Contributors to this Issue

J. HARRY COTTON is presently Professor of Philosophy, Wabash College, Crawfordsville, Indiana. He was formerly professor at the Harvard Divinity School and professor and president of McCormick Theological Seminary. His paper on "Questions, Interest, and Theological Inquiry" was read at the 1968 fall meeting of the American Theological Society (Midwest Division).

JOHN F. DEDEK is Professor of Moral Theology, St. Mary of the Lake Seminary, Mundelein, Illinois. Father Dedek's article offers significant guidance on the responsible use of ecclesiastical pronouncements on social and moral issues, and is therefore of interest to Protestants as well as Catholics. It first appeared in the Summer 1968 issue of *Chicago Studies* ("edited by the faculty of St. Mary of the Lake Seminary and the priests of the Archdiocese of Chicago"), and is reprinted with permission.

LUTHER P. GERLACH is Associate Professor of Anthropology, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota. His article is an expression of remarks to the faculty and students of the Seminary, during his visit as a special lecturer under the auspices of the Weyerhaeuser Program in Religion and the Sciences of Man.

B. A. GERRISH is Professor of Historical Theology and Reformation History, The Divinity School, The University of Chicago. He was formerly a member of the faculty of the Seminary. His article is reprinted with permission from the Pentecost 1968 issue of UNA SANCTA, a quarterly devoted to ecumenical thought.

McCORMICK QUARTERLY is published in November, January, March, and May at Berne, Indiana, by McCormick Theological Seminary, 800 W. Belden Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60614. Entered as second-class matter November 1, 1947 at the Post Office at Berne, Indiana, under act of March 3, 1879.

Subscription price—three dollars a year, one dollar per copy. Address correspondence to the editor and changes of address to the Seminary Publication Office. Send form 3579 to: McCormick Seminary, 800 West Belden Ave., Chicago, Illinois 60614.

John Calvin and the Reformed Doctrine of the Lord's Supper

B. A. Gerrish

In a widely used history of Christian thought the judgment is expressed that "Calvin can be studied, exhausted, and mastered. He is contrasted, in this respect, with Luther, who left behind him unpolished gold, so that successive generations of scholars have studied his writings "seemingly without exhausting them." The judgment and the contrast rest, of course, on the common image of Calvin as a logical, systematic thinker with a special talent for organization. I want to suggest, at the outset, that the clarity and consistency of Calvin's teaching, not least on the Lord's supper, can be exaggerated. In Calvin's own opinion, a merit of his position, over against the views of his rivals, was indeed its superior clarity. But it still seems to me that his language is complex; it could lead in more than one direction, and it is not easy to harmonize all his different affirmations. Further, some of the terms he uses—such as "substance" —remain ambiguous, perhaps obscure. The task of "mastering" his eucharistic ideas is by no means simple.

The present century has witnessed something of a "Calvin-renaissance"—a little renaissance, let us say, since it has not been able to match the enormous output of the Luther scholars. One result of the renewed interest in Calvin has been the breaking of certain inherited stereotypes which have lent the illusion of simplicity to his theological thought. It is no longer possible, for example, to think of predestination as the structural center of Calvin's entire theology. Again, the old image of Calvin as a "theocentric" thinker has been modified by recognition of the "Christocentric" character of his thought. Finally, to mention just one more point, recent literature on his doctrine of the Lord's supper has drawn attention to the differences between Calvin and Zwingli. One reason for the "new look" in Calvin research has been the refusal to regard him as a man of a single book: the entire corpus of his writings, and not just the *Institutes,* has been subjected to careful study. Another reason

has been the influence of the Barthian theology, which has made us aware of much in Calvin which the orthodox Calvinists overlooked.

If a certain caution is needed because of the complexity of Calvin's thinking, a further note of warning has to be added by reason of the highly controversial nature of eucharistic questions. During the sixteenth century each party's teaching on the Lord's supper was developed dialectically, so to say, in conversation with rival interpretations. And sometimes conversation became bitter polemic. Hence it is very hard for any of us to approach the historical problems apart from our own confessional commitments. In the final analysis, of course, decisions may have to be made. But only in the final analysis. The decisions should not be there at the beginning, where they control the course of the historical interpretation. Calvin's doctrine of the Lord's supper is not adequately understood as, for example, a critique of medieval teachings; nor as a deviation from Lutheranism; nor as an attempt to formulate a compromise position among the various protestant options. It would be easy to point to attempts at interpretations along these lines. But the only approach which does justice to Calvin himself must begin with his own chief theological concerns, and must ask how he saw the relationship between his gospel and his understanding of the Lord's supper. Calvin's thought moves outwards from his apprehension of the gospel to his interpretation of the eucharist. The inner coherence of his thinking is of far greater importance than its dialectical relationships, although no actual separation should or can be made between the inner and outer concerns.[1]

To take a concrete case in point, it makes no sense to begin from the Marburg Colloquy, at which Calvin was not present, and then to interpret the subsequent eucharistic debates on the Marburg model. It is surprising how often the debate of 1529 between Luther and Zwingli and their respective followers has been taken as the paradigm for the Lutheran-Reformed differences on the eucharist. Not Zwingli's, but Calvin's mind was to be the decisive influence on the Reformed Church; and, in the judgment of Calvin, Luther was the clear victor in the first intra-protestant debate on the Lord's supper. So certain did he feel about his verdict that (as he himself admits) he did not, at first, even trouble to read Zwingli's eucharistic arguments; later he pronounced Zwingli's opinion on the use of the sacraments "false and pernicious."[2]

With these preliminary remarks in mind, I suggest that we approach Calvin's doctrine of the Lord's supper from the perspective of his apprehension of the gospel. Only the main features of the theme "Gospel and Eucharist in Calvin" can be considered. For clarity, I shall adopt four headings: the centrality of Christ's presence, the manner of Christ's presence, the eucharistic presence, and, finally, Calvin and the Reformed doctrine of the Lord's supper. In the final section my aim is to raise the question—so important for our ecumenical discussions—how far the Reformed Church identified itself with Calvin's own eucharistic teaching.

The Centrality of Christ's Presence

What needs to be said under my first heading can be summarized in a single sentence from Calvin himself: "This," he asserts, "is the purpose of the Gospel, that Christ should become ours, and that we should be ingrafted into his Body."[3] The very structure of the *Institutes,* in its final edition, is designed to show the unconditional necessity for Christ as mediator. No doubt, Calvin has, on occasion, been misread as furnishing a kind of natural theology, on which revealed theology is afterwards built up. In actual fact, he reverses this well-known order, and maintains that a knowledge of God in nature is attained only by those who have been reconciled to God through Christ. For Adam in paradise the "natural order" would certainly have led from the school of nature to eternal life. But this route is no longer open to fallen man.[4] And, in any case, as Calvin points out, the fall of man was itself a turning away from Christ, for in him was man's life from the beginning; and man's salvation consists in returning to that source.[5] The entire history of salvation is presented as centering upon the person and work of the one mediator. Even the patriarchs of the Old Testament were saved by Christ, though they lived before the manifestation of Christ in the gospel of the New Testament."

We do not need to follow the details of Calvin's presentation in order to establish the obvious point, that the content of the Christian faith is undersood by him in strictly Christocentic terms.

Christ is the content of the gospel. In modern times no topic of Calvin research has been more hotly debated than the question, What is Calvin's central doctrine? Much of the older literature presumed that predestination was the center of his thinking. Nowadays, there is general agreement that the older view was mistaken and can only be explained as a misreading of Calvin through the spectacles of later Calvinistic theology. But no other central doctrine has been found to take the place of predestination. The truth seems to be that Calvin did not teach the kind of theological system in which everything is inferred from some basic principle or principles. Nevertheless, the strongly Christocentric character of all his thinking has been more fully recognized. And if we cannot say that christology is the systematic center of his theology, it is still the christological reference that determines both the structure of the *Institutes* and the content of the major doctrines.

But in the quotation from Calvin with which I began he claims something more than this. Christ is not merely the content of the gospel: the purpose of the gospel is that he might become ours. In other words, when we speak of the gospel, we are not merely talking about Christ as the content of the saving history, but about the real presence of Christ in the here and now. Though Calvin seeks to show at length how Christ obtained our redemption by the whole course of his obedience, his thinking culminates in the idea of a "secret communion," by which Christ-for-us becomes Christ-in-us. Calvin spoke frequently and emphatically about this "communion with Christ," and his friend, Peter Martyr, wrote him for further details. The reply deserves to be considered Calvin's most important discussion of the theme.[7] He writes (in part):

> . . . we become truly members of His Body, and life flows into us from Him as from the Head. For in no other way does he reconcile us to God by the sacrifice of his death than because he is ours and we are one with him. . . . How this happens, I confess is something far above the measure of my intelligence. Hence I adore this mystery rather than labor to understand it. . . . He dwells in us, sustains us, gives us life, and fulfills all the functions of the Head.

The benefits of Christ, according to Calvin, are ours only as a result of this secret communion which we have with Christ himself. In the *Institutes* Calvin distinguishes two "graces" which we receive from Christ: reconciliation (or justification) and sanctification.[8] And the important point to notice is that neither of the two is given precedence as the supposed center of evangelical theology, since both look away to the christological point of reference above them. The dominant motif is the "real presence" of Christ with the Christian as the head of the body. This, of course, is to put the matter in our own words, not Calvin's, since he prefers to speak of the *arcana communicatio* or "secret communication" of Christ. But whichever terms we use, the point that I want to make is that we are already using eucharistic language before we come to speak directly about the Lord's supper. Calvin's understanding of the Christian gospel is such that the transition from gospel to eucharist is a very short step indeed. But we are not quite ready yet to make the transition.

The Manner of Christ's Presence

If there lies at the heart of Calvin's gospel the thought of Christ's real presence or his real self-communication, the next question to be answered concerns the manner of that presence. *How* does Christ communicate himself? What is the vehicle of the real presence?

The question can be answered from three different viewpoints, and it is essential to hold the three together in giving a fair and adequate account of Calvin's teaching.[9] We may answer the question, first, from the standpoint of the human subject: Christ is present in the act of believing. Second, we may answer from the standpoint of the divine subject: Christ is present through the activity of the Holy Spirit. Third, we may speak of the external means: Christ is present through the word. These three—faith, Spirit, and word—must not be separated. To use an expression which is much in vogue at the present and which (in my opinion) represents Calvin's view very well, we must speak of an "event" in which Christ is redemptively present; and faith, Spirit, and word are the essential factors in this event.

Calvin's conception of faith is complex, built up out of several different moments, and yet remarkably consistent and well unified. Faith includes knowledge, and its proper object is Christ. But it is not mere historical knowledge. Faith does not look at Christ from the distance, but embraces him.[10] Hence it is correct to say that by faith we "put on Christ" or are "ingrafted

into him." But the mystery of faith is that we have it as a divine gift, not as a human accomplishment. Our thoughts must therefore be carried back to "the secret efficacy of the Spirit, by which it comes about that we enjoy Christ and all his benefits." It is by the Spirit that Christ unites himself to us. But we can press the argument further and ask how the Spirit confers the gift of faith upon us. And the answer is, Through the word or the gospel. Accordingly, Calvin can say that the proper object of faith is "Christ clothed with the gospel"; or he can state, without further qualification, that the word is the instrument by which Jesus Christ is given to us.[11] Obviously, then, we have to hold these various factors together: faith, the Holy Spirit, and the word or gospel. And sometimes Calvin reminds us explicitly of this interconnection, since it was the error of the enthusiasts or fanatics to dissolve it. The word is the Spirit's instrument, and the two are joined together by an indissoluble bond.[12]

Where, then, do the sacraments come in? As Calvin thinks of them, they are simply visible forms of the word, so that what he says of the word applies also, in general, to the sacraments.[13] The spoken form of the word (in the Church's proclamation) is in itself the sufficient vehicle of Christ's self-communication. But God has regard for the sensuous nature of his creatures, and adds the word in visible form. From Augustine, Calvin takes over the description of a sacrament as *verbum visibile*, "Word that you see" in distinction from preaching as the word spoken and heard. The identity of content between sacrament and proclamation provides him with the clue to solving many of the old questions about how a sacrament works.

In general, the function of the sacramental signs is to represent the promises of God graphically. They picture the content of the word, make the promises visible to the eye. In the final analysis, they are simply proclamation; and, like the word preached, they both demand and evoke faith. Hence it is a mistake to ascribe to the sacraments some kind of secret powers, which are endowed with quasi-magical effect. "He is mistaken who thinks that something more is conferred on him by the sacraments than is offered by the word of God and received by true faith." Or again, we may say that since the sacraments are the Spirit's instruments, then without his working they are of no use,

so that we may not view the signs in abstraction from the activity of the Spirit. The efficacy of the sacraments lies in that triple conjunction of word, Spirit, and faith at which we have already looked. Any attempt to break the unity of this conjunction can only lead to misunderstanding.

On the other hand, if the sacraments confer no more than the word, it is equally clear to Calvin that they confer no less. The sacraments have the *same* function as the word of God, to offer and present to us Jesus Christ. In other words, the sacraments, like preaching, are the vehicle of Christ's self-communication, of the real presence. Only the most perverse misreading of the sources could conclude that the sacraments for Calvin have a purely symbolic and pedagogical function. Regrettably, one could point to such misunderstanding of Calvin in the general literature, though not of course in the monographs. It should be plain, however, from our entire presentation that to treat the sacraments as merely didactic for Calvin would undermine, not only his view of the sacraments themselves, but also of the word of God. What we have in Calvin's teaching is not an either-or, but a both-and. Word and sacraments certainly have a pedagogic function, but this does not make them any the less vehicles of Christ's self-giving. The sacraments do instruct by means of graphic symbols, but they also are real means of grace by which the thing symbolized is communicated.

If this were not already clear enough from the entire progress of thought in the *Institutes*, it should have been removed beyond all doubt by Calvin's careful and explicit statements about the nature of signs. To the relation of sign and thing signified he applies the language of the christological formula, "distinction without division."[14] We must distinguish the sign from the thing signified, but we cannot separate them. Where the sign is, there is the reality also. And since Christ himself is the reality—the "matter" or the "substance" of the sacraments—the signs are nothing less than pledges of the real presence. Indeed, they are the media through which Christ effects his presence to his people. The sign cannot be or become the reality, but it is not the symbol of an absent reality either. It is hardly too much to say that Calvin's entire sacramental theology lies implicit in his doctrine of signs (which, of course, he borrowed from St. Augustine).

The Eucharistic Presence

So far, then, we have endeavored to show how the idea of Christ's living presence, effected through the word of God, is the heart of Calvin's gospel. What needs to be said about Calvin's doctrine of the Lord's supper is already at least half said. The role of the eucharist in the life of the Church is traced by Calvin to the fact that our communion with Christ is not whole and perfect from the very first, but subject to growth, vicissitudes, impediments. Receiving Christ is not, for Calvin, a crisis-decision achieved once and for all. It is a magnitude, subject to variation. In fact, Calvin is willing to say of receiving Christ what he refuses to admit concerning justification: it is partial (ex *parte*).[15] The most infinitesimal faith in Christ is enough for our justification, but a fuller possession and enjoyment of Christ is always open to us. And it is with this fuller possession that the eucharist is concerned.

The very nature of the symbolism suggests to Calvin that the Lord's supper is a matter of nourishing, sustaining, and increasing a communion with Christ to which the word and baptism have initiated us. But he makes no rigid doctrinaire distinctions between baptism and the supper: he recognizes the possibility that ingrafting into Christ, normally the function of baptism, may be effected in the eucharist.[16] Still, the eucharistic symbolism points, in general, to the deepening of a communion already begun. It is an aid by which, being already ingrafted into Christ, we may be united with him more and more, until the union is made perfect in heaven.[17]

The special reverence that Calvin felt for the sacrament of the Lord's supper is too plain to be overlooked: nowhere is the man's piety more clearly revealed. The person of the living Christ dominates his discussions of the sacrament; but the presence of Christ remains, in the end, a mystery to be adored, not captured in theological explanations. What Calvin wrote to Peter Martyr about our communion with Christ is echoed in his language about the eucharist, in which the communion takes place: he is content to marvel at what he cannot comprehend.[18] Nevertheless, the main features of his interpretation can readily be stated. I shall put them in the form of six propositions together with some brief "elucidations." And at this stage it will not, I think, be misleading to note how Calvin sets his own position against the views of his opponents, since we can now show how his positive position determines the polemic, and not *vice versa*.

First, *the Lord's supper is a gift.* This is fundamental to the whole orientation of Calvin's thinking on the sacrament. Nor is it by any means something obvious. It is precisely at this point that Calvin parts company with Zwingli and stands in uncompromising opposition to Rome. (I leave aside the question how far Calvin really understood either of these opponents, since our interest, at the moment, is only in clarifying his own position.) The Roman Catholic, so Calvin believed, thought of the eucharist as a "good work," something presented by men to God. Against this he states bluntly: "As widely as giving differs from receiving does sacrifice differ from the sacrament of the supper."[19] It is God who gives. We do not give, we receive. The Lord's supper is not a human offering, but a divine gift.

Calvin found Zwingli's position no less defective than the Roman, for Zwingli (like Carlstadt) seemed to turn the sacrament into a religious exercise, in which the devout communicant concentrated his thoughts on what the dying Christ had done for him centuries ago. Against this, Calvin insists that we do not merely recall Christ's benefits in the supper: we actually receive them. The supper is a gift, it does not merely remind us of a gift. The crucified Lord is the risen Lord who invites us to his table and bids us receive: "Take, eat, this is my body."[20]

Second, *the gift is Jesus Christ himself.* This Calvin never tires of saying. Nor will he allow the Zwinglian evasion that our communion is solely with the divinity of Christ. In the eucharist we have to do with the whole Christ—indeed, in a special sense with the body and blood. For it was in his humanity that Christ won our redemption, in his flesh.

> It is not merely a question of being made partakers of his Spirit: we must also participate in his humanity, in which he rendered all obedience to God his Father. . . . When he gives himself to us, it is in order that we may possess him entirely. . . . Our souls must feed on his body and blood as their proper food.[21]

Third, *the gift is given through the signs.* Once again this implies a rejection of both Zwingli and Rome. Against both Cal-

vin levels the same basic charge, though for different reasons. Both misrepresent the nature of a sign. In the Roman theory of transubstantiation the sign is virtually transformed into the thing signified: the substance of the bread becomes the substance of the body. The symbolic relationship is destroyed by a failure to maintain the distinction.[22] On the Zwinglian view, by contrast, the sign and the realtiy are divorced. As Calvin likes to put it, the sign (in the Zwinglian teaching) signifies in vain, since the body of Christ is absent from the supper. This, too, destroys, in its own way, the symbolic relationship. For Calvin, a sign guarantees the presence of what is signified. When the elements are offered to us, Christ is offered to us with his body and blood. The signs "present" what they "represent": they are not empty signs, but effectual signs.[23]

Fourth, *the gift is given by the Holy Spirit*. This is what Calvin means by a "spiritual" presence in the Lord's supper. The body and blood of Christ are made present to the communicant by the mysterious power of the Holy Spirit. He does not mean that the presence of Christ is merely a presence of his Spirit, nor that he is present only in the communicant's imagination. (Both these views have been erroneously attributed to Calvin, although he expressly denies them in nearly everything he wrote on the Lord's supper.) Calvin did not share Zwingli's embarrassment over physical media. Indeed, he followed Luther in rejecting this embarrassment as "enthusiasm" or "fanaticism." But, again like Luther, he was careful to safeguard himself against the superstitious nation that the physical means of grace possessed power in themselves. Christ is not bodily enclosed in the bread and the wine, but the bread and the wine are taken by the Spirit and made the vehicles of Christ's self-giving. In this sense Calvin teaches a Spiritual presence (with a capital "S"). He does not "spiritualize" the eucharist (with a small "s").[24]

Fifth, *the gift is given to all who communicate*, pious and impious, believers and unbelievers. But this is not to say that it makes no difference whether we believe or not. If we receive the bread and wine without believing, then we receive them to our condemnation, not discerning the Lord's body. Calvin would not entertain the possibility of a neutral receiving of the sacrament, any more than he would admit the possibility of a neutral

hearing of the Word. We hear God's word and receive the sacrament either to our salvation or to our condemnation.

> Christ offers this spiritual food and gives this spiritual drink to all. Some feed upon them eagerly, others disdainfully reject them. Will their rejection cause the food and drink to lose their nature? . . . Nothing is detracted from the Sacrament; no, its reality and efficacy remain unimpaired. . . . The integrity of the Sacrament . . . is this: that the flesh and blood of Christ are not less truly given to the unworthy than to the elect believers of God.[25]

Sixth, *the gift evokes gratitude*. Now, strictly speaking, the sacrament itself is an act of God. But the eucharist in the broader liturgical sense—that is, the service of worship in which the sacrament is administered—is also an act of the Church. As the name "eucharist" implies, it is the Church's thanksgiving for the gift given. According to Calvin, a eucharistic sacrifice, as opposed to a propitiatory sacrifice, is an indispensable part of the liturgy. This, of course, has nothing to do with the "sacrifice of the mass." It is a liturgical act by which the communicants respond in thankful self-dedication to the self-giving of Christ. And this liturgical act Calvin saw as inseparable from the entire existence of the Church and the individual Christian, since the Christian life is nothing but a eucharistic sacrifice, a self-offering in gratitude by the royal priesthood.[26]

It will not have escaped the reader's notice that in this entire summary of Calvin's position I have not indicated a single criticism of Martin Luther's teaching on the sacrament of the altar. I believe that such a presentation does justice to Calvin's own intentions. Though he never agreed with Luther in every respect, he considered himself, in essentials, Luther's disciple. Rather than take up the difference between Luther and Calvin I propose to devote my concluding remarks to the question whether or not Calvin speaks for the Reformed or Presbyterian Church. Obviously, an answer to this question is prerequisite to our ecumenical conversations.

The Reformed Doctrine of the Lord's Supper

But what exactly are we asking? It is not a matter of sending around questionnaires to Presbyterian communicants, to find out if they agree with Calvin. It would be hard, I think, to find even a few theologians who agree *entirely* with *all* that Calvin said about the Lord's supper, though the disagreements would mostly lie outside my six propositions. But the question really

concerns the confessional position of Presbyterianism, not the private opinions of either communicants or theologians. Of course, there cannot be any fundamental disharmony between confessional position and private opinion. But in a confessional communion it is with the official standards that we have to begin. And the question is whether Calvin's view of the Lord's supper has, in the main, shaped the confessional standards.

So formulated, the question is extremely complicated, not least because of the nature of the Reformed confessions. (The Reformed have no preeminent confession like Augsburg and no closed symbolic collection like the Book of Concord.) Rather than enter into the details of historical debate, however, I shall presume to state the conclusions for which I have argued elsewhere.[27] I have suggested that if we take account of the full range of Reformed confessions, we find, not one, but three doctrines of the Lord's supper. They have in common a typically Reformed interest in the symbolism of the sacrament. And what distinguishes them is different views as to what a symbol does. On one view, a symbol calls to mind something that has happened. On another view, a symbol is the means by which a spiritual good is communicated in the present. On yet a third view, a material symbol is the evidence that a spiritual occurrence is taking place. I have termed the three views, respectively, "symbolic memorialism," "symbolic instrumentalism," and "symbolic parallelism."

Now, you will have recognized the first two views: they are the characteristic doctrines of Zwingli and Calvin respectively. And I do not need to explain them any further. Suffice it to say that the Zwinglian view (symbolic memorialism) does find its way into the Reformed *corpus confessionum,* but it does not appear in a single confession of more than temporary or local significance. We may, then, dare to assert, as a general truth, that the Reformed Church disowned Zwinglianism. If Zwinglianism nevertheless survives within the Reformed Church, it does so in the same manner in which Pelagianism survives, as a heresy and not as a recognized theological option. And yet Calvin's view does not hold the field alone.

The third interpretation of the Lord's supper, symbolic parallelism, is most clearly represented by the Second Helvetic Confession (1563) of Heinrich Bullinger. In distinction from Zwingli, Bullinger's interest is in the real, present communication of Christ's body. The key thought is "communion," not "remembrance." And yet, in distinction from Calvin's usual mode of expression, Bullinger seems to avoid speaking of the signs as means, instruments, or vehicles. Rather, the Second Helvetic Confession teaches two parallel events: outwardly we eat bread, inwardly and at the same time we feed upon Christ's body. In the Latin, the connection is denoted by the words *intus interim*: "Meanwhile, back inside. . . ." This does, of course, go beyond Zwingli, whose characteristic tense is the past, not the present. For the Zwinglian the elements call to mind something which has happened: the body was broken, and we have believed. Bullinger, on the other hand, holds firmly to the interpretation of the sacrament as a gift given in the present. It is only our third proposition—that the gift is given through the signs—which seems to cause him difficulty.

If my analysis is correct, then the real division in Reformed theology is not between Zwingli and Calvin, but between Calvin and Bullinger. That is to say, parallelism and instrumentalism are both recognized options, represented in major Reformed confessions, whereas we cannot say the same of a bare memorialism. And it has to be stressed that the difference between Bullinger and Calvin is not of the same order as the difference between Calvin and Zwingli. It is not a matter of two antagonistic theological types, but rather of a "school debate" within a single coherent tradition. The Reformed theologian may have his preference, as I myself do. But he will not be willing to anathematize the champions of the rival interpretation. The essential matter is that in the sacrament the crucified and risen Lord is present to his people and gives himself to them as their food and drink. "The purpose of the gospel is that Christ should become ours, and that we should be ingrafted into his body." The purpose of the Lord's supper is no different from that of the gospel. On this Calvin and Bullinger agree. Would Luther disagree? Or are the debates between Lutherans and Reformed likewise "school questions" within a single eucharistic tradition? These are the problems we have to decide in our interconfessional dialogue.

NOTES

1. Since "Gospel and Eucharist in the Theology of Calvin" is the theme of a monograph which I am presently engaged in writing, I have thought it permissible to dispense with any detailed discussions of the literature in this brief paper. My references, in what follows, seek only to identify direct quotations from Calvin himself or to provide the bare minimum of documentation. Translations are my own. I have also thought it best to retain the form of the spoken word very nearly as originally given in my address.
2. C.O. (*Iohannis Calvini Opera quae supersunt omnia, Corpus Reformatorum*, ed. G. Baum et al., 59 vols., Brunswick, 1863-1900), 9, 51; 10, II, 346.
3. C.O. 49, 313.
4. *Inst.* (*Institutio christianae religionis*, edn. of 1559) II, vi, 1.
5. *Ibid.*
6. *Inst.* II, vi-vii.
7. C.O. 15, 722-25. For the idea of Christ's obedience, see *Inst.* II, xvi, 5.
8. *Inst.* III, xi, 1 and 3.
9. My discussion follows the presentation in *Inst.* III, i-ii. Other sources are noted only where I have alluded to them in amplifying the argument of the *Institutes*.
10. C.O. 47, 145.
11. O.S. (*Iohannis Calvini Opera selecta*, ed. Peter Barth and Wilhelm Niesel, 5 vols., Munich, 1926-36), 1, 504-5.
12. *Inst.* I, ix, 1.
13. For this interpretation of the sacraments in Calvin, see esp. *Inst.* IV, xiv. Cf. also O.S. 1, 504-5
14. Cf. O.S. 1, 509.
15. C.O. 6, 126.
16. *Inst.* IV, xvii, 33.
17. *Ibid.*
18. *Inst.* IV, xvii, 7 and 10.
19. *Inst.* IV, xviii, 7.
30. *Inst.* IV, xvii, 3 and 5.
21. O.S. 1, 508.
22. *Inst.* IV, xvii, 14; O.S. 1, 520.
23. O.S. 1, 509f., 527ff., C.O. 37, 764ff.
24. *Inst.* IV, xvii, 33.
25. *Ibid.*
26. *Inst.* IV, xviii, 12-18.
27. "The Lord's Supper in the Reformed Confessions," *Theology Today*, Vol. XXIII, no. 2 (July 1966), pp. 224-243.

Which Way for America?

Luther P. Gerlach

In August 1968 in Chicago during the Democratic National Convention the police with military support met head on with a mass of demonstrators. The police and military perceived their role to be that of guardians of the established order and opponents of the demonstrators. The demonstrators saw the police and military as the primary objects of their assault, and as clearly identifiable symbols of a system which they believe to be defective, contrary to the true principles of American democracy, and incapable of constructive change. With the stage thus set for confrontation, with each side seeing the other as the enemy, violence was inevitable. If the goal of the demonstrators was to generate creative, lasting and adaptive change with a minimum of purposeless violence, they failed. A large segment of America is more resistant than ever to change and the various social movements which help generate change. More than ever this growing segment cries for law and order, without considering the consequences, and major political leaders heed their cries.

On the other hand, if the goal of law enforcement and government was to maintain law and order within a framework of justice and a minimum of purposeless violence, they also failed. Just as more persons than ever have been moved to favor "crackdown" on demonstrators, so have more persons become committed to the cause of the militant revolutionary change or at least to sympathy with those opposing established order.

The Chicago confrontation is but the most recent and dramatic example of this process of escalating polarization and despair. If this process continues it will result in the destruction of the American dream and the end of democracy here if not throughout the world.

The purpose of this paper is to show that an escalation of force will not arrest this process, but instead propel it. It is absolutely necessary that all Americans, not just those in law enforcement or on the side of revolution recognize this and seek