

Joachim Westphal's Sacramentology

Second lecture for the Korean Calvin Society and the Korean Institute for Reformed Studies, Kosin University, South Korea,

5 by Wim Janse, Leiden University/VU University Amsterdam

Contents

10 I. Introduction, p. 1

II. Against Karlstadt and Zwingli, not Calvin, p. 4

III. Calvin quoted against Calvin, p. 11

IV. Warranting sacramental objectivity, p. 14

15

I. Introduction

20

The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is nothing but a sign, type, or representation of the body of Christ, a sign that reminds us of his suffering and signifies the Church's communion with Christ. [...] In the Supper, he nourishes with his body and blood in such a way that his flesh is not violated but remains whole and unharmed in heaven, and does not leave heaven. [...] The body of Christ is food for the soul, not the stomach. [...] To eat and drink Christ's body and blood spiritually [...] is to eat the bread and drink the cup of the Lord in faith, and to do this in remembrance of Him. [...] The faithful eat and drink spiritually. [...] In any case, carnal and gross images should be kept far from the mystical Supper.

25

30

In these quotations, taken from the dispute that took place from 1552 to 1558 between the Hamburg Lutheran pastor Joachim Westphal (1510-74) and John Calvin (1509-64),¹ few people will hesitate to identify the voice of the Genevan reformer. This easy attribution illustrates the stereotyping of the views of these two theologians, which has been a tendency in the historiography of the second Eucharistic controversy in the wake of the Zurich-Genevan *Consensio mutua* or *Consensus Tigurinus* (1549).² For this attribution

35

¹ See J.N. Tylenda, The Calvin-Westphal Exchange: The Genesis of Calvin's Treatises against Westphal, *Calvin Theological Journal* 9 (1974), 182-209; summarized in idem, Calvin and Westphal: Two Eucharistic Theologies in Conflict, in *Calvin's Books: Festschrift dedicated to Peter de Klerk on the occasion of his seventieth birthday*, ed. W.H. Neuser et al. (Heerenveen, 1997), 9-21. For a general overview of Westphal's career, see Irene Dingel, Westphal, Joachim, in *TRE*.

² For an overview, see Wilhelm Neuser, Der zweite Abendmahlsstreit, in *Handbuch der Dogmen- und Theologiegeschichte*, ed. C. Andresen, 3 vols. (Göttingen, 1988), 2: 272-85.

is wrong. Not Calvin, but his Lutheran opponent was the author of these phrases.³ This takes us immediately to the **thesis** of this paper. As a defense of Martin Luther's legacy, Westphal's sacramental theology was rather congenial to Calvin's, that is, before the latter succumbed to Heinrich Bullinger's spiritualism during the *Consensus* negotiations in 1549. Westphal did not formulate his sacramentology *contra* Calvin but against the Zwinglians. During the disputation he became convinced, not incorrectly, that the post-1549 Calvin should also be counted among them. Rather than representing an alleged orthodoxization of Lutheran theology Westphal's sacramentology documents the change in Calvin's thought.

There are various causes for the **distortion** that Westphal's sacramentology suffers, in as far as his views are known at all. Westphal's sacramentology has never been investigated separately, only as part of his polemic with Calvin. Consequently it could only be the opposite of Calvin's view, and correspondingly, any writings on the sacraments that Westphal published separately from his discussion with the Genevan reformer remained outside any study.⁴ In addition, historical interest in the discussion usually⁵ had a

³ Westphal, *Collectanea*, H1v-2r: "Coenae Domini Sacramentum nihil est nisi signum, typus et figura corporis Christi, in memo[H2]riam revocans eius passionem, et communionem Ecclesiae cum Christo significans." G2r-v: "Eo modo pascit enim corpore et sanguine suo in Coena, ut non violetur caro eius, sed inte[G2v]gra et illaesa maneat in coelo, nec deserat coelum." Idem, *Iusta defensio*, 61: "[...] corpus Christi [...] animae cibus est, non ventris." Idem, *Farrago*, E5v-6r: "[...] edant carnem Christi et bibant eius sanguinem fide spiritualiter [...] eaque fide edunt panem et bibunt calicem Domini, idque faciunt in eius commemorationem." E6v-7r: "credentes edunt et bibunt spiritualiter. [...] Certe carnales et crassae cogitationes procul abesse debent a mystica Coena."

⁴ E.g., *Fides divi Cyrilli Episcopi Alexandrini de praesentia Corporis et sanguinis Christi in sacrae coenae communionem* (Francoforti, 1555) (VD 16, C 6577); *Loci praecipui, de vi, usu, et dignitate salutiferi Baptismi ex Evangelistis et Apostolis collecti a Magistro Ioachimo Westphalo, Ecclesiae Hamburgensis Pastore* (Argentorati, 1556) (VD 16, W 2298); *Iusta defensio adversus insignia mendacia Ioannis a Lasco, quae in Epistola ad Sereniss. Poloniae Regem etc. contra Saxonicas ecclesias sparsit* (Argentorati, 1557) (VD 16, W 2296); *Responsio ad scriptum Iohannis a Lasco in quo Augustanam Confessionem in Cinglianismum transformat* (Ursellis, 1557) (VD 16, W 2283); *Clarissimi viri Ph. Melancthonis sententia de coena Domini ex scriptis eius collecta* (Hamburgae, 1557) (VD 16, W 2271); *Apologia adversus venenatum antidotum Valerii Pollani sacramentarii* (Ursellis, 1557) (VD 16, W 2263).

⁵ Exceptions are Wilhelm Niesel, *Calvins Lehre vom Abendmahl im Lichte seiner letzten Antwort an Westphal* (München, 1930); B. Cottret, *Pour une sémiotique de la Réforme: Le 'Consensus Tigurinus' (1549) et la 'Brève résolution...' (1555) de Calvin*, *Annales: Économies, Sociétés, Civilizations* 39 (1984), 265-85; Wim Janse,

confessional stamp, resulting in a confessional narrowing already reflected in the order of the opponents' names in the titles of Lutheran ('Westphal and Calvin'⁶) and Reformed studies ('Calvin and Westphal'⁷). The fact that Westphal's part in the polemic, contrary to Calvin's, has until now never been translated or re-published only increased its unfamiliarity – if knowledge about Westphal's views was not already usually based on Calvin's polemical representation of it.

Another obscuring factor in the perception, moreover, is unfamiliarity with the **development in the sacramentology** of Westphal's Genevan opponent. After a formative period during his first stay in Geneva (1536-38), the theological position Calvin occupied until the signing of the *Zurich Agreement* of 1549, in which he was partly also influenced by the Strasbourg reformer Martin Bucer, was one with which Westphal could largely agree. The development of this lutheranising **Calvin** into the **spiritualizing** ally of the Swiss in the 1550s I have recently detailed elsewhere.⁸ Rightly, Westphal was able to appeal in 1555 "to Calvin against Calvin", i.e., to the pre-1549 Calvin against the signatory of the 1549 *Agreement*. Rightly, John a Lasco wrote to Geneva in 1555: "They say he [scil., Westphal] attacks you with your own words"⁹ and to Zurich: "Westphal quotes Calvin against himself."¹⁰ Rightly, the Lutheran felt made a caricature of by the closing articles of the *Consensus*,

'De controverse tussen Westphal en Calvin over de kinderdoop (1555-1556). Tekst, vertaling en toelichting,' in *Verbum dei manet in aeternum: Luther en Calvin in hun Schrifverstaan*, ed. Wim Balke and Sabine Hiebsch (Kampen, 2006) (forthcoming). See also Helmut Gollwitzer, *Coena Domini. Die althutherische Abendmahlslehre in ihrer Auseinandersetzung mit dem Calvinismus dargestellt an der lutherischen Frühorthodoxie* [1937], mit einer Einführung zur Neuausgabe von Dietrich Braun (München, 1988), passim.

⁶ C. Mönckeberg, *Joachim Westphal und Johannes Calvin* (Hamburg, 1865); J.T.A. Nieter, *De controversia, quae de coena sacra inter Westphalum et Calvinum fuit, dijudicatio* (Berolini, [1872]).

⁷ A. Ebrard, Calvin und Westfal, in idem, *Das Dogma vom heiligen Abendmahl und seine Geschichte* II (Frankfurt am Main, 1845), 525-74; E. Lengereau, *Théorie de Calvin sur la Cène d'après ses controverses avec Joachim Westphal et Tilemann Heshusius* (Toulouse, 1896); G. Bouwmeester, Calvinij contra Westphal over den Doop, *Bezinning. Gereformeerd maandblad tot bewaring en bevordering van het christelijk leven* 2 (1947), 130-7, 165-19; P.H. Fick, Die ontwikkeling van 'n nagmaalsleer: Calvin en Westphal, *Koers* 55 (1990), 129-41.

⁸ Wim Janse, Calvin's Eucharistic Theology: Three Dogma-Historical Observations (to be published in the proceedings of the ninth International Congress on Calvin Research, Emden, August 22-26, 2006).

⁹ A Lasco to Calvin, 19 September 1555, *CO* 15,772-4, there 774.

¹⁰ A Lasco to Bullinger, 19 September 1555, *CO* 15,771-2, there 772.

which exuded the disgust that the Swiss, since Luther's *Kurzes Bekenntnis* (1544) had felt against the Lutherans, about the "gross figments and futile quibbles"¹¹ of consubstantiation,¹² local inclusion,¹³ ubiquity,¹⁴ and artolatry.¹⁵ Just like the younger Calvin, Westphal only wished to denounce any Zwinglian evacuation of the elements, and to do justice to the objectivity of the sacramental gifts and the divinely ordained instrumentality of the sacraments. Let me illustrate this.

10

II. *Opposing Karlstadt and Zwingli, not Calvin*

Westphal's sacramentology had no other aim than to maintain the grace-giving presence and gift of the true flesh and blood of the Savior,¹⁶ in the tangible sacrament as a means of grace no less than in the audible Word. This placed the Hamburg pastor on the line of the "vir excellentissimus" and the "fortis miles Christi"¹⁷ Luther, who did want to feel Christ with the tongue and grasp Him, and spoke of "divine water" in order not to relinquish God's real presence.¹⁸ In the phrasing of his **thesis Westphal** actually literally resumed the consecration formulas of Baptism and the Eucharist, in which true rest was only to be found through sincere faith.¹⁹ His stipulation of

15

20

¹¹ *Cons. Tigur.*, Art. 24.

¹² *Cons. Tigur.*, Artt. 21 and 24.

¹³ *Cons. Tigur.*, Art. 26.

¹⁴ *Cons. Tigur.*, Art. 25.

¹⁵ *Cons. Tigur.*, Art. 26.

¹⁶ *Farrago*, A3v: "[...] ut relinquat in sacrosancta Coena veri corporis et sanguinis Christi redemptoris nostri eam participationem, quam Ecclesia Dei a temporibus Apostolorum, ex verbis Christi acceptam inviolatam tenuit."

¹⁷ *Farrago*, A6r and A7v, respectively.

¹⁸ M. Luther, *Auslegung des dritten und vierten Kapitels Johannis in Predigten 1538-1540*, 38. Predigt (on John 3,22), WA 47,138.39-139.2: "Also hatt ehr [...] uns gegeben die Tauffe, das Sacrament des altars, die absolution, auff das wir Christum auff's allerneheste hetten, nicht allein im hertzen, sondern auch auff der Zunge, das wir ihnen können fhulen, greiffen und tappen"; idem, *Deutsch Catechismus (Der Große Katechismus)* (1529), WA 30/1,213.31 and 214.10-11, cf. 215.17-18: "ein Gottes wasser" and "Darümb ist es nicht allein ein natürlich wasser sondern ein Götlich, hymlich, heilig und selig wasser, und wie mans mehr loben kan [...]" See also Irene Dingel, *Strukturen der Lutherrezeption. Am Beispiel einer Lutherzitatensammlung von Joachim Westphal*, in *Kommunikationsstrukturen im europäischen Luthertum der Frühen Neuzeit*, ed. Wolfgang Sommer (Gütersloh, 2005), 32-50.

¹⁹ E.g., *Farrago*, A8v: "[...] abiectis suis adiunctionibus acquiescant fide syncera claris verbis Domini."

the *necessitas baptismi*,²⁰ and his use of the phrases “adesse, dari, et sumi,”²¹ “dispensari et sumi,”²² “distribui et percipi,”²³ “pane et calice distribui,”²⁴ “pani adesse et cum pane simul manducari,”²⁵ or “cum signis vere exhiberi”²⁶ of the true body and blood echoed the phrases of the *Augsburg Confession* (1530),²⁷ the *Wittenberg Concord* (1536),²⁸ and even Melancthon’s 1540 *Variata* form of the *Augsburg Confession*.²⁹

Consequently, for Westphal the **antithesis to his thesis** was found wherever he observed the evacuation of the sacraments, that is, in the Zwinglians³⁰ or “Sacramentarians,” for whom external, sensory

²⁰ *Collectanea*, A8r-v; *Iusta defensio* (1555), 105, 130-9; *De vi, usu, et dignitate salutiferi Baptismi* (1556) (see above, n. 4); *Apologia confessionis* (1558), 349-61.

²¹ *Farrago*, E7v: “[...] intelligitur, creditur et docetur in Eucharistia adesse, dari, et sumi verum corpus et sanguinem nostri Redemptoris.”

²² *Collectanea*, B1r; cf. C5r: “dispensari et percipi.”

²³ *Farrago*, B1v: “[...] corpus et sanguinem Christi omnes intelligunt de vero corpore Christi, cuius verbis insistentes docent constanter in hac Coena distribui et percipi verum corpus et sanguinem Domini nostri Iesu Christi.”

²⁴ *Farrago*, A4a.

²⁵ *Iusta defensio*, 87.

²⁶ *Farrago*, A5r: “[...] quod panis et vinum non tantum sint signa corporis et sanguinis, sed etiam cum signis vere exhibeantur corpus et sanguis Christi.” *Apologia*, 305: “[...] cum pane praesens suum corpus, cum vino sanguinem suum [...] dispenset.”

²⁷ *Augsburgische Confession* (1530), Art. 9: “De baptismo docent, quod sit necessarius ad salutem, quodque per baptismum offeratur gratia Dei, et quod pueri sint baptizandi, qui per baptismum oblato Deo recipiuntur in gratiam Dei.” Art. 10: “Von dem Abendmahl des Herren wird also gelehrt, dass wahrer Leib und Blut Christi wahrhaftiglich unter der Gestalt des Brots und Weins im Abendmahl gegenwärtig sei und da ausgeteilt und genommen werde [...]”; “De coena Domini docent, quod corpus et sanguis Christi vere adsint et distribuantur vescentibus in coena Domini; [...]”

²⁸ *Wittenberg Concord* (1536): “Itaque sentiunt et docent, cum pane et vino vere et substantialiter adesse, exhiberi et sumi corpus Christi et sanguinem.” Cf. also *Iusta defensio*, 20: “adesse et dari substantialiter.”

²⁹ *Confessio Augustana Variata* (1540), Art. 10: “De coena domini docent, quod cum pane et vino vere exhibeantur corpus et sanguis Christi vescentibus in coena domini.”

³⁰ E.g., *Farrago*, A3r (“adsertores Zwingliani erroris, tollentis e sacra Coena veritatem corporis et sanguinis Christi”); *Recta fides*, I1r (“Astute ergo ludunt Amphibologia Zwingliani”); *Epistola Ioachimi Westphali qua breviter respondet ad convicia Iohannis Calvini* (Ursellis, 1557) (VD 16, W 2312), CO 9,xviii-xxi, there xviii-xix: “[...] admisi inexpiabile scelus, qui ausus sum dogma Cinglianæ officinae atro [xix] carbone notare.” *Confessio*, A6v-7r: “[...] credo et hoc pro meo modulo defendo, Corpus et Sanguinem Christi, in sacra Coena vere adesse et distribui [A7] iuxta indubitata veritatem verbi eius, et contrariam doctrinam

elements did not constitute means of grace:³¹ Andreas Karlstadt, who as the “first master of deviation”³² had breathed new life into Berengarianism³³ together with “the other prophet” Huldrych Zwingli;³⁴ Johannes a Lasco;³⁵ Johannes Oecolampadius;³⁶ Peter Martyr Vermigli;³⁷ and especially Bullinger and his Zurich colleagues.³⁸

Westphal devoted three publications to the refutation of these “Zwinglians” **before** July 1555, when, directly attacked by Calvin, he aimed his arrows at the Genevan: these three were the *Farrago* (1552),³⁹ the *Recta fides* (1553),⁴⁰ and the *Collectanea* or ‘Collection of quotes from the holy Aurelius Augustine,’ Westphal’s “nobiscum sentit Augustinus” (early 1555).⁴¹ In as far as **Calvin** was mentioned in these documents at all,⁴² he was mainly quoted with **approval**. Calvin judged Luther fairly, according to Westphal, who supported this by ample quotes from Calvin’s unionistic *Petit traicté de la sainte cene* of 1541.⁴³ Calvin rightly called bread and wine

Cinglii positam in figuris et tropis, qui inde auferunt substantiam Corporis et Sanguinis Domini, reprehendo, reiicio et damno.”

³¹ E.g., *Iusta defensio*, 46, marginal note to 46-95: “Sacramentarii in pane et calice nihil praeter vacua symbola relinquunt.”

³² *Farrago*, A4v, A5r, B3r-4r, C6v, C7r, D5v, E2r; *Iusta defensio*, 27-8; 30; 123-4; 78: “[...] Carolstadium, post Berengarium alterum patrem Sacramentarium.”

³³ *Iusta defensio* (1555), 11: “Multi [...] contradicunt ubique Berengarii heresi per Carolstadium et Zwinglium resuscitata”; cf. 80. See also *Collectanea*, A4v, A8r, D4r, F2v. *Iusta defensio*, A4b, 78, 80.

³⁴ *Farrago*, A5r (“alius propheta”). Probably, this designation was an allusion to Luther’s treatise against Karlstadt, *Wider die himmlischen Propheten, von den Bildern und Sakrament* (1525), WA 18,62-125, 134-214. Cf. *Farrago*, B5v-7r (quotations from Zwingli’s writings). In *Recta fides*, N3r, Zwingli is placed third in the list of “blasphemous mockers,” after Cerinthus and Arius.

³⁵ *Farrago*, D8r-E3r.

³⁶ *Farrago*, B8v-C1v.

³⁷ *Farrago*, B7r-8r.

³⁸ *Farrago*, C5r-D1r.

³⁹ *Farrago confusaneorum et inter se dissidentium opinionum De Coena Domini, ex Sacramentarium libris congesta* (Magdeburgi, 1552) (VD 16, W 2287).

⁴⁰ *Recta fides de Coena Domini, ex verbis Apostoli Pauli, et Evangelistarum demonstrata ac communita* (Magdeburgae, 1553) (VD 16, W 2308).

⁴¹ *Collectanea sententiarum divi Aurelii Augustini Episcopi Hipponensis de Coena Domini. Addita est confutatio vindicans a corruptelis plerosque locos, quos pro se ex Augustino falso citant Sacramentarii* (Ratisbonae, 1555) (VD 16, A 4170). The quote is from F3v; cf. H6v: “in omnibus nobiscum sentit [...] nihil iuvat adversarios.”

⁴² In *Recta fides* (1553) not at all.

⁴³ *Farrago*, D1v-5r; cf. the marginal note on D4v: “D. Lutherus in omnibus satis se declaravit.”

“instruments by which the Lord distributes his body and blood.”⁴⁴ Calvin had creditably unmasked Karlstadt as an inveterate liar,⁴⁵ disproved the resemblance between Zwingli and Luther proposed by Bucer and Martyr,⁴⁶ and had pointed out to the Zwinglians that “cum signis” Christ’s real body and blood are exhibited.⁴⁷ With approval, Westphal noted in the margin at Calvin’s lecturing of the Swiss in the *Petit traicté*:⁴⁸ “It is out of sheer thoughtlessness that the Zwinglians have maintained for fifteen years that bread and wine are empty signs.”⁴⁹ Against Bullinger’s remark that the sacraments “in no way exhibit what they figure” and that it was not true that *simul* with the elements forgiveness or the *communio Christi* was offered,⁵⁰ Westphal noted, with approval, and rightly: “Calvin says exactly the opposite.”⁵¹ True enough, during the *Consensus* negotiations this had been the subject of a difference of opinion between the two, and because of Bullinger’s fear of a causal, lutheranizing interpretation, Calvin had had to give up his *simul* in favor of *similiter* (equally), a term meant to serve as an assurance,⁵² and which also showed that

⁴⁴ *Farrago*, D2r, marginal note: “Panem et vinum esse instrumenta quibus Dominus corpus et sanguinem suum distribuit.”

⁴⁵ *Farrago*, A4v; D5v; E2r; *Iusta defensio*, 30.

⁴⁶ *Farrago*, A6r, B8r; D3v-4v; for Bucer, see C2v, C3r; for Peter Martyr, B7r-8r.

⁴⁷ *Farrago*, A5r.

⁴⁸ *Farrago*, D5r (quotation from Calvin): “Hoc intelligo, dum nimis studiose ac diligenter, in hoc toti incumbabant, ut assererent panem et vinum, corpus et sanguinem Christi vocari, quod ipsorum signa sint, non cogitarunt sibi hoc interea simul agendum, ut adiungerent ita signa ut nihilominus veritatas cum eis coniuncta sit, nec testati sunt, sese non eo tendere, ut veram communionem obscurarent, quam nobis hoc Sacramento Dominus in corpore et sanguine suo exhibet.” Cf. *CO* 5,459; *OS* 2,529. See also *Farrago*, A5r.

⁴⁹ *Farrago*, D5r, marginal note: “Incogitantia Zwinglianorum quindecim annis contenderunt panem et vinum esse vacua signa.”

⁵⁰ *Farrago*, D1r (quotation from Bullinger): “[...] non continent autem in se Sacramenta, neque habent, quod significant, proinde nequaquam quod significant exhibent. Desidero manifestae scripturae locum, qui perspicue tradat, cum aqua simul adferri foedus Dei gratiam et remissionem peccatorum, cum pane et vino simul exhiberi corpus et sanguinem Christi, aut ipsissimam Christi communionem.”

⁵¹ *Farrago*, D1r, marginal note: “In alteram partem contra Calvinus disputat.”

⁵² Ioannis Calvini propositiones de sacramentis. Annotationes breves adscripsit Henricus Bullingerus (November 1548), *CO* 7,693-700, there 695-6: “IX. Ergo qui baptismum recipit, simul peccatorum remissionem percipit’. In hac propositione offendit nos particula Simul. [...] Et particula Simul perinde sonat ac si sacramentis alligata sit gratia, et quasi iam primum, quum baptismus percipitur, remissio peccatorum conferatur.” Calvini responsio ad annotationes Bullingeri (January 1549), *CO* 7,701-8, there 704: “Atque hic sensus est: tam vere nos fieri compotes rei signatae, quam vere signum oculis cernimus.” Henrici Bullingeri annotata ad Calvini animadversiones, *CO* 7,709-16, there 713, IX.

5 Calvin had given in to Bullinger's symbolic parallelism.⁵³ Rightly, Westphal did not see a similarity between the Frenchman and the Swiss before 1549. On the contrary, Westphal quoted with approval from Calvin's *1 Corinthians Commentary* of 1546, which indeed is phrased in strongly anti-Swiss terms:⁵⁴

10 The statue of Hercules is called Hercules, but what have we there but a bare, empty representation? The Spirit, on the other hand, is called a dove, as being a sure pledge of the invisible presence of the Spirit. Hence the bread is Christ's body, because it assuredly testifies, that the body which it represents is exhibited to us, or because the Lord, by holding out to us that symbol, gives us at the same time (*una*) his own body; for Christ is not a deceiver, to mock us with empty representations. Hence I regard it as beyond all controversy, that the reality is here conjoined with the sign.⁵⁵

15

Cf. Janse, Westphal en Calvijn over de kinderdoop (see above, n. 5).

⁵³ For the characterization of Bullinger's, Calvin's, and Zwingli's Eucharistic views as, respectively, symbolic parallelism, symbolic instrumentalism, and symbolic memorialism, see Brian A. Gerrish, *The Lord's Supper in the Reformed Confessions*, *Theology Today* 23 (1966), 224-43, repr. in idem, *The Old Protestantism and the New: Essays on the Reformation Heritage* (Edinburgh, 1982), 118-30; idem, John Calvin and the Reformed Doctrine of the Lord's Supper, *McCormick Quarterly* 22/2 (1969), 85-98; idem, *Grace and Gratitude: The Eucharistic Theology of John Calvin* (Minneapolis, 1993), 167; and elsewhere.

⁵⁴ See Janse, Calvin's Eucharistic Theology (see above, n. 8): "In the 1546 *1 Corinthians Commentary* a Lutheran battle front seemed hardly to exist; wherever possible it was covered up. [...] The demarcation of the Swiss position, on the other hand, was as bold as it was cutting [...]. Undoubtedly, this delineation was meant to serve a rapprochement from the side of the Lutherans, still hoped for in 1546 [...]. In his *1 Corinthians* of 1546 Calvin distanced himself in no uncertain terms from the Zwinglian reduction of the sacrament to its ecclesiological-ethical and commemorative notions, to the detriment of its gift-character. He dissociated himself unconditionally from the limitation of the *communio corporis Christi* to a partaking of his *beneficia*; he distanced himself from the negation of the soteriological plus of the *manducatio sacramentalis*; from the noetic interpretation of the *commemoratio*; from the disjunction of *signum* and *res signata*, and from the resulting *evacuatio sacramentorum* – all this while continually honoring the instrumentality of the sacrament."

⁵⁵ Calvin, *Comm. 1 Cor.* (1546), 1 Cor 11,24; CO 49,486-7 (cf. CTS 378): "Vocatur Hercules statua Herculis: sed quid illic est praeter nudam inanemque figuram? Columba autem spiritus vocatur, quia certa sit tessera invisibilis spiritus praesentiae. Ergo panis est Christi corpus: quia certo testetur exhiberi nobis corpus illud quod figurat: vel quia Dominus visibile illud symbolum nobis porrigendo una dat etiam nobis suum corpus: neque enim fallax est Christus, qui vacuis figuris [487] nos ludat. Proinde illud mihi est extra controversiam, veritatem hic cum suo signo coniunctam esse."

Not realizing that one year later Calvin had adduced these reservations explicitly against Bullinger,⁵⁶ Westphal expressed his support of this passage with the exclamation: “Here we see how Calvin interprets the reality and substance of Christ’s body.”⁵⁷

5 However, even without any connection with the Genevan reformer the Lutheran made **statements** that came **close to Calvin’s thought**, as for instance: The sacraments “are instruments by which God offers, exhibits, grants, and seals salvation to the faithful.”⁵⁸ “Christ may be sought and found spiritually, and in heaven.”⁵⁹ “By
10 virtue of the truth of his promise he exhibits Himself to us as present [...]. Our ratio and senses do not observe anything here outside bread and wine, but faith ...”⁶⁰ No less explicitly than Calvin⁶¹ – and

⁵⁶ See Calvin to Bullinger, 25 February 1547, *CO* 12,480-9, there 482, 484-5: “Ubi enim spiritus in imagine Caesaris, qui ipsam quodammodo vivificet, quo efficax sit in cordibus nostris? Scio multos bonos viros abhorruisse a Zwinglii doctrina, quod toties occurreret ista comparatio absque correctione. Inde enim colligebant fieri ex coena theatricum spectaculum. [...] [484] Panem esse signum contendis. Idem sentimus. Exhibitionem negas. Ego contra assero. In figura nodum putas explicari. Non admitto. Signum enim a Deo vacuum non proficiscitur. [...] [485] Solus est Deus qui efficit spiritu suo quod symbolo figurat. Similiter columba erat spiritus. [...] Mihi satis est quod spiritus sanctus praesentiae suae symbolum in columba exhibendo se praesentem exhibuit.”

⁵⁷ *Farrago*, D6r: “Hic observa, quid Calvinus intelligat per veritatem et substantiam corporis Christi.”

⁵⁸ *Collectanea*, H6r: “[...] sunt organa, quibus Deus offert, exhibet, praestat et obsignat salutem credentibus.” Cf. Calvin, e.g., *Conf. de euchar.* (1537), *CO* 9,712; *OS* 1,435 (cf. Reid, 168): “Hanc autem carnis et sanguinis sui communionem Christus sub panis et vini symbolis in sacrosancta sua coena offert, et exhibet omnibus qui eam rite celebrant iuxta legitimum eius institutum.” Idem, *Traité Cène* (1541), *CO* 5,439; *OS* 1,508-9: “Le pain et le vin [...] sont comme instruments par lesquelz le Seigneur Iesus nous les [scil., le corps et le sang] distribue. [...] [509] C’est doncq à bon droict que le pain est nommé corps, puis que non seulement il le nous represente, mais aussi nous le presente.”

⁵⁹ *Farrago*, E8r: “Christus spiritualiter et in supernis quaeritur et invenitur, fide nitente verbo eius;” cf. Calvin’s *sursum corda*.

⁶⁰ *Farrago*, E8r: “[...] et pro veritate promissionis suae exhibet se nobis praesentem [...]. Ratio et sensus nostri praeter panem et vinum nihil hic percipiunt. Fides vero [...]”; *Iusta defensio*, 69;

cf. Calvin, *Comm. 1 Cor.*, 1 Cor 11,24; *CO* 49,486-7 and 488 (cf. *CTS* 378, 380): “Ergo panis est Christi corpus: quia certo testetur exhiberi nobis corpus illud quod figurat: [...] neque enim fallax est Christus, qui vacuis figuris [487] nos ludat. [...] [488] Memineris arcanum ac mirificum esse spiritus sancti opus, quod intelligentiae tuae modulo metiri sit nefas.” Ibid., 1 Cor 11,25; *CO* 49,489 (cf. *CTS* 382): “[...] neque enim adest Christus visibiliter, neque oculis cernitur sicuti symbola [...]. Denique locum non mutat, ut nobis adsit, sed e coelo praesentem in nos carnis suae virtutem transmittit.”

Luther⁶² – Westphal emphasized the condition of faith for the reception of the fruit of the sacrament: “The Word demands faith plus the added signs of the sacraments, and these only profit those who use them in faith.”⁶³

5 Westphal, however, was not happy with the fact that he had to deduce from the **1549 Consensus** that Calvin professed *quaecunque alias* (“some things in a different way”),⁶⁴ and that, in spite of *consonantia* in words, he harbored *dissonantia* in doctrine and faith;⁶⁵ that he *tacite* (tacitly) also interpreted the consecration words
10 significatively, symbolically, and spiritually,⁶⁶ and hence must have spoken with a double tongue.⁶⁷ Re-reading the *Petit traicté* (1541) from the perspective of the *Consensus*, Westphal noted that Calvin did speak of *substantia* and *communicatio Christi*, but sometimes accompanied this with the adjective *spiritualis*, or else used the word

⁶¹ E.g., Calvin, *Comm. 1 Cor* (1546), 1 Cor 11,28; CO 49,492: “Vides expeditissimam methodum: si rite vis uti Christi beneficio, fidem afferas et poenitentiam.” Idem, *Def. de sacr.* (1555), CO 9,26; OS 2,278.23-6: “Sed quum Dominus vere semper quod figurat [...] praestare sit paratus: non nisi fide recipi fatemur, quod oblatum est.”

⁶² E.g., WA 6,517.28-33; WA 6,533.32-4: “[...] neque enim credi potest, nisi assit promissio, nec promissio stabilitur, nisi credatur.”; WA 30/1,216.13-14: “On glauben ist es [scil. das heylsame Göttliche wasser) nichts nütz.”

⁶³ *Collectanea*, E6v: “Deposcit fidem verbum et addita sigilla Sacramentorum, neque prosunt nisi utentibus fide.” See also, e.g., H5r: “Sacramenta remittunt ad Christum et fidem in eum requirunt.”

⁶⁴ *Farrago*, D6v: “Habes explicata, quaecunque alias de Eucharistia scribit Calvinus.”

⁶⁵ *Iusta defensio*, 51: “Praemonendi causa Farrago indicavit partim consonantiam aliquam in verbis, in doctrina vero et fide dissonantiam, partim discrepantiam in verbis et sententiis.”

⁶⁶ *Farrago*, D6v-7v, cf. marginal notes: “Panis et vinum significant corpus et sanguinem Christi.” “Panis datur in symbolum communionis, quam credentes habent cum Christo.” “Coena Domini est testificatio, quae spirituales gratias figurat.” “Pane et vino corpus et sanguis Christi figuratur.”

⁶⁷ *Farrago*, D4v: “[...] nonnulli fatentur, in hac Coena exhiberi, edi et bibi Domini corpus et sanguinem, sed spiritualiter, non tamen, ut panis Eucharistiae sit corpus et vinum sit sanguis Domini. Hi astute ita occultant suum errorem, ut videantur de synaxi sentire et loqui, secundum orthodoxam fidem, non aliter quam recte institutos convenit credere et docere de hoc Sacramento [...]. Verbis quidem idem sonant, quod alii synceri in recta fide, cum dicunt, fideles edere [E5] corpus Christi et bibere eius sanguinem, sed non sentient idem [...]. His verbis edere corpus et bibere sanguinem Christi addunt suam glossam, sive expresse sive tacite, quod esum corporis et potum sanguinis Domini intelligi velint spiritualem seu symbolicum.”

*figura*⁶⁸ – terms that were also in Westphal’s vocabulary, as we have seen in the opening quotations of this paper. At first, therefore, in 1552 Westphal still wanted to include Calvin among those who “are less dangerous to the simpler people”:

5

Some theologians manage to adapt their speech in such a way that it seems they are totally ignorant of the Sacramentarian heresy. For they say that in the Eucharist *vere corpus Christi adesse et exhiberi*. The more simple-minded among the faithful have little to fear from them, because most of these simpletons do not understand what the scholars are hiding, but only what corresponds to the true faith, although with many of them error manages to insinuate itself even under this guise.⁶⁹

10

15

Of the 28 errors listed in Westphal’s 1552 table of the “chaos diversarum opinionum” among “Sacramentarians” about the consecration words, only three were Calvin’s, two of which dated from 1549 or later – as opposed to twelve each of Karlstadt, Zwingli, Bullinger, and Zurich; seven of A Lasco, five of Oecolampadius, and one of Bucer.⁷⁰ The object of Westphal’s resistance was not Calvin’s thought, at least at first.

20

III. Calvin quoted against Calvin

25

This only began to be the case when in January **1555**, with the defense of “his heretical”⁷¹ *Consensus*, Calvin presented himself as the spokesman of the “Sacramentarians,” and “was going to come out of his hiding places and **from under his cloak** and make an end to all ambiguity.”⁷² This man, who as recently as 1552 had been described as “less dangerous,” was now branded the “currently most prominent

30

⁶⁸ *Farrago*, D1v-2v. Westphal felt disappointed about Bucer, too, *ibid.*, B2v-B3r: “Unus Bucerus videtur rediisse in viam, si id sensit, quod scriptum reliquit in quibusdam posterioribus suis libris. Est qui fatetur substantiam corporis Christi dari in sacra coe[B3r]na, satis tamen declarat, quod loquatur de substantia spirituali, non de vero corpore Christi.”

⁶⁹ *Farrago*, B2v: “Quidam ita noverunt attemperare sermonem, ut videantur esse alieni et exempti a sacramentaria haeresi, et recte sentire, sic enim loquuntur, in Eucharistia vere corpus Christi adesse et exhiberi. Ab his minus est periculi simplicioribus. Nam plerique non quid ipsi occultent, sed quid cum recta consentiat fide, intelligunt, quanquam aliquibus sub ista specie error etiam insinuetur.”

⁷⁰ Westphal, *Tabula breviter et summatim ob oculos proponens chaos diversarum opinionum de verbis Christi, hoc est corpus meum*, in *Farrago*, E4r-v.

⁷¹ *Iusta defensio*, 20 resp. 17.

⁷² *Iusta defensio*, 55: “[...] atque ex latebris et involucris se evolutum patefaceret, omnemque ambiguitatem, nebulis et tenebris dispulsis, tolleret.”

defender of the accursed Zwinglian error” and “the terrifying giant of the Philistines.”⁷³ He who in his *Petit traicté* and in his commentaries⁷⁴ “considered it one of the false opinions that some people only postulated the figure and symbols of the body,” because
5 “the reality is conjoined with the signs,”⁷⁵ and who “without doubt believed nothing less than that Christ’s body is substantially present in the Eucharist and distributed,”⁷⁶ was now found to “distribute
poison with his honey.”⁷⁷

10 Calvin seems to say and feel exactly the same as we do, without any suspicion of intentional deceit and trickery. For, he confesses that the faithful receive Christ’s body under the symbol of bread; that He who speaks is trustworthy; that it would be completely out of character for Him to disappoint us by giving us a hollow token; that we are not shown an empty figure, but are offered a pledge to which both the actual thing and
15 reality are connected, namely, that our souls are nourished with Christ’s flesh and blood. Similarly, [he says] that the bread is called the body of Christ because it is a symbol to which its reality is tied. Somebody would have to be a complete unbeliever, and obstinate, to desire more [from Calvin] and still doubt his words [...], especially because Calvin adds the

⁷³ *Confessio*, A4v: “Primarius hoc tempore propugnator execrandi erroris Cingliani”; idem, A8r: “[...] nihil extimescentes GIGANTEM PHILISTINORUM.” In the *Iusta defensio* Calvin is called: “egregius aliquis Sacramentarius,” “meus adversarius,” “meus repr(a)ehensor,” “meus conviciator,” “meus irrisor,” “meus criminator,” “meus accusator;” while Luther is called “excellentissimum illud organum Dei aeternae memoriae,” “Elias nostri temporis,” “sagacissimus,” “propheta Dei,” “eximie a Deo doctus.” This nomenclature exemplifies the confessionalistic hardening.

⁷⁴ *Iusta defensio*, 55: “Alibi in commentariis suis eandem sententiam retinuit, sed tectius et occultius, coloribus ita temperatis, ut nonnulli, quamvis non obtusi nec hebetes in perspicendo vero, vix divinarent quid sibi vellet, et anguillam, quod dicitur, cauda tenerent, dubii et perplexi, quaenam eius certa sententia esset. Aliqui minus perspicaces credunt ipsum cum nostris idem docere, quo nomine coeperunt eius libri pluribus esse gratiores, donec in lucem daretur *Consensio mutua*.” As witness his quotations Westphal was rightly thinking of the *1 Corinthians Commentary* (1546); cf. above, n. 56.

⁷⁵ *Iusta defensio*, 47: “Cur ergo ante annos ferme viginti recensuit inter falsas opiniones, quod quidam ponerent tantum figuram et symbola corporis? Cur in libro quodam Zvinglii sodales reprehendit, ad annos quindecim contendisse et non cogitasse, dum toti in hoc errant, ut assererent panem et vinum corpus et sanguinem Christi vocari, quod ipsorum signa sint: sibi hoc interea simul agendum, ut adiungerent ita signa esse, ut nihilo minus veritas cum eis coniuncta sit.” See also 85.

⁷⁶ *Iusta defensio*, 54: “Si perstat in ea fide, quam declaravit ante annos circiter viginti, certe nihil minus credit, quod substantialiter Christi corpus adesse et dispensari in Coena.” See also 49: “[...] quum disertis verbis non solum affirmet adversarius, in Coena mystica Christi corpus et sanguinem percipi, sed Augustanae Confessioni etiam subscribat?”

⁷⁷ *Iusta defensio*, 49.

solemn assurance that he is speaking of the true body, that was once sacrificed for us ...How many would he have deceived with these tricks? It is good that he now shows his real face.⁷⁸

- 5 True enough, in his *Defensio* of 1555 – although countering the accusation of *evacuatio sacramentorum* – Calvin had allowed himself pointedly Zwinglianizing statements.⁷⁹ “It is totally unnecessary to look for proof elsewhere,” Westphal said, “This one document, not just tainted but completely filled with stench, provides enough.”⁸⁰
- 10 Next, Westphal’s tactics were to “**play off the witness against himself**”:⁸¹ following the text of the *Defensio* he analyzed what his opponent ‘really’ understood by *consonantia* such as *corpus* (namely, *vigor* or *virtus*);⁸² *veritas signi* (namely, *virtus seu effectus* or *vis spiritualis*, instead of *substantia*);⁸³ by *realiter* (namely, non-imaginary instead of non-figurative);⁸⁴ by *spiritualiter* (namely, non-sincerely, instead of reception ‘in faith’);⁸⁵ by *edere carnis Christi* (namely, *credere* and *beneficia commemorare*, instead of *corpus recipere*);⁸⁶ by *praesentia corporis* (namely, *praesentia Spiritus*
- 15

⁷⁸ *Iusta defensio*, 56-7: “Videtur plane idem cum nostris, absque ullius doli mali et fraudis suspicione, loqui et sentire, quia confitetur fideles sub panis symbolo Christi recipere corpus: veracem esse qui loquitur: minime ei convenire inanem tesseram porrigendo nos frustrari: non inanem oculis figuram proponi, sed pignus nobis porrigi, cui res ipsa et veritas coniuncta est, quod scilicet Christi carne et sanguine animae nostrae pascantur. Item, panem vocari corpus Christi, quia symbolum est, cui sua annexa sit veritas. Nimium incredulus et morosus sit oportet, si quis aliquid desideret amplius, [...] praesertim quum accedat asseveratio tam sancta qua affirmat, se sentire de vero corpore, quod pro nobis semel oblatum est. Quam multos deciperet his praestigiis? [...] Sed bene habet, quod satis se aperit.”

⁷⁹ See Janse, Calvin’s Eucharistic Theology (see above, n. 8). Especially when focusing in 1555-56 on infant Baptism – stressing its dispensability in the case of those who die young, and its apparent ineffectiveness in some adults – Calvin got into Zwinglian waters; see Janse, Westphal en Calvijn over de kinderdoop (see above, n. 5).

⁸⁰ *Iusta defensio*, 57: “Aliunde sumere probationes nihil opus est, suppeditat nobis non paucas unum hoc, non tinctum sed perfusum virulentia scriptum, quas ordine recitabo.”

⁸¹ *Iusta defensio*, 85: [...] si licet eum testem contra seipsum adducere.”

⁸² *Iusta defensio*, 57-8; cf. *Apologia*, 71-83.

⁸³ *Iusta defensio*, 58-9.

⁸⁴ *Iusta defensio*, 59-60.

⁸⁵ *Iusta defensio*, 61-2.

⁸⁶ *Iusta defensio*, 63-5. Here Westphal’s argument reflected Calvin’s own criticism, in his 1546 *1 Corinthians Commentary*, on the Zwinglian limitation of the *communio Christi* to a partaking of Christ’s blessings and the equation of sacramental eating and faith. Cf. Westphal, *Iusta defensio*, 65: “[...] aliud est, quod iubemur edere corpus Domini, aliud est finis et usus rei quae accipitur, videlicet

5 *sancti*);⁸⁷ by *substantia* (namely, *vis carnis*);⁸⁸ by *sumptio corporis* (namely, *gratiae perceptio*, 81).⁸⁹ The conclusion could only be that Calvin “provides many crystal-clear indications that he, possessed by Zwingli’s spirit, only generates, broadcasts, and produces what the latter has generated.”⁹⁰ What was Westphal’s own position, he who had detected at least a verbal congeniality in the younger Calvin?

10 IV. Warranting sacramental objectivity

By force of Luther’s dyad of Word and faith,⁹¹ for the Lutherans the real presence was traditionally anchored in the Lord’s consecration words⁹² – reflected in the phrase “*Dominus dixit*”⁹³ – to which ‘faith’

commemorare beneficia nostri redemptoris, qui seipsum tradidit pro nobis. Si quis autem tollit rem ipsam, tollit simul rei usum et effectum. Defraudant itaque se usu Coenae Domini, et ad effectum fruitionis beneficiorum non perveniunt qui ex communione auferunt substantiam carnis et sanguinis vivifici.” and Calvin, *Comm. 1 Cor.*, 1 Cor 11,24; *CO* 49,487 (cf. *CTS* 379): “Ego autem tunc nos demum participare Christi bonis agnosco, postquam Christum ipsum obtinemus. Obtineri autem dico, non tantum quum pro nobis factum fuisse victimam credimus: sed dum in nobis habitat, dum est unum nobiscum, dum eius sumus membra ex carne eius, dum in unam denique et vitam et substantiam (ut ita loquar) cum ipso coalescimus. Praeterea audio quid verba sonent: neque enim mortis tantum ac resurrectionis suae beneficium nobis offert Christus, sed corpus ipsum, in quo passus est ac resurrexit.”

⁸⁷ *Iusta defensio*, 65-7.

⁸⁸ *Iusta defensio*, 72-3; see also, there: “In quodam eius libro leguntur haec verba: Non est figura nuda, sed veritati et substantiae suae coniuncta. Sacramenta Domini nullo modo a substantia et veritate sua separari o[73]portet. Hic usus substantiae vocabulo nonnullos permovit, ut putarent ipsum confiteri, quod caro Christi substantialiter adsit in Sacramento: alios perplexos reddidit, ut dubitarent, quid sentiret.”

⁸⁹ *Iusta defensio*, 81.

⁹⁰ *Iusta defensio*, 57: “[...] et multa praebet certissima indicia, spiritu Zwinglii obsessum, nihil aliud parturire, circumferre et edere in lucem, quam ille parturiit.”

⁹¹ See, e.g., *WA* 6,516.30-32: “Neque enim deus, ut dixi, aliter cum hominibus unquam egit aut agit quam verbo promissionis. Rursus, nec nos cum deo unquam agere aliter possumus quam fide in verbum promissionis eius.” Cf *WA* 6,533.32-3 (see above, n. 62).

⁹² Cf. Luther’s treatise against Zwingli, *Daß diese wort Christi (Das ist mein Leib etce) noch fest stehen widder die Schwermgeister* (1527), *WA* 23,64-283; and Luther’s statement to Zwingli at the Marburg Colloquy (1529), *WA* 30/3,137.10-13: “Mein allerliebsten Herren, dieweil der Text meines Herrn Jhesu Christi alda steht: Hoc Est Corpus meum, So kan ich nicht füruber, sondern mus bekennen und gleuben, das der Leib Chisti da sey.”

⁹³ Cf. Theodor Mahlmann, *Das neue Dogma der lutherischen Christologie. Problem und Geschichte seiner Begründung* (Gütersloh, 1969), 51-2, 239.

was the only answer. For Westphal, too, the real presence was supported by the **two pillars** of “the truthfulness of the speaking, and the omnipotence of the acting God.”⁹⁴ The quotations on the title page of the *Collectanea* served as the explanatory principle of Westphal’s entire Eucharistic oeuvre: “For with God nothing shall be impossible” (Lc 1,37); “If you only acknowledge what you can see, where is faith?” (Augustine); “We are not directed by the Lord to discuss divine matters or investigate these by our reason, but simply and unshakably show faith” (Augustine).⁹⁵ Together with Luther, and just like Bucer and the younger Calvin, Westphal wanted to preserve the *quod* of the real presence;⁹⁶ curiosity as to its *quomodo* he qualified as philosophy and rationalism, which were at odds with the ‘mystery’ character of the sacrament.⁹⁷ The same qualification Westphal also applied to the “Sacramentarians” argument of the *localitas* of the human body against what was later called – but rejected by Westphal together with Augustine⁹⁸ – corporeal ubiquity.⁹⁹ The Christological presupposition of this simultaneous presence of

⁹⁴ *Collectanea*, F4r: “Vix patienter ferunt Sacramentarii, omnes copias sophismatum suorum arceri, infringi et profligari a nobis duabus theologicis demonstrationibus, altera deducta ex veritate Dei loquentis, altera petita ab omnipotentia facientis, quae quia stant immotae tanquam duae columnae adversus quamlibet acrem impressionem, ideo sunt eis intolerabiles.” See also *Apologia*, 208.

⁹⁵ *Collectanea*, A1r: “Lucae, I. Non erit impossibile apud Deum omne verbum. August. Serm. de tempore CXI. Si non nosti nisi quod vides, ubi est fides? Augustinus Sermone CXXXI. de tempore. Dominus noster non iubet nos discutere divina, nec rationem requirere, sed fidem simpliciter et immobiliter exhibere. Non nobis veniat in cogitationem, quomodo hoc aut illud potuit fieri, qui omnipotentem praecipimur confiteri.” See, e.g., *Iusta defensio*, A3b.

⁹⁶ *Iusta defensio*, 71-2: “Simpliciter esse et dari docemus, quod sapientia aeterni Patris esse et dari affirmat: confitemur praesentiam veri corpo[72]ris pro nobis dati et sanguinis pro nobis effusi: non statuimus modum praesentiae nobis incomprehensibilem, nec curiositati humanae perscrutabilem.”

⁹⁷ E.g., *Recta fides*, E1r; *Collectanea*, F2r, F4v (“Non patiamur nos inde abduci super arenam philosophiae et rationem sapientiae humanae.”); *Iusta defensio*, 68-70; *Confessio*, A6v; *Apologia*, 177-8 (“illud quomodo [...] Iudaicum enim hoc verbum est”).

⁹⁸ E.g., *Collectanea*, G4r: “Quemadmodum visus est ire in coelum, id est, in eadem carnis forma atque substantia, veniet; secundum hanc formam, qua visus est ire in coelum, non est putandus Christus ubique diffusus.”

⁹⁹ *Collectanea*, F2r-H8r; cf. F2r: “In hoc argumento philosophico constituunt defensionis suae proram et puppim. [...] Qui expendunt quantum tribuendum sit philosophicis rationibus in mysteriis ignotis et incomprehensibilibus rationi, memores praecepti Pauli, cavent sibi, ne quisquam eos seducat per inanem philosophiam. Inanis certe, vana et fallax est, cum claris verbis Christi opponitur. Quid consistet inviolabile et integrum, si audiemus dictata rationis in mysteriis fidei?” Cf. *Apologia*, 189-99.

- Christ's body in several communion celebrations – something *credita*¹⁰⁰ – Westphal had not sufficiently worked out, any more than Luther had.¹⁰¹ It consisted of a rather clumsy appeal to the *unio personalis*,¹⁰² and thus resembled Melanchthon's views on Christ's personal presence and the *ubivoli* presence, or, as Westphal might have phrased it, the *ubipromisi* presence.¹⁰³ It was Johann Brenz who in 1557, with his dogma of the *ubiquitas absoluta*, provided the Lutheran doctrine of real presence with a Christological foundation.¹⁰⁴
- 10 With extensive appeals to Augustine¹⁰⁵ and in partial verbal *consonantia* with the Swiss – for instance, using the term 'spiritual' for "everything that is learnt, believed, and done in faith, according to

¹⁰⁰ Cf. *Iusta defensio*, 113-4: "Si doctorum albo dignos censet [scil., Calvinus] non alios, quam qui ex geometricis rationibus metiantur corporis Christi praesentiam in Sacramento Coenae, et philosophentur corpus Christi non posse ideo adesse in communione, quia ascendit in coelum, eo quod ex geometrica demonstratione corpus physicum uno loco concludatur: et ex philosophia colligunt multa absurda contra *creditam* praesentiam substantiae corporis [114] Christi: malo indocti nomen habere quam ista ratione vel a doctissimis aliquam laudem doctrinae obtinere." (italics are mine). It is tempting to hear here a reminiscence of the 51st (49th) Art. of Luther's *Disputatio contra scholasticam theologiam* (1517), WA 1,226: [49] "Si forma syllogistica tenet in divinis, articulus trinitatis erit scitus et non creditus."

¹⁰¹ Cf. Luther, for whom Christ's presence in the sacrament was not limited to his divine nature, WA 26.333.6-8: "Nein geselle, wo du mir Gott hinsetzest, da mustu mir die menscheit mit hin setzen, Sie lassen sich nicht sondern und von einander trennen, Es ist eine person worden."

¹⁰² *Collectanea*, F4r; F7r: "corpus Christi esse coniunctum divinitati"; G1v: "Non facimus confusionem naturarum, neque abiectioem alterius naturae"; G3r: "Nam duae naturae divina et humana in una persona Christi inseparabiliter sunt coniunctae, ut nec Filius Dei usquam sit absque carne, nec homo usquam sit ubi non sit Filius Dei." G8r-H1r; see G8v-H1r: "Quam denique ineffabilem, nec communicabilem ulli creaturae obtinet gloriam, quod haec *caro* exaltata est et sedet ad dexteram Patris, *eique* data est omnis potestas [H1] in coelo et in terra?" (the italics are mine).

¹⁰³ *Iusta defensio*, 75: "Nos vero Christum quaeramus, non ubi homines volunt, sed ubicunque promisit se praesentem futurum, et ubi se exhibet in verbo et Sacramentis: nihil haesitemus, ibi coelum et domum Dei esse, ibique Christum certo inveniri." Also *Apologia*, 301.

¹⁰⁴ Mahlmann, *Das neue Dogma* (see above, n. 93), 134-5; Wim Janse, *Albert Hardenberg als Theologe. Profil eines Bucer-Schülers* [SHCT 57] (Leiden/New York/Köln, 1994), 325-37.

¹⁰⁵ In her paper delivered at the 2004 SCSC at Toronto "Use of the Fathers in the Second Eucharistic Controversy: Calvin vs. Westphal," Esther Chung-Kim (Ph.D. student of David Steinmetz) rightly argued that in reaction to Westphal Calvin sought to de-lutheranize Augustine in his *Def. sec. c. Westph.* (1556).

God's Word, by the power and action of the Holy Spirit"¹⁰⁶, and 'carnal' for "everything that is done without Word and faith"¹⁰⁷ – Westphal maintained the *manducatio spiritualis* as well as the *manducatio impiorum*, and the condition of the receipt by faith.

5 Corresponding to the essential **distinction** between on the one hand the **sacrament**, which, just as the Word,¹⁰⁸ promises and offers, and on the other hand **faith**, which appropriates, the *dispensatio* and *sumptio* of Word and sacrament applied to everybody, the appropriation did not. This distinction implied a *duplex manducatio*:

10 the *manducatio sacramentalis* or *participatio corporis* by all – including the *impii* – through the mouth (*ore*), and the *manducatio spiritualis* in faith, by the *digni*, through the heart (*corde*).¹⁰⁹

In a Calvinian phrase, the *manducatio sacramentalis* was called "sub forma panis et vini participare corpus et sanguinem,"¹¹⁰

15 but "non visibili et sensibili modo."¹¹¹ Together with Augustine, and in the same way as Luther¹¹² and Westphal's fellow-opponent to Calvin, Tilemann Heshusius (1560),¹¹³ Westphal rejected a *praesentia localis* or *carnalis*, as well as impanation, local inclusion, and consubstantiation, which were always attributed to the

¹⁰⁶ *Farrago*, E5v: "In scriptura spirituale dicitur, quod est ex Spiritu Dei, et quicquid docetur, creditur, et agitur in fide, secundum Dei verbum, virtute et operatione Spiritus sancti, ut ex multis locis, et in primis ex verbis Christi apparet." Cf. Westphal, *De spirituali corporis et potu sanguinis Christi Redemptoris nostri Admonitio Ioachimi Westphali*, in *Farrago*, E4v-8r.

¹⁰⁷ *Iusta defensio*, 62: "Nam spiritualiter agitur quicquid fit et geritur secundum Dei verbum et fidem: econtra carnaliter fit, quicquid fit sine verbo et fide." See also *Apologia*, 128-37.

¹⁰⁸ *Collectanea*, C5v-8v, there esp. C8r.

¹⁰⁹ *Collectanea*, C2v-3v; G2v-3v; G5r; *Apologia*, 137-58.

¹¹⁰ *Collectanea*, E3v-4r: "Non negavit alio modo in Sacramento [E4r] carnem Domini manducari, eo nimirum modo ut ordinavit sub forma panis et vini participare corpus et sanguinem suum." Cf. Calvin, e.g., *Traité Cène*, CO 5,460; OS 1,529: "Nous [...] sommes vrayment faictz participans de la propre substance du corps et du sang de Iesus Christ." Idem, *Optima ratio*, OS 2,293.24-6: "[...] licebit admittere loquendi formas [...] sub pane vel cum pane nobis dari Christi corpus."

¹¹¹ *Collectanea*, G5r.

¹¹² See, e.g., WA 26,339.14-340.34.

¹¹³ See David Steinmetz, Calvin and His Lutheran Critics, in idem, *Calvin in Context* (New York/Oxford, 1995), 172-86, there 174-6. Cf. Thilo Krüger, *Empfangene Allmacht. Die Christologie Tilemann Heshusens (1527-1588)* [Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte 87] (Göttingen, 2004), 68-96, 154-63.

5 Lutherans.¹¹⁴ By *praesentia corporalis*¹¹⁵ he in fact meant what Calvin, in his lutheranizing mode, called “substantialiter pasci Christi carne,”¹¹⁶ that is, a *praesentia corporis* non-“corporali et physico modo.”¹¹⁷ Westphal, too, called this corporeal presence *spiritualis*,
10 namely “according to the faith that is based on the words of Christ”¹¹⁸, and considered it a specimen of Christ’s presence promised in John 14 and Mt 18 and 28, “peculiari quodam modo.”¹¹⁹ The intentions behind Westphal’s view that this presence was realized by the power of Christ’s majesty, grace, and word,¹²⁰ and behind Calvin’s view that it was the power of the Holy Spirit, did not differ much. In any case, for both Calvin and Westphal the sacramental eating had a significance distinct from the value of faith.

¹¹⁴ *Collectanea*, G2r-4r. *Iusta defensio*, 71-2: “Nos neque transfundi, neque locari, neque connecti aut copulari carnem cum pane dicimus: non reperiuntur eius generis locutiones in nostris scriptis, non in concionibus audiuntur. [...] non facimus connexionem, non transfusionem, aut tale aliquid, quod designet aut exprimat locale quid, vel alioqui parum cum recta fide consentaneum.” Idem, 78. *Apologia*, 297-309.

¹¹⁵ E.g., *Collectanea*, G6r: “Tractat. 92. scribit quod Christus reliquit discipulos praesentia corporali, cum omnibus suis futurus usque in consummationem seculi praesentia spirituali. Ab ineffabili et invisibili gratia, ab occulta misericordia, a spirituali praesentia Domini, non distrahenda est praesentia corporis Christi in Eucharistia. Nam praesentiam spirituaalem opponit Augustinus corporali praesentiae visibili, qualis erat cum Christus in terra conversaretur, non autem praesentiae corporali in Coena, quae spiritualis est iuxta fidei rationem pendens ex verbis Christi.”

¹¹⁶ Calvin, *Optima ratio*, OS 2,294.20.

¹¹⁷ *Iusta defensio*, 60-1: “Simili arte illudunt Sacramentarii per amphibologiam, quando obiiciunt, repugnare articulis fidei putare quod corporaliter seu carnaliter Christus adsit vel manducetur in Coena: intelligitur enim adverbium corporaliter, de corporali et physico modo et de praesentia corporis: quo [61] sensu posteriore a nostris enunciatur, a Sacramentariis vero rapitur in calumniam iuxta priorem sensum.” Cf. *Apologia*, 250-5.

¹¹⁸ See above, n. 115. Cf. Westphal, Admonitio (see above, n. 106). *Iusta defensio*, 76: “[...] ille modus praesentiae corporalis (qui tamen pro ratione fidei spiritualibus vere est spiritualis).”

¹¹⁹ *Collectanea*, G3r: “De ista praesentia, qua adest iuxta verbum suum, Christus dedit promissionem Ioan. 14: Ego et Pater ad eum veniemus etc. Matt. 18: Ubi duo vel tres etc. Matt. 28: Ecce ego vobiscum sum etc. Iuxta has promissiones adest Christus Ecclesiae suae, et quidem Deus et homo totus ac indivisus. [...] Ad istum ergo modum praesentiae per gratiam pertinet Coenae Dominicae Sacramentum et Baptismus, in utroque adest eo modo, quo visum est illi se praesentem exhibere, in Eucharistia peculiari quodam modo, ut corpore et sanguine suo se praesentem impertiat.”

¹²⁰ *Collectanea*, G2v-4v, passim; G6v-7r. Cf. *Apologia*, 233-50.

To Westphal, the *manducatio spiritualis of faith* – described in John 6¹²¹ and, in agreement with Augustine, Calvin, and the Swiss, also existing outside the sacrament¹²² – was related to the *gratia, virtus, or fructus et effectus* of the sacrament: the merits of Christ's passion.¹²³ Consequently, the unbelievers did partake in the sacrament (the *veritas rei praesentis*), but not in its effect (the *veritas efficaciae*).¹²⁴ Regarding the familiar *dictum Augustini* about Judas, who, unlike the Apostles, did not eat the Lord with the bread, but ate the bread against the Lord, Westphal stressed, along the line of Luther,¹²⁵ that Judas did not eat only bread, but *panis Domini*: “sacramentum, non sola elementa,” the sacrament of flesh and blood.¹²⁶

Westphal's objection to the “Sacramentarians” was that they saw the sacramental communion as being lost in the spiritual eating by faith (“edere est credere”),¹²⁷ and so in fact postulated the

¹²¹ *Collectanea*, E1v: “[...] et nos non contradicamus, Christi sermonem Ioan. 6. esse figuratam eo modo, quando intelligitur de spirituali manducatione, et de recordatione mortis Christi et redemptione per eam parta.” E5v-6r: From John 6 “nihilque amplius inde doceri probarique potest, quam quod modus edendi Domini carnem et bibendi illius sanguinem sit spiritualis, et non crasso ac passibili modo ista fiat manducatio, quali putabant Capernaitae manducandam carnem et bibendum esse sanguinem Iesu. Modus tamen ille spiritualiter percipiendi [E6] refectionem salutaris illius cibi ac potus non facit, ut verum corpus et sanguis Christi absint et non sumantur in Eucharistia. Non [*editio princeps*: Nam] enim ideo necesse est, ut res sit spiritualis, vel nihil sit, vel absit, quia spiritualiter tractatur.”

¹²² *Collectanea*, E6v.

¹²³ E.g., *Collectanea*, E4v: “Spiritualiter intelligere est, ei ita intelligere fide, ut Christus secundum beneplacitum, ordinationem et verbum suum dispensat suum corpus et sanguinem in Sacramento, novo et occulto modo, et credentibus fructum ac merita suae passionis communicat.”

¹²⁴ *Collectanea*, E7r: “Indigni namque vere manducant, quantum attinet ad veritatem rei presentis, non vere communicant, quantum spectat ad veritatem efficaciae. [...] Cum igitur aliud sit fides, aliud Coena Domini, consequitur necessario, aliud esse spiritualiter manducare, aliud in Eucharistia Christi carnem et sanguinem participare.” Also *Apologia*, 104-28.

¹²⁵ Cf., e.g., Luther, WA 30/1,223.25-28: “[...] das Sacrament ist brod und wein, aber nicht schlecht brod noch wein, so man sonst zu tisch tregt, sondern brod und wein ynn Gottes wort gefasset und daran gebunden.”

¹²⁶ *Collectanea*, E7v-F2r (the quotation at: F1v). Cf. C6v: “Unde cibus in Coena Domini vivificat, si nihil ibi datur praeter vulgarem cibum et potum, panem videlicet et vinum? si vivificat alios cibus ille et alios mortificat, corpus Christi ibi sumitur, non solummodo panis?”

¹²⁷ *Collectanea*, D5r: “Ad spiritualem manducationem solam communio Sacramenti transfertur.” E5r: “Satis igitur sophisticet et fallaciter Sacramentarii ab uno modo edendi Domini carnem negato, progrediuntur eousque, ut tollant etiam alterum

dispensability of the sacrament; that, in so doing, they characterized the Lutheran sacramental eating as “Capernaite” (i.e., *carnaliter, sensibiliter*),¹²⁸ and **reproached** the Lutherans **with over-valuing the sacraments** by granting to created beings what is only God’s prerogative. When during the *Consensus* negotiations, in 1548, Calvin was accused of this by Bullinger, he had replied: “We neither link God’s grace to the sacraments, nor do we transfer the office and power of the Holy Spirit to them, nor do we place the trust in salvation in them. For we confess clearly, that it is God alone who acts through the sacraments.”¹²⁹ When Calvin in his turn, having moved to Bullinger’s position, directed the latter’s accusation to Westphal in 1555,¹³⁰ the Lutheran defended the efficacy of the sacraments in words reflecting Calvin’s own:

15 Why [...] does Calvin accuse me of blindness, and does he tell all and sundry that we erroneously place our trust in salvation in the sacraments,

modum institutioni Christi proprium et congruum Christianae fidei, et hunc a spirituali modo excludant.” See also G6r.

¹²⁸ E.g., *Collectanea*, A3v: “[...] et non aliter quam illi imaginantes et obiiicientes physicam et prorsus carnalem manducationem corporis Christi.” A8v: “nisi quod crassam et physicam Caparnaitarum imaginationem de manducatione carnis Christi, quam etiam Sacramentarii toti occupati in ea obiiicere solent.” Esp. E3r-4r, E5r-6r; e.g., E3v: “Illi animo concipiebant modum manducandi omnino carnalem ea forma et ratione, qua bestiarum caro manducari solet cocta vel assata. Quis nostrum docet, credit, aut quis pius unquam sensit, eo modo Domini carnem in Coena eucharistica edi?” *Confessio*, A7r: “[...] plenus spiritu Carolstadii et Cinglii, conviciatur [scil., Calvinus] Scythicam esse barbariem docere Corpus Christi manducari in Coena Eucharistica, et id genus conviciis disertus, irreverenter ne quid dicam durius, effutit illa: Corpus Christi vorari, ingurgitari, coelo elici, affigi pani, Christum prostitui.” Cf. *Apologia*, 180-9.

¹²⁹ Calvin to Bullinger, 26 June 1548, *CO* 12,726-31, there 727: “Nam quod ad sacramenta in genere spectat, neque illis gratiam Dei alligandus, neque ad ea transferimus spiritus sancti officium aut virtutem, neque in ipsis locamus salutis fiduciam. Diserte enim profiteamur solum Deum esse qui agit per sacramenta.” Also: Ioannis Calvinii propositiones de sacramentis (see above, n. 52), *CO* 7,693: “I. Sacramentis Dei gratiam non alligamus. II. Ad sacramenta non transferimus spiritus sancti virtutem aut officium. III. In sacramentis non locamus salutis fiduciam. IV. Solus Deus est qui agit per sacramenta et totam efficaciam spiritui sancto ferimus acceptam.” and Calvinii responsio ad annotationes Bullingeri (see above, n. 52), *CO* 7,703-4, Ad VII.

¹³⁰ See Calvin, *Def. de sacr.*, 31, *CO* 9,21; *OS* 2,273.18-23 (cf. *TT* 2, 227): “Ubi vero accedit immodica commendatio, vix se a pravo et vitioso reverentiae excessu continet centisimus quisque. Ita et illis perperam affigitur salutis fiducia, et quod unius Dei proprium erat, indigne ad illa transfertur. Qua in re plus quam caeca est istorum qui nobis obtreant pervicacia”; cf. *Cons. Tigur.*, Art. 11, *CO* 7,739; *OS* 2,249.26-8 (cf. *TT* 2, 215): “Hinc concidit eorum error, qui in elementis obstupescunt, et illis affigunt salutis suae fiduciam.”

5 and award them a power that is God's alone? It is not we who ascribe the
power of salvation to the sacraments, but our Lord Jesus Christ [...]. We
do not transfer some part of salvation to created beings, nor do we detract
from God's power or activity, even if we say that sacraments are
10 instruments of salvation; for we speak of God's sacraments, [134] God's
promise, and God's presence working through the ordained means [...]. If
they are called God's instruments, surely all the honor, power, and
efficacy of the sacraments is ascribed to God; in the same way as they
have been instituted and ordained by Him, they also acquire their power
and honor from Him alone. However, the fact that it has pleased God to
15 institute them and demonstrate his power through them, does not mean
that the sacraments should be denied power, which should be allotted to
them as holy instruments. [...] How can sacraments be nothing¹³¹ [135] or
effect nothing,¹³² if office holders honor preachers by calling them God's
fellow workers [1 Cor 3,9] and servants by whom people come to believe
[1 Cor 3,5]?¹³³ God is present in the sacraments and in his Word, and
effects faith and salvation in people; thus, the sacraments are effective by
virtue of God's order, presence, and action.¹³⁴

¹³¹ Cf. *Confessio Gebennensis ecclesiae ministrorum de sacramentis Bernensium synodo oblata mense Martio 1549*, CO 7,717-22, there 718-9, IX: “[...] ita et de sacramentis dicendum est, ea nihil esse, quia nihil profutura sint, nisi Deus in solidum omnia efficiat.” *Cons. Tigur.*, Art. 11, CO 7,739; OS 2,249.28-9 (cf. TT 2, 215): “[...] quum sacramenta a Christo separata nihil sint quam inanes larvae.”

¹³² Cf. *Cons. Tigur.*, Art. 13, CO 7,739; OS 2,250.6-10 (cf. TT 2, 216): “Itaque, quemadmodum Paulus admonet, eum qui plantat aut rigat nihil esse, sed unum Deum qui dat incrementum: ita et de Sacramentis dicendum est, ea nihil esse, quia nihil profutura sint, nisi Deus in solidum omnia efficiat.”

¹³³ This reflects Calvin's objection to Bullinger from January 1549, see Calvini responsio ad annotationes Bullingeri (see above, n. 52), CO 7,703: “Vide tamen quale sit tuum argumentum: Deus solus agit; cessant igitur instrumenta. Quid? annon Paulus qui admonet nihil esse totum hominum laborem omnesque conatus, idem se profitetur Dei cooperarium? Deus ergo solus nos regenerat, sed hominis opera.”

¹³⁴ *Iusta defensio*, 133-5: “[...] cur [...] caecitatis nos Calvinus arguit, et traducit, perperam nos affigere illis salutis fiduciam, et quod solius Dei est proprium ad illa transferre? Non a nobis salus Sacramentis affigitur, sed [...] a Domino nostro Iesu Christo [...]. Non transferimus partem aliquam salutis ad creaturas, neque Dei potentiae et operationi detrahimus, etiamsi perhibeamus Sacramenta esse organa salutis, quia sermo est de Dei Sacra[134]mentis, de Dei promissione, de praesentia Dei operantis per ordinata media [...]. Cum organa Dei appellantur, certe omnis dignitas, virtus et efficacia Sacramentorum Deo tribuitur, a quo ut sunt instituta et ordinata, ita ab eo solo habent suam virtutem et dignitatem. Quia vero Deo placuit ea instituere, et virtutem suam in illis exerere, ob hanc causam Sacramentis, ut organis sanctis tribuenda est, non adimenda sua virtus. [...] Quomodo Sacramenta nihil [135] sunt, aut nihil operantur, cum a ministerio tam magnifice praedicatores commendentur, quod sint operarii Dei et ministri per quos homines credunt? Deus Sacramentis et verbo suo adest, operatur in hominibus fidem et salutem; sunt ergo efficacia ex Dei ordinatione, praesentia, et operatione.”

In my view, this quotation takes us to the **heart of Westphal's objection** – and that of the pre-1549 Calvin¹³⁵ – against the “Sacramentarians” sacramentology, i.e., that it broke up Luther's *cantus firmus*, the dyad of Word and faith, or, stated anachronistically: that it depreciated the sacrament because of a subjectivization of **faith** (and disbelief), which as *causa efficiens* instead of *causa applicativa* detracted from the sacramental objectivity (*integritas*¹³⁶). In Westphal's own words:

10 The sacraments should not be discarded for the sake of faith. Rather, they
should be linked to faith, but in such a way that the two are not
inextricably mixed. The Sacramentarians merge them, with the result that
the sacraments are taken away and robbed, sometimes of their content,
sometimes of their specific effects. *To faith they allocate the communion*
15 *with Christ, forgiveness of sins, and salvation in such a way that these are*
taken out of the sacraments. However, sacraments, Word, and faith, are
separate matters [...]. For faith rests on God's Word and the sacraments;
from these, by virtue of the action of the Holy Spirit, faith arises, and is
confirmed, nurtured, and strengthened.¹³⁷

¹³⁵ See above, n. 129 and 133; also Calvini responsio ad annotationes Bullingeri (see above, n. 52), *CO* 7,701-4.

¹³⁶ *Collectanea*, F1v: “Non solis elementis integritas Sacramenti constat, sed etiam verbo, Hoc est corpus meum. Quae verbo suo Deus pronunciat esse, ea vere sunt.” Cf. *Iusta defensio*, 82-3.

¹³⁷ *Collectanea*, E6r-v: “[...] non propter fidem auferenda sunt Sacramenta, sed haec cum illa coniungenda, ita tamen ut non inter se commisceantur. Sacramentarii commiscent illa, ut detrahant Sacra[E6v]menta et evacuent tum rebus, tum propriis suis effectibus, fidei ita tribuunt communionem cum Christo, remissionem peccatorum et salutem, ut illa adimunt Sacramentis. Atque Sacramenta, verbum et fides, res sunt distinctae, aliud sunt Sacramenta, aliud verbum quod tamen habent Sacramenta annexum, aliud est fides. Versatur enim fides circa verbum Dei et Sacramenta, inde operante Spiritu sancto oritur, confirmatur, nutritur et corroboratur.” Cf. also *De vi, usu, et dignitate salutiferi Baptismi* (see above, n. 4), 75-6: “Definitur a Christo baptismus esse lavacrum regenerationis ex aqua et spiritu, per quod homo renatus haeres sit regni Dei. Haec definitio complectitur baptismi elementum, causam efficientem, finalem, virtutem, et usum baptismi. Elementum est aqua; *causa efficiens*, *Spiritus sanctus*; effectus, regeneratio et ingressus in regnum Dei. Coniungit Christus aquam et Spiritum; non ponit aquam solam absque Spiritu, nec solum Spiritum absque aqua. Non debent ergo separari in regenerationis sacramento aqua et spiritus, neque a baptismo Spiritus removeri. Ex aqua non posset homo renasci, aqua non ablueret peccata, si Spiritus sanctus abesset. Vere dicitur, res externas non conducere ad regenerationem et peccatorum absolutionem, si absint Dei verbum [76] et Spiritus. Aqua quidem est res externa, quae nihil confert ad renascentiam et salutem hominis. Baptismus autem est non solum aqua, sed habet coniunctum Dei verbum et Spiritum sanctum. Nihil igitur movemur clamoribus pseudoprophetarum vociferantium, baptismum esse rem externam et inutilem.”

5 When a believer comes up to the Supper, [thus Calvin,] its force is connected with the signs, and through his faith he receives the grace offered. But when an evil and unworthy person comes to the Supper, its force has suddenly ceased to be linked to the signs, and he receives nothing but the mere signs. Where, then, is the Word of the Lord, which constitutes the sacrament for all equally, whether good or evil?¹³⁸

10 “**Verbum Christi efficit Sacramentum, non nostra fides**” – “The Word of Christ makes the sacrament effective, not our faith.”¹³⁹ This conviction may be seen as the core of Westphal’s sacramentology. It served no other purpose than to prevent any detraction from the priority of God’s merciful offer and the integrity of the means of grace, which can only serve as consolation if no human conditions need to be fulfilled. This pastoral intention took Westphal closer to
15 Calvin than either of them wanted to acknowledge in the face of the rising confessionalism.

© Wim Janse (Leiden University/Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam), Pusan, Korea, August 24, 2007

¹³⁸ *Iusta defensio*, 81-2: “Accedit pius ad synaxin, iam virtus sua est coniuncta cum signis, hoc est, gratiam oblatam fide percipit. Accedit aliquis malus et indignus, iam virtus non est coniuncta signis. Et nihil is accipit praeter vacua symbola. Ubi [82] ergo manet verbum Domini constituens Sacramentum unum et idem omnibus, sive bonis sive malis [...]”

¹³⁹ *Iusta defensio*, 82.