

AUTHOR 이양호

TITLE Calvin's Doctrine of the Lord's Supper

IN Yonsei journal of theology, Vol.5 (2000)

Calvin's Doctrine of the Lord's Supper

Yang-Ho Lee

I. Introduction

John Calvin, as a second generation of the Reformation, tried to reconcile between the Lutherans and the Zwinglians in the doctrine of Sacraments. However, Calvin's attempt was suspicioned by both the Lutherans and the Zwinglians. Once Bullinger, the successor of Zwingli, said to Calvin, "Here I do not see how your doctrine is different from the doctrine of the papists, who teach that sacraments confer grace to all that take them."¹⁾ On the other hand, the Lutherans, in *Formula of Concord*, criticized the Calvinists, as "subtle Sacramentarians, the most harmful kind, who in part talk our language very plausibly and claim to believe a true presence of the true, essential, and living body and blood of Christ in the Holy Spirit but assert that this takes place spiritually by faith."²⁾

In the nineteenth century, there was a controversy on Calvin's doctrine of the Lord's Supper between John Williamson Nevin and

1) *Ioannis Calvinii opera quae supersunt omnia*, eds. Wilhelm Baum, Edward Cunitz, and Edward Reuss (Brunswick: Schwetschke et Filium, 1863-1900), 7:693 [hereafter cited as CO with volum and column number]. "Hic non video quid doctrina vestra discrepet a doctrina papistarum, qui docent sacramenta conferre gratiam omnibus sumentibus ipsa."

2) *Formula of Concord*, art. VII, *The Book of Concord*, trans. and ed. Theodore G. Tappert (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1959), 482.

Charles Hodge. Nevin, in *The Mystical Presence: A Vindication of the Reformed or Christian Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*, wrote: "The living energy, the vivific virtue, as Calvin styles it, of Christ's flesh, is made to flow over into the communicant, making him more and more one with Christ himself, and thus more and more an heir of the immortality that is brought to light in his person."³⁾ Also he wrote: "The signs are bound to what they represent [the very body and blood of Christ], not subjectively simply in the thought of the worshipper, but objectively, by the force of a divine appointment."⁴⁾ *The Mystical Presence* was sent for review to Charles Hodge. He took offense at many things. "We know nothing in [Cardinal] Bellarmine," Hodge commented, "that goes beyond that."⁵⁾ According to Hodge, Calvin's own doctrine of the Lord's Supper is an uncongenial foreign element in Reformed theology, partly derived from Lutheran influence. In the Reformed church, Hodge insisted, the notion of a mysterious efficacy flowing from the glorified body of Christ in heaven almost immediately died out.⁶⁾ Also according to G. P. Hartvelt the strange notion of Christ's life-giving flesh (the *caro vivifica*) stood at the center of Calvin's doctrine of the Lord's Supper and cannot be explained away.⁷⁾

3) John Williamson Nevin, *The Mystical Presence: A Vindication of the Reformed or Christian Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist* (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co., 1846), 61, quoted in B. A. Gerrish, *Grace and Gratitude: The Eucharistic Theology of John Calvin* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 4.

4) Nevin, *The Mystical Presence*, 61, quoted in Gerrish, *Grace and Gratitude*, 4.

5) Charles Hodge, "Doctrine of the Reformed Church on the Lord's Supper," *Princeton Review* 20 (1848):275, quoted in Gerrish, *Grace and Gratitude*, 4.

6) Hodge, "Doctrine of the Reformed Church," 251-52, cited by Gerrish, *Grace and Gratitude*, 5.

7) G. P. Hartvelt, *Verum corpus: Een studie over een centraal hoofdstuk uit de avondmaalsleer van Calvijn* (Delft: W. D. Meinema, 1960), 96-97, 114, 165, 201, cited by Gerrish, *Grace and Gratitude*, 5.

On the contrary, Otto Ritschl acknowledged that Calvin's doctrine of the Lord's Supper, like Martin Bucer's, was of mediating type, harmonizing the extremes of Luther's and Zwingli's views, but he added: "Nevertheless, Calvin remained essentially faithful to Zwingli's symbolic theory (*dem Symbolismus Zwingli*)."⁸⁾ Also Hans Grass concluded that Calvin's realistic way of speaking is to be taken *cum grano salis*, with a grain of salt. In Grass's interpretation, no reception of the flesh and blood happens at all, according to Calvin, but only a reception of the power, effects, merits, and fruits of the flesh.⁹⁾ Again, Kilian McDonnell, with regard to Calvin's Eucharistic preoccupations, said, "God uses bread to nourish us because he chose to do so, but he does not in any sense remain bound to objects even after having chosen them."¹⁰⁾ Also he said, "To feed man unto salvation is a work of God and the sacraments never possess this as an immanent power."¹¹⁾ According to McDonnell, Calvin's doctrine of the Lord's Supper is very similar to Zwingli's.

Meanwhile, recently, some scholars insisted that Calvin's doctrine of the Lord's Supper is similar to Luther's rather than Zwingli's. B. A. Gerrish said, "Calvin is not Zwingli.... Unlike Zwingli, who found the eucharistic imagery as repulsive as to speak of eating one's own children out of love, and who therefore had to make of it a harmless metaphor for faith, Calvin seems to have thrived on it, as Luther did.

8) Otto Ritschl, *Die reformierte Theologie des 16. und des 17. Jahrhunderts in ihrer Entstehung und Entwicklung. Dogmengeschichte des Protestantismus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1926), 3:239, quoted in Gerrish, *Grace and Gratitude*, 6.

9) Hans Grass, *Die Abendmahlslehre bei Luther und Calvin* (Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie, second series, vol. 47: Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1954), 248-53, cited by Gerrish, *Grace and Gratitude*, 6.

10) Kilian McDonnell, *John Calvin, the Church, and the Eucharist* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1967), 166.

11) McDonnell, *John Calvin*, 166-67.

He was convinced that Luther's understanding of the Lord's Supper was essentially the same as his, and that the difference concerned only the 'mode' of Christ's presence (or the 'mode' of partaking of him)."¹²⁾ Also Timothy George, quoting the words of Gerrish, said, "The Consensus, then, 'did not say all Calvin liked to say about the sacraments, only what he was not prepared to omit.'"¹³⁾ Gerrish said, "Calvin was at no time a pure Zwinglian. From the very first, he was convinced that Zwingli was wrong about the principal agent in both Baptism and the Lord's Supper." Gerrish, distinguishing within the Reformed camp three conceptions of sacramental signs: symbolic memorialism, symbolic parallelism, and symbolic instrumentalism, said, "without the instrumental language, you do not have a fully Calvinistic doctrine of the Sacrament."¹⁴⁾ Meanwhile, François Wendel said, "The divergence is reducible, then, proportionately speaking, to that which in the Middle Ages had set the Franciscans and Duns Scotus in opposition to the traditional teaching represented by, above all, Thomas Aquinas. For Franciscan doctrine, as for Calvin, there was a parallelism between the reception of the elements in the Supper and the action of the Spirit of Christ, but the elements and the Spirit remained distinct."¹⁵⁾ On the contrary, Gerrish said, "there are scholars who simply identify Calvinist sacramental theology with parallelism. I do not agree with them."¹⁶⁾

12) B. A. Gerrish, *The Old Protestantism and the New: Essays on the Reformation Heritage* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark Limited, 1982), 115-16.

13) Timothy George(ed), *John Calvin and the Church: A Prism of Reform* (Westminster: John Knox Press, 1990), 55.

14) Gerrish, *Grace and Gratitude*, 167.

15) François Wendel, *Calvin: The Origins and Development of His Religious Thought*, trans. Philip Mairet (Glasgow: William Collins Sons & Co. Ltd., 1950), 344-45.

16) Gerrish, *Grace and Gratitude*, 168.

II. Luther and Zwingli on the Lord's Supper

As mentioned above, Calvin's doctrine of the Lord's Supper had been shaped in the midst of the controversies between Lutherans and Zwinglians. Therefore, it is helpful for us to consider the doctrines of Luther and Zwingli on the Lord's Supper in order to understand Calvin's doctrine of the Lord's Supper.

For Zwingli the Sacrament was the sign of holy thing. "Sacrament - as even the papists maintain - are simply the signs of holy things."¹⁷ Sign and thing signified cannot be the same thing. "If they are the things which they signify they are no longer signs."¹⁸ Bread is merely bread, not the body of Christ. It might seem to Luther that Zwingli's doctrine of the Sacrament destroyed the divinely instituted channel through which God gave us his grace. How can we receive the grace of God without the divinely instituted channel? Luther said;

The blind fool does not know that the *merit of Christ and distribution of merit* are two different things. And he confuses them like a filthy sow. Christ has once for all merited and won for us the forgiveness of sins on the cross; but this forgiveness he distributes wherever he is, at all times and in all places, as Luke writes, chapter 24 (:46f). "Thus it is written, that Christ had to suffer and on the third day rise (in this consists his merit), and that repentance and forgiveness of sins should be preached in his name (here the distribution of his merit comes in)." This is why we say there is forgiveness of sins in the Supper, not on account of the eating, nor because Christ merits or achieves forgiveness of sins there, but on account of the word through which he distributes among us this acquired forgiveness, saying, "This is my body which is given for you." Here you perceive that we eat the body as it was given for us; we hear this and believe it as we eat. Hence there is

17) Huldrych Zwingli, *Of Baptism*, in *Zwingli and Bullinger*, ed. G. W. Bromiley (The Library of Christian Classics 24; Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1953), 131 [hereafter cited by LCC].

18) Zwingli, *Of Baptism*, LCC 24:131.

distributed here the forgiveness of sins, which however was obtained on the cross.¹⁹⁾

Zwingli centered on John 6. Jesus Christ said: "It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing." "The flesh profiteth nothing' . . . is quite enough to prove that Christ's words: 'This is my body' cannot possibly refer to the literal, carnal flesh. For if the flesh profiteth nothing, then Christ did not give it."²⁰⁾ On the contrary, Luther said that "flesh" here does not point out the flesh of Christ. Luther said: "We have interpreted this in no other way than as follows: 'My teaching is spiritual. Anyone who understands it in a fleshly manners errs, and his interpretation is of no avail. but whoever understands it spiritually will live.'"²¹⁾ Luther continued to say: "Wherever spirit and flesh are contrasted in Scripture, flesh never means Christ's flesh but the Old Adam."²²⁾ Luther says, "As he says in II Corinthians 10 (:3), 'Though we walk in the flesh, we do not war according to the flesh,' . . . 'In the flesh' and 'according to the flesh' are two quite different things."²³⁾ In short, Luther distinguished between flesh as bodiliness and flesh as sinfulness in the Scriptures. As Paul Althaus pointed out, "Zwingli and his followers . . . understand spirit as the opposite of flesh in the sense of bodiliness. For Luther, however, spirit is the opposite of flesh in the sense of sinfulness."²⁴⁾

19) Martin Luther, *Confession Concerning Christ's Supper*, in *Luther's Works* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1961) 37:192 [hereafter cited as LW].

20) Huldrych Zwingli, *On the Lord's Supper*, in *Zwingli and Bullinger*, ed. G. W. Bromiley (The Library of Christian Classics 24; Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1953), 209.

21) Luther, *Confession Concerning*, LW 37:248.

22) Luther, *Confession Concerning*, LW 37:249.

23) Luther, *Confession Concerning*, LW 37:201.

24) Paul Althaus, *The Theology of Martin Luther*, trans. Robert C. Schultz (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1970), 395.

According to Zwingli, as the Scriptures and the articles of the Creed say, Christ "ascended into heaven, And sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty; From thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead."²⁵⁾ Therefore Christ cannot be present in the bread and wine. Luther answered: "My grounds on which I rest in this matter, are as follows: The first is this article of our faith, that Jesus Christ is essential, natural, true, complete God and man in one person, undivided and inseparable. The second, that the right hand of God is everywhere. The third, that the Word of God is not false or deceitful. The fourth, that God has and knows various ways to be present at a certain place, not only the single one of which the fanatics prattle, which the philosophers call 'local'."²⁶⁾ Here Luther accepted the Occamist opinion that there are three modes of being present in a given place: locally or circumscriptively, definitively, and repletively.²⁷⁾ An object is locally in a place, if the space and the object occupying it exactly correspond and fit into the same measurements, such as wine or water in a cask.²⁸⁾ "An object is in a place definitively... if the object or body is not palpably in one place and is not measurable according to the dimensions of the place where it is, but can occupy either more room or less. Thus it is said that angels and spirits are in certain places. For an angel or devil can be present in an entire house or city; again he can be in a room, a chest or a box, indeed, in a nutshell."²⁹⁾ "This was the mode in which the body of Christ was present when he came out of the closed grave, and came to the disciples through a closed door.... Just so, Christ can be and is in the bread, even though he can also show himself in

25) Zwingli, *On the Lord's Supper*, LCC 24:212.

26) Luther, *Confession Concerning*, LW 37:214.

27) Luther, *Confession Concerning*, LW 37:215.

28) Luther, *Confession Concerning*, LW 37:215.

29) Luther, *Confession Concerning*, LW 37:215.

circumscribed and visible form wherever he wills."³⁰⁾ "An object occupies places repletively ... if it is simultaneously present in all places whole and entire.... This mode of existence belongs to God alone...."³¹⁾ "Since he is a man who is supernaturally one person with God, and apart from this man there is no God, it must follow that according to the third supernatural mode, he is and can be wherever God is and that everything is full of Christ through and through"³²⁾ Luther argued, "Because we prove from Scripture... that Christ's body can exist in a given place in other modes than this corporeal one, we have by the same token sufficiently argued that the words, 'This is my body,' ought to be believed as they read...."³³⁾

Furthermore, according to Zwingli, the words 'This is my body' can be interpreted as 'This signifies my body,' in accordance with the biblical usage, and this interpretation best harmonizes with the Scriptures and the articles of the Creed. Zwingli argued:

For instance, in John 15 Christ says: "I am the vine." This means that Christ is like a vine when considered in relation to us, who are sustained and grow in him in the same way as branches grow in the vine. Similarly the words, "You are the branches," are a trope. We have to take them metaphorically.... Now the word "is" is used with particular frequency in a figurative or metaphorical sense. For example, in Luke 8 Christ says: "The seed is the word of God.".... In this instance, then, the word "is" is used for "signify," that is: "The seed signifies the word of God.... In all these sayings "is" means "signifies"....

On the contrary, Luther said, "I requested that they prove to us out of Scripture that the word 'is' means the same as 'represents in the Supper...."³⁴⁾ Luther argued:

30) Luther, *Confession Concerning*, LW 37:216.

31) Luther, *Confession Concerning*, LW 37:216.

32) Luther, *Confession Concerning*, LW 37:218.

33) Luther, *Confession Concerning*, LW 37:217.

34) Luther, *Confession Concerning*, LW 37:170.

The word "flower" according to its primary and original sense means a rose, lily.... Now if I wish to glorify Christ with an elegant eulogy ... I may take the word "flower" and make a trope, that is, give it a new sense and application by saying, "Christ is a flower." All grammarians say that "flower" here has become a new word and has acquired a new meaning and now no longer means the flower in the field but the child Jesus. They do not say that the word "is" here has become metaphorical, for Christ does not represent a flower but is a flower, yet a different flower from the natural one.

....
How does it sound, my friend, when you try to interpret this according to Zwingli's opinion, "Christ signifies the true vine"? Who then is the true vine which Christ signifies? For it is better that Christ should be signified than he should signify, since that which represents is always inferior to the thing they signify.

... For no language or logic permits us to say, "Christ signifies the true vine." In this passage no one can say that the true vine is the wood in the vineyard. Hence the text irresistibly compels us to regard "vine" as a new word, meaning a second, new, real vine, and not the vine in the vineyard. Therefore "is" cannot be metaphorical here....³⁵⁾

In short, as mentioned above, Zwingli argued: "The word 'is' is used . . . in a figurative or metaphorical sense." Luther, however, argued: "'is' cannot be metaphorical...." According to Luther, the words "This is my body" cannot be interpreted metaphorically, because the biblical usage does not permit it.

III. The Developments of Calvin's Doctrine of the Lord's Supper

Calvin dealt with the doctrine of the Lord's Supper in his *Institutes*

35) Luther, *Confession Concerning*, LW 37:171-74.

of the Christian Religion and also wrote many treatises about the Lord's Supper. Here we are about to Calvin's doctrine of the Lord's Supper chronologically.

First of all, Calvin treated Luther's doctrine of Lord's Supper more sincerely in the later editions of the *Institutes*. Calvin, in "Prefatory Address to King Francis I of France" in the first edition of the *Institutes*, said "therefore, they overstep the bound, when they make really and substantially."³⁶ In the second edition of the *Institutes*, he said, "Therefore, they overstep the bound, when they suppose to be circumscribed and contained locally there."³⁷ Meanwhile, in the last edition, he said, "Therefore, they overstep the bound in pretending that when the Lord's words are repeated the substance of bread and wine ceases and is transubstantiated into body and blood."³⁸ When Calvin said, in the first edition, "really," it was an obstacle to Lutherans, because Luther insisted on real presence of Christ in the Supper. And when Calvin said, in the second edition, "to be circumscribed and contained locally there," it might be an obstacle to Lutherans. Because Luther said that the body of Christ is present in the bread, even though he denied that the body of Christ is present locally or circumscriptively. On the other hand, In the last edition, Calvin criticized only Roman Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation.

In 1541, Calvin published *Short Treatise on the Holy Supper of our Lord and only Saviour Jesus Christ*. In this treatise Calvin was in the middle way, and tried to reconcile Lutherans with Zwinglians. Calvin said about Luther as follows.

36) "igitur modum praetereunt, cum faciunt reale et substantiale." CO 1:18.

37) "Igitur modum praeterunt quum localiter illic circumscriptum contineri fingunt." CO 1:267.

38) "Igitur modum praetereunt qui fingunt desinere sustantiam panis et vini verbis Domini recitatis, ut in corpus ac sanguinem transsustantietur." CO 2:19.

When Luther began to teach, he regarded the matter of the Supper in such a way, that, with respect to the corporal presence of Christ, he appeared ready to leave it as the world generally conceived it. For while condemning transubstantiation, he said that the bread was the body of Christ, insofar as it was united with him. Further, he added some similes which were a little harsh and rude. But he did so as by constraint, because he could not otherwise explain his meaning. For it is difficult to give an explanation of so high a matter, without using some impropriety of speech.³⁹⁾

Meanwhile, Calvin said about Zwingli and Oecolampadius as follows.

On the other hand, there arose Zwingli and Oecolampadius, who, considering the abuse and deceit which the devil had employed to establish such a carnal presence of Christ as had been taught and held for more than six hundred years, thought it wrong to dissimulate; since this view implied an execrable idolatry, in that Jesus Christ was adored as if enclosed under the bread. Now because it was very difficult to remove this opinion, rooted so long in the hearts of men, they applied all their mind to decry it, remonstrating that it was a quite gross error not to acknowledge what is so clearly testified in Scripture, concerning the ascension of Jesus Christ, that he was in his humanity received up into heaven, where he dwells until he descend to judge the world. While they were absorbed with this point, they forgot to define what is the presence of Christ in the Supper in which one ought to believe, and what communication of his body and his blood one there received.⁴⁰⁾

According to Calvin, "So Luther thought that they intended to leave nothing else but bare signs without any corresponding spiritual substance. Hence he began to resist and oppose them, even to the

39) John Calvin, *Short Treatise on the Holy Supper of our Lord and only Saviour Jesus Christ*, in *Calvin: Theological Treatises*, ed. J. K. S. Reid (The Library of Christian Classics 22; Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1954), 164, CO 5:458

40) Calvin, *Short Treatise*, LCC 22:164-65, CO 5:458.

extent of denouncing them as heretics."⁴¹ "Both parties failed altogether to have patience to listen to each other, in order to follow truth without passion, wherever it might be found."⁴²

Calvin began to have dialog with Zwinglians. In 1544 Calvin wrote to Bullinger, "If we were able to discuss the matter some time for only half a day, we would, I hope, easily agree, and not only in regard to the matter itself but even in regard to its formulation. Meanwhile, this small disagreement should not prevent our having the same Christ, or being one in him."⁴³ At last, Calvin and Bullinger, through their dialogs, composed and published *Mutual Consent in regard to the Sacraments Between the ministers of the Church of Zurich and John Calvin, minister of the Church of Geneva*.⁴⁴ This *Consent* expresses the necessary elements of Calvin's eucharistic theology. But it has not sufficient elements of his eucharistic theology.

Lutherans attacked Calvin, after Calvin and Bullinger published *Mutual Consent*. At first Westphal, a minister of Hamburg, attacked Calvin as a heretic. Against Westphal, Calvin wrote *Defensio*⁴⁵ in 1555, *Secunda defensio*⁴⁶ in 1556, and *Ultima admonitio*⁴⁷ in 1557. Again in 1561 Calvin wrote *Dilucida explicatio*⁴⁸ against another Lutheran Heshusius who had attacked him.

41) Calvin, *Short Treatise*, LCC 22:165, CO 5:458.

42) Calvin, *Short Treatise*, LCC 22:166, CO 5:460.

43) CO 12:66, quoted in George (ed.), *John Calvin*, 46.

44) John Calvin, *Tracts and Treatises on the Doctrine and Worship of the Church*, trans. Henry Beveridge (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1958), 2:199 ff. [hereafter cited by T&T], CO 7:733 ff.

45) CO 9:1-40.

46) CO 9:41-120.

47) CO 9:137-252.

48) CO 9:457-524.

IV. Calvin's Eucharistic Thought

According to Calvin, God, by the sign of baptism, confirms that we are received into the house of God. After God has received us into his family, he undertakes to nourish us throughout the course of our life. The Lord's Supper is a sign by which we know that we are nourished by God.

Firstly, the Supper is a sign and seal which represents our union with Christ. Christ suffered in the cross for our salvation. However, as long as Christ remains outside of us, and we are separated from him, all that he has suffered and done for the salvation of the human race remains useless and of no value for us.⁴⁹⁾ We have to unite with Christ in order to receive the merits of Christ. How can we unite with Christ? "It is true that we obtain this by faith."⁵⁰⁾ However, this is a mystery which our intellect cannot understand. Therefore, God shows us this mystery by a visible sign. "Godly souls can gather great assurance and delight from this Sacrament; in it they have a witness of our growth into one body with Christ such that whatever is his may be called ours."⁵¹⁾ Of course, the Supper is only a sign which represents our union with Christ. It is the Spirit who unites us with Christ. The "Spirit truly unites things separated in space."⁵²⁾ The breaking of bread is a symbol; it is not the thing itself.⁵³⁾ Nevertheless, we have to believe that by the showing of the symbol the thing itself

49) John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, 1559 edition, 3.1.1 [hereafter cited as Inst. followed by book, chapter, and section] ; *Ioannis Calvini Opera Selecta*, eds. Peter Barth, Wilhelm Niesel, and Dora Scheuner (Munich: Chr. Kaiser, 1926-1952), 4.1.10-13 [hereafter cited as OS with volume, page, and line number].

50) Inst. 3.1.1, OS 4.1.19-20.

51) Inst. 4.17.2, OS 5.343.21-24.

52) Inst. 4.17.10, OS 5.351.30-31.

53) Inst. 4.17.10, OS 5.352.9.

is also shown. "For unless a man means to call God a deceiver, he would never dare assert that an empty symbol is set forth by him."⁵⁴⁾

Secondly, the Supper is a sign and seal which represents our partaking of the body of Christ. It is to seal and confirm that promise by which he testifies that his flesh is food and his blood is drink.⁵⁵⁾ In this regard, Calvin criticized Zwingli and the Anabaptists. There are some who define the eating of Christ's flesh and the drinking of his blood as nothing but to believe in Christ. However, eating and drinking is different from believing. "Here is the difference between my words and theirs: for them to eat is only to believe; I say that we eat Christ's flesh in believing, because it is made ours by faith, and that this eating is the result and effect of faith."⁵⁶⁾

The Supper is a symbol which represents our eating of Christ's flesh and our drinking of Christ's blood. "As body is nourished by bread and wine, so Christ's flesh is the food of the soul, and his blood the drink of the soul."⁵⁷⁾ Therefore, the Sacrament is a sort of analogy to spiritual things.⁵⁸⁾ In this regard, Calvin criticized Roman Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation. If the substance of bread is transformed in the Supper, it is no longer true bread. Then the Sacrament is no longer an analogy to spiritual things. "The truth of this mystery accordingly perishes for us unless true bread represents the true body of Christ."⁵⁹⁾

As mentioned above, Calvin developed his doctrine of the Supper in the midst of Lutheran-Zwinglian debates over the Supper. First of all, Calvin, like Zwingli, insisted that Christ, in his humanity, is in

54) Inst. 4.17.10, OS 5.352.11-12.

55) Inst. 4.17.4, OS 5.345.

56) Inst. 4.17.5, OS 5.347.15-18.

57) CO 7:622. "Sicuti pane et vino alitur corpus, ita cibum animae esse Christi carnem, et sanguinem eius, potum."

58) Inst. 4.17.3, OS 5.344.27-28.

59) Inst. 4.17.4, OS 5.359.27-28.

heaven, even though he, in his divinity, fill the world. Therefore, Christ's body cannot be really present in the Supper. It is the Holy Spirit who unites Christ in heaven with us on earth. Calvin said, as quoted above, "The Spirit truly unites things separated in space." By this union we receive life from the substance of his flesh.⁶⁰⁾ Not only the Holy Spirit but also the divinity of Christ unites the body of Christ with us. "As the divine majesty and essence of Christ fills heaven and earth, and this is extended to the flesh; therefore, independently of the use of the Supper, the flesh of Christ dwells essentially in believers, because they possess the presence of his deity."⁶¹⁾ That is to say, it is the Holy Spirit and the divinity of Christ that unite us with the body of Christ in heaven and transmit the merit of Christ's suffering to us. Therefore, our uniting with Christ and our partaking of Christ are possible without the Supper. Otherwise, "the head will always be separated from the members, except at the particular moment when the bread is put into the mouth and throat."⁶²⁾ The Supper in itself cannot give this kind of union. The Supper only shows, in visible form, the invisible mystery of the union.

On the other hand, Calvin criticized the Zwinglians who insisted that the Supper is mere sign, and that the eating of Christ's flesh and the drinking of Christ's blood are only believing in Christ. "I read in Luther that Zwingli and Oecolampadius left nothing in the Sacraments but bare and empty figures, I confess I took such a dislike for their writings that I long refrained from reading them."⁶³⁾

60) Calvin, *Secunda defensio*, CO 9:47. "Christum asserimus a carnis suae substantia vitam in animas nostra spirare."

61) Calvin, *Dilucida explicatio*, LCC 22:313, CO 9:509. "Quia coelum et terram implet divina Christi maiestas et essentia, id ad carnem extenditur: ergo extra coenae usum caro Christi in fidelibus essentialiter habitat, quia potiuntur deitatis praesentia."

62) Calvin, *Dilucida explicatio*, LCC 22:279, CO 9:479.

63) Calvin, *Secunda defensio*, T&T 2:252-53, CO 9:51.

According to Calvin, God does not give an empty symbol, but the substance with the symbol. God, who unites us with Christ by the work of the Holy Spirit, independently of the use of the Supper, and who makes us partake of the body of Christ, cannot give us an empty symbol in the Supper. Therefore, Calvin said that the body of Christ is truly present in the Supper.⁶⁴⁾

We can summarize the viewpoints of Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin on the Lord's Supper. In Zwingli, the Supper is a bare sign; in Luther, the Supper is a substance; and in Calvin, the Supper is a sign of an invisible substance. In Zwingli, our eating of Christ's body is our believing in Christ; in Luther, our eating of Christ's body is our eating of the real body of Christ; and in Calvin, our eating of Christ's body is our partaking of Christ's real body in heaven by the bond of the Holy Spirit.

Calvin sometimes quoted the words of Augustine in order to strengthen his doctrine of the Lord's Supper. Augustine, like Zwingli and Calvin, said that Christ, in his humanity, is present in heaven, though he, in his divinity, fills the world. Augustine said, "do not doubt that as God He is everywhere wholly present, and also as God He dwells in the same temple of God; while in His true Body He is in some part of heaven."⁶⁵⁾ Did Augustine, like Zwingli, think that the

64) Calvin preferred "true presence" to "real presence." *Mutual Consent in regard to the Sacraments*, T&T 2:239-240. Also cf. Joseph N. Tylenda, "Calvin and Christ's Presence in the Supper - True or Real," *Scottish Journal of Theology*, 27(1974):65 ff. However, according to Jean Cadier, in Calvin's usage, 'vraiment' signifies always 'réellement.' Jean Cadier, *La Doctrine Calviniste de la Sainte Cène* (Montpellier: Faculté de Théologie Protestante, 1951), 30.

65) Augustine, Ep. 187.41, *Obras de San Agustin* (Madrid: Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, 1958-1975), 11a, 564 [hereafter cited by OSA]. (The Fathers of the Church, Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1955-1966, 30:254-55.) "et ubique totum praesentem esse non dubites tanquam Deum, et in eodem templo Dei esse tanquam inhabitantem Deum, et in loco aliquo caeli propter veri corporis modum." Also cf. Inst. 4.17.28, OS 5:380 ff.

Supper is mere memorial ceremony of Christ's suffering? Augustine, in his explanation of the phrase, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink His blood, ye have no life in you," said, "we should retain a sweet and profitable memory of the fact that His flesh was wounded and crucified for us."⁶⁶ This phrase of Augustine seems to support the opinion of Zwingli. However, Augustine said, "He gave us the salutary food of His body and blood." Also he said, "If anything is visibly consumed in the Sacrament, in very truth it is spiritually eaten and spiritually drunk."⁶⁷ These expressions of Augustine are approaching to Calvin's teaching rather than Zwingli's memorialism.

Calvin, criticizing Roman Catholic doctrine of *opus operatum*, emphasized faith in the Lord's Supper. "When papists speak of the Sacraments they say that they are efficacious, if we only remove the obstacle of mortal sin: they make no mention of faith. If a person is neither a thief, nor an adulterer, nor a homicide, they say that the Sacraments produce their own effect: for example, if any one without a single particle of faith intrudes himself at the table of Christ, they say that he receives not only his body and blood, but the fruit of his death and resurrection, and only because he has not committed mortal sin; that is, cannot be convicted of theft or homicide."⁶⁸ And so

66) Augustine, *De Doctrina Christiana* 3.16.24, OSA 15:182 (A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, First Series, Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1956, 2:563). "suaviter atque utiliter recondendum in memoria quod pro nobis caro eius crucifixa et vulnerata sit."

67) Augustine, *Sermo*. 131.1.1, quoted in Eugène Portalié, *A Guide to the Thought of Saint Augustine*, trans. Ralph J. Bastian (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, Publishers, 1975), 257.

68) Calvin, *Comm. Ezek.* 20:20, *CO* 9:492. "Papistae quum de sacramentis loquuntur, dicunt habere efficaciam, modo ne ponamus obicem peccati mortails: illic nulla fidei mentio. Modo igitur ne quispiam sit fur, aut adulter aut homicida dicunt habere suum effectum: exempli gratia, si quis etiam, qui ne

Calvin said, "they attribute a magical potency to the Sacraments."⁶⁹⁾

Calvin, in the first edition of the *Institutes*, said that the Supper is turned into a deadly poison for the unworthy. "On the other hand, it is turned into a deadly poison for all those whose faith it does not nourish and strengthen, and whom it does not arouse to thanksgiving and to love."⁷⁰⁾ In the second edition of the *Institutes*, he added as following: "Physical food, when it comes into a stomach occupied by evil humors, and is itself also vitiated and corrupted, harms rather than nourishes. So also this spiritual food, it enters a soul corrupted by malice and wickedness, casts it down with a greater ruin - not by the fault of the food itself, but because to polluted and unbelieving men nothing is clean, however much it otherwise be sanctified by the Lord's blessing."⁷¹⁾ This teaching of Calvin is very similar to that of Luther. However, Calvin, in the last edition of the *Institutes*, said, "the flesh and blood of Christ are no less truly given to the unworthy than to God's elect believers. At the same time, it is true, however, that, just as rain falling upon a hard rock flows off because no entrance opens into the stone, the wicked by their hardness so repel God's grace that it does not reach them."⁷²⁾ Also he said, "It is pointless for them to ask how Christ has come for the damnation of some, unless they receive him unworthily, since we nowhere read that men bring death upon themselves by receiving Christ unworthily, but rather by despising him."⁷³⁾ *Confession of Faith in Name of the Reformed*

guttam quidem fidei habeat, se ingerat ad mensam Christi, ille, inquit, recipiet non tantum corpus et sanguinem eius, sed fructum mortis et resurrectionis: et tantum quia non ponit obicem peccati mortalis, hoc est, non potest convinci furti, aut homicidii."

69) Calvin. Comm. Acts, 8:13, CO 48:180.

70) CO 1:127

71) CO 1;1015.

72) Inst. 4.17.33, OS 5:393.35-394.4.

73) Inst. 4.17.33, OS 5:394.5-9.

Churches of France, which was drawn up by Calvin in 1562, reads, "And in fact it were grossly absurd to hold that Jesus Christ is received by those who are entire strangers to him, and that the wicked eat his body and drink his blood while destitute of his Spirit."⁷⁴ Also it reads, "For it is not said by St. Paul that they are condemned for having received the body and the blood, but for not having discerned between them and profane things. Their offence then is that they rejected Christ when he was presented to them."⁷⁵ On the contrary, Calvin, in the first edition of the *Institutes*, said, "We must note in this passage that 'not to discern the body and blood of the Lord' and 'to receive it unworthily' are taken to mean the same thing."⁷⁶ However, Calvin, in the last edition of the *Institutes*, omitted this passage. In short, with regard to this issue, Calvin, in his later days, departed from the teaching of Luther.

V. Conclusion

We have dealt with Calvin's doctrine of the Lord's Supper. Was his doctrine of the Supper Lutheran or Zwinglian? It is very difficult to answer this question. It seems that Calvin was in the middle way such that he did not belong to one party. Or it seems that Calvin's doctrine of the Lord's Supper was so very creative that it was not Lutheran nor Zwinglian.

Calvin said that the body of Christ is in heaven. In this regard, Calvin supported Zwingli. However, Calvin said that the Holy Spirit unites us and Christ's body in heaven and makes us receive the virtue of Christ. And so Calvin said that we have got life from the substance

74) Calvin, T&T, 2:158

75) Calvin, T&T, 2:158.

76) CO 1:127

of Christ's body. In this regard, Calvin tried to accept Luther's teaching. Luther attacked Zwingli that he did not distinguish between the merit of Christ and the distribution of the merit. With regard to this dispute, Calvin distinguished between the merit of Christ and the distribution of merit, and showed the way by which we receive the merit of Christ. For Calvin the way is the work of the Holy Spirit.

What, then, is the originality of Calvin's doctrine of the Lord's Supper. It seems that the originality of his doctrine of the Supper consists in its peculiar instrumentalism. Calvin said, "Therefore when it is a question of the remission of sins, we must look for no other originator of it than the Heavenly Father; we must imagine no other material cause than the blood of Christ. But when it comes to the formal cause the Holy Spirit indeed plays the leading role, but an inferior instrument is added, the preaching of the Gospel and baptism itself."⁷⁷⁾ Here Calvin regards the Gospel and the Sacrament as instruments. Just as we, hearing and believing the Gospel through the work of the Holy Spirit, receive our salvation, so we, participating in the Sacrament, receive our salvation. This instrumentalism is Calvin's peculiar contribution to the doctrine of the Supper.

77) Calvin, *Comm. Acts*, 22:16, CO 48:496.