scripture alone is the authority to decide theological and biblical questions. Where is the Eucharistic Sacrifice in the Bible?

The argument that I present will be depart from Paul's letters to the Hebrews 9:11-12, which says: "*But when Christ came as high priest of the good things that are now already here, he went through the greater and perfect tabernacle that is not made with human hands, that is to say, is not a part of this creation. He did not enter by means of the blood of goats and calves; but he entered the Most Holy Place once for all by his own blood, thus obtaining eternal redemption.*" The question in this passage is on what basis does Christ enter into the holy place? From a Catholic position, it happens not through the blood of goats and calves, but through his own blood, He enters into the presence of the Father having obtained the eternal redemption. One of the most influential theologians in the twentieth century, Karl Rahner, explains that Christ himself before the Father is the perfect oblation on behalf of his people.<sup>203</sup> His work of intercession points to his work on atonement. Intercession is not a different kind of work, but it is a presentation of the work of the cross before the father. The son intercedes for his people before God by the fact that in his death, he has taken away the sin of Gods people. By presenting the finished work on Calvary before God, he assures the application of the benefits of his death to those for whom He intercedes. This is the essence of the Catholic Eucharistic sacrificial mass. This does not correspond to the Lutheran teaching since one does not offer any other sacrifice. One makes commemoration of the one saving sacrifice as the Lord commended us to do in the memory of him. The Lutheran theologian and Professor Rudolf Bultmann states that there is nothing to go back to other than Christ, since he is the final sacrifice and superior to everything.<sup>204</sup>

Another question is, does Christ save sinners by his power alone or attempts to save sinners if we cooperate well with Christ? Christ came to the world to save sinners not simply to make sinners saveable through interceding for them.<sup>205</sup> If that was the case, that makes someone who goes to mass receivable of a certain amount of grace and forgiveness. Rahner argues by saying that a propitiatory work of Christ is in this text, which is connected with the intercession<sup>206</sup>. He therefore intervenes for us before the Father. This is what happens in the mass.

---

<sup>203</sup> Robert C. Croken, *Luther's First Front*,95.

<sup>204</sup> Tony Lane, *A Concise History of Christian Thought*. (New York: T&T Clark,2006),245.

<sup>205</sup> Marc Lienhard, *Luther: Witness to Jesus Christ* (Eugene, Oregon: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 2004), 128.

<sup>206</sup> Robert C. Croken, *Luther's First Front*,95.



Christ obtained the redemption but not to a certain group because that does not give any sense. It is not an incomplete work of Christ since the cross is the perfect one. He offers his propitiatory sacrifice on the cross to the father in heaven for our sins.

The bloody sacrifice wants to be accomplished on the cross might be represented into the end of the world. The council of Trent teaches that this is truly propitiatory.<sup>207</sup> He offers himself with his own body and blood under the form of bread and wine, which is truly propitiatory to the Father as a propitiatory sacrifice. The intercession in the Hebrews is that what Christ now presents to the Father, is the propitiatory work of the cross.

Why would this message of the propitiatory intercession be so important in the book of Hebrews? There are many passages in the chapter that concerns the issue of sin and the redemption to fall away from the faith.<sup>208</sup> Kereszty writes that the message of Hebrews is that if one finds oneself falling into sin and being tempted to fall away, and then go to Christ the heavenly intercessor.<sup>209</sup> Another reference would be from the Hebrews, chapter 10 that says that if we wilfully sin, it remains no more sacrifice for sin. What sacrifice is this? This message is that the sacrifice is not being applied to someone who wilfully sins.

This is not supported by Lutheran interpretations. The scriptural passage, says that Christ enters the holy place once and for all (Heb9:12). For Wisløff and Bultmann, this goes back to the teaching of justification. When Christ was the perfect sacrifice, there is no need for a priest to remind the people the need for doing this as a justification by good works.<sup>210</sup> Wisløff follows the teaching of Luther by saying against Catholics who supported the traditional Catholic teaching on the Eucharistic sacrifice. Donald Guthrie says that the original context is about the intension of the author and writer of the letters who favours Christ as the sacrifice to put away sin rather than a Eucharistic Catholic understanding of sacrifice.<sup>211</sup> The high priest had to go into the holy place and then go out and in again the next year. Christ did not.<sup>212</sup> Christ enters once into the most holy place and does not go out anymore. He shed his own blood and not somebody else's blood. Then he stays there. Wisløff agrees that Christ lives and is present in mass but not as a sacrifice.<sup>213</sup>

---

<sup>207</sup> Norman P. Tanner, ed. *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, 735.

<sup>208</sup> Donald Guthrie. *Hebrews*, 199.

<sup>209</sup> Roch A. Kereszty, *Wedding Feast of the Lamb*, 74.

<sup>210</sup> Gudmund Waaler, *Nattverden som offer*, 66.

<sup>211</sup> Donald Guthrie, *Hebrews: Tyndale New Testament Commentaries* (Michigan: Grand Rapids, 1983), 199.

<sup>212</sup> *Ibid.*, 197.

<sup>213</sup> Gudmund Waaler, *Nattverden som offer*, 43.

For Kereszty, the only reason this phrase “once and for all” appears in this context is to contrast to what the High priest did in the Old Testament.<sup>214</sup> Christ presents his work of the cross to his father without any need to leave his holy place. In Hebrews 9.23-25, sacrifices are mentioned in plural, why? Kereszty writes that Christ offered himself as the high priest, but He does not do it as the high priest did in the Old Testament who brought sacrifices.<sup>215</sup> The priest was a sinful man and goes out which is a contrast to Christ who is without sin as he offers the propitiatory sacrifice or sacrifices. The Lutherans interpret this passage in a different way. The letters to the Hebrews 9.23 where “sacrifices” is in plural, is written to distinguish the difference between the sacrifices that were cleansed in the Old Testament than the one sacrifice that was cleansed in the New Testament.<sup>216</sup> Only one priest and sacrifice takes away sin and Christ is in this case not going in and out. If there is a perfect and sufficient sacrifice, then does it perfect anyone?

The response from Kereszty is that the cross itself is limited in its power to atone, because not everyone will go to heaven even if Christ died for the whole world.<sup>217</sup> Why is not everybody saved? This is because they won't be saved (Matthew 25). He offered himself once, but did not take away the sins of all people because they did not will it. That faithlessness retards the atoning work of the mass.<sup>218</sup> From a Catholic position, the passages in Hebrews 7.24-25, the writer demonstrates the superiority of Christ as high priest of priesthood who continues forever.<sup>219</sup> The old priesthood died and gave it up, because of the fact of their sinfulness. Therefore, describing Jesus, he is able also to save for ever or to the uttermost those who draw near to God through him since he always lives to make intercessions for them. This is what happens in the mass. This describes the capability and power of Christ. He holds his priesthood permanently. He is able to save the uttermost. He wants to save, but the problem is the state of sin. He is the sin-bearer and bore our sins in his body upon the cross and therefore sin has been banished by him. He is able to do so, because he always makes intercession for them.

---

<sup>214</sup> Roch A. Kereszty. *Wedding Feast of the Lamb*, 71.

<sup>215</sup> *Ibid.*, 74.

<sup>216</sup> Donald Guthrie, *Hebrews*, 198.

<sup>217</sup> *Ibid.*, 74f.

<sup>218</sup> *Ibid.*, 74.

<sup>219</sup> *Ibid.*

In this section, we have seen how Catholics and Lutherans look at the sacrifice both in mass and in the Scripture. There is an agreement that the meaning of the Christian sacrifice is that one cannot understand Christ as sacrifice in the New Testament, without the material from the Old Testament. Both denominations agree that Christ is the center in the Eucharistic celebration that is being praised, offered and being united to Christ through the gifts of the elements. However, there has been a different biblical understanding of the how one shall interpret the sacrifice of Christ.

In the end, Phillip McCosker claims that there is no clear and solemn definition of Sacrifice. He defines the word as a polyvalent concept.<sup>220</sup> Add to that, the Bible has always been of source of various interpretations. Lutherans cannot find any biblical proof in the Hebrews that convince them to think otherwise. Based on Paul's letters to the Hebrews and other scriptural passages it makes it difficult for Lutherans to accept any sacrifice in mass due to lack of biblical evidence. The Catholics have a different interpretation and rely on their tradition too. It seems difficult to reach an agreement.

I take into account the Lutheran biblical reflection, but since the Bible also was written in a tradition, it makes it difficult for me to only accept scriptural passages. Due to the tradition, it is important to ask, what do the Church Fathers say on this matter, what does the magisterium teach, what has been discussed in the Councils and what are the reflections from theologians today. All this will complete the foundation of the Eucharistic theology. It is not only Scripture, but together with the Christian tradition that dealt with theological questions.

## 5.2 Remembrance or repetition

The milestone between the two denominations had been if the Eucharist is a memorial communion from a Lutheran view or does the sacrifice of Christ repeat itself by becoming fully present every Eucharistic celebration from a Catholic perspective. What is the important fact that is vital to connect it to the Eucharistic sacrifice? The relation between remembrance or repetition is important because if the mass is not being repeated and only connects to Christ as a remembrance, then it will have an effect and consequence on how one shall verify a Eucharistic presence or not. In response to this, I want to address the following question: Why do the Eucharistic sacrifice need to be celebrated repeatedly by the Catholic Church if Christ died once for all and His sacrifice is an eternal one? I will discuss the arguments saying that if the sacrifice refers to the cross that happened once, there is no need for another sacrifice.

---

<sup>220</sup> Phillip McCosker, "Sacrifice in Recent Roman Catholic Thought.",133.

The next argument is the idea of Christ who suffers and dies each mass and finally if there is no sacrifice, the sacrament is only a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving. James Alison stated that during mass, one celebrates the freedom from this sacrifice by repeating with gratitude and praise.<sup>221</sup>

For Lutherans, the sacrifice of the cross was an event that happened once. The Eucharistic sacrifice cannot be another repetition of what happened in the past. Wisløff writes that the one sacrifice is fully valid for the forgiveness of sins to all eternity.<sup>222</sup> A repetition or an actualization makes more sense for Wisløff when one talks about the homily. The word of God is still coming in a new way with new reflections and discernments. The homily is the bridge between the past, present and the future while there is no need to repeat something that has already happened in the Eucharist. Wisløff believes that the Catholics rely on the theory of atonement and this was also understood as sacrificio.<sup>223</sup>

The question still is: Why go to mass every time in life and not be perfected by that, if it is the same sacrifice as the sacrifice of the cross that was done once? If so, there is a disconnection since one must talk about two different sacrifices. The response from the Vatican and the Holy See is clear. Catholic teaching distinguishes between the event on Calvary and the resurrected Christ in heaven. It is not the suffering Christ, gasping for air with blood and wounds on his body that is being repeated (*obaltio cruenta*). It is the glorified and bloodless Christ as sacrifice, which signifies the mass. (*oblation incruenta*). The historical act that happened on Calvary is passed and it is a false premise to believe otherwise from a Catholic point of view. When Christ appear he came as the perfect tabernacle, he enters the holy place to finish and complete once and for all the eternal redemption (Hebrews: 9.11). There has been one final sacrifice and the high priest does not have to go back and forth with an imperfect sacrifice. He enters to present the perfect sacrifice, and not an imperfect sacrifice that makes us go over and over again to attend mass. The high priest sits down because his work is done. He has obtained the eternal redemption. For this reason, he is the mediator of the new covenant. His work is perfect on behalf of his own people as the angels said that he will save the people from sins (Hebrews: 9.24-29).

The work of Jesus and his approach to sinful people, is a completed work and the forgiveness of sin. That is why he can save the uttermost of those who are drawn to him.

---

<sup>221</sup> Ibid., 144.

<sup>222</sup> Gudmund Waaler, *Nattverden som offer*, 67.

<sup>223</sup> Ibid., 69.

For Wisløff, there is no need to celebrate mass day after day to get some portion of salvation in order to be reach closer to perfection or salvation. However, Wisløff thinks that Christ does not need to shed his blood by dying again.<sup>224</sup> Friedrich Schleiermacher amongst others states that the intercession of Christ refers to the one saving act on the cross instead of the need of several repetition linked to his sacrifice.<sup>225</sup> This is not a total contrast to the Catholic teaching either. The one sacrifice for sin that has been completed by Christ. A repetition is an abuse of the sacrament, which goes back to an abuse of Christ himself. The Lutheran/Roman Catholic Joint Commission confirms that there is no statement that Christ suffers repeatedly in the Eucharist. "*That the Eucharist is a sacrifice in the sacramental sense, provided that it is clear that this is not a repetition of the historical sacrifice.*"<sup>226</sup> The mass does not repeat Calvary and has never been the teaching of the Church. The mass makes Calvary once and for all sacrificed and efficacious for human beings.

In terms of the remembrance, Wisløff referred to the word of Christ in the New Testament.<sup>227</sup> On the contrary, the reason to attend mass is to hear the homily and the word of God being proclaimed which is makes the homily a sacrificial character.<sup>228</sup> Catholic teaching does in other words, not deny that there is an aspect of remembrance.<sup>229</sup> The thanksgiving and praise express the memory that one is reminded of God's good creation. A memorial sacrifice refers for instance to proclaim the death of Lord until He comes again. The memorial was not just looking back to a special historical year. The concept remembrance (anamnesis) is used in the liturgy for the community to recall the Pascal Mysteries, which is the life of Jesus, his mission, death and resurrection.

Aulén favours the remembrance aspect in three points:<sup>230</sup> First, the anamnesis where one recalls what happened to Christ on the cross by being the victim and the sacrifice for human salvation. Then the event is not only a past event but is being actualized as he is alive and present among us. It has also an eschatological perspective where one waits for his coming at the end of time.

---

<sup>224</sup> Ibid.

<sup>225</sup> Tony Lane, *A Concise History of Christian thought*, 299f.

<sup>226</sup> Lutheran/Roman Catholic Joint Commission, "The Eucharist.", from 1978 [http://www.prounione.urbe.it/dia-int/1-rc/doc/e\\_1-rc\\_eucharist.html](http://www.prounione.urbe.it/dia-int/1-rc/doc/e_1-rc_eucharist.html). Accessed 22 March 2018.

<sup>227</sup> Gudmund Waaler, *Nattverden som offer*, 73.

<sup>228</sup> Ibid.,74.

<sup>229</sup> Lutheran/Roman Catholic Joint Commission, "The Eucharist.", from [http://www.prounione.urbe.it/dia-int/1-rc/doc/e\\_1-rc\\_eucharist.html](http://www.prounione.urbe.it/dia-int/1-rc/doc/e_1-rc_eucharist.html). Accessed 22 March 2018.

<sup>230</sup> Gudmund Waaler, *Nattverden som offer*, 269.

We partake in these events where we are connected to the heavenly and earthly celebration in the Eucharist. This implies of course that one talks about a sacrifice of remembrance and not an atoning sacrifice. In an atoning sacrifice, one can never act with Christ as object.

The sacrifice of the new covenant was a memorial of the one true oblation. When Christ says, "*Do this in remembrance of me.*" that points to a reliving with Christ. The entire reality of the risen Lord is glorified and all that is achieved for us is present at the celebration of mass.<sup>231</sup> Every mass is an encounter with Christ, by words, and one receives him also in the consecrated bread and wine. He is the saving fruit through food and drink. The word "anamnesis" is not only an intellectual conscience.<sup>232</sup> The meaning of remembrance or anamnesis is a word that stands for memorial sacrifice. To eat and drink in the remembrance of Christ. It has a connotation of sin that is brought forth. It is not only to remember Jesus, but remembering him for a reason. In the Mass one does not just enter into the saving events of Christ two thousand years ago, but is conscious that those events also *represent* (re-present = to make present) what is continuing to happen. Luther saw all this as a thanksgiving, prayer, praise while Catholics holds to the teaching that Christ is involved using the priest as the pastor and mediator for the people.<sup>233</sup>

Prenter has another interpretation of the concept of "remembrance" which is not only linked to the Eucharistic sacrifice. The remembrance for Prenter is the offertory where one brings the gifts, giving thanks and prayers as part of the Eucharistic sacrifice.<sup>234</sup> It is all together a participation of not only the priest and the community, but also Christ himself is involved since Christ is the one who transforms the gifts. He seems to be quite close to a Catholic interpretation of the Eucharistic sacrifice where the anamnesis is being repeated. Prenter has a double interpretation of the Eucharistic tradition.<sup>235</sup> On the one hand, he focuses on Christ, as the subject in relation to the sacrifice on the cross. On the other hand, he does not ignore the importance of the communion between the resurrected Christ and the community as part of this remembrance.

Aulén explains that it is not either or, but both arguments from the two churches are connected. The Eucharist is also a remembrance where one recalls the Pascal Mystery. He states that this Eucharistic sacrifice has an effect, which becomes present in the Eucharist.<sup>236</sup> The remembrance is not an event that has passed in history but again one recalls what Christ

---

<sup>231</sup> William B. Monahan, *St. Thomas Aquinas on the Eucharist* (London: Trinity Press, 1940), 74.

<sup>232</sup> Gudmund Waaler, *Nattverden som offer*, 74.

<sup>233</sup> Asle Eikrem, *God as Sacrificial Love*, 192.

<sup>234</sup> Gudmund Waaler, *Nattverden som offer*, 167.

<sup>235</sup> *Ibid.*, 245.

<sup>236</sup> *Ibid.*, 247.

did during the Eucharistic celebration. Donald Guthrie has a different approach to this.

The remembrance is the sin bearer who puts away sin and completes the sacrifice once and for all again.<sup>237</sup> For Aquinas one is reminded of our sins during mass, meaning that Christ is being the intercessor to the father in heaven.<sup>238</sup> He sat down for one offering, he has perfected for all time those who were sanctified. That makes Christ the saviour. Aquinas insisted on the Mass being memorial in nature as well as the uniqueness of the sacrifice of the cross where Jesus's human acts are instruments of divine action.<sup>239</sup> His actions are temporarily. In other words, His suffering on the cross happened there and then. The cross cannot be, by this, an eternal event because the human event occurred in human history.

However, the human acts of Jesus communicate the Divine power, and the instrument of this humanity serves a filter-living trace of itself in the act. Power thinks there is a practical remembrance of him in the mutual service that his followers render to each other.<sup>240</sup>

Wisløff and others think it is still difficult to see from a Christological angle the need to look at the mass as a daily sacrifice if everything was done and through the perfect sacrifice of Christ. It can never be repeated again even if Catholics explain that it is the glorified Christ interceding that is being repeated.<sup>241</sup> There is no sacrifice on the bloodless altar, or forgiveness of sins as they see it.<sup>242</sup> The scripture says that the old covenant of priests is gone forever and there is no need for new covenant priesthood. They are sinful men and cannot offer their own blood but Christ alone. An angle taken a bloodless sacrifice to God does not correspond to a Lutheran sacramental theology. Christ alone presented his own blood to God once and for all.

This topic has been interesting from the perspectives of the two denominations. Catholics supports that the mass can imply a recall of what God has done in history and made present and a re-enactment of the event.<sup>243</sup> There is an agreement among Catholics and Lutherans that Christ was the perfect sacrifice that died once and for all. The challenge is in what way does one recall Christ. They seem to both agree that the Eucharistic sacrifice does not connect to the completed blood sacrifice of the cross.

---

<sup>237</sup> Donald Guthrie. *Hebrews*, 199f.

<sup>238</sup> William B. Monahan. *St. Thomas Aquinas on the Eucharist*, 78f.

<sup>239</sup> *Ibid.*, 12.

<sup>240</sup> Phillip McCosker, "Sacrifice in Recent Roman Catholic Thought", 136.

<sup>241</sup> William B. Monahan, *St. Thomas Aquinas on the Eucharist*, 78.

<sup>242</sup> Gudmund Waaler, *Nattverden som offer*, 65.

<sup>243</sup> Phillip McCosker, "Sacrifice in Recent Roman Catholic Thought", 135.

This was confirmed in an ecumenical document on the Eucharist between Catholics and Lutherans.<sup>244</sup> They stand closer in some parts of the discussion and there is still need to continue to debate especially on the repetitive part.

I think it is better to say that the sacrifice is made present again, rather than repeated. It is the same sacrifice, for the sacrifice on the cross was once and for all. If it were repeated, then there would be multiple sacrifices, which would 1) directly contradict Scripture; and 2) make Christ's death on the Cross somehow limited in efficacy, or insufficient, which would be impossible (as to why it would be impossible, again you need to bring up metaphysics, causality, and Christology). The Body of Christ is there under the accidents of bread and wine. Since Christ died and rose, His humanity was thoroughly divinized and after the resurrection, glorified. The body and blood of Christ cannot be separated again.

If the sacrifice of Christ were actually repeated, then He would be dying at every Mass, and this cannot be for He cannot die again. So it must be a Christ who cannot die again who gives His body and blood, but in substance, not in their proper accidents. The sacrifice is not repeated, which would imply multiple sacrifices.

I think Lutherans and Catholics have a closer understanding to what is being repeated and what one understands by the term remembrance. They have different interpretations of the word but it should not lead to a huge gap between Catholics and Lutherans. I also think that they have a closer common interpretation of what is being repeated and that the event of Calvary will always be passed. Hence, I stand by the Catholic teaching that the bloodless and resurrected Christ presents the sacrifice on the altar. This belief is strengthened by the fact that the consecrated gift transform into the true sacrifice of Christ.<sup>245</sup> This will lead on to the next debate on what way Christ is present during the Eucharistic sacrifice.

### 5.3 The presence of Christ

Lutherans and Catholics have a common understanding that Christ is present in the Eucharist. The question is in what way is he present? This is important to find out because the way Christ is present in mass also has a consequence if there is a substantial presence of the Eucharistic sacrifice. If there is no transubstantiation, then there is no real presence of Christ in the Eucharist at the Mass. What happens with Christ during the consecration?

---

<sup>244</sup> Lutheran/Roman Catholic Joint Commission, "The Eucharist.", from 1978

[http://www.prounione.urbe.it/dia-int/l-rc/doc/e\\_1-rc\\_eucharist.html](http://www.prounione.urbe.it/dia-int/l-rc/doc/e_1-rc_eucharist.html).

<sup>245</sup> Roch A. Kereszty, *Wedding Feast of the Lamb*, 184-185.



Luther maintained that the true humanity of Christ concerning the real presence, which became the Lutheran teaching on the consubstantiation. The teaching of Aquinas on this matter still accounts today in the Catholic teaching. He takes transubstantiation as a tool to explain the sacrificial presence of Christ.<sup>246</sup> Lutherans did not support that doctrine, claimed that it was not biblical, and contained too many philosophical speculations, which were not relevant. They believe on the real presence and that the presence of Christ is also outside the Church. I want to explore how does the transubstantiation affects the Catholic Eucharistic Sacrifice and in what way Christ is present.

### 5.3.1. Is the transubstantiation Biblical?

Lutherans relies on the Scripture as the supreme authority. The scriptural passage that is used to justify the transubstantiation is John 6. There are arguments from Kereszty that support that John 6 contains teaching about the Eucharist as sacrifice.<sup>247</sup>

Just as Jesus draws his life from the Father and lives for the Father, so does the one who feeds on his flesh and drinks his blood live through Jesus and for Jesus. Coming to Jesus in faith leads to eating his flesh and drinking his blood. To follow Jesus establishes the beginning of a personal communion. The feeding on his flesh and drinking his blood brings about its consummation. It is only His sacrificed and risen humanity that becomes for us the food and the drink.<sup>248</sup> The flesh of Jesus is linked to the word and his eternal body. The same word is used in the Eucharistic prayer and Last Supper. Jesus came down from heaven as human flesh and blood to give himself to his people. He is the continuation of Manna as a gift of life, which is the root of the Eucharist. Jesus himself is the true flesh and drink that one must eat to have the eternal life. It shows a sacrifice that culminates in the meal.<sup>249</sup>

Lutherans are careful not to read the Bible word by word. The Bible must be contextualized. For instance, did Nicodemus literally have to be reborn again? When Christ says he is the wine, is he really a cup of wine that is literally speaking? Bultmann claims that metaphors and symbolism must be taken into account.<sup>250</sup> For example, Jesus is not the son in the sky, a Shepard of sheep or living wine but it symbolizes his ministry. When Christ says that he is the bread of life, he says so in front of his audience and not in the last supper.

---

<sup>246</sup> Lutheran/Roman Catholic Joint Commission, "The Eucharist.", from 1978  
[http:// www.prounione.urbe.it/dia-int/l-rc/doc/e\\_1-rc\\_eucharist.html](http://www.prounione.urbe.it/dia-int/l-rc/doc/e_1-rc_eucharist.html). Accessed 22 March 2018.

<sup>247</sup> Roch A. Kereszty, *Wedding Feast of the Lamb*, 61.

<sup>248</sup> Wiliam B. Monahan, *St. Thomas Aquinas on the Eucharist*,124.

<sup>249</sup> Roch A. Kereszty, *Wedding Feast of the Lamb*, 61.

<sup>250</sup> Tony Lane, *A Concise History of Christian thought*, 245.

God sent down the bread of life from heaven and Christ is the true bread from heaven that gives life in the word. They want this bread as word of God not as a sacrifice. Christ tells them what is necessary to have this eternal life. John 6 is about receiving spiritual food in order to come to him and have faith in him.<sup>251</sup> The word of Jesus "*I am the bread of life*" means come to Christ and believe in Jesus. Then one shall never hunger and thirst.

All who come to believe will be raised up on the last day, which includes having the eternal life. "*Truly, I tell you the truth, anyone who believes has eternal life*" (John 6:47). It is an invitation from Christ to come and believe which is mentioned six times in that chapter.<sup>252</sup> It is not enough to see John 6 alone as a Eucharistic understanding without taking other biblical texts into consideration. Does it avoid the interpretation of John 6 to be read literally?

Kereszty has a very different view on John 6.<sup>253</sup> Christ says for example that His flesh is real food and His blood is real drink. He uses graphic language by saying that the bread he will give is His flesh for the life. The disciples did not understand and ask how this man can give His flesh to eat. Jesus does not correct the language by saying that He misunderstood. They trust his words as they chose to follow Him. Due to the graphic language, Jesus continues to say that this is my body and blood. He will give his flesh for the life of the world and he adds to the graphic terminology of "chewing." When the Old Testament talks of eating flesh, it always refers to a violent situation. It never uses it as a metaphor for believing in them, and accepting teaching. The Wisdom talks of eating manna as receiving wisdom, but not eating flesh. Kereszty refers to John 6.2, that says, "*what if you see him ascending to where he was before.*" It is a reference to Daniel 7. Christ will ascend to where he was before. He is a celestial figure. The flesh you will eat will be an ascended glorified flesh.<sup>254</sup> This reading avoids a cannibalistic interpretation.

Another question would be, how can Lutherans read the Bible Christological and literally, except when it comes to John 6? It was not imaginable to think that the disciples at the last supper ate a transubstantiated Jesus who was not yet sacrificed or glorified. (Matthew, 26:17-30, Marc 14:12-25, Luke 22:7.23. The eating and drinking must be in connection to his speech and words. Joachim Jeremias tells that John 6 is an example of a metaphorical understanding.<sup>255</sup>

---

<sup>251</sup> Roch A. Kereszty, *Wedding Feast of the Lamb*,59.

<sup>252</sup> Karl Olav Sandnes (Professor The Lutheran Faculty of Theology, Oslo) Lectures October, 2001.

<sup>253</sup> Roch A. Kereszty, *Wedding Feast of the Lamb*,60.

<sup>254</sup> *Ibid.*,61.

<sup>255</sup> *Ibid.*, 52.

To eat and drink, cannot be literal either because the teaching is not based on cannibalism. When he speaks to the crowd around him He does not imply to eat his body parts. At the same time, they also take into account in John 6; it is used figures of speech to underline the reality of Jesus in his ministry. Does that mean that Christ offered truly and literally his own body and blood to eat and drink? Even if Aulén is less sceptical to use the word sacrifice he does not conclude that this text talks about a Eucharistic sacrifice. He says that through the bread and wine one is nourished and strengthened to grow closer to God as a part of his salvation.<sup>256</sup>

Catholics are taught that Jesus in John 6 commanded all of his faithful to literally eat his flesh and drink his blood for eternal life (John 6:46-58). Then Christ instituted the transubstantiation at the last supper in order to give the disciples and all Christians his flesh to eat and his blood to drink.<sup>257</sup> They are taught that Jesus also instituted a new covenant of priesthood at the same supper.

This event as the last supper is the same event and the same thing as eating the body and blood of Christ from the Catholic altar after the ceremony of the transformation. Ordained priests had the same authority to officiate such transubstantiation every single day.

The newly constituted piece of bread and cup of wine is the body, blood soul and divinity of Christ. To eat the bread and drink the wine is to receive many blessings. Among them is the forgiveness of some kinds of sins. They are specifically taught that this offering is to be carried up to God in the heavens and presented before God by an angel.

The Lutheran response is to look for biblical proof.<sup>258</sup> For instance, Jesus is verified by his resurrection with physical proofs he was alive. Jesus relied upon verification upon resurrection by asking those in his presence to see him, touch him and to hear his voice (Luc 24:39). From the beginning in John 1:4 the word of life verifies his resurrection as important for the Christian faith to say how do we know what we know.

By using the physical senses, one can identify what we know. Theological interpretation without verification can signify everything. Texts without proofs can be read as a fiction. Any sign of transubstantiation in John 6 is for Lutherans speculative interpretation without any proof. *"This terminology has widely been considered by Lutherans as an attempt rationalistically to explain the mystery of Christ's presence in the sacrament;"*<sup>259</sup>

---

<sup>256</sup> Gudmund Waaler, *Nattverden som offer*, 219.

<sup>257</sup> Wiliam B. Monahn, *St. Thomas Aquinas on the Eucharist*, 123.

<sup>258</sup> Roch A. Kereszty, *Wedding Feast of the Lamb*, 52.

<sup>259</sup> Lutheran/Roman Catholic Joint Commission, "The Eucharist.", from 1978  
[http:// www.prounione.urbe.it/dia-int/l-rc/doc/e\\_l-rc\\_eucharist.html](http://www.prounione.urbe.it/dia-int/l-rc/doc/e_l-rc_eucharist.html).

Is it enough to only look at the Scripture literally by saying that since Eucharistic sacrifice and transubstantiation are not written in John 6, is it therefore a heresy? In John 6.55, it is written to eat his flesh and drink his blood and he will transform the bread and the grape juice into his blood. The word “therefore” in John 6.53 is according to Trent, is biblical proof that God declared that what Christ offered, was truly his own body when he said what he said without any questions asked or other explanations behind the statement.<sup>260</sup>

Wisløff emphasized that the proclamation of the gospel and the gift of the sacrament are enough to justify that Christ is present in the gifts of the elements. He supports that the real presence where Christ is present in bread and wine, including John 6, but not the way Catholics see this in the light of sacrifice and the transubstantiation.<sup>261</sup> It is the sacramental dimension of the Eucharistic sacrifice that is hard to understand for Lutherans. The Gospel of John does not speak directly about the bread and wine as Eucharistic celebration, but Jesus teaches the Christians that he himself is their food and drink in the Eucharist.<sup>262</sup> There is nothing in this passage that concludes that he does not speak literally.

Kereszty refers to when Christ says “truly”, it must be said that this is what he really meant.<sup>263</sup> It is not a language of metaphor or symbol when he refers to eat and drink. The word “chewing”, cannot be used metaphorically. Jesus does not attempt to correct his language when the disciples did not understand. Hans von Seldén said. Rudolf Bultmann and other Lutheran theologians interpret this type of reading as too sacramental.<sup>264</sup> He has to make these later additions to make sense of his reading. There is no other sacrifice that should be added to Christ’s own offering. The self-offering of the Church is also called metaphorically a sacrifice. For Lutherans, to offer bread and wine is not necessary but it says something about the nature of the Eucharist. Christ’s death and resurrection symbolizes the obedience of Christ as a metaphor of the expiation of sins.

### **5.3.2. Is the Eucharistic Christ transubstantiated?**

In this section, I want to find out where the relation is between the transubstantiation and the Eucharistic sacrifice? First, I will find out if there are other theological arguments than the Scripture that justify this relation. I am going to use the Early Church at the very beginning of the post apostolic period.

---

<sup>260</sup> William B. Monahan, *St. Thomas Aquinas on the Eucharist*, 63.

<sup>261</sup> Gudmund Waaler, *Nattverden som offer*, 63.

<sup>262</sup> *Ibid.*, 62.

<sup>263</sup> Roch A. Kereszty, *Wedding Feast of the Lamb*, 61.

<sup>264</sup> *Ibid.*, 52.

I will sum up a little bit of the history in order to better understand the meaning behind the relation between the transubstantiation and the Eucharistic sacrifice. Then I will present the discussion between the real presence and the transubstantiation to see if this has any consequence for the Eucharistic sacrifice between the Catholics and Lutherans before the conclusion takes place.

According to Catholic Canon Law, the nature behind the Eucharistic sacrifice has to do with how one sees the connection between the Church and the other sacraments. Christ has founded the Church. This comes from his own words to Peter when he said I am the rock and gave Peter the authority to lead the flock and his Church, (Mt 16:18). In Canon Law “The Church is apostolic because she is founded on the apostles, in three ways (CL 857): First, she was and remains built on ‘the foundation of the Apostles,’ the witnesses chosen and sent on mission by Christ himself. Second, with the help of the Spirit dwelling in her, the Church keeps and hands on the teaching. That is the ‘good deposit,’ or the salutary words she has heard from the apostles, and third, she continues to be taught, sanctified and guided by the apostles until Christ’s return, through their successors in pastoral office. The college of bishops, ‘assisted by priests, are in union with the successor of Peter, the Church’s supreme pastor’.” From the beginning of his ministry, he ‘called to him those whom he desired; He appointed twelve, whom also he named apostles, to be with him, and to be sent out to preach.’”(Mk 3:13-14) The mission continued through the apostles: “As the Father has sent me, even so I send you.”(Mt 10:40) There is the great commission from Christ after the resurrection “Go therefore and make disciples of all nations, baptising them in the name of the father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, and teaching them to obey everything that I have commanded you. Christ’s own words “*And remember that I am with you always, to the end of the age.*”(Mt 28:19-20), confirms that the apostles and bishops are teaching and governing the Church. This teaching was passed on to the Church fathers.

This apostolic tradition is an important key to understand the Catholic Eucharistic sacramental theology. The Church Fathers believe that the Eucharist is a sacrifice with the real presence of Jesus Christ. Why is that? Because that was the faith in the very ancient Church and it still is. The teaching was handed on to the apostles and later the Church fathers. One of these early Fathers was Ignatius the bishop of Antioch.<sup>265</sup> On his way to martyrdom in Rome, he wrote epistles to some of the same churches as Paul wrote to.

---

<sup>265</sup> Mary Ann Clarahan (The Pontifical Beda College) Lectures February 2016.

In the epistles to the Romans, he wrote "*I want the bread of God which is the flesh of Jesus Christ and as drink I want his blood which is his incorruptible love.*"<sup>266</sup> In his epistles to the Church at Smyrna he observed well those who were heterodox that they are opposed to the mind of God as they abstain from Eucharist because they do not confess that the Eucharist is the flesh of Christ. To the Church in Philadelphia, he takes for granted that there is only one Eucharist. That is because there is only one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ and one cup of union in his blood, one altar of sacrifice as there is only one bishop with the priests and deacons. In the 1. Corinthians 10:17, Paul urged the Christians to have only one assembly, to not break up, led by one bishop with breaking the bread which is the medicine to immortality that offers life given by Christ.

Justin Martyr stated that the bread and wine in the ancient church are believed to be flesh and blood of Christ.<sup>267</sup> John Chrysostom (344-407) wrote on his Homily that Christ feeds the faithful with himself and Christ sacrifices these offerings and transforms them.<sup>268</sup> Aquinas mentioned in his teaching of concomitance, that every particle is the body of Christ.<sup>269</sup> All the Latin fathers of the Church and Aquinas proclaim that the Eucharist is really and truly the body and blood of Christ. Augustine wrote that Christ walked on earth in that same flesh, and gave that same flesh to us to be eaten for our salvation.<sup>270</sup> This teaching is also found at the Vatican council which underlines that "*certitude that Christ is present sacramentally and substantially when under the species of bread and wine. These earthly realities are changed into the reality of his Body and Blood, Soul and Divinity.*"<sup>271</sup> This is about a mystical union with Christ. On one hand, one assents the presence of the substance of Christ's body because we accept the truth of the word of Christ which is "this is my body" (Luc 22:19). On the other hand, one assents to the continued presence of the accidents of breads from the fact that we trust our senses. Jesus could perform miracles, change his hair or tan his skin, transform the gifts but he remains human throughout.

---

<sup>266</sup> Ken Kurtis and Dan Graves, "Article #5 I am the wheat of God." Christian History Institute 2018, <https://christianhistoryinstitute.org/incontext/article/ignatius>. Accessed 12 May 2018.

<sup>267</sup> Edward J Kilmartin, *The Eucharist in the West*, 68.

<sup>268</sup> Adalbert Hamman, *How to Read the Church Fathers* (New York: the Crossroad Publishing Company, 1993), 86.

<sup>269</sup> William B. Monahan, St. Thomas Aquinas on the Eucharist, 74-75.

<sup>270</sup> Edward J Kilmartin, *The Eucharist in the West*, 24..

<sup>271</sup> Lutheran/Roman Catholic Joint Commission, "The Eucharist.", from 1978  
[http://www.prounione.urbe.it/dia-int/l-rc/doc/e\\_l-rc\\_eucharist.html](http://www.prounione.urbe.it/dia-int/l-rc/doc/e_l-rc_eucharist.html).

This opens up a question: How can Lutherans proclaim that there is no substantial change in Christ? There are two principles causes to respond to this question. The first is Biblical.

Wisløff among others supports the Lutheran teaching that there is no scriptural evidence for this. It is simply not possible to support the transubstantiation as a biblical truth. Therefore, one cannot introduce a liturgy or ceremonies with arguments that are not scriptural. Lutherans take the interpretation of the Church fathers and the Church history into account, but their arguments are more Christological.<sup>272</sup> The Lords supper goes back to the death of Christ. When Christ said “This is my body and blood,” one may ask how did the Jewish disciples understand this? Did they, as Jews, really think that Jesus was saying literally, to eat his body and believe that this lead to the doctrine of transubstantiation? Some would say at that it would be strange for a Jew because it would be cannibalism.<sup>273</sup> The Jewish always broke the bread, as the father broke the bread and distributed it to his family in the Jewish Passover. However, Lutherans agree the presence of Christ is there. Jesus demonstrated his presence only alongside the bread and wine. The phrase “being given” demonstrates in the Lords supper what God does to his family in Jesus Christ alone, not what a priest does or what we do as a sacrifice. It is a thanksgiving meal where Christ instituted the new Passover lamb as a new covenant and a community meal.

For Aquinas, the transubstantiation does not describe a process, which in any way produces a local extension of Christ. There is nothing that happens to His Person when the consecration occurs.<sup>274</sup> The sacramental presence is no less real. Christ is present in the host. Hence, when the sacred host is broken into pieces or the consecrated contents of the chalice are consumed in small quantities, Christ is again, fully present in each particle and in every drop.<sup>275</sup> Trent also supports this teaching. Even before the actual division of the sacred species, Christ is present whatever the substance of bread, which was present before the consecration. The transubstantiation changes the whole substance of bread into the substance of the body. The substance of the bread and of the wine before the consecration, present the totality of the host as well as the small parts whether separated or united. This is the explanation behind the Eucharistic sacrifice.

---

<sup>272</sup> Gudmund Waaler, *Nattverden som offer*, 55.

<sup>273</sup> Roch A. Kereszty, *Wedding Feast of the Lamb*, 193.

<sup>274</sup> Wiliam B. Monahan, *St. Thomas Aquinas on the Eucharist*, 65.

<sup>275</sup> *Ibid.*, 75.

The second cause goes back to the teaching of ubiquity where Prenter proclaim that Christ is also omnipresent.<sup>276</sup> He states that it makes the Eucharist an atoning sacrifice.<sup>277</sup> Christ is still not only present in the Eucharist itself but in the Church too. The presence of Christ can be experienced by hearing the word outside the Church through prayers and readings. He thinks that Christ is present in us as nourishment unto eternal life in the Eucharist.<sup>278</sup> From this teaching, it is not bread and wine because the substance of the bread has undergone change (transformation). It is either Christ since the body of Christ no longer has extension in time and space. For Prenter, Christ is not identical with the body and blood and there is no such thing as a transformation or substantial change either by the words of institution.<sup>279</sup> He uses the concept “change” instead to convince that a consecration is taken place. The way I look at Prenter, he seems to be between a Catholic and Reformed sacramental theology. He agrees with the reformers by denying a substantial change that is linked to transubstantiation. He supports the Catholic doctrine on the Real Presence and agrees that there is a change. Prenter agrees with Luther that metaphysical part of the Catholic doctrine is speculative and does not solve this problem. Prenter appeals to the hypostatic union: the one person of Christ is inseparable from his divine and human nature.<sup>280</sup> Luther does more than propose that Christ’s humanity operates everywhere. He thinks Christ is personally present in his two natures throughout the universe. Luther’s approach proposes the closest relation between the two natures, at the risk of mingling them by saying that there is no contradiction between the exegetical approach where Christ is bodily presence and a spiritual presence.<sup>281</sup> For he attributes divine properties to Christ’s human nature, in order to account for how Christ’s body and blood can be present on the altar.

No Catholic theology of transubstantiation makes such a move. The real presence is in a way a contrast to the metaphysical understanding of this substantial change. To understand the Catholic Eucharistic sacrifice one must be able to see the connection to the metaphysical aspect and to grasp why this matters. At question 76, article 1 Aquinas deals with this issue as he appeals to the principle of concomitance.<sup>282</sup>

---

<sup>276</sup> Bjørn Ole Hovda. "Brødet er Kristi lekam. Martin Luthers syn på transsubstansiasjonslære og realpresens i tre skrift." (Masteroppgave i Kristendomsstudier, B.O.Hovda,2007).

<sup>277</sup> Gudmund Waaler, *Nattverden som offer*, 118

<sup>278</sup> *Ibid.*, 120.

<sup>279</sup> *Ibid.*, 184.

<sup>280</sup> *Ibid.*, 331.

<sup>281</sup> *Ibid.*, 302.

<sup>282</sup> Wiliam B.Monahan, *St. Thomas Aquinas on the Eucharist*, 74.



This means that whatever is actually connected with the body and blood of Christ, is made present when the gifts of the elements are made present. Christ is made present in the Eucharist as He really is. It is not another Christ that is made present. Hence, after the resurrection, the body of Christ is united to his blood and his soul.

They are hypostatically united to the word of God.<sup>283</sup> When the body and blood are made present, so also are his soul, and divinity. By the power of the sacrament, the whole humanity of Christ is made present both under the species of bread and the species of wine, but that his divinity is made present by concomitance. Likewise, when by the force of the words spoken by the priest, the blood is made present under the continued appearance of wine the Body soul and divinity of Christ are made present by natural concomitance.

### **5.3.3 The relation between the real presence and the transubstantiation**

I will now look at the discussion between the teaching from Luther and Aquinas before I make a summary to clarify the relation between the presence of Christ and the Eucharistic sacrifice.

My goal is not to prove which theory is the right one, but to clarify the teaching in light of the sacrificial dimension of the Eucharist. While Catholics base their faith on the transubstantiation, many Lutherans struggle to accept this teaching. Does the teaching of transubstantiation reinforce the Eucharistic sacrifice? Luther rejected the transubstantiation, especially in the way the consecration took place.<sup>284</sup> Wisløff and other Lutherans have tried to avoid the Aristotelian philosophy and metaphysics as basic sources to grasp the teaching of the transubstantiation. This implies concepts such as substance, accidents, form and matter. Luther wanted instead to concentrate on the Eucharist as a mystery and that there was no contradiction between the real presence of Christ and that the bread and wine could still be present at the same time. For instance, Reinhold Seeberg and Paul Wiliam Generich have interpreted the texts of Luther from a Christological point of view. They both claim that Christ is substantially and personally present in the gifts of the elements.<sup>285</sup> The presence happens because of the word of institution has taken place. Scripture points rather convincingly towards an Institution Narrative.

---

<sup>283</sup> Roch A. Kereszty, *Wedding Feast of the Lamb*, 214.

<sup>284</sup> Bjørn Ole Hovda. "Brødet er Kristi lekam. Martin Luthers syn på transsubstansiasjonslære og realpresens i tre skrift." (Masteroppgave i Kristendomsstudier, B.O.Hovda,2007).

<sup>285</sup> Gudmund Waaler, *Nattverden som offer*, 55.

Much of the accounts of the Last Supper and the institution of the Eucharist make reference to such a narrative being central to the Eucharistic celebration. Wisløff followed Luther by saying that by the words of institution, the bread and wine were truly the body and blood of Christ. However, it is not a Eucharistic sacrifice for that reason. Wisløff uses the incarnation as an example of the presence of Christ, which happens by the word of institution.<sup>286</sup>

Christ own words that “This is my body” do not refer to any sacrifice. The presence of Christ has been understood differently among Catholics.

The presence of Christ according to Catholic Teaching is that the whole Christ was truly present in the elements and in the host. This led to a different worship of Christ such as private masses and adorations, which were an abuse of the sacrament for Luther and his followers. Lutherans underlines that it is the Christology and the interpretation of the Scripture that has had a great influence on Luther on his arguments of the real presence.<sup>287</sup>

Wisløff thinks that the Eucharist for him is, first and foremost, a proclamation of the gospel. It is the word of Christ, that makes him present and not the priest.<sup>288</sup> Prenter underlines the presence of Christ in terms of the doctrine of justification. The key word is the merit of the Eucharistic sacrifice. God redeems human beings in the mass by partaking of the sacrificial death of Christ. The explanation of how Christ is present under each species requires to consider how Christ is made present in the first place. An important principle of the Catholic sacramental theology is that sacraments cause by signifying.

At q. 76, a. 1, ad 1, Aquinas points to a crucial theological implication of concomitance. Without the divinity joined to Christ’s body, his Eucharistic body does not give eternal life. Christ’s body by itself does not give grace. Christ saves one for He is God. As God, he saves us through the instrumentality of his humanity. His body brims over with his divinity, and so, he can give grace through his sacred humanity, through his body in mass. Christ is present under the appearance of either a small or a big piece of bread or of little or much wine in the Eucharist.<sup>289</sup> Christ is present in any fragment of the consecrated host or in any drop of the blood. Nevertheless, it is especially fitting to receive Christ in both forms during the celebration of the Eucharist. He is, in other words, naturally present as He is in heaven but sacramentally present in the Eucharist.

---

<sup>286</sup> Gudmund Waaler, *Nattverden som offer*, 52.

<sup>287</sup> Ibid.

<sup>288</sup> Ibid., 60.

<sup>289</sup> William B. Monahan, *St. Thomas Aquinas on the Eucharist*, 75.

Aquinas holds that the presence of Christ's blood is not determined in the consecration of the host.<sup>290</sup> The Eucharist contains truly and substantially the body and blood together with the Soul and the Divinity of Christ. Christ's body is really joined to his soul. Also, both his glorified body and soul are really joined to his divinity. His body and soul cannot be separated. Christ cannot die again and be separated again. Aquinas holds that the words of consecration do not signify the presence of Christ's soul, but because the body is present, the soul must be present as well.

The same holds for his divinity: it is present on the altar because the body is present.

Therefore, wherever his body is present, his divinity is also present. Aquinas explains that, in the chalice, the blood becomes present by signification, but the body becomes present "by concomitance," because it is inseparable from the blood of the glorified Jesus.<sup>291</sup>

Aulén does not support the teaching of transubstantiation because Christ cannot be present by the words of institution and in the elements at the same time.<sup>292</sup> He links the connection between sacrifice and the real presence.<sup>293</sup> He states that there is a connection between the words of institution and the sacrifice on the cross because Christ actualises his sacrifice. He describes that the real presence in the gifts of the elements is an effective presence of the eternal+ sacrifice.<sup>294</sup> Christ is, for Aulén, not present in the bread and wine, which contradicts to the Catholic theology of Aquinas and others. The glorified Christ actualizes the effect of the perfect sacrifice on the cross where Christ partakes in the bread and wine.<sup>295</sup>

This means instead of saying that Christ dies every Eucharist, the presence of Christ is being actualized.<sup>296</sup> This shows that there is a closer connection between the sacrifice on the cross and the Eucharistic sacrifice. His saving action and presence is to be found in the bread and the wine. For Aulén, the Eucharist is linked to the salvation and therefore this connection and actualisation are important aspects of the Real Presence. The atoning sacrifice happened on the cross but God's saving action happens in the Eucharist. The very gift of salvation is linked to gifts of the elements.

---

<sup>290</sup> Ibid., 74.

<sup>291</sup> Ibid., 73f.

<sup>292</sup> Gudmund Waaler, *Nattverden som offer*, 219.

<sup>293</sup> Ibid., 221.

<sup>294</sup> Ibid.

<sup>295</sup> Ibid., 222.

<sup>296</sup> Robert C. Croken, *Luther's First Front*, 141.

Kereszty explains that the real presence of Christ is not a goal itself but rather the active presence of Christ who is offering to God in the form of his gift of self to humankind.<sup>297</sup> That was the intention of Christ by offering himself to us by sharing his gifts to us as participants. He talks about a sacramental presence where Christ is present spiritually and concretely which happens through the gifts, which are being transformed into the body and blood of Christ. What is the implication of this teaching of Eucharist and Transubstantiation? In the Council of Trent, the definition of transubstantiation was: "*By the consecration of the bread and wine, a conversion takes place of the substance of the bread, into the substance of the substance of the body of Christ our Lord, and of the whole substance of the wine, into the substance of His Blood.*"<sup>298</sup> The true body of our Lord and His true blood together with His soul and divinity exist under the species of bread and wine. This implies the whole Christ is being offered. At the end of the 13th section it is written that "if anyone denies that in the sacrament of the most holy Eucharist are contained truly really and substantially the body and blood together with the soul and divinity of Jesus Christ (...) let that man be accursed."<sup>299</sup> The Catholic Catechism supports this teaching too (CC1375). The words "This is my body" transforms the elements that are offered. Catholic theologians are taught that God preserves the accidents of bread and wine. There is a substantial change into the body, soul, blood and divinity of Christ. Since all accidents need a substance, God replaces the substance of bread and wine with the body of Jesus Christ. This transformation takes place by the word of the priest who acts on the place of Jesus.

According to Lutheran teaching, Scripture is the source for their Eucharistic theology. Who has the authority to do such a thing? The Catholic Catechism is clear on this matter. It is only a validly ordained priest who has this authority to preside at the Eucharist and consecrate the bread and wine to become the body and blood of the Lord (CCC1411). The Lutheran real presence means that Christ is present but not identical with the bread after the consecration in the light of the transubstantiation. He held his own blood and his own body in his hands. Lutherans are more focused on the faith. It is not only the gift of the Eucharist that transforms a person. Since there is no substantial change in the Eucharist, there is also no sacrifice present at the altar. A transformation is something that can happen inside through personal experiences with the omnipresent God. They have different mystical ideas by looking more at the word of God that transforms us.

---

<sup>297</sup> Roch A. Kereszty, *Wedding Feast of the Lamb*, 213.

<sup>298</sup> Norman P. Tanner, ed. *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, 695.

<sup>299</sup> *Ibid.*, 735.

Faith is based on the scripture and tradition so the influence from Church fathers is crucial to grasp the Eucharistic faith. This is not the case for the Catholics. The transubstantiation cannot be separated from the Eucharistic mass. Luther's doctrine on consubstantiation was condemned because it requires the connection between the substance of the bread and the substance of the true body of Christ, which showed to be impossible.<sup>300</sup> The transubstantiation is a tool towards the understanding of the sacrifice. Paul addresses in his letter to the Corinthians 11 where he criticized the faithful who behaved disrespectfully on their approach to the Eucharist. Anyone who eats and drink in an unworthy way is guilty (1. Corinthians 11:27-34).

A Catholic position is that it is not either symbolism or reality, but both are. In the Eucharist, the real presence in the body of Christ is present. As we know, the body of Christ does not refer to the historical body of Jesus who lived on earth. One believes that the Eucharist consecrated is the real presence of Christ glorified and risen. It is not as if a presence compared to people speaking to each face to face in the city. It is the glorified Lord who is present who fills the entirety of the universe with his presence. He is able to be with His people through the sign of the Eucharistic bread. The Transubstantiation is the reality of material things. Each thing has a substance. The elements are unavailable to the faith but speak to the senses. Aquinas talked about the sense of sight and smell and trusty hearing as we hear these words and promises.<sup>301</sup> According to Lutheran teaching, the relation between the transubstantiation and the Eucharistic sacrifice adds more than Luther followers could support. How can Jesus be as sacrifice in the bread substantially and at the same time be in many places at once in the form of his body, soul, blood and divinity in Eucharist?

According to the teaching of Aquinas, the transubstantiation gives the possibility of multiple masses being said at once in the world through which Christ is corporeally present on many altars at once (q. 76, a. 1, ad 3). It accounts for the presence of his divinity in the gifts and the unchanged state of his glorified existence in heaven. It also explains why we can receive as much Jesus in one drop of the cup or one small fragment of a host as we can with multiple hosts or an entire cup because quantity is an accident. The substance in and of itself is not quantified, but rather has the accident of quantity (q. 76, a. 1, ad 3). We do not crunch Jesus' bones, because we do no violence to the substance of his body when we consume the host and drink from the cup.

---

<sup>300</sup> William B. Monahan, *St. Thomas Aquinas on the Eucharist*, 70.

<sup>301</sup> *Ibid.*

By eating and drinking, the accidents of the host and in the cup change, but they are accidents of bread and wine. Christ's body can only be broken in its proper species, that is, in its proper accidents. He was broken in his proper species during his Passion, when his body was torn apart. This is no longer possible after his Ascension. For Christ to suffer in his body, he must be acted upon through his proper accidents, the accidents that are now in heaven. One cannot crush his bones or teeth by eating the Eucharist, because all of his bones, teeth and the rest of his physical existence are present by mode of substance in the host (q. 77, a. 7). In this way, the transubstantiation also avoids merely symbolic and cannibalistic notions of the Eucharist.<sup>302</sup> We do not eat his teeth literally either from the past or modern time.

At question 75, article 4, Thomas notes that transubstantiation is something that is more a supernatural change. The difference is that this substantial changes are not a change of the whole substance of water (form and matter) into a whole new substance of wine. Rather, by a miraculous divine deed, water matter loses water form and takes on the form of wine. The miracle of transubstantiation is similar. In transubstantiation, the change is more radical. After the consecration, the only substance present is that of Christ's body and that of his blood. The bread and wine accidents have a metaphysical relation to no merely created substance.<sup>303</sup> They contain the body, blood, soul and divinity of Christ. Here, the word "contain" has a metaphysical meaning: It signifies that they really mediate access to Christ.<sup>304</sup> The term does not have a spatial meaning. The bread and wine accidents contain a human bodily substance that is joined to the divine substance. The relation between the bread accidents and body substance is not like the Incarnation, because in the Eucharist, Christ does not actually take on bread quantity, texture or appearances, nor does he take on the nature of bread or wine substance. The bread and wine accidents mediate more than access to Christ's saving power: they give us access Christ in his very flesh and blood, his bodily being, not just his action. In Thomas' view, the accidents mediate access to the body and blood of Christ because the substance of the bread and wine is converted into that body and blood. Now clearly, these accidents do not become the very accidents of Christ but the language of the accidents "containing" the substance of body and blood signals the metaphysical transcendental relation.<sup>305</sup>

---

<sup>302</sup> Roch A. Kereszty, *Wedding Feast of the Lamb*, 193.

<sup>303</sup> Tomas Alvira, Luis Clavell, Tomas Melendo, *Metaphysics*. Understanding the science of being (Makati City: Sinag-Tala Publishers, 1990), 49.

<sup>304</sup> William B. Monahan, *St. Thomas Aquinas on the Eucharist*, 76.

<sup>305</sup> Tomas Alvira, Luis Clavell, Tomas Melendo, *Metaphysics*, 70.

In q. 77, a. 1, ad 2, the substance of Christ's body is the subject of his own accidents in heaven, and not the proper subject of the accidents of bread and wine on the altar. Christ's substance does not properly become the subject of new accidents. Everything is possible for God. Lutherans and Catholics agree that everything is possible for God. The question is how does this happen? Lutherans highlight the Scripture to find proof for theological and Eucharistic statements. The philosophies from Aquinas is just theories.<sup>306</sup>

Lutherans claims that there is theological proof in the New Testament that can verify that Christ lives, since they could see, hear, and touch him. If there are no explanations, how can the transubstantiation be verified? A possible response from Catholics is to say that both the soul and substance are invisible to our eyes, but they are real. The invisible body and blood of Jesus are also real. The soul is not accessible to the research of natural science or good intellectual thoughts. Every being is a substance that is independent for scientific investigation. Philosophy tells us about the soul and substance, but science does not. We cannot experience soul or substance. Lutherans agree that one receive the word of God through faith. Lutherans have a different approach to the presence of Christ. According to Prenter, the transubstantiation could be understood as a magical process due to the substantial change of the gifts.<sup>307</sup> He rather combines the word of God as a gift of the gospel that is received from the community.<sup>308</sup> This makes it difficult for Lutherans to accept that there is any talk of a sacrifice since this a gift by the grace of God.

Wisløff does not find evidence for any theory where the teaching on the transubstantiation can be verified. They do find the real presence because of Christ's own words saying "This is my body and blood." Lutherans did not concern themselves too much on speculative discussions with regards to substance and accidents. For Wisløff, Prenter and Aulén, the Christological view is centred on theory of ubiquity where Christ as omnipresent. He is the founder of the words of institution making it impossible to be present in the bread and wine too.<sup>309</sup> The theories seems to be not too far away from each other as they both confirm the presence of Christ but the way the real presence and the transubstantiation explain his presence, is very different. The transubstantiation serve to explain the sacrificial presence in the Eucharist and clarify why there is a sacrificial presence of Christ in mass.

---

<sup>306</sup> Gudmund Waaler, *Nattverden som offer*, 53.

<sup>307</sup> *Ibid.*, 124.

<sup>308</sup> *Ibid.*, 58.

<sup>309</sup> *Ibid.*, 52.

Odo Casel OSB (1886-1948), claims that faith is necessary to understand without any scientific proof.<sup>310</sup> At question 75, article 4, Aquinas cites Ambrose in order to make an analogy with Christ's miraculous conception in Mary's womb. In the case of the Incarnation, the creation of a substance is beyond the limits of natural causes for instance when Virgin Mary conceives without a man. It is not possible and not necessary to explain how this process works by reason or scientific proof because it is supernatural for Aquinas.<sup>311</sup> He mentions that God takes the initiative and reveals himself through Christ and continues to act after his death and Resurrection in the liturgy of the Church. It is before where they proclaim the mystery of faith. David Power talks about the Eucharist as a sign of thanksgiving and praise.<sup>312</sup> The very shape of our prayers, praise and gestures, have their origins, not simply in the early centuries of Christianity. Even in some of the oldest stories of the Bible. Casel, points more to the scriptural passages and patristic concept of mystery.<sup>313</sup> Finally, a corporeal substance is present on the altar, because of the change of substance.<sup>314</sup> The divine power of Christ makes his body and blood present. At the last supper, he acted through his divine power, but also his humanity. The last supper presents in a sacramental manor the offering of the cross. The body that is being offered is invisibly present. The natural mode is Christ suffering on the cross. The Mass is a sacramental mode. He does not suffer at Mass, he suffered when blood literally poured out of his body and he died. He sacramentally offers to the Father at the last supper. At Golgotha, he actually gives his body over in a natural mode.<sup>315</sup> Christ instituted the Eucharist in the context of the Passover. It foreshadowed the full conclusion of the celebration of the liberation, which is eternally affected by Him and in Him.

The discussion has so far has shown that various interpretations in scripture led to different teachings on how to explain the Eucharistic sacrifice in the light of the real presence and the transubstantiation. Lutherans have emphasized that the Scripture is the first priority in searching for theological questions. Catholics consider the Scripture, but together with the tradition by asking what are the theological arguments from the Church Fathers, the magisterium and the councils. Scripture and tradition has been important to see how the transubstantiation and the Eucharistic sacrifice can be defended.

---

<sup>310</sup> Gudmund Waaler, *Nattverden som offer*, 65.

<sup>311</sup> William B. Monahan, *St. Thomas Aquinas on the Eucharist*, 63.

<sup>312</sup> Phillip McCosker, "Sacrifice in Recent Roman Catholic Thought", 136.

<sup>313</sup> *Ibid.*, 134.

<sup>314</sup> William B. Monahan, *St. Thomas Aquinas on the Eucharist*, 70.

<sup>315</sup> *Ibid.*, 74.



At the same time, as long as the philosophy and the metaphysical aspect is not taken into account for the Lutherans it seems that it is difficult to reach a common agreement. They both agree to disagree in this issue. I think it is a false promise to say that Lutherans only read the Scripture literally. The passage of John 6 favours from both positions a symbolic or metaphorical understanding of the substantial presence of Christ in the Eucharist. I hold that both the real presence and transubstantiation are biblical through John 6.

I believe it is true that John 6 refers to a substantial change and that the gifts of the elements were transformed. This happens at every mass but it is also important that one has to take into consideration other factors than biblical arguments to support the relation between the transubstantiation and the Eucharistic sacrifice. I do not believe that transubstantiation is violence to the Scripture. Scripture says that the suffering on the cross is the means of salvation. When the saving death is present on the altar then the saving power is present also. The power hidden on the Cross, is present but hidden in the Eucharist.

The transubstantiation is vital to the understanding of the mass as Propitiatory sacrifice. If Christ is not being physically present on the altar, one could not have a Eucharistic sacrifice. It would not be the same body that was sacrificed on the Cross, was resurrected, and ascended into Heaven. Without transubstantiation, you do not have any metaphysical link to the same body on Calvary. Christ is present, as He exists now, in a glorified state. There is saving power when the substance of His body is present. He instituted the Sacrament; He wanted it this way. Finally, we need supernatural faith to really understand his words. A natural or rational understanding is not enough. I believe that in the Eucharist Jesus died once and for all. It is sacrifice, which is eternally present. At the last supper, he made his eternal sacrifice under the appearance of bread and wine. The Eucharist is offered and received and that is why the Eucharist is a sacrament and sacrifice.

#### 5.4 The ministry of the communion

The role of the priest has been important in both traditions. The dialogue between Catholics and Lutherans from 1978 states that "*Catholic and Lutheran Christians are of the conviction that the celebration of the Eucharist involves the leadership of a minister appointed by the church.*"<sup>316</sup> Who is the subject and the object in the communion?

---

<sup>316</sup> Lutheran/Roman Catholic Joint Commission, "The Eucharist.", from 1978  
[http:// www.prounione.urbe.it/dia-int/l-rc/doc/e\\_l-rc\\_eucharist.html](http://www.prounione.urbe.it/dia-int/l-rc/doc/e_l-rc_eucharist.html). Accessed 22 March 2018.

I will discuss the Lutheran arguments that say that Christ alone is the only subject who acts in the ministry of the sacraments. There is no need for a sacrifice though a mediator and the priest is not the subject due to their character. The ministry of the sacrament is an act where the priest is the pastor who acts together with the lay people. In Catholic teaching, the role of the priest in relation to the sacrifice is crucial. If there is a real presence of Christ, the question is who makes that transformation possible?

Lutheran teaching says that there is no sacrifice, no need for a mediator to bear a sacrifice and that Christ is the only subject in the ministry of the sacrament. I will present the arguments to reply on the question of who is the subject and object in the communion and if it has an importance for the Eucharistic sacrifice. In the Eucharistic Prayer: Who is doing what? The starting point for Luther is to separate what he classifies as thanks giving, prayer, praise and what works are human works where human beings are the subject and the mass. The sacrament and the testament are where one is the object that one receives something from Christ.<sup>317</sup> Lutherans claim that with the new covenant there is no hope for obtaining justification or repetition of human works to get closer to God.<sup>318</sup> Aquinas states that one still continues to sin and that is why the Eucharistic aspect is there. Catholic teaching underlines that the primary ritual agent is not the presiding minister but the whole assembly.<sup>319</sup> Those presiding do not speak in their own voice or for themselves alone, nor do they speak as mediators between God or Christ and the assembly, but always in the first person plural, as one of the assembly. The ministration of the priest is for Luther a social event.<sup>320</sup> It is a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving where the Church and the assembly bring bread and wine to express the joy and praise for God's creation. The Eucharist is also an anamnesis where Christ is present and through the remembrance of what God has done for us.<sup>321</sup>

Who is saying what? The Catholic position has a very different approach because their hierarchical system relies on the clergy as the subject of the ministry of the sacraments. The foundation of a church on these apostles so that where they are, Jesus is with them. The ministry handed on to the apostles who were given the authority to proclaim the gospel, teach and govern the Church. (CCC 859). The apostles received both their mandate and mission from Christ as ministers, servants, ambassadors and stewards of the mysteries of God. (2. Corinthians 3:6; 6:4; 5:20; 1. Corinthians 4:1).

---

<sup>317</sup> Asle Eikrem, *God as sacrificial love*, 192.

<sup>318</sup> Paul Althaus, *The Theology of Martin Luther*, 225f.

<sup>319</sup> Roch A. Kereszty, *Wedding Feast of the Lamb*, 204.

<sup>320</sup> Asle Eikrem, *God as sacrificial love*, 192.

<sup>321</sup> Harald Hegstad (Professor, the Lutheran theological faculty of Oslo), Lectures, March 2018.

They cannot transmit the fact they were chosen to witness the resurrection (CCC 860). That has happened once and for all, but the message of it that they preach and the successors of them preaching the message is continuous, hence the appointment of successors.<sup>322</sup>

Paul's address to the Ephesians is an example of designating those to take over their apostolic ministry and have succession (CCC 861): "*Keep watch over yourselves and over all the flock, of which the Holy Spirit has made you overseers, to shepherd the church of God.*" (Acts 20:28). Just as the apostles apart from God can do nothing (John 5:19, 30), so the faithful who are separated and do not listen to the bishops in office ordained to the apostles by Jesus, can do nothing themselves (CCC 859+862). Peter received his separate special commission as the prince of the apostles, feeding the sheep and being the rock on which the Church will be built. "*The whole Church is apostolic through the successors of St. Peter and the apostles in communion of faith and life with her origin were sent out to the whole world.*" (CCC 863-864). The Church is ultimately *one, holy, catholic and apostolic* in her deepest and ultimate identity. That is because it is in her that "the Kingdom of heaven" and the "Reign of God" already exists and will be fulfilled at the end of time (CCC 865). This gives the clergy the authority to teach, sanctify and govern the sacraments.

Prenter relies on the teaching of Luther and the doctrine of justification. Christ completes the guilt, shame and the sins of humans by being the perfect sacrifice, which signify his sacrificial love.<sup>323</sup> The concepts Prenter uses are Love, Sanctity and Mercy.<sup>324</sup> Therefore, God acts alone and completes his mission on the cross by Jesus. God alone is the subject of his action in the Eucharist too. In this case, Prenter relies on the doctrine of justification and the classical teaching of the theory of atonement.<sup>325</sup> This saving act becomes actualized making it possible for Christ to fulfil his plan through the sacrament. Because of this, there are many Lutherans who favor that it is Christ himself and no other, who is the high priest.

According to Catholic teaching, the priest brings Christ down from his throne and from heaven and renders him present on the altar mass after mass. Kereszty argues against the repetitive idea about the priest who is offering sacrifices over and over again in mass.<sup>326</sup>

The priest does not celebrate his daily ministry of the repetitive idea to repeat the same sacrifices time after time and mass after mass either.

---

<sup>322</sup> Fredrik Hansen, ed. *Det Annet Vatikankonsil-dokumenter* (Oslo: St Olav Forlag, 2013), 135 (LG20).

<sup>323</sup> Asle Eikrem, *God as Sacrificial Love*, 1.

<sup>324</sup> Gudmund Waaler, *Nattverden som offer*, 140.

<sup>325</sup> *Ibid.*, 142.

<sup>326</sup> Roch A. Kereszty, *The Wedding Feast of the Lamb*, 71.

He teaches on the authority and the power of Christ. He presents the sacrifice that Christ made on Calvary as he presents another Christ. In the Eucharist, there is no sacrifice that is carried out in an earthly shrine.<sup>327</sup> The priest acts in the person of Christ, but only in an instrumental way. That is because it is Jesus himself as the high priest, who offers his mass through his own prayer to the Father instead of looking at the Eucharist as only a sacrifice of thanksgiving (Romans 5). The last words in the Eucharistic prayer sum it up. The phrase "With him and in him" underlines Christ as the subject of the mass. Despite Catholic teaching, the priest is not Jesus Christ. The sacrificial Catholic clergy cannot take away sins by earthly men who serve on an earthly altar. The priest cannot represent Christ as in persona Christi. They are men like others. Prenter calls this an atoning sacrifice because Christ's saving act on the cross. There is therefore no need for any mediators. When the priest acts, he does this not on behalf of the people but together with the community through Christ.<sup>328</sup> This happens through a unity between the kingdom of Christ and the universal priesthood. If he acts on behalf of Christ, he does so by serving Christ not to replace his character and role (in persona Christi).

For Prenter, the priest only speaks and acts in the name of Christ.<sup>329</sup> Christ represents himself in heaven at the right hand of His Father as Christians confess in the Creed. I see that this can be summarized in three points: First, is that Christ who is in heaven, who intercedes for us, is the subject who acts and who is present in the Eucharist by giving us the gifts. Secondly, the priest acts by being the instrument of Christ as a leader and a pastor of the community when he proclaims the word of God and acts by the word of institution. Thirdly, the community participates together with the priest. Prenter states that human beings partake the same sacrifice that was given on the cross, as a gift given by high priest. He does not agree that one talks about a Eucharistic sacrifice in a Catholic context. From a Catholic point of view, the words of institution are not performative but epileptic (i.e., they work not by the action of the priest but by way of invocation of the Holy Spirit). The transformation of the gifts is no more than the transformation of the assembly and does not take place through the action of the priest, but by the action of God and the Holy Spirit. God is called upon to bring these transformations about.<sup>330</sup> What is taking place? The Eucharist is entrusted to and participated in by the Church as Christ's own sacrifice.

---

<sup>327</sup> Gudmund Waaler, *Nattverden som offer*, 147.

<sup>328</sup> *Ibid.*, 172.

<sup>329</sup> *Ibid.*, 172.

<sup>330</sup> Roch A. Kereszty, *Wedding Feast of the Lamb*, 187.

Therefore, only someone sent by Christ and representing Christ as the head of the Church can validly make the sacrifice of Christ present in the assembly.<sup>331</sup> From a level of human ritual action, it is the presider who is speaking or acting not just *in persona Christi* but also *in persona Christi capitis ecclesiae* – in the person of Christ the head of the Church. According to Catholic teaching, Christ is the chef celebrant at the last supper and the host of the sacrificial meal. He is also the high priest offering the sacrifice on the cross. The role of the presider is not that of a mediator between Christ and the church; The presider's role is embedded in the Christ-church relationship from which the Eucharist comes.<sup>332</sup> How is it that the Church is confident that God, the Spirit, is bringing about on the transcendent level of divine action? The Eucharistic elements of bread and wine are being transformed into the Body and Blood of Christ. The participating faithful are becoming more fully members of the Body of Christ.

The question still is: What is Christ doing in the Eucharist? If the community acts, does Christ act? Alternatively, if Christ acts, do we act at all. Wisløff is more consequent that it is Christ alone who is the subject in the Eucharist and leaves no room for metaphysical speculations or an attempt to support the teaching of Prenter where Christ acts differently in heaven and in the Eucharist.<sup>333</sup> Aulén is more focused on Christ's divine nature and his victory and resurrection. Everything that happened to Christ before are past events. For Aulén, one can never act with Christ as an object in the Eucharist.<sup>334</sup> God is not a passive object waiting death and suffering or an active subject ready to fulfill his punishment.

Based on the theory of Atonement, Christ is for Aulén the redeemer who reconciles with human beings in love to fight against evil and save us from sin through His participation of Christ in the Eucharist<sup>335</sup>. Not only Christ but also the whole Trinity is the subject. Christ acts on behalf of the obedience to His Father and in solidarity with His people. Aulén explains that it is a celebration and worshipping of the resurrected Christ.<sup>336</sup> This is actually the identity of the mass and the liturgy too. The whole community, the priests and the Church are in communion celebrating the victorious Christ in heaven. It is in communion with the Lord who expresses the praise, joy, prayer and thanksgiving. This may express for Lutherans a sacrifice of praise.

---

<sup>331</sup> Roch A. Kereszty, *Wedding Feast of the Lamb*, 168f.

<sup>332</sup> *Ibid.*, 187.

<sup>333</sup> Gudmund Waaler, *Nattverden som offer*, 332.

<sup>334</sup> *Ibid.*, 303.

<sup>335</sup> *Ibid.*, 248.

<sup>336</sup> Gudmund Waaler, *Nattverden som offer*, 268.

It indicates that it is neither God nor human beings who are the subject but both in combination with each other.<sup>337</sup> Consequently, the body and blood of Christ can never be put in the hands of a priest. Christ can never be an object during the Eucharist.<sup>338</sup> Christ is the subject that always acts. His role is not being a victim, which was an historical event. For Prenter the role of Christ is being a servant who represents the Lord victory against death, darkness and evil. He rejects that a priest can be a subject in a Eucharistic sacrifice. The priest is a part of the community who together with the lay people receive God's sacrificial love.<sup>339</sup> There is no need for a mediator. Aulén is more Christological by referring to the Second article in the creed where Christ is the subject for the action that happens in the Eucharist.<sup>340</sup> For him, there is only an invisible access to God. In my interpretation of Prenter, it seems that he takes a middle way positions between a Catholic and Lutheran understanding. He does not deny that a priest is important as a subject of serving but not in terms of a mediator. On one hand, Prenter favors a Catholic understanding of the free will of human beings in relation to God. God is not the authoritative subject where His people and the object by receiving from God. On the other hand, he supports the Catholic aspect that human acts are not equal to God as not being the subject. From a Catholic point of view, the description of Prenter can serve as an analogy of the role of the priest. He is not at the center, Christ is. From this perspective, the priest is not the subject due to the main agent being God. Unlike a Lutheran interpretation, that is precisely the reason for why the priest needs to be docile to the reality that already exists. There has been discussion among Catholics in addition to who does the priest properly present. Is it the Church?

Denis Ferrara says that in the consecration, the priest is the subject to the Church who acts in the words of institution.<sup>341</sup> The priest is an instrument through his voice but it is Christ alone who acts. The representation of the priest is limited. Ferrara seems to compare Christ representing the Church in a way that a priest represents a country. He says further that the sacraments are acts of the Church and in the consecration; it is the action of the Holy Spirit making the Church's act into Christ's act. Prenter also supports this Trinitarian perspective. Ferrara explains that the priests act on behalf of the Church and that Christ makes that prayer his own. The words belong to Christ and the Church at the same time. Because of this, one needs a valid ordained priest to consecrate and celebrate the Eucharist.

---

<sup>337</sup> Ibid.

<sup>338</sup> Ibid., 255.

<sup>339</sup> Ibid.

<sup>340</sup> Ibid..

<sup>341</sup> Denis Ferrara, "In Persona Christi: A Reply to Sarah Butler." *Theological Studies*, 56, 1995, 81-91.

I think Ferrara tries to reduce the priest's instrumental act where only his voice that is the instrument. This leads to the metaphysical aspect of the Catholic interpretation. Catholic theologians agree that the Christological aspect is important to grasp the meaning of the liturgy and the Eucharist. There must also be a metaphysical relationship of the priest to Christ. The humanity of Christ is an instrumental cause of Divinity as principle cause in both the incarnation and the sacrament. There is no competition between the two causes.

That is because it is the same sacrifice! Christ's offering is the very act of the Cross. By His beatific vision He can offer Himself at all masses - it is as if in a flash He were to see all the saving sacrificial acts of all future masses. He knows all. Christ chiefly acts at mass, He is main host in the sacrificial meal, and the main celebrant. Causes operate on distinct levels but each and together are the one whole cause. Instruments depend entirely on God. Human instrument can reveal the divine source of the act. Jesus points out what God is doing. The incarnation gives us a conjoined instrument through hypostatic union but the sacraments are not conjoined. Christ's way of acting through humanity is grounded in being. The humanity of Christ is not a passive instrument. It is disposition to be moved by Christ in order to render the gifts. Christ, the high priest has priority.

Lutherans do not preoccupy too much time to whether the subject or the object relation relies on these theories. In Catholic teaching, the dignity of the priest is to be subordinate to Christ. The priest manifests the source and the goal of Christ in reference to the Eucharist. The gestures and the words of the priest manifests what the priest does just as Christ's words and actions manifest God's work. If the presider is not a priest, there is no ontological change. Then, there is no ontologically distinct instrumentality or mediation and no logic of Incarnation. In the light of Incarnation, Prenter states that the way Christ reveals himself in the world is not the same way as being present on the altar.<sup>342</sup> In this way, the communion and the sacrifice of Christ are connected without any references that a new sacrifices is carried to the community through a priest as mediator. Kereszty refers to the Second Vatican Council and *Lumen Gentium* in the doctrine of *Mediator Dei* to distinguish between a sacramental priest and a universal priest of faithful.<sup>343</sup> The document underlines that all faithful have a reasonability to be witness, to proclaim the gospel and to serve God in mission.

A ministerial priest is the one who lead his flock through governance of the sacraments and teaching and scantily by acting in the person of Christ (LG, 10).

---

<sup>342</sup> Gudmund Waaler, *Nattverden som offer*, 227.

<sup>343</sup> Roch A. Keretsky, *Wedding Feast of the Lamb*, 169.

Aulén rejects these Catholic statements because it will always be Christ who is the acting subject in the Eucharist and the main celebrant as a consequence of the Real Presence too.<sup>344</sup> The Church proceeds from Christ and comes to us. From his Christological point of view, the role of the priest has less importance since he is a part of a bigger subject that contains the whole Church in unity with Christ.<sup>345</sup> The ecclesiastical office can never be the subject or replace the action of Christ, according to Prenter (ex operato). The Church is not subordinate to the priest either. The priesthood has been grounded on a mission given by Christ who is the acting subject. However, the Church may be, for Prenter, an acting subject in the Eucharist where there is an unity between the Church and Christ.<sup>346</sup>

According to Catholic teaching, the offering of bread and wine is connected with what the priest offers to the Father after the consecration. That is namely the Body and Blood of Christ that one offers to God. This is also the key question based on what is the consequence of the Catholic and Lutheran teaching. Who and what is being offered at the altar? Is this truly the body and blood of Christ? In terms of the incarnation, one can distinguish between the humiliation of Christ and the state of exaltation. Aulén supports Catholic and Lutheran theology of the two natures of Christ and the doctrine of the triune God. In both statements, it is the same Christ who died and rose again. They see the incarnation as a model, making it possible for Prenter to support the real presence but unlike Wisløff, he does not reject the sacrificial aspect.<sup>347</sup> A principle for Prenter, is to not ignore the metaphysical teaching behind the real presence. He wrote: "*Where the bread is no longer bread, where it has been changed in its substance, although not in its accidentals, but the relation of the redemption and the sacraments has been obscured.*"<sup>348</sup>

Both Catholics and Lutherans agree that communion is not only about a personal relationship to God, but it involves the whole community where all Christians are included. They have a common understanding that the Eucharist expresses a sacrament of praise, prayer and thanksgiving. According to Lutherans, there is no contradiction to proclaim that the Eucharist can be a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving but never a Eucharistic sacrifice.<sup>349</sup>

In terms of who is the subject in the Eucharist, there is a huge gap between the two positions. Catholic understanding of the role of the priest makes it difficult to come closer to an agreement.

---

<sup>344</sup> Gudmund Waaler, *Nattverden som offer*, 265.

<sup>345</sup> Ibid.

<sup>346</sup> Ibid., 266.

<sup>347</sup> Ibid., 301.

<sup>348</sup> Ibid., 120.

<sup>349</sup> Asle Eikrem, *God as Sacrificial Love*, 192.



Catholics lean on the apostolic tradition as Christ gives the authority to the apostles to govern the sacraments. It makes it difficult to separate the priest as a mediator and minister of the Eucharist. Lutherans rely on the universal priesthood and that Christ is the only subject and minister of the communion. He uses the clergy or lay people to serve the Eucharistic elements on his behalf.

I stand by Catholic teaching, which is also based on the Scripture. It is clear that there is a difference between the universal priesthood and the sacramental one. For instance, we are all called to proclaim the gospel and be missionaries of our faith (Mt 28.18).

The Bible talks about certain people that Christ himself calls to serve and lead his flock, teach, and govern on behalf of him and his Church too (Mt 16.18). The apostolic succession and tradition support this teaching. Christ as high priest is working through the priest at the altar. Christ had the authority, commission and power given to apostles and successors. The priest speaks in the name of another which goes back to Last Supper, transmitted through ordination. It is not enough to have juridical authority. Otherwise you are an ambassador, and you will have parallel causes. This is not about speaking, but about doing and effecting. Jesus speaks because of representation. The priest represents Christ's act at Last Supper. Representation here is more specific kind of power is made present again, that effected the transformation of gifts 2000 years ago. That is why the representation is vital. The priest cannot act on his own. He acts in the Power of Christ. Christ acts in Him in that very moment. So priest must represent intention of church and Christ Priest's act does not hinder Christ's act. Christ is principle cause, merits the way gifts are consecrated. God is the principal cause working through the instrumental causality of the priest, which means 100% Christ, and 100% priest. It is therefore natural, that priests, as mediators must be the subject in mass. I believe Christ is present at the altar during the Eucharist. Therefore, it makes sense that the function of the priest as subject is necessary and without them, there would be no mass and no Eucharist either.

## **6. SUMMARY**

In this thesis, I have discussed the teaching on the Eucharist amongst Catholics and Lutherans. In the above discussion, I have attempted to distinguish the different instructions surrounding the Eucharist and the meaning of sacrifice.

Based on this study, I wanted to explore why the differences exist and examine if there are any possibilities for a common understanding despite different points of view.

The central part of my thesis contains themes such as the presence of Christ during the Eucharist, the role of the priest, and the Eucharist acting as a memorial versus a repetition of Christ's sacrifice at every mass, and lastly, the development of the Catholic and Lutheran evaluation post-reformation. One has seen many differences between Catholics and Lutherans on the Eucharistic sacrifice. In Catholic teaching, the mass is a Eucharistic sacrifice where human beings re-experience God as sacrificial love. The Eucharist is not just a community meal but a sacrificial meal as well.<sup>350</sup> The central point in the mass is the consecration where the priest as mediator repeats the words of the institution, where the transformation of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ takes place. This theology has been supported by the Church Fathers through history.

Luther stood behind his battle on salvation by faith alone. He argues against the Catholic Eucharistic sacrifice and the role of the priest. Christ has already completed His sacrifice of righteousness for all sin once and for all on the cross (Hebrews 26+13:15). He attacks an understanding of a mass where Christ is the sacrifice. Luther's critique of the Sacrifice of the Mass was highly influential. He was shocked to see how the Church practised their faith in the liturgy, the homilies, the governance of the sacraments and Christian life in general. He also questioned the doctrines behind such practice. Several Lutheran thinkers accepted his critique of Catholic doctrine, and still do today.

The Council of Trent supported the celebration of private masses.<sup>351</sup> The Council declared the Mass to be a "true and proper sacrifice – verum et proprium sacrificium," but Trent did deepen the signification of the nature of the sacrifice. The discussion on this topic developed later on in both documents of the First and Second Vatican council. Trent did not change any doctrines due to the reformation of the Church. The aim for this ecumenical Council had been to defend the faith on this theme, define and explain the teaching behind the sacraments, e.g the nature of the Eucharist. Trent was also used as an example for the other ecumenical councils and teaching books to clarify and strengthen the faith on this matter. However, there are also sign of agreements that have been important and relevant to discuss.

Due to the Last Supper, Catholics and Lutherans agree that Christ is truly present in the bread and wine (real presence) in the light of the words of Christ. The difference is based on the way it is presented. Lutheran teaching claims that Christ is with and alongside the gifts of the elements (consubstantiation).

---

<sup>350</sup> *Den Katolske kirke, "Nattverden," from 10 January 1998*

<http://www.katolsk.no/tro/tema/sakramenter/artikler/noter#n2> Accessed 12 May 2018.

<sup>351</sup> Robert C. Croken. *Luther's First Front.*,121.

Catholic teaching go further by saying that Christ is present by chewing his full body and drinking the whole substance of Christ. This happens through a substantial change and a transformation of the bread and wine into the entire body and blood of Christ (transubstantiation). It is, therefore, a disagreement on whether it can be a Eucharistic sacrifice of the living resurrected Christ. This conflict also led to a discussion whether Christ is still present after the consecration and the communion. This clarification would imply a question if it permits an adoration of the Lord in the gifts of the elements.

Lutherans points to Christs own words when he said: "Do this in memory of me" (1. Corinthians 11:24 f). They recall what Christ did for us (the teaching of justification) and his saving action once and for all, completed on Calvary. Catholics agree that the sacrifice on the cross can never be repeated, replaced or fulfilled, and this memory is not only to be a memory of what once happened to Christ but also that He comes to us in the present and we partake the fruits of his Eucharistic sacrifice. Lutherans agree that the Eucharist is a gift from God and may express a sacrifice of praise prayer, and thanksgiving (Jfr. Rom. 12:1, Hebr. 13:15, 1. Pet. 2:5.) but not as a Eucharistic sacrifice during mass.

Catholics are convinced that the sacrifice on the cross is one of the same sacrifices that is being offered in mass. This same sacrifice is being offered in a bloodless manner. The sacrificial gift is Christ himself. He is the high priest who offers himself to the Father and intercedes for him. Human beings are sinners and are not able to offer anything to God. That is why Christ does it instead as the new lamb and new Isaac from the Old Testament. All people are included in the sacrifice of Christ. The Lutherans conclude that Christ is the only high priest who is the subject in the Eucharist. Christ has fulfilled the promises in the Old Testament and has already taken away all sin. Therefore, there is no need for living sacrifice, no priests as mediators because Christ has completed his sacrificial act for our salvation once and for all. Lutherans look at the Eucharist as a sacrament of praise, prayer, and thanksgiving to God. They understand sacrifice in the letters to the Romans 5, the Hebrews 9 and John 6 differently than the Catholics. Christ does not bear any sacrifices at all. An atoning Eucharistic sacrifice is difficult to verify in Scripture, according to Lutheran teaching. The sacrifice was made by Christ alone for us, and there is nothing we can do to fulfil that. It happened, in other words, without participation from human beings. The Lord's supper is a gift from Jesus Christ to his church and his people.

We receive this gift, not only based on a personal relationship with God but also in communion, we celebrate Christ's memory in His words. There is no Eucharist without the words of institution.

I support the Catholic sacramental theology. The New Testament canon was being written while the Eucharistic liturgies were being celebrated. This means that the early Church understood that Christ linked the Eucharist He himself instituted with His sacrifice on the Cross. Prior to the 16<sup>th</sup> century, there was no opposition to seeing the Eucharist as a sacrifice. This implies that 1500 years of tradition are behind this.

When the saving death is present on the altar then the saving power is present too. The power hidden on the Cross, is present but hidden in the Eucharist. We are not sacrificing again but re-presenting or making present again, the same sacrifice. If one does not include the transubstantiation, there is no link to the efficacious once-for-all sacrifice on Calvary.

Ultimately, one will not be able to leave out philosophy or Christology. The efficacy of the sacrifice on the Cross is tied to the Eucharist due to the hypostatic union and Christ's assumed humanity who is acting as the metaphysical conduit for the divine nature. Without this access via Christ's divinized humanity we could not access the divine nature and partake of it through the very ritual Jesus instituted. There is no way around metaphysics when dealing with Christology and Eucharistic theology.

## 7. OUTLOOK

We have seen agreements between the two denominations. These agreements are documented in the Eucharistic document between Catholics and Lutherans.<sup>352</sup> However, the differences between both faiths shall not lead to isolation. Despite the differences in the interpretation of Scripture, participants from both sides have noted how critical the reading of Scripture and prayer has been for the ecumenical dialogue and discussion of sacramental questions.<sup>353</sup> Catholics can be inspired by Lutherans to appreciate the Scripture and Lutherans can embrace the fact that the Bible was written in a tradition. Lutherans can embrace this tradition as a support to the Christian faith, which includes their understanding of the Eucharist. The Holy Spirit guides all Christians in theological themes.

They both agree that dogmas can never be allowed if they contradict Scripture. The question is whether both traditions have universal and fundamental criteria between which dogmas correspond to Scripture.

---

<sup>352</sup> Lutheran/Roman Catholic Joint Commission, "The Eucharist.", from 1978  
[http:// www.prounione.urbe.it/dia-int/l-rc/doc/e\\_l-rc\\_eucharist.html](http://www.prounione.urbe.it/dia-int/l-rc/doc/e_l-rc_eucharist.html). Accessed 22 March 2018.

<sup>353</sup> Harald Hegstad, "Fra konfesjonalisme til differensiert konsensus," *Evangelisk-Luthersk Kirke i en økumenisk kontekst*, Oslo, (2011), 206.

Another question to be discussed is whether Catholic teaching on the Eucharistic sacrifice is unchangeable related to the political structure and hierarchy.

Or, rather, is it possible for Lutherans to rethink their theological perspectives without being trapped within their system? I think it is possible to get closer to each other but not to a complete agreement on every aspect of the Eucharist. For instance, to celebrate the Eucharist together it requires also that one is in the unity of the Pope and the Catholic doctrines on this matter is very difficult to change. It is essential to be clear and strengthen one's faith without giving up theological doctrines and values just for the sake of ecumenism. To agree to disagree on certain things is the nature of differentiated consensus.<sup>354</sup>

Thus, there are good reasons for us to continue a dialogue in a climate of mutual respect and understanding in matters of faith and practice, to find points of substantial agreement, and to indicate areas in which we believe further dialogue is required.<sup>355</sup> To create a constructive dialogue one must be careful to promote one's own truth and that there is no salvation without their Church. This can exclude the other tradition. A dialogue must show an aspect of giving and take. Leif Aalen suggests that one has to develop an ecumenical hermeneutic where one admits the possibility of understanding the Gospel in different ways and separate the central and less central elements of Scripture.<sup>356</sup> An example is to ask how important is the transubstantiation to look at the presence of Christ in the Eucharist. On the contrary, it can be relevant to see this teaching as meaningful and as a supplement to better explain the Eucharist.

What are the criteria for a fruitful dialogue? First, it has to rely on openness and honesty. Even if both traditions are based on mission and conversion, a dialogue must not lead to manipulation with lack of freedom to choose each other's identity. An openness and understanding of the others faith and tradition, which include letting past issues go. This requires knowing each other, being a better listener and studying Catholicism and Lutheranism to be grounded and prepared to better see the different points of view better.

St Paul says, *"If I do not grasp the meaning of what someone is saying, I am a foreigner to the speaker, and the speaker is a foreigner to me"* (1 Corinthians 14:11). We need to learn from each other's faith and practice. The challenge is to look for common values and to have

---

<sup>354</sup> Harald Hegstad, "Fra konfesjonalisme til differensiert konsensus: Evangelisk-Luthersk Kirke i en økumenisk kontekst,," Lectures 2018, 206.

<sup>355</sup> Terje Hegertun (Professor, The Lutheran Faculty of Theology) Lectures, November, 2017.

<sup>356</sup> Harald Hegstad, "Fra konfesjonalisme til differensiert konsensus," 202.

tolerance with differences. That is also a gift because that is a way the Christians and others can grow and learn from each other.

Lutherans and Catholics, along with other Christians, can continue the dialogue to acknowledge the uniqueness of the Bible as the inspired and authoritative Word of God, and as a foundational source for Christian reflection. They shall not ignore to include extensive reference to various writings from the patristic era in this study. The writings of the Fathers of the Church have played an important role in Catholic understanding of the Word of God.

They were a witness, wrote what they saw, and heard from the ancient early Church. They can share some of the richness of this patristic tradition to grasp the sacramental theology behind the Eucharist. These writers are, after all, part of the broader Christian community that spans the centuries.

Catholics and Lutherans bear witness to the faith through their faithfulness as well as their ministry, love, and devotion to the Lord Jesus Christ and also Catholics and together they can enrich and fulfil each other.<sup>357</sup> During the last few years that there have been contacts that has great significance for clarifying the relationship between the two churches. One of them is from the Vatican Secretary for Christian Unity and the Lutheran World Council.<sup>358</sup> There has also been dialogue in Norway between Catholics and Lutherans by the constitution of The Catholic Lutheran group dialogue with an open and brotherly atmosphere.<sup>359</sup> The Eucharist has been central for both Catholics and Lutherans. They both agree to avoid too spiritual interpretations on the presence of Christ. This development is helpful for the Lutheran-Catholic dialogue because it enables them to see this dialogue in the broader context of the wider ecumenical movement. The way to a full agreement seems still far. It requires a profound theological work where they need to take their faith seriously and consciously in prayer, humility, and love.

The more communication that goes on between Catholics and Lutherans, the easier it will be to get to know one another. Catholics and Lutherans can enrich and fulfil each other in order to grow in faith, knowing that God is bigger than our own doctrines.

The Second Vatican Council has opened the Catholic Church more to other churches and ecclesiastical communities. The intention from Pope John XXIII was to open the window so

---

<sup>357</sup> Harald Hegstad, "Fra konfesjonalisme til differensiert konsensus," *Evangelisk-Luthersk Kirke i en økumenisk kontekst*, Oslo, (2011), 206.

<sup>358</sup> Lutheran/Roman Catholic Joint Commission, "The Eucharist.", from 1978  
[http:// www.prounione.urbe.it/dia-int/l-rc/doc/e\\_l-rc\\_eucharist.html](http://www.prounione.urbe.it/dia-int/l-rc/doc/e_l-rc_eucharist.html). Accessed 22 March 2018.

<sup>359</sup> Lutheran/Roman Catholic Joint Commission, "The Eucharist.", from  
[http:// www.prounione.urbe.it/dia-int/l-rc/doc/e\\_l-rc\\_eucharist.html](http://www.prounione.urbe.it/dia-int/l-rc/doc/e_l-rc_eucharist.html)

they could see the others outside and they could see them from the inside. They have favoured many of the ideas from Luther such as to involve the lay people more than before, to celebrate masses in different languages, to look at the Scripture as a high value and realize certain misinterpretations and abuse that was found in the past. It is also true that there are certain dogmas and doctrines that are very difficult to change. On the one hand, the Popes have said that they have no authority to change what Christ has revealed. That is, for instance, the doctrine on Mary, the Trinity, the role of the priest, the substantial change in the consecration instituted by Christ himself, and the Eucharistic sacrifice. On the other hand, to be ecumenical means to give and take and God is bigger than ecclesiastical doctrines.

## **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

### **Literature**

Althaus, Paul. *The Theology of Martin Luther*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966.

Alvira, Tomas, Luis Clavell, and Tomas Melendo, *Metaphysics. Understanding the science of being*. Makati City: Sinag-Tala Publishers, 1990.

Austad, Torleiv. *Tolkning av kristen tro. Metodespørsmål i systematisk teologi*. Kristiansand: Høyskoleforlaget, 2008.

Barr, Kevin. *Let's change the world. Catholic Social Teaching today*. Suva: Chevalier Publications, 1994.

Bugge, F.W, ed. *Luthers Store Katekisme*. Gjøvik: Mariendals Boktrykkeri, 1952.

Burg, van der Johannes. (1960): *Forklaring av Den Hellige Messe*. Oslo: St. Olavs Forlag.

Croken, Robert C. *Luther's First Front. The Eucharist as Sacrifice*,

Ottava: University of Ottawa Press, 1999.

Davies, Michael. *A short History of the Roman Mass*. Rockford, IL: Tan Books, 1997.

Eikrem, Asle. *God as Sacrificial Love*, London: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc, 2018.

Ebeling, Gerard. *Luther: En innføring i hans tenking*. Oslo: Gyldendal Norsk Forlag, 1978.

Ferrara, Denis. "In Persona Christi: A Reply to Sarah Butler." *Theological Studies*, 56, 1995: 81-91.

Grane, Leif. *Confessio Augustana* Frederiksberg: Forlaget ANIS, 1994.

Grenholm, Carl-Henric. "Att förstå religion: metoder för teologisk forskning." Lund: Studentlitteratur, 2006.

Guthrie, Donald. *Hebrews: Tyndale New Testament Commentaries* Michigan: Grand Rapids, 1983.

Hamman, Adalbert. *How to Read the Church Fathers*. New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 1993.

Henriksen, Jan O, *Guds Virkelighet*. Kristen dogmatikk, Oslo: Luther Forlag, 1994.

Jeanrond, Werner G, *Theological Hermeneutics*, Development and Significance, London: SCM Press Ltd, 1994.

Jenson, Robert W. *Systematic Theology. Vol. 1. The Triune God*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Jeremias, Joachim. *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*. London: SCM Press LTD, 1974.

Lane. Tony. *A Concise History of Christian Thought*. New York: T&T Clark, 2006.

Lienhard, Marc. *Luther: Witness to Jesus Christ*. Eugene, Oregon: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 2004.

Kereszty, Roch A. *Wedding Feast of the Lamb: Eucharistic Theology form a Biblical Historical and Systematic Perspective*. Chicago: Hillenbrand Books, 2007.

Kilmartin, Edward J. *The Eucharist in the West: History and Theology*. Collegeville Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1994.

McCosker, Phillip. "Sacrifice in Recent Roman Catholic Thought: From paradox to polarity and Back Again"?: *Sacrifice and Modern Thought*, ed. Julia Mezaros and Johannes



Zachhuber, 132-147. Oxford: University Press, 2013.

Mcgowan, A.B, *Ancient, Christian worship. Early Church Practices in Social, Historical and Theological Perspective*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2014.

Monahan, William B. *St Thomas Aquinas on the Eucharist* London: Trinity Press, 1940.

Smith, Dennis E. *From Symposium to Eucharist. The Banquet in the Early Christian World*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2009.

Waalder, Gudmund. *Nattverden som offer*. Bergen: Eide Forlag, 2012.

Wright, N.T. *Jesus and the Victory of God*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996.

## **Sources**

Bakke, Kai Tore. "Tekstintern og tekstekstern hermeneutikk som basis for en vurdering," in Åge Åleskjærs nye reformasjon *Tidsskrift for baptistisk historie og teologi*. (2008): 13-25.

Clarahan, Mary Ann. "Baptizing a Child. Whose faith is it?" *Furrow* 57:1 (2006): 30-38.

Hegstad, Harald. "Fra konfesjonalisme til differensiert konsensus." *Evangelisk-Luthersk Kirke i en økumenisk kontekst*, Oslo, (2011): 202-207.

Hovda, Bjørn Ole. "Brødet er Kristi lekam: Martin Luthers syn på transsubstansiasjonslære og realpresens i tre skrift." Masteroppgave i Kristendomstudier, O.B.Hovda, 2007.

## **References**

Bibelen. Den Hellige Skrift. Bibelselskapet 1938.

Catechism of the Catholic Church, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edit. Vatican City: St Paul's Publications, 1994.

. Hansen, Fredrik, ed. *Det Annet Vatikankonsil- dokumenter*. Oslo: St Olav Forlag, 2013.

Luther, Martin. "Admonition Concerning the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our

Lord." In *Word and Sacrament II*, ed. M.E. Lehmann, 97-145.  
Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 38, 1971.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Babylonian Captivity of the Church." In *Word and Sacrament II*,  
ed. A.R. Wentz, 3-127. Philadelphia, Fortress Press, 36, 1936.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Misuse of the Mass." In *Word and Sacrament II*, ed. A.R. Wentz, 133-230.  
Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 36, 1936.

\_\_\_\_\_. "A Treatise on the New Testament, that is, the Holy Mass." In *Word and  
Sacrament*, ed. I.E.T. Bachmann, 75-111. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 35, 1960.

Melanchthon, Philip. "Apology of the Augsburg Confession: The Book of Concord." In  
*The Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*, ed R. Kolb and  
T.J.Wengert,107-294. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000.

Misale Romanum. Oslo: Oslo Katolske Bisepedomme,1961.

Tanner, Norman P, ed. *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils – Volume II: Trent to Vatican II*.  
Vatican City: Sheed & Ward and Georgetown University Press, 1990.

*St Pauls Weekday Missal* (Popular Edition). Sydney: St Paul's Publications, 2012.

The Code of Canon Law. In English Translation. Sydney, Collins Liturgical  
Publications, 2001.

St. Thomas Aquinas Summa Theologiae. Translated by Fathers of the English Dominican  
Province. Vol 5. London: Westminster Maryland, 1948.

Tanner, Norman P. (1990) "Council of Trent" in Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils.  
Volume Two. Trent to Vatican II. *Norman P. Tanner*, Georgetown:  
University Press: 693-736.

## **Websites**

Chemnitz et al. "Eucharist.", from New World Encyclopaedia 15 December 2015  
<http://www.newworldencyclopedia.org/entry/Eucharist>

Den Katolske kirke." Nattverden." from 10 January 1998 from

<http://www.katolsk.no/tro/tema/sakramenter/artikler/noter#n27>.

Hegertun, Terje. "Mellom historie og dogmer. Metodespørsmål i systematisk teologi."

From Hegertuns blogg.org (Blogg), 2016. Accessed 16 March 2018.

Kurtis, Ken, and Dan Graves. "Article #5 I am the wheat of God." *Christian History Institute* 2018. <https://christianhistoryinstitute.org/incontext/article/ignatius>

Lutheran/Roman Catholic Joint Commission. "The Eucharist." from  
[http:// www.prounione.urbe.it/dia-int/l-rc/doc/e\\_l-rc\\_eucharist.html](http://www.prounione.urbe.it/dia-int/l-rc/doc/e_l-rc_eucharist.html)

Pohle, Joseph. "Eucharist." *The Catholic Encyclopaedia*. Vol. 5. New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1909. <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/05572c.htm>.

Together At One Altar." *The Middle Ages*." form 2011  
<https://www.togetheratonealtar.catholic.edu.au/explore/dspcontent.cfm?loadref=64i>.



