

To Mix, or Not to Mix:
The Sacramental Character of the Reliquiae

Rev. Paul L. Beisel, S.T.M.

Iowa District East Fall Pastor's Conference
Sectional Paper
October 1-2, 2007

One of the primary duties of Old Testament Priests was to distinguish between the holy and unholy, the clean and the unclean (Leviticus 10:10). Failure to do so resulted in God's judgment. In the New Testament, the whole community of the baptized is charged with this duty, particularly with regard to the Holy Supper of our Lord. St. Paul may have had this priestly duty in mind when he wrote to the Corinthians concerning the most holy Sacrament: "Whoever, therefore, eats the bread or drinks the cup of the Lord in an unworthy manner will be guilty of profaning the body and blood of the Lord. Let a person examine himself, then, and so eat of the bread and drink of the cup. For anyone who eats and drinks without discerning the body eats and drinks judgment on himself" (1 Corinthians 11:27-29).¹

If this is true of the baptized, royal priests of God's house, how much more is it incumbent upon the ministers of the royal priesthood, stewards of God's mysteries, to distinguish carefully between that which God has sanctified by His Word and that which he has not? And yet, too often today it seems that the same pastors who confess with their mouths the real presence of Christ in the Sacrament weaken this confession by a careless or ambivalent attitude towards the remaining sacramental elements (*reliquiae*). I'm referring specifically to the following practices that are common in our churches: mixing consecrated bread or wine with unconsecrated; throwing left-over communion bread or wine into an unfit receptacle (such as a waste-basket, sink, or in some cases even a toilet); throwing out plastic individual cups without having first washed them out; over-preparing wafers or wine, leaving an unnecessary overabundance of *reliquiae*, making it impossible to consume all the elements during or immediately after the service.

The thesis of this short essay is that these practices, while perhaps carried out with the best of intentions, are incompatible with a Eucharistic theology that acknowledges the consecrated bread and wine to be the very Body and Blood of Christ the Savior. Pastors who take seriously their role as stewards of the mysteries of God will see to it that they do not deny by their actions what they have confessed with their lips and believed with their hearts.

I. Much Ado About Nothing?

Whenever this topic is broached among Lutheran pastors there are inevitably some who cry out: "Romanist!" At best, it is viewed as a case of "much ado about nothing" or just another example of "overly fussy" pastors. Some protest any criticism of their practices by citing the well-known

¹ See John Kleinig, *Leviticus*, Concordia Commentary Series (St. Louis: CPH, 2003), 237-238.

axiom of Philip Melanchthon: “Nothing has the character of a Sacrament outside of its use.”² To them this means that once the sacramental action is completed, consecrated bread and wine go back to being common bread and wine, meaning they can dispose of the leftovers however they wish. For Luther and the authors of the Formula of Concord, it simply meant that the sacrament must be used for the purpose for which Christ instituted it. In fact, Luther sharply criticized one pastor in his hometown of Eisleben for using Melanchthon’s formula to defend his practice of mixing consecrated and unconsecrated communion elements.³ In 1543 Luther wrote two letters to Simon Wolferinus, explaining his understanding of the *Nihil* rule and urging Wolferinus to discontinue the practice. Chief among Luther’s concerns was the appearance that was given by such a practice:

We do not have it from you, but you from us that the sacraments are actions, not stationary objects. But what is this singular temerity of yours that you do not refrain from so evil an appearance—which you ought to know is scandalous—namely, that you mix what remains of the [consecrated] wine or bread with unconsecrated [Latin: *prior*] bread and wine? On the basis of what example are you doing this? Do you not clearly see how you will arouse dangerous questions, if, “convinced in your own mind” [cf. Rom. 14.5], you contend that the Sacrament ceases when the action ceases? Perhaps you want to be called Zwinglian? I believe that you are afflicted with the insanity of Zwingli, you who so pridefully and contemptibly incite [matters] with your singular and glorious wisdom. Was there no other way to avoid suspicion being sown among the simple and our adversaries that you are a despiser of the sacrament, than by your giving offense with the evil appearance of mixing and confounding the remains of the sacrament with

² Solid Declaration VII:85-87 (Triglotta): “To preserve this true Christian doctrine concerning the Holy Supper, and to avoid and abolish manifold idolatrous abuses and perversions of this testament, the following useful rule and standard has been derived from the words of institution: *Nihil habet rationem sacramenti extra usum a Christo institutum* ("Nothing has the nature of a sacrament apart from the use instituted by Christ") or *extra actionem divinitus institutam* ("apart from the action divinely instituted"). That is: If the institution of Christ be not observed as He appointed it, there is no sacrament. This is by no means to be rejected, but can and should be urged and maintained with profit in the Church of God. **86]** And the use or action here does not mean chiefly faith, neither the oral participation only, but the entire external, visible action of the Lord's Supper instituted by Christ, [to this indeed is required] the consecration, or words of institution, the distribution and reception, or oral partaking [manducation] of the consecrated bread and wine, [likewise the partaking] of the body and blood of Christ. **87]** And apart from this use, when in the papistic mass the bread is not distributed, but offered up or enclosed, borne about, and exhibited for adoration, it is to be regarded as no sacrament; just as the water of baptism, when used to consecrate bells or to cure leprosy, or otherwise exhibited for worship, is no sacrament or baptism. For against such papistic abuses this rule has been set up at the beginning [of the reviving Gospel], and has been explained by Dr. Luther himself, Tom. IV, Jena.”

³ For a detailed historical and theological treatment of the whole controversy, see Timothy Wengert, “Luther and Melanchthon on Consecrated Communion Wine (Eisleben 1542-43),” *Lutheran Quarterly* XV (2001). See also Bjarne Teigen, *The Lord's Supper in the Theology of Martin Chemnitz* (Brewster, MA: Trinity Lutheran Press, 1986), 135-140.

[unconsecrated] wine? Why do you not imitate other churches? [and consume all the elements] Why do you want to be held to be the only, new and dangerous author [of this practice]? I write these things in this manner with deep sorrow, so that you may know that you have offended me and profoundly saddened my spirit.⁴

Much ado about nothing? Evidently not for Luther. Clearly it mattered a lot to Luther how the body and blood of Christ were treated, and even how the *reliquiae* were treated after the Communion was over. In Luther's estimation, Wolferinus too narrowly defined the action of the Sacrament, limiting the "action" to the mere eating and drinking. Taking the emphasis off of the "chief thing" (Words of Christ) would give the appearance that there was no sacrament at all:

Indeed Master Philip wrote correctly, that outside the sacramental action is no sacrament. However, you take the sacramental action far too hasty and are ending [it] abruptly. By doing so, you will bring about the appearance that perhaps you have no Sacrament. Then if this hurried, cut short action should be enduring, then it will follow, that after the pronouncement of the Words, which are the principle and chief thing in the Sacrament, no Body and Blood would be received, [now] that the action had stopped. This Master Philip certainly does not intend. And this interpretation of the action would give rise to countless heavy - consciences and endless questions; just as it is disputed by the Papist whether the Body and Blood of Christ is there during the first, middle, or last syllable [of the Words of Institution].⁵

Luther did not reject Melancthon's formula in these letters, but unlike Wolferinus he understood the sacramental action to include more than just eating and drinking. Luther saw the sacramental action, and thus the Real Presence, as beginning with the consecration and lasting until all had communed and departed from the altar. It was not Melancthon's intention, he argues, to put time limits on the sacramental union but to defend the Sacrament against abuses such as "enclosure and carrying around of the Sacrament." In cases where something remains in the Sacrament after all had communed, Luther recommends consuming all that remains, so as not to "divide the Sacrament by a wicked example, or to handle the sacramental action irreverently." In this case, Wolferinus had gone too far. Luther's correspondence with Wolferinus may have been influential in the formulation of Solid Declaration VII on the Lord's Supper,⁶ which is normative for our doctrine and practice. To dismiss Luther's opinions as "much ado about nothing" would be terribly unwise.

Unfortunate as this controversy was, it ultimately served to reveal the dangers of Melancthon's teaching on the consecration and sacramental action. So significant was the issue that it would

⁴ Quoted in Wengert, "Luther and Melancthon," 32. Found in WA Br 10:347.

⁵ WA Br 10:347.

⁶ Bjarne Teigen argues that the reference in Solid Declaration VII to Luther's teaching is a reference to his correspondence with Wolferinus. See his article "The Case of the Lost Luther Reference," *CTQ* 43:4 (1979): 295-309. Also available at <http://www.ctsfw.edu/library/files/pb/1665>.

eventually become divisive for many Lutherans.⁷ What was at stake? The clear confession of the bodily presence of Christ in the Supper. For the Philippists, the words of Institution by themselves did not effect the sacramental union, but only held out the promise of it upon the first reception of the blessed elements. And since there was no beginning to the sacramental union until the action of eating and drinking, neither was there an enduring union after the eating and drinking had ceased. Thus, it made no difference to them what was done with the remaining elements, since outside of the use there was no sacrament.⁸ The gnesio-Lutherans [Genuine Lutherans], following Luther, believed that the words of Christ effected the sacramental union, so that those who ate and drank could be confident that what they ate and drank was in fact Christ's true body and blood.⁹ And they also believed that what remained retained its sacramental character, and thus had to be consumed, not mixed with unconsecrated elements. Summarizing the main differences at hand, Hardt writes:

Here lies the essential point, the *status controversiae*. For the Lutherans, Christ had made the bread his body through the consecration and commanded us to eat it; for the Philippists, Christ had promised to give His body if one ate the bread. Not without reason, the latter drew from this premise the conclusion that the Sacrament was an act, not a thing, and that if the bread were not eaten, Christ would have no reason to fulfill His promise for a communicant who is not there. In this case the words of Jesus do not have any direct connection with the bread, the only role of which is to render possible the promise's being fulfilled for the communicant. Logically this is an easily comprehensible construction, which shies in front of the words, "This (bread) is my body," as being "too literal," but which at the same time wished to retain a church tradition with decisive values for piety.¹⁰

II. Philippism and the Missouri Synod

It is not difficult to see how the practices mentioned above made their way into our Synod when you consider the Eucharistic teaching of some of the leading theologians of the Missouri Synod. We will look at two. The first is C.F.W. Walther, founder and first president of the Missouri

⁷ Tom G. A. Hardt reports that some Lutheran pastors even on their death beds would not receive the Lord's Supper from those who did not teach that the remaining elements retained their sacramental character after the communion was over. *On the Sacrament of the Altar: A Book on the Lutheran Doctrine of the Lord's Supper*, (Fort Wayne: CTS Press, 1984), 34.

⁸ For a more detailed treatment of Melanchthon's influence on later Lutheran orthodoxy, see John Stephenson, *The Lord's Supper*, Confessional Lutheran Dogmatics Volume XII, John Stephenson, ed. (St. Louis: Luther Academy, 2003), 91-93. Noting the influence of Aristotle on Melanchthon's view of the sacramental action, Stephenson writes: "Melanchthon and his later disciples limited the real presence to the point in time when the consecrated elements reached the lips of communicants," (91).

⁹ In Matthew 26:28, the causal particle γάρ makes clear that the reason the disciples are to "take and drink" is not *in order that* the wine may be Jesus' blood, but *because* it already is His blood.

¹⁰ Hardt, *On the Sacrament of the Altar*, 34.

Synod. While there can be no doubt that Walther was a faithful confessor of the Real Presence in the Lord's Supper, there are aspects of his teaching that show a divergence from Luther's doctrine of the consecration. For example, in his discussion of the role of the Words of Institution in the Lord's Supper, he cites favorably one of the theologians of later Lutheran orthodoxy, J. A. Quenstedt, who wrote concerning the sacramental union:

The sacramental union does not happen except in the distribution. For the elements, bread and wine, do not sooner become the means of receiving the body and blood of Christ until through the addition of the distribution they are eaten and drunk...Christ also does not say absolutely of the consecrated bread but rather of the bread broken and given to be eaten that it is Christ's body. For He said first, 'Take and eat,' then He said, 'This is my body'" (*Theol. did.pol.*, Cap. De Coena S. 1187, 1268).¹¹

Walther, following the lead of Quenstedt and the theologians of Lutheran orthodoxy, writes:

From the fact that the recitation of the Words of Institution does not work magically but is necessary only to obey the command of Christ, "This do," and to complete the action in which the Lord has promised the presence of His body and blood, it follows that the mere recitation of the Words of Institution does not make the Sacrament real if the consecrated elements are not also administered to communicants and received by them.¹²

Although Walther here seems to border on Philippism, the practice of mixing consecrated hosts or wine with unconsecrated cannot be directly traced to him. Walther strictly forbids this practice, citing Luther's criticism of Wolferinus. Instead, he favors consumption of all the elements by the communicants or elders. Still, Walther did not think that there was anything dogmatic about Luther's concern with Wolferinus, but that Luther "rather rebuked that procedure so seriously because it looked bad and could give offense."¹³ Thus, Walther's strict recommendations do not flow from a belief that the remaining elements have a *sacramental character*, but from a desire to avoid offense and to treat the consecrated elements reverently.

Francis Pieper's *Christian Dogmatics* has taught generations of LC-MS pastors. His precision in discussing all areas of Christian theology is a gift to the Church. But he, like Walther and Quenstedt, rejects the idea that the words of Institution effect the sacramental union by themselves. Intending to base his teaching on the words of the Formula of Concord, Pieper writes:

¹¹ Quoted by C.F.W. Walther in *Pastor Theology*, (New Haven: Lutheran News, Inc., 1995), 134.

¹² *Ibid.*, 133-134.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 145. Hardt disagrees. Citing Luther's second letter to Wolferinus, Hardt writes: "The meal of Christ lasts 'until all have received the Sacrament, drunk the chalice and eaten up the pieces of bread.' What remains after the end of the communion is therefore consecrated by Christ to be His holy body and blood and is to be received carefully and with reverence by the priest or another person *as Sacrament*. For Luther it is thus a *dogmatic demand that in the mass everything that has been consecrated is to be consumed*. *On the Sacrament of the Altar*, 32-33.

It should be added that the Formula of Concord very definitely rejects the opinion that the consecration by itself, or the mere recitation of the words of institution, makes the Sacrament or brings about the *unio sacramentalis*.¹⁴

However, if you examine the statement of the Formula, it does not simply say that the Consecration by itself does not make the sacrament. It says, “this blessing, or the recitation of the words of Institution of Christ alone, does not make a Sacrament *if the entire action of the Supper, as it was instituted by Christ, is not observed* [...].” In other words, the Words of Institution are only effective when spoken in the context of a valid communion service. Even the strictest consecrationist would not suggest that wherever the words are spoken they effect this union, such as if children are playing church, or if non-Christians in mockery use the Words of Institution with bread within their own services.

Even more revealing is Pieper’s editorial statement in a footnote where he cites the Formula of Concord, SD VII (the *Nihil* rule). He adds the following scenario, as if to say, this is what is meant by the Formula’s words:

If a wafer happens to fall to the floor during the distribution, or some of the wine is spilled, Christ’s body does not fall to the ground, nor is Christ’s blood spilled, since *extra usum a Christo institutum no unio sacramentalis* obtains.¹⁵

Contrast this with the sacramental piety of Luther, whom witnesses say wept when some of the wine from the chalice was spilled during a celebration of the Lord’s Supper.¹⁶ As Hardt suggests, for Luther this unfortunate accident had “happened to the true blood of Christ.”¹⁷ Commenting on Luther’s reaction to this kind of an incident, Hardt writes:

Luther speaks of how such an accident, which is not necessarily due to any sin, is followed by great “fear and trembling” in the good Christian. We are also informed as to how Luther actually acted. Such an accident occurred at the distribution of communion in the town church at Wittenberg in the year 1542, when Luther and the officiating pastor and the deacon, with the greatest reverence and in deep excitement, attempted to consume the poured-out blood of Christ from the floor of the sanctuary. The witness writes: “This accident touched Doctor Martin’s heart so profoundly that he sighed about it and said: ‘Oh God, help!’ His eyes were also full of tears.” After mass Luther, following medieval precedent, had a chair, on which the Sacrament had been spilled, planed off and the wood shavings burned together with pieces of cloth that had likewise

¹⁴ *Christian Dogmatics* vol. 3, (St. Louis: CPH, 1953), 372.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 354 f.

¹⁶ Johann Hachenburg, *Wider den Jrrthumb der newen zwinglianer notiger unterrichtung* (Erfurd: Kerten von Dolgen, 1557), fols. Fii-a & b, translated in Edward Frederick Peters, *The Origin and Meaning of the Axiom: “Nothing Has the Character of a Sacrament Outside of the Use,” in Sixteenth-Century and Seventeenth-Century Lutheran Theology* (Th. D. dissertation, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, 1968), 191.

¹⁷ Hardt, *On the Sacrament of the Altar*, 33.

been involved. This story is told also by the leading theologians of the Formula of Concord, who express their approval. They were capable of taking cognizance of and highly valuating the same fact which Herman Sasse has worried in our day, “Perhaps no Catholic ever had such reverence for the miracle of the Real Presence as Luther did. No one could think more highly of the consecration, no one could treat the consecrated elements more reverently.”¹⁸

We are grateful to the Lord for the witness that men like Walther and Pieper gave to the Lutheran Church concerning the sacramental character of the bread and wine in the Lord’s Supper. However, by following the theological lead of some teachers, who were influenced by Philippism, in their understanding of the consecration they may have left the door open for the un-Lutheran theology that gives rise to various un-Lutheran practices that we see today.

III. What do the Rubrics say?

Hopefully by this point it is clear that discussing the proper care and handling of the *reliquiae* is not “much ado about nothing” or another example of pastoral “fussiness”. On the contrary, it is a very serious matter, and a discussion worth having, especially considering the widespread practice in our churches of mixing consecrated and unconsecrated hosts or wine. Poor practice over time will ultimately weaken this confession, because actions communicate something to our people. Irreverence towards the *reliquiae* may result in Luther’s worst fear: giving the impression that you have no sacrament. We are not without instruction in this regard, however. Those who have read the General Rubrics of *The Lutheran Liturgy* may recall the following instructions concerning the preparation and disposal of the sacred elements:

In making ready the elements for the Holy Communion, so much of the bread and the wine shall be placed in the proper vessels as in the judgment of the Celebrant will be required for the Administration. If the consecrated bread or wine be spent before all have communed, the Celebrant shall consecrate more, saying aloud so much of the Words of Institution as pertains to the elements to be consecrated. When all have received the Holy Sacrament, the Celebrant shall cover what remains of the bread and wine with the veil. When the Service has been completed, the celebrant or a deacon shall remove the sacramental vessels from the altar to the sacristy and dispose of that part of the bread and wine which remains as follows: He shall carefully remove the bread from the paten and ciborium to a fit receptacle, there to be kept against the next Communion. He shall pour what remains of the consecrated wine into the piscine [a special sink that drains into the earth, not the sewer] or upon the ground at a proper and convenient place outside of the Church.¹⁹

Simply following the first part of this rubric would happily eliminate all such questions of proper practice with regard to the *reliquiae*. Admittedly, this is more easily done in small parishes than

¹⁸ *On the Sacrament of the Altar*, 33. Hardt also notes how Luther saw an analogy of the Consecration in the words of Creation, using an example from Psalm 33:9, “He bid and it stood there.”

¹⁹ *The Lutheran Liturgy* (St. Louis: CPH), 421-422.

in large ones. At my own parishes, I know how many communicants I will have from week to week. I usually prepare a little extra in case we have guests. It is never more than I can consume by myself. At one parish I commune the organist after the service because she is handicapped and the organ is upstairs. But what about parishes that number in the hundreds on any given Sunday? This becomes a bit more tricky. I do know of larger parishes that prepare the minimum amount before the service based on the average number of communicants, and during the Offertory add more if it appears more is needed. There was a time when pastors knew exactly how many would be communing, since the people had to announce before each Communion. Even this practice was much easier when the Sacrament was only offered once/month (or even four times a year). Today, however, we are seeing a resurgence of weekly communion (and thankfully so), so the custom of announcing before each communion would be difficult to resurrect. One has to admit, though, that it had its advantages.

The second part of the rubric prescribes that if all the consecrated bread and wine be spent before all have communed, that more be consecrated. My guess is that most pastors follow this rubric simply by common custom, even if they never knew it existed. But doubtless there are some who do not see the need to recite the Words of Institution unconsecrated elements.²⁰

Arthur Carl Piepkorn, once a professor at Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, wrote a book called *Conduct of the Service*. It has been reprinted by Redeemer Press in Fort Wayne, IN and you would not be the worse off for buying a copy. Piepkorn's little manual is basically a commentary on the General Rubrics of *The Lutheran Liturgy*. In it he also provides instructions on how Lutheran pastors *could* conduct the service using more elaborate ceremonies, all of which have Lutheran precedent. Commenting on the above rubric from *The Lutheran Liturgy*, Piepkorn writes:

As the responsible "steward of the Mysteries of God," the celebrant should carry out these prescriptions himself and should not delegate them to a deacon. That which has been formally consecrated and blessed for sacramental use should be treated with due respect. The rubric does not prescribe the nature of the "fit receptacle"; it is very clear, however, that the consecrated hosts are not to be mixed with un-consecrated hosts but are to be carefully segregated; it is the celebrant's responsibility to insure that they are the first to be distributed at the next Communion (which need not necessarily be the next parochial Communion Service but might conceivably be a bedside celebration for a sick

²⁰ At one celebration of Holy Communion at one of our seminary chapels, myself and several others were appalled that wine brought from a credence table was not consecrated before being distributed to the communicants. When this was brought up to the Dean of Chapel, he hurriedly brought us down to the sacristy and consecrated wine for us to drink, to remove any doubt about what we had received. Research for this paper revealed an interesting article by Lowell Green in which he evaluated a Statement on Communion Practices presented to the LCA and the ALC. One of the points made in this statement was that if the consecrated bread and wine was consumed before all had communed, it was not necessary to consecrate fresh supplies. See "The Statement on Communion Practices: A Critical Appraisal," *CTQ* 41:2 (1977), 67. This is contrasted by C.F.W. Walther's approach in *Pastoral Theology*, namely, that if this were to happen the additional hosts and wine must be consecrated (p. 133).

communicant).²¹ “Fit receptacle” could well be a special pyx or ciborium. The consecrated wine is to be poured into the sacrarium, or piscina.²²

Piepkorn, like Luther, puts the emphasis on the consecration, and without speculating on how long the sacramental union endures, simply recommends what the rubrics in *TLL* recommend: setting aside the remaining hosts in a “fit receptacle” “carefully segregated” from the unconsecrated hosts, and pouring the remaining wine into the piscina. Even this, however, is a departure from what Luther and Chemnitz both urged and practiced.

Piepkorn does recommend in Communion services that take place outside of the normal sanctuary that all the consecrated elements be consumed. My personal opinion and the teaching of Martin Luther is that this ought to be the norm for any service of Holy Communion. If, for some reason, the remaining elements are too much for the pastor and his assistants to consume during the service, then there would be nothing wrong with inviting a couple of the elders or ushers to consume the *reliquiae* either at the altar or in the sacristy immediately following the service. This removes any question of what is remaining once the sacramental action is complete. This was also the belief of Martin Chemnitz, who cites several examples from antiquity in support of this practice.²³

IV. Conclusion

Actions do speak louder than words. And the message that is often communicated to the church by ambivalent pastors or poorly trained altar guilds is that the consecrated bread and wine are no different than common bread and wine. We run the risk of denying by our actions what we have confessed and acknowledged with our lips and hearts. If we really believe that what is on the altar, what we hold in our hands, and what we place into the mouths of the communicants is Christ’s body and blood, will we not want to *act* in a way that is consistent with such faith? Are we not compelled by the nature of what we handle, eat, and drink to show godly reverence toward these elements both in our distribution of them, and in our disposal or storing of what remains after all communicants have partaken?

²¹ Even this practice is discouraged by Martin Chemnitz, who believed strongly that what is consecrated ought to be consumed as soon as possible afterward. In other words, the sacramental action ought to be kept intact, not divided. In his *Examination of the Council of Trent*, Chemnitz notes that in some cases in antiquity what was consecrated in the Service was taken to the sick. Without condemning these men for doing this, he also notes, however that “when there were no sick persons to be communed, nothing was reserved or put back” (*Ex.* 2:309). Instead of taking consecrated elements outside of the Service, these were consumed and the Lutherans would consecrate bread and wine anew in the presence of those who are sick or dying. For a discussion of Chemnitz’ position, see also Teigen, *Lord’s Supper*, 125-133.

²² A. C. Piepkorn, *Conduct of the Service* (Fort Wayne: Redeemer Press, 2006), 34.

²³ Martin Chemnitz, *Examination of the Council of Trent: Part II*, (Saint Louis: CPH, 1978), 298.

Attempts to improve sacramental practice in our Synod need not be interpreted as attempts to dislodge the Confessional rule about the use of the sacrament. Rather they should be seen as an attempt to more faithfully believe, teach, and confess the doctrine of the Sacrament of the Altar. Our Lord Jesus Christ said: “Do this.” And so we do. We distribute what Christ has called His true body and blood in the Consecration, and we eat and drink what was consecrated, thus proclaiming the Lord’s death until he come.

WORKS CITED

- Chemnitz, Martin. *Examination of the Council of Trent, 4 vols.* St. Louis: CPH, 1978.
- Concordia Triglotta. The Symbolical Books of the Ev. Lutheran Church.* St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1921.
- D. Martin Luthers Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe.* 68 vols. Weimar: Herman Boehlau und Nachfolger, 1883.
- Green, Lowell. “The Statement on Communion Practices: A Critical Appraisal,” *CTQ* 41:2 (1977).
- Hachenburg, Johann. *Wider den Jrrthumb der newen zwinglianer notiger unterrichtung.* Erfurd: Kerten von Dolgen, 1557, fols. Fii-a & b, translated in Edward Frederick Peters, *The Origin and Meaning of the Axiom: “Nothing Has the Character of a Sacrament Outside of the Use,” in Sixteenth-Century and Seventeenth-Century Lutheran Theology.* Th. D. dissertation, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, 1968.
- Hardt, Tom G. A. *On the Sacrament of the Altar: A Book of the Lutheran Doctrine of the Lord’s Supper.* Fort Wayne: CTS Press, 1984.
- Kleinig, John. *Leviticus, Concordia Commentary Series.* St. Louis: CPH, 2003.
- Pieper, Francis. *Christian Dogmatics, 3 vols.* St. Louis: CPH, 1953.
- Piepkorn, Arthur C. and Charles McClean. *The Conduct of the Service.* Fort Wayne: Redeemer Press, 2006.
- Stephenson, John R. *The Lord’s Supper.* Confessional Lutheran Dogmatics Volume XII. John Stephenson, ed. St. Louis: Luther Academy, 2003.
- Teigen, Bjarne W. “The Case of the Lost Luther Reference,” *CTQ* 43:4 (1979).
- _____. *The Lord’s Supper in the Theology of Martin Chemnitz.* Brewster, MA: Trinity Lutheran Press, 1986.
- The Lutheran Liturgy.* St. Louis: CPH.
- Walther, C. F. W. *Pastoral Theology.* New Haven: Lutheran News, Inc., 1995.