Acta Theologica
2014 Suppl 20: 194-210
DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.4314/actat.v20i1.13S
ISSN 1015-8758

<http://www.ufs.ac.za/ActaTheologica>

E. de Boer

LITURGICAL REFORM IN THE "BREAKING OF THE BREAD" IN THE LORD'S SUPPER IN THE PALATINATE AND ITS RESONANCE IN THE HEIDELBERG CATECHISM

ABSTRACT

Liturgical practices mirror the doctrine. Changes in form reflect a changed spirituality. In the reformation of the sixteenth century the practice of the distribution of individual consecrated oblates to the kneeling communicant was replaced in the Palatinate by the breaking of a loaf of bread and the distribution of pieces to the congregation who received it standing or sitting. The present article describes how the reformation was initiated and implemented by the elector Frederic III, what the response from Lutheran theologians was, and how the theological defence from the Heidelberg theologians came to be formulated. The main conclusion of our investigation is that it is not easy to determine which elements in the sacrament – in this case: the Lord's Supper – are essential or accidental (*adiaphoron*). While the exegetical basis of a chosen form may be inconclusive, motives behind the choice may be such that exclusion of people from the Christian community is effected or individuality underlined. A healthy view of communality and celebration can undergird the doctrine of the Church and the sacrament.

1. INTRODUCTION

The sacramental bread, given to the faithful in the Roman mass, had over the ages received the special form and substance of the communion wafers. The oblate was made of unleavened dough, baked in small round form, and often imprinted with the figure of the cross, crucifix, or lamb. Although in the early sixteenth century Martin Luther had advocated the

Prof. Erik de Boer, Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam, The Netherlands; Research fellow, University of the Free State, South Africa. E-mail: eadeboer@tukampen.nl

abrogation of the Roman mass, he retained the use of the oblate, to be distributed by the priest to the individual communicants. It was especially in the Palatinate, birthplace of the Heidelberg Catechism, that this ancient rite became the object of great controversy between the parties leaning towards a more Zwinglian or Lutheran doctrine and corresponding liturgy of the Lord's Supper. The sacramental wafers were replaced, quite radically, with a common bread, to be broken into pieces, and distributed among the faithful. The one bread was regarded as visualization of the unity of the members in the body of Christ, received and experienced by his sacrifice and in his Supper.

This article traces how Elector Frederic III himself came to introduce the *fractio panis* or breaking of the bread in the liturgy, what the reaction from Lutheran princes and advisors was, how various Reformed theologians and ministers began to formulate a coherent defence of the new rite, and how it was at last codified in the Church order of the Netherlands.

In 1857 the communion table was segregated in South-Africa along the racial lines, which is now considered as a breaking of the unity of the Church. More recently the individual cups ("kelkies") have been introduced at the Lord's table, defended on grounds of hygiene (Van Wijk 1991). The discussion over such liturgical practices shows that the preferred liturgical form reflects a doctrinal stand or moral attitude. The "breaking of the bread" in the Palatinate exemplifies such liturgical implementation of changing doctrine.

2. A DUTCHMAN IN THE PALATINATE

Researching for the various courses in Church history and my lectures on the Heidelberg Catechism in 2013, the present author's focus was on a Dutchman, Jan Gerritsz, who happened to become involved in the Reformation of the Palatinate before the Heidelberg Catechism was drafted. Versteghe latinized his name as Joannes Anastasius, "John the Resurrected One", referring to the remorse over his recantation of the Reformed faith after three years of imprisonment and heavy pressure from the Inquisition. Having agreed to another three years, now of theological study, at Leuven University, he fled to the "Eastern Lands" and settled in the Palatinate. In 1554 he became pastor in the village Steeg, close to the city of Bacharach. In 1561 he was promoted to superintendent, the Lutheran office of dean over the pastors of his district, Bacharach and Kaub (De Boer 2013; Morsink 1986).

This focus on one of the pastors and Church leaders of lower rank opened fascinating avenues of research. The sources from which the

authors of the HC drew, have been investigated time and again. The theologians who might have been involved in drafting the new Catechism are reasonably well researched (Ursinus, Olevianus), and also recently the professor of medicine Thomas Erastus (Gunnoe 2011). But it were the less-known superintendents who were called to Heidelberg in January 1563 to have the new Catechism read to them, to pose questions, and finally accept and sign this standard of catechetical instruction. The tiny number of archival data did not invite the study of the local pastors and regional superintendents.

Joannes Anastasius, however, contributed to the theological discussion and popular dissemination of ideas with at least three books (between 1557 and 1566) in German, aiming at a readership of fellow-ministers and laymen. If I may give a characteristic of this refugee-minister it is that a. his writings focus on Christology and the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, addressing the Lutheran politicians and theologians, b. that he did so in a truly ecumenical and appealing way, striving for unity and acceptance among the evangelical movement, and c. that he defended the Elector's course of a Melanchthonian reformation publicly and wholeheartedly (De Boer 2014a; 2014b).

3. DOCTRINAL TEACHING AND LITURGICAL PRACTICE

One of the points of reform that needed such defence was the so-called "Brotbrechen" or "fractio panis" (breaking of the communion bread). Somehow this seems to be connected to the Synod of January 1563 in which the Heidelberg Catechism was adopted. I found two old documents which may be connected to this meeting in Heidelberg in which the text of the new Catechism was read and explained to the assembled superintendents. The first document is the report of a disenchanted superintendent, who refused to sign the Catechism (Goeters 1989:338-341). The second is a satirical pamphlet in the form of Synod minutes, which may have been composed on the basis of the said report.

The satirical report is entitled "Various Articles. What the Zwinglians in the Palatinate have deliberated and enforced in their Synod" (*Ettliche artickell. So die Zwinglianer jn der Pfalz jn jrem Synodo berathschlagt und angerichtet haben*; edited in Goeters 1989:243-245). It reads that, among other things, this was decided:

> The chalice etc. must be removed from the churches and the breaking of the bread be introduced, as it is deemed necessary in the Lord's Supper and is stressed by them.

This is corroborated by a letter from 30 March 1563 by Frederic's wife Maria, who proudly reported to her family:

> It is true that my lovely does not permit the use of the round oblate in the Lord's Supper, but that they put a big oblate in a plate, breaks a piece from it and hands it to the people, after speaking the words of the Lord Christ over it (Kluckhohn 1868a:394).

Article 16 adds, quite surprisingly: "Every superintendent shall be given a baking tin, so that he can bake the bread, necessary for the Lord's Supper, himself". The critique, added in Latin, says: "Holy baker!" Is this utter satirical nonsense or the simple, if surprisingly strange truth?

The ceremony of the breaking of the bread of communion in the liturgy of the Lord's Supper became a *conditio sine qua non* for reformation of doctrine and celebration of the sacrament. At the same time it became the focus of attack by the (Gnesio-)Lutheran opponents who thought such breaking of the bread epitomized the denial of the real presence of the Lord's body in the sacrament. The doctrinal position regarding the mode of Christ's presence in the sacrament became tangible for laypeople (including the worldly rulers) in the *fractio panis*, which served to illustrate the teaching on the Lord's Supper also as it was taught in Heidelberg's new Catechism and its strategically unique position in the Holy Roman Empire.

It may be that the breaking of the bread is today in the Reformed tradition a normal ceremony in the celebration of the Lord's Supper. If it is, it is so because of the revolutionary move to re-introduce the (highly contended) *fractio panis* (not in Geneva but) in the Heidelberg reformation.

4. FROM LUTHERAN TO REFORMED CONFESSION

During the short reign of Elector Ottheinrich (1556-1559) the reformation of the Palatinate was in the Lutheran line. Ottheinrich's Church order contained Luther's *Small Catechism* plus Johannes Brenz' catechism. The Roman Mass was abolished, but in the celebration of the Lord's Supper chalice, altar, and oblate were maintained.[1]

1 It was also Ottheinrich who brought all books from court and church together into one library on the first floor of the Heiliggeist Kirche. This library was confiscated during the Thirty Years War and carried on one hundred donkeys over the Alps to Rome and stored in the library of the Vatican. However, some nine thousand Latin (still in Rome) and some nine hundred German books and manuscript (given back to Heidelberg in the 19th century) of the *Bibliotheca Palatina* are now accessible on the internet. Among the German manuscripts various catalogues are found which document what books different sections

When Frederic III became the Elector and Count of the Palatinate there were people of Lutheran, Calvinist ,and Zwinglian persuasion at the court, in the university, and in the church. In 1560 a debate on the Lord's Supper was held, in which the main contenders were Tilemann Heshusen and Wilhelm Klebitz. The Lutheran Heshusen was suggested by his teacher Melanchthon and appointed as head-superintendent in Heidelberg, where he also became leader of the theological faculty and president of the church council. His opponent Klebitz (nicknamed "Kleinwitz" by Heshusen) was deacon (assistant-preacher) in Heidelberg. He ridiculed the use of wafers in the Lord's Supper and declared the origin of the oblate as follows:

> For since Christ was betrayed by Judas for pieces of silver (*denarii*), they think that the small bread in the Eucharist in the form of silver coins are appropriate. Such buns are being called in derision since many years "mini coins" (*minutiae numulariae*). Further, nobody can deny that crucifix and lamb [imprinted on the oblate] stem from the school of superstition (Klebtiz 1561:f. C 2b).

Klebitz only wrote this after both he and Heshusen had been summarily dismissed by Frederic III in late 1560. Of course, such satire in 1561 was not a positive clarification of Frederic's intended reform of the elements as used in the Lord's Supper.

Yet, surprisingly, it was the Elector himself who order the ministers of the Palatinate to abolish the use of oblates and introduce the breaking of the bread in the Lord's Supper. He did so already in the course of the year 1561. What were his motives and theological arguments? His main motive was to radically counter the idolatry which he witnessed among the people. In a personal letter to his son-in-law and opponent Johann Friedrich II of Saxony he wrote:

> [O]f course we must eat the holy bread, because this is what Christ wanted. But the pope and his disciples have thought it otherwise and according to them in a better way: in order to prevent people from eating the holy bread, that is chew (for every food which one does not chew, must be regarded as not having been eaten, but swallowed), he invented an idolatrous small round bread with an imprinted "small Lord God" (*hergottlein*), as they call it. They are not allowed to eat it, for it might get stuck between the teeth, but they must swallow it.

---

of the Bibliotheca Palatina contained during the 16th century. See http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/en/bpd/bibliotheca_palatina/geschichte.html (accessed on 20 February 2014).

So in Saxony they still use the oblate, while Christ says: "Take and eat it" (Kluckhohn 1868: 589; no. 309 of 7 June 1565). And to counter superstition among the laypeople so Frederic III ordered to abolish the oblate and introduce common bread in the celebration of the Lord's Supper.

On 11 December 1561 Stephan Circler, the Elector's secretary, wrote to Heinrich Bullinger:

> These days we have introduced the breaking of the bread after the individual round breads were rejected. May God grant us his grace to also change the remaining business. I do not want to 'elevate' the piety and constancy of the prince. For sure, he is secure in the saddle and can compete with a great theologian who thinks high of himself.[2]

In retrospect the fact Elector Frederic III stresses that

> the Palatinate without the advice of your councils abolished such round bread in order to remove the idolatry from the hearts of the people and moreover has introduced the breaking of the bread (16 June 1564; Kluckhohn 1868:514).

The introduction of the breaking of one large bread during the Lord's Supper could not be enforced immediately. According to a letter by Ursinus the Synod in the autumn of 1563 still permit the use of oblates in some congregations, if only it is possible to break it (which is difficult with unleavened bread).

> The people, drenched in the old idolatry in the Lord's Supper, must really be taught the difference between the bread as we eat it at home and as we eat it at the Lord's table, which lies not in the substance, but in our use of it.[3]

---

2 "Introducimus his diebus practionem panis explosis rotundis particulis. Deus nobis suam gratiam concedat, ut reliqua quoque emendare liceat. Principis pietatem ac constantiam nolo encomiis elevare. *Er sitzt fürwar im Sattel und soll noch einem großen theologo, der sich etwas zu sein dünkt, zu schaffen geben*. Ipsemet legit, perpendit, examinat … nec ab aliorum iudicio more reliquorum principium pendet" (Wesel-Roth 1954:131). Vgl. Sehling 1969:39. Bullinger reported this message to Ambriosius Blaurer on 19 December (see Hollweg 1961:183).

3 Ursinus: "Reverentia Coenae consistit […] non in eo, ut panis peculiaris in illa usurpetur, quod neque mandatum est, et quare non prosit, cum alia tum praecipue haec est causa, quod populus immersus coeno veteris Idololatriae ilso facto docendus est, discrimen panis, quem edit in dominica et in domestica mensa, esse in usu non in substantia. Nam in substantia discrimen quaerere desinet aegerrime, quamdiu videt alium hic panem usurpari quam vulgo. *So*

5. THE BOOKLET ON BREAD BREAKING

There is a very close relation between the HC and a booklet which was also published in early 1563, entitled "Account of Some Reasons Why the Precious Sacrament of the Supper of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ Should Not Be Held Without the Breaking of the Bread" (1563).

It appeared anonymously, but medical professor Thomas Erastus is now recognized as author.[4] The theological argument runs as follows.

Christ himself in celebrating the sacrament broke the bread, and also his disciples did so. The words of institutions in the Gospels and in Paul tell us so. The apostles did so on Christ's command: "Do this in remembrance of me" (Luc. 22:19). This is what the apostles taught others, so that the Lord's Supper was even called "the breaking of the bread" (Acts 2:42, 46). Central in the argument is Paul's rendering of the words of institution in 1 Corinthians 11: "He has told and ordered them, the Corinthians, regarding the Lord's Supper, nothing else than what he himself had received from the Lord himself", which is: "Is not the bread, which we break, a communion with the body of Christ?"

---

wissen sie nicht anders denn es sey ein hergot oder steck einer dainn. Sed non possum scribere multa. Hodie in Synodo de hac re disputavimus. Variantur sententiae, non propter rem ipsam, de qua nemo dubitabat, sed propter circumstantias temporum et locorum. Visum est, ut in quibus Ecclesiis potuit res, praeeunte doctrina et institutione populi, sine magna offensione confici, in iis retineatur panis cubarius ; in quibus autem nondum facile potuit aut potest, in illis utantur oblatis, quas vocant, ubique tamen aptis ad fractionem servandam, donec successu temporis populus intellecta doctrina sine scandalo admittat id, quod melius est etiam in adiaphoris, ex quibus hoc per se esse non dubitamus" (Kluckhohn 1868 :4 ; August 1563 to Crato von Crafftheim).

4 Thomas Erastus claimed to be its author: "Catechismus editus est, ut vides, hic tibi missus. Addidi libellum, quem de fractione panis propter rudiores ex principis voluntate omisso nomine edidi quod melius ita iudicarent" (Erastus to Bullinger, 26 Februari [1563], in Wesel-Roth 1954:133). There are a number of features which connect this booklet closely to the Heidelberg Catechism. First, it was Frederic III who ordered the author to write it to clarify the liturgical ritual of the breaking of the bread (introduced by the Elector himself). Second, when in 1563 the Elector sent the Catechism to his colleagues, he apparently also send them the booklet on the breaking of the bread. Third, the Lutheran theologians who immediately wrote a critique of the HC, included their critique on the breaking of the bread and thus responded to Erastus' booklet. Four, many 1563-editions of the HC, held in libraries, are bound together with the booklet on the breaking of the bread. It contains only 22 pages *in octavo* and was printed by the Publisher of the new Catechism, Johannes Mayer n the Elector's city of Heidelberg (see the title in the bibliography below).

When we skip the critique of the historical development in the form of the Roman mass, the author takes up his argument in stating that Jesus' words "Do this in remembrance of me" cannot be only applied to the eating and drinking. Also the thankfully breaking of the bread is meant. "The other reason why the breaking of the bread must be applied to the Lord's Supper, is that Christ wanted to visualize for us and confront us with the bitter and unspeakable pain of death which he suffered for us, by which his body and soul were torn apart. He wanted to teach us this way how heavy and great our sins are, which brought about such anguish of the Son of God".

By the power of the Holy Spirit we are made one body, of which Christ is the head. "When the bread is not broken, but round wafers (having been broken before) are distributed, our hearts cannot according to God's order be taught and be remembered by our eyes that we are all members of the one body of Christ, when we do not receive a part of the one bread, but each receives and eats a separate bread" ([Erastus] 1563:15-16).

The conclusion is: "without breaking the bread the holy sacrament of Christ's Supper cannot and shall not be celebrated completely according to the will of Christ". At the end of the treatise a number of objections are discussed (Luke 24 read as a miracle; whether or not the sitting or the night time is included in the commandment).

This might all seem more biblicistic than sound biblical theology. The very first critique did not come from theologians, but in a letter from count Wolfgang von Zweibrücken, duke Christoph of Württemberg, and count Johann Friedrich II von Sachsen, addressed to Frederic III (Gooszen 1893:1-30). There is not enough reason, they write on May 4th 1563, "to reject a harmless old custom [of the wafers] as non-Christian". Their first counterargument is: the expression "breaking the bread" is not to be understood from the German, but from the Hebrew language. It means: to feed, to distribute – as examples from the Old Testament show. Second, the fact that Jesus did not cut slices of bread with a knife, is according to the custom of the land. His command "Do this in remembrance of me" does not imply the circumstances of place and time and the rites in general, but only the "principalia", that is the blessing and saying grace by Christ and the eating and drinking of what he gave. Third, against the stress on the breaking of bread could be argued that the prophecy says "not one of his bones shall be broken". Jesus's act of breaking the bread cannot refer to his suffering on the cross. Fourth, also the small wafers have been baked from the same flour. And various churches, each having her own bread of communion, can still be called the one body of Christ (Gooszen 1893:139-165).

Historically, in the background is the liturgical model of Hyldrich Zwingli of 1525. The breaking of the bread was prescribed by Zwingli in his liturgy for the Lord's Supper of 1525. His instruction was that following the sermon unleavened bread on wooden plates and wine in wooden cups shall be put on the table. The bread shall be carried from one person to the other "and everyone shall with his own hand break a piece or mouthful (good bite) and eat it." In this way also the wine will be distributed (Zwingli 4:16; Pahl 1983:196).[5] The recited words of institution from 1 Corinthians 11 refer to Jesus, breaking the bread at Pesach, but the form does not elaborate on this.

6. LUTHERAN CRITIQUE

Who were the Lutheran theological advisors who may have stood behind this critique of Frederic's noble colleagues? The first possible influence on the princes is Matthias Flacius Illyricus, working in Regensburg, who published his *Widerlegung Eines kleinen Deutschen Calvinistischen Catechismi so in disem M.D.LXIII Jar sampt etlichen andern irrigen Tractetlin ausgangen* (Flacius 1563). Listing eight errors in the Heidelberg Catechism, he comes to his ninth and last point, the error of breaking the bread, on which "these teachers have issued also a short pamphlet without the name of author and printer". Flacius comes right to the point of the treatise, that is the statement that with individual wafers and without the breaking and sharing of one bread no real and full communion takes place. The sharing of common bread makes it all the more easy to convince the people that not the true body and blood of Christy are received in the sacrament, but only bread and wine.

His line of arguing against Erastus' treatise is very much the same as that of the three princes. The Hebrew verb means to distribute, to hand over, as in Isaiah 58 where "Frange esurienti manem tuum" means "to share your bread with the hungry". In Genesis 42 Joseph is called the "fragmentator" of bread, meaning distributor (of the corn in store) for the people who suffered from the famine. His very first argument, however, is that the Heidelberg theologians have altered the words of institution in the Gospels and substituted "which has been broken for you". It may be

5 Zwingli 1525:16. Also: "Demnach tragind die verordneten diener das ungeheblet brot harumb, und nemme eyn yetlicher glöubiger mit siner eygnen hand einen bitz oder mundvoll darvon, oder lasß im dasselbig bieten durch den diener, der das brot harumb treit. Und so die mit dem brot so vil vorggangen sind, das ein yeder sin stücklin gessen habe, so gangind die anderen diener mit dem tranck hinnach, und gäbind glycherwyß einem yetlichen ze trincken" (Zwingli 1525:23).

that Flacius relied on the Vulgate and was not aware of text variant in the Greek manuscripts of 1 Corinthians 11, on which Desiderius Erasmus had informed the readers of his *Annotationes* (Erasmus 2000:323-324).

Repeatedly Flacius informs his readers how in the Palatinate in line with their argument "they must bake big cakes in their Churches". He uses the words "a large Westphalian bread". This wording, somewhat ridiculing the Palatinate rite, became a set expression in the polemical literature of the late 16th century. As late as 1581 Herman Hamelmann informs his readers on the sacramental customs of the Palatinate. While writing in Latin, he gives an extended quotation in German from a dialogue, written by Joannes Anastasius Geldrus, where he read these lines: "that he earnestly wanted to advise to use a big, common and black Westphalian farmer bread (*ein groiβ grob und Schwarz Westphalisch Pauren broit*), rather than the papist-like wafers" (Hamelmann 1581: f. C4^{v}). The bread on the Lord's table cannot be common enough.

What is Flacius's source in writing as early as 1563 of "plain Westphalian farmer's bread"? When Hamelmann in 1581 quoted from a dialogue, written by Joannes Anastasius Geldrus, he most probably had before him *Ein kurrzer Wegweiser. Wie ietz die lauffende irthumb zu meiden und die warheit Christi zu finden sey: begriffen in zwölff gesprechen Theophili und Irenei*, addressed *An die Teutsche Christliche Oberherren: unnd fürnemlich in dem Niederlandt*, published anonymously in 1564. Although Morsink maintains that this book must be attributed to the nephew, Gerhartus Gardirius Geldrus, working in Alzey, also in the Palatinate (Morsink 1986:155-157), we accept for argument's sake that Hamelmann considered Joannes Anastasius to be the author's (Hammelmann 1581: f. C4). The stress on common bread, used by Flacius, described by Hamelmann, and exemplified in *Ein kurtzer Wegweiser*, may have become a common place as early as 1563.

There is much more material to be found on the defence of the new rite of the breaking of the bread in the Lord's Supper. In 1563 the Frenchman Pierre Boquin published a Latin defence of the Palatinate doctrine of the Lord's Supper with an appendix on the *fractio panis* (Boquinus 1563). The Heidelberg theologians composed a German language defence of their Catechism against Lutheran critique, especially from Flacius Illyricus and Heshusius, in the following year (Ursinus 1564). This work, which was reprinted until the end of the century, also had an appendix, a highly controversial one. In this appendix Heidelberg defended the breaking of the bread by presenting quotations from Martin Luther in his work *De abrogatione missae*. Also Chapter eleven of *Ein kurtzer Wegweiser*, also from 1564, contains more material on the defence of the rite of *fractio panis* than space allows us to describe.

7. THE CATECHISM AND OLEVIANUS' LITURGICAL FORM

Does the Heidelberg Catechism mirror this doctrinal polemic? One would expect this since "The Booklet of the Breaking of the Bread" was published almost as an appendix to the Catechism's first edition. On Question 75, "How is it signified and sealed to you in the Holy Supper that you partake of the one sacrifice of Christ on the cross and all His benefits?", The Answer is:

> Thus: that Christ has commanded me and all believers to eat of *this broken bread* and to drink this cup in remembrance to Him, and has joined therewith these promises: first, *that His body was offered and broken* on the cross for me and His blood shed for me, as certainly *as I see with my eyes the bread of the Lord broken for me* and the cup communicated to me; and further, that with His crucified body and shed blood He Himself feeds and nourishes my soul to everlasting life, as certainly *as I receive from the hand of the minister and taste with my mouth the bread* and cup of the Lord, which are given to me as certain tokens of the body and blood of Christ.[6]

Someone used to this liturgical form may miss how strong the stress of the actual breaking and personal eating of the bread is. Against the background of the Palatinate's revolutionary novelty, as it was experienced by Roman Catholics and Lutherans, the Catechism's stress on "diesem gebrochenen Brot" and on Christ's command to eat (and drink) is clear. The German wording may help to convey this even more clearly:

> *[D]ass sein leib so gewiss für mich am creutz geopfert und gebrochen [...] sey, so gewiss ich mit den augen sehe, dass das brot des herrn mir gebrochen und der kelch mir mitgetheilet wird* (Bakhuizen 1976:190).

Christ's promise to the communicants is as sure "als ich auss der hand des dieners empfange und leiblich niesse das brod und den kelch des herrn" (Sehling 1969:357f).

In the biblical references the words of institution from the synoptic Gospels and 1 Corinthians 11 are listed, the passages discussed in "The Booklet on the Breaking of the Bread". In Q/A/ 77 these words of institution are given in full, as in earlier days the Catechisms of Luther and Johannes Brenz, as included in the Church order of Ottheinrich, had taught the people to learn by heart: "Nemet und esset, das ist mein leib, der für euch gebrochen wirdt, solchs thut zu meiner gedechtnuss." The

6 Italics added by the present author.

Heidelberg Catechism also calls the bread "das heilig brodt", even when it is underlined that this bread is not transformed into the body of Christ ("nit der leib christi selbst"; Q/A. 78). Thus the following features of the Catechism's teaching on the Lord's Supper correspond with Erastus's booklet of 1563: the breaking of the sacramental bread, the reference to Christ's suffering on the cross, the reception of a piece of the broken bread as given by the minister, and the actual eating.

The new Church order of Frederic III, implemented in November 1563, contains the full text of the Catechism (third edition), and also the "summa", where the words of institution are printed again. In the "summa" the doctrine of the Lord's Supper receives ample space. The words of institution, to be memorized by hearing their frequent reading in Church, connect the Lutheran and Reformed teaching (Sehling 1969:379). This Church order also contains the liturgical text, written by Caspar Olevianus for the celebration of the Supper (Sehling 1969:383-388). It begins with the very words of institution, quoting from 1 Corinthians 11. Why not Jesus' own words from the Gospels? Probably because of Paul's wording, read as explicating what Jesus implied: "Nemet, esset, das ist mein leib, der für euch gebrochen wird" (although the last words are only found in Luke in the version "given for you"). This introduction sets the tone for the formula, so that the next reference to the words of institution can be from Luke: "Nemet hin und esset, das ist mein leib, der für euch gegeben wird" (Luc. 22:19). In the following explanation the words of Catechism's Q/A. 75 return: the promise of forgiveness is "as sure to anyone as this bread is broken before his eyes and as this chalice is given to him and you – in remembrance of me – eat and drink with your mouth" (so gwiss als einem jeden dises brodt für seinen augen gebrochen und dieser kelch im gegeben wirdt und ihr dieselben zu meiner gedechtnuss mit euerm mund esset und trinket; Sehling 1969:385). From this perspective the instruction to the minister is telling: "At this point the minister shall break the bread of the Lord for each and everyone (*einem jeden*) and speak while presenting the bread: the bread, which we break, is the communion with the body of Christ". These words are not spoken once to the whole congregation, but time and again to every communicant personally. The special accent on the *fractio panis*, defended in "The Booklet on the Breaking of the Bread", is also found in the Catechism and liturgical formula of the Palatinate.

8. THE LOW COUNTRIES

The draft Church order, transmitted as the Wesel articles of 1568, for the Low Countries has the following article:

The breaking of the bread we think is totally necessary, because Christ has instituted it clearly and the apostles and the whole ancient Church has observed it without good reason.

It is also specified that common bread, and not any kind of special or unleavened bread, shall be used to avoid superstition (Rutgers 1980:30). Although this church order was never implemented, the Synod of Emden 1571 stipulated:

> We deem that in the churches, to be instituted when liberty has been given to us, common or daily bread (*pane communi seu cibario*) shall be used and that is shall be broken during the administration of the holy Supper. We regard it as an indifferent matter to take part in the Holy Supper either standing of sitting (Rutgers 1980:65).

In the following years we find ordinances concerning the use of the words of institution from 1 Corinthians 10 (Dordrecht 1574), and again on the mode of sitting or standing as "adiaphoron", but against superstitious kneeling (Dordrecht 1578; Middelburg 1581; (Rutgers:1980:147, 251, 393). Concerning the breaking of the bread the Synod of Middelburg answered a question from one of the churches:

> Is it permitted to bring the bread for the administration of the sacrament to the table, already being cut or broken in pieces? The answer was: that the breaking of the bread shall take place in the presence of the congregation (Rutgers 1980:451).

The Reformed Churches of the Netherlands, before and after the liberation from Spanish rule, differentiated clearly between "outward ceremonies, prescribed by God's Word" and "indifferent matters", on which Churches abroad with other practices must not be condemned (Rutgers 1980:393, 500). The public breaking of the bread, introduced by the Pauline words of institution, was the most prominent feature among the first category.

9. CONCLUSIONS

The Palatinate practice of bread breaking in the Lord's Supper summarizes the doctrinal stand that Christ's bodily presence *in pane* or *sub panem* is denied. Both adoration of the host and reverence for the sacramental wafers are rejected. Doctrinal nuance disappears when the breaking of the bread is specified as eaten, chewing, and swallowing of a substantial piece of bread by every communicant.

The liturgical practice in the Netherlands is unthinkable without this Heidelberg reformation of the celebration of the Lord's Supper until today.[7] Today's discussions whether or not individual small communion cups (in Afrikaans "kelkies") or if the wine can be substituted by grape juice run along comparable lines: what is an "outward ceremony, prescribed by the Word of God, which may not be altered" (as article 62 of the Church order of the GKSA, the Reformed Churches of South-Africa has it)?

Both Lord's Days 28 and 29, composed in Heidelberg after Frederic III ordered the rite of breaking the bread, and the form for celebration of the Lord's Supper, written by Caspar Olevianus, take their starting point for the words of institution not in the Gospels, but in the most specific and elaborate account by St. Paul in 1 Corinthians 11. The stress on the meaning of the act of breaking the bread can be regarded as an important aspect of teaching the Reformed doctrine of the sacrament.

The doctrine of the Lord's Supper, as received in the Palatinate of Frederic III, contains important Christological, sacramental, and ecclesiological aspects, which come together in the teaching of Christ's bodily real presence in heaven at the right hand of the Father and of the real body of Christ on earth being the one Church as gathered around the table of communion. *Communio cum Christo* implies that by his flesh and blood, communicated through the life giving Spirit, we become flesh of his flesh and bone of his bones (cf. Ephesians 5, verse 31 as the Reformers read in the majority text version), or as we would say it, his flesh and blood. Ecclesiologically, according to the civil and ecclesiastical reformers of Heidelberg, such communion requires a bread which can be broken and cup which can be shared as intended by our Saviour to make our unity in him apparent to all our senses.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bakhuizen Van Den Brink, J. N.
1976. *De Nederlandse belijdenisgeschriften*, 2. ed. Amsterdam: Ton Bolland.

Boquinus, P.
1563. *Canones quibus defenditur dianoia in verbis Christi, hoc est corpus meum, et controversiae de coena domini atque similum dijucandae certissima ratio demonstrator*; Item Assertio ritus frangendi, in manusque sumendi panis in celebration coenae Domini auctore, P.Boquino. Heidelberg: Michael Schirat.

7 Cf. Convent of Wesel, 1568: "Panis fractionem, quia est a Christo manifeste instituta et ab apostolis totaque vetustiori ecclesia non sine gravissimis causis observatis, necessariam esse omnino censemus" (Goeters 1968, 18).

De Boer, E. A.
2013. Een Nederlander als peetvader van de Heidelberger. Joannes Anastasius Geldrus, de Pfalz en de Catechismus. In: F. van der Pol & W. van Vlastuin (ed.), *Leven met de Heidelbergse Catechismus. 450-jaar omgang met het troostboek*. (Gouda: Driestar Educatief), pp. 9-30, 135-137.

2014a. Adoration or idolatry? Q/A. 80 in the Context of the Catechetical Teaching of Joannes anastasius in the Palatinate. In: A. Huijgen (ed.), *The Spirituality of the Heidelberg Catechism. Papers of the International Conference on the Heidelberg Catechism at the Theological University Apeldoorn, 21-22 June 2013* (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht). Forthcoming.

2014b. Joannes Anastasius Geldrus on the Lord's supper and Christology against the Gnesio-Lutherans in relation to the Heidelberg Catechism. In: Andreas Beck (ed.), *proceedings from The Heidelberg Catechism in Oecumenical Perspective.* International conference on the Occasion of its 450th Anniversary (1563-2013) at Evangelische Theologische Faculteit Leuven, 18-19 April 2013 (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht). Forthcoming.

Erasmus, D.
2000. *Opera omnia* VI-5 (Annotationes in novum Testamentum pars prima), ed. P.F. Hovingh (Amsterdam e.a.l.: Elsevier).

Erastus, T. H.
1563. *Erzelung Etlicher ursachen warumb das hochwirdig Sacrament des Nachtmals unsern herrn und heylandts Jhese christi nocht solle ohne das brodbrechen gehalten werden*. Heidelberg: Johannes Mayer.

Flacius, M.
1563. Widerlegung Eines kleinen Deutschen Calvinistischen Catechismi so in disem M.D.LXIII Jar sampt etlichen andern irrigen Tractetlin ausgangen. Item Verweisung Das auch die unwirdigen den waren Leib und Blut Jesu Christi im Abendmal empfahen. Wide rein Schwenckfeldischen Büchlein so newlich on namen durch den Druck ausgestrewet worden (Regenburg).

Goeters
1989. Bericht des Superintendents im Amt Oppenheim über die Heidelberger Superintendentenkonferenz vom 13.-18. Januar 1563 Beratung und Billigung des Heidelberger Katechismus. In: J.F.G. Goeters (ed.), "*Caspar Olevianus als Theologe*," Monatshefte für evangelische Kirchengeschichte des Rheinlandes 37-38 (1988-1989), 338-341.

Gooszen, M. A.
1893. *De Heidelbergsche Catechismus en het boekje van de breking des broods, in het jaar 1563-64 bestreden en verdedigd. Oorkonden en dogmen-historisch onderzoek. Nieuwe bijdrage tot de kennis van het gereformeerd protestantisme*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Gunnoe, C. D.
2011. *Thomas Erastus and the Palatinate. A Renaissance Physician in the Second Reformation* [BSCH 48] (Boston – Leiden).

Hamelmann, H.
1581. De sacramentorum furoribus, portentosis et seditiosis conatibus [...] historica narratio conscripta (Oldenburg: s.n.).

Hollweg, W.
1961 Neue Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Lehre des Heidelberger Katechismus, [Beiträge zur Geschichte und Lehre der Reformierten Kirche 13] (Neukirchen: Neukirchner Verlag).

Klebtiz, W.
1561. *Victoria veritatis ac ruina papatus Saxonici. Responsio Wilhelmi Klebitii necessaria ad Argumenta Doct. Tilemanni Heshudii pro defensione*. Freiburg: Daniel Delenus.

Kluckhohn, A. (ed.)
1868. *Briefe Friedrich des Frommen, kurfürsten von der Pfalz mit verwandten Schriftstücken, vol. 1: 1559-1566*. Braunschweig: Schwetschke und Sohn.

Morsink, G.
1986. *Joannes Anastasius Veluanus. Jan Gerritsz. Versteghe. Levensloop en ontwikkelingsgang.* Kampen: J.H. Kok.

Pahl, I. (ed.)
1983. *Coena Domini I. Die Abendmahlsliturgie der Reformationskirchen im 16./17. Jahrhundert* [Spicilegium Friburgense. Texte zur Geschichte des kirchlichen Lebens 29]. Freiburg: Universitätsverlag Freiburg Schweiz.

Rutgers, F. L.
1980. Acta van de Nederlandsche Synoden der zestiende eeuw verzameld en uitgegeven, 2. ed. = 1899 (Dordrecht: J.P. van der Tol).

Sehling, E. (ed.)
1969. *Die evangelischen Kirchenordnungen des XVI. Jahrhunderts, dl. 14: Kurpfalz*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).

Ursinus, Z.
1564. *Verantwortung wider die ungegründten aufflagen unnd verkerungen mit welchen der Catechismus Christlicher lere zu Heidelberg im Jar M,.D.LXIII. aussgangen von ettlichen unbillicher weise beschweret ist. Geschrieben durch die theologen der Universitet Heidelber*g. Item D. Martin Luthers meinung vom Brtobrechen im H. Abendmal. Heidelberg: Johannes Mayer.

Van Wijk, J. H.
1991. Besinning oor die viering van die heilige nagmaal. *In die Skriflig* 25/2: 245-264.

Wesel-Roth, R.
1954. *Thomas Erastus. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der reformierten Kirche und zur Lehre von der Staatssouveränität* [Veröffentlichungen des Vereins für kirchengeschihcte in der evang. Landeskirche Badens 15]. Lahr: Verlag Moritz Schauenburg.

ZWINGLI, H.
1525. Aktion oder Brauch des Nachtmals. *Huldreich Zwingli Werke Sämtliche Werke, vol. 4 [Corpus Reformatorum 94]*. Leipzig: Heinsius, 1927.

Keywords	*Trefwoorde*
Lord’s Supper	Nagmaal
Palatinate reformation	Palitinate reformasie
Liturgical practices	Liturgiese praktyke
Fractio panis	Fractio panis