
Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2023 with funding from
Kahle/Austin Foundation

https://archive.org/details/huldrychzwingliw0002zwin

G.M. Elliott Library
Cincinnati Christian University
2700 Glenway Ave
Cincinnati, OH 45204-3200

PITTSBURGH THEOLOGICAL MONOGRAPHS

New Series

Dikran Y. Hadidian

General Editor

13

SELECTED WRITINGS OF HULDRYCH ZWINGLI

Volume Two

In Search of True Religion
Reformation, Pastoral and Eucharistic Writings



G.M. Elliott Library
Cincinnati Christian
2700 Glenway
Cincinnati, OH 45

500th Anniversary Volume

Huldrych Zwingli writings

Volume Two

In Search of True Religion: Reformation, Pastoral and Eucharistic Writings

Translated by
H. Wayne Pipkin

G.M. ELLIOTT LIBRARY
Cincinnati Christian University



PICKWICK PUBLICATIONS
Allison Park, Pennsylvania
1984

230.42
Z98h
1984
v. 2

Copyright © 1984 by **Pickwick Publications**
4137 Timberlane Drive, Allison Park, PA 15101

All rights reserved.
Printed in the United States of America.

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Zwingli, Ulrich, 1484–1531.
Selected writings of Huldrych Zwingli.

(Pittsburgh theological monographs ; new ser., 12–13)
Vol. 2 edited and translated by H. Wayne Pipkin.
Includes indexes.
Contents: v. 1. In defense of the reformed faith—v. 2. In search of true religion, Reformation, pastoral, and eucharistic writings.
1. Reformed Church—Doctrines—Addresses, essays, lectures. 2. Theology—Addresses, essays, lectures. I Furcha, E.J. (Edward J.), 1935– . II. Pipkin, H. Wayne. III. Title. IV. Series.
BR346.A2513 1984 230'.42 84-25454
ISBN 0–915138–58–1 (v. 1)
ISBN 0–915138–59–X (v. 2)

Printed and Bound by Publishers Choice Book Mfg. Co.
Mars, Pennsylvania 16046

Dedicated with affection and in gratitude
to the memory of

FORD LEWIS BATTLES
1915-1979

His incisive mind and gentle spirit
transformed drudgery into thanksgiving and
elevated scholarship once more to the place of
a divine science.

H. Wayne Pipkin
Rüschlikon, Switzerland

Edward J. Furcha
Montreal, Canada

CONTENTS

Abbreviations ix
Foreword . . . . H. Wayne Pipkin & Edward J. Furcha xiii
Acknowledgments xvii

Divine and Human Righteousness, July 1523 1

Short Christian Instruction, November 1523 43

The Shepherd, March 1524 77

Letter to Matthew Alber Concerning the
Lord's Supper, November 1524 127

The Preaching Office, June 1525 147

Subsidiary Essay on the Eucharist, August 1525 187

Friendly Exegesis, that is,
Exposition of the Matter of the Eucharist
To Martin Luther, February 1527 233

Indices

Index of Biblical Citations 387
Index of Names and Places 400
Index of Subjects. 403

ABBREVIATIONS

ADB	**Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie,** 56 vols. Reprint: Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1965.
ANF	**The Ante-Nicene Fathers.** Edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1956.
Blackfriars	Thomas Aquinas, **Summa Theologica.** Blackfriars translation. 60 vols. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1963ff.
Bullinger	**Heinrich Bullingers Reformationsgeschichte.** Edited by J. J. Hottinger and H. H. Vögel. 3 vols. Frauenfeld: Ch. Beyel, 1838.
EA	**Amtliche Sammlung der ältern Eidgenössichen Abschiede,** Serie 1245-1798. Edited by A. P. von Segesser. Lucerne, Berne, 1874-1886.
Egli	Emil Egli (ed.), **Actensammlung zur Geschichte der Zürcher Reformation in den Jahren 1519-1533.** Zurich: J. Schabelitz, 1879.
Erasmus, Op. Omnia	Erasmus, **Opera Omnia.** Edited by Joannes Clericus. 10 vols. Photoreproduction of 1703 Leiden edition: Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1961-1962.
Georges	**Ausführliches Lateinisch-Deutsches Handwörtbuch.** 9th edition: Basel: Benno Schwabe & Co., 1951.
Jackson	**The Latin Works of Huldrych Zwingli.** Vol. I edited by S. M. Jackson. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1912. Vol. II edited by William John Hinke. Vol. III edited by Clarence Nevin Heller. Philadelphia: The Heidelberg Press, 1922, 1929.

Karlstadt, **Schriften**	**Karlstadts Schriften aus den Jahren 1523-1525.** Selected and edited by Erich Hertzsch. Halle: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1956ff.
Köhler	Walther Köhler, **Zwingli und Luther.** Ihr Streit über das Abendmahl nach seinen politischen und religiösen Beziehungen. Vol. I: **Die religiöse und politische Entwicklung bis zum Marburger Religionsgespräch 1529.** Leipzig: M. Heinsius Nachfolger, 1924.
LCC	**Zwingli and Bullinger.** Vol. 24 of **Library of Christian Classics.** Edited by G. W. Bromiley. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1953.
Locher	Gottfried W. Locher, **Die Zwinglishche Reformation im Rahmen der europäischen Kirchengeschichte.** Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979.
LW	**Luther's Works.** Edited by Jaroslav Pelikan and Helmut Lehmann. 55 vols. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1955ff.
MGL	J. P. Migne (ed.), **Patrologiae cursus completus,** series graeca. 161 vols. Paris: Migne, 1857-1866.
MPL	J. P. Migne (ed.), **Patrologiae cursus completus,** series latina. 221 vols. Paris: Migne, 1844-1855.
NPNF	**The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers.** Edited by Philip Schaff et al. First Series, 14 vols. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1956.
NPNF/2	**The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers.** Edited by Philip Schaff et al. Second Series, 14 vols. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1956.
OLD	**Oxford Latin Dictionary.** Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1968-1982.
Otto	A. Otto, **Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Romer.** Reprint: Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlags-buchhandlung, 1962.
Pauly	**Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertums-wissenschaft.** Stuttgart: J. B. Metzlersche, 1893ff.
Pelikan I	Jaroslav Pelikan, **The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition.** Vol. I of **The Christian Tradition.** Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1971.

Pelikan III	Jaroslav Pelikan, **The Growth of Medieval Theology.** Vol. 3 of **The Christian Tradition.** Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1978.
RGG^3	**Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart.** 7 vols. 3rd edition: Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1957.
Strickler	Joh. Strickler (ed.), **Actensammlung zur Schweizerischen Reformationsgeschichte in den Jahren 1521-1532.** Zurich: Meyer & Zeller, 1878.
Quasten	Johannes Quasten, **Patrology**, 3 vols. Utrecht: Spectrum, 1945-1960.
Quintilianus	**The Institutio Oratoria of Quintilian.** Translated by H. F. Butler, 4 vols. London: Weinemann Ltd., 1958ff.
TRE	**Theologische Realenzyklopädie.** Berlin: Walther de Gruyter, 1977ff.
WA	**D. Martin Luthers Werke.** Kritische Gesamtausgabe edited by J. K. F. Knaake, G. Kawerau, et al. Weimar: Böhlau, 1883--.
Wander	Carl Friedrich Wander, **Deutsches Sprichwörterlexikon.** 5 vols. Leipzig: E. A. Brockhaus, 1867-1880.
Wyss	**Die Chronik des Bernhard Wyss 1519-1530.** Edited by George Finsler. Basel: Basler Buch- und Antiquariatshandlung, 1901.
Z	**Huldreich Zwinglis Sämtliche Werke.** Edited by Emil Egli, et al. **Corpus Reformatorum**, vols. 88ff. Reprint: Zurich: Theologischer Verlag Zurich, 1983.

FOREWORD

This volume is an attempt to help overcome a lamentable gap in English language Reformation studies by making available in English for the first time several important Reformation, pastoral and eucharistic writings of Huldrych Zwingli on the occasion of the 500th anniversary of his birth.

This project and its antecedents have a long history. At the end of the nineteenth century a complete edition of the works of Zwingli in English was envisioned by the father of North American Zwingli studies, Professor Samuel Jackson of Union Theological Seminary, New York City. Under his direction a series of translations from the Latin was commissioned and many were carried out by the classical scholar, Henry Preble. Many of these were eventually published in the three volumes of Zwingli's **Works.** Two of these volumes were published after Professor Jackson's death. The materials for a fourth volume of the eucharistic writings of Zwingli lay in Preble's handwritten manuscripts in a metal box in an office in Union Seminary. In the 1960's they were in the office of Professor Robert Handy who told Professor Ford Lewis Battles of their existence.

In 1976 Professor Battles and now Professor Pipkin went to New York where they investigated the Preble materials. It was decided that the materials were valuable, but that they would in fact require substantial revising in order to bring them into alignment with both theological language and the English of the mid-twentieth century. With Professor Handy's permission they were taken, and Pipkin transcribed them into typescript. Copies of these transcripts now lie in Rüschlikon, at Princeton Theological Seminary and at Calvin Theological Seminary. Professor Handy told Professor Battles that it was hoped that the materials could one day be published and that the only restriction was that they be published by responsible scholars. Professor Battles contacted a team of scholars, including the editors of this two-volume set of Zwingli's writings, with the intention of publishing the Preble materials along with the other writings of Zwingli.

The lack of financial support and the press of other projects prohibited the successful conclusion of the plans. When the project was resurrected in 1979 it soon encountered a setback in the untimely death of Professor Battles. It was hoped by the present writers, that it would be possible to carry forth the project to conclusion and to do it in memory of Professor Battles. Fortunately, this has been made possible by the willingness of Dikran Y. Hadidian of Pickwick Publications and by the gracious support of the Emil Brunner-Stiftung of Zurich. The two editors, both former students of Professor Ford Lewis Battles, joined together in the project and are now pleased to be able to make available this selection of the works of Zwingli. We dedicate the two volumes to the memory of our erstwhile mentor, Professor F. L. Battles.

The two editors have worked independently but have made every effort to overcome the distance between them by frequent communication. Edward J. Furcha assumed responsibility for the translating and editing of the **Exposition** in Volume I and for **Divine and Human Righteousness** and the **Preaching Office** in Volume II. H. Wayne Pipkin translated and edited the **Shepherd** and the **Instruction** and carefully revised and edited the eucharistic writings initially translated by Mr. Preble. This latter process was carried out in as painstaking a fashion as possible so that the content of those treatises now reflect, in the editors' opinion, the reforming and theological perspective of Zwingli in a way that the Victorian English of the handwritten manuscripts could not. In addition, the editor of Volume II assumed the responsibility for editing the Preble treatises. Both editors were available to the other for consultation and each has read carefully the work of the other and has made appropriate suggestions.

It was our goal to present translations that were true to their original, but which, in the final analysis, were to be English language documents and not just German or Latin documents with English words. Such was the legacy of Professor Battles as translator and editor. The annotations are intended to provide necessary information for understanding the content of the treatises and we have sought, where possible, to make notice of the classical, patristic, and other sources of the writings. This has been particularly important for the Latin writings of Zwingli, for it is in these that Zwingli the humanist most clearly emerges. Whenever possible we have sought to insert references into the text itself and have done so consistently with scripture references and occasional references to other writings of Zwingli or Luther. We have sought to give reference to many technical expressions and classical allusions by citing standard reference works such as those of Otto, Wander, and the now completed **Oxford Latin Dictionary.** The latter source is often given in the annotations in order to alert the reader to possible classical sources of the person, expression or proverb cited. Whenever possible we have used standard,

printed editions. In a few cases, such as Erasmus' Latin Bible translation, published in Basel in 1522, no current edition exists. In these cases the editors have been grateful for the rich resources of the Zurich libraries, which often contain the first edition and, sometimes, the autograph.

It is to be noted that we have not merely taken over the annotations of the critical text, however helpful they have been. Every citation has been personally checked. In this way, we found it possible to correct minor errors and to make other allusions that were not possible at an earlier time. For the most part, however, it must be said that the critical text of the works of Zwingli is a model of historical and theological scholarship and we are grateful for it. Reformation scholars are indebted to several generations of Zwingli researchers who have produced these useful volumes.

In the citation of scripture references the verses have been inserted even though they were not so rendered by Zwingli. Where Zwingli did not cite a scriptural source himself, these have been inserted in brackets.

For the most part, space limitations have prohibited our making extensive bibliographical references. It is believed that the standard bibliographies by Finsler, Pipkin and Gäbler and the fruitful work of Locher make such citations unnecessary in a work of this kind.

Special appreciation is extended to Professor Fritz Büsser and the governing board of the Emil Brunner-Stiftung of Zurich for their grant which helps make possible the publication of this two-volume set.

H. Wayne Pipkin
Edward J. Furcha

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Acknowledgment of thanks and expression of appreciation to many people is necessary in a project of this size. I would like personally to thank my students for their understanding and support for me in the course of this project. Likewise I want to thank my colleagues at Baptist Theological Seminary, Rüschlikon, Switzerland for their understanding and their active support. Many persons have helped in various ways, large and small. Elizabeth Green Castellina made several timely interventions in numerous ways that insured the completion of the project. I am greatly indebted to my student and friend Christoph Weichert who has been available at all levels of involvement, from reading and criticizing the translations and seeking references, to the preparation of the indices. To my colleague Edward Furcha I am especially grateful for his patience and his expertise. Much that is good in the translations is due to the critique of these two. I am grateful as well to others who have contributed in smaller, but still important ways: Sonja Weichert, Lieven Schoorens, Gustav Eisenmann and Estella Blank. I want also to express my appreciation to Dikran Y. Hadidian and to Pickwick Publications for the willingness to take on this project in time for the quinquecentennial of the birth of Zwingli. Appreciation is also especially due to Professor Fritz Büsser and the board of the Emil Brunner-Stiftung, Zurich, whose financial support has helped make possible this publication. It is appropriate that some support for this project come out of Zurich in this year. I am thankful for collegial support as well.

I simply run the risk of being trite in trying to express my appreciation to my wife, Arlene, and to my daughters, Nancy and Heather. Only they can know how thankful I am and how important a role they have played in the completion of the project.

January 1, 1984

H. Wayne Pipkin
Rüschlikon, Switzerland

DIVINE AND HUMAN RIGHTEOUSNESS

Translated and edited by H. Wayne Pipkin

DIVINE AND HUMAN RIGHTEOUSNESS

Preface

Of Divine and Human Righteousness and How They Relate To One Another. A Sermon by Huldrych Zwingli preached on St. John the Baptist Day in the year 1523.

To Nicholaus of Wattenwyl, [1] Dean of the Cathedral at Bern, Switzerland, grace and peace from God, our Lord Jesus Christ.

Just as all Christians everywhere rejoice in the faith of the gospel of Jesus Christ which your fatherland, my dearest brother in Christ Jesus, the pious city of Bern, accepts and daily grows in, so I especially rejoice in your conversion from darkness to light. For there are many things which could have prevented you from it: your noble ancestry (for your own father has been ennobled with many and frequent offices and mayoral duties), [2] riches, your own virtue, gentleness of character, and graciousness toward everyone; but the most serious is [472] that all these are highly valued by many popes and bishops. All these things undoubtedly could have prevented you from coming to the free knowledge of the gospel of Christ had not God especially drawn you and all your people through you. Oh, how true the word of Christ is: no one comes to me unless my heavenly Father draw him [John 6:44]. He effects everything in people; him we ought to praise and thank to all eternity for your faith. Amen.

That I, dear brother, am so bold as to address you in an open letter, though I have had no particular friendship with you before this, comes simply from the one Christ who makes us brothers and members of one body. For as the heathen have it in a proverb, "The good join with the good unsolicited", so also a Christian has every right to seek the friendship of other Christians since they are of one God, one baptism, and one faith in Christ Jesus (Ephesians 4:5). Now though I preached on divine and human righteousness on St. John the Baptist Day [3] past, and have been asked since then by many honorable people to write

on that matter, yet did I not dare to dedicate this pamphlet to your good city, though I had the urge to do so; for I heard that it has been rumored among you that things are pretty bad with us here in Zurich--which is not the case at all. For a great deal of friendship and love grows daily among the believers; God be praised. And no one undertakes anything except it be at the bidding of the magistrates and on their decision.

But there are quite a few rebellious spirits who probably look to other teachings than the teaching of Christ; these we must tolerate until God himself chastizes them, so that the strength of his word may win more honorably. It must be resisted in order that its full force may come to the fore. Now, though I dared not dedicate such thoughts to your church, I nonetheless undertook to send them to you, an earnest, faithful servant of God, confident that they would not seem strange to you, but that you would receive this well--as it happened, of course. [473]

In this [work] you will see that the gospel of Christ is not over against the magistrate and that it does not cause dissension for the sake of temporal goods. Rather, it strengthens the magistrate [obergheit], teaches it what is right, and maintains it in harmony with the people, as long as it acts in a Christian manner, according to the measure set by God.

Read this [work], therefore, with the believers in your church and should you require my humble services, feel free to request and order them.

May God, who has led us into the wonderful light of his knowledge, confirm in us all that he has begun.

Extend my greeting to Thomas Wyttenbach, [4] to Henry Lupulus, [Wöflin] [5] both of whom have been my instructors; to Sebastian Maier, [6] Berchtold Haller, [7] teachers of your church and my associates in the gospel of Christ; and the honorable, firm, etc. gentlemen, your father and my lord, as well as J. Hans Rudolph Hetzel [8] of Lindach, firm protectors of Christian teaching. Greet also Valerian, [9] the city doctor and Leonard Trempen, [10] my relative [kämmet], [11] along with your entire congregation.

Written on the 30th day of July, 1523.

Signed

Huldrych Zwingli,
Your and all Christians' Servant

Although divine righteousness unfolds through God's word more in our generation than it has for several hundred years now, there are certain people who do not accept it as they ought: some others again, while undoubtedly heeding it, seek to accommodate it to their respective anxieties (suis affectibus). [12] Superiors see in it such beauty that no person may approach it. When, for example, God does not desire that one should swear either by him, or by heaven and earth, or by our own head [cf. Mt. 5:34-36], they see clearly that we cannot fulfill that commandment. They think, however, that at this point, one should move cautiously in the matter of disallowing oaths until it suits them. Allegedly there are some who will think that they are not obliged to keep an oath, though they have sworn perfectly legal and honest oaths, since according to Christ's word one should not swear any oath whatever, Mt. 5:34. On the other hand, there are a few in the community who, when they hear that Christ has bid us part with the coat when someone takes away our jacket [cf. Mt. 5:40], wish to apply this only to their taking. They do not think at all that such a commandment touches them as much as it does other Christians and that they, too, should rather leave their jacket and coat than fight for them, not to say, take from another what is his. I considered it imperative, therefore, to publish the following [475] sermon which I gave on divine and human righteousness on St. John the Baptist Day so that those who have much more leisure than I do at the moment may pursue the matter in greater depth.

In order that it might become apparent how divine righteousness and our miserable human righteousness relate to one another, I shall first of all speak of divine righteousness.

God is not righteous simply because he gives to everyone his own, as people have tended to define righteousness. For should we measure him by this yardstick we might conclude that we are something apart from him. What, after all, is ours? Nothing. Everything we have and are is his. And he is not obligated to (darff) give us what is ours; for nothing is ours; whatever he gives is all his. But he is righteous in a different manner, or else he would not give anything to anyone; for he does not owe anything to anyone. He is righteous in that he is the wholesome font of all innocence, goodness, righteousness and of everything good; for he is himself essentially righteousness, goodness and every good itself, so that nothing is godly, righteous or good except what comes from him. Just as he is not merely truthful, but truth

itself, John 14:6, so also is he not merely righteous, but wholesome righteousness itself which is so pure and essentially undefiled that in it there is no mingling with any kind of uncleanness or temptation. For whatever is mingled cannot be eternal. But God is the eternal good; therefore, he who is righteousness must be unmingled and freed from any temptation and selfish desire.

We see this pure, undefiled, unalloyed righteousness of God in his own word. For just as an evil person brings forth evil out of the evil treasure of his heart, Luke 6:45, so God, who alone is good, Mark 10:18, brings forth nothing but good out of his heart. In this pouring forth of righteousness and goodness we may recognize the original font; for one knows the tree by its fruit [Luke 6:44]. Similarly, one knows God's righteousness by his words. Now since his words are, as David says in Psalm 11 [Ps. 12:6], "The words or sayings of the Lord are pure; they are like silver refined and cleaned of all dirt, indeed, seven [476] times purified, thus well cleansed of all dirt," it must needs follow that nothing may be found in them which resembles earthly temptations. From this it becomes readily apparent that divine righteousness is as far above human righteousness, as far as God is above humankind. It follows then that we cannot come up to his righteousness; in other words, we may not attain to the measure of his beauty, innocence and purity.

Nonetheless, God demands that we be like him if we desire to dwell with him. For just as a householder does not tolerate any servant in his employ who is not like him in his habits, so God tolerates even less anyone in his kingdom who is not formed in accordance with his beauty and innocence and who is not as pure as when he created the first being. Christ illustrates this for us in the person who was invited to the marriage feast, Mt. 22:11-13; since he did not wear a wedding garment he was, therefore, thrown out. And yet, the lord who had bid people to be invited to the wedding ordered that the poor, sick, blind and lame be called in, Luke 14:21. They had to be clean, however, in the manner in which he demands it. For God is an eternally consuming fire with whom no one can dwell who has something clinging to him which the fire cannot tame or which resists it; rather, whatever seeks to dwell with him must be holy and godly, pure and undefiled, just as he is. Isaiah points to this in chapter 33 [14-17], "Who among you is able to dwell with the consuming fire or who among you is able to dwell in eternal heat?" Answer: "Whoever walks in righteousness or who is righteous; whoever speaks the truth; whoever disdains greed which harms the community and who keeps his hands off any gifts and bribes; whoever closes his eyes in order not to see evil. Such a one shall dwell in the heights; his elevation shall surpass the fortified rocks; he shall receive food [477] or bread; his waterstreams are pure and clear; they shall see the king in his splendor and their eyes shall see land from afar off."

Isaiah seeks to show by these words how those have to be who desire to dwell with God. And the sum thereof is that they must be innocent in every way. David speaks in like manner in Psalm 14 [Ps. 15:1ff.], "Lord, who shall dwell in your tent or dwelling place or who shall rest on your holy mountain?" Answer: "Whoever walks without pretense and does what is right," etc. Now David speaks almost like Isaiah, though he comes before him; thus we can see by this that all of it derives from the same spirit.

Christ has summed it all up in a few words in Mt. 5:8, "Blessed are those who are pure in heart, for they shall see God." But what is a pure heart or which of them is pure? On earth there is none; for what is there that is not selfish, impressed by itself or in some way tainted--something that God cannot tolerate at all. I will discuss this a little later.

In the same breath we must point here to the gospel. We heard expressly that no one may come to God unless he is pious, pure, righteous and innocent, as God requires. For he says in Leviticus 20:7, "Be godly, [14] pure or righteous; for I am pure." Just as if he were saying, "I am righteous, pure, godly; therefore, if you wish to be of me, you must be like me" (understand "pure" not as "to do honest works," but as "clean"). All humans are bound to fall short of this righteousness; for who is so holy that his heart is without temptation and desire? Thus no one is able to dwell with God; for whoever desires to dwell with him must be spotless. God saw this our misery and impotence and took pity, finding means by which his righteousness might be appeased on our behalf so that we might dwell with him; he therefore allowed his son to become human through the pure handmaiden Mary, conceived without any sin through the Holy Spirit, so that his heart which was without any sinful temptation--since it was not conceived in sin as we are--Psalm 50 [Ps. 51:7] [478] might be altogether pure.

Now since he who was innocent suffered death for us guilty sinners, he paid off for us the beautiful righteousness of God, which otherwise no human being is able to satisfy; thus he earned for us the right to come to God by virtue of his free grace and gift. Whoever hears this and believes it without doubt shall be saved. That is the gospel.

Yet that which God demands still remains, namely, that we are duty bound at all times to live as pure, clean, unspotted and right as God wants it. For Christ says, Mt. 5:48, "You must be perfect as your heavenly father is perfect." Yet in deed we are never thus; for it is impossible, as long as we live, to be that pure. Therefore we must at all times come to God through the one, righteous, innocent Jesus Christ; for he alone is the advocate

and recompense for our sin unto eternity, 1 John 2:1ff. This, in brief, is the relationship of the gospel to our guilt and impotence. If you desire to see the foundation of Scripture at greater length, please read the first few "Conclusions" and their expositions which we recently published [summer of 1523].

That God demands such great innocence from us--innocence which is untainted by any temptations and desires--we learn from his very own word. At the same time, though, he has given salvation and grace through Jesus Christ. However, this was given us for our salvation. Not on account of our merit, but because of the sheer grace of God. So that after we learn of our powerlessness and despair in ourselves--for we should never be able to attain to divine righteousness--we should nonethless find our salvation in Christ Jesus. Whereby, though we are always rejected, God's grace and mercy become great and dear to us. Always look to the same, o believer, and allow nothing to push you away from it. It is sure; of that the son of God is a pledge. And though you should despair because of what God demands of you, because you are unable to attain to it, [479] you, nonetheless, do not despair in the one who has carried all our labor and infirmity and has paid for and reconciled us. Rather, you learn through the word of the divine will what a great treasure God is. For the goodness which he prescribes for us, he is in himself and he conducts himself as he bids us do; for he is not at all like the tyrants who devise superb laws which they themselves never keep. For this reason Christ reprimands the Pharisees and scribes of the Jews, Luke 11:46. And you must unceasingly strive that you might be ever more fully conformed to the divine will to grow unto perfect manhood according to the measure of Christ, Eph. 4:13. Do not ever think of yourself as having done enough, but placing all your confidence in God, ascribe that which you might have accomplished not to yourself but to God. You will further recognize that your work is nothing and has no value before God and that everything that God shows toward you happens not on account of your merit but because it is a free gift from him.

Here then follows a word on divine righteousness which alone may be properly called righteousness.

Divine righteousness is as pure and beautiful in itself as it challenges us to be.

1. It bids us forgive, just as we desire God to forgive us [Mt. 6:14]; and it achieves this so richly that it does not forgive as it desires to be forgiven; for there is nothing that has to be forgiven it; rather, if we but require its grace it forgives beyond all measure and without any merit on our part. Yes, even though we should be in disfavor and worthy of his righteous wrath, he forgives us, Rom. 5:6-11. Christ died for us while we were yet sinners.

2. God bids us not only not to kill, but even not to become angry, Mt. 5:22. He, too, does not get angry; and wherever anger is attributed to him in Scripture it is none other but deserved wrath.

3. God bids us not to engage in lawsuits and quarrels. Rather, if the coat should be taken from us, we are asked to leave the overcoat as well, Mt. 5:40, Luke 6:29, which he did. [480] He allowed his enemies to take him to court without demanding any justice and to kill him, as the prophet prophesied, Is. 53:7: "He was led to his death like a sheep and did not open his mouth." And Is. 42:1, "He shall not cry and wrangle." Mt. 12:49.

4. Not only does God bid us not to commit adultery, but that we should not even desire a married person, Mt. 5:28. He keeps that; for he is without any temptation whatever. Indeed, the humanity of Jesus is without any sinful temptation. And he bids us leave father and mother rather than our marriage partner and not to break asunder what God has joined together, Gen. 2:24, Mt. 19:5ff.

5. God forbids any swearing and bids us be so dependable that our yes is yes and our no, no, without any oath at all, Mt. 5:37. He, too, is like that; for heaven and earth shall sooner pass away than that any of his words remain unfulfilled [Mt. 24:35]. We experience that daily.

6. God bids us give away our possessions to those of whom we can expect nothing in return and who shall not recompense us. Luke 6:35. He himself does the same; for not only does he feed humans but also the birds of the air, Mt. 6:26, without any compensation.

7. God bids us do good not only to friends and blameless persons, but also to enemies, Mt. 5:44, "I say unto you, you ought to love your enemies, do good to those who hate you and pray for those who persecute and derile you." He himself does so also. He causes his sun to shine on the just and unjust and the rain to fall on the pious and impious, Mt. 5:45. He provides fruit and food to unbelievers and enemies as much as to believers.

8. Not only does God bid us not to steal, but also that we not desire the goods of another person, Ex. 20:15, 17. He himself does the same. It is so far from him to demand something of us or to desire what he wills to our detriment that we may demand everything of him, for he will provide for us and restore all our necessities.

9. Not only does God will that we refrain from speaking evil or slanderously, but also that we speak no unnecessary word

even, Mt. 12:36, "I say to you [481] that for every unnecessary word which people speak, they will have to give account." He does so, too. There is nothing false, deceitful or vain to be found in his mouth, 1 Pet. 2. He taught, not in useless, vain words, as the scribes and Pharisees did, but in power, so that his words were strong and remained in the hearts of his hearers, Mt. 7:29.

10. God is not content when we do no harm to the neighbor or come to his aid only after we have secured our own position. Rather, he wills that we love the neighbor as much as ourselves, Mt. 22:39. He himself acted toward him in that manner. He gave himself for us and has taken us unto himself as his friends, kinsfolk and heirs. Jn. 15:13; Mt. 23:8; Gal. 4:5.

Much more might be said about the things that God demands of us in his word and by the example of his deeds, such as, that we should for the sake of his word suffer death and derision on behalf of every brother in Christ. All other commandments are contained in the above-mentioned. The commandments of God are not just counsels, as the Papists maintain, but actual ordinances of God [precepts] which he demands of us, not allowing us to come to him unless we are so innocent, pure and good as is demanded by his will. And this, his will, is not known to us other than in his commandment. And his commandment is nothing other than an unveiling of his own will. Be mindful always of the gospel in all these commandments of God which is nothing other than (after we despair because we are incapable of doing what God demands of us), that God has given us his son as a perfecter of his will, who was able to keep all his commandments and who paid for all our sin and has become the great pledge on whose account we may come to God. This consolation saves us from despairing in God; for God bids us not to become subject to desires and temptations, which is impossible for us. Thus [482] we are equally incapable of coming to God.

For, in short, he demands such purity and innocence of us. But the fact that Christ compensates for our infirmities and becomes our patron causes us not to despair in God but to see how all our salvation depends on his mercy; we learn from his words what a beautiful God he is--how pure, just and righteous. And however much we labor to measure up to his word and to fulfill it, we always discover our impotence. Still, it ought to be the greatest joy of believers to train themselves in keeping with the word and demands of God, though they shall never be able to reach the measure that is worthy of God. Yet this joy seeks always to please its treasure, comfort and confidence.

That the above-mentioned and similar matters are commandments and not simply advice, is borne out by Christ's own word who calls them commandments in Mt. 5:19, "Whoever does

not keep the least of these my commandments," etc. Note that there he refers to the commandments which follow immediately; these he calls commandments. Furthermore, he bids the disciples teach people to keep all that he commanded, Mt. 28:20. Further, all above-mentioned commandments are contained in the two foremost commandments [Mt. 22:37-39], "You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, soul and mind and strength and your neighbor as yourself." That we ought not speak any unnecessary, vain word we discover in the first; for inasmuch as we love God above all things and with all our strength, we are incapable of any vanity. Yes, if we were to keep that one commandment (which they have to concede is a commandment, since Christ prescribed it in Mt. 22:37-39), we should never act against God; for no creature should ever be able to enter our heart when we love God in our heart with all our strength. For then nothing ever is credited to a creature; or else, not all our strength is directed to loving God; which, of course, is truly our predicament. Therefore we are never fully without sin.

For the other, the commandment that we should never swear [Mt. 5:34], is contained in the second commandment. If everyone were to keep the same, and love his neighbor as himself, one would need [483] no oaths. Just as no one likes to be cheated by another, so he himself would not cheat anyone and there would be only yes, yes and no, no. Thus all other commandments are contained in these two, as anyone who looks at them may readily determine. For Christ does not lie when he says, Mt. 22:40, "On these two laws hang all the law and the prophets." And finally, the words of Christ have not been spoken casually in the above-mentioned commandments; rather, they bid and command.

I hope it is apparent then that anyone who seeks to come to God through works errs; for he may see from the outset by the very first commandment that he cannot keep it.

Thus God commands what is appropriate to his righteousness; but we are incapable of keeping his commandments. Yet no one can aid us in this our impotence except God alone. He has done it through his son Christ Jesus.

Now since there are still many godless people who not only are afflicted by the common imperfection of not loving God above all else, but who also do not believe that there is a God who punishes and requites everything that is good and evil [just and unjust]. As a result, they fall into horrendous vices. If he were not there ahead of their evil designs, they would destroy everyone with their evil and impiety. Since they do not fear God--for they do not believe that there is a God--they would take from everyone what belongs to him and if he should be displeased, they would simply kill him. God foresaw that and provided laws

by which a godless person might be inhibited and subdued. Though he does not care much for God, he must, nonetheless, leave people in peace and cannot intimidate anyone. Here poor, weak human righteousness becomes apparent. Laws have been given for the sake of wicked people, as Paul says in 1 Tim. 1:9-11, "The law has not been given for the righteous but for those who lead evil lives, are disobedient, godless, sinners, impious, profane, those who commit patricide and matricide, [484] murderers, the uncouth, sodomites, kidnappers, liars, perjurers and those who have other vices" which are set over against righteous teaching, which according to the gospel is oriented to the honor of the holy God. You may readily see by this riffraff that God gave numerous laws on account of wicked and godless people. From this it follows that though a person may not be involved in one of these vulgar vices he is yet not righteous; for these are merely laws against the worst of evils. And anyone who keeps these is, therefore, not yet righteous before God; but he manages to escape punishment. As Paul says in Gal. 3:12, "Whoever does the things which the law bids him do, shall live by them." In other words, whoever does what the law commands or who abstains from the things which the law forbids, lives his life so that he is not judged or punished by the content of the law, Deut. 4:40.

Therefore we distinguish two types of law, just as there are two types of righteousness, divine and human.

One type of law looks only to the inward person, such as how one is to love God and neighbor. These laws no one is able to fulfill. Just as there is no one who is righteous except for the one God and the one who by grace, of which Christ is the guarantor, is made righteous through faith.

The other type of laws looks only to the outward person. On their account someone might be outwardly good and righteous while inwardly, nonetheless, impious and condemned in God's sight. Take an example: "You shall not steal" [Ex. 20:15] addresses itself to the outward life and goodness. "You shall not covet another's property" [cf. Ex. 20:17; Rom. 7:7] is directed to the inward divine righteousness. Yet both refer to one thing alone: thievery. Now if a person does not steal he is considered good in human eyes (understood here are all those vices publicly condemned by people), but in God's sight he is unjust. He may well have a greater desire and temptation for other peoples' possessions than one who has actually stolen. Yet a thief is hanged because he is an exposed thief. [485] But this knave [gotsschelm], who is actually greedier for temporal goods, is reputed to be righteous, simply because he did not follow through in deed; yet in God's sight he is not righteous. Therefore, the saying is a good one, provided it is used correctly, which states that one is a known knave [schelm]. It seeks to show that in God's sight we are all knaves.

Although a person may not desire temporal goods in his heart, he may instead desire the marriage partner of another or have other temptations. For this reason he is a knave in God's sight, though he be considered righteous in human eyes. His heart is too deep for people to look into. But God alone knows the hearts, while people judge by outward deed only. Known knaves are those only who are profane and ungodly so that their inner temptations break forth and they are recognized by people because of their fruits [cf. Mt. 7:16].

Thus one may discern the boundaries between divine and human righteousness.

Measured by divine righteousness we are all knaves. Since our iniquity is known to God alone, the one God also judges the one or grants the other to us through his grace, if we believe knowingly that he died and made payment for us out of his compassion.

Measured by human righteousness we are often found to be righteous, though we are truly knaves in God's sight. But one who is found by human righteousness to be not only a knave in God's sight but a known sinner is turned over to the one who judges transgressors, namely the magistrate or judge.

Note that I call this human righteousness a poor and feeble righteousness, simply because a person may be found to be righteous in human eyes when he is, nonetheless, not righteous in God's sight; for no one is righteous before God. Note, too, in the same vein, what sort of a righteousness it is which struts its stuff before [486] people with cassocks, signs, vestments, and you will find that it is nothing other than sheer hypocrisy. It is impossible that any person be found who is inwardly good, pure and clean, according to divine righteousness. And since such a one passes himself off as good in outward appearance despite his impotence, impurity and weakness, it becomes an even greater knavery before God. Therefore Christ rightly says, "They have their reward" [Mt. 6:5]. For people judge by what they see and assess others by appearances [1 Sam. 16:7]. Thus when they appear to be good, they are taken to be good and they receive what they work for, right here and now. But there are some who fail to detect the pretense; these are to be pitied in that they fail to recognize universal infirmity. For it does not help when one says, "We wear cassocks that we might atone for our sins." The reason is, if you were really penitent, you would not seek to feign repentance before human eyes. Therefore, in short, anything is hypocrisy which seeks to appear beautiful in human eyes. It does not fit with poor, human righteousness, for it is deception and sin.

When compared to the divine, human righteousness is not worthy to be called righteousness; nonetheless, God instituted it on account of our disobedience, and commanded us to follow it. For example, a person who commends his son to the teacher says, "Teach him this and that; beat the fellow and do not spare the rod." The father does not mean by this that his son should be beaten because he learns well. Rather, the father knows well the boy's disposition and that he does not learn willingly unless he is beaten. In like manner, the heavenly father assumes that we have no desire for alien things and that all our desire is for him; yet he knows well that we cannot attain to this goodness and righteousness. Whereupon he gives ordinances which are useful to us and serve well to enable us to live happily and well with one another. And he says, "You shall not steal; you shall not commit adultery; you shall not [487] lie, kill, nor utter false witness," etc. [Ex. 20:13-16]. All of these commandments we should not need at all if we would only keep that other commandment, "You shall love your neighbor as yourself" [Mt. 22:39]. But since we do not keep that, God had to issue all these other commandments. And that in itself was not enough; he had to recommend, in addition, that the transgressor be punished. A thief is to make amends by giving back fivefold or fourfold, the adulterer is to be stoned, etc. And this has been recommended to the teacher who is the magistrate. To what extent the magistrate is to punish or establish ordinances, we shall discuss later.

At this point let us set the ten enumerated arguments over against human righteousness and see how they relate to one another and how God has commanded human righteousness as well--though only after it was found that we could not keep the former.

1 & 3. God bids us forgive unconditionally or else he, too, will not forgive us. But though we do not want to do so at all, a private person is still not entitled to seek vindication. Such would only lead to unrest and discord and destroy all human peace and community. Therefore he instituted superiors and judges to arbitrate and settle dissension by giving to each his due, Ex. 18:21f. "Go and look for wise and godfearing men from among the people who are truthful and who are strangers to greed (prick up your ears, you judge and superior), and divide them into thousands, hundreds, fifties and tens who pass judgement on the people at all times and who deal solely with minor conflicts." You see from this that God ordained judgement because many refused to forgive as they desired to be forgiven. So that human interaction might not turn into bloodshed, authorities were not to permit private individuals to take revenge in any way outside the law. Rather, they were to ensure that all disagreements be carried out within the law. [488] For if this poor righteousness should also escape us, as divine righteousness has, human society would be little

better than the existence of dumb animals: the stronger would be right. Therefore judges and superiors are servants of God. They are the teachers. Any person, whether spiritual or carnal, who does not obey their justice, acts against God, as I shall show below. And though such a person may live blamelessly, he is not righteous in God's sight, though he does escape death or punishment.

2. God commands not only that we do not kill, but also that we not be angry [Mt. 5:21-24]. If we avoided anger, there would be no killing afterwards. But since we transgress God's righteousness in that matter, God has to command that we do not kill. So that we do not deviate from that commandment either, the teacher has to revenge death for death, life for life, eye for eye, burning for burning, wound for wound, blow for blow. Though a person may live in such a way as not to transgress in this matter, his is nonetheless not righteous, but simply escapes the punishment of the authorities. This is what is called to live within the law [Gal. 3:10].

4. God bids us not to covet the marriage partner of another person. Since we do not keep this (for we are certainly not without that temptation), he bids us not to commit adultery. Though we may actually not commit adultery in deed, but do so in our desiring, we are clearly righteous in human eyes--yet adulterers in God's eyes. So that we do not fall into this evil deed and become like animals, he commends us to the teacher; the same is to stone us, Lev. 20:10. We Christians have actually allowed this punishment to go by the boards, either because adultery was initially so rare that there was seldom an offense, or else because the superiors are adulterers and do not punish as severely as they ought the vices in which they themselves are involved. Since we now notice adultery to be quite common and shameless, we ought to intensify justly the punishment once again [489] in order that we might not be deprived of poor righteousness. For just as stealing is punished more harshly than God has commanded, Ex. 22:1-12, simply because thieves undoubtedly did not abstain because of the punishment, so one should reintroduce and intensify once again the punishment for adultery.

5. God bids us speak and act so truthfully that we need not say more than "yes" and "no". If we fail to do so and deceive one another instead, he bids us enforce it with an oath, Ex. 22:11. If we should break that, the school master is there with the rod and has us stoned like the two false witnesses who undertook to commit Suzanna unto death. Cf. the account of Daniel and Suzanna in the apocrypal editions to the Book of Daniel, chapter 1. For perjury is denial of God and God punishes idolatry through stoning, Deut. 17[5].

6. God bids us give our possessions to the needy without

compensation. If we should ever fail to do that, he bids us lend out money without profit, Ex. 22:25, Lev. 25:36. And if we should fail to do that, there is the teacher who teaches us how to give and take with gain.

And though the penalty for profit-taking is not clearly stated, it is, however, left to the judges who were established so that they might settle the resulting abuses and quarrels, Ex. 18:25-27. Now one who does not practice usury is considered good in human eyes because of it, for the authorities cannot get at him on account of usury. In God's sight, however, he is still not good unless he sells all he has and gives it to the poor, Lk. 12:33. If no one does that, then there is no one who is good according to divine righteousness. May we assume then that you know yourself a sinner?

7. God bids us do good to our enemies. If we fail to do so, he bids us, nonetheless, not ever to harm him and to avert any harm from him which he might not even be aware of, Ex. 23:4f. When you come across a stray [490] cow or donkey which belongs to your enemy, you are to lead it back on to the path. And should you see the donkey of one who hates you or who is your enemy weighted down by its load, you are not to pass by, but help it up again. If you neglect that, the teacher is to punish you, for you have transgressed the simplest law of God which demands that we protect what we can almost not save lest it be all destroyed. Though you might never transgress this law at all, you are still not righteous in God's sight unless you forgive your enemy in the manner in which you want God to forgive you.

8. God bids us not to covet the possessions of another. If we kept this law there would be neither robbery nor theft. Since this is not so, God gives the simplest commandment which a human society and community can tolerate: you shall not steal. We see from this commandment (just as we do from "You shall not desire another's marriage partner" and alongside that, "You shall not commit adultery," the latter of which is also the most basic), that God has given certain laws which, though we keep them, still do not make us righteous. They merely help us escape punishment. He has given them so that human friendship and community may not disintegrate. Thus, one who takes another's property secretly or by force is either a thief or a robber. Such a one the teacher or custodian has to punish with the rod. It is true that since God gives us the earth and all its fruits freely without our having to pay for them, they should remain free. Indeed, if we do not observe this we are forever indebted to God and in his bad books for having made our own what belongs to God. Yet God knows that we do not keep such law, but that we are selfish ever since Adam, with everyone appropriating things for himself. He bridles our greed and commands us not to rob or

steal so that human society be not destroyed because of our greed. One who stays clear of theft is therefore not righteous, unless, of course, he does not even desire another's property. You note here that those [491] who give a needy person nothing for his own goods when they have actually taken his capital and who take refuge in the teaching of God are nothing but thieves and scoundrels. Indeed a wealthy person owes it to the poor to give him his own; God bids him do that. But he does not bid you take it away from him when he does not give it willingly. To assure that no harm befalls anyone, he does bid the authorities to punish you, should you try something like that. Therefore, file and authority tolerates Jews or other usurers; you are a thief or robber if you undertake by theft or by force to collect interest or profit from one whose capital you have taken from him through careful design; so God has forbidden such arbitary taking of goods.

We shall discuss later how earnestly the magistrate must see to it that practices are removed which harmonize neither with God's nor with this poor righteousness--which God has instituted merely to make living easier. Anyone who engages in one of these practices sins in a twofold manner: firstly, because of a common human affliction they desire another's goods; secondly, they commit evil deeds on its account, giving rise to unrest and disrespect of the God-ordained authority. For we poor, righteous people must cling firmly to the thread of righteousness or else life would be sheer murder, robbery, and thieving.

9. God wills that we do not utter a single vain word [Mt. 12:36ff.]. Thus a person is not righteous, though he may not swear, speak evil or lie, as long as he speaks vainly. Yet poor human righteousness is satisfied as long as one does not curse, speak evil or lie. But if one should transgress after all and should have spoken, offended, lied or perjured himself, God commands the false person and liar to be treated as he would have had it done to one against whom he lied or perjured himself, Deut. 19:19.

If our speech were yes, yes and no, no, God would not have needed this commandment. It follows then that God [492] has given certain commandments, which, though we must keep them, still do not make us good and righteous. Look how miserable it is with those who say, I am a good person. They determine their goodness from the fact alone that they do not transgress in things which the authorities punish. Note further that all human knowledge is actually not able to discern who is a good person; for faith, which alone makes good and which alone is capable of knowing both infirmities and salvation, is known only to God. Nonetheless, we must maintain the poor, lowly righteousness, too.

10. That we do not keep the singular commandment,

"You shall love your neighbor as much as yourself" [Lev. 19:18; Mk. 12:31; Gal. 5:14], is the reason for all other commandments concerning the neighbor. This is the law of nature, except that Christ has sweetened it with love which is appropriate to him, since he is love, 1 John 4[16]. The law of nature is: What you do not want done to you, do not do to anyone else. This law Christ sweetens with love. For if we love God, God is in us. And if God is in us, the love of neighbor is in us, too, for God so loved us that he gave himself for us--and where God is, this disposition is present, too. Therefore Christ adorns the law of nature with these words, "You shall love your neighbor as yourself." Everyone fails in this; we all know that well. And human righteousness is deficient in this in every way, for it has taken on self-concern so much that it cannot bring anyone into community; it was destroyed in Paradise. Therefore no one is punished who is unable to keep this commandment, though all people are guilty; and while some deeds which transgress from this law are penalized, the entire commandment is not enforced. From this one may conclude that it is with human righteousness very much as it is with the defiled cloth of a menstruating woman, Is. 64:6. And though we may appear good in the sight of the world, we are, nonetheless, knaves in God's sight, and in need of oversight by the authorities. Just [493] as a father takes care that his beguiled daughter does not become altogether common, so, in God's place, do the authorities take care that our life does not altogether turn to beastly irrationality.

We have perceived by now, I hope, how carefully divine righteousness must be distinguished from human righteousness. Though human righteousness is also commanded by God, it is not the perfection which God demands. It has been commanded merely on account of our broken nature, when God saw that our temptations and desires were unable to keep up with and follow his will. Therefore it is no more than a corrective; and although we may keep it, we shall not be saved thereby or become pleasing to God. Ex. 20:25. "I have given them laws which are not good and ordinances by which they do not live," i.e. by which they cannot be saved. Though these words must be understood primarily with reference to ceremonies, the term "statutes" indicates nonetheless that it ought to be understood in relation to human righteousness and the magistrate, too. The difference between what is written here, namely that we shall not live within those statutes, and Gal. 3:12, "Those who keep the commandments of the law shall live," is this: though we adhere to human righteousness, we shall not thereby achieve eternal salvation, which to Ezekiel means "not to live". Paul, however, means that if we keep the statutes which are given on account of human infirmity, we shall save the physical life, meaning the authorities shall not kill us. Deut. 4:40: if we do not kill we shall not be killed either.

How one is to conduct oneself within divine and human righteousness.

Divine righteousness ought to be revealed and preached unceasingly to all people and one should rather risk life and limb than allow anyone to frighten us off such preaching and proclamation, as Christ has often commanded. In Mt. 6:33 he says, "Seek above all else the kingdom of God and its righteousness, and all necessities will be added unto you." We hear there that everyone is bid to seek divine righteousness which means unceasingly, in keeping with his will, to strive after innocence [494] until we reach the measure of Christ, Eph. 4:13, and that we should never be satisfied with being considered good according to human righteousness. Now it must be kept in mind at all times that our diligence in matters of divine righteousness is not sufficient. However our impotence is richly compensated by the one Christ. The word of God in which his righteousness appears is a light which illumines every person. Therefore the light must never be hidden under a bushel, just as no one hides physical light, but rather kindles it in order to see by it and to get on with one's work. In like manner the pure word of God is to be proclaimed unceasingly; for in it one learns what God demands of us and with what grace he comes to our aid. And nothing contained therein ought to be kept hidden; for it is different in nature from human wisdom or words which show themselves other than they really are. This word of God points up clearly what God wants of us. It explains at the same time how God is in himself, which delights us above all else. According to the word of David in Psalm 18 [19:9], "the decrees of the Lord are right and delight the heart. The commandment of God is clear and enlightens the eyes." For this reason it must be revealed. It seeks to shine and teach, so one need not walk in darkness. It contains nothing within it which ought not be revealed; rather, as God is a common good, so too does his word work toward the good of the common human race. Therefore they are not true believers who think that one ought not continue preaching the word of God beyond what human righteousness or authorities permit. For if it were so, all divine righteousness would fade away and everyone would be content with limp human righteousness. All righteousness would turn out to be nothing but pretense, for everyone would inwardly disregard God and be intent only on how to behave before people and avoid punishment--as we were unfortunately able to witness with several people some time ago. For this reason then, as Christ said in Matthew 10 and Luke 8, the proclaimer of God's word ought to keep nothing back; for from his hands or from the hands of those whose silence has caused the little sheep [495] to go astray, their blood will be demanded, Ezekiel 5:5-17.

And again Christ says, Lk. 9:26, "Whoever is ashamed

of me, my teaching or my words, of him will the Son of Man be ashamed when he comes in his honor and power and in that of the Father and the holy angels."

Therefore all messengers of God ought to preach in the open what has been told them in secret, and from the housetops, what has been spoken into their ears, Lk. 12:3. For the word of God will always want to be manifested. For just as snow and rain fall from heaven and moisten the ground to make it green, so also does the word of God work, Is. 55:10f. It does not remain ineffective. Therefore let no authority dare oppose the word of God, though it thereby becomes apparent how poor and miserable its own righteousness is. They are human and have the infirmity of human impotence in common with everyone. Therefore they, too, must hear what God demands of them and all people, so that no one might be condemned by God by limiting himself to human righteousness. For, in short, we are obliged to keep the commandments, of which we have demonstrated a portion. For they are not counsels but commandments. One may glean that from the word of Christ in Mt. 5:17 when he says, "You must not think that I have come to destroy the law, but to fulfill it." The meaning of that word is this: I have not come to take away the law which is nothing other than a manifestation of the divine will, so that no one should have to concern himself diligently with God's will any longer. Rather, I have come that I might manifest what has hitherto not been manifest in the law. You have heard it stated in the law that one should not covet or steal another's possession. The one then who does not covet the possessions of another has achieved a great deal of innocence with regard to temporal goods. However, as long as he has temporal goods, it is not sufficient for him merely not to desire another's goods. He must distribute his own possessions to the poor. Lk. 12:33. "Sell what you have and give it as alms." Note how the perfection which God demands shows itself even more clearly at this point. In addition, in order that no one suffer want in this world, [496] Christ has fulfilled the law, that he might fulfill the will of the father in heaven for us who are impotent. No one who has been conceived in sin can satisfy him, for such a person is unable to achieve the measure of divine righteousness. Christ, however, who cannot be accused of or charged with any sin or infirmity, alone is able to meet the requirement which God demands. Therefore he fulfilled the law, in part to say to us clearly what God expected us to keep, that by it we might discover our own helplessness. Besides that, he gave himself in our stead and fulfilled the law which we ourselves could not keep--for we are capable of nothing. He thereby satisfied and fulfilled divine righteousness. But one discovers here that what Christ has fulfilled is law and commandment, as is everything God demands of us. Ceremonies do nothing whatever either for divine or human righteousness. Therefore they have been set aside, as Christ indicates in Luke

16:16, "Therefore do not concern yourself with them." But if you wish to get to the bottom of the matter, you should read the argument in my "Conclusions". Thus the law has been renewed and set aside through Christ. Renewed, in that Christ has stated and commanded more clearly than ever before what God demands of us. Set aside, in that no one can ever condemn us for transgressing the law if we believe knowingly that Christ has fulfilled it and that he has paid our access to God as a warranty for all eternity. This merciful deed of his makes us new beings and consecrates us to God in that we discern our impotence and his grace and henceforth are never again satisfied with ourselves and always do what God demands of us. Further, we shall never fully be able to know and praise God's mercy which he so graciously unfolds toward us. All this serves to the end that a person might learn to preach divine righteousness and mercy diligently without regard to persons, though he might be concerned that his impotence become apparent. For thus one must ever be mindful of what God demands of him [Micah 6:8]. A believer will always fail in his works, yet cling to God without doubt, thus remaining whole and upright. [497]

Again one must recognize that divine righteousness and mercy must be taught unceasingly by the fact that God condemns us if we fail to do so, for Christ says in Mt. 25:41-45, "those who have failed to feed him, give him drink, shelter, clothe, visit and comfort him in sickness and imprisonment in the persons of the poor, shall be consigned unto eternal fire." All these things, of course, are not commanded by human righteousness, for no magistrate forces anyone to give alms, shelter, clothing and such like. Yet if we fail to do these things we shall be consigned to eternal pain along with the goats. Much more so shall the one be counted among the damned who was entrusted to proclaim this but failed to do so.

Thus enough has been said and demonstrated concerning divine righteousness, that one is duty bound to teach the same on penalty of condemnation. No magistrate who seeks to be Christian is able to forbid such. For it is not good enough for believers to follow human righteousness alone, which they know to be an imperfect thing. Rather, they specifically delight, the longer the more, in patterning themselves after divine righteousness. Though they know themselves incapable of fulfilling it, and that God does not work disparately within us, the desire is nonetheless greater in one than in another, after God has kindled his fire in our hearts. For he effects all things within us, 1 Cor. 12:6.

One must also be subject to and obedient to human righteousness according to God's commandment, though it is a poor righteousness and does no more than protect us from the gravest evils. A person is not righteous in God's sight, even when he does

nothing against it, but when he acts against it he sins against God and humankind. Human righteousness or authority is no more than orderly authority which we call temporal power; for so-called spiritual authority has no basis in Scripture for its rule. For spiritual superiors are not to be considered in any other way than as servants and messengers of God and distributors of [498] the secret things of God, i.e. as proclaimers of the wholesome word of God which was previously hidden from the gentiles and has begun to be proclaimed to everyone only at the time of Christ. Therefore its nature is not power or authority, but an office of serving the gospel, as we have amply stated in the "Exposition of the 67 Articles". Christ bids us be obedient to this human righteousness or authority in Matthew 22:21, "Give to Caesar what you owe to Caesar and to God what you owe to God." Christ does not intend to order here that all the world must obey Caesar; rather, he commands only that part of humanity which came under the dominion of Caesar to be obedient to Caesar. Had he found the people of Israel under the jurisdiction of the Babylonian king he would have said, "Give to the Babylonian king what you owe him." One ought to apply this to one's respective authority. If you live under the king of France, then give to him what you owe him. The same applies all the way through [Durch den Bank hinweg]. For Christ does not exempt a person from temporal authority just because he has faith in him. He knows well that our inclination to vice requires a school master. For this reason he paid taxes in Matthew 7:27, though he was not required to pay them, in order not to give rise to unrest and offense.

Peter says in 1 Peter, chapter 2, "Be subject to all human creatures, for the Lord's sake." If your authority is a king, then be obedient to him as one who is the highest or unsurpassed, or to the leaders and prefects who have been sent by them to punish evildoers and to praise and laud those who live aright. You note well here that Peter bids all believers to render obedience unto their kings and superiors. He says nothing at all of his power, but only of the temporal power [the power of the laos] which alone is the power instituted by God. The papists, however, say, "For this reason then one ought to obey us, too, since Peter says that one ought to obey all human creatures [499] for the Lord's sake. We do not demand obedience to us, but to God, so that one might obey us, in God's place." Answer: on this word of Peter look at your breadbasket a bit better; it contains something other than what you think. You ought to obey all human creatures means that you, believers, are to be for all persons. You ought to serve all or you ought to obey all human order which I have established for you, be they kings or other superiors. This word applies to every believer; therefore, anyone might say to you just as readily, "O pope or bishop you ought to be obedient to me" as you might say to him that he ought to obey you. For to the extent that these words of Peter refer to the servanthood

and love of Christians among themselves, you are obligated toward me to the same extent as I am toward you. To the extent, however, that this then extends also to obedience which one owes to the authorities you are bid, as much as I am, to submit to the yoke. You have no more basis in Scripture to impose leaders on me that they might govern me than I have to impose them on you.

For just as you say, "one ought to obey me, a bishop or pope, since I am a human being; Peter says so," I, too, can say that "you must obey me, for I am a human being; Peter says so." I do not say this because I envy them their government.

I neither desire nor respect it. Rather, if they desire to govern like the rulers of this world, they should not bear the name of messenger or bishop which means to be a guardian. On the other hand, if they wish to be proclaimers of the gospel, messengers and shepherds of Christ, they should not rule, Luke 22:26. This opinion does not teach disobedience, as the windbags boast. Rather, their magistrate and potentates always confuse true human authority. And no one is less obedient to the authority which has been ordered by God than these spirituals. Of those, every group, order and sect has a special number. If they live [500] disgracefully, so that many people take offense, a duly instituted magistrate cannot do a thing about it, since they have their own superiors. These beat them with the pompoms of their caps and tie them to a sausage, as allegedly the dog was tied to one, but the offense is not alleviated. Those, however, who teach in a Christian manner teach that the magistrate which has been instituted by God must be obeyed. If everyone were obedient to it who comes under its authority, much greater peace and unity would prevail than is the case when everyone who wishes to be a shepherd and official of God desires, in addition, to have princely pomp and authority.

Paul says, in Romans 13:1-7, as follows: "Every living human being ought to obey the highest authority or the superiors. For there is no authority which is not of God. All existing authorities are instituted by God. Thus, whoever sets himself against the authorities opposes the divine order. Those who oppose them incur their own judgement or condemnation; for superiors do not deter from or infuse fear of good works, but evil ones. If, then, you do not intend to fear authority, do what is right and the authorities will praise you, for they are servants of God for your own good. But if you were to do evil, you should be afraid, for they do not bear the sword in vain. They are servants of God who punish all who do evil with severity [Rom. 13:4]. Therefore you ought to obey, not only because of the severity of the punishment, but also because of your conscience. For this you pay taxes. They are servants of God and attend to the very thing. Therefore you must give to everyone their just due. Pay taxes to whom you

owe them, and to whom you owe duty, levies and protection, pay them. To those whom you owe respect and honor, give them."

Though these words of Paul are clear, we shall, nonetheless, deal with them at length, for here we are not [501] only taught obedience, but also what the authorities are to command.

First of all, God commands, through the mouth of Paul, that everyone must be obedient unto the authorities; since all authority is from God. We discover here that even the evil, godless superiors are from God. Of course God ordains such superiors that he might punish our sin. Isaiah 3:4, "I shall give them children and weaklings for princes," i.e. babes shall rule over them. What shall we make of this in our own day and age? Is it not evident that Christendom is full of young, unknown princes, superiors and prefects? [15] Where else but among young feverish hearts who find nothing too much to start something without ever contemplating the end, do unrest, warfare and uprisings originate? Thus we can also feel that God's hand is present with the rod. It is there to punish us for our sin. The princes and superiors, though they begin right away to mature in years, are by and large raw. Many of them are still like babes. Thus it is with all their attire, clothing and deportment: anyone who looks at them might think that he has a host of decked-out women before him. I shan't mention the beastly excesses, games, cursing and other inhuman trespasses. These rogues are punishment from God, for Solomon also says in Ecclesiastes 10:16, "Woe to you, land, whose king is a child and whose princes indulge themselves freely." Thus we may see before us the misery we are in; for children everywhere aim for domination. And those who, in terms of their years, are actually not children at all are, for the greater part of day and night, so full of it that they are worse than children. If one allows them to get to it, one will also reap fruits from them accordingly. Yet, once they govern we are commanded by God to obey them, for he intends to punish our sin through them. 1 Pet. 2: servants are to be [502] obedient to their masters in all fear; not only when these are kind and good, but also when they are otherwise and crooked.

At this point, however, knavish superiors become proud and do not as much as by a hair's breadth improve in any virtue. Therefore the preachers are forced to teach obedience to them however wicked they are, and undertake to exercise their authority and meddle with God's word and Christian liberty, and forbid the preaching of the word of God other than in the manner in which it suits the Pope. They refuse to free poor consciences which for such a long time have been tortured and held captive but which lately have been liberated by the word of God. They force the priest who has just learned that the mass is not a sacrifice, and who therefore refuses to sell out the body and blood

of Christ, to take the Pope's side so that without the support of Scripture he has to say it is a sacrifice. The monk who has been informed that his order is pretense and truly against God and who begins to work for a living and to live a Christian life (and in like manner, the nuns), they force back into cloisters--the prison houses of the conscience. Yet there is nothing in their oath or obedience which entitles them to rule over the souls and consciences of people; for they are incapable of doing so. As little as they know what is in the heart of a person, so little are they capable of ruling the human heart, to make it good or evil, believing or unbelieving.

Caesar has no power in such matters, says an ancient heathen poet [Ovid, **Tristia** III, 7.48]. Caesar has not been able to control my heart or to take away from me the gifts of the heart. Now the teaching of Christ is nothing other than a freeing of the conscience. Jn. 8 [32,36]. When the truth shall set you free, you will be truly free. The human heart is known by no one except by the one God. Hence, no one but God is able to instruct it. For as long as God does not set a person free in his heart he is not free. As soon as he is liberated though, no one is able to enslave him. Though one might force him to believe differently, it cannot be done. Therefore the raging defenders of the Pope will have to become their tyrants--as were Nero and [503] Domitian--before they shall be able to change their minds. Whenever they do so, however, one ought not obey them. For Christians have a rule that we ought to endure death rather than depart from or keep silent the truth we know, Luke 12:4. Therefore, no prince ought or is able to command anything that is against the word of God. Nor should one preach God's word in order to please people. For as soon as this happens, the messengers of God are to say, "One ought to obey God more than one obeys people," Acts 4:19 and 5:29. But the messengers who fail to speak thus--of whom we have some right now--who undertake to tie together Christ and Belial because they are afraid, are true distorters of the word of God which demands to be preached purely and cannot be mingled with the water of human pretense, Isaiah 1[22]. As soon, then, as princes command anything that is against or denies divine truth, those who believe God's word ought to endure death rather than depart from the truth. If they fail to do so, they are not followers of Christ. But this be far from you, superiors, that you should ever undertake to fight against God; it would be sheer presumption and should never succeed in the end, anyhow. For it should prove easier to a human being to bring down the heavens than to eradicate the comforting word of God. Heaven and earth shall pass away, but not God's word. Therefore, no magistrate ought to set itself up against this word or else it will destroy the magistrate. Thus we find here an area in which one is not bound to obey the authorities. I shall speak later about other commandments.

Secondly, it follows from Paul's words [Rom. 13:3] that superiors are not a deterrent to good works, but to evil ones. We note here, firstly, that evil hearts which are not manifest cannot be punished by superiors, for they cannot be recognized until they have been revealed through works. Therefore Paul does not say that they ought to deter or punish evil thoughts or hearts, but rather, evil deeds. And from that it may be concluded [504] that human righteousness is a poor righteousness, though one is in need of it as much as one needs food. It comes into effect and punishes only after the evil has broken out which long before has been accomplished in the heart but is known to God only. Those who contemplated murder, betrayal and other such plots without accomplishing them are counted among the culprits. For that someone should have dared plot with another is as good as if it had become known and is the beginning of the deed. I have said this for those who are quarrelsome.

The fact that superiors are not a deterrent and threat to good works comes from their knowing which are good works and which are not. Where else but from the word of God are they to learn this? Therein they find the truth that does not deceive. Hence, no teaching serves a government and magistrate better than the teaching of Christ. It teaches what is good and what is evil. Not only does it teach external piety but it leads superiors and subjects alike to an internal piety and to greater perfection than is required by human righteousness, setting before both of them a common mind so that one does not hold for a good what the other does not consider thus. Now one may see in this that a great deal of controversy comes solely from the fact that not all of us believe the singular word of God and fail to learn from it alone what is evil and what is good. Take an example: that a nun, monk or priest should enter into matrimony is right and good in God's sight and in human eyes. God says through Paul, 1 Cor. 7:9, "whoever is unable to live untainted should resort to marriage." Among all unbelievers marriage is considered to be right, too. The papists do not allow it.

A controversy ensues as a result.

The Pope has his bellies who support him. They praise chastity so highly (yet engage all the while in such inhuman unchastity that it is shameful to even mention it). This confuses the magistrate and haunts [durchächten] poor, [505] weak persons who would have preferred to live godly and honest rather than detestable lives. What is one to do in all this? One ought not pay attention to people, but to the word of God. And when we discover that God has not forbidden marriage to any person, we will not even aggravate innocent people by our power. Leviticus 19:13, "You shall not inflict upon your neighbor any injustice, disgrace or damage. Nor shall you oppress him by force." Yet

what else is it but oppression by force when marriage is prohibited to those who were hitherto considered to be religious? For marriage is right for God's sake and for the sake of people. To the bishops, however, it is intolerable; the payment of concubinage fees is lost to them as a result. This has to be unjust force, since neither divine nor human law forbids anything. You may search your handbooks and you will not find anything. The Pope alone forbids it. Therefore all magistrates sin who punish what is not considered unlawful in God's sight. For they ought not undertake to punish good works.

With the aid of this example all other matters about which one quarrels to this day must be understood. If one can find God's word dealing with the matter, one ought to let it decide. If no word on the matter can be found, pay no attention to the matter which is the bone of contention; for we ought neither add nor subtract anything from the word of God, Deut. 4:2 and 12:32.

At this point, however, the papists say that Paul states in 1 Cor. 7:20 that everyone ought to remain in the calling to which he has been called. Hence, those who are in orders ought to remain in them. If they have promised chastity, they ought by right remain in it. Answer: you violate Scripture at this point, just as you do in all other cases when you interpret it in light of your own inclination. Paul does not speak there of the calling of the conscience or of the calling to the Christian faith but he speaks of bodily habits and the human condition, as [506] the passages immediately preceding and following clearly indicate. Bodily habit you should understand as follows: whoever was a Jew had undergone circumcision. When gentiles came to the Christian faith, Jews thought that these had to be circumcised in their physical bodies, too. To that Paul addressed himself: if someone has come to the faith uncircumcised, he ought not first of all be circumcised; rather in whatever form he has come to the faith, in that form he ought to remain. Regarding physical condition, you should understand it as follows: if someone belonged to a master, he was not freed from this condition on account of the faith. Thus, these words are more likely against you, dear papists, than they are in support of you; for Paul says that the uncircumcised is not to be circumcised. Thus you, too, ought to leave people in the condition of life in which they have come to the faith. For what else is an order or cassock other than what circumcision was among the Jews, in which sense Paul uses it here? I have made this aside here since I forgot to make it in developing an objection in my "Exposition". You will find other objections raised there.

Thirdly, it follows that the magistrate is to praise the one who does what is right, just as it punishes the one who does

what is wrong. In our day and age one might be satisfied if the magistrate did not praise anyone (as, of course, happens), as long as it protects those who do what is right. Thus, in my opinion, to praise here means to promote, advance and protect. For it is ever the task of the magistrate to protect the innocent, and the helpless throng of widows, orphans and oppressed people, Isaiah 1:17.

Fourthly, that the magistrate is a servant of God serves to your benefit; for it desires that we lead a peaceful life, though we may not fully measure up to its righteousness. Therefore Paul teaches in 1 Tim. 2:1f. that we ought to intercede earnestly [507] for the magistrate that God may grant us to lead a peaceful life, pleasing to God and in all earnest. Hence, the magistrate serves God when it tames obnoxious goats with whom the weak sheep might otherwise not be able to live; by that I mean they are so irrational and evil in their temptations and desires that they dare inflict harm on their neighbor simply to satisfy their temptations. Thus it is a service to God when evildoers are punished.

Fifthly, should you do evil, you ought to be afraid. I have said plenty on this earlier, regarding the manner by which the magistrate might know what is good or evil. Now they hear once again that the evildoer alone has been entrusted to their punishment. For this reason, righteous magistrate, stay clear of punishing the little sheep of Christ. Where they do not act against God, you, too, must not act against God so you do not afflict and distress his innocent little sheep. For all authorities are unmistakably threatened in all of Scripture when they burden or punish the innocent. Read Micah 3 and 7.

Sixthly: for he does not bear the sword in vain; he is a servant of God who judges and punishes in all severity the one who does evil. Paul here refers to the custom of superiors or judges who--in order to indicate their office--bear the sword so they might be feared by evil persons and loved by the good. They punish with all severity, but they should not punish more harshly and severely than is warranted by the transgression. Rather, "with severity" here means that since a person has dared by outward evil deeds to assert himself so as to have harmed his neighbor, the judge then ought to chastise him with outward revenge and not pussyfoot at all where great evil has been committed, as Eli had done [1 Sam. 2:22ff.]. One may note in this context that this understanding [508] of the magistrate does not refer to the Pope and his hordes. He neither does nor should bear the sword. Christ bid Peter to sheath his sword and he commanded the disciples not to take along a staff with which they might beat others. He allowed, of course, that they might use a staff to assist them on the journey, Mark 6:8. But that he draws a sword and fights

with it indicates to me that he shall also die by the sword--God grant it when God wills it. For Christ does not lie.

In the seventh place, God speaks further through Paul [Rom. 13:5], "Therefore it must needs be that you ought to be obedient not only because of order but also because of your conscience." What can all papists together do against this strong word? God says, "You ought to be obedient to the power that bears the sword." Understand by this the things that pertain to this life, society, friends; indeed, everything pertaining to human righteousness. Don't you hear, pope and popess, it must be thus. Come down, therefore. Be obedient to God's word and give heed to the one who bears the sword. Do not worry about human righteouness. Christ, too, did not worry about it. When someone said to him, "Master, speak to my brother that he might divide the inheritance with me," he replied, "Who set me up to be a judge and divider of your inheritance?" Luke 12:14. He further said to Pilate, "My kingdom is not of this world. If my kingdom were of this world, my servants would undoubtedly fight for me," etc. Note well, O pope, that Christ does not want anyone to fight on his behalf. Accordingly, what can you papists add to what God says through the mouth of Paul, namely that you ought to be obedient not only from fear of punishment but because of your conscience, simply because God bid it and did it himself. Christ gave his mother's name at Bethlehem [509] [cf. Mt. 1:21ff.]. He paid to Caesar his tax [cf. Mt. 17:24ff.]. He commanded, in addition, "Give to Caesar what you owe him," etc. Whoever then acts against God hurts his conscience; for one's conscience is not ever afflicted except when it knows that it has acted contrary to God. It knows that it has acted contrary to God precisely when it fails to follow his word. It would not know that, if it did not believe in God first of all, that there is a God and that he is its God. Only after that does it believe his word. By this you may establish, you papists, that you are unbelievers. For if you believed in God and that he is your God, you would also believe in his word. And if you believe his word, your conscience would be hurt if you act contrary to his word. Thus, your desire to rule after human fashion, contrary to God's word, indicates that you have no conscience about God. For if you had consciences which fear God you would not protect your pomp; for you could readily see that it is contrary to God. Rather, you would surrender, just as any other sinner does who may very well sin, but he confesses to being a sinner and is not godless. But since you dare fight against the clear word of God, it is evident that you are godless. Again, all of you Christian people, be obedient to the magistrate which preserves human righteousness for us so that we might lead a peaceful, quiet life. Superiors, be diligent in what is right and good. Command nothing against God, lest you hurt and turn consciences against you which otherwise are hurt when they do

not obey you who are rightly set to govern. In summary, it is a sin for you, pope, bishops, priest, monk and nun, not to obey the authority which bears the sword. That word you cannot break with all your might.

In the eighth place, "for this you pay taxes; for they are servants of God and attend to the very thing" [Rom. 13:6]. We hear at this point that we owe taxes for their sustenance to those who protect human righteousness. The magistrate suffers no want there, of course. They feed so [510] sumptuously on that word everywhere in the world that one should worry that some of them demand too much rather than not enough. There are many superiors whom one might justifiably restrict, since they conduct themselves without moderation toward their poor subjects. These are as godless as the papists. Nonetheless one ought to endure them, until God shows his grace to us. He will surely be able to bring it about.

"They are entitled to it" means they have been set up to punish evildoers and protect those who do good. To that they look intently. But should you superiors fail to take seriously that evildoers are punished and the good protected and still firmly insist on receiving tax and assessment moneys, the rope may be stretched until it tears. Then one would have to be concerned that the cat turns out to be the most domesticated beast. [16] There are among many of the superiors excesses which deserve punishment and improvement as much as among certain spirituals. If they refuse to change their ways at all, relying on their power, God will surely look around for an avenger of his people, even though he may have to bring him from a far country. He always found someone to be over the children of Israel who was able to mete out their reward.

Ninthly, God speaks through Paul, "Give to everyone what you owe them." You note here the irresponsibility of the enemies of Christ who always shout that we teach through [511] the gospel that no one should be paid. Yet God commands that one ought to give everyone what one owes him. Now the problem arises from our not obeying the commandment of God which states that you ought to love your neighbor as yourself. Were we to keep that, a person who has would, of his own free will and accord, help one who suffers want. But where we fail to keep it, the fruits and possessions of this world have become private property. People keep for themselves what God has given them freely and without price. For what do we give him for the fruit we daily receive? Since all things have become private property, we know that all of us are sinners. Though we may not be evil by nature, that very inclination is sin enough to earn God's condemnation--for that which he gives us freely we turn into our own property.

Even a beggar is not free from this sin. Everyone, in

his own way, is selfish. To keep this inclination from leading to unrest or evil, God commands against our weakness, "You shall not covet someone else's goods." We note here that the commandment must have arisen after the inclination. Indeed this commandment is too difficult for us. Our flesh is unable to keep it; therefore, God issues the last commandment pertaining to temporal goods, "You shall not steal." If we were able to keep "You shall not covet", we would not require "You shall not steal". Anyone then who transgresses these breaks poor, makeshift human righteousness and divine righteousness, too. He therefore falls into the hands of the law as well as into God's hands. Now in order to escape the hands of others and to maintain friendship, God commands that we give to everyone what we owe them.

I should like to speak here of the four kinds of indebtedness: debt which arises from buying and selling, the debt of the tenth, debt of interest, debt of usury.

Regarding debt which arises from legitimate buying and selling [512], I trust, by God, that there is not a single Christian who might think that he does not owe and must repay what he has promised and for which he has received value. For whoever might think thus is a robber or thief and justifiably falls into the hands of the authorities, on top of being considered a thief in God's sight. Where there is deceit in trade, every magistrate knows well how to order compensation to be made. It would lead too far to speak here of contracts, i.e. procedures concerning selling, vending and hiring. Such a debt one owes according to human and divine law.

Concerning Tithes

I shan't undertake to talk here of tithes which belong to lay persons because of the land they once owned which they then rented out for eight, nine or ten percent; indeed, some even for five percent. But I shall concern myself with tithes which belong to the clergy or were purchased from them (as the false popes did in violation of their own rights, allowing tithes to fall into the hands of certain lay persons, 16 q, chapter 1, quoniam [**Corpus Juris Canonici** c. 68 causa 16 q 1] and 16, q 7, decimos quas [**C.J.C.** 1.XVI 9.7]. And yet, these poor people gave up their capital [513] thinking that what the Pope allows to happen is all right. Therefore the debt owing them is a true debt, for they purchased it. What a magistrate should do in the matter will be dealt with a little later.) I say that everyone is obliged to pay it as long as a magistrate orders it generally. The magistrate is entitled to punish the defaulter who refused to pay it; for it

was by common consent of the lords and upon such consent all purchases were made so that the lands were sold either dirt cheap or else very dearly, according to whether they were free of tithes or not.

Whoever then should not willingly render the tenth, in opposition to this common agreement of the authorities, would thereby go beyond what was granted him in an upright, straightforward purchase--the kind of purchase which the authorities considered to be right and legal. Such a person would then resist the authorities; and whoever resists the authorities opposes God, as we have shown earlier. However, should an entire government, seeking to protect these, decree that the tenth need no longer be paid, such a government would also have to ascertain beforehand that those who hold tithes receive adequate compensation or else that those who possess the land retain what they did not purchase. As long as this does not happen, everyone ought to render the tenth, as the authorities decree, and no one ought, on his own, to undertake anything by force, [514] lest he be judged like a robber or thief. But here it is the duty of the authorities to see to it that the tenth is not abused and, where this should be the case, that improvements be sought. For, in short, if they fail to punish the misdeed, they are judged to be an unjust authority. And no one should be allowed to dissuade them in the matter. For everyone can readily see that where a thing is seen to be forever abused, there one will also find ways, in the end, by which to overcome the abuse; and this happens with somewhat more tumult and disorder than through timely counsel. This briefly stated opinion I am willing to substantiate by Scripture.

That no hothead might be able to say here: "That you bank here on the magistrate who is to control this by protective measures shows that one has to take the mass to be a sacrifice, that one has to run to the priest for forgiveness of one's sins, that one has to preach the gospel in keeping with the Pope's whim, and other such like things, until some magistrate orders it to be done otherwise." The answer is, "No." One ought not appeal to the magistrate in such matters; for it has not been set over God's word and Christian freedom as over temporal goods. This has been sufficiently shown earlier. On the contrary, even if the magistrate were to say, as the Jews did to Christ's messengers in Acts 5:28, "We have forbidden you to teach these things," the preachers of God's word ought to say, "Our lord Christ prophesied that we would be led before kings, princes, governors and authorities, for his sake [Mt. 10:17; Mk. 13:9; Lk. 21:12]. However, he said at the same time that we need not fear them, though they might take our bodies, for they are incapable of harming the soul [Mt. 10:28; Lk. 12:4]. Therefore we stand here and say with the apostles that we ought to obey God more than people [Acts 5:29]. God bids us preach his word truly and not to hide

anything that is contained therein, but it must be an opportune time. Thus, if you superiors want to [515] be Christians, you will have to permit us to preach the clear word of God and allow it to take effect thereafter. You are not lords over the souls and consciences of people. If you cannot accede to that, you become like unbelieving Jews and heathen tyrants," etc. Thus we note well that the power which the magistrate has over temporal goods and the body does not extend to the soul. Now if the paying of tithes comes under temporal goods, it is proper for an authority to order them rightly used or given, or else to find alternate means, as long as this is done without hurting human friendship and justice. I leave aside, once again, the question of the right by which one is entitled to demand the tenth. If a sufficiently strong, legitimate magistrate demands it, I shall be only too glad to help probe into the matter and establish it on the basis of Scripture.

One must also pay interest [Zins] according to God's command, "You ought to render to everyone what you owe them" [Rom. 13:7]. For since private property has been established, a magistrate cannot force anyone to lend out what is his without expecting some return or profit.

And we owe such not any the less on the basis of God's commandments. Based on these Christ calls riches unjust or unlawful, Luke 16:9, since without doubt the earth and the fruits of the earth are God's, Psalm 23 [Ps. 24:1], which he allows us to possess and enjoy without compensation. We, however, appropriate to ourselves what is God's. God permits this to the extent that we remain his debtors, nonetheless, and obligated all along to use temporal matters only according to his word and bidding. This obligation shall never be lifted. For this reason, everyone who does not use the temporal in keeping with God's will is unjust in God's sight, though he may not contravene human righteousness in using it. Therefore Christ rightly calls [516] riches unjust--in part also because we do not use according to his will that which is God's and over which he has set us as stewards. Hence all interest is ungodly.

First, regarding all riches being unjust; from this we fathom why Christ said that it would be easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle than for a rich person to enter the kingdom of heaven [Mt. 19:24; Mk. 10:25; Lk. 18:25]. Let no one despair at this point. God's grace is greater than our misdeed, but we must recognize absolutely that riches belong to God. We must always be ready to place them under the will and in the service of God. They must be to us as if we did not have them at all. Otherwise I fail to understand how a rich person can be a believer if his heart is with the temporal treasure. His heart is there if he does not always have his treasure ready according to the will

of the Lord, and does not use it in keeping with that will. For from this it happens that he values the treasure more highly than God. If he does not believe in this fashion, he cannot be saved.

Secondly, it is ungodly to take interest since God bids us make loans without expecting anything in return, Lk. 6:35, Ex. 22:25.

Because human beings did not wish to leave to the needy the things which they appropriated for themselves without his making some kind of return, it led to the relaxing of poor, human righteousness so that a creditor demanded from the borrower a return on the basis of the amount of fruit harvested, or according to the total number of fruit grown in the following fashion: if the land is worth 100 guilders and the borrower takes 50 on it, he is obligated to leave half the fruit to the creditor. If he has 5 on which he then borrowed 20, he owes a quarter of the fruit, etc. Lawyers will have to understand the matter in this way if they are to defend the taking of interest as if it were a purchase of fruit. Indeed, according to human righteousness, interest-taking would not be considered a great burden if it were used in this fashion, though in God's sight it is unjust, nonetheless, as I have stated above. That someone should have to pay interest on land, a field or a vineyard [517] which you lawyers call a purchase of fruit or custom [ususfructus] whether, God willing, there be fruit or no, is a bit too much. I am totally taken aback by the fact that those who attended the Council of Constance or Basel were so utterly unreasonable even by the standards of human righteousness in allowing such an unworthy thing to get by that it was indeed too much even for unbelieving princes to allow this among their people. [17] Why did they not look to the word of Christ, "you ought to lend and not expect anything in return"? How dared these false priests speak about it and deal with it when they should have actually frightened off the princes in case they might have brought such forward for themselves? But the fact that they were not satisfied with the tenth but allowed themselves to take interest on it indicates quite clearly to me that they invented this unwholesome interest. Look, where are these dishonest babblers now, "Yes, councils are convoked in the Holy Spirit!" Does the Holy Spirit act against God? Nonetheless, as long as the general practice favors purchase with interest and sanctions it with letters and seals of the magistrate, let everyone pay interest on the capital which, after careful consideration, he acquired as his property for this purpose; otherwise he would disturb human peace. I say this only about interest which, in keeping with humanly instituted righteousness (which one is tempted to call something else here; for those who set up purchase with interest did not consider God's word nor the law [518] of nature), was purchased 20 on 1. Such a person would sin against God, too; the latter bids us give to everyone what we owe him.

But the magistrate ought to look seriously into this abuse of interest-taking. This would be my advice--but I advise here as a person, just as Paul had done in the case of the Corinthians in 1 Corinthians 7:12; for if I were to teach God's word, I would have to say, "You should lend and hope for nothing in return" [Lk. 6:35]. But in this case, since I can see that all those who have interest should have all the land assessed on which they have interest and accordingly collect annually a portion of the yield in proportion to the amount of money borrowed. Otherwise, I greatly fear that a lot of people will burden themselves with the taking of interest more than can be credited to human infirmity. Because of their premeditated malice, they will be considered knaves in God's sight. For this reason--and now I speak God's word--let no one be too careful on how he intends to sustain his life. God feeds the ravens [Ps. 147:9] and other birds who gather up nothing and he clothes the little flowers of the field. Yet how much more are we in the eyes of the Lord [Lk. 12:24-27]? Now then, he will also feed us and our children. All these grave abuses stem from unbelief and lack of the knowledge of God. May he illumine all people that they might know and love him above everything else and all these shortcomings will fall by the wayside without agrievement. Amen.

Interest, however, which has not been purchased in accordance with magisterial ordinances should be paid in no other way than in proportion to the sum. Understand this as follows: there are greedy persons who demand as much from a 15% loan [519] as they do from a 20% loan. In addition, there are some superiors who will sanction such purchase of interest with letter and seal. In such a case superiors act against their own justice and abuse their power. Therefore they are obligated to help the oppressed even though he might have overreached himself, so that he will not be deprived of more than what their poor righteousness or justice has laid down. Unfaithfulness and deceit are to fall back upon the deceiver. Though they act in this way, they are, nonetheless, not righteous. They merely eliminate the worst offense, but a great deal of evil still remains. Thus, anyone who is burdened with unjust purchase of interest should be able to have his complaint heard.

This opinion I hold on the shady business of charging interest, but those who are opposed to me spread the news that I teach that no one ought to be paid interest of any kind. Allegedly I cry that whoever has accepted interest is a thief if he refuses to give that which he has promised, as long as the purchase of interest was done orderly and in keeping with human decrees and measures. I often have to speak quite against my own will in order to shut the mouths of those who protect all vices and who undertake to support every injustice. Yet all my work simply achieves that those who purchase interest do not sin against God

three times. For the one who has been entrusted with guarding the salvation of people ought to prevent any damage done to the soul lest those who perish shall be demanded from his hand [Heb. 13:17]. If he is incapable of preventing such harm he should, nonetheless, not cease trying to do so. It might perchance be that he can prevent greater harm.

On usury, I think as follows: in cases where a magistrate allows usury, the debtor is obligated to pay what is demanded of him. [520] But no magistrate ought to be so unjust towards its subjects as to tolerate Jews or other usurers to compound interest on interest on a part or on the total sum. But in cases where the magistrate does tolerate usury and does not pronounce judgement on it, one is not obligated to pay. Indeed, the magistrate ought to punish both the ones who take and who receive it, whenever it is aware of what is going on, even though the one is obligated to return the capital--unless the magistrate goes by another rule. This prattle one my find among human law-givers (if I remember correctly) whom I have to use to get through the mire of usury; for to God, such a one is so offensive that he cannot tolerate him. Nonetheless, the magistrate has been instituted that it might deal as closely to divine righteousness as it is capable of in such matters. It is duty bound, therefore, to accept all such ungodly burdens, as far as this is possible without further damage. In short, no one should destroy human friendship for the sake of temporal goods. Rather, when one is concerned with something he does not want to forsake out of respect for the divine word, he should handle it through authority alone, and not tolerate that Christian teaching is charged with causing dissension. Further, the magistrate is to keep its eyes open so that all abuses which are so crassly against God might be removed; or else, long suffering to which nothing is conceded is twisted into nonsense in the end. How can an honorable magistrate tolerate the tomfoolery of the so-called spirituals? How can it watch its poor [521] people being consumed by usurers and bailiffs? Therefore God kindles the light of his word once again so that this filth be washed out and cleaned for once.

Regarding the tenth, Paul says [Rom. 13:7], "to whom you owe taxes you ought to pay them; to whom you owe duty, transport or escort service, you ought to give it; to whom you owe respect and honor, render it." These words are clear and they affect everyone. Nor am I particularly worried regarding the freedom of the spirituals, whether one maintains them exempt from tax or duty, provided it is not to the disadvantage of others--which may be hard to do. Let each authority do what seems right to them, but I am happy to have been able to show that they are not free on account of any divine right or commandment.

To sum up: God's word ought to govern all people. It

ought to be prescribed, proclaimed and faithfully interpreted and made known to them, for we are obliged to follow it. Our own impotence is aided by the singular grace of God through our Lord, Jesus Christ, etc. The more we recognize our own guilt and impotence the more we find the beauty and omnipotence of God, and we discover more and more the love and confidence of his grace which makes us good and God-fearing as nothing else can. In case there are some who do not listen to or live by the word of God, because they are either godless or unbelieving, God has provided for us the lowest possible commandment--not that in living thereby we should be considered godly--but rather that human society might be preserved and protected and that guardians be set up who see to it earnestly [522] that the last shred of poor, human righteousness be not torn away also. These guardians are the properly ordained magistrate which is none other than the one that carries the sword--in other words, the one we call secular authority, whose office it is to conduct everything in keeping with the divine will; and if that is not possible for us, to guide us by the divine commandment. Therefore, everything that is neither to be found in God's word and commandment nor given in human righteousness should be set aside by them and held to be false, unlawful and unjust--even by human righteousness.

I will now once again and in brevity recapitulate this opinion and relate divine and human righteousness to each other. 1) God is the highest, most perfect good. 2) He is willing to reveal himself to all creatures and to be of aid to them without any return or retribution. 3) He is not selfish nor subject to affectation.

He requires of us to be like that, too; for he says, "You are to be perfect as your heavenly Father is perfect," Matthew 5:48. If we intend to come into his presence we must, therefore, 1) be perfect, i.e., pure, upright, beautiful and without any infirmity. 2) We must not think that we are our own masters but know ourselves to be God's; and if we are God's we are the neighbor's also. 3) We cannot be in any way selfish nor afflicted, either by avarice, desire, ambition or lust.

We ought to seek above all else the kingdom of God and its righteousness [Mt. 6:33], which means that we must become righteous as he is righteous. This, of course, is impossible for us; therefore he assures us by his grace through his son whom he has given up for us unto death. That is the gospel.

Now, if we are incapable of reaching this measure of goodness which God demands of us and yet are bid to be perfect, [523] it must needs follow that that which God bids us do he will without hesitation reveal unto us so that we might grow with unceasing diligence in all good things without, however, becoming

proud because of our virtue. For we have not yet reached the measure which God requires. For this reason God has provided other laws through which we are able to live peaceably one with another, just as Christ says to the Jews, Matthew 19:8, that Moses, on account of the hardness of their hearts, allowed the Jews to divorce, though in the beginning it was not so.

Look at that very passage carefully. We remain not any the less obligated to live by divine righteousness. Yet we are unable to do so for 1) we are evil and utter darkness by nature, Genesis 8:21. 2) We do not like to belong to other people but in all things seek to be our own selves; 3) we are selfish ever since the fall of the first Adam and desire carnal things.

But in order that these infirmities might not become so monstrous that we go totally wild and become more evil than irrational beasts, God has provided for us two things which are to direct and govern us: his word and the magistrate who keeps our infirmities in check through punishment.

1) Through the word of God we learn how good or godly we ought to be. In it we find salvation through grace. No one is master over this word for it is set over all people. For no one who is born in sin is so righteous or without guilt that he is capable of doing justice to this word. Nor is there anyone who does not lack the grace which is assured us in that word.

2) In order that no violence grow out of our selfishness we have been given the magistrate to control the evildoer so that he may not rob another because of his selfish desire.

3) So that we may not lose all shame, like dogs, this same magistrate is to punish us, for it has laws for this purpose. [524]

1) That we may not become blasphemers but be obedient to his word.

2) That we might not touch another's property either through bold robbery or theft [clandestinely].

3) That we might not kill anyone in anger, or abuse another's wife, or debauch ourselves and such like things.

1) But should you defame or blaspheme God, the magistrate will punish you.

2) Similarly you will be hanged by the magistrate should you steal or rob.

3) Should you kill, you will be killed, too. Similarly, if you do wrong because of other temptations you will be punished.

1) Beyond this the magistrate is not to refer to or take refuge in the word of God for anything else, for it can only punish outward misdeeds but cannot make one either good or bad inwardly; God alone is able to do that in human hearts.

2) It follows that it should only prevent apparent, open misdeeds by decree and punishment.

3) It should not seek to prohibit whatever is right or not forbidden or permitted by God.

4) For they cannot turn into sin what is no sin.

5) But they ought to promote what contributes to fear of God and Christian piety.

6) They should not hold to be a good what is invented by humans, but only what God has ordained.

7) Should they punish those who have done nothing against God, they, too, will be punished by God.

8) But if they fail to punish those who act against God, they in turn will be punished.

9) Note, God wills in all his words and commandments that we look upon him alone.

10) Therefore no authority should punish anyone because of outward ceremonies, as happens in our day, whose removal many [525] people bemoan. Nor should they punish anyone who refuses to allow the Pope to divert him from the word of God. They should not punish anything that pertains to the conscience of the inner being alone, for to judge that is in God's hand alone. For example, monks and nuns in cloisters discover that orders, sects and assemblies are against God and how they have been misdirected to look for their salvation in cloisters. After this they then desire to put away such hypocrisy and to lead a sincere Christian life along with ordinary Christian brothers. What authority is there to stop such undertaking? None is master over human consciences. Should there be public abuse in such matters of the authority which has been entrusted to them, they may then and ought to use their power. They ought also attempt to stop whatever is against God's word. Thus they shall bring about peace and a wholesome government. For if we learn daily through God's word what abuses there are and if they are not stopped by timely counsel, one might fear that the indignation of the oppressed will become

so great in the end that we will have to be in fear of it. For in short, the word of God cannot be captured nor tied down. But if all of us together endeavor to follow the word of God, God will thereafter govern. He will bring about that everything follows in its proper way. To him be praise and honor in all eternity. Amen.

NOTES

1. Wattenwyl had enjoyed a successful clerical career from 1508-1523 at which time he was provost of the Chorherrenstift, Bern. He must have shown interest in the evangelical cause, hence Zwingli's reference to his "conversion". However, he did not formally accept Reformed teaching until late in 1525. Cf. ADB 41:249f.

2. Jakob von Wattenwyl was a successful merchant and entrepreneur who was given many social and political responsibilities as member of the Rat, city treasurer, and mayor [Schultheiss] in Thun and Bern, respectively. Cf. **Sammlung Bernischer Biographien,** IV:2 or 7ff.

3. In the calendar of Christian festivals this day is June 24.

4. Thomas Wyttenbach, a native of Biel, came to Basel in 1505. He was one of Zwingli's teachers there. From 1507 on he served in several ecclesiastical offices, among them as Dean of the Cathedral of Bern. Cf. **Sammlung Bernischer Biographien,** II:424ff.

5. Wölflin was another of Zwingli's teachers. Cf. ADB 19:651.

6. Sebastian Maier began his reformatory career by refuting a pastoral letter of the Bishop of Constance in 1522. He was forced to leave Bern in 1524 but was recalled in 1536. Cf. Anshelm's **Berner Chronik,** vol. V.14.

7. B. Haller is generally acknowledged to be the chief reformer of the City of Bern. Cf. ADB 10:427ff.

8. Hetzel, a professional soldier whose military services on the side of the French angered the populace so severely that they lynched and killed his father in 1513. He was pardoned in 1518 but later served once again with Duke Ulrich of Württemberg and at the papal court. In 1526 he nonetheless became a member of the Council of Bern. Cf. ADB 12:322ff.

9. V. Anshelm, also known as Rüd, worked as medical doctor and chronicler. He was closely befriended with Zwingli, Vadian and B. Haller. Cf. ADB 1:483f.

10. L. Tremp is a relative of Zwingli and an ardent advocate of the reform cause. After Zwingli's death he supervised the education of his eldest son, Wilhelm. Cf. S. Scheurer, **Bernisches Mausoleum**, II.224f.

11. The term kämmet is translated by Gwalter as affinis. The actual degree of affinity is not clearly established, but L. Tremp must have been close enough to Zwingli to assume responsibility for part of his family after Zwingli's death in 1531.

12. Anfechtungen means "temptations, anxieties, tribulations, etc." A good contemporary term might be "stressful situations". However, Zwingli may have intended no more than "specific needs".

13. The Vulgate has in excelsis.

14. The term fromm, here as elsewhere in Zwingli's works, seems to have many connotations. We have generally translated it by "godly". However, "pious, upright, trustworthy" are also implied. For a detailed discussion, cf. **Idiotikon**, I.1295-1296 and Veronika Günther, **"fromm" in der Zürcher Reformation**, Aarau 1955.

15. Charles V became Emperor in 1519 at the age of 19. Frances I became King of France in 1515, aged 21. Henry VIII ascended to the English throne in 1509 at 18 years of age.

16. Cf. Wander, II, p. 1198, or E. Thiele, **Luthers Sprichwörtersammlung**, p. 322ff. The meaning is that the cat will turn out to be so harmless as to allow mice to return to the house.

17. Cf. G. D. Mansi, **Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio**, XXVII: sessions XL, XLIII of the Council of Constance and XXIX: session XXI of the Council of Basel.

SHORT CHRISTIAN INSTRUCTION

November 1523

(Z II: 628-663)

Translated and edited by H. Wayne Pipkin

Introduction

The year 1523 which began in Zürich with the first disputation between Zwingli and his Catholic opponent John Faber culminated in an event that was decisive for the nature of the Zwinglian Reformation: the Second Zürich Disputation.

During the course of the year opposition to religious images, both inside church buildings and out, had flared. Some well-known images had been destroyed in acts of unlawful vandalism.

A disputation was called to consider both the matter of images and the question of the Mass. A predominantly lay group of 900 men assembled October 26-28. Under the decisive influence of Zwingli it was decided that there was no scriptural basis for understanding the Mass as a sacrifice or for maintaining images in the churches. Having assumed responsibility for modification in accordance with the word of God, the Council nonetheless did not immediately institute the called-for changes. Instead, the Council appointed a committee, including the influential Zürich preachers Zwingli, Jud and Engelhart, to study the situation and report back their conclusions regarding the reform. The Council then decided that Zwingli should write a brief summary of evangelical doctrine. This summary statement was to instruct the pastors in the basic perspective of the Zürich reform which underlay the decision of the Council to omit the reference to the Mass as sacrifice and to take the images from the churches.

Johann Stumpf described in his reformation chronicle the efforts of the Council to bring about unanimity:

> Meanwhile the pastors in the Zürich countryside were not of one mind in doctrine; also some did not receive happily the restoration of evangelical truth and apostolic doctrine. Therefore, so that a uniform teaching might be reported to all the churches regarding images and the mass, and that the basis of such things be planted among the people, the honorable Council of the City of

> Zürich conferred together with the scholars, heard an instruction read and ordered the publication of the same. A copy was sent to each pastor with the order and command to read the contents of the same. [1]

Bullinger remarked in his **Reformation History** that the Council, recognizing the lack of unity in the matter of preaching the word of God, "authorized a short account as to how one might easily and simply preach the truth to the churches." [2] Thus the treatise was first of all intended to be an instruction in evangelical faith that would bring about unity of preaching and practice in the Zürich region.

The **Instruction** contained both a statement of evangelical doctrine and critique of current church practice. The evangelical theology contained two major emphases: first, the individual suffers from the infirmity of sin, both from inheritance and from yielding to temptations; therefore, a person cannot come to God unaided. Secondly, human access to God is provided by the grace of God in Christ Jesus, humanity's only mediator. This work of grace has already been accomplished.

The **Instruction** also contains a criticism of current church practice. The use of images and the Mass as sacrifice are human attempts to merit the favor of God. These practices are evidence of false religion offered in lieu of true belief. Only the righteousness of God is effective for human salvation. The practice of false religion must be abolished.

It is also significant that the **Instruction** was published by official mandate of the City Council. It was the first official confessional statement of the Zürich Reformation. With its "official" delineation of evangelical theology it was sent beyond the confines of Zürich to the Swiss confederates, to the University of Basel, and to the Bishops of Constance, Chur and Basel. A reply was requested from the recipients. A deadline of Pentecost, May, 1524, was tendered. The date was passed without response, though a late reply came from Bishop Hugo of Constance on June 1 which was answered by Zwingli in August, 1524. [3] The Council had decided in the meantime to remove the images from the churches. Thus, on June 20, the three people's priests led a committee into the churches and systematically removed the images.

The **Instruction** has been included in two standard collections of Reformed confessions: E. G. A. Boeckel's 1846 collection, **Die Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-reformierten Kirche** and E. F. Karl's 1903 edition, **Die Bekenntnisschriften der reformierten Kirche.** It was translated into Latin by Rudolf Gwalter and into New High German by Raget Christoffel. A modern German rendition is Gerhard Muras, **Christliche Anleitung** (Hamburg, 1962)

and a French translation has been published by Jacques Courvoisier, **Brève Instruction Chrétienne** (Geneva, 1953).

HWP

NOTES

1. **Johannes Stumpfs Schweizer-und Reformationschronik.** Edited by Ernst Gagliardi, Hans Mueller and Fritz Büsser. Basel: Verlag Birkhäuser, 1952.

2. Bullinger, I:135.

3. The reply of Bishop Hugo is found in Z III:146-149. Zwingli's answer is in Z III:153-229.

A SHORT CHRISTIAN INSTRUCTION, SENT BY THE HONORABLE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ZURICH TO THE MINISTERS AND PREACHERS LIVING IN THE TOWNS, VILLAGES AND DISTRICTS, THAT THEY HENCEFORTH UNANIMOUSLY PROCLAIM AND PREACH THE EVANGELICAL TRUTH TO THEIR SUBJECTS

Issued on the 17th day of November, 1523

[1] Mandate

We, the burgomaster, the Council and the Great Council, as the Two Hundred of the City of Zurich are called, send first our greeting, favor and every good thing to each and everyone, both clerics and laity, prelates, abbots, deans, secular priests, ministers, pastors, and preachers of the word of God living in our towns, villages and districts. [1] As you perceived and understood in the last mandate we sent you, we promised to put into print as soon as possible a short instruction drawn by the scholars from the sacred Scriptures. [2] On our order such a work has been prepared. We have listened to a reading of it and, in our opinion, it is solidly based on the divine, evangelical writings of the New and Old Testaments. We do not want to keep this instruction from you; therefore, we are both publishing it at large and sending it to each of you individually.

Our demand and wish in this matter, therefore, is that you comply with the latest mandate announced above, and faithfully peruse this instruction and introduction of ours which is sent to you. Let the evangelical Scriptures declared therein be thoroughly and diligently reflected on in their original form. We certainly hope the **Instruction** will further lead you and many others into

the knowledge of the true divine Scriptures. [629] For this reason we admonish you with all earnestness, and for God's sake, as each office is required to do, both by the order of God and the command of Christ, so that the true knowledge and honor of God, Christian love and unity, and also the bettering of our morals, be learned from the word of God, increasing more and more. For our wish always is that everywhere in our districts your teachings come up to and be of one mind with the gospel. However, should there be any negligent or disagreeable ones among you, who act without the basis of the holy, divine and evangelical Scriptures, we will proceed against them so that they shall be found to have acted unjustly and against the teachings of Christ. Previously, in the general proclamation and in your convocation concerning the two articles, namely on images and the Mass, we invited and requested in a friendly manner our gracious lords, the bishops of Constance, Chur, and Basel, as well as the university at the latter place, and likewise our faithful, beloved confederates of the twelve regions and others, to help us by reporting on these articles through their learned messengers on the basis of the true, divine, evangelical Scriptures. Once again we desire that whoever is able advise us better or differently by the true divine Scriptures. We shall gladly receive such advice from them with particular gratitude and joy. Hereby we also once again ask each and everyone, that whoever finds us in some way to have erred against God and his word of the holy gospel, or to be wrong, to point it out in a friendly way out of the true word of God and of the gospel for the sake of the honor of God, of truth, and Christian love. We shall receive and welcome such with the highest gratitude. [630]

[2] A Short Christian Instruction [3]

First, since anyone may well observe that the controversies of today arise solely out of some people's misunderstandings, and since all human teaching is in vain unless God enlightens and draws people inwardly, so every Christian, as an individual and when one prays in community, should call anxiously upon God to let the light of his word shine forth and draw us poor ignorant ones by his grace, so that we may learn to know him truly. And, as we know him, to acquire true love and to order all our actions out of love to him according to his pleasure--after this time eternally to receive, enjoy, and possess him. Such prayers of ours God will answer, for in Matthew 18:19 he has promised us that whatever we ask from him he will give. He also says in Luke 11:13: "If you who are evil can give good gifts to your children, how much more will your heavenly father give a holy or godly spirit to those who call upon him." St. James also says, "If anyone of you lack wisdom, let him request it from God, who gives to all people

purely and simply, without reservation. Thus it will be given to him; however, he should ask in faith or confidence, doubting nothing, etc." [James 1:5]

Consequently, without doubt it is fitting to begin the teachings of God in the same way Christ began. Now Christ began thus: "Mend your ways! The kingdom of God is near!" according to Matthew 4:7 and Mark 1:15. Therefore, without doubt we should also cry in this sinful world: "Mend your ways." Indeed, as John the Baptist added in Matthew 3:10, "The axe already has been laid to the root of the tree. Each tree that does not bring forth good fruit will be cut down and thrown into the fire."

For anyone to know why he should mend his ways, it is necessary for him to recognize his guilt. Therefore it is essential in the first place to know the source of sin. After we find that, each person will judge himself to be a sinner and trust himself to the mercy of God. [631]

[3] Concerning Sin [4]

We learn to recognize sin in a two-fold manner: first as coming from birth; secondly, we find it in our temptations.

From birth we are all sinners, for we are all born of Adam. Now Adam fell into sin, weakness, and death before he ever gave birth. Thus it also follows that all who come from him inherit such weakness from him. [5] For, just as it is not possible for a person to beget an angel, so also the fallen, sinful Adam could not beget a sinless person. Adam fell as recorded in Genesis 2:17: "When God in paradise forbade use of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, he said, 'On the day you eat thereof, you will certainly die.'" Now God cannot lie. [Cf. Hebrews 6:18] And as Adam ate the forbidden food, he died. The result is a dead Adam, and inasmuch as no dead person can beget a living person so is it clear that all who are born of Adam are dead. The death of Adam is not only a bodily death, even though that also came with time, for the passage "then you will certainly die" means the following: the loss of the grace and friendship of God, the loss of the indwelling, ruling or leading of the spirit of God, the loss of the perfect order of human nature, and the fall into sin. That is, after the destruction of his nature Adam and all his descendants are incapable of doing anything good; for they are sinful. What is here called "sin" is nothing but the weakness of the fall and the impotence of our flesh as in Romans 7:17: "I can therefore work nothing, but the sin which lives in me." This is the sin that is innate within me, the sinful fall through which death came

into us. According to Romans 5:12, "Sin came into all humankind through one person and death through sin."

This is the first death of Adam: he has lost the grace of God. Where there is no grace there is no salvation, but only complete despair. His shame of nakedness also signifies this. When the Lord called him, he said, "Lord, I heard your voice and was afraid, since I was naked, and hid myself." [Genesis 2:9f.] Note! What is this [632] nakedness of Adam, since God created him naked and he had so walked before him? It was nothing but that he had fallen into death, sin, transgression, misery, weakness, and powerlessness, and that he saw in himself nothing good, under which protective cover or cloak he would be permitted to come before God. Which bodily death, do you think, which would so quickly have taken him out of shame, would have hurt Adam so much as the death of disaster, dishonor and weakness wherein he and all his descendants had to stand before God? They have nothing good with which they could cover or protect themselves; therefore, the first death is the more serious.

The other death is bodily, a punishment for sin inflicted on us by God. And, as surely as all people who are conceived in sin must die, so certainly are they also children of Adam with regard to transgression, sin, powerlessness and nakedness. For we are nothing but flesh, as God says in Genesis 6:3: "My spirit will not remain with humankind, for it is flesh." Since, however, we all know that the flesh is worthless, is incapable of anything and gives birth to nothing good, it follows that we, just as Adam, since we are nothing but flesh, are by nature incapable of anything that is either just or good. Rather, all our inclinations are directed only to evil, as God himself says in the previous passage: "All thoughts of the heart are always directed to evil" [Genesis 6:5]. And likewise in Genesis 8:21 he says: "The understanding and counsel of the human heart is evil from youth." If it is evil from childhood on then it must come from the heritage of Adam. This is the right understanding of original sin: the fall, transgression, powerlessness, loss of God, weakness, sin, or whatever you want to call it. It is clear how we are by nature all together the children of wrath. See Ephesians 2:3. And also how we have all sinned. See Romans 3:12, 23. Also how we are completely useless and do nothing good. See Psalm 14:1. For we are by nature all together the children of Adam and stand on the side of the transgressing party, and no one [633] can by nature perform either good or reconciling deeds--neither for oneself nor for anyone else, for we are all sinners [cf. Romans 3:23].

Secondly, we can become aware of the sin, that is, weakness, powerlessness, etc., in ourselves, for we feel in ourselves that sin dwells in us [Romans 7:18]. For so long as we live in the body, hereditary sin will bear evil fruit forever and forever.

M. ELLIOTT LIBRARY
Cincinnati Christian University

Now the sin and fall came out of inordinate desire, namely, that Adam wanted to know and to become great--indeed, to become like God [cf. Genesis 3:4-6]. Thus still today every person is selfish. He pushes himself toward honor, name, power, riches, and reputation for himself. He values himself more than he is worth; he believes that other people's work should serve him and he strives to that end. Denial is of no use here. If every person were to examine his own desires he would find them so great that no one could satisfy them. However, where a person does not destroy anything, it is through God's power--not his own. We will speak about this later. We are speaking here of humankind and its reason, striving and power. By nature they always look out for themselves first and always regard themselves first. In short, they do nothing just, but are completely selfish. Thus Paul says in Romans 7:18: "I know that nothing good lives in me, that is, in my flesh." Read the whole chapter; it will provide much understanding in the matter. Therefore, the will of the flesh, that is, of broken humanity, is always opposing God. Don't we all know how sweet it seems to us when God bids us die, suffer, endure. It is all rooted in the sin of the first fall and in selfishness.

At this point you say: "I do not know whether selfishness is just or unjust. How then can I perceive that sin is in me? Why should I not think of myself first? Does not nature teach that to me? The unreasoning animals care for themselves first." I answer: you speak correctly that the unreasoning animals think of themselves first; however, you prove nothing but that if you also do it, you do nothing other than the animals who are nothing but flesh. [634] Thereby you then see that you are in yourself nothing but flesh as Christ says in John 3:6, "What is born of the flesh is flesh." You think of nothing but what is of the flesh. Here now your sin becomes evident. If you were reasonable you would realize that you, without doubt, should think and act much differently than the unreasoning animals. However, since you are exactly like them in your struggles--as Psalm 49:13 says, "Since man was in honor, he has not understood it, but has become exactly like the unreasoning animals"--you can well realize that the weakness must somehow come from a sickness which actually restrains us and is born in us, i.e., the fall of Adam. However, since our reason by itself does not recognize the just and godly, God has revealed the law to us wherein we may see what would be just or unjust. For as Paul says in Romans 7:7, "I did not recognize sin except through the law only. For I would not have known that covetousness was sin had the law not said, 'You shall not covet.'"

In order to make clearer what this means, it is necessary for us to speak of the law.

[4] Concerning the Law

The law is nothing but a manifestation of the will of God. As the will of God is eternal, so also is the law. Consequently we are speaking here only of the law which is conducive to the godliness of the inner person. That is indeed nothing other than a manifestation of the divine will. For example, this law: "You should love your neighbor as yourself" [Leviticus 19:18; Matthew 22:30] is nothing but the law of nature that says "Whatever you want done to you, do also to another" [cf. Mt. 7:12; Lk. 6:31] and conversely: "What you do not want, do also to no one" [Tobit 4:16]. Yes, this law of nature, which God made sweet with love, must only come from God. And although the heathen also accept it, it nevertheless does not come from human reason--let them say what they want. For this same reason only considers itself and does not hold that it should show consideration for others, but that others should show consideration for it. Therefore all laws which make the inner person godly can be from no one but God. However, understand: laws do not have the power to make a person [635] godly or righteous; rather, they point out only how a person should be if he wants to live according to the will of God, become godly and come to God. According to Romans 7:12, "The law is holy and the commandment is also holy." Now it cannot be holy unless it comes from one who is holy. Insofar as it came from us it would not be holy, for we are not holy. Therefore Paul says again soon after: "We know that the law is spiritual" [Rom. 7:14]. However, if we are carnal, then it is obvious that the law cannot be from us. All this proves that the law which teaches the true inner godliness must flow alone out of the divine will.

Furthermore, if we now have the law we are not therefore righteous, for they are not recognized as godly who hear the law. Rather they are reckoned godly who do the law. What then is the law good for? The answer according to Romans 3:20 is that one recognizes sin through the law. Therefore understand that with the following example: "You should covet no one's spouse or possessions" [Ex. 20:17] shows you without doubt that if you covet these things you sin. And you fancy that the desire would not be sin, for you think that if you were on your guard before the act that you would not have sinned. But see our cunning! We are godly only because of the outward deed, and yet inwardly the heart has already become adulterous, a thief, a usurer or a robber. For if he were permitted to do it, then he would do it. Now our God is not blind; he sees the heart of people. If God finds the coveting or plotting therein, then the person has already incurred the penalty before God. On the other hand it is not possible for us to be without temptations and lusts so long as we wear the skin of Adam. For the flesh bears its fruit forever. For the law stands firm and does not let itself fall nor bend: you

shall covet the goods of no one. And if we cannot be on our own power with the desire, so also are we also transgressors and fallen into the wrath and penalty of God. All this will be clear in the words of Paul in Romans 7:8-9: "sin was dead without the law," that is, one knows nothing of sin where there is no law. "I have also lived once without the law," that is, so long as we have not yet been instructed with the word of God, as children are, then we live without the law. "When, however, the command has come," that is, after [636] the commandment is made known to us, "sin came alive," that is, I then realized what sin is. "And yet I have died," that is, when I recognized the law, I saw well that I was of death. "Therefore the commandment that was given to me for good has become death for me," that is, I have seen therein how I am worthy of death since I cannot fulfill it, etc. Soon after that [Romans 7:14-20]: "We know that the law is spiritual and yet I am carnal, for I have been given away or sold under the weakness of sin (understand: that which we bring here from Adam). For that which I already do does not please me. For I do not do what I want, but I do what I hate," that is, since the time I heard the law and the word of God I want to avoid sin but the weak flesh does not let me come to that point. "If I only do that which I do not want, then I am in harmony with the law, which to be sure is good. However, if I do the opposite, it is the sin doing it," that is, the weakness which lies or lives in me, etc. Soon after that [Romans 7:21-25]: "Therefore I find that if I want to do the good or the righteous thing according to the instruction of the law, that evil lies close to me. For I delight in the law of God according to the inner person. I see in my members," that is, in my body, "another law. The same fights against the law of the heart and leads me forth captive under the law of sin," that is, of the weakness which lives in my body. "What a wretched person I am! Who will redeem me from the body of death? I say, 'Thanks be to God, that I have been redeemed through Jesus Christ our Lord.'" See! In Paul's view we perceive and experience our own weakness and impotence. If, however, no one can come to God unless he has no blemish, according to Psalm 15:1-3, and we cannot be without blemish, it then follows that we must despair in ourselves of being able to come to God. Here the grace of God that is shown to us in Christ will reveal itself.

Now follows, concerning the gospel.

Next we shall show how the law is abolished.

[5] The Gospel

Although since the creation of the world Almighty God has dealt and spoken much with his people, the powerlessness and sin of Adam has been so great that no one could fulfill his word. [637] Therefore it also follows that no one could come to God. For although he is merciful, he is at the same time righteous, as Psalm 111:4 says, "The Lord is a tender God of mercy; he is also righteous." Therefore if we could perfectly fulfill his commandments in this age, we would no less need his pure grace so that he could give us the eternal kingdom and joy. For however great a person's merit would be, he would still have no account due against the eternal, as Romans 8:18 says, "The sorrows of this age are not worthy of the future glory which will be revealed in us." We shall remain silent here concerning the greatness of the splendor and joy.

Since, after all that, we are not only unable to fulfill what his righteousness demands but even cannot reach it because of the evil temptations and sins, nevertheless the righteousness of God must be met. Therefore hear what a wise counsel the Divine Wisdom has taken. It is so wonderful that it is inconceivable and unbelievable for the human understanding, unless God enlightens a person's understanding, takes his heart and makes it faithful.

1. Adam, created by the Divine Wisdom who is the Son of God [cf. I Cor. 1:24], sinned out of pride.

2. Just as he fell into the more serious death of the disfavor of God and sin and also into bodily death, because he had transgressed the commandment of God, so also all we who are his children, are sinful, in the disfavor of God, and subject to both kinds of death even as he was.

3. And even if we were godly and without our sin, and served God all our lives according to his pleasure, human life still would not be worthy of the long, immeasurable eternity.

4. Also, heavenly joy is so wonderfully great, holy and beautiful that no earthly life could deserve it, even if we were good, useful servants [cf. Luke 17:16]. Behold, how truly Christ has said that it is impossible for a person to be saved [cf. Mt 19:26].

However, note on the other hand how wisely God has taken care of all our sins in Christ Jesus [cf. Isa. 53:4].

1. Christ was humbled even to the humiliating death of the cross as we read in Philippians 2:8, and he [638] through

whom we were created, bore it for our sake. Thus we are redeemed by the Wisdom of God through whom we are created and against whom Adam sinned.

2. Christ did not have the guilt of any transgression in himself [Hebrews 4:15], for as I Peter 2:22 says, "he never did any sin and there was not found any unloyalty in his mouth." He also had no sinful weakness of the corrupted nature in him, for he was not conceived in sin and the stain of Adam, but was conceived by the Holy Spirit in the pure body of the Virgin Mary. Therefore, as he through whom we were created gave himself for us, so does he pay the divine righteousness for the burdensome death of the fall, of weakness and disfavor of God, and makes his believers cheerfully take on bodily death for his sake.

3. He obtained eternal salvation for all people for they were all created as well as redeemed through him. And since he is eternal God he is sufficient and worthy enough to take upon himself the sin of all people for eternity and to lead us into eternal salvation, according to Hebrews 9 and 10.

He also embodies the beauty and image of the father according to Hebrews 1:3 and has let himself be so miserably spit on, mocked, and beaten for our sakes [cf. Mt. 27:29ff.]. Of that Isaiah 53:2 and 3 says, "he has neither form nor comeliness," and "he has truly carried our sin and sickness." He also is the salvation which the angels rejoice to behold in I Peter 1:12. Yes, he bore misery for our sakes in order to obtain eternal joy and comeliness for us.

These few passages provide an instruction for the consideration and admiration of the eternal wisdom of God who has done these things for our redemption's sake, for no one can otherwise fathom or articulate it, as Romans 11:33-35 says.

Now when the savior of all people, Christ, was born of the holy, pure Virgin Mary, as Luke 2:10f. states, the angel spoke to the shepherds: "See, I proclaim great joy to you, which all people will have, for to you a [639] savior is born who is Christ the Lord, etc." Since then the gracious activity of God which he completed with us through his son is being called the gospel: that in all our need, impotence, and despair the Son of God is proclaimed to us, that a savior has come who healed all our sins. And therefore he has been called Jesus, that is, a savior, because he has healed humankind from their sin according to Matthew 1:21. Here we have in short the entire foundation of the gospel, namely, that since it was impossible for us poor people to come to God on our merit, God ordained his son to take human nature and to be given for us unto death. He who was perfect in every way and without blemish was able to take away all our blemishes.

Whoever firmly believes in this activity and trusts the precious fruitfulness of the suffering of Christ has already believed the gospel and will be saved. Whoever does not believe therein is lost, according to Mark 16:16. For it has previously been sufficiently pointed out that we can do nothing good. So also the works of the law cannot save us for we cannot fulfill them as God demands. According to Galatians 2:16, "All flesh is not recognized as just by the works of the law."

This gracious activity, namely, that we are saved not by our works but by the pure grace of God through the redeeming Lord Jesus Christ, we have basically in the word of God. Christ says in Luke 17:10: "When you do all things which are commanded of you, then say, 'We are unworthy servants, etc.'" John the Baptist says in John 1:29: "See! The Lamb of God. See! He it is that takes away the sin of the world." If he takes it away, then the merit of our works does not take it away. Christ says in John 10:10: "I have come that people might have life, and also have it abundantly." In John 5:24: "Truly I say to you, whoever trusts in me has eternal life." In John 3:14: "If I am lifted up from the earth, I will draw all things to me." [Check Jn. 12:32.] In John 6:50: "That is the food or bread which comes from heaven" (understand: the food of the word of the gospel) "and gives life to the world, etc." In Matthew 11:28: "Come to me all, etc." The words of Christ are full of this view everywhere. Paul, before all others, has clearly presented and proven this view in the Epistle to the Romans and [640] the one to the Galatians, and in other places. It is reasonable for every pastor to seriously consider this.

Here, however, there are many false or weak Christians who say: "If our works do not save us, but only the grace of God which is given and assured to us in his son, then we do not need to do anything good anymore; rather, let us sin, or as Romans 3:8 says: 'Let us do much evil so that God may do much good in forgiveness through Jesus Christ.' Or, as Romans 6:1 says: 'Let us remain in sin.'" I answer: whoever speaks thus has not yet experienced how sweet the Lord is, nor has he tasted the heavenly gift of the fellowship of the Holy Spirit recorded in Hebrews 6:4. For those who recognize their sin which descends from Adam, and their own inner deceit which every person well knows resides within, see their own misery and impotence to attain salvation. And if, on the other hand, they see the grace and salvation of Jesus Christ and trust therein, then they have been born of God, as John 1:13 states. If they are now the sons of God, then they will act like sons. They devote themselves to the will of their father, after they have come again out of disfavor into grace. In Luke 15:21 the lost son did not say, "Father, I know you do pardon me; therefore I will sin and be wicked," but "Father, I have acted against God and you, so that I am not worthy to be

called your son." Notice! It does not occur to him to do the former misdeeds again by which he had sinned against the father. Thus, those who firmly believe they are reckoned among the sons of God also say, "Father, I am such a miserable wretch that I am not worthy to be called your son. But since you have given your son for me--certainly the highest good that is in heaven or on the earth--I may think that you refuse me nothing." Hence Romans 8:32. How could he? Has not God given us all things with his son? Since you have now given him for our sin, I see that I may live in sin no longer. For since I have previously stood so hopelessly in sin, why would I wander more therein? Since I am happy that I have been lifted out of the mire and have been washed, [641] why would I want to throw myself therein again? This is the view of Paul in Romans 6:2: "Why would we who have been dead in sin want to live therein any longer?" And afterwards he so beautifully points out that as Christ died and has risen, so also, after we have been buried in baptism with him, as it were [Romans 6:3-4], shall afterwards rise up and lead a new life, etc. For if we have trusted in Christ then this has come to pass with God's power. Where God is, there all work is directed as to how one departs from sin. It follows that those who speak thus have not trusted in Christ, even if they say with their mouth that they are Christians. For the person whose only comfort and confidence is God cannot endure to think now that God is pleased by misdeeds.

However, if someone says now: "No one would be able to come to God in this manner; for although a person trusts in God, he nevertheless falls into sin daily and accordingly loses the grace of God again," then we answer: that is true. As long as we live, that rogue, the body, because of the temptation, will never let us live a godly life. However, if we have trusted in God through Christ, then the fruits of the flesh cannot throw us down into damnation. Rather, as Christ said to Peter: "See! The devil has lain in waiting for you so that he may sift you as wheat. But I have prayed for you, Peter, that your faith become neither unsteady nor weak" [Luke 22:31f.]. Thus we must remain firm in faith so that all our sins will be forgiven through Christ, although both the devil and the flesh will force us through the sieve and entice us with sin to despair. But, as Peter's external denial did not bring him into damnation, so also may no sin bring us to damnation, save one: unbelief. Here, however, the true non-Christians say: "I firmly believe in Christ." Yet they do nothing Christian. Herein one sees that they are non-Christians, for one recognizes a tree by its fruit. [Cf. Mt. 7:16, 20.] Therefore, note for better understanding: as has often been pointed out before, whoever has securely trusted in the grace of God through Christ, after recognizing his sin, [642] cannot be without the love of God. Who would not love him who has so graciously taken away his sin and has begun first to love him, as I John 4:19 says, and to draw him to himself? Where, now, the love of God is, there

is God; for God is love himself and whoever is in the love of God is in God and God is in him, as I John 4:16 says. Now if God is in the right believer and he nevertheless sins, then it follows that it is as Paul says in Romans 8:10: "If now Christ is in you, then the body is dead because of sin, but the spirit or soul lives because of justification." This justification is nothing but a person's placing himself in and devoting himself to the grace of God. This is true belief. So the opinion of Paul is that our body is always dead and gives birth to works of death and sin. However, the same sins cannot damn us if we are righteous in faith, so that we trust with certainty the grace of God through the Lord Jesus Christ.

We shall set here two persons as an example so that one may understand how it may come to pass that the believer is not damned, even if he sins, but that the sins are for him an occasion for resurrection and improvement. Romans 8:28 says, "For all things work together for good for those who love God." On the other hand, for those who judge themselves pious by their works--their good works serve to their detriment. Take the pharisee and the publican of Luke 18:10-14. The pharisee holds his own works in high esteem and, as he looks at himself, thinks he is righteous and thanks God that he is not like other people. The publican who has despaired of all his piety but not of God, said: "God, be merciful to me, a sinner." This one was adjudged by Christ more godly than the pharisee, not because he had lived more respectably, but because he considers God to be so merciful and true that he would hear him as he had promised us. See. Here is the true righteousness of faith made clear. The pharisee trusts in his works; therefore, he speaks nothing but naked arrogance and builds on sand. [Cf. Lk. 6:49.] "Lord, I thank you that I am not as other people." See how our righteousness serves arrogance; therefore, [643] it is not righteousness but grave guilt. For overweening opinion of one's self is the real type of sin against God. See, however, on the other hand, the righteousness of faith: it rejects no one but itself, humbles itself, trusts in the mercy of God alone and builds on the rock. [Cf. Lk. 6:48.]

Now take this publican who so faithfully trusts in the mercy of God and let him live all life long in the body; he will not be without the temptations of the flesh. However, he does not despair at them, but as often as he falls into sin, he is humbled by it and always says: "O Lord, how wickedly I live in your eyes, but I hold myself to your mercy." This diligent running to God and lamenting restrains all vices more than any other care and precaution. For hope in God points out all sin, so reveals the secret scoundrel in the heart that he is not permitted to pass himself off as pious, and makes him more and more ashamed so that he always comes before God with the old vices. Observe the diligent, necessary watchman: faith. This view you find in

Romans 6:12. There Paul teaches that we should give attention lest sin rule in us and we become subject to sinful temptations. Then the temptations of sin rule when we let them rage unimpeded, uncensored, and uninterrupted, and would pay for them later with our works. Where there is such a plan, one gives free course to sin and seeks other works. Afterwards one wants to force them on God, that he should take them for our sins. However, wherever the true watchman, faith, is, which contains in itself affection to God and fear, there one struggles again and again with the flesh, keeps guard and crucifies the flesh with its temptations, according to Galatians 5:24. See! Thus it happens that sin does not damage believers. And only he will be saved who has such confidence in God. [644] Hereby we also learn that no one will be more inclined to better himself from day to day except the one who puts all his trust in God. The guardian watches and admonishes constantly without intermission while the self-righteous one charges and debits for his sin as he wishes: he is a completely godless person. The believer is faithful through the Spirit of God. Now where God is, there the good is always increased and grows. And when we see some people who believe in the word of God and yet do not mend their ways, then it happens that either they are not believing and are play-acting before people as if they were believing, or they are still immature in faith, but will increase and grow until they acquire the perfect maturity according to the strength of Christ described in Ephesians 4:13. To put it in a few words: where the love of God is, its efficaciousness is not less than that of lustful bodily love.

For more elucidation and strengthening of faith, Paul says in Romans 8:31: "If God is on our side," that is, if God is so favorable to us, "who will be against us?" So that we see how God is favorable to us he says further: "He did not spare his own son but gave him for us all. Has he not given us all things with him?" [Rom. 8:32] It is as if he were to say: "How could one reconcile the fact that he had given for us the greatest treasure, his own son, and would now deny us anything?" With that God teaches us through the mouth of Paul to come to him in joy and in trust. If we are simple and cannot speak to God then it is enough that we only show our trust in God through Jesus Christ in our hearts. "He represents us before God with sighs which we cannot imagine," according to Romans 8:26. He is wise enough, for he is the Divine Wisdom and yet has become ours; therefore, he is our wisdom. When we are unjust and impure, then he is just and pure and has paid for our unrighteousness. When we are unholy and sinful, then he is holy and yet he is ours. When we are mortgaged because of sin, then he is our ransom and payment. Therefore, see: whatever is lacking in us, Christ obtains for us before God. For whatever he is, he is ours. This is why Paul says in I Corinthians 1:30, "He was made or given to us by God, so that he is our wisdom, our righteousness, [645]

our holiness and our salvation." John says in I John 2:1f.: "My son! I write these things to you that you sin not. But if one has sinned, then we have an advocate or representative with the father, the righteous Jesus Christ, and he is the reconciliation for our sins, and not for ours alone, but for the sin of the whole world." Here everyone sees that all confidence in God through Christ Jesus is certain.

Now let us hear the words of Christ himself. In Matthew 11:28 he says: "Come to me all who are burdened and heavily laden; I will give you rest." See. We are truly instructed with such clear teachings and proof that we should run to God confidently and full of trust in all distress, sorrow and concern, and he will grant to us all things through the Lord Christ Jesus. Therefore, all who teach coming to God through other mediators teach against God, for he calls us to himself. Indeed, he says in John 10:1, "Whoever enters through another than me is a thief and a murderer." And again, in John 14:6, "No one can come to the father but through me." In I Timothy 2:5 he is also the only mediator: "There is one God and one mediator between God and humankind--Jesus Christ." What would any person want to bring forward against these words of God? Indeed I am not permitted to come before God; I am foolish, sinful, insignificant and unrighteous. Do you not hear God saying that Christ is our wisdom, innocence, beauty, righteousness and payment? Do you not hear that he calls us when we are heavily laden? Indeed, I must have another mediator, for I am not allowed rightly to come to God. Do you not hear that no one but Christ Jesus alone can be our mediator? Indeed, I must have an intercessor. Do you not hear that Christ does everything? You are lacking in that you still do not recognize him, for you do not trust yourself to him as to a father and yet you call him father. You reckon him a tyrant and a cruel oppressor. Therefore, all who teach that one may not come to God without different mediators insult God, falsify to him his word, and drive away the believing hearts from our [646] merciful God and father. These are the real, true anti-Christs. Everything they should ascribe to and attribute to Jesus Christ, our savior, they take away from him and give it wrongly and falsely to another creature--without any scriptural foundation, against the clear word of God.

In short, here no one should let himself be misled so as to seek grace from anyone but God himself. For this reason we have the clear word of God. Whoever does not hold this is not a Christian. The pure faith cannot tolerate one's seeking another solace than the spouse of the believing soul: God.

[6] Concerning the Abolition of the Law

There are many who speak about the abolition of the law in a wholly clumsy fashion. As a result, the ignorant or, actually, willful ones speak so arrogantly that it is an insult to God. Therefore, as promised above, I shall here discuss the abolition of the law.

Christ says in Luke 16:16f.: "The law and the prophets lasted until John. From that time the kingdom of God is preached and everyone forces his way in strongly. However, it is easier for heaven and earth to pass away than that a single letter or punctuation mark of the law become void." Here first we clearly hear that the law has lasted only until John; second that no letter or period of the law may become void. These two meanings appear to us to be contrary to one another and yet the mouth of God himself purposely has spoken and placed them together. From which we well see that it has not happened in vain. We need not point out how the ceremonies of the Old Testament, that is, the external sacrifices: the washings, the burning of incense and candles have been abolished together with the costumes, vessels, form of the temple, etc.; for these things have been only a pointing to Christ. Therefore, when Christ came, they ceased as a shadow does when the light comes. However, one must say here how the law that concerns the inner person is abolished, such as "You shall love God with the whole heart, soul, mind, and power" [Mt. 22:37] and "You shall love your neighbor as [647] yourself" [Mt. 22:39]. If these laws were abolished, then in fact faith, which is nothing but constant depending on God, would be abolished.

Therefore, pay attention to the following:

The law is a good thing in itself, for it shows the will of God, as said before. Yet it kills us. Not that the law kills us by itself, but that we learn from the law that if we do not follow it we deserve death. Thus the letter of the law kills, according to II Corinthians 3:6 and Romans 7:10. Thus all people learn from the law "You shall love God with all your strength" [Matthew 22:37] that they deserve death; for there is no one who does not either love other things more than God or many times forgets God. Therefore, everyone perceives one is justly damned according to the righteousness of God. If, however, Christ does justice to it before God--for he is our righteousness--see, then we are redeemed from the law, that is, we are freed so that the law cannot kill us. Nevertheless, the law remains firm for eternity. So the law damned all people until Christ came--even though Christ pointed to John out of modesty. For no one had come yet to pay for us since we deserved death. The speech of Christ is as if he said, "The prophets have predicted my coming and my nature.

This has lasted until John. In him and in me everything is fulfilled which was previously predicted of us. The law made all humankind guilty of death. However, after John showed that I am the savior, it has not been able to bring anyone to death who has faith in me, for I am payment and redemption. Nevertheless, all the law as far as concerns the inner person, remains valid eternally. This becomes clear by an example: "You shall not steal" [Ex. 20:15] is an eternal commandment. Yet if one has stolen and you redeem him before the judge from the gallows, then he is now redeemed from the law, that is, from the punishment of the law. Nevertheless, he is not redeemed so that in the future, contrary to the law he may continue to steal. And, although one would redeem him from the gallows as often as he stole, he would never be made free from keeping the law. [648] Thus, although Christ has paid for our sin for eternity, nonetheless the law stands firm always. But if we trust in Christ we cannot be damned by the law. This is one part of the abolition of the law: that we are redeemed from the punishment of the law if we trust in the Lord Jesus Christ, our savior.

In the second place, the law was removed solely from the godly; indeed, according to I Timothy 1:9, it was never given to them. But who is called godly in the Scriptures? Not the person who does not sin, for none is without sin, so I John 1:8. Rather it is the one who believes as it is written in Habakkuk 2:4 and Romans 1:17: "The believer shall live in faith." That one alone is living who knows himself to be dead and powerless and who relies on the grace of God alone. God now lives in him; he is dead. He alone is godly or righteous who recognizes his unrighteousness and who solely relies on the righteous Jesus Christ. So it happens in the way Paul teaches in Galatians 2:19: "I have died to the law through the law, so that I live for God. I am crucified with Christ, and I do no longer live; rather, Christ lives in me. For when I now live in the body I live in the faith and trust of the son of God."

How can one die to the law through the law? Answer: as has often been said before, in that one correctly looks at the law and finds it impossible to keep and fulfill it. He further despairs of attaining salvation because of his works, and comes to the point where he surrenders himself solely to the grace of God. Now he is in the grace of God, and through recognition of the law has died to the law; therefore, he now lives in the sole comfort of the grace of God. He is now crucified with Christ if by despair in himself he has died in himself. He lives no more, for in himself he has been found dead by the law. However, that he lives, i.e. that he has the comfort and certainty of the grace of God, means nothing but that he has placed all his comfort in trust of Jesus Christ. This person now lives in Christ, and Christ lives in him. Such faith is not the result of human reason nor

power but of the hand and power of God. Notice, whoever is such a believer does not need any law, but all his life sees only Christ who lives in him and is his comfort--just as a righteous, thankful [649] person looks in all his conduct and behavior to another person who grants him all of his life and necessities. According to Romans 8:9, "Whoever has such a spirit of Christ is his." And, even though we know that we are still far from perfection, we still find in fact that the measure of goodness grows in us according to the measure of faith and confidence in Christ. Just as faith is forever tested, so also does the flesh forever bear its fruits. We do not grow weary of these fruits, except through the firmness of faith, which is nothing but our union with God through constant confidence and running to him. Thus, those who are now in faith, that is, in the certain confidence of the grace of God, are under the law no longer, but are under grace. Romans 6:5: "Whoever lives therein lives in God and God in him." For everything God demands from him is sweet, agreeable and pleasant according to the inner person, even if he cannot fulfill it because of weakness--for he holds on to the grace of God. And whatever pleases God pleases him also, even if the flesh cannot follow. For thus has the law of the living spirit redeemed him from the law of sin and death, according to Romans 8:2. What is the law of the living spirit? Answer: the leading and instructing which God offers to us out of a true understanding of his word if we have depended on him. According to John 6:45 and I John 2:27 we may learn this from no one.

Now we have two salvations from the law: one is from the ceremonies, that is, external things or empty church performances. The other is from the punishment of our misdeeds. If we have completely depended on God, we no longer need any law. For there it is God himself who leads us, and as God needs no law, so also do those who live in God need no law--because God leads them. For where the Spirit of God is, there is freedom, as II Corinthians 3:17 says. The person who depends on God is also free from the law which concerns the inner being. Nevertheless, he does freely and cheerfully all things that [650] are the duty of a Christian person. One can recognize by their fruits those who are free in such a manner. When they are humble it happens out of the indwelling Divine Spirit; Christ was also like that. When they care for other people's salvation, then Christ did likewise; thus the care must come from Christ alone. When they are patient, then it is the same; for Christ was also patient. When they are peaceful, then this, too, is from God; Christ was also. When they are courageous for the sake of the honor of God, Christ was, too. When they are cheerful in calamity for the sake of the honor of God, then all this is from God, etc. However, we find here a great number of false Christians who pass themselves off as if they were built on God and were free. Yet there is no humility in them, rather they want to become great, rich,

or esteemed through their pretensions. Where they should care for others they care only for themselves. They do not want to bear anything for the sake of God, but for the sake of their own profit and name they bear all things. They are not peaceful. Their business is nothing but to come into discord with other people, to fight and to destroy--even though the honor of God is seriously harmed thereby. They are learned and courageous in the defense of their deeds, however wrong they might be. Yet for increasing the honor of God and teaching their neighbors in friendly fashion, they are worth nothing--even though sometimes one must handle them in roughness. And, for the price of a small disagreeableness, if they lose a small temporary gain they fall away, etc. However, in calling someone to account, in not forgiving any weak person, in praising their skills (but not being the master of them), in boasting how one should kill the priests, burn the monks and drown the nuns, how one should punish the things of which they believe themselves free, in short, in embracing at once without investigation all external things, indeed in that they are "good" Christians. However, finally, if you identify them well by their fruits, you will not find that they have first become Christians within themselves. As a result, the teaching of God is dishonored and badly injured here by many who are good Christians only as it concerns the body and external appearance, though in time one must also do away with the abuse of things. But the [651] inner sin they do not want to touch upon, although it is to be hoped that as far as they have begun to believe the word, they will in time allow themselves to be led truly.

In the third place, we Christians are also free from all those laws imposed on us for the purpose of making us pious or good. Herein belong all papal laws not grounded on the word of God: prohibition of foods, commands to chastity, vows, auricular confession, sacrifices, financial payments, indulgences and the whole worthless business. We are also free from humanly devised teachings devised by men, such as intercessions to the saints, purgatory, images, church decorations, ordering masses, the purchase of vigils and other things, etc.; for they are not based on the word of God. The foundation of everything is the sole word of Christ in Matthew 15:9: "They honor me in vain if they teach the teachings and commandments of people." In short, according to Luke 16:15 all that is considered good out of the teachings of humankind is an abomination before God.

Finally, on the pretext that they are Christians, some want to exempt themselves from obedience to true government which we call the temporal. They are the worst enemies of the teachings of God. For in addition to acting contrary to the clear word of God, they also slander the teaching of Christ before other people and render it worthless. In the Old Testament in Exodus 18:21-26 God established the government that keeps the human

community and justice for peace and rest. In the New, Christ has ordered one's giving to Caesar (which we shall take to mean every government) what one owes to him [Matthew 22:21]. He also commands this through the mouth of Paul in Romans 13; read the whole chapter. Through the mouth of Peter, Book One, Chapter Two: "You should be obedient to the ruler and his governors or captains, etc." [Cf. I Peter 2:13-15.] And soon after: "You should not make Christian freedom a pretext for evil, etc. Fear God and hold the rulers in honor, etc." [I Peter 2:16-17] In Hebrews 13:17: "Be obedient to your superiors, etc." The proof texts are enough for us to see that we are to be obedient by divine command to the government, which carries the sword. However, a government shall command nothing [652: 1] that is against the honor of God and his word, or the true Christian will say, "One must be more obedient to God than people" as Acts 4:19 and 5:29 state. Therefore, it is not appropriate for the government to demand anything contrary to the word of God if it wants to be truly Christian.

Now all those who in this time dare to extricate themselves from all obligations of rents, fees, tithes and other just obligations, break the commandment "You shall not steal" [Exodus 20:15]. For it has become a virtual custom that everybody buys the piece of land on which he pays a tithe for exactly that amount less. One must do away with the misuse of tithes or the whole order will founder. These people are more evil thieves than others because they make Christ a pretext for their theft. If it should come to the point that under Christians one does not give a godly person what is his due, and as well not be obedient to the government, then it would be better to live with the Turks than with such a people. One cannot make a greater blasphemy of God than by protecting such wickedness in his name. However, every government should also pay attention to abolish the fraud, usury and malice of rents. As God has given the sword into the government's hand, it should see to it that it does not fight for the sake of its own profit, but that it punishes the evil with it and protects the good. Otherwise, God will find as well a way to shatter the government's power even as the priests' power.

The wanton ones sin also against the priests; for private individuals have presumed to revile them, to despoil them, to beat them to death--all of which is unchristian. Their matter should be handled in this fashion: they are to be advised of their errors and are to do away with them. Let them die in peace as they have come. In this way lawful obligation will be fulfilled; for our, that is, the temporal government, has given them a promise that may not be broken to those who are dedicated to it, but no more may be established. If, however, there are some stiffnecked ones that will not yield to the word of God [653] and yet cannot bring forward contrary evidence, the government,

not private individuals, shall deal with these. They will then fairly act according to Matthew 18:17 and Deuteronomy Chapter 13. In short, the ruthless ones, who can do nothing but rob and steal, are such pernicious people that when they presume to gloss it over with the name of Christ, it would be better to have as many Turks in their place. The supercilious priests who want to accomplish everything with their arrogance and authority are just as pernicious. Therefore, the government must act earnestly lest the wantonness of both godless parties prove detrimental to the honor of God. In short, every Christian should give to everyone what is his due, as Romans 13:7 says. That is a duty which a government recognizes and considers as obligation. But in this regard let the government really see that it prohibits or changes the duties which are unjust before God. And if one wants to limit the number of priests to the essential number, the goods they now possess still do not belong to you or to anyone else but to the poor, and that according to the decree of the government and each parish. This is not the place to harp on this matter constantly. Insofar as a preacher of God's word has a clear, simple eye he will not proceed dangerously.

Everybody may well recognize that this **Short Instruction,** delivered for the unlearned is in vain when the teachers do not first earnestly pray to God that he give them grace, and afterwards search in the Scriptures diligently, remaining therein day and night, and as well finally when they do not show a disposition to build the true Jerusalem. But if they advance the honor of God and the welfare of souls, as it is their duty, and look not to the temporal but to the eternal, then God will abundantly offer them the word of truth. He turns the shepherd Amos into a preaching prophet [cf. Am. 1:1]. Therefore they ought to be rich in the word of God and they should teach the gospel, which may not be understood without the law, in such a way that good and evil persons may know how to come to God. There also are many recalcitrant ones who must be sharply reprimanded. [654] They praise themselves as being free of the law and yet they are in need of much harder laws in order to be kept on the way, and, in general, they teach which works are most pleasing to God, namely, what he teaches in Matthew 5-7 and John 13-17. Also, one should softly and strictly fight against the superabundance of games, eating, clothing, swearing, fighting, quarreling and avarice. There are beasts enough whom we can fight today without needing the preaching either of fables or sophistical arguments in the pulpit.

So much for the instruction of the doctrine of God.

[7] Concerning Images

Concerning images: it is reasonable for everyone to teach, as has been found, that images are forbidden by God--so that, after they have been instructed and strengthened, the unlearned and weak ones may soon accept what should be done with the images. For this purpose, the little book that recently came out, **On the Abolition of Images**, will serve well because it has much scriptural evidence. [7] Whoever does not have this, let him read the following passages:

> Exodus 20:23 (at the end on the silver idols); Exodus 34: 12-17; Leviticus 19:4; Leviticus 26:1; Deuteronomy 4:3, 23-28; Deuteronomy 5:7-9; I Samuel 7:3-6; Numbers 25:4f.; Deuteronomy 7:5, 25f.; Deuteronomy 11:16f.; Deuteronomy 13:6-18; Deuteronomy 27:15; Joshua 24:23; Judges 10:6-16; Psalm 96:5; Psalm 115:4-8; Isaiah 42:17; Isaiah 44:9-20; Jeremiah 10:2-16; Jeremiah 13:10; Ezekiel 14; Ezekiel 6; Micah 1:5-7; Habakkuk 2:18f.; II Kings 18:4, 33-35; II Kings 10:15-30; II Kings 23:4-23; II Chronicles 31:1-7; I Corinthians 5:10f.; Acts 15:20, 29; I Corinthians 8:4f.; I Corinthians 10:19-21; I Corinthians 12:2; Galatians 5:1, 20; I Thessalonians 1:9; I Peter 4:3; I John 5:21.

Of the passages noted, some forbid images or idols, some ridicule them, and some teach how one should abolish them. At the same time, however, one is to proceed carefully so that evil does not result. For until Christian people are instructed rightly, that one should not pay the images any honor, one may still have patience until the weak are also able to follow--so that the matter may be brought to a conclusion with unanimity. Some passages praise those who have got rid of images.

Here some disagree in the following way: "This command concerns only Jews and not us Christians." One should answer thus: the two parts, "You shall not have foreign gods" [Exodus 20:3] and "You shall have no image or likeness" [Exodus 20:4], are like a safeguard and explanation of the first commandment, "You shall trust in one God." Look at Deuteronomy 5:6, where God says: "I am your Lord God, who has led you out of Egypt, etc." Observe that this is the first commandment, wherein God has set himself forth as our God. Now he forbids the things which want to lead us away from him and says immediately thereafter, "You shall not have other gods after me or in my sight" [Deut. 5:7]. And that is a way through which the children of Israel were often led away--and we Christians the same. For whoever has sought help and confidence from a creature which the believer ought to seek only with God, has made a foreign god for himself. For that is forever one's god in which one takes refuge. Hence,

that is one thing that may draw us from God: foreign gods.

The other thing that may lead us away is images. For that reason, God forbids them first: "You shall make no carved image, nor likeness or copy of the things which are in heaven, on the earth or in the water" [Deut. 5:8]. See, one is simply not to make any. And if in some way we must have an image before us, as happened to Daniel and others in Daniel Chapter 3, then he says: "You shall give them no honor"--neither genuflecting, bowing nor reverencing (for that is what the word schahah means), "and render them no service either." The Latin words also sufficiently point this out: "You shall not worship them; also show them no honor." If one has them in a church [656] then one has already given the images honor. And, if one says "I do not worship them; they teach and admonish me," that is all a fable. God does not speak here of worship, which we want to understand: he is above that, for he knows well that no wise person worships an image. However, he forbids here all manifestations of honor, so that one may not bow, genuflect, kneel, light candles or burn incense before them. If one is not honoring them, then what are they doing on the altar? Indeed, one is honoring them no less than pagans do their images of idols when they have called them by the name of idols. We have done likewise. We name the pieces of wood with the names of the blessed. One piece of wood we name Our Lady and the Mother of God, the other we name St. Nicholas, etc. And those who do this cry that we want to destroy the honor of the saints, but when they call idols by saints' names they are already dishonoring the saints.

Moreover, it is also wrong that the pictures teach us. We should be taught solely by the word of God. Instead, the idle priests, who should have taught us unceasingly, have painted the teachings on the walls for us. And we poor simple people have therewith been deprived of the teaching and have fallen to images, and have honored them. We have begun to seek from creatures what we should have sought only from God. And though they often should have taught us, they omitted teaching and held the Mass frequently instead. We simple ones have not understood the Mass, and also the majority of them also, until it has come to the point that by far the majority of Christian people have not known the essential point as to how a person is saved. Indeed, with their fables of the saints, some have pitiably turned us from the true word of God to the creature.

But if one objects that images are not forbidden in the New Testament, this also is wrong. For where one finds in the New Testament idolum or simulachrum, there one should read in German bilder ("images") or glychnussen ("likenesses"). Let no one be mistaken that if he finds in the newly published New Testament in the designated passages the words [657] abgot ("idol")

or froembde goett ("foreign gods") it should always read "images" or "likenesses" instead. Idolon, semeion, says Hesychius, "is the Latin 'simulachrum';" in German: a bild ("image") or glychnus ("likeness"). Now compare I John 5:21: "Dear Children, be on your guard against images!" and other passages and see, therefore, whether or not images are also forbidden in the New Testament. Acts Chapter 15 is advice by the Christians at Jerusalem that Christians should be on guard against the defilement caused by images.

Furthermore, if we say "The saints' images show us what they have done and suffered so that we do likewise." then one should ask us when our works are righteous. We must always say: if they are done in faith which is also the love for God, then they are pleasing to God according to I Corinthians Chapter 13. One asks us further: on what basis have the saints done such? We will say: out of true faith. Now let someone show us where they have painted or copied this faith. We cannot show it save in their hearts. Therefore it must always follow that we also must learn that faith is necessary in our hearts if we want to do anything pleasing to God. This we cannot learn from walls but only from the gracious pulling of God out of his own word. See. We recognize here that the image leads only to external weakness and cannot make the heart faithful. We see externally what the saints have done, but images cannot give us the faith wherein all things must come to pass. If we now have pure and undefiled faith, see, we will ridicule ourselves for having had so ignorant and weak a faith that we imagined images admonish us--when, in fact, everything without faith is vain.

Here one makes another objection: "Then it is not fitting for one to paint a story on his house, or to have any kinds of pictures painted or carved. In the Old Testament we see two cherubim and woven or embroidered cloths with the cherubim and bronze serpents, and buttons, lilies and violets on the menorah and garlands on the ephod. [658] Also in I Kings Chapter 6, Solomon let them make cherubim, palm trees and numbers of paintings in the temple that were so beautiful they appeared to grow out of the walls. Therefore it is without doubt also fitting for us to have such paintings or images." I answer: it is certain that God has only forbidden all forms and images, lest one begin to honor anything or render honor to any creature in addition to him, as one can well understand in Deuteronomy Chapter 4. Therefore we may well note that such forms as flower patterns, lions' heads, wings and the like that never can be taken as God and as aids are not forbidden. For Solomon would not have let such trees and flowers be made in the temple, nor would God have ordered the making of the menorah, if they had produced the danger of idolatry. However, with regard to the images and the paintings which we have in churches, it is evident that they have

created the danger of idolatry. Therefore, one should not leave them there any longer--nor in your chamber, in the marketplace, or anywhere one shows any kind of honor. Especially are they intolerable in the churches, for everything we have there is holy to us. Where anyone would have them outside the church as a representation of historical events without instruction for veneration, they may be tolerated. But whenever one begins to bow before them and to give them honor, then they are to be tolerated nowhere on earth. For then they are, in short, either an aid to idolatry, or idolatry itself.

[8] Concerning the Mass

If one wants to speak of the mass, one should first point out, so as not to offend anyone, that none of us wants to abolish or belittle the body and blood of Christ, or to teach that it is nothing--but that the mass has a different purpose from that of eating and drinking the body and blood of Christ. That is to say it has always been taught that the laity and priests eat one thing when they eat the body and blood of Christ. This is true, for Christ made in it only one order and institution. Nonetheless, several hundred years ago the erring priests turned it into a sacrifice--which it is not. No layman considers it anything but food for the soul. [659] It is that, and God instituted it for that and nothing else, as will clearly be shown later. Therefore it cannot be anything else. Here one must point out what people have meant in calling it a sacrifice and what a sacrifice is.

In short, the word "sacrifice" in the Old Testament stands for a gift that one has brought to God. The priest then took the gift, lifted it onto the altar and burned it, or raised it up, or moved it back and forth--in accordance with the type of sacrifice. This was done for the purification of their sin. Now all this was but an image saying that Christ, the true priest, would come, and would offer for the sins of all the world not an animal nor an imperfect sacrifice, but a pure unstained sacrifice. No person in all humanity could have been found to do this except Christ himself. Therefore he offered up himself as he suffered the death on the cross for us. By this one death he purified and paid for the sins of the whole world for eternity. This true meaning one finds grounded in the letter to the Hebrews, especially chapters 6 to 10. Now since Christ has suffered only once the death on the cross, thus he also has been sacrificed only once. His dying is his sacrifice for us, and his sacrifice is his dying. His sacrifice is the purification of our sin and his death is also the purification of our sin. Therefore as he has died only once as Romans 6:10

states, so also has he suffered death only once and has been sacrificed only once. And, therefore, where one finds in the Scripture that Christ's death has taken away our sin and finds in addition that his sacrifice has taken away our sin, and his shedding of his blood has taken away our sin, as Colossians 1:22 says, then they all together have only one meaning, namely, that Christ has saved us and paid for our sin, because he has given and sacrificed himself for us in the death of the cross. As he died only once, thus has he been sacrificed only once.

However the claim of priesthood to sacrifice Christ for other people has been invented in themselves without foundation in the word of God. As a result there arise two serious blasphemies of God--and two big sins. [660]

The first blasphemy of God is that through it the great value and treasure of the sufferings of Christ is obscured. Christ, who is true God and human, is so high and valuable that his death offered only once is rich and precious enough to pay for all the world's sin for eternity; for he is eternal God. Therefore his suffering is also unceasingly fruitful for eternity. If, now, the priesthood claims that they sacrifice for sin, then that must mean that Christ did not complete salvation perfectly with his suffering--or that it is no longer powerful. For if we believe that he, once sacrificed, has redeemed and paid for eternity for us, that is, the believers, then it must be a blasphemy to undertake it again, just as if it has not previously been accomplished.

The other blasphemy and abomination consists in that no one can sacrifice anything higher than himself, a sacrifice about which Paul teaches in Romans chapter 12: "I ask you, dear brothers, through the mercy of God, that you offer your bodies as a living sacrifice, a holy sacrifice, a sacrifice pleasing to God, and that your service come from your mind and heart" [Rom. 12:1]. Observe that this is the highest sacrifice which a person can offer: oneself. Now if one undertakes to sacrifice God, one blasphemes him, for he is making himself so great as if he were able to sacrifice God. But no one can sacrifice Christ other than he himself. For as the sacrifice must be pure, so also must the priest be pure. As we have no priest in the entire human race who is without sin other than Christ alone, then also can no one sacrifice him other than he himself. And, therefore, whoever calls himself a sacrificer takes Christ's honor away from him and gives it to himself. This is an intolerable abomination.

The two sins are these:

The first is that the wrong understanding of sacrifice has planted and encouraged all vices. For all robbers, usurers, traitors, murderers, and adulterers have believed that their matter

becomes right if they let a mass be said for their misdeeds. It cannot be other than that they have sinned as a result. One sees this well in their donating of religious foundations and purchases of masses, which they would not establish if it were not their last refuge. That's how much they love possessions. [661]

The other sin is that one has collected so much temporal good with the mass and has taken it for the fabricated sacrifice. Even if it were a sacrifice it would still be an abomination to take money and rewards of temporal goods for it. Yet this was not enough. They also used the possessions arbitrarily and even deprived the poor of that which belonged to them before all others. The majority of all the alms has been made use of in that way.

For this purpose they have been as oppressive as they could be.

In the first place, they have called their eating a mass, that is, as much as a sacrifice or a sent sacrifice; but, as said above, it cannot be such. For Christ has instituted it only once and in one way, and has not named it a sacrifice or mass but a testament and memorial. Therefore, this name is incorrectly imposed on the body and blood of Christ.

Also, they have cut off one kind, namely the blood, which is never given to the common person, though Christ instituted the practice. One fears this happened only for the reason that they had the one as a sacrifice and the other not, with many other ceremonies, vestments, crosses, and peculiar opinions.

In order that it may become obvious to every person how Christ instituted this food for the soul one should diligently look at the words of Christ which are in Matthew 26:26-29, Mark 14: 22-25, and Luke 22:19f. and explain them to the people. The same will be much clearer from the words of Paul of I Corinthians 11:23-26, which we also want to make our own here: "I have declared to you what I have received or learned from God, namely that the Lord Jesus took bread the night he was betrayed, and after he gave thanks, broke it and said, 'Take. Eat. This is my body which is broken for you. Do this in my memory.'" These are the words concerning the body. Here we see in the first place that Christ says, "the body, which is broken for you," that is, as I now [662] break the bread for you so will I be afflicted and killed for you. Afterwards he says, "Do this in my memory" [I Cor. 11:24]. See. He himself calls it a commemoration, and of the meal which he instituted himself. From this we see Christ has not performed a sacrifice after the night's meal wherein he gave the disciples his flesh and blood, but only the day after when he died on the cross. But his flesh and blood should be a remembrance of these things which he has done--as will be shown later.

Now follow the words concerning the blood: "The same also, the cup after the supper saying, 'This cup is the New Testament in my blood. Do this, as often as you drink it, in my memory.' For as often as you will eat the bread and drink the cup, you proclaim the death of the Lord, until he will come" [I Cor. 11: 25-26]. These are the words concerning the blood of Christ wherein we shall first of all understand that this word "cup" is named here for the word "drink". Accordingly, he calls the drink the "New Testament", that is, the new covenant and legacy. For, as stated above, by shedding his blood Christ has reconciled us again to his heavenly father and made an eternal covenant through which we can come to God. If we look at the characteristics of a testament we will see that a legacy is only established when its author dies. Thus the testament of Christ is only established in his death on the cross. Just as little as a person can establish a testament such as Christ did, so little can he perform a sacrifice. However, a person can remember what Christ has done. And one who trusts in Christ's suffering and salvation is saved. Of this Christ has left for us a certain, safe sign of his flesh and blood, and has called these two to be eaten and drunk in his memory. And as to how the commemoration should be handled, Paul formulates here exactly and says, "For as often as you will eat the bread and drink the drink, you shall proclaim the death of the Lord" [I Cor. 11:26]. Thus we learn that the legitimate use of this sacrament should be as follows: as often in the year as it pleases the parish, one should proclaim and preach the suffering and death of Christ telling how much good and peace has been brought to us, and for the confirmation of all that, feed all the believers who wish it with the body and blood of Christ. [663] This, in short, is the simple wish and intention of Christ.

If we now see that the mass is no special establishment of Christ, but considered by human beings as a sacrifice (where, nevertheless, this sacrament is nothing but the eating and drinking of the body and blood of Christ) then it should be a concern for all persons that such misuse will be abolished where one pretends to perform a sacrifice for others--nevertheless, with such discretion and prudence that a riot does not occur because of it. Then one can find good ways to abolish the abuses. Therefore the preachers shall excuse the ordinary mass-priests everywhere. For, since these errors did not spring from them, they should not suffer for them. Let all people be admonished so that they let them depart in peace as they came. For the majority of them are so old that they cannot any longer be set to work. And no Christian should destroy the work of God on account of the supper, as Romans 14:20 says. However, where some behave so indecently--by opposition without basis in the word of God--then nobody should act against them; rather, leave them to the government which will handle them as is fitting. For, in short, when Almighty God

reveals his word, then people must see that they comply with it, or they will invite the wrath of God on themselves.

[9] Conclusion

And, if you fulfill what is written above, as you are obliged to do, and as we demand from you, then we have in God the certain hope that he will make his word fruitful and increase his honor by our improvement and peaceful lives. May God give this to us through Jesus Christ, our redeemer and savior. Amen!

Dated the 17th day of November, 1523.

NOTES

1. On the role of the City Council of Zurich in the progress of the Reformation in Zurich, see Robert C. Walton, **Zwingli's Theocracy**, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967 and Robert C. Walton, "The Institutionalization of the Reformation at Zurich," **Zwingliana** XIII/8 (1972):497-515.

2. Cf. Egli, Nr. 436.

3. The term Einleitung (Anleitung) may alternatively be translated as "Introduction". The nature of this treatise, however, as both confessional and educational in intent is best rendered by the term "Instruction". It is therefore used here. For a study of the theology of the **Instruction** and its place in the Zurich reformation, as well as lengthy annotations comparing the content of the **Instruction** to other theologians, both contemporary to Zwingli and preceding him, see H. Wayne Pipkin, "The Nature and Development of the Zwinglian Reformation," Hartford Dissertation, 1968.

4. This rubric is missing in the German, but was inserted by Gwalter in the Latin translation.

5. The reference to "original sin" as prest or präst is a peculiarity of Zwingli, to which many call attention. It is difficult to render the term in English, due largely to its importance and its distinctiveness. Where one expects to find erbsünd in Zwingli, one finds erbpräst. It will be rendered by both "sin" and "weakness". When the latter term is used, it must be kept in mind that the weakness intended is severe. I am indebted to G. R. Potter for a succint statement

of the meaning of presten as "an inherent and irresistible inclination to sin". For Zwingli it is the weakness inherent in the "flesh". For a discussion of current conclusions on the concept, see Gottfried W. Locher, "The Change in the Understanding of Zwingli in Recent Research," **Church History** XXXIV (1965):10. For other places where Zwingli uses the term, see Z II:45:6, Z V:369-396 (tr. Jackson II:1-32). See also: **Schweizerisches Idiotikon** V:836ff.

6. The rubric, missing in the German edition, is supplied by Gwalter.

7. Zwingli is referring to the 1523 treatise of Ludwig Hätzer published by Froschower: **Ein urtheil gottes unsers eegemahels, wie man sich mit allen goetzen und bildnussen halten sol, uss goettlicher gschrifft gezogen.** See Charles Garside, Jr., "Ludwig Haetzer's Pamphlet Against Images: a critical study," **Mennonite Quarterly Review** XXIV (1960):20-36. Hätzer, a native of Zurich, was the secretary of the Second Disputation. He later became an anti-trinitarian. See G. H. Williams, **The Radical Reformation**, Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1962, pp. 80, 91-92, 192-93.

THE SHEPHERD

March 1524

(Z III: 5-68)

Translated and edited by H. Wayne Pipkin

Introduction

The Second Disputation of October, 1523 found 350 priests present among the 900 in attendance. It was a rare opportunity for Zwingli to engage in the spiritual formation of the evangelical clergy. To this end, on the third morning of the disputation, the memorial day of Saints Simon and Jude, Zwingli preached his influential sermon. In it he described the ideal, or true shepherd, over against the false shepherd. He called the assembled pastors to an evangelical spirituality that would dispense with the external forms of false religion and would be characterized by a firm commitment to biblical religion as it should be lived out among the people. It is significant that in the context of the disputation that established the nature of the Zürich Reformation, the Reformer addressed himself to the matter of the spirituality of its guardians.

The importance of the statement was recognized and Zwingli was prevailed upon to publish it. An enlarged, reworked version was brought out by Froschower in March, 1524. On the recommendation of the St. Gall Reformer, Joachim Vadian, Zwingli dedicated the treatise to Jacob Schurtanner, evangelical pastor at Teufen, Appenzell.

The title, the **Shepherd,** was taken from the ancient **Shepherd of Hermas,** which Zwingli imagined could be replaced in the Reformer's day by his own sermon.

The published sermon should be read in conjunction with the **Short Christian Instruction.** The two tracts together represent a concise statement of the life, doctrine and spirituality of the Zürich Reformation.

The sermon was translated into Latin by Rudolph Gwalter in his sixteenth century edition. A new High German translation appeared in Raget Christoffel, **Zeitgemässe Auswahl aus Huldreich Zwinglis praktischen Schriften,** Vol. III, Zürich, 1843.

An English translation enjoyed wide circulation throughout Great Britain under the title: The ymage of bothe pastoures, sethe forthe by that mooste famous clerck, Huldrych Zwinglius, and now translated out of Latin and into Englishe by John Wernon Synonoys. A most fruitefull and necessary boke, to be had and redde in all churches, therewyth to enarme all symple and ignorant folkes, against the ravennige wolues and false prophets. London, 1550.

HWP

THE SHEPHERD

How one can recognize true Christian shepherds and also the false, and also how one should behave in regard to them, written by Huldrych Zwingli in the year 1524

To Jacob Schurtanner, Ceraunelateus, bishop, that is guardian and shepherd at Teufen in Appenzell, [1] his dear brother in God, Huldyrch Zwingli, offers grace and peace from God the Father and his Son, our Lord Jesus Christ.

Dear brother! When Dr. Joachim von Watt, the capable physician of body and soul who is a credit and honor not only to the noble city of St. Gall and the entire confederation, [2] but to all Christians, was with me the last time he requested for your sake the sermon which I preached at the last disputation on Simon and Jude's day with God's help to the bishops, shepherds or guardians. [3] Although my intention was to write nothing for a while, [6] but to spend this half year entirely in the comparison of the Hebrew, Greek and Latin Old Testament, I was not able, however, to refuse anything either to him or to you. Although I come later to the task, due to the many singular winds that have unusually and uncommonly thrust against me this year, thereby preventing me from taking up the task, I do come finally to do so, though not at all with so full a hand as I would wish. As you well know, Jerome verified that Hermas wrote a book in the Greek language called "The Shepherd", which was highly esteemed by the ancient Christians. [4] I have often wished that someone would emerge--since today there are so many god-fearing and learned persons--who would replace for us with true faithfulness the missing "Shepherd", so that everyone might be able to distinguish the true shepherds from the false. Since no one has emerged, I have presumed to do so, for, although ignorant, I may dare as Paul [cf. 2 Cor. 1:6] and undertake such a thing. Now it did not turn out as well, but perhaps it will bring forth all the more fruit, for God enjoys overturning the wise and high things of this world with the poor and weak. [Cf. 1 Cor. 1:27] [7]

In the first part you will find the color and shape of a true shepherd painted with clear strokes. This picture is for sure

not a pleasant incentive for the flesh. Rather, it is an eternal, unending struggle with all that is of the flesh, with father and mother, etc., with itself, with all arrogant power, with everything that is not with God. From this we see very well that to administer undefiled such a difficult office is not by human but by divine power.

In the second part you will see also the false wolves which pass themselves off in sheep's clothing [cf. Mt. 7:15], standing with their fangs and claws which the sheep's clothing cannot cover. You will also thereby find that I have not placed very much in this writing for the friends of this world. For they are few who preach the gospel as strictly and consistently as it should be taught. Among these I include even myself. May God improve the situation. These same ones will therefore complain about the strong words. The other wolves will not only cry, "Heretic!" as they have up to now, but they will cry, "Murderer! Thief! Traitor!"--and whatever greater things they can think up. It will be like the time when the doctor and canon of Constance sat in the earlier disputation in his red hood, and already out of questionable willfulness began to call me a murderer. [5] I won't even mention his name. All he achieved by that was that the strong, firm godly ones who heard have gotten to know, as I hoped, his brutal anger. For I will remain my life long an enemy of murderers, especially of soul murderers. Yes, they will slander me so badly, but with the truth the gates of hell will not be able to prevail against me. [Cf. Mt. 16:18] God be praised and thanked that they cannot prevail over the divine word and now must turn to blasphemy just like angry women. Also, as there is cause to suspect, they will not mend their ways, for [8] Jeroboam did not mend his ways even though his arm grew stiff [cf. 1 K. 13:4], nor did Pharoah, when God through Moses spoke to him and gave him signs. [Cf. Ex. 5:1ff.]

In the same way, the only goal which I have in mind, is to lead them away from their designs. Many persons, with gentleness and goodness, have attempted that before, but it achieved only as much as words of exhortation to unmoving horses. One must use spurs, whips, switches and sticks in order to get them moving. So one must take off his guest's hat and simply present the truth, so that if they do not mend their ways the godly Christian people will be on guard against them, so that with time the splendor and misuse of power will be taken away from them by the loss of the people.

In the meantime God's servants must work unceasingly, for those others will always entangle the princes and rulers with new artifices, so that they protect them by force from loss. Now they command that one should confess twice to the pastor, even though the papal laws themselves cannot force one to go to confes-

sion more than once. [9] They order that one should make oblations. Everywhere in the world that has been free. One should give for Our Lady's building at the cathedral. Since time immemorial that has also been voluntary. And yet the poor people need it much more for their own church buildings and other needs. They have allowed the eating of forbidden foods for six or nine kreuzer. Now they stir up the authorities to punish it with imprisonment and heavy fines. Yes, I hear of two princes who have raged even more foolishly. [6] They have now come to the point where they call good evil, and evil good [Isa. 5:20]. They have thereby also led astray the foolish princes, who indeed should know without doubt what is right, so that they hate the good and love the evil [Mic. 3:2].

Yes, so must their evil-mindedness be sufficiently fulfilled. They are the type who will stir up the world against itself for their own protection. They have done that for a long time and will keep on doing it. In the final analysis, however, God will be master. But if they daily suffer the loss of their profits so that they no longer have so much to make payments, than the princes and rulers will grow tired of their begging. And where the princes and rulers do not dislike such, the people will begin to dislike the princes and rulers. And if that happens then they will be despised along with the bishops--if nothing worse follows after. God remains eternally one kind of God. He saw how the children of Israel were oppressed in Egypt and he redeemed them. We see today such a sudden opening up and accepting of the word of God, an increase the size of which no one had hoped for in so short a time. It can only be the providence of God who has once again seen the captivity of his people and has sent redemption. Look at Exodus chapter 3 and Psalm 110 [Ex. 3:7f.; Ps. 111:9]. We see that he has not forgotten us. He has [10] sent his word and made us whole. He has redeemed us from the havoc of ruination as he promised by the prophets [Ps. 107:20]. What more miserable thing could the Christian people encounter than such shepherds who have sold for money what they did not have and what they would not let be bought for money if they had it. They have left with this all consciences hungry and in doubt. For they themselves have not believed what they have offered to the world. For had they believed it they would have lived differently. Now, however, the heavenly light so clearly discloses itself they will not be able to force anyone into the darkness.

Therefore, dear Jacob, be strong! Do not let yourself be overcome, so that you are called Israel. [Cf. Gen. 32:24, 28] We must fight with the enemy until morning comes, until, as 2 Peter 1:19 says, the morning star rises in our hearts and the servants of darkness hide themselves in their night.

I do not say this because I in any way thought you will

quit; rather, I am encouraging you so you might also hear that your faithful diligence is a living fragrance among the believers. For God is my witness as to how wonderfully great the joy was when the report came as to how the godly people of Appenzell have received the word of God. I also would have been anxious as to how they could have been strengthened, were your faith, loyalty and love which you have for God not known to me. I have no doubt that with these you will complete the good work with God which he has begun with them. [Cf. Phil. 1:6] It is well to be hoped that, just as they are the last of the regions to be admitted to the noble confederation, they will be neither the smallest nor the last in faith. [7] For they do not live in the midst of a land of amusement where the danger of selfishness and lasciviousness is the greatest, but in a rugged area where pious simplicity may better be protected. This innocent simplicity together with sensible godliness [11] is a special home and dwelling place of faith. For Christian doctrine and life is nowhere easier planted than with those people who know the least of all about the deceitful tricks of this world. It is not that the godly Appenzellers lack anything in reason and wisdom. Rather, their unspoiled behavior shows us still something of the qualities of the confederation. When the word of God comes to them, it will doubtless draw a wonderfully pious and god-fearing people, and will do away with the selfishness which Brother Claus von Unterwalden prophesied will be so detrimental. [8] Where this selfishness is not done away with, no government can continue. Although some are of a different opinion, nothing other than the word of God has done away with the mercenary service with foreign lords in Zurich city and territory. That will be seen, if God wills, in the constant increase of faith and everything good. Therefore, continue to exercise care for your children which were born to you as you have done until now, and teach them not to abandon the healing teaching of God because of any flattery or threats of the false shepherds. Put your foot firmly in between the teeth of the ravenous wolves and do not let the little sheep be snatched away from you. Above all watch out for the little papist fox [9] who would gladly, where permitted, eat [12] as the wolves. I hear he has been sent to hinder and to lead astray. Follow after him strongly until you lead him away from error, and, failing that, away from the sheep. Keep yourself strong and your heart firmly in God, of whose assistance you can be certain.

Give greetings to your loyal co-workers in the Gospel of Christ, the bishops of Gais, Bernhardin N., and to all who hold loyally to God. [10] We hear that the majority of your bishops, though their names be unknown to me, are loyal. Thanks be to God. Greet also the two daughters of Trogen. [11]

God bless you and the whole people of Appenzell.

Given at Zurich, 26 March, 1524.

Pray to God for me with all your people.

Dearest brothers in God and co-ministers in the household of God, the prophets in the Old Testament and many distinguished and pious Christians in the New have directed warnings and admonitions to the shepherds, as one still clearly sees in their writings. Therefore I hope it is also proper for me to speak earnestly and faithfully with you concerning our office, especially in this divine gathering wherein have come together so many hundred shepherds and learned men, together with the great number of the people thirsting for the word of God.

Well, now! May God be gracious to us.

A shepherd and the sheep he tends bear so clearly a resemblance to God and to us that the writings of the Old Testament constantly portray the divine providence and caring for us poor people under the image of the shepherd--wherein God is understood--and the image of the sheep--wherein we are understood. Also [13] in John 10:11 our savior Jesus Christ has called himself a shepherd since he is the true pasture and food, and in addition, the leader or shepherd who has led us out of the dark stall of ignorance and the bondage of human teaching into the light of divine wisdom and the freedom of sons.

Therefore it is also necessary that all those sent among his sheep as shepherds learn to administer their office and commission from no other model than the only true word of God, which has expressed itself visibly and in the most real sense now in the last times in the Lord Jesus Christ, true Son of God, and before that, though less clearly, in the Old Testament, in many fathers and prophets.

Thus in the first place we want to consider the word of God out of the mouth and activity of Christ, true God, and thereafter from the prophets and apostles, in order to see what and how big the office of shepherd is which we call bishop, pastor, people's priest, prophet, evangelist or preacher.

Next we also want to sketch the picture of the false prophets, so one can recognize them and show what their punishment will be so they will be reformed by this recognition, or, failing that, be deposed.

So that we do not delay a long time with the mysterious understanding of the incarnation and birth of Christ we want

to start with those things he did and taught after he revealed himself in this world. When Simeon took him in his arms and indicated that he would be the savior of the world, Simeon said to his mother in Luke 2:34f.: "See! This child is set forth for the fall and rising of many in Israel and to a symbol which many will oppose. A sword will pierce your own soul so that the thoughts of many hearts will be revealed." Thus must every shepherd be prepared that in his pasture some will become worse, [14] but that some will be resurrected from their sins. He will also always be opposed by unbelievers, for the carnal person does not accept the spiritual word of God but fights against it with all his might [1 Cor. 2:14]. For this reason the shepherd must always stand exposed to danger and persecution by the enemies of the word of God. His father and mother and all his relatives must be prepared to have to see their children suffer the mockery and rejection of the world. The flesh does not let itself be so easily cheated that it does not break out and assert its attacks. So are the relatives distressed with sorrow and anxiety in their heart just as the Virgin Mary also suffered her sword. Parents bear such love for their children that they have compassion with them in their sorrow not only when they are just but also when they are unjust, as David did over the disobedience of his son Absalom [2 S. 18:33].

On the other hand also the shepherd must leave father and mother and, without consideration of them, persist in the work of God, as Christ himself teaches in Luke 2:48f. In that passage, Joseph and Jesus' mother had sought him in distress and found him on the third day in the midst of the scholars. His mother scolded him: "O Son, how could you do this to us? In distress have I and your father sought you." He answered them: "Why are you looking for me? Did you not know that I had to be about my father's business?" In the same way the shepherd must not let himself be led astray from the advancement of divine work by the distress of father and mother nor by child, wife, sister, brother or friend. For so acted the obedient son of Mary, Jesus Christ. Therefore in Matthew 10:37 he says to his disciples when he sends them out to preach: "Whoever loves his father or mother, son and daughters more than me is not worthy of me," or more to the point: he is of no use to me. [15]

He must also not let himself be influenced by father or mother so that he limits or directs the word according to their will, for Christ gave a harsh answer to his dear mother when she wanted to admonish him to help the people with the wine at the wedding: "Woman, what do I have to do with you?" [Jn. 2:4] See, the shepherd must so firmly lead to pasture that he is not ruled by the forwardness of any person, not even of father or mother.

But where they still want to do that and do not surrender

to the word of God, there the shepherd must become their enemy, must leave them and hate them. For Christ sends the disciples forth with the following commission: "You should not think I have come to bring peace to earth. I have not come to bring peace but the sword. For I have come to divide sons against fathers, daughters against mothers, etc." [Mt. 10:39f.] "Whoever comes to me and does not hate his father and mother, wife and child, brothers and sisters, and even his own soul, may not be my disciple." [Lk. 14:26] So peculiar must the shepherd of God be: he must hate even the father and mother God otherwise calls to love and honor--if they try to make him unfaithful. These commands are not only for shepherds, but are for all people. Nevertheless, primarily and first of all they are for the shepherd.

We have seen how the shepherd must be independent of father and mother, etc., and how they must be prepared to experience no earthly honor in their child, and if they are tempted so they would lead the shepherd, their child, astray, he must accept struggle, animosity and separation from them.

Now we want to see in addition how the shepherd must be in himself.

Christ says in Matthew 16:24f. and Luke 9:23: "Whoever wants to come after me should deny himself, take up his cross daily and follow me. For whoever wants to preserve his soul will lose or destroy it; however, whoever [16] will lose or destroy his soul for my sake, will preserve it or make it whole."

In the first place he must deny himself, for he wants always and everywhere to be something, to be capable and to be able. He must be pawned and spurned in himself like a serf or menial servant; he must look up only to what God commands him, doing nothing on his own power or knowledge, but considering the only guide, God, and his word.

That happens only at the cross. That he must take daily on himself. For opposition will always fall his lot. This he must bear on himself and not avoid. If a person has denied himself and looks to God alone he finds daily a greater number of those who do not deny themselves than those who have. Between these there originates as certain a strife as between fire and water; for the flesh always lusts against the spirit and the spirit against the flesh. [Gal. 5:17]

The flesh also espouses the true and just, wants also to keep up with it and also be sincere in it. And when it sees its nature is only a deception against the work of God, it does not yield to God, even though it wants to appear to be God-fearing before people. This, however, cannot remain hidden before that

person who has truly denied himself, for this one will notice immediately when self-seeking lifts itself. And as soon as he shows the flesh its falsity and malice, then it resorts to its weapons and scolds him who has stirred up the matter, and attacks him constantly with all strength, even to the point of killing him who has stirred it up. Therefore Christ teaches to be ready to bear the cross daily, for persecution grows the more the divine word grows. The more that grows, the more the flesh is angered. Therefore they are wrong who think they will soon obtain rest, that they will not have to suffer great persecution for the sake of the word of God. Even though the people come to the word of God in droves, nevertheless there will be opposition enough from the high ones of this time. Even if they were not there, then all the more the false teachers will stand up, who have more knowledge than love, [17] and for the sake of a hazelnut will wound all the simple and quiet ones to show how learned they are. Hereby the cross becomes very burdensome and requires new strength; for offense of the simple does not take place without great concern by the strong who are concerned on behalf of the simple. As Paul also says in 2 Corinthians 11:29: "Who is offended that I am not burned?" In short, everyday there is a new cross; it must be so. Christ does not lie, since he says in Matthew 6:34: "The day will have enough troubles and work of its own." "Whoever wants to preserve his soul, etc." [Mt. 16:25; Lk. 9:24] Here the soul is not only taken for the bodily life but for human feeling, intention or counsel. Whoever retreats from the word of God for the sake of this ephemeral life will lose his life. Whoever depends on his own knowledge, counsel or feeling, thinking therewith to save himself, will destroy his own soul. Therefore the shepherd must deny himself, throw off his self-love, and certainly prepare himself to bear each day a new cross. Christ Jesus himself did so, always subjugating his will to that of the Father, bearing every cross until he came to the honor of sitting at the right hand of God.

When now the shepherd, or any person, empties himself in this way, then the next thing is to be filled again with God, that is, he has all his confidence and consolation in God. This Christ demonstrated in his disciples whom he cares for not only with temporal nourishment (since they follow him) in that they answered that nothing was lacking when he asked them whether they lacked anything as he sent them out without staff and sack. [Cf. Lk. 22:35] He also commanded them not to be concerned as to how they would answer when they were delivered up before the judge. For in the same hour they would receive what [18] to answer when being delivered up before the judge [Mt. 10:19]. Christ also breathed on them and before he bestowed the office of preaching on them [Jn. 20:22] said to them: "Take the Holy Spirit." For none is suitable for feeding the sheep unless he has emptied himself and only God dwells in him and speaks out of

him. Therefore he ordered them not to leave Jerusalem until they had received the promised spirit. [Cf. Lk. 24:49; Acts 1:4] When they had received it with much joy and rejoicing they began from that hour on to preach. Thus must the shepherd lead his sheep into no other pasture than that in which he has previously been nourished, that is, in the knowledge and trust of God. So must he always know God beforehand and have all his solace in him.

Following that, he should begin to preach as Christ began: "Repent!" [Mt. 4:17] It was with this form that the forerunner John the Baptist also began. [Cf. Mt. 3:2] Now no one will repent who does not know how evil he is. Therefore here must sin be preached first, and then salvation. Let no one here be led astray by the fact that Christ says in Matthew 10:7 and Mark 16:15 to preach only salvation or the gospel. For always the illness must be recognized before one takes the medicine. Christ also in those passages takes the word of salvation in terms of grace, for the gospel is the message of the certain grace of God. However, the recognition of sin, which also is necessary, brings nothing other than despair in ourselves and powerfully drives us to the mercy of God. Of that mercy we are certain, for God has given his son for us. Therefore he names the means of redemption in those passages after the medicine. However in Luke 24:47 he links repentance or remorse and forgiveness with one another, saying: "thus in his name (that is, in Christ's) repentance or remorse and forgiveness of sins must be preached to all people." See! Here are the gospel and repentance connected; for no one really rejoices in the gospel who has not previously rightly recognized the disease of sin. [19]

Now if a person has recognized his misery and found after that salvation in Christ Jesus it is not seemly any longer to live in sin. For since we have died to sin in Christ, we may no longer live in sin, Romans 6:2. Therefore the shepherd must also carefully prevent the washed sheep's falling again in the excrement, that is, after the believers have come into knowledge of their savior and have experienced the friendly grace of God, they should thereafter lead a blameless life so that they no longer walk in death. Just as Christ also, having risen from the dead dies no more, so also they, having laid aside the old being, should put on a new being [Eph. 4:22, 24] which is like God, that is, the Lord Jesus Christ. Putting on this new being is nothing other than living as he lived. Therefore he commands the disciples in Mt. 28:19ff.: "Go forth! Teach all people. Baptize them in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit. Teach them also to hold all things which I have commanded you." For whoever does not change his life from day to day, after he has been redeemed in Christ mocks the name of Christ and disparages and disdains it before the unbelievers. Therefore St. Peter in 1 Peter 4:1-3

also says: "Now as Christ suffered for us in the flesh so should you also be armed with the same mind. For as he suffered in the flesh he has silenced sin so that you may live the rest of the time not in human desires but in the will of God. For it is enough that in the past time of our lives we have performed the willfulness of the Gentiles, walking in impurity, in lusts, drunkenness, gluttony, tippling and unseemly worship of idols, etc." Therein we see that it is not enough only to take possession of salvation, it is also necessary to take care so that one does not lose or despise it.

Most helpful toward that end is the shepherd's doing in practice what he teaches in words, which Christ demands most clearly in Matthew 5:19: "Whoever dismisses one of the smallest commandments and teaches people to do so will be called the smallest in the kingdom of heaven. However, whoever will act and teach will be great in the kingdom of heaven." This is certain: it is only hypocrisy when one speaks beautifully of God [20] but does not form one's life according to him. As Paul also in Titus 1:16 points out: "They say they know God but with their actions they deny him. They are reprobate, disobedient and good for nothing." Again in Romans 2:21-24: "You teach others but not yourself. You preach that one should not steal and yet you steal. You say one should not commit adultery and you do so. You condemn idols but you are faithless in holy things. You boast in the law and yet dishonor God with transgression of the law. Therefore it happens that the name of God is slandered among the heathen on your account." The shepherd must essentially guard against breaking with the deed what he teaches with words. For the weak believers too easily let the inconsistent deed turn them away from the word of God.

Here the shepherd should carefully guard against putting on a hypocritical dress for the true one, so that he decks himself out with cowls and hooded mantles while he is inwardly full of avarice--as for the most part the monks and theologians of this time do. They bow low, but they have an arrogant disposition; they wear a white shirt, but are more unchaste than the wild boar; high shoes and hats, but are full of envy and hatred; murmur many psalms, but leave the clear word of God, etc. The simple people learn by such works to live a life of hypocrisy only, while inwardly the temptations remain with them. Therefore the shepherd must not let himself be shaped according to humanly created teaching but according to the word of God which he preaches, or else he plants nothing but hypocrisy. And since Christ is a perfect model, the shepherd must see that he relies only on his example.

If Christ did not need works of hypocrisy, then it is not seemly to have anything to do with them. For the locus ab auctori-

tate is valid [21] in a negative sense with God; therefore, since he is so perfect a good, nothing may be lacking in him. Consequently no one may concoct anything that would improve or replace the divine. Thus in these things the shepherd must prove himself to be an educator as is the right of a father. He does not run around in disguise so as to deceive his children. Rather, he sees to it that they are trained into undefiled lives, friendly, harmless, seemly in all things, and fleeing all intemperance. So must the shepherd also act. For this reason he is called a housefather or householder by Christ. [Cf. Lk. 12:42ff.] Paul also complains against the Corinthians in 1 Corinthians 4:15 that though they had innumerable teachers they had too few fathers. Therefore we clearly note that those who are not our fathers are also not true teachers. Fathers are eager with deed and teaching to live without any advantages against their children. Thus the shepherds are never right if they do not bear a fatherly disposition over against their charges. If the teachers do not take pains in the things they teach then they are not true. However, if they practice those things which they teach from God, then that living example teaches more than a hundred thousand words. However, if they do not teach God's word, but human teachings and trifles, and if they would live the same, then they are the genuine false prophets whom God commands to kill. [Cf. Jer. 14:15] Concerning these, more is to come later. Therefore the shepherd must represent a model, not out of everything we treasure as good, but of those things alone which God teaches and demands of us.

What should be preached, however, may clearly enough be understood from the above, namely nothing other than the word of God. [22] Therefore the shepherd is to bring his charges to an understanding of their infirmity. If they understand that and perceive that they cannot be saved out of their power, then he should point them to the grace of God so they let themselves trust fully in it. For God has given us for a certain assurance of his grace his only begotten son, Jesus Christ our Lord, through whom we have forever a certain entry to God. [Cf. Rom. 5:2] If they, who were previously of the flesh and damnation, have believed the salvation and assurance of the grace of God and have now become God's, then they are also now obligated henceforth to live according to the will of God from now on--for they are a new creation. [Gal. 6:15] Therefore the shepherd is zealously to prevent the healed sheep's falling again into sickness. This must all be accomplished with the word of God; therefore, he must be well-trained in the same before all else. The same he must learn only out of the writings of the Holy Bible. Now learning the letters is nothing if God does not draw his heart, so that the shepherd has faith in the word, not interpreting it according to his own understanding, but letting the word be free as the divine breath inspires it. All this is contained in short in the words of Paul in 2 Timothy 3:16: "All scripture which is inspired by

God is also useful for teaching, for punishment, for correction, for education in righteousness, so that the person who is of God may be whole, equipped for every good work and perfect." Therefore all nourishment offered by the shepherd is to be of this form. Which books are biblical and which not I don't need to say here, for it is well enough known to all those who are well trained in the languages.

If now the shepherd is suited on account of his relations, his life and his teaching (divine love will be treated later), then it will consequently be [23] necessary that he know how he should behave in regard to the other external things and what earnings he should hope for.

We find that the shepherd must in the first place attack fearlessly the most harmful of all vices and let himself not be threatened by the inflated power of this world nor by any persecution. As God says to Jeremiah in chapter 1: "Look, I have set my word in your mouth and have established you in the present day over the peoples or heathen and nations, that you may tear out and break to pieces, destroy and take apart and then again to build and plant." [Jer. 1:9ff.] Therefore the shepherd must attack and destroy all buildings which have raised themselves against the heavenly word, however high they may be. [2 Cor. 10:5] Christ presented us a true model of that. For when he saw the hypocrisy and avarice of the priests among the Jewish people as a cause for all the people straying from God and that they were held captive in the priests' avarice, statutes and willfulness, he attacked nothing more vigorously than the hypocrisy and avarice. He had great sympathy with the misled people in that they were robbed of the word of God and had no fatherly shepherds, Matthew 9:36. For the most part he taught in a friendly way. If he ever had to upbraid them he did not attack them so hard as he did the misleading priests. These he scolded as ignorant, blind, vipers, devil's children, hypocrites, deceivers, flatterers, and the like. All this can be read throughout the gospels: prooftexts are not needed here.

If now in our time hypocrisy has come to the point that it is so rich and strong that it no longer needs to hide but dares to protect itself openly with a strong hand, what do you think, O pious servant of God, ought to be done to you? If you keep silent, the blood of the dying will be demanded from your hands, Ezekiel 3:18. Now, however, you see that the hypocrisy of the papists (that is, the whole crowd of those one calls spiritual, excepting those who clearly preach the word of God) has taken so many goods and power that [24] it no longer needs to hide, as happened with the Jews, but it is allowed to protect itself with bribes, gifts, wars, arson, destruction, killing and all kinds of evil, so much so that even the Sicilian tyrants could not be

more inhuman. For even these do not proceed so forcefully without just cause against anyone. Most diligently, however, the papists wherever possible lead the rulers by means of bribes and gifts to think they act rightly if they persecute without just cause those who preach God's word. Where they themselves have the power of the sword they rage against the innocent like tigers and crocodiles. And if they were not afraid that the same that they have used against others would be used against them if they were attacked, then they would not be satisfied with normal killings, but, like Phalaris [12] they would devise new types of pain and death for the servants of God.

You see also, O pious servant of God, how the majority of those in power who hold the sword administer justice more out of avarice, arbitrariness, wantonness, and only for self-elevation and lust rather than out of love or fear of God--if in fact one can call it justice at all. Against their subjects it is nothing but raging, punishing, ill-treating, scraping, interest-bearing and mortgaging. Against foreigners it is nothing but waging wars, robbing and fighting. Among themselves it is nothing but boozing, playing, whoring, slandering and dancing. See, pious shepherd, it is so evil around the leaders. So, consider seriously what is to be done. For if you do not speak, the blood of the perishing will be demanded from you, as said above. However, if you speak you fall into their power. [25] The papal gang has insinuated itself among many of the princes by caring for their children, of which they made one son into a cardinal, another a bishop, an abbot, a commander, a provost, a guardian, an administrator or a coadjutator. Consequently, the princes have become not a little indebted to the papists. Also the papists have let them partake of the indulgence money that has been taken from their poor people. If you want to attack the gang of hypocrites, on the basis of the model of Christ, then these jump forward as their defenders. However, if you want to throw away the shield and spear and not perform the duty of your office, then you will be counted among the faithless shepherds who, upon seeing the wolf, leave the sheep and flee. [Cf. Jn. 10:12] Here one learns in passing what the power and strength of faith is. For wherever a person is placed in doubt, if he is faithful he knows to run to no one but God and his word, to take counsel therefrom and to trust faithfully in the same.

Therefore, come to Christ who says in John 10:12: "The good shepherd gives his soul for his sheep. Therefore, if you want to be counted among the good shepherds, you must give your life for the sheep." He wakens us also with other words in Matthew 10:27f.: "What I say to you in the darkness, speak in the light; what is said in your ear, preach on the rooftops. Do not fear those who kill the body, for the soul they cannot kill; rather, fear those who can destroy the soul and the body with eternal pain." Here we clearly hear that we should not withhold the word,

but publicly speak it forth without fear of those who can injure us. We are responsible to act and speak against all those who sin, as he says again by the prophet in Jeremiah 1:7: "You will go out everywhere, to those to whom I send you." And by Isaiah 58:1: "Cry out! Do not cease! Lift your voice as a trumpet and proclaim to my people their vices." Hence we note well that the shepherd is responsible [26] to come out against all enemies for the protection of the sheep. He also is to lift the sheep out of the mire of sin, for where that is not, one does not need a shepherd. For if the sheep do not lack anything, they do not require a guardian. However, they require a shepherd in case of danger. However, if the shepherd wants to flee in the face of danger then it will be the same for the sheep as if they had no shepherd.

Therefore it is necessary that one look to Christ. He says in John 10:11: "I give my life for my sheep." He not only said that but fulfilled it with deeds. When he was on the way to Jerusalem he spoke to the disciples publicly about the danger in Matthew 16:21. When Peter wanted to turn them aside he said to him, "Get behind me, Satan! You hinder me, for you do not see the things that are of God but those that are of humankind." [Mt. 16:23] After he had come to Jerusalem, he chased the buyers and sellers out of the temple, unmindful of the snares of the avaricious priests, scholars and authorities [cf. Mt. 21:12f.; Mk. 11:15-18; Lk. 19:45f.] and he also spoke sharply and harshly in public before all the people about their vices of avarice, ambition, and hypocrisy in Matthew 23:1-33. When the time came that he would sacrifice himself for us all, and the enemy sought to capture him, he went to meet them. In order to give the understanding that a shepherd should prevent the bodily harm of his sheep, he gave himself not only for us, but also protected the bodily life of the disciples. He said with divine power [Jn. 18:8], "If you are seeking me, let them go." Thus he laid out his life for us. Therefore every shepherd, insofar as he is a shepherd among the sheep of Christ, should stand forth against all those who persecute him for the sake of God and his true word and also for the loyalty he has to his sheep, unmindful as to whether he must speak against the great Alexander, Julius, pope, king, princes or authority. This he should also do, not only when they contradict the word of God, but even if they overload their good folk [27] too much and unreasonably with temporal burdens. This will all be treated later with examples and Scripture passages.

When God saw the excessive sufferings of the children of Israel under the king Pharaoh and the Egyptian people he sent Moses to liberate them and to lead them out, for he no longer wanted to endure the unjust suffering of his people, Exodus 3:1-13. Although Moses sought to excuse himself because of his unfitness [cf. Ex. 3:11] he had to lead out against the Pharaoh so great a number of people--through water, desert, enemy, hunger, thirst,

punishment and plague--that anyone would be seized with horror if he only heard of the trouble suffered. Yet God has always given his promises and words power and he made Moses victorious with them. Thus, if the tyrants excessively oppress their charges so unjustly and ungodly, then also should a shepherd step forth and defend the sheep.

Rulers should be doers of good, not oppressors, slave drivers and plunderers, Luke 22:25. Seneca also says it, "regnum: beneficium", that is, the empire or government should be an office of good deeds. [13] One knows well that one owes the government something, Romans 13:7. However, we are speaking here against the tyrannical offenders, in whom there is no fear of God and no love, indeed no consideration of neighbor. Don't you think, O pious Christian, that God with special diligence is revealing his word so powerfully in this sinful time wherein such willfulness and destruction of piety, of justice, of virgins, of loyalty and faith and with that, shameless taking, robbery, usury, money-changing, devaluation of money and everything for which the publicans were despised by the Romans, has grown up in a great number of the princes. Since we [28] find at no time since the beginning of Christian faith that the word of God has been so strongly disclosed anywhere as at this time, it is good to realize that it serves us all for salvation. The false hypocrisy of human teachings should be taken away. Therefore woe to the shepherd who, in this time in which the children and the foolish are qualified to speak, is silent, places the light under the bushel [cf. Mt. 5:15; Mk. 4:21; Lk. 11:33], does the work of God sluggishly and does not help to liberate the people of God.

God ordered Saul through the prophet Samuel to kill the Amalekites young and old and their livestock, and in no way to touch or desire their possessions. Nevertheless, Saul erred and did not kill the Amalekite king Agag, also kept much livestock as sacrifice and booty for God and some precious clothes and treasures for himself. The prophet Samuel did not overlook this impertinence, even though Saul was the king and recently victorious. He went to him and said: "Why have you not been obedient to the word and voice of God, but have turned to plunder and have done evil before the Lord God?" Saul justified himself: he had been obedient, for he had killed the Amalekites and had taken their king Agag alive. The people also kept some possessions and livestock that they wanted to sacrifice to God. Therefore Samuel scolded him again and said: "Do you think God takes pleasure in burnt sacrifices and other offerings and does not any longer demand that one should be obedient to his command? Obedience is better than sacrifice. Opposing God is just as much sin as witchcraft and fortune-telling and to not be obedient to him is the same as worshipping idols. You have rejected the word of God and thus has God also rejected you so that you may no longer

be king, etc.," 1 Samuel 15:1-30. Afterwards the prophet Samuel hacked to pieces the captive king Agag. [1 S. 15:33] This teaches us clearly that the shepherd should not excuse the king, prince or government anything, but as soon as he sees them departing from the way should point out to them their error. [29]

Therefore the prelate, whose name for God's sake I hold back here, has been impertinent. When, not long ago, he conferred a benefice on a priest, he earnestly counseled him not to scold his order with any word. He should also preach the gospel in such a way that he rebuked no one. Look, what will the poor pastor preach? The whole world lies in evil and he should not rebuke it. Why then do they need a shepherd? I know well that the good Lord said that the gospel rebukes no one. Dear sir, open your eyes better and look in Matthew 23:1-33; 3:2; John 8:1-59; 3:1-36, and in many other places and see how Christ and John spoke and acted. Probably he will further answer me: Yes, the pastor should rebuke the peasants and draw them from vice. For he has boasted he would not want to be against the gospel, but that he is also for the same. Herein lies the sin. The high ones of this world would not mind that one preaches the truth insofar as one does not learn to recognize their tyranny thereby and does not touch them, so they do not also lose anything thereby. The shepherd, however, learns there something else, namely, that one is not to overlook anything by the king, or the government and is to say: "One must obey God rather than people." [Acts 5:29]

Since, however, the papal gang also invests their obedience with these words, we want to speak further about them.

When Saul wanted to act more according to his own judgement than the word of God he committed the highest disobedience. Therefore Samuel says to him that not doing what God has commanded is idolatry, damaging and deceptive--just as magicians and fortune-tellers deceive with their made-up fables. Without doubt, if a person considers something good on the basis of reason and does not learn what is right and good from God alone and his word, the same has erected an idol in himself, namely, his own understanding and judgements. Such an idol will be thrown over with difficulty, for he begins also externally with his wizardry, that is, with hypocritical pretense he sells himself before people as true and righteous. And just as apes are well-pleased with their offspring so are also people pleased with their inventions. [30] Just as Saul thought it was fitting that a king should not kill the other but take him captive, he thought it would also not be useful for the valuable clothes and treasures to be destroyed and the livestock to be killed. Therefore he left to the people what was valuable as if it were founded in the commandment of love of neighbor, and ordered a great sacrifice to be offered to God and out of the livestock as if it were based on the com-

mandment, "You shall worship and honor the one God." [Ex. 20:3ff.] To that Samuel says, "Obedience is better than sacrifice." Which obedience? Not as Saul ordered, not killing the king, giving the valuable things to the people and preserving the livestock as a sacrifice to God, even though that looks good. Rather the obedience God wants is to observe firmly his word. It is this Saul ought to have obeyed--not his own calculations. Thus find the papists, monks, priests and nuns, that this word, "obedience surpasses sacrifice" is not for, but really against them. These words say that a person may do no greater service of God than to follow without deviation the one word of God, letting no other person, nor judgements lead one astray.

If the whole gang of papists speak out of their statutes, teachings and opinions that are inconsistent with God's word, then we should always set that word against them. If they say: you should be obedient to the pope, the abbot, the prior, etc., then let one look to see if what they are commanding has any basis in the word of God. If it does, then one does not need their commandments, but one should take forth the word of God, hold to it, live under it, and not credit it to people. However, if they command something which has no basis in the word of God and say, "even if we command something ungodly, you should be obedient to us, for obedience is above everything," then one should say, "that which you seek in obedience you should seek in God." Thus, one should rather suffer death before one acts against the word of God. Nothing is more pleasing to God than for one to be obedient to him and not to let oneself be led astray by anyone's opinions. [31] Hence, if you now command what has no basis in the word, then one does God the highest service if one is not obedient to you.

When David took the dear wife of the godly Uriah [2 S. 11:4], while he in the meantime risked his life for David against the enemy, David arranged it so that he would be killed. Therefore God sent the prophet Nathan to him to point out to him his murderous wickedness, that he had thus despised God and was not ashamed to do before God what he now would like to hide from the people. Therefore the punishment of God was strongly proclaimed to him in 2 Samuel 12:9f.: "You have killed Uriah with the sword and have taken his wife to yourself as wife. Therefore will the sword no longer depart from your home, etc." See, here the prophet must lift up to the most powerful David his adultery and deathblow, indeed the unfaithful murder. What do the powerless shepherds do now who daily encounter enormous adultery and yet do nothing to restrain it, but often help it, etc.? What do we first want to say about the impure purity of the papists who daily behave worse than dogs before us, constantly bragging about their hypocritical purity. It would be bearable if some of them would remain within natural limits.

Jeroboam, the king of Israel, was so sacrilegious that he erected two golden calves, one in Bethel, the other in Dan. By that he perverted the festival of booths that one celebrated in Judah so that the people would not want to go to Jerusalem. He was therefore the first king that brought Israel into idolatry, 1 Kings 12, 13. When the day of sacrifice came and Jeroboam stood by the altar and burnt incense, see, there came a man of God, a prophet from Judah, who cried out of the word of God what had been commanded him. [32] "Altar, Altar! Thus says the Lord: Behold, there will be born a son with the name Josiah, born from the race of David. He will slaughter or sacrifice on you the priests of the mountain churches who now burn incense on you, and will burn human bones on you." The prophet gave with that a sign saying: "See, the altar will split and the ashes on it will be split." At that the king stretched out his hand from the altar and said, "Seize him!" In that moment the hand which he stretched out against the prophet withered so that he could no longer draw it back. The altar split and the ashes fell, as the prophet had said. After the prophet prayed to God for him the hand again became healthy. Still he did not turn away from the idolatry. See, what impenitence does.

Here the shepherd learns that he should not let the sheep be led into idolatry nor into any kind of unrighteousness. Although the sacrilegious and wicked Jeroboam has the impudence to do such, the prophet should stand over against the king even though he knows he will not be obeyed. God knew well that Jeroboam would not abstain; nevertheless, he sent his prophet to him. This is against the shepherds, who excuse their silence because they know that their speaking does not help. For Christ did not cease teaching the unbelieving Jews, even though he knew they would not accept his teaching.

Ahab was also a godless, sacrilegious king in Israel like the one above. Indeed, he surpassed all the evil kings, for in addition to all the other idolatry, he erected the idol Baal and installed many priests. Therefore God stopped it from raining for three years. Consequently, he sent Elijah to disgrace the priests of Baal and to lead the people again into the knowledge of him. Thus he came to the great godless scoundrel Ahab. The king said to him: "Is it you, who troubles Israel?" Elijah answered, "I have not troubled Israel, but you and the family of your father. You have left the commandments of God and have followed after the idolatrous Baalim." Then [33] he agreed with him to gather the 450 priests of Baal and the 400 priests of the forest shrine on Mount Carmel so that one could see who was the true God, as it is written in 1 Kings 18:21. Then he said to the people: "How long do you want to limp between both sides? Is the Lord your God? Then follow him. Is it Baal? Then follow him." They were not able to light the sacrifice in the way stipulated. However,

when Elijah called on the true God of Israel it hit immediately. What happened after will come later. Here Elijah opposes the worship of idols before the furious king and before so many false priests although he had been the only prophet left, as it is written later on in 1 Kings 19:10. From this the shepherd can well learn that it is his duty to stand firmly with the word of God--even if the whole world would stand against him. Also, he should not let the great number of the Baal priests frighten him. Nor is it allowed for the people to limp between two sides, that is, not to lie in the error which says, "Yes, I trust in God; however, I trust also in the creatures who are blessed." God may not endure such limping. He wants to be everything himself. Nonetheless the Israelite people sometimes also did not honor the true God. God, however, does not want to tolerate it.

It was just this Ahab who desired that a pious man, Naboth, sell him his vineyard which was well situated next to his palace. [Cf. 1 K. 21:1ff.] When Naboth did not want to do it, it made Ahab sick with anger. His wife Jezebel came to him to help in such fashion: she secured two false witnesses against Naboth to say he had blasphemed God and ordered him to be killed. Then she ordered the man to get up and to be happy, because Naboth was dead and the vineyard had fallen to the king. Elijah, because of this shameful murder, was sent a second time and he said to Ahab: "you have killed and appropriated to yourself unlawfully. In the place where the dogs licked Naboth's blood they will also [34] lick yours, etc." Of Jezebel he said: "The dogs will devour Jezebel in the field Jezrael," 1 Kings 21:19, 23. All of that came to pass. Here the shepherd learns that he should step forth not only when an entire people is oppressed, but also when one individual person is oppressed, and that even against the greatest tyrant.

Since all the false prophets prophesied to Jehoshaphat, the king of Judah, and the oft-mentioned Ahab that they should fight against the Syrian king [cf. 1 K. 22:1-54] the only prophet Micaiah contradicted them and set before them all the things which encountered them later. Although the arrogant prophet Zedekiah struck him on the cheeks and protested strongly that the spirit of God had instructed him to speak just as well as Micaiah, Micaiah nevertheless persisted even when they put him in prison. Then in the same battle Jehoshaphat was wounded and Ahab was shot dead. When they washed the chariot in which he had ridden in the pool of Samaria the dogs drank therefrom his blood, as God had said through Elijah. Here the shepherd learns that he also should oppose those who boast that they have the word of God, but actually don't have it but speak nothing except their own judgements or flattery. If one violates the word of God, then the word itself will reveal it. Accordingly the shepherd also learns that he should rebuke and hinder the wanton warring of the princes. Where are the papists, the high bishops and the

whole number of the so-called spirituals? How have they behaved themselves? They have for the last fifteen years set the greatest and strongest peoples against one another with the result that so many people's honor, bodies and possessions have been destroyed that it cannot be counted. Lately they have been the most evil ones. As often as they have begun to speak of peace, it always has been to their own advantage and consequently war has increased so that still today during the daytime one shudders with fear as soon as one hears them speak of peace. They intend to send detriment, that is, injury into the world. In short, whoever [35] would have peace, should take from this hour on the word of God that reveals itself clearly in this time, or he will never again enjoy peace. The axe is laid to the tree. [Cf. Mt. 3:10; Lk. 3:9]

What should one demonstrate himself out of the prophets as to how the shepherd should resist all evil? If the shepherd would read the prophets then he would find nothing other than an eternal battle with the powerful and the vices of this world. How Isaiah rebukes the powerful in chapter 1:23: "Your princes are godless, societies of thieves. They all like bribes and strive after bribes and payments. They do not provide justice for the orphans and the cause of the widows may not come up before them." Likewise Jeremiah also cries out in chapter 5:4f. that the powerful have exceeded the impiety of the community. And our rulers say indeed they would obligate us not to touch them. Still all evil comes here from the powerful and the authorities. How does he rebuke the false prophets? Look at Ezekiel 34:2-10 where he threatens the shepherds who only nourish themselves, of which without doubt there were a great number. Still the prophet speaks against them. How Amos rebukes the powerful, calling them fat cows, telling them what great miseries they will encounter. How Jonah [cf. Jonah 1:2; 3:4] has to go into a great godless city to preach that they will fall in forty days. How all those preached, prophesied and warned before the Babylonian captivity. Yet nothing helped.

The forerunner and baptizer of Christ, John, saw well how strong and powerful Herod was, so that the people were not permitted to say anything to him about his shameful life. Nevertheless, John sees that he should not overlook Herod, and when no one chastises him, John goes to him, points out his vices and says: "It is not seemly for you to have the wife of your brother" [Mk. 6:18], which, however, Herod did. Consequently, John was taken captive and killed. [Mk. 6:17-28] From this one learns that the shepherd must attack and hinder all that which one is not permitted to do omitting no one, standing over against princes, people and priests--letting himself not be frightened by size, strength, number, nor any kind of [36] intimidation from that hour in which God calls him, and not to cease until they are con-

verted, as Jeremiah 1 and 15 say: "They shall be turned to you, and not you to them. I shall give you to the people as a strong, bronze wall. They will fight against you, but not overcome, for I am with you." [Cf. Jer. 1:18f.; 15:20]

As there were ephors with the Spartans and tribunes with the Romans, so there are in many German cities today chief guildmasters who oppose the head when too much power is used. [14] Likewise God has placed among his people officials--the Shepherds--who are to watch at all times. God does not want anyone to have power so unqualified that no one may not point out his misdeeds to him. And if the power who is entitled to act does not risk such out of treachery or fear, the prophet still should never sleep. If the authorities help, then vice can be expelled with the greater peace, but if they do not, then the shepherd has to risk his skin and hope for no other help nor liberation than that from God. In short, there must be watchfulness and restraint, for God always sends his prophets in time to warn the sinful world, as Jeremiah 25 and 29 point out. After the warning comes, nothing helps better than to change and improve. Then, if that does not take place, a greater evil is at the door--and that from day to day until the entire people is destroyed. An example serves to illustrate this: Sodom and Nineveh, and the Israelite people, who in the desert worshipped the calf and were pardoned. In turn, since the same people did not improve after all these warnings, they were led into the Babylonian captivity.

If now the shepherd must stand against all the great and high powers of this world and must fight against them, then it is necessary that he be well armed. Therefore we must lead him into the armory of Christ, so that [37] he arms himself well with those weapons with which the Lord armed his disciples. [Cf. Eph. 6] He sends forth his disciples in Matthew 10:7-25; Mark 6:7-13; Luke 9:1-11 and 10:2-16: "When you now go forth, preach, saying, 'The kingdom of God is at hand.' Heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, awaken the dead, cast out devils and preach, 'The kingdom of God is at hand.' Freely you have received; freely give. You should not take gold, silver, nor money in your purses, nor sacks for the road. Do not take a spare coat, nor shoes, nor staff; for the worker is worthy of his food." See! Christ does not here at all want the shepherd to concern himself with any kind of temporal nourishment, but only with the carrying out of faithful work. He does not doubt that you will never lack the necessary nourishment or whatever is needed. For if you work faithfully, then you will always find that you lack nothing. He is the clothier and feeder of birds and flowers. How could he let his workers lack anything? He commands also that the gifts which he freely, gratuitously, gave to them for their work, they are gratuitously again to give away. The staff which by Mark 6:8 is allowed is for help on the way so they recognize that the pomp of the cart and of

riding is forbidden. In Matthew 10:10 it is forbidden so that they do not use it for dealing out blows--and also so they learn to depend only on the care of their Lord and not on their own means.

Soon thereafter he says further: And whoever does not receive you and accept your word, then go from that same house or city and shake the dust from your feet [cf. Mt. 10:14f.]: "Truly I say to you, it will go better for the people of Sodom and Gomorrah on the day of judgement than for that same city." As he previously [38] commanded using the key of loosing in preaching the gospel, namely, that the kingdom of God is at hand [Mt. 10:7], so does he also demand here again the binding of those who do not accept their word, that is, shaking the dust from their feet as a symbol that the unbelievers are held captive in their unbelief, that the believers of God should not have in common with the unbelievers their dust, which is a discarded thing. Thus did Paul in Acts 18:5f. also use the key of binding: "When the Jews at Corinth were contradicting and reviling Christ he rent his clothes and said to them: 'The guilt of your blood be on your own heads; clean, I shall turn from you to the Gentiles.'" Thus we see here also that Christ does not want anyone to be forced by coercion into faith so that all power and honor be given to God and his word--though many pretend this faith before Christians and, it is to be feared, only aspire for temporal goods and the earthly kingdom.

He says further [Mt. 10:16-18]: "See, I send you forth as sheep among wolves. Therefore be wary as serpents and innocent as doves. Be on your guard before the people; for they will deliver you up to their councils and in their gatherings they will flog you. You will be led for my sake to the princes and the kings for witness to them and to the heathen, etc." See how he withdraws from them all comfort of this world. What more dreadful things can be said to the flesh than "You will be placed before councils, princes, king, and will be betrayed and scourged. A brother will give the other into death, and the father the son, and in return the sons the fathers." And he says in addition, "They will be defenseless with regard to the body in the midst of the enemy, just like sheep among wolves. They have no mercy with the little sheep, however pitiable, virtuous and innocent an animal it might be. Thus will the shepherds and servants of God also find no mercy with the godless, but will be considered as sheep ordained for the butcher. Everyone who kills them will think that they have performed a service to God. [39]

These weapons and still many others, namely: they do not stand above the master, that as he is despised so will they be despised [cf. Jn. 15:20]; the world will hate them and will call them seducers, etc. [Cf. Jn. 15:18] These might be seen more as a hindrance than a help, though they are truly nothing

other than weapons. For if one is prepared before the attack, then he is armed so that no one can hurt him. Where the opponents can not hurt the shepherd, it must be that he has a strong armor against the attack.

Here I do not want to describe the armor portrayed in Ephesians 6:11; rather, I use the explanation which Christ used with few words in Matthew 10:26, 28. Immediately after he has enumerated the many things they will use against the shepherd, he says, "You should not be afraid," and soon thereafter: "You should not fear those who kill the body, but cannot kill the soul; rather, fear much more him who can destroy body and soul in damnation." Not to fear is the armor. So now you want to say: I would without doubt certainly know even if Christ had not said so, that is, where I do not fear anything, there I would attack all things bravely. If it were given to me not to fear then I would stand steadfast, but not if I am only told not to be afraid. Therefore Christ shows us how to attain the point that we are without fear in John 16:33: "These things have I spoken to you that you have peace in me. You will have anxiety or affliction in the world; but do not be afraid, for I have overcome the world." Here we see the pioneer, Christ. He calls us to be untroubled and to go forward in his work, although at the same time we are faced with affliction. The world cannot do anything different to the shepherd. But herein lies our certain comfort, that he is the victor over the world. And if we are his loyal servants, then he will also overcome these afflictions for us. Therefore we should now be joyous. As Moses also says to the children of Israel in Exodus 14:14: "The Lord will fight for you, and you will be still, silent, and rest." So should the shepherd do the work of his Lord and accordingly let him rule and protect him. [40]

If, however, the shepherd would like to object here: "yes, he protects me until I am killed," then I answer: indeed he has truly and rightly protected you; for no one who is not God's suffers death for the sake of God. Here you will learn the first basis of faith and of love as has been previously promised. [Cf. Mt. 10:26-28] Do you believe there is one all-powerful God? Yes. Do you also believe he is your God, Lord and father? Yes. Do you also place all your confidence in him? Yes. Do you also believe without doubt that he has not promised you anything but what he will do for you? Yes. Do you have him for a father, so that you will also love him without doubt and follow him in everything that he demands? Yes. Will you also have joy when you can serve him? Yes. Then follow out of the faith by which you have him for the highest God, for your God, for your father, that you hope for the first to come to him; indeed, you hurry to come to him. If you have him for your father then you will also love him. If you love him then you are not able to endure that his name not be honored, that one not believe his word, that one live so shame-

fully contrary to him. And just as you would rather die than shame your earthly father so all the more would you rather suffer death for the heavenly father than that you would live to the detriment of him.

If you believe that God's word cannot fail then you also will know that to die here for him is the greatest honor which a child can do to honor his heavenly God and Father. The less you fear death, the stronger your faith is. The more you fear death, the less is there trust and love of God in you. Where true faith and divine love is, there the person knows that to die for the sake of God is gain, and a beginning of true life. He also knows that no one is conquered who dies by virtue of the constant confession of the word of God, but he who lets himself be turned away from God by the love of this life. Then he will no longer say: "Yes, I am killed thereby," for that is a voice of the flesh. Where, however, true divine love is, there may no external fire extinguish this love. With this must the enemies of God be overcome. As Paul in Romans 8:38 points out, "I am convinced that neither death nor life, angels nor powers, etc. can separate us from the divine love, etc." [41]

If love now is necessary for the shepherd then we must show why and how it will be bestowed upon him.

Love is therefore necessary so that all things be judged and measured by it. For the carpenter is not so certain with his eye; for him, a ruler is also necessary. All courage, skill and faith are nothing if they are not judged according to love. As 1 Corinthians 13:4-8 points out: "Love is patient and friendly. Love does not hate. Love is not irksome. It does not exalt itself nor is it rude or improper. It does not seek its own needs. It is not short-tempered. It does not keep an account of evil. It does not rejoice over unrighteousness; however, it rejoices with the truth. It bears all things, trusts all things, hopes all things. Love never falls away nor commits mistakes." Here you see the type of love that is necessary for the shepherd before all other godly virtues. Just as the shepherd strikes some sheep--some with the hand, pushing some with the feet, calling others with a whistle, lures some with a piece of salt--so others if they are weak he carries and others he leaves at home until they are strong enough. All this he still does for the good of his Lord so that the little sheep increase in number and become pure and healthy. Thus the shepherd of God should do all things out of love for the increase and advancement of the sheep of God, now rough, now hard, according as the sheep require it and as God may permit it. In short: where there is love it never fails. There one is never lazy. One increases the honor of God more and more and one can endure thereby all things. For without love a person falls easily into pride. Indeed, where there is no love of God everything is nothing but pride.

How one receives the love of God is easily learned from the words of Christ in John 6:44: "No one comes to me unless my Father has drawn him." Thus clinging to God comes from the God who draws himself, for God himself is love, 1 John 4:16. [42] Whoever now remains in love remains in God and God remains in him. Thus it will be necessary for the shepherd earnestly to call on God that he ignite him with the fire of his love. How will he call upon him, however, if he does not trust him, Romans 10:14. Therefore it now follows that calling upon God comes out of trust. For we do not call upon him whom we do not expect to help us, or if we hope for help and he does not want to help us then we would not call upon him. Now if we trust that God is so faithful that he wants to compensate for our needs, and that he is so strong that he is capable of such response, then God is already in us; for our flesh does not recognize God in such a way. Now if such knowledge and trust of God is in us, then it does not come from us but from God. It is through his Son, Jesus Christ, that he instructs and makes certain in us these two things, that he can and wants to. Whoever accepts him as the Son of God is already certain that God can and wants to help us, for he has given his only son for us--what would, for a person, be the highest act. Whoever now is secure through Jesus Christ is born out of God and God is in him. [Cf. 1 Jn.4:15] For we do not come so far out of our capability and understanding that we thereby accept Christ; it must come about from God. If God is now in him then is he also certain that God will give him everything; therefore he calls on him. From all this it follows that all those who complain about the coldness of God's love and do not want to suffer death for God's sake have not yet accepted Jesus Christ. For whoever has accepted him is ashamed to devise such obstacles since God has so joyously and freely given forth his son for our sakes. Therefore whoever wants to have the love of God should ask God to effect in him the right knowledge of his son and to give him right confidence--then love is already present. He will thank God if he wants to use his contemptuous body for his honor. Although our flesh flee and is fearful--for even Christ had anxiety before death--nonetheless, it will be awakened with the stronger fire of confidence and love of God so that he must follow. Thus is love necessary and there one finds it. [43]

It is apparent that nothing other than divine love can bring the shepherd to deny himself, to leave father and mother, to go forth without purse, knapsack and staff, to be dragged before the princes, beaten, falsely accused and killed and that love may not exist without the fundamental of undoubting trust.

Now we have to see what his recompense is and whether he will serve loyally for his payment so that the recompense can attract him to so great a work. Christ confirms the payment

in Mark 10:28-30 when Peter, in the name of the disciples, asks, "See, we have left all and followed after you. What will our payment be?" In Matthew 19:29 Christ answered him: "Truly, I say to you: there is no one who has left his house, brother, sister, father, mother, wife, child or land for my sake and the sake of the gospel who will not be rewarded a hundredfold of the value of houses, brothers, sisters, mothers, children and land through persecutions, and in the future world, eternal life." Here Christ promises a great recompense; however, he makes it very bitter for he says, "the same is given with persecution". Therefore one must see where the hundredfold payment is being given which he promises here. In these days we find well the persecution, but the hundred houses, brothers, etc., we do not find. Observe: when Peter in Acts 2:41 preached there were three thousand persons converted to the faith. Peter received here in one moment a much greater number of sisters and brothers, also houses, land and provisions than he had previously had, in that all those who believe in Christ he does not love less than his own naturally-born brothers. Nor is he concerned about their possessions any less than as if they were his very own, namely, that they are not loved too much or misused against God. So have the true shepherds always done.

Now this recompense does not serve the body, but increases in the shepherd care and anxiety for his charges. What should one say first of all concerning the promise of persecution which so certainly happens that the shepherds everywhere for a long time have been delivered unto death? You see well that the shepherds have not [44] served with a view to temporal payment. Since eternal life is also promised here we must see whether one undertakes the shepherd's office for that reason. What we find is that the shepherd, insofar as he is true, does not serve only for the sake of eternal reward. Here it is that we learn about our wages and payment. Whoever serves for eternal recompense must know beforehand where it has been promised to him, who it is that has promised the same to him, and that he who has promised him does not lie and is not deceitful. When now a person knows the promised payment it is in the first place necessary that he is certain that the promisor does not deceive him. If he has certainty, then he has right faith and trust in God. Where that is the case, then nothing else is possible but that the love for God follows after. For who could truly hold God to be a gracious, undeceiving, highest good and not love him, especially since he has assured us so dearly of his grace through Jesus Christ, his son?

It follows that a true shepherd cannot look for a reward. For if he trusts that the recompense is certain then the faith is already certainly there. If faith is there then along with it follows love. Now if love and faith are already there then it is

out of these that work is done and not with a view to payment. The servants look only at the payment, but the sons look not at the payment but work with loyalty in the house of their father, letting the fact and means of the payment be determined at the discretion of the father. Now we are the children of God [Gal. 4:7] and co-heirs with Christ [Rom. 8:17]. Why then do we, like the unfree servant, want to look to the payment and not only to the honor of God, our father, and accordingly let him divide the inheritance among us as it pleases him?

The shepherd who does not come to such a measure of love will often become unstable in the fire of persecution. For that reason Christ, before he would let his disciples go out to preach, confirmed them beforehand with the Holy Spirit in the symbol of the tongues of fire and the deafening roar of a strong wind. [Cf. Acts 1:2; 2:1-13] The [45] wind came first to show the waves and turbulence of this world, and then the tongues of fire, signifying the confirmation of God ignited in our hearts through love for him.

Concerning the False Shepherds

False shepherds are nothing other than false prophets which God often portrays in their true form. Still we do not want to know them. Yet Christ describes them so clearly in Matthew 7:15f.: "Beware of false prophets who come to you in the clothing of sheep, but inwardly are ravenous wolves. You will recognize them by their fruits. Does one gather grapes from thorns or figs from thistles?"

Here we see a general picture wherein we can recognize all false shepherds and prophets described by the truth itself.

First of all, they come in an unarmed, innocent form, just as if they, like the little sheep, could not injure--as we now see the papists coming with words. As with their external behavior and their servants they travel here just like tyrants all decked out in full armor; they also show by their bite that they are wolves. Where they find that the simple word of God is preached they come to the government with words like: "We see that the seamless robe of God is being evilly separated, and the Christian Church which Christ Jesus ordained in himself, and won and received with his own rose-colored blood is evilly disturbed, etc." What believers would not have their eyes overflow with tears when they illustrate the painful death and blood of Jesus Christ? When their speech is at an end, see if it is for the sake of Christ or for the sake of their money chests.

Their complaints usually sound like this: "No one any longer pays attention to the words of the fathers." [46] It is from these fathers, however, that they have the sinecures, pensions, first fruits, yearly church collections, excommunications payments, the ban for temporal goods, and the deplorable powers of their laws. "They are saying the mass is not a sacrifice." Here is where they have gathered the greatest hoard of their riches together. "They reject confession." With confession they have held all consciences captive, not letting them out of their prisons until they have been paid an expensive ransom. However, they do not ask for right confession where a person is led into true peace and displeasure of himself. "They no longer hold to the Mother of God." Therefore no one any longer dresses her with silver, gold and precious stones, wherein the worm of avarice has had a special harvest every year. One should instead give such riches to the poor, as the poor son of Mary himself did. "The monks and nuns run out of the cloisters." Yes, the greatest fortress of the papists is in the cloisters. Therein have they lured the children of the rich and the powerful to have them as hostages so that they are everywhere less vulnerable to attack. That we see in this time. The word of Christ is less resisted wherever there are few cloisters among a people. "The priests take wives." God himself orders that. If they have whores and pay every year four guilders for a child and every fifth year a fine, or yearly for a visitation so that the bishop receives yearly four thousand guilders, then everything is right. "What is being preached leads to disorder." And they think the fact that they have brought the world, with no justification, into interest payments and subservience does not lead to disorder. Yet it is clear that all the rebellions which [47] have ever been in the world have only grown out of oppression by the powerful. They put forward many such complaints at last so that one sees that they are hypocritically covering their desires with the gracious activity of Jesus Christ, our Lord. If they do not already spread out their tails like a peacock then all one has to do actually is to look at their retinue and glory and observe whether they are there for God or for their own glory. Christ never had such servants with him.

Since they, however, give prominence to the Christian church here, which Christ won with his bitter death and which he himself instituted, then one must see exactly what the Christian church is. Where should one find that other than with Christ, that is, in his word itself? If one finds in Christ that the papal conspiracy is the Christian church then one should simply consider them to be that. If they, however, are not confirmed by Christ, why do they then maintain that they are the church? They would indeed like to be a papal church or assembly, but the Christian church which we believe (that is, the entire believing people) is a bride of Christ, and they are that as little as Belial is God. If not, then our belief concerning the church would stand on deceiving, fallible humanity--which, however, cannot be the case.

The church, first of all, insofar as it is fitting to speak here about it, is taken to be all those who have built all their confidence and security of salvation on Christ, as he says in Matthew 16:18: "On the same will I build my church." For that reason he gave Peter his name, that is, rock, which means, "I will reconcile my people with God [48] so that I am for their sin a compensating lamb and sacrifice. Whoever trusts himself in that will be saved and is a member of my saints, that is, of my people and of my church." Thus one finds in the word of Christ, that this Christ-believing church is all those who trust in Christ. For truly, whoever is built on the rock is in the church; for the church is built on the rock.

In the second place the church is taken to be every parish. Thus we call the church at Corinth [cf. 1 Cor. 1:2] that part of the universal church which was gathered at Corinth, who were otherwise all members of the church with all other believers. Nonetheless they were also called a church, that is, a congregation or an assembly. Thus, the church at Appenzell is called the parish of Appenzell. They are nonetheless members of the whole Christian people, which is the true church in which we believe. Just as the church at Corinth and at Appenzell cannot impose laws and prohibitions over all of Christendom, so little may the papal church impose statutes and laws on other people, for it is only one particular church (if it has the faith of Christ!) that elevates itself.

All this is pointed out sufficiently in other places with many proofs based on Scripture, but here is not the place nor the need to speak thereof. Therefore, when the papists complain about the break-up of the church, they are only complaining about their losses. For the more people enter into the true Christian faith, the larger is the church, even if there were no pope nor higher bishop on earth. Now this is a pretty picture: it's as if in caring for the sheep all they care about is the wool and the shearers. For they should know that the church of God or the sheep of God or the people of God, whatever you want to call it, can be nourished in no other pasture than in the word of God. If that is everywhere richly brought forth then they should not complain how [49] disruption would come into being; rather they ought to rejoice that the pasture of the divine word so richly grows everywhere.

It also does not help when they say, "Yes, if only they would present it according to the view of the fathers." For Christ has this word: "A person will live by every word that comes from the mouth of God," Matthew 4:4, not by the judgement, law or mouth of the fathers; rather, he is speaking of the word that comes from his own mouth. See also Deuteronomy 8:3.

In short, so that every Christian understands: how did

it stand with the Christian faith, or what did one preach, before those whom they call the fathers were born? How did the holy apostles preach the word of God? Thus it becomes clear that with the fathers they want nothing but to frighten the simple ones, and take the word of God captive with them. The Christian people never lived godlier and more innocently than when no human additions or obligations were added to the simple word of God.

Thus they first of all use words so that they deceive the simple by an illusion. In fact, we ought to thank God that they begin now to speak thus. Recently they have published three or four mandates, in which they, in the first place, forgot to recommend that one should preach God's word with all seriousness. [15] Now they only come along as an afterthought, as one issued an invitation to the neighbor: "Friend Hans, you, too, are invited!" We want, they say, nonetheless that one preach the gospel. Now it has become so much better, for they are recommending for the first time that the gospel be preached, and then they come with the addition, "yet according to the understanding of the fathers and the common [50] understanding of the faithful." How well it turned out for God's word that the fathers appeared; otherwise it would not have been allowed for his word to be preached! Suppose that no father would ever have explained the word of God in writing, would they let it be preached or not? If it can now be preached more correctly, lucidly and clearly without the fathers, why do they bind the word then to the fathers even when their own canon law (Corpus iur. can. Dist. VIII and IX) points out that the fathers should give way to the word of God and not God's word to the fathers? Where, however, the proper understanding of the word of God comes from, one will find enough said in the little book, "On the Clarity of God's Word." [16]

Thus it is established that those who hold forth Jesus Christ our Lord and God in their demands as a pretense, and have nothing else in themselves, one sees that they only believe in Christ in order to be recognized as shepherds. Truly, however, if you inspect the false shepherds down to their feet, you will find their wolf's claws always sticking out. This applies not only to the high bishops but to all those bishops or pastors to whom one must listen, whether they teach for the good of the sheep or for the good of their own kitchen. These protect the papal church. Indeed they affirm that what it says is even as good as the word of God (what a shameful idolatry that is, for how can the creature be set next to the creator?). It destroys the passion of Christ when they say, "a human being must and can be saved by his own work," for if it were so then Christ would have died in vain, Galatians 2:21. They speak deception, however, for they know well that every person doubts his own works. And if one depends on his works then he looks around for help with the works and accordingly returns to the priestly and monkish murmurings

of the psalms, to the holding of masses and to the increase of church decoration. All that brings to the false shepherd the milk [51] and wool of the sheep. This is expressed in the following words of Christ, where he says: "You will recognize them by their fruits" [Mt. 7:16], that is, you will see well from what they seek whether they tend the sheep out of love for God or out of avarice. Such a test of the shepherd he recommends to all Christians. Therefore must the papists also allow themselves to be tested, indeed, by the simplest ones of all, for Christ says this to the sheep, or the church. Thus must the fathers, along with the papists and bishops, let themselves be judged as to whether they are wolves or shepherds. And if the church finds they are wolves and not shepherds, then God grant it be on guard against them, however much they might boast.

There follows further in the test of Christ in Matthew 7:17-20, "Every good tree brings forth good fruit but the bad tree brings forth bad fruit. A good tree cannot bring forth bad fruit nor the bad tree good fruit. Every tree that does not bring forth good fruit is cut down and thrown into the fire. Therefore you will know them by their fruit." Here it is clearly to be seen, how earlier it was said of the true shepherd, that he should apply himself to what he finds and to what is taught in God's word and is not to bring forth his own hypocritical works.

Thus the people should also judge the shepherds not by humanly created works, but by those works which God has commanded. But as the shepherd is not now tested by such works, there are, therefore, many ignorant ones who say, "Look, they are not holding the mass, they are not honoring the images, they no longer hold to singing in the church nor to indulgences. No one any longer gives gifts and offerings to the monks, nuns and priests. They give nothing for prayer to Our Lady, etc." If they only knew that bought-masses are a horror to God and that for the honoring of God one should clothe the living images of God--poor Christians--and not wooden and stone idols, and that to worship God in the spirit and the truth--not senseless yelling--[cf. Jn. 4:24] [52] is the most God-pleasing song; that their indulgences have been nothing more than a permit for all vices, for with them they have robbed, stolen, practiced usury, fought, betrayed, indeed begun all great evils; that it is harmful for there to be so many loafers, priests, monks and nuns among the Christian people, for they are the originators of all the wantonness and licentiousness. Also, if they would consider that other than that of the only Lord Jesus Christ, truly God and truly human, no human work can be considered above another; that the highest honor to be offered the Virgin Mary is not the building of high walls, the riding of the cathedral canons on beautiful horses and eating with beautiful women, but that it is to be found among all those who hope in her Son, obtaining his help, and when all that which is spent on

the walls is given over to the protection of the godliness of poor daughters and women whose beauty is led into danger through poverty. Yes, if the uninstructed would truly know what Christian works are, then they also would learn to recognize the shepherds by the works alone. Otherwise if the shepherd is avaricious, unchaste, a drunkard and a play actor, and at the same time passes himself off as God-fearing with much mass saying and external appearance of clothing and customs [cf. Tit. 1:7] then the simple sheep will think he is a shepherd, even though he is nothing other than a rapacious wolf.

How Saint Paul described a true bishop, that is pastor, in Titus 1:5-9 and 1 Timothy 3:1-7 I have diligently saved up to this point so that one may recognize darkness next to the light, the false shepherd next to the true. "A bishop or pastor," says Paul, "shall be irreproachable, a husband of one wife, temperate, moderate, right-minded, of good morals, hospitable, capable to teach. His children should be faithful and obedient, whom one cannot describe as unruly or wanton. The bishop or pastor must not be stained with vices, for [53] that is fitting for a housekeeper of God. Therefore he must not be stubborn or self-willed, not wrathful, not a winebibber, neither a violent person nor a scoffer, not covetous of dishonest gain. He must also be firm or tenacious in the doctrine of the true faith so that he can comfort and admonish in right, wholesome doctrine and draw out and rebuke the contentious ones." See, in these words of Paul one learns how one can recognize the true shepherd. Thus it must also follow that those who do not behave in this manner are false shepherds and are unfit for the office.

These descriptions are also contained in love, as we have previously heard.

If now a shepherd is accused or slandered, insofar as he is not honestly accused, it does no harm. Unfortunately, nowadays it happens that everyone who is so inclined to enmity of the word of God defames with massive lies those who preach. Insofar as he is guilty of public vice then he may be judged not to be worthy of the bishops' office. Oh, how I would like to demonstrate here the loathsome faults of several high bishops who accuse me wrongly behind my back of great vices, as if their gossip bothered me!

It is also to be seen in the words of Paul, that every pastor who does not live chastely and yet does not marry is a false shepherd, for he is not ashamed of scandal. Indeed, he adds all the more to the scandal of the godly people.

Gluttons and carousers are false shepherds. For we know well what is needed for moderate living.

He should not be a crank, half mad and immoderate in speech and [54] other things. The lying gossips and dreamers are false shepherds.

Those who lead an undisciplined manner of life in clothing and other things are not shepherds but wolves.

Those who do not shelter the poor are false shepherds. In this matter the common shepherds of our time are not much to blame, for the prelates take away the tithes and rents and leave the pastors to suck on their paws. [17] Therefore every parish should see to it that their pastor is appropriately provided for out of their tithes and tributes and that he also be able to help the poor. Where that happens all these foolish works whereby people were enticed into offerings will fall away.

Above all they are not worthy to be called shepherds who cannot teach, or if they could teach, are not strong enough to withstand strongly those who oppose them.

The children of a shepherd should be proper, faithful and well brought up. Therefore one sees that one should not elect foolish young men as shepherds but those who now have maintained for a while a household and who have well-bred children. Let it be someone like Timothy, a youth with the right gifts, who belongs to the office of bishop. [Cf. 1 Tim. 4:12ff.]

The rest of the characteristics one can measure for himself.

Thus, according to the words of Christ [cf. Mt. 7:17-20], one should actually learn to recognize the false shepherds by their fruits and one should know which fruits are divine and which are of the devil, so that one does not keep the chaff and throw away the seed. [Mt. 13:29]

The meaning of the cut-down tree's being thrown into the fire will be treated later.

They are also all false shepherds who are inwardly not truly devout and not lovers of God, as was clearly pointed out previously by the example and words of Christ concerning the real shepherd. One sees this lack of faith clearly in the works. [55]

In the beginning we heard that the shepherd should leave father and mother, sister and brothers, etc., for the sake of God and his word. [Cf. Mt. 10:37] So those must be false who make their brothers and themselves rich with their shepherd's office, as we see daily with the high bishops who bring their relatives to great riches, with fictitious indulgence, permission and judgment

letters and numerous other foolish things of this sort. Yes, no frivolous Bacchant has performed matchmaking service for them in their youth, so they must become a canon or a rich pastor. So now those who in the world were previously poor, yet upon coming to the bishop's office have gathered riches for themselves and their families, leave us with a certain sign that they are false shepherds. These riches belong to the poor. It is they to whom God teaches us to do good, not those who misuse riches for greater and higher pomp. Christ commands that we leave our relatives, but the false shepherds embrace them first.

We have also heard that the shepherd must be ready to take up the cross of Christ daily and carry it after him. From this we see that the bishops are false shepherds, who not only don't want to suffer death, but who cannot even suffer any disadvantage or slander for God's sake. So much do many of them love their souls and bodies in this world that they think nothing at all of inciting all nations against one another only in order to be protected in their wanton lives. Open your eyes, all you who sit in authority. The false shepherds have easily excited you to a great rage and vindictiveness. Many stories of our time point out what happens next, wherein such damaging wars were caused by the false shepherds, which they afterwards could not have averted. Indeed, they did not want to. Therewith has the poverty and misery at home grown for the princes and people while they laugh up their sleeves. [56]

Those are also false shepherds who in no way act as parents and do not let the pre-occupations and anxieties of the sheep be their own concerns but look only to their own matters, saying, "I want to have that which is mine." However, what should one say about those who do not teach with the word and do nothing with works but destroy? As we have previously pointed out from the word of Christ, those who teach and do not fulfill their teachings with works are the smallest of all in the kingdom of God [Mt. 5:19], that is among Christians. Now if those who are unfit teachers are simply counted among the false shepherds what do we do with those who neither teach nor act and nevertheless want to bear the names of shepherds, bishops and fathers, for they collect the temporal payment of prophets and shepherds? Don't worry yourself with it, pious one! They are nothing but rapacious wolves. We also see that all those who endeavor other works than God has commanded are nothing but false shepherds and hypocrites.

We have also heard that the unique office of the bishop or the shepherd is preaching and that preaching rebukes and restrains vices. So it is obvious that all those who do not preach and restrain vice are neither shepherds nor bishops. It is also obvious that the bishops who punish all vices only for the sake

of money are nothing more than rapacious wolves. For if they were pained by vice, they would not be relieved of it by money. Rather they would work to lead sinners away from vice with divine teaching. That they do not do that is certain: rather they are only looking to their money purse. One recognizes them by the seeking for gain which they practice. It is a pity that one should now call them shepherds, for they are nothing other than real wolves. Since the true shepherd is promised persecution with his payment it is clear that those who want to endure no persecution [57] are not shepherds; rather, they are cowardly hirelings.

With what names shall we call those who are hostile to the true shepherds, persecute them with all power, and, where their power does not reach that far, give others payment to persecute them? I would well like to name several of these along with their bribes, but it is not yet the time to do so. Their evil must first reach its full measure. Then it will also come to light, for there is nothing that is hidden that will not be revealed. Mark 4:22.

There are also all those false shepherds who do not resist the kings and peoples who sin, but allow them constantly to go on sinning unashamedly, to the vexation of all godly folk. The scandal would not be so great if these same false shepherds did not surpass the others. It is shameful to speak of their unbridled and secret vices, Ephesians 5:12. If one would dig through their walls and look at their secrets, as God revealed in Ezekiel 8:8-18, then the worst idolatry would be seen with their playing, whoring, leading astray of souls, and all other kinds of vices, so that we would say with Christ: why do they now have the world within? We still too often consider the wolves as shepherds. Still even that is not enough for them. Many of them are not even ashamed to do publicly what a person should never do in daylight, much less before other people. Christ commands us to dig out such eyes and throw them away [Mt. 19:9] and we implant them more and more.

Christ has also forbidden [cf. Mt. 10:10] the disciples to go forth preaching with staff, purse and sack. Thus it follows that those who have the staff, that is, worldly power along with the office of the shepherd, are not shepherds but wolves, for Christ has forbidden the shepherd all ruling according to the custom of the princes of this world, as he says in Luke 22:26: "You should not so rule," and in Matthew 20:25-27: "You know that the princes of the Gentiles rule over them, etc.; it will not be so among you." Do they have now the [58] staff which Christ has forbidden them to have? Then they are false shepherds. Do they have sack and purse? Yes, truly they have it all. And if Christ had said, "You should see to it that you make all the possessions of this world your own," then they could not more diligently follow that same

command. Thus they have been spiritual until they have conquered the best and greatest part, and now they let the whole world serve them. Indeed, the princes themselves must gape at them with empty hands. Look, they have left their sack and purse lying behind them and still they are taken as shepherds and not recognized as real, ripping, rapacious, ravenous wolves. For they disguise their avarice by using Christ or his mother or the baptizer John or others who have despised the whole world as dung, saying: "It is of God, Our Lady, Saint John." These will only after their death, in eternity, be rulers since here they must beg, produce abundantly, be oppressed and threatened. Yet while they were on earth they gave up all things and gave them to the poor. That means that they must be made fools. [18]

We also know them by the fact that Christ has sent his shepherds into the midst of tyrants, as one sends sheep into the midst of wolves. The false shepherds are just like wolves among sheep, for where do they not tear you apart, rob, kill and destroy you? If the gospel is accepted by any people and they see that their plunder cannot escape notice, then only observe how they sow destruction, unrest and enmity on every hand. Yet they always have on their lips: these preachers give birth to unrest and rebellion. However, the poor people are nonetheless so graced by God that the salvation of the soul cannot be stolen from them, even if they are so miserably plagued in the body. They cannot tolerate that, for they learn to help their neighbor [59] and not to give in to the shameless begging of the papists. That is what they call inciting unrest when they are no longer given anything so that they can unsettle the whole world. Plainly their sin has been long enough condoned. They have not wanted to be converted themselves by admonitions. One must begin to press them with the simple, uncolored truth and after that to let God take charge.

And now a summary wherein you can recognize the false shepherds:

1. All who do not teach are nothing but wolves, though they might be called shepherd, bishop, or king. See in this connection how many teaching bishops there are.

2. Those who teach their own dreams rather than the word of God are wolves.

3. Those who teach the word of God, yet not to the honor of God, but for themselves and their head, the Pope, for protection of their fabricated high station, are harmful wolves, coming in sheep's clothing.

4. Those who teach already and teach even with the word of God, but do not, however, disturb the greatest aggravators,

the leaders, but allow their tyranny to grow, are flattering wolves or traitors of the people.

5. Those who do not practice with works what they teach with the word are nothing among the Christian people, destroying much more with their works than they build with their words.

6. Those who do not pay attention to the poor but let them be oppressed and burdened, are false shepherds.

7. Those who wear the name of shepherd, yet rule in the worldly sense are the most evil werwolves.

8. Those who gather riches, filling sack, purse, storehouse and cellar are true werwolves. And finally, those who do other things with doctrine than undertaking [60] to plant the knowledge, love and childlike fear of God among the people are false shepherds. They must soon be removed from the sheep or they will devour them entirely.

9. Therefore it is easy to understand that all those are false shepherds who lead from the Creator to the creature.

If now almighty God has for so long a time punished our sin with false shepherds who have not fed us with his word, and with wolves who have taken away our temporal goods, indeed, who have made us entirely their own, but has now ignited the light of his truth again so that we may see it everywhere and can well recognize it, then in that should the believing people not be hindered, but should let themselves be led out of the prison of the wolves. What is to be considered here is not bodily injury but the falsification and concealment of the word of God. For the false shepherds have either been silent or have falsified it. They still press with all earnestness, power and deception that one either not preach the gospel at all or else preach with the deceitful, false mixture and power of human teaching. For if we are being deceived once again, it stems solely from the fact that our vices are so great that we cannot endure the divine word: the brilliance of the truth blinds us. Thus our damnation is reasonable that we should doubly bear their yoke, for the light has come into the world and humankind has preferred the darkness to the light, John 3:19. Therefore one must seek to prevent all princes, rulers and people from such a relapse, for the Redeemer, after all, is here--we must simply follow him. If we want to be true children of God then we must see and listen to his word alone and not listen to those who want to lead us away from it. Indeed, we must separate ourselves from them and not live among them. Every father demands such from his children, how much more will the Heavenly Father demand it from his children whom with his Son he himself has made a chosen people and household. [Cf. 1 Pet. 2:9]

Therefore we want to show further how we can get away from the false shepherds. [61]

In the first place, we point out their wages and see if perhaps in viewing the reward they would stand down and not serve for such a payment any longer.

God says in Deuteronomy 13:1-5: "If a prophet arise in your midst, or one who says how in his sleep a vision or dream has come forth and he prophesies a miracle or wonder, and if what he said also happens, and if he says to you, 'Let us go after other Gods, which you however do not know, and let us serve them,' then you should not listen to the words of the prophet or dreamer. For your Lord God tempts you so that it will be obvious if you love him with your whole heart or soul. For you should follow you Lord God and fear him, hold to his commandments and hear his voice. Him should you serve and to him cleave. However this prophet or dreamer should be killed, for he has spoken so that he has turned you away from your Lord God, etc." See, O pious servant of God, how God so strongly tempts the believers that he lets the false prophets prophesy so that not only the simple but also the elect, Matthew 24:24, can be led into error. However he wants to teach that we should have more faith in his word than in miracles and he would test us to see whether we love him truly in heart and soul. However, so that such temptations do not become too great, he says, "Kill the prophets." See! That is the payment which one should give the false shepherds if they lead us to foreign gods: they shall be beaten to death. However, if they would say, "We do not teach idolatry," therefore that law in the New Testament does not apply to us, then we answer first of all: all those who have taught taking refuge elsewhere than with the one true God, so that they have turned to creatures, have led to foreign gods. For that is one's God in which one trusts and in whom one takes refuge.

Moreover, the papists for centuries have more foolishly led people to their idol, the pope, than any worshipper of real idols ever did. For the pagans honored the idolatrous images of Jupiter, Juno, Mars only as images of the true gods (as they thought of them) and never took any living [62] person to be a god. I shall disregard here that the flatterers have sacrificed to many as to idols. That has never been with the consent of the wise and the pious. However, the papists have called their idol, the pope, an earthly god and have honored him with much more adoration than the true one, our Lord and God. Indeed, the poverty of our God and Savior, Jesus Christ, they have held up for derision and still do so today, as if Christ did not know better how to live. But their God knows how. [19] In time the pope has taken on another manner of life. Therefore, one will no longer live in the poverty of Christ. Peter, too, is considered to have been a

fool. Note here! Has the pope created such a magnificent life according to the word of God? No. He undoubtedly never considered anything other than his own reason and dreams and has led the people away from God. Therefore the law condemns him to death, for God does not want to suffer such dreamers. In Jeremiah 14: 13-15 the prophet says: "Ah, Ah, Ah! Lord, the prophets say to them: you will not see the sword and will not have hunger among you, but there will be true peace given in this place." (Thus also in our sinful times the false shepherds want to promise peace, though they never want to pursue it.) If they would proclaim the message of the word of God then they should well know that either this sinful world must change and mend its ways or else it will suffer hunger, war, pestilence or captivity. But they cry after peace where it is not to be hoped for. As along as their rents and incomes remain then they are for peace. Then the Lord spoke to me: "The prophets speak falsely in my name. I have not sent them. I entrusted them with nothing and have not spoken to them. They speak to you false visions or apparitions, deceitful sayings and the deceptions of their hearts. Therefore God says these things to the prophets who speak in my name: I have not sent those who say [63] that neither sword nor hunger will be in this land. The prophets will die with the sword and hunger, etc."

See, God threatens here the false prophets with the sword. However, so that none others can be understood than those who teach human doctrines, as the papists do, he paints it even clearer in the twenty-third chapter: "Woe to those shepherds who destroy and devour the flocks of my pasture (see if he is not here speaking of the ravenous wolves who destroy with the manifold error of human teaching!) and speak the thoughts of their hearts. I did not send them and they run forth. I said nothing to them and they prophesy. How long will that be in the hearts of the prophets who teach lies and the seductions of their hearts? They want to make my people forget my name for the sake of their dreams which they utter to their neighbors. Whichever prophet has a dream speaks the dream and whichever has my word speaks my word. What does the chaff have to do with the wheat?" [Jer. 23:1] Here one could hear well of which prophets God is speaking, namely, those who tell dreams and fairy tales. What does he promise them for a recompense? "Their path will be like an icy or slippery path in darkness. They will be pushed and fall therein, etc. I will feed them with bitterness to eat and gall to drink." See the slip, the fall into their darkness of ignorance and the great, heavy bitterness which grows in them daily. Their fall comes no less than the fall of the broken wall of Isaiah 30:13f.

We find many other prooftexts in Scripture of this same kind wherein one may recognize the false prophets. Particularly good is Ezekiel 34:1-10 since the false prophets are most truly

depicted there, but it is too long to quote here. Nevertheless it always comes to the same end that one should do away with them.

As to doing away with them, and as to whether one should kill them violently, it is certain that no person is to strike another to death without the legal right or the command of God. Therefore the angry, ill-tempered Christians are unjust if they think that, according to the word of Deuteronomy 13 [64], one should strike them. Rather one should leave them to God. He will arrange it as he wants to have it. Until then be joyous and mindful of whose Spirit you are and hold yourself to the gracious judgement of God who says in Matthew 7:19: "Every tree which does not bring forth good fruit will be cut down and thrown into the fire." If the shepherd is false, then do not listen to him. If the entire parish recognizes his falsehood then cast him out unanimously. If you cannot do that, then no one should listen to him. Suffer death before you listen to the shepherd or wolf who will pull you away from God. All this is clear enough in the previously cited passages of Scripture. So also does Christ command us in Matthew 5:29: "If our right eye vexes us then we should dig it out and cast it away." Thus we want to dig out the eye and cast it away: that is, dig out the falsely nourishing shepherds and the unuseful bad tree and let them be thrown into the fire by the Lord, as it please him. When he is separated from the office of teaching then we want to consider him among the common weeds which we should let stand until the harvest. [Cf. Mt. 13:30] So God says also in Ezekiel 34:10: "I shall demand an accounting of my flock from their hand and will bring their work as shepherds to an end so that they do not any longer nourish either my sheep nor themselves." For that reason the text in Deuteronomy 13:5 states, "The powerful who bear the sword should indeed see whom they should kill." And if these same ones, bearing the same marks and colors, do nothing, then we must suffer as in a babylonian captivity until God with his own hand redeems us. For that which we in the meantime endure is not a disadvantage but an embellishment of our robes and crowns.

Though God may be patient for a long time, yet no one may run away from nor escape him, Psalm 139:7. Also we do not find that either Christ [65] or the apostles have attacked so hard that blood flowed. However, every parish may properly separate themselves from the false shepherds, and even turn them over to those who bear the power of the sword to kill them if they do not change their perverse ways. Do not stain your own hands, for God will not fail to act. He will, insofar as the wolves cannot be driven away from the land peacefully so that they come no more, raise up an Elijah who at one blow will kill 450 priests of Baal and 400 mountain priests. [Cf. 1 K. 18:40] He will not fail. Do not lose patience. Christ did not condemn the adulterous

woman to death in John 8:3-11, even though she had sinned unto death according to the law. How pitiably did he repay the Jewish priests and people in the conquering of Titus? Thus should we also follow the patience of God. If we are able, we should never suffer the wolf in the place of the shepherd. If we cannot, then we must wait for redemption. For the gracious example of Christ is far more effective for me than the rough punishment of Moses. Nevertheless, Christ will come when it pleases him and he will arm either the rulers or the people for vengeance.

Conclusion on the True Shepherds

Therefore, all you most beloved brothers and co-workers in the vineyard of Christ, . do not let yourselves be frightened by the anxiety and turbulence of these stormy times, so that Christ rebukes you as being of little faith. [Cf. Matthew 8:18, 23-27; Mark 4:35-41; Luke 8:22-25] For he does not sleep, but he is testing you to see how steadfast you are. And if it pleases him he will command the wind to be still and will hold you upon the water so you do not sink. He does not let you be tempted beyond your ability to bear it, but always shows you the way out of the misery or out of the world [cf. 1 Cor. 10:13] and gives you power over dragons, lions and basilisks [cf. Mk. 16:18] so that you can walk and tread over them. [66] [Cf. Lk. 10:19] You have agreed to trust and love him in the answer of Peter, when he asked Peter whether he loved him and Peter said, "Lord, you know that I love you." [John 21:15-17] Or you would have forcefully and by another way than through Christ entered into the stall of the sheep. [Cf. John 10:1] So let us now see who will be the first: the one who out of love of his Lord will be permitted to suffer. [Cf. Matthew 20:20-28; Mark 10:35-45] What useful thing could you bring to him, if you work and guide the ship to him only in beautiful weather, and when a thunderstorm arises, you flee from it?

The princes of this world have those who fight for them and suffer death for only a little money. Should our heavenly father and Lord have no one who fights for his sake and suffers death for him who gives not mere perishing recompense but eternal joy and who has freed and redeemed us with his own Son? And all the while you only confess Christ when it goes according to your wish and then flee when it goes contrary; no one will believe because of your example. If by the word you preach you do not expect to risk death, then everyone will think you do not believe in him yourselves. Therefore if you see that when the roar and murmur of persecutions lift themselves up, even if they be far

from you, and you think of fleeing, consider instead that God has called you to arms as weak persons and is waiting to see how valiantly each of you holds yourself. Shame on those who would think here of fleeing and not of placing themselves on the very front point for the sake of the sheep; so the Lord stands and fights. Lay before God earnest prayer about this so that he confirm that good work which he has begun in you [cf. Phil. 1:6], that you bring that to the end, that his name and word again be brought into the knowledge of the poor tempted sheep and that they live according to his will. For only those will attain to salvation who endure to the end. [Mt. 24:13]

Conclusion on the False Shepherds

Therefore, you false shepherds, if there is still a tiny spark within you that thinks there is a God, if there is still a drop of human [67] kindness in your hearts, then, for the sake of God and human society, take care of the wishes of the poor people which you have for so long a time let suffer a hungering for the word of God and which you--above all you high bishops--have overladen with oppressive burdens. [Cf. Luke 11:46] Let them out of captivity and do not confuse the whole world because of your avarice and love of splendor. If you believe also that there is a God and that he will hold a universal judgement and trial over all people, how can you then always be so calm when your whole position is nothing other than a heavy burden to Christians, and you press them ever onward without rest or mitigation? Therefore it is obvious that you fear neither God nor his strong judgement, for where there is fear there is also improvement. Now if none of you do anything to relieve the unjust burdens, then it is true that you pay little attention to God. In whose name are you here, otherwise? You trust yourselves to the cane staff of Egypt [cf. Isa. 36:6], that is, in the princes and powers of this world. The staff will break in your hand and the splinters will injure badly. For what is the power of the king other than his people? If then the people do not help the king to protect you, as is certainly to be expected if everywhere they are depending en masse on the word of God, then where is your salvation? Where is the power of the king? Thus will your experience, if you do not relent, that you with them will come to misery at home.

If, in the meantime, by your letter and seal you break faith and trust and the pious proclaimers of the gospel are captured, tortured and killed, then by that you will only call in the wrath of God over you. The gospel grows on that account until God sends his redemption--just as the Israelite people in Egypt,

when one began to kill them, continued to increase until Moses led them forth. [Exodus 1:1-7] It also does not help to call on councils. No council will any longer be held. [68] Accordingly you should do right and not burden his people against God. Elijah, under the unjust, ruthless tyrant Ahab, killed the priest of Baal and the mountain priests, a single prophet amidst so great a number of the enemies of God, 1 Kings 18:40. After that, with a beautiful craftiness, Jehu killed all the priests of Baal, 2 Kings 10:15-28. Josiah, the godly king, did the same thing to all mountain priests. 2 Kings 23:4-15, 24. Herewith be forewarned! God has put up with you long enough. He will come at the end finally with the rod. For your loss will stand as much chance of being restored as it will be for Lucifer to re-enter Heaven. Therefore set your hopes elsewhere, namely in God, the comforter of all hearts. He wants to bring you into his knowledge so that you humble yourselves under the powerful hand and cross of Christ and be saved with all believers.

Amen.

NOTES

1. Jacob Schurtanner (d. 1525) was the main proponent of the Reformation in Appenzell. See Walther Klarer, "Geschichte der Reformation im Appenzellerlande," **Appenzellische Jahrbücher** 2. Folge. 8/1 (1873):86-106. On October 8, 1523 Schurtanner reported to Vadian that "the pure word of God" had been accepted by the Council of Appenzell. He asked, in the name of all the preachers of Appenzell, that Zwingli not disdain nourishing the new reformed churches with milk until they could bear more substantial food.

2. Joachim von Watt, or Vadian (1484-1551), was the reformer of St. Gall. The standard work on Vadian is Werner Näf, **Vadian und seine Stadt St. Gallen**, 2 vols., St. Gallen: Fehr'sche Buchhandlung, 1944, 1957.

3. Zwingli preached the original version of **The Shepherd** as a sermon during the Second Disputation on October 28, 1523.

4. **The Shepherd of Hermas** is a second century apocalyptic work which is strong in its ethical content especially, but also notable for certain dogmatic aspects, particularly the doctrine of penance. Cf. Quasten I:92-105. The reference by Jerome is MPL 23:658.

5. See below, **Friendly Exegesis**, note III:6.

6. Zwingli is likely referring to the Emperor Charles V and Pope Leo X and their proceedings against Luther. Cf. Z III:9 n. 6.

7. Appenzell was admitted to the Swiss Confederation on December 12, 1513. EA III/2:1361-1364.

8. Niklaus von Flüe (1417-1487), the only canonized Swiss, was a symbol both of Christian spirituality and Swiss unity. See Heinrich Stirnimann, **Niklaus von Flüe**, Freiburg: Freiburg University Press, 1981.

9. Walther Klarer, **Appenzeller Geschichte**, Urnäsch: Schoop & Co., 1964. I:326: the opponent of the reform to whom Zwingli is writing is Theobald Huter, pastor in Appenzell.

10. The pastor of the village of Gais in the Appenzell was Bernhardin Benz. See Klarer I:88ff.

11. Emil Egli identified the reference here as to the two communities of Rehtobel and Wald. Cited in Z III:12 n. 4.

12. Phalaris (c. 570-554 B.C.), the tyrant of Agrigentum, was notorious for his roasting his victims in a bronze bull. OLD:1372.

13. The exact reference for this Seneca citation has not been identified, though the source is likely Seneca's **de Beneficiis.**

14. On the role of the guildmaster in Zurich, see Renè Hauswirth, "Die Zürcher Obristmeister (Oberzunftmeister) 1518-1547," **Zwingliana** XII (1964-1968): 596-602.

15. Cf. Egli, Nrs. 251, 386. Also: Strickler, Nrs. 464, 689.

16. Cf. Z I:338-384 (tr. LCC: 59-95).

17. For the expression an den Klauen saugen see Wander, II:1369.

18. For the expression einen am Narrenseile führen see Wander, III:941. A Latin variation is found in Erasmus, **Adagia**, I. VIII:22 (Op. omnia II, col. 307).

19. That is, the Pope.

LETTER TO MATTHEW ALBER CONCERNING THE LORD'S SUPPER

November 1524

(Z III: 335-354)

Translated by Henry Preble

Revised and edited by H. Wayne Pipkin

Introduction

The **Letter to Matthew Alber** represents an important stage in the development of Zwingli's eucharistic thinking. It is in the form of an open letter to the Reutlingen Reformer. Dated originally November 16, 1524, it was not apparently published in printed form by Froschower until March 1525. It apparently circulated widely in handwritten form and it is not clear that it was in fact sent originally to its addressee, though it may have been. [1]

The impetus for the writing of the letter lay in the 1524 publication by Andrew Karlstadt in Basel of five treatises on the eucharist. The views of Karlstadt were sufficiently close to those of Zwingli, thereby all but forcing Zwingli to put forward his own position. The letter is not, however, merely a polemic. It puts forth many of the characteristic Zwinglian reflections on the eucharist.

The main features of Zwingli's Lord Supper doctrine are depicted, especially in the light of John chapter six from which he seeks to infer the sum of the whole matter. In addition, under the influence of the letter of Cornelius Hoen, Zwingli had come to understand the word "is" in "This is my body" to mean "signifies". [2] This interpretation freed him to come to a symbolical interpretation of the words of Institution, an essential feature in Zwingli's memorial understanding of the eucharist. This letter reveals for the first time Zwingli's symbolical understanding. It contains as well Zwingli's understanding of the sacrament as a symbol of community within the body of Christ and his view of the sacrament as oath of allegiance, indeed as confession of faith, which binds the believer to the Christian life.

In this letter Zwingli clearly has departed from the form and content of the Roman Catholic position. He likewise considers the Lutheran view as unacceptable. Although Luther is not directly mentioned, it is apparent that Zwingli was rejecting Lutheran views in his treatment of John 6. The letter is then an important

statement of the maturing Zwinglian view and is an opening salvo in the dispute with Luther. An all out doctrinal conflict between the two great reformers was to follow.

The letter circulated widely in both handwritten and printed form. It was translated by Georg Binder into German in 1525 and was published in J. G. Walch's eighteenth century collection of Luther's works in a translation by Augustus Tittel.

HWP

NOTES

1. It has been generally assumed that the "open letter" did not go directly to Alber. For reflections on the question, see Martin Brecht, "Hat Zwingli seinen Brief an Matthäus Alber über das Abendmahl abgesandt?" **Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte** 58 (1967):100-2. See also the arguments for a positive conclusion in Locher, p. 297 n. 127.

2. The letter of Cornelius Hoen was published in Zurich in 1525. See Z IV:512-518. It is not clear when Zwingli first encountered the ideas in it, but certainly by the time of the present epistle. An English translation is found in Heiko A. Obermann, **Forerunners of the Reformation**, New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1966, pp. 268-278.

Grace and Peace from the Lord. A rumor has reached me of a contest you are to have with a certain brother who, as they say, is honestly devoted to Christ, and known to me by sight, though unknown to me by name. [1] You, on the other hand, are very well known to me by name and for your fame in Gospel matters, though your face is not known to me. My friend Michael has heard that the contest is peri tēs eucharistias in regard to the Eucharist, a matter in which I am afraid many people are tremendously in error, unless I am more in error than all people. Unless I am ignorant of the proper signification and sense of all Scripture, nay, I should say, of piety itself, we have thus far shot wide of the mark. Now is not the time for me to say in a letter which must be brief who is responsible for this wrong.

I may not be silent concerning Carlstadt, who seasonably or unseasonably dragged the matter suddenly before the attention of the public and published a pamphlet of three pages on it, entitled "On the Detestable Abuse of the Eucharist". [2] I read this after the brethren, especially my dear Leo, not disapproving of it, begged me to read it. I liked many things in it, and disliked some because either from its longwindedness or from my slowness, it did not seem equal to this most difficult subject. I see that the truth is told in this pamphlet but in such a way that it offends rather than edifies--not those brethren who have their perceptions trained, but those who [336] are offended by everything said without due circumspection, on account of those who are offended by the whole Gospel.

I approve the view of Carlstadt, if I rightly understand his pamphlet, but his language itself does not attain what the subject demands. Just as I am saying this, other brethren appear saying that a much harsher dialogue has been put together by the same author in which he overpowers with immoderate taunts what is hideous enough in itself, and makes more hateful, as if on purpose, a thing in itself unpleasantly strange to the ears of the simple or impious. [3] I have not read that dialogue; indeed, I have never read anything by Carlstadt except the aforesaid three quarto sheets. The pamphlets of Carlstadt, then, offend many among us, and especially for the reason that they avoid somewhat the path we had entered upon--of which later. What one ought to hold in regard to the matter itself, decide after you have read what I have to say. For I offer it for comparison--not as authoritative. The matter is so difficult that unless the Lord gives understanding [2 Tim. 2:7] I shall have spoken in vain whatever I say.

Now I come to the subject.

The gist of this matter can easily be gathered from the sixth chapter of John. Do not listen to those who at once cry out, "Christ is not dealing there with this sacrament at all." I hold the same view, but he treats there something by which our unsound views about him are most certainly confuted. I began with this chapter when at last, after much deliberation, I was at the point of taking up this by far most dangerous theme. Whence by the gift of God it has come to pass that there are few among us who do not know what this bread and cup are. The faithful among us take part absolutely in no mass, and I had at least decided to abolish the old ritual of the mass with something new, but here again it has happened by the gift of God that things turned out differently. If I had had my way, I would simply have [337] driven out one nail with another. [4] A newly accepted ritual might have been harder to abolish than one that came down from antiquity. You have, then, as I promised a little while ago, the order in which I attacked the matter, namely, sending forward the sixth chapter of John as the bravest and best equipped line of troops. In that passage Christ, according to his habit of passing from the things of sense to the inner and spiritual things, very graciously admonished them who sought him in the hope of food to honor and seek before all things that food which never perishes nor passes away. Thus he discovers a way of passing over to spiritual things and the truth that just as bodily food, for example, nourishes and revives the limbs, so does spiritual food renew the soul. Hence from the eating of the food which fills the belly he passes most opportunely to the eating of the word he calls heavenly food which enlivens humankind and may likewise enliven whoever eats it so that they shall never afterwards hunger. In accordance with the Hebrew custom of calling any food bread, he calls this food sometimes bread and sometimes food. When they, hearing this, had a vision of some bodily food before their eyes, and brought up the manna which had been given them when Moses led them, he disclosed what this food was of which he spoke, saying, "I am the bread of life. Whoever comes to me shall never hunger, and whoever believes in me shall never thirst." [Jn. 6:35] By these words he means simply those who come to him, that is, believe in Christ, as he himself presently adds, saying, "whoever believes in me" will never feel the hunger of despair: "For as many as have faith in him are certain they are the children of God." [Jn. 1:12] Nor shall they wander anymore like hungry dogs through the whole city in search of food, for they have within them the pledge of the Spirit by which they know themselves to have returned into grace with God through God. Christ urges this view with many words. The Jews, not understanding the matter at all, murmured because Christ had represented himself as the bread or food of life [cf. Jn. 6:41], and they took refuge in the usual reproach with which we express contempt for those born

among ourselves, saying, "Is not this the son of Joseph?" [Jn. 6:42] They marveled on two accounts, both because he had called himself the food of life and because he boasted of his descent from heaven. Then the Lord a second time tries to prevent them from getting into worse sin and reviling of him, and admonishes them not to murmur, for this thing is not a matter of human comprehension, but of the inspiration and teaching of the spirit, as the Lord foretold by the mouth of the prophet, saying, "They shall be all taught of the Lord." [338] [Isa. 54:13, cf. Jn. 6:45] Therefore it comes to pass that no one believes that Christ came down from heaven and is the food of the soul unless the Father had drawn him to himself. [Jn. 6:41-44] Then he proceeds to teach clearly wherein he himself is the food of the soul, and finally how we ought to eat this food. The first point he approaches thus: "Verily, I say unto you, whoever believes in me has eternal life." [Jn. 6:47] "I am the bread of life which came down from heaven. If, then, anyone eats that, he will certainly attain heavenly, that is, eternal life. But, not to keep you too long, this bread which I proclaim to you now is nothing else than my flesh which you see before you, and which is to be given for the making alive of the world. This surrendering and killing of me for the enemy will reconcile the world to the Father, which is nothing else than restoration to life. Therefore what these many things I have said to you at length now mean is that while I am delivered up and die for the world I shall be the food of the soul by which its hope is fed and it is made sure of the mercy of God. For how can he refuse anything to unhappy mortals when he has given his Son for them? Thus the bread, that is, the food of the soul which I have promised you, is my flesh, not as you think, living and associating with you, but given for the life of the world, that is, savagely slain for the dead that they may be made alive. This finally is the meaning of the words 'the bread which I will give is my flesh, given for the life of the world'. [Jn. 6:51] My flesh, therefore, insofar as it is cast down by death, is food, that is, the hope of the soul." From these words we learn clearly that the flesh of Christ is the food and hope of the human heart, simply in that he was slain for us. For what is produced of flesh is flesh. [Jn. 3:6] The flesh of Christ, therefore, being eaten, cannot produce anything but flesh. Yet the flesh of Christ in dying for us makes that person spiritual, that is, truly a child of God, who rests upon his death. I conclude, therefore, that this bread of which Christ speaks is simply this: that Christ was delivered up to death for our life. The Jews, not understanding this, and like certain theologians, becoming more and more obtuse, strove among themselves, and indignantly objected, saying [Jn. 6:52], "How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" See how they were astonished because their minds took in only what the senses suggested to them. The meaning of Christ's words was, "No one will live except he believes that I have been delivered up to death for his salvation," even though he clothes this meaning in civil

and metaphorical words: "I am the bread of life," that is, living food. "He, therefore, that eats me shall never hunger or thirst." [Jn. 6:35].

The Jews, inasmuch as they are ignorant of the spirit, failed to comprehend [339] that Christ meant "eats me" to be understood as "believes in me", so they answered, not only in boorish but in insulting fashion, "How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" [Jn. 6:52] The heavenly wisdom, after its usual habit, threatens them more heavily and closely, reproaches their unbelief, and urges them, saying, "Unless you eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, you will have no life in you." [Jn. 6:53] What, O good God, no one lives unless he devour you with his teeth and drink you with bloodthirsty, open mouth? How do the unbelieving live, and not only not eat you, but even know not that you are God or that you even exist? Someone will say, "there is double sin here, for they that eat do not eat physically, and what is eaten is not perceived as physical body. Quite right, to be sure. Why, then, do we wander longer than the king of Ithaca? [5] Is there any other physical body than that which is perceived? Yet what is perceived is an object of the senses. Since the senses perceive nothing here, and whatever is done takes place inwardly, what need is there of talking of the body insofar as it is body, since it is not this way that Christ is the food of the soul--otherwise the Jews would not have shrunk from this so. He is the food of the soul in that he was slain according to the body. Whoever, therefore, trusts in Christ as having died for him, is this person not refreshed within by Christ's body and blood, and if he does not have faith what will it mean to eat Christ physically but only to feed the body? For it is forever true: what is born of flesh is flesh, and on the other hand, what is born of spirit is spirit. Christ, therefore, means here a spiritual eating, but of what nature? Such that we are to say that Christ is eaten here physically? Are to eat spiritually and to eat physically one and the same thing then? Even the logician knows that is absurd. If it is spiritual eating why do you call it physical? If it is physical, what else can it do but comfort the body? Christ means, therefore, that unless we eat his flesh, that is, unless we believe that he underwent death and poured out his blood for us, we shall not attain life. Again, that if we eat his flesh, that is, believe he died for us, and drink his blood, that is, firmly believe that his blood was poured out for us, then Christ is in us and we in him. But is Christ in anybody physically? By no means. Why, then, are we asking about eating the body? His body is eaten when it is believed that it was slain for us. It is faith, therefore, not eating, about which Christ is speaking here.

But you say, "You explain it thus, and force the Scripture to serve your error." By no means. I learned from the following notes that Christ [340] spoke here of faith, not of the sacrament

of the Eucharist. The first is that in the beginning of this discourse Christ said, "Labor not for the food which perishes, but for that which lasts unto eternal life, which the Son of Man will give you." [Jn. 6:27] Christ has held out to us no other food to secure our happiness than the Gospel, that is, he suffered death freely for us. The second note is, "For him has God the Father sealed." [Jn. 6:27] How has He sealed him? With the seal that is a sign by which we are delivered from the bite of the serpent. [Cf. Gen. 3:15.] How are we delivered? Through eating his body. Not that his body is really eaten, for that is impossible. Although we are at sometime to know Christ according to the flesh, we do not yet, but he is believed in as having died for us. The third note is, "This is the work of God, that you believe in him whom he has sent." [Jn. 6:29] Here you see the work through which we can obtain the food that does not perish, namely, faith in him whom the Father sent. Faith, therefore, is the work that blesses, not physical eating of the body. If the body thus eaten could bless, there would be two means or paths by which we could obtain happiness, namely, the work of God, that faith already spoken of, and the physical eating of his body. How absurd this is it is easy to say. The fourth note is, "For the true bread is that which comes down from heaven and gives life to the world." [Jn. 6:33] The body of Christ did not come down from heaven, but was born in the womb of the perpetual virgin. Moreover, Christ gives life to the world not because he is flesh, but because he is God and the Son of God. Again, therefore, it appears that he is life insofar as he is believed to be the Son of God and to have died according to the flesh he had taken on from the virgin, and that he gives life to those who have believed in this way, not those who have eaten physically.

There are also many other notes by which you can clearly detect that this meaning which I have given is the genuine one. But let us come to that one Christ, the truth itself [Jn. 14:6], has shown us, from which it would be faithlessness to have been of a different opinion. In truth it is as follows: the Jews, failing utterly to take in the sweet, figurative language of Christ, did what is characteristic of all stiffnecked people. They shrank away from him altogether. [Cf. Jn. 6:66.] Now Christ perceived that this came from his constantly declaring, "Unless you eat the flesh and drink the blood, you will not live." [Jn. 6:53] In fact, the Jews could not turn the mind's eye away from the body which they saw before their eyes. Since they had not even the slightest inclination of trust in his death, he thus addressed them in the most unequivocal words [Jn. 6:61-63], "Does this offend you? What if you see the Son of Man ascending where he was before? It is the Spirit who makes alive; the flesh profits nothing. The words I speak to you are Spirit and life." What, pray, could be said more plainly, clearly, transparently, or briefly than "It is the Spirit who gives life; the flesh [341] profits nothing"? [Jn. 6:63] Does

not this passage sufficiently answer all those questions by which, with greater curiosity than piety, they now declare that the substance of the bread is transformed into that of the flesh? They laugh at this view, yet assert that the flesh is eaten in essential and bodily form and, when they reject others most of all, fail to see that they are wrong by the whole width of heaven. [6] So mighty is philautia, self-esteem, that when it has detected anyone's error and found out, as it imagines, how it comes about, nothing can make it budge. What could be brought forward more powerful to make us scorn all the theories devised about the physical and essential body of Christ in this sacrament? "The flesh profits nothing." [Jn. 6:63] Are we to say, then, that Christ gave us that which profits nothing? Heaven forbid! For marvelous and magnificent are the works of the Lord [Ps. 139:14], wrought out according to His will. These words, then, are, as I said in the beginning, a barrier to shut out all the attempts of those who talk of the essential body of Christ. We shall ever hold these words before us as a shield, saying, "Be silent, pray, with your wisdom of the flesh. The flesh profits nothing." [Jn. 6:63] What does profit, then? What follows: "The words I speak unto you are spirit and life." [John 6:63] What words? "Whoever eats my flesh and drinks my blood has eternal life." [Jn. 6:54] What flesh and what blood? Not that one which has fluids nor that one that has weight, but that which we know in our heart is a pledge of our salvation because it suffered death on the cross for us. These words, I say, believed by us and sunk into the depths of our souls win eternal life, for by faith alone are we justified. [Rom. 5:1] Therefore, the faith which is certain is that Christ crucified is our redemption and salvation. It is itself these words which Christ spoke which are spirit and life.

Therefore teach above all things, dear Matthew, what Christ means here by "eat", namely, "believe". This I, too, have done so successfully that there is almost no one among us who does not recoil from those insane questions. All darts are turned aside by this one shield. Someone will say, "Do you not believe the body of Christ is eaten here?" Reply: "The flesh profits nothing. Why should I then discuss it?" Teach that these words are to be clung to especially. They are the [342] words of the Gospel; they are faith itself. What else is it to be a Christian than to believe that Christ, the Son of God, suffered for one? Another will say, "And faith blesses me here, too, for I believe I eat in that bread the real and essential and corporeal body of Christ." You could answer, "You say this out of your own head, but there is need of the writing of the Word of God here to enable the faith to save you that you believe Christ is eaten here in bodily shape, and since you have no such Scripture, you undoubtedly see that this whole notion is at the same time dead and the most damnable invention of idolatry. For who has not worshipped this sacrament? And why have we not worshipped baptism in the same way, since the rationale of the sacraments as such is the same?"

By far the most difficult thing in this matter now remains, namely how we are to interpret the words of Christ, the so-called words of consecration. For since Christ said, "This is my body which is given for you," [Luke 22:19] the words cannot be made to mean anything else than that this bread which Christ held out was his body--not his mystical body, the Church, for that was not given for us, but the real body of Christ itself which was slain for us upon the cross. The words are clear and intelligible, and it is easier for heaven and earth to pass away than for one jot or tittle of them. [Lk. 16:17] Here, truly, all the powers of faith must be exerted, and the throne of heavenly grace must be approached with the petition that what is hidden here may be revealed. For if those words have not been rightly understood thus far, we have sinned more here than in anything, and I know not whether it was a greater abomination to have worshipped the golden calf in Dan [cf. 1 K. 12:28-30; 2 K. 10:29; 2 Ch. 11:15] than to have worshipped this consecrated bread, if indeed it is nothing but bread. I say "if", for although the opinion I am going to mention greatly appeals to me, I lay down nothing categorically. I put forth what I think. If it please the Lord, others also may be taught to think the same, but taught by the Spirit, who teaches us everything. [Jn. 16:13] If the Spirit forbids this interpretation all my words will be vain. I pray the most High God, therefore to direct my ways. If, after the manner of Balaam [Nu. 22:24] I obstinately resist the truth, may He station His angel in the way to frighten my ass with his sword--I mean my ignorance and overboldness, if at least I do anything here from overboldness and a desire for glory--and so drive him against the wall so a broken leg results, that is, have my impure and unclean carnalmindedness enfeebled, and go to blaspheme no more the name of the Lord my God.

There are, therefore, people who have learned from faith--for it is from it that solid truth is learned--that it is healing for us if we believe that Christ suffered for us, that this is the one path to the stars, [7] this the word [343] which we all preach. [Jn. 1:1-3] From this they then easily infer that salvation can come in no other way than through Christ, and therefore not through the sacramental eating of bread and wine. When they look at the words of Christ which we call the words of consecration, they perceive that some figure of speech is involved in them, though they cannot easily explain what it is or of what nature. Carlstadt, in the pamphlet which I have read, wants the demonstrative pronoun to be changed so that when it said, "Jesus took bread, blessed and broke it and gave it to the disciples, saying, 'Take and eat; this is my body which is given for you,'" makes the pronoun "this" refer not to the bread, but to Christ himself, in the sense, "Take, eat; for I am going to give this, my body, for you." [8] I will frankly say that I praise the man's diligent effort, but I congratulate him much more on the faith by which he has learned

that salvation cannot be delivered in any other way than through this faith by which we believe that Christ suffered for us. Even if he never quite got at the meaning of the words, the man realized in his piety that another meaning must underlie them than appeared on their face, but he did not see clearly enough to explain it--unless I see less clearly than he does. This is said without boasting. He adds that the pronoun "this" refers in rhetorical emphasis to the crucifying of Christ's body which also the prophets foretold. So the meaning is: "Now the prophets proclaimed that I should put on flesh and in it atone for the sorrows of mortals. Look! This is my body itself which the prophets promised to you; it is the very body that is given for many." If this were the meaning, those two things might have been added, the already threatening danger of arrest and death, and what he said in John 6:51, "the bread that I will give is my flesh; it is for the life of the world." Thus he would say here, "Behold, this is my body which is given for the life of the world, as I have promised you in earlier years. Nay, when we came up here a few days ago from Galilee, I told you what was about to happen to me. [Mk. 8:31f.; Lk. 9:22] Now is that moment at hand." [344] They say that also in that "Dialogue," [9] which I have not read, and by which many are offended, that something is brought forward about the characteristics of the Greek language by which the change of the demonstrative is clearly approved, namely that artos, bread, is masculine, and sōma, body, is neuter. If I may be permitted to say so, I think there are not a few places of this kind in Greek as well as in Latin in which a preceding masculine or feminine is referred to by a neuter demonstrative. I have no time to look up examples, for I am obliged to write in a great hurry. If anyone approves this view of Carlstadt's, he will not offend me in the least, but I beg him also to consider mine. I [345] think the hinge of the matter is to be found in a very short syllable, namely, in the word "is", the meaning of which is not always given by "is" but sometimes by "signifies". In the meantime I would warn you, my very dear brother, not to put any faith in me unless I prove what I maintain by the clearest words of Holy Scripture. Joseph answered with regard to Pharaoh's dream [Gen. 41:26], "The seven fat cows are seven fruitful years," and yet seven cattle cannot be seven years. It is therefore clear that this word "are" is used for "signifies" or "portends". Thus the meaning is, "The seven fat cows you saw in sleep portend or signify seven fruitful years, etc." Christ says, John 15:1, "I am the vine" and yet he was not a vine but showed the character of a vine. It is therefore evident that this word "am" cannot be taken for "being" at all, but for "I signify" or "I represent" so that the meaning is, "I signify or represent the vine, or show its character." Again he says [Lk. 8:11], "The seed is the Word of God," but yet the Word of God was not a seed. Hence this "is" cannot be taken for "being" either. It is clear that it is used for "signifies", for Christ is disclosing to the apostles by these words the parable he had put forth about

the sowing of the seed, saying, "The seed of which I speak is," that is, signifies, "the word of God". Such and similar forms of expression may be seen throughout the sacred writings, whence it is not necessary for me to trouble you with more here.

Now take up Christ's words in Matthew 26:26, "Jesus took bread, etc., saying, 'Take, eat; this is my body,' [Lk. 22:19]: 'which is given for you.'" Put "signifies" for "is" here and you have, "Take, eat; this signifies my body which is given for you." Then the meaning will certainly be, "Take, eat, for this which I bid you do will signify to you or remind you of my body which presently is to be given for you." For he adds immediately [Lk. 22:19], "This do in remembrance of me." Behold the end for which he bids them eat, namely, the commemoration of him. This Paul expresses thus [1 Cor. 11:26], "For as often as you eat this bread and drink this cup, you show the Lord's death." What else does Paul command here but to commemorate the Lord's death publicly? Since, therefore, this Lord's Feast, or in Paul's words, Lord's Supper, was instituted that we might call to remembrance the death of Christ, which he suffered for us, it is clear that it is the sign itself by which those who rely upon the death and blood of Christ mutually prove to their brethren that they have this faith. The meaning of Christ's words becomes perfectly plain to this effect: "This feast signifies or is the symbol [346] by which you will recall that my body, mine, the Son of God, your Lord and Master, was given for you."

So these words of Christ's were understood by Tertullian, a man of marvelous piety, remarkable knowledge of language, and wonderful eloquence. In his Book I **Against Marcion**, after many other things, he says, "Nor did he disdain bread as a representative of his body." [**10**] He means that Christ did not repudiate his sacraments nor even reject bread (behold, he calls it bread) by which he represents his body. He did not say "which bread is his body," but "which represents his body." How does bread represent a body? Certainly in that when thus eaten it recalls to remembrance that Christ presented his body to his murderers for us. I make a transition to Paul's words in which the idea is rendered more clear which Luke expresses thus: "This cup is the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you." [Lk. 22:20] Behold, what the two others expressed thus, "This is my blood," Luke calls "the new testament." He did not say, "this new testament is my blood," but "this cup is the new testament in my blood." Now what therefore is in another thing is not that thing itself in which it is. The new testament has its force and basis in the blood of Christ shed for us, and this cup is the cup of the new testament. It is apparent, therefore, that the cup is not the blood but the testament, that is, the commemoration of that making alive by the shedding of Christ's blood. These words of Luke furnish the key for opening the words of Matthew and Mark. For since

he says that this cup has the power of the new testament in Christ's blood, I infer that they used a figure of speech rather unusual to us in saying for it, "This is my body," which is, "This eating is a symbol of the new testament, the strength of which consists in this, that I give myself for you and for the whole world." They say "this is my blood" instead of "This cup is a symbol or will signify to you that this, my blood, has been shed for you." [346 n. 2]

Thus Augustine understands the matter in his Introduction to the Third Psalm, where he says that the Lord Jesus summoned even Judas to the feast at [347] which he commended to the disciples the figure of his body and blood. [11] What does he understand here by "figure"? A likeness giving his expression and features? Or a figure by which some future thing is foreshadowed, such as were the figures that appeared to the minds of the fathers? By no means. A figure here is a form by which we commemorate his body given for us and the shedding of his blood for our atonement.

I would remind you here, my very dear brother, that I do not make the authority of Augustine or of anyone else of sufficient moment to venture to found any doctrine upon it, but bring forward the opinion of the fathers: so you may see that it is no recently sprung-up notion that I am offering concerning these words and the sacrament. That Augustine seriously held this view of the sacrament will be made plain at greater length a little later, after I have quoted Paul's opinion.

Paul, writing to the Corinthians in 1 Corinthians 10:14-22 and desiring to draw them away from all commerce of idols (for there were some who, boasting their knowledge that an idol was a thing of no account, yet were in the habit of eating of the meat sacrificed to idols all the same), desiring, I say, to keep them away from commerce of idols, reproaches them with the use of the Eucharist which he represents as of such character and import that the man is guilty of idolatry who shares both the table of the Lord and of demons. There can be no doubt that in reproaching them thus with the use of the Eucharist he sets it before them in its real and essential nature. Now he says [1 Cor. 10:16], "The cup of blessing which we bless or praise, is it not the communication of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communication of the body of Christ?" Here they that teach that Christ is eaten in a bodily sense suddenly jump up with "What need have we of further testimony?" [348] We have ourselves heard it is the communication of the blood and the body of Christ. For Paul did not say, "It is the partaking of bread or wine, but of the blood and body." Be patient, if you please, until the last act of the drama is finished. Otherwise you will find nothing but strife, brawls and uproar. Carefully note,

therefore, what immediately follows these words, and you will see what it is that Paul calls the communion of the body and blood here. After he said [1 Cor. 10:16], "The bread which we break, is it not the sharing of the body of Christ?" he explains what the nature of this sharing is by saying [1 Cor. 10:17], "since we, being many are one bread and one body, truly we all partake of one bread and one cup." Paul seems to proclaim plainly there that those who eat this bread and drink this cup unite in one body with the rest of the brethren, which indeed is the body of Christ because that is the body of Christ which believes that the flesh of its author has been slain and his blood shed for it. He means, therefore, that they become partakers in the body and blood of Christ when they confess that they with the rest of the brethren trust in the death of Christ and the shedding of his blood. So they may bear witness to the brethren that they believe this with faithful hearts and because they abhor all worship of idols and foreign gods, they should take the bread and cup of commemoration together with the brethren in the Lord's Supper, that brother may see that brother unites with him through this oath of allegiance as it were (whence it is called a sacrament) into one body, one bread, one profession. He says [1 Cor. 10:17], "For we, being many, are one bread and one body." Therefore we eat this bread that we may finally become one bread. But what is this bread into which we pass? It is a strange thing, this great play upon words [cf. 1 Cor. 10:17]: we eat bread so that we are made into one bread. We do not know what Paul is saying here. Festive and full of heavenly eloquence are these words of Paul, my good sir, whoever you are. He calls bread what we eat and he calls bread what we become by eating such. But what we become by this eating, provided we have first digested by faith in our closets the suffering of Christ for us, not his flesh, and sinews, and bones--what we become, I say, is the body of Christ. And who are the body of Christ? They of whom he is the head, while they are his members. Of whom is he the head? Those who follow him and trust in him. Who are the members? These whom I have mentioned. The members, though so numerous, are made yet one body, not then only when they eat this bread and drink this cup, but as soon as they believe that Christ Jesus, the instituter of this feast, was crowned with death and disgrace for our salvation. What, then, does this eating do? Nothing but make it plain to your brother that you are a member of Christ, and one of these who trust in Christ. [349] Again, it binds you to the Christian life, so that if by chance you live shamelessly and do not repent, you may be shut out from the other members--hence excommunication and avoidance with the fathers. It is clear, then, that in these words of Paul's [1 Cor. 10:16], "Is it not the sharing of the blood of Christ?" and "is it not the sharing of the body of the Lord?", sharing is not used for the eating--as the theologians have thus far taken it to be--but for the sharing of the Church, that is, to show that everyone in this way recom-

mends himself to the Church and associates himself with it just as with an oath of allegiance. For Paul himself says [1 Cor. 10:17], "For we, being many, are one bread and one body: truly we are all partakers of one bread and of one cup." Behold, the reason why we become one bread is because we are partakers of one bread and of one cup. See now the grace of Paul's words. Christ gave us bread that by eating it together we might unite into one body of his own, provided we had first eaten the heavenly bread, as he teaches in John 6[51], and this body is the Church of Christ. Hence we, too, who are his body, are called bread, for by this bread we show to our brethren that we are members of the body of Christ. These verbal transitions and juxtapositions brought it about that there were not wanting in early times men who applied these words of Christ, "This is my body," to the Church--as may be seen in Thomas and Scotus, [12] if I remember rightly--[350] and thought that Christ pointed to those to whom he had handed the bread, saying that they were his body, in the sense "You who are present at this feast are my body," and since the words that followed did not square with this, they explained "which is given for you" as "for whom I am given." I have more admiration for their faith than for the learning of all the theologians. I do not suppose there ever was anybody who believed that he ate Christ in bodily and essential form in the sacrament, although they all strenuously taught or pretended it. Such is that bold evil, hypocrisy. I would not have you shudder here, most excellent sir, and cry out with the hypocrites, "I have believed," and "what right have you to judge my conscience?" You, like me, either have not believed, or have turned your mind away from the subject, that it might not cry out in protest, or have been terribly troubled as to how the truth was to come out freely at last. I say I admire the faith of those who shrank from this senseless tradition, and who, seeing the words so terribly unyielding, sought to discover how this body was to be understood, and coming upon this passage of Paul, had the courage to use it as a sort of two-edged axe with which to undo the knot. They were firmly persuaded, as I said of Carlstadt above, that faith had no need of the kind of eating which the theologians teach, and that there must be in these words of Christ some other meaning, whatever it might be. I say I praise their faith. They lacked clearness of vision, but they had no need of that while faith was theirs. See what it is to be taught of Scripture and of the Spirit. I said a little while ago that this opinion of the theologians in general was senseless. I beg you not to be offended by this. I should have preferred to call it not only stupid, but even impious. For have not these distinguished theologians outdone the Jews in impiety? When they supposed that the whole discourse was about bodily eating, they shrank away [cf. Jn. 6:41], but Christ came to their rescue with kindly teaching. He freed them from their foolish understanding with the words, "It is the Spirit that makes alive; the flesh profits nothing. The words I speak to you are spirit and life." [Jn. 6:63]

Then they, understanding no better than before, abandoned Christ altogether, but our theologians have shown themselves a thousand times more stupid. They assert shamelessly this very thing that the Jews could not understand, and, casting aside Christ's [351] directions through which they might see the whole thing clearly, they do not run away from him but stay by him, asserting, even in spite of himself, that his body is eaten here in the way that drove the Jews from him--they are more horrible than all the Scythians. Their own words plainly show this. One of them begins to eat him in the manger, another as he hangs trembling on the cross. For instance, they declare, "For we eat the body of Christ truly and physically, as he lay in the manger, and as he hung upon the cross." It is not possible to say anything more senseless. But now let me take in my sails [13]--you will want me, no doubt, to give you a brief resumé of what has been said, an epilogue, as it were. Here you have it.

Christ, now near his death, feasted most pleasantly with his disciples. He said, "with desire I have desired to eat this passover with you." [Lk. 22:15] And he refreshed them not only with the material dinner, but with the delicious pemmasi, that is, sweetmeats, of the heavenly word. Wishing to leave us a ceremony of commemoration of his having been savagely slain for us, he took bread and commanded them all to eat, for this was a symbol to his faithful followers of the death of his body who was himself God and their lord and master. Therefore, we, too, should eat together in memory of him, and commend his grace. This is to be understood of the cup also. Therefore the disciples of Christ had all who confessed that they were brethren eat and drink thus with the rest of the brethren as Christ had instituted, and in this way they were received into the communion of the brethren who believed that they had been redeemed by the body and blood of Christ. But they are in vain as far as conscience is concerned unless they were previously sure of faith concerning salvation through Christ. Hence we see, in passing, this also: the eating of the Eucharist does not take away sins but is the symbol of those who firmly believe that sin was exhausted and destroyed by the death of Christ and give thanks therefore. Look at Augustine, Homily 26 on John 6, and you will see plainly [352] how he separates sacramental from spiritual eating. [14] See also Origen on Matthew, Homily 35. [15] These are the only ones that occur to me now. Most of the fathers hold the pious view about this sacrament.

This, most fairminded brother, is what I wanted to suggest to you by letter now, for I am afraid that certain people are too much sworn to the word of their teachers. [*352 n. 2] If you say to me, "I have begun to celebrate the mass in German, and if I now teach otherwise, many will be most offended," take this as a remedy: teach your people that you are not going to do

away with the communion of the table of the Lord, but are going to extend its natural use more and more all the time, and frequently drive this home that if people eat the bread of the communion and are not sound in faith nor sincere in love of neighbor, [353] they eat and drink judgement to themselves. Many will give it up, believe me. And when Easter comes, do the whole thing as Christ instituted it, as I also am going to do.

Take this in good part, and cling to the word of God alone.

Pray to the Lord to direct your ways. [354] Do not contend against that brother--I have now learned his name--Conrad Hermann in this matter unless he is greatly in error, but if the opportunity offers, let him read this letter.

Farewell in Christ Jesus, our Lord.

Zurich, November 16, 1524.

To Matthew Alber, Preacher at Reutlingen.

Your devoted servant, Huldrych Zwingli.

I charge you by Christ Jesus, who is to judge the living and the dead, to show this letter to no person unless there is reason to believe that he has sincere faith in our same Lord. I will do likewise, and if the situation demands sometime that the letter be printed, I will attend to the matter. I have written the whole letter most hurriedly, so that it has hardly been once read over in a cursory fashion.

NOTES

1. Zwingli identifies the person as Conrad Hermann, a follower of Carlstadt's eucharistic doctrine, at the end of the treatise. See p. 144.

2. The treatise which appeared in 1524 in Basel is: **Von dem widerchristlichen missbrauch des hern brodt und kelch.** See E. Freys and H. Barge, **Verzeichnis der gedruckten Schriften des Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt**, Nieuwkoop: B. De Graaf, 1965, Nrs. 135-137.

3. The late 1524 treatise was entitled **Dialogus oder ein gesprechbüchlin Von dem grewlichen unnd abgöttischen missbrauch des hochwirdigsten sacraments Jesu Christi**, Karlstadt, Schriften II:5-49.

4. For the expression clavum clavo pellere see Erasmus, **Adagia,** I.II:4 (Op. Omnia II, col. 70).

5. The King of Ithaca was Odysseus.

6. For the expression toto coelo errare see Erasmus, **Adagia,** I.I:49 (Op. Omnia II, col. 48).

7. For the expression sic itur ad astra see Otto, 43.

8. The exegesis mentioned here is the distinctive contribution of Carlstadt to the eucharistic debates. See Hermann Barge, **Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt**, 2 vols., Leipzig: Brandstetter, 1905, II:169ff.

9. See Karlstadt, Schriften II:13:25-15:7.

10. Tertullian, **Against Marcion,** I.xiv (MPL 2:261f., tr. ANF III:281).

11. MPL 36:73.

12. Thomas Aquinas, **Commentum in quartum librum sententiarum magistri Petri Lombardi**, VIII. II. i. v. IV. Duns Scotus, **Quaestiones in librum quartum sententiarum**, VIII. I.

13. For the expression vela colligere see Otto, 363.

14. Cf. MPL 35:1613-1615.

15. MGL 13:1734f.

THE PREACHING OFFICE

June 1525

(Z IV: 382-433)

Translated and edited by Edward J. Furcha

Introduction

Zwingli's reform of the church in Zurich was moving along a pace when in 1524-25 several opponents to his work were stirring up trouble. If the relatively harmonious development of the Evangelical cause in Zurich was to triumph, order would have to be maintained in the state of the Zurich churches.

Certain "inspired" converts to his cause were insisting in recent months on the fullness of Christian liberty. They assumed the right--possibly considered it their Christian duty even--to preach and read the word of God though they were not trained for that task.

Conscious of the full authority of his own training and authorization to preach, Zwingli rejects their demands and undertakes to harness the spirit to which they appeal. The booklet **Vom Predigtamt**, published by Christoph Froschower on June 30, 1525, makes a forceful case on relatively slim biblical foundations.

Little is known of the effect this publication had; the Anabaptist cause was not greatly affected it would seem, though a "reasonable" argument for decency and order had been advanced here.

Rudolf Gwalter, Zwingli's son-in-law, provided a Latin translation and R. Christoffel, a High German translation in the mid 19th century. The present translation is, to the best of our knowledge, the first into English.

EJF

ON THE PREACHING OFFICE

THROUGH WHICH ONE MAY LEARN HOW SELF-APPOINTED RABBLE ROUSERS--NOT 'APOSTLES' AS THEY WISH TO BE CALLED--ACT CONTRARY TO GOD'S WORD WHEN THEY IMPOSE THEMSELVES UPON A FAITHFUL GUARDIAN OR PREACHER OF THE GOSPEL WHEN THEY PREACH AMONG HIS FLOCK UNNECESSARILY AND WITHOUT THE APPROVAL OF EITHER THE PEOPLE OR THE GUARDIAN [1]

To the honorable, wise town council and the entire community of the county of Toggenburg and to the specially dear lords and citizens, Zwingli extends grace and peace from God. [2]

I thank God, the heavenly Father, for illumining you through the light of his word and for leading you in apprehending the truth, in which you now stand so firmly, as you confess. All this, of course, is because of his grace and mercy and not because of your wisdom. To him be praise and honor forever. May he keep you so that you might increase daily in everything good. Amen.

Dear gentlemen and brothers. The moderation with which you remove by legitimate means idol worship and all priests who resist the gospel, shows that you are increasing in all divine knowledge and in valor. [3] Nonetheless, I should hereby like to admonish you to take heed lest the [383] devil place some obstacle in your path which somehow or other may cause you to fall into error that could prove more harmful to you than any former one [cf. Mt. 12:45], such as if we were all to affirm, "I am a Christian," yet failed to maintain a Christian and peaceful manner of living. I hear this might soon happen to you because of those people who, without any permission whatever from the congregation to which they have come, begin to preach and rebaptize on their own initiative. The former act serves to confound the truth, while

the latter leads to disorder; for rebaptism is initiated for no other reason than to provide a pretext for rebellious gatherings and insurrection against the authorities (when I speak of authorities I do not mean the papacy). It ought not govern in temporal matters, Mt. 20:25-27. Yet both these [i.e. indiscriminate preaching and rebaptism] are wholly against Christ. Firstly, no one should teach unless he has been sent; secondly, rebaptism is utterly against God. It is not instituted either by word or example and cannot be found in either the Old or New Testament.

Circumcision was introduced only for bygone days. It was the sign among the ancients which baptism is for us. Neither Christ nor the holy apostles repeated it, nor did they leave instruction that it should be repeated. We published a book on this matter, longer and more cumbersome than I wanted it to be, shortly before the current one [cf. **VON DER TAUFE**, 27 May 1525 in Z IV:188ff.] Since these rebellious spirits who elevate themselves to the rank of apostle and preacher cause great dissention by their preaching, I wish to write on the preaching office, too, so that everyone might avoid these obstinate, arrogant babblers. It shall all be backed by the clear word of God. For if [384] one does not guard against them, new errors arise daily--as everyone can clearly see. If every Christian were permitted to say whatever he wanted and if the church failed to judge him in the matter and did not reject his error, cunning people would daily hatch eggs to display their wisdom and craft. Things are much the same in our day as they were at the time of the apostles. Then, too, certain people came from Jerusalem to Antioch, Corinth, Philippi, Crete and to the Galatians and undertook to teach; but all their diligence was focused on outward things, primarily on circumcision. They were highly respected for having come from Jerusalem and for being Israelites.

In order to have greater credibility, they claimed to have learned Christian teaching from those who in turn had it directly from Christ. Indeed, some might even have seen Christ Jesus in person, but they said all this primarily to discredit Paul's name and bring him into disrepute (for he strongly resisted their devious ways, so strongly, in fact, that he always overcame them with the truth through his epistles), and secondly, to create their own following. Christendom was rent asunder by this. Now they did all this, thinking they might make themselves important with their new teaching and secure their livelihood by it. But when Paul recognized their unfaithfulness, he brought them into the clear light everywhere, but most clearly in Philippians 3:2, "Look out for the dogs, look out for the evil-workers, look out for the mutilation." (Paul used these words deliberately. They introduced circumcision; he calls it mutilation, for they split believing people with their circumcision-talk; just as if someone in our day were to call the Anabaptists "drowners" because they therewith cause

a great deal of disunity to arise among believing people and as a consequence much harm and suppression of the gospel.) "Yes," Paul says, "look out for the mutilation; for we are the true circumcision, who serve in the spirit of God and trust in Christ Jesus, not putting our trust in the flesh," etc. After that he says, [385] "Brothers, follow me and look to those who walk, as you have an example in us. For there are many (I have warned you before and now repeat it with tears) who walk as enemies of the cross of Christ. For those who look to earthly things only end in destruction; their belly is their god and they glory in their shame." [Phil. 3:17-19]

Let us now compare our mutilators to these. [4] Firstly, they started out of Zurich, and mingled with pious folk and fooled them, by quick action, into accepting rebaptism. Let every good Christian note how easily and faithfully they did this. First of all, they had been publicly and privately overcome so that they should not even have taken their teaching on baptism to other congregations and stain them with error. [5] For if someone who has been convicted of untruth, nonetheless continues to stain other congregations as well, the result is greater dissention among Christians than among unbelievers; yet we have been baptized by one spirit, into one body, that we might preserve unity, 1 Cor. 12.

Secondly, they did not spell out to the simple people, in their preaching on baptism, the reasons for infant baptism which had been given them at Zurich. [6] Thereafter--since it is well enough known that we practice infant baptism and resist rebaptism here at Zurich (the magistrate by counsel and deed and we, by preaching God's word)--they proceeded mercilessly to speak of this honorable council in so derogatory a manner that it got to be too much; they berated so abominably the preachers--myself, above all--that they must have readily displeased all God-fearing people with their inhuman derision. All this happens because they esteem themselves too highly [386] while denying, at the same time, any insight and faith to those who oppose them. They alone are to have God's Spirit; for they despise everyone who does not accept their baptism or who stands against them. And why do they despise these? They despise them perhaps because they have not been baptized; from this then follows that they esteem themselves the more highly the more they despise the unbaptized. Or else they despise other Christians because they assume them to be unbelievers. Then it would follow that in the last analysis they have convinced themselves that no one but they themselves have the spirit of God or faith. This perverted view of theirs is demonstrated by the fact that they have rejected the knowledge and advice of so many highly learned, wise men and so many God-fearing, pious people. They have introduced rebaptism against all evidence from God's words; they set themselves up as apostles

and introduced rebaptism in every parish without permission or the support of the community and that even when the bishop and his flock are believers. Are not such people dissemblers, as Paul calls them? Can there be greater enemies of the cross of Christ than they are, even though they hide behind a cloak of great humility? Who ever started sects or groups without such hypocritical humility? Who ever appeared to be humbler than the Carthusians? Yet they did not wish to say much about their losses in the Ittingen uprising and why they were claiming 12,000 guilders. [7] Note, there they did not lose a single acre, meadow, vineyard, fish pond, field, wooded area, court or district. How much more of the rest must there still be. All this was acquired in such a short time that almost everyone can recall the day when there were no Carthusians at [387] Ittingen. I simply cite this by way of illustration to indicate how false humility in the end breaks forth in an ugly manner. Paul warns us to guard against it, Col. 2:18; for verily, their belly is their God. [Phil. 3:19] I know well what was ailing some of them. Zurich is no longer granted any privileges, except for the clergy. And yet some of them would have dearly loved to "buy in" and become a millstone around the necks of the poor, to be maintained by them, teaching all the while (but falsely) that no one who holds a benefice ought to preach. They were hoping that all parish priests might be expelled; they would then have seen to it that they were made parish priests in their place. Publicly they declared, "we need no benefice." But who knows (the way the barefooted friars abscond with money) if someone had passed it to them on the sly and shoved it up their sleeve! Thus they served their bellies no less than certain people did in the days of St. Paul. A few of them have actually come to me to ask for a recommendation to a benefice, which they cannot truthfully deny. [388] [8]

All their boasting is only carnal, for to be rebaptized is nothing other than an external matter--just as those others made a great deal of the fact that their shame was circumcised. These Anabaptists foist themselves on others just as those people had done. They undertake to boast so excessively in the matter of God and present themselves in such dire straits as if they had just been rescued from a shipwreck. Then simple people just stand there amazed and frightened. In the end, however, it all boils down to rebaptism, infant baptism, that one should not have a magistrate, that one ought to hold all things in common and that one owes neither rent nor tithes, of which two things we have issued a Christian admonition in another context [cf. Z III:388ff., **WER URSACH GEBE ZU AUFRUHR** and Z IV, p. 25ff., **RATHSCHLAG BETREFFEND AUSSCHLIESSUNG**].

And in all this they are sly. Publicly they moan greatly, saying, "Woe, woe to anyone who collects rent and tithes." Nonetheless, you must pay it. But later they whisper: "After you have

paid rent for twenty years, you no longer owe anything to the creditor." Now then look good, faithful lords and friends, what follows from all of this, namely, that even those who do not concern themselves with the gospel appear to be more eager than others in wanting to carry it out. They see to it, should it come to that, that no one owes anything to anyone. To this end the teaching of the Anabaptists and self-styled apostles is aimed.

Although many goods are abused, chief among them the spiritual ones, the matter must, nonetheless, be decided by a judge, i.e. the magistrate. Those who by willful force withhold or take away from another that which belongs to him, are robbers and not Christians. In case [389] the magistrate is unwilling to do anything, God will in the end set it all aright. Therefore we must have a magistrate and everyone must stand by their commitment and duty. For to start removing the magistrate which acts in a Christian manner is just like pushing the sheep out into the wilderness without a shepherd. On this point, faithful and dear gentlemen and brothers, I worried on your account, lest your simple, pious people be led into error by wanton, rebellious teachers. For you are always close to me as my lords and brothers. I shall always consider myself one of you. For you shall see that whenever temporal and excessive honor alone are considered, renewal has no room. But where there is the knowledge and fear of God and one seeks to attain to God's honor, no one could possibly be victorious over you or anyone else.

I have dedicated this booklet to you that you may learn how to safeguard against these babblers and troublemakers who run to and fro, who never go anywhere other than where pure teaching has already taken place. There they dare overturn through external things that which has previously been built up.

God bless you. May he confirm that which he has begun among you.

Given at Zurich.

Should I be able to serve you in anything whatever, command; I shall always be obedient to you.

On the Preaching Office

I shall not state, beyond this, what has caused me to write this booklet. I have amply demonstrated above that it came about because several people have been so bold as to go, without

approval by a bishop or parish [council], [9] to neighboring parishes, running, ringing bells, preaching what they pleased, and rebaptizing, thereby causing great unrest and rebellion. On top of it all, they claim to do the right thing and to have been sent by God. To them I want to show in like coinage that they have not been sent by God and that such conduct must not be tolerated in any parish, unless it be permitted by the unanimous decision of the entire parish. [390]

Thus, though the booklet is entitled **ON THE PREACHING OFFICE**, I shall, God willing, also speak to the teaching that was current at the time of the apostles.

To this end, let us consider, first of all, Paul's words in Ephesians 4:11-14, where he says, "And he (Christ), has called some to be apostles, some prophets, some evangelists, some shepherds and teachers, that they might serve God's work unto the perfecting of the saints and the edification of the body of Christ, until all of us reach the unity of the faith and the knowledge of the son of God, that we may attain to full humanity, after the measure of the age and perfection of Christ; henceforth to be children no longer, tossed to and fro by the wind of every doctrine, duped by human craftiness and wicked deceitfulness toward the introduction of error."

These words of Paul mean that Christ incorporated specific offices (of which we shall speak in some detail later) into his body, i.e., the church, in order to build up and perfect his body in the unity of the faith and in the knowledge of the son of God, to become such a perfect, strong and well-matured body as Christ had become in his human nature and age--a perfect physical man. But at the height of his physical prowess he was killed that we may no longer allow ourselves to be tossed to and fro by every wind of puffed-up teaching which stems from evil design and cunning and leads us into sectarianism and error.

Note well, godly Christians, if these offices have been instituted by God to prevent certain teachings, it cannot ever be fitting then for just anyone to set himself up as a public teacher--for as many heads, so many different minds, and a rogue may well go unnoticed. For no one handles himself so poorly that he can't be shown in a good light. The pope managed thus to create his entire mob of learned people. Indeed, they made quite sure that no error arose. Nonetheless, in our day and age they fought openly so that truth might not break through. But is that enough cause for anyone to set himself up as apostle, teacher or evangelist? No. I shall speak on this more clearly later on. [391]

Let us now, first of all, speak of the office of apostle, for each office has certain distinct characteristics. "Apostle"

is another term for "messenger". Accordingly, we Germans are right when we say there are twelve "messengers". But then we cannot say "Peter, the messenger" or "James, the messenger". Christ instituted the particular name and office. Luke 6:13 writes as follows, "Jesus called his disciples, selecting from among them twelve whom he also called 'messengers'." Let this suffice on the name.

Their office, however, is to preach the gospel, i.e. to teach the world to know God and itself. Now when a person knows himself he must needs come to be displeased with himself. Out of this, remorse and improvement must follow inasmuch as one knows God. Only after that, a new despair sets in. Although a person may find himself so sinful that he can recognize the need for correction and though he then works on it daily, he, nonetheless, finds such weakness, shortcomings and imperfections that he despairs of ever coming to God. At that point, the salvation which God has graciously given us through his son is opened up for him. This is the task of the messengers; and it is the highest of all such tasks. The apostles had to travel a great deal since they were messengers and they were the first who set out to carry the matter of salvation into all the world. Christ entrusted this office to them for the first time when he sent them to preach to Israel only, saying, "Do not go to the gentiles [Mt. 10:5-16] (for initially he wanted to reveal himself to his own people) and do not visit the towns of the Samaritans, but go first of all to the sheep that have strayed away from the house of Israel. And when you get there, preach, saying that the kingdom of heaven has come. Heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, waken the dead, cast out devils. You have received it without cost, give also without cost. Do not prepare or get ready for your journey any gold or silver or any money in your belts or bags. Do not take two coats, shoes or a walking stick, for a worker deserves his food. And when you reach a city or market place, enquire where there is a worthy [392] or honorable person. Stay there until you are ready to move on. And when you enter a home, extend a greeting. And if the house or its occupants are worthy, your peace will be with them. But if it is unworthy, your peace will return to you. If someone does not receive you, nor hears your word, leave that house and dwelling place and shake its dust from your feet. Truly, I say to you, on the day of judgement it will be easier for Sodom and Gomorrah than for such a place. Behold, I am sending you forth like sheep amidst the wolves" etc.

We see here that the apostles had a common commission concerning the mandate and subject matter they were to preach. That all those were to preach who had been appointed leaders for the purpose of teaching. Consequently, all those who preach have no other office than the one the apostles had. But in this one thing the apostles are above prophets, evangelists and teachers:

they made the first attempt to go to an alien, unbelieving world and spread God's word through far-ranging dangerous journeys, as we noted clearly in the case of St. Paul. God did not permit them any comfort or support through temporal aid and succor which later on, however, was deemed fitting for everyone who was appointed a leader in the church in their place, as we shall show below.

Secondly, Christ gave them the very same commission, but with somewhat extended boundaries, when he said to them on the day of the resurrection, John 20:21-23, "'As my father has sent me, so I send you.' And when he had said this, he breathed upon them and said: 'Receive the Holy Spirit. The sins of those whom you forgive will be forgiven; and those from whom you withhold forgiveness will not be forgiven.'"

Mark 16:15-16 expressed the substance of this in these words, "Preach the gospel to all creatures. Whoever believes and is baptized shall be saved. And whoever does not believe shall be damned." This is what is meant by binding and loosing. Whoever believes is set free; whoever does not believe [393] is bound. This is amply demonstrated in other writings. [Cf. Zwingli's **EXPOSITION**, articles 50-52; **ARCHETELES**, Z I:295ff.; **DE VERA ET FALSA RELIGIONE**, Z III:723.]

Luke presents the commission in chapter 24[45-47] as follows: "He then opened their minds so that they might understand Scripture, saying to them that it was written thus and that Christ had to suffer and rise again from the dead on the third day and that repentance or conversion and forgiveness of sin had to be preached in his name among all nations, beginning with Jerusalem," etc. This commission is like the previous one where he bids them go into all the world, but first of all to the land of the Jews, as Matthew 28:19, 20 actually says: "Go then and teach all nations and baptize them in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, teaching them to keep all things which I have commanded you." In other words, among servants of the word there is no distinction between apostles and others, except that the apostles were bid to go into the world without preparation or provisions for the road. For this reason I have always maintained that those Christians who boast of being apostles, such as the mighty bishops and prelates, should similarly not carry bag or baggage. [Cf. Z I:231, **FRIENDLY ADMONITION** and Z XI:439, **EXPOSITION**, Article 61; Z III:412, **WER URSACH GEBE ZU AUFRUHR** and Z III:45, **DER HIRT.**]

Right now these people live in a manner that would put the devil to shame. They do not preach at all, yet want to be called apostles. They appear with a pomp which exceeds that of the tyrants of this world. It is impossible for them to be apostles

or messengers, for not only do they not follow the word, they do not even concern themselves with it. For this reason, those are not apostles either who preach the word, yet remain permanently in their parishes. More on this later.

Now let us turn to the phrase in Paul [Ephesians 4:11], "and some to be prophets". The term "prophet" is not Hebrew but Greek. It is derived from "to recite"; its actual meaning is "one who predicts, who speaks of coming events before they take place". [394] Now in the Old Testament this was the task of prophets; with us it has come to be the task of evangelists, bishops or ministers of religion. They look to human vices, either to prevent them or--where they have grown up--to pull them out. As God spoke to Jeremiah in chapter 1:9, 10, "Note, I have placed my words in your mouth; I have set you to be a guardian over nations and kingdoms that you might pluck up, break, despoil and destroy, but also build up and plant." In short, it is the primary task of a prophet that he pluck up, tear down and destroy whatever is set up against God and that he build and plant, on the other hand, what God desires.

Further, at the time of the apostles those also were called prophets who made known the meaning of Scripture to the entire church, for in those days there were no New Testament writings. The apostles taught orally. Though the evangelists wrote soon after, their writings were taught, understood and believed before they were written. The epistles, too, were written in order to strengthen the faith which they had earlier acquired without writings, through proclamation, and which by divine nurture they believed. From this we learn that those, too, were called prophets at the time of the apostles who expounded the writings of the Old Testament for the entire congregation. 1 Corinthians 14:26-33 notes this well where Paul says, "When you meet, each one of you has a Psalm, some teaching, the ability to speak in tongues, revelation and interpretation. Let all these serve unto edification. If someone is able to speak in tongues, let it be that two or three, at the most, speak in turn, with one being the interpreter. But if there is no interpreter, be silent in the church and speak with yourself and God. But if there are prophets, two or three may speak and the others judge. But when one of those present receives a revelation, let the first one be silent. For all of you may prophesy, one after the other, or speak of the meaning of Scripture so that all may learn, be comforted or admonished; for the prophetic spirits obey [395] the prophets. For God is not a God of disorder and conflict, but of peace." Now this is the meaning of Paul's words: when you come together to hear the psalms or Scripture, some of you are learned, some know languages (he means Hebrew, above all else), to some God has given a special revelation, some are capable interpreters, translating Hebrew into Greek or some such. You are to undertake everything in a way that will enable you to upbuild therewith.

Those who know Hebrew (to cite an example, for many of them emigrated from the land of the Jews as soon as they became Christians, to live among gentiles who had been converted) speak or read in an orderly fashion, one after the other, those passages of Scripture of which the prophets spoke. Thereafter let someone translate the same words into the common language. And anyone who is not an interpreter or knowledgeable in the language should not speak before the prophets have been interpreted. Rather, let such a one be silent and meanwhile commune with himself and God. For although Scripture may be read in two languages, it is often not commonly understood. Therefore the prophets begin with interpretation of Scripture and from it they unveil God's will. Prophets then must have been well versed in languages, for all other gifts served to the end of attaining to the highest, i.e. to prophesy, which means to interpret, 1 Cor. 14:1: "Seek after spiritual gifts, above all, to prophesy, which is to be able to interpret the writings of God's word." Now whenever prophets interpret, the entire community, i.e. everyone else, judges whether or not the prophet does justice to the word. Note, by what measure is the congregation to judge and on what grounds, if it hears something it has not heard before? Answer: from the very God who dwells within them. A person in whom God dwells understands readily whatever serves to promote God's honor and the neighbor's peace. By this we learn, by the way, that the pope and all his adherents ought to be [396] judged by the church, in other words, by those to whom he preaches; and he cannot violate the word since they judge his interpretation. Observe how far astray the papacy has gone. They do not teach, but do violence to the word. Woe, woe. How is one to deal with those blind people who forever protect an erring papacy?

Now if prophets do speak orderly, one after the other, and if someone who sits in the congregation is given the meaning of the text by God, it is appropriate for such person to speak of the understanding of Scripture he has. But this is to take place in such order and discipline that, if a new one were to begin speaking, the former would be silent and no one else should start to talk as long as the former is still talking. It is fitting that one should follow another when interpreting Scripture to the gathered congregation. Indeed everyone in his own congregation and appropriately one after another, so that everyone might be comforted and learn the truth. Note, though it is proper for everyone in the congregation to speak on Scripture, it is right to do so only after the prophets and then only when the prophet has failed to understand or explain the meaning. Accordingly, those who claim to be apostles or prophets do not, in interpreting Scripture, act according to the custom of the apostles. They do not stay in their own congregations, but run to other congregations and there they speak without the prophets. Though they substantiate their right to interpret Scripture with Paul's writings, they do

not, in turn, allow others to speak. Though they may grant others permission to speak, they do not allow anyone to teach them.

I would have plenty of examples of well instructed prophets who attended their sermons when they read from the New Testament. When the prophets asked for permission to speak to the text they were told that they were free to do so. When they pointed out the actual meaning, the rebaptizers refused to accept it, though the rest of the congregation did. Hence they do not come to the church to learn, but to teach, and to be taught by no one, although they declare themselves willing, in so many words, to be taught. Further, Paul says here [1 Cor. 14:30-33] that prophets eagerly listen to one another in peace and to those also who are [397] hearers, as long as they bring truth to light, for the spirit of the prophets is subject to them. In other words, if they are true prophets of God, they would gladly hear those who are able to reveal the hidden meaning of Scripture. And all this takes place in peace, for God is not a God of disorder and conflict, but a God of peace. Note, how evident it is at this point what kind of spirit the Anabaptists have, however humble they pretend to be. Their spirits do not submit to the prophets, for they begin the first disagreement with them. Let me give an example: an honorable, pious prophet interpreted to his congregation the meaning of Paul's 1 Corinthians 3:13-15, which at one time was understood to refer to purgatory. However one of the rebaptizers who attacked him did not understand the passage. As soon as the sermon had ended, the rebaptizer went about saying that he had lied. Note how amiably the prophetic spirit begins to speak. If they had the God who reveals his gospel to us in our day, they would have a God of peace, not of discord. If they cause discord they do not have the God of peace who in the beginning revealed to us the gospel through his prophets or evangelists. There was no discord among believers then. We speak, of course, only of the prophets and churches in which the gospel is preached. They disturb those very churches but they do not go among the churches of unbelievers.

If they now bring confusion into believing churches in which at one time there was a great and strong peace in God and if they do so merely for temporal, outward things, it is evident that they do not have the God of peace, but instead have the God of disorder and discord. This is like those who came to Antioch saying, "Unless you are circumcised you cannot be saved," Acts 15:5. With this they confused Christian people. In like manner these people say, "Unless you are rebaptized you cannot be saved." They, too, confuse the people.

Thus we have two distinct functions of the prophetic office: the one is like that of the prophets of the Old Testament who fended off evil and implanted the good; in like manner, the

guardians or pastors in [398] the New Testament ought to act. Here the prophetic, episcopal or pastoral office and the office of evangelist are one and the same.

The second office of prophet in the large churches is to interpret the meaning of Scripture, foremost the Old Testament, whenever people gather to study Scripture. This calling is not too common as yet, but should, God willing, begin with us here in Zurich in the not too distant future. [10] The execution of that task has already begun, as it was promised at one time when the reorganization of the Great Minster was announced [see Council action of Sept. 29, 1523]. Thus, to speak precisely, one can't be a prophet in this second sense of office, unless he is able to interpret the languages.

Thereafter Paul speaks of evangelists [Eph. 4:11], "and some as evangelists." This office of evangelist is none other than [399] the prophetic office, as long as "prophet" is understood to be one who plucks up and plants. He is really none other than a bishop or pastor, as may be clearly seen from 2 Timothy 4:5, where Paul writes to Timothy as follows, "do as befits an evangelist, and carry out all the duties of your office." Now Timothy was a bishop. It follows, therefore, that evangelist and bishop is the same office. One may also see from Paul's word, just prior to this passage, that he considers evangelist and bishop to be one and the same when he says in 2 Tim. 4:2, "preach the word, persevere, be mild, be severe, rebuke, exhort, comfort with all patience, and teach," etc. What is this other than the office of a bishop, prophet or pastor. In terms of teaching, this office is no different than that of apostle. There is a difference: while the apostles were wanderers and travelers every bishop resides in the place in which he is bishop or pastor. While the apostles were not permitted to have possessions, it is fitting for a pastor to do so. This must be quite clear, though jealous, rebellious sectarians teach simple folk something different. Paul writes, Titus 1:5-9, "For that I left you behind in Crete, so that you might set up the things that are still lacking and install in all places priests or elders (priest here is taken to mean bishop or pastor), as I directed you: a person who is blameless, has only one wife, whose children are believers and do not have the reputation of being profligate or disobedient; for a bishop (note how he calls the one bishop whom earlier he called priest) ought to be blameless as is fitting for one of God's stewards; not stubborn, quick tempered or a drunkard, not violent or of vile tongue, not greedy for gain but hospitable; a good person, sober, just, righteous, holy, disciplined, firm in the teaching of the faith, that [400] he may be able to comfort and admonish in sound, wholesome doctrine and to confute and punish those who disagree." Of these words of Paul which now, at long last, are known to every Christian, I will mention those only which serve our purpose here.

At the outset there must well have been Christians in Crete who proclaimed the faith; but these were not as yet priests, bishops, guardians, evangelists, pastors or prophets; for he says, "for this reason I left you behind in Crete, that you might institute those things which are lacking as yet." Hence the office of apostle has to be broader than or different from that of evangelist.

Secondly, for his words regarding the faith and good training of a bishop's children one may clearly note that he speaks of a householder who is well suited and honorable. Where in all this are those trouble makers who disturb the simple by saying, "Your pastor should not have his own house; he ought to be lodged with other people and (adding a bit later), if he has his own house, he is unable to speak the truth." Yet Paul says again in 1 Tim. 3:4, when speaking of the office of bishop, "A bishop ought to manage or master his house well and honorably."

And shortly after, "but if a person cannot govern his own, how can he care for God's church?" Note how the difference between apostle and bishop becomes clearly apparent so that one may learn to discern the spirit of those who rebel against God. I should like to point out here that in such an election fewer of those who are extremely poor and forsaken will be elected bishop than of those who are well-to-do.

The extremely impoverished generally govern their households poorly. For where one governs well, one also becomes well-to-do. But I shan't pursue this any further, lest I provide someone with excuses for hiding his avarice.

And finally we hear in this text that a bishop may also be chosen because of his ability to govern his household well. Hence he must have his own household. Indeed, he means that one who has an immoral, quarrelsome, careless and neglected family is not [401] suited to take care of an entire congregation. What would you say, you squabblers, had Titus, along with the Cretes, chosen a well-to-do, rich person for the office of bishop? Look to Scripture more carefully and leave aside your quarreling. That Paul indicates neither poor nor rich here, but rather one who is a good householder, is not to be taken that by managing he means "gathering up riches"; for he says that the bishop should not desire unworthy gain. From this the entire church learned well that it was not to elect bishops from among extravagant, unscrupulous seekers of gain, usurers or greedy persons. One perceives readily from the seriousness with which he concerns himself with bishops and how they are to be aided, that not only the rich were chosen. For it is hard for a rich person to enter heaven, as Christ says in Luke 18. Nonetheless, they had to choose those who managed their households well. And that cannot easily be achieved by beggars, for beggars have neither houses nor families.

Rather, Paul understood by householder a disciplined man who could govern his family in such a way that no one would be harmed. He was to be honorable, obedient and in pursuit of righteous deeds. Where there is such a family and householder one is always concerned with having an adequate livelihood without burdening or having to trouble the neighbor. All this merely serves to show that bishops or evangelists are not against Christ or popish if they possess their own houses and property, as long as they do not unduly desire to possess temporal goods. When Paul indicates, further on, that a bishop ought to be hospitable, in other words, to lodge and feed the poor, it points up, even more strongly, that he must have a house in order to be hospitable and that he ought to have some property if he is to feed everyone who comes to him. [402]

At this point we must refute the impudent allegations which are made against evangelists by these squabblers when they say that anyone who has a prebend cannot speak the truth and insist that he ought not be considered a pastor. Christ says in Luke 10:7, "A worker is worthy of his hire." In the same context he speaks openly with the apostles not to be troubled in their consciences when they eat without labor with those to whom they preach. Someone might readily object at this point that Christ spoke to his disciples only. Remember, however, that St. Paul intends these words to refer to evangelists, too, i.e. to prophets, ministers, guardians, bishops, or whatever you might call them. For he says in 1 Cor. 9:7-15, "Who has ever waged war at his own expense or planted a vineyard without enjoying its yield? Who keeps cattle and does not drink the milk? Do you think that I speak merely as a human being, off the top of my head? Does not the law also state it thus? For it is written in the law of Moses (as found in Deut. 25:4), 'You shall not muzzle the ox when it thrashes corn.' Does God have concern for the oxen or does he speak this for our benefit, as he surely does? For it is written for our sake. And whoever tills the soil shall do so in hope, and whoever thrashes in hope shall have a share of that which he hopes for. And if we have sowed spiritual things does it seem too much to you when we share your temporal goods? If others become recipients of your goods, how much more appropriate is it for us? Nonetheless, we have never made use of such power, but we endured everything in order not to erect a stumbling block for the gospel of Christ. Do you not know (among the ancients and the gentiles as well) that those who prepared and executed sacrifices ate of them and that those who served at the altar became partakers of the altar? In like manner, the Lord bids those who proclaim the gospel (note who instituted this order regarding food) to live by the gospel. Yet I have made use of [403] none of these. Neither did I write this that I might use it in this manner; for I'd rather die than have someone destroy my reputation" etc.

These words of Paul are so clear they require no further clarification. He drives to the point with full force that those who proclaim God's word ought to be fed, though he himself accepted nothing from the Corinthians and little in other places. For he says in Acts 20:34, "These hands (with that he showed his hands) have received what I and those who were with me needed." Nonetheless, he points up that those who serve the gospel ought to be maintained by the people to whom they proclaim the gospel, as he states in 1 Thess. 5:12, 13, "We implore you, dear brethren, to look up to those who labor among you and who have been appointed your superiors in the Lord. We advise you to value them highly in love, for the sake of their labors, and maintain peace with them." Similarly, Hebrews 13:7, "Be mindful of those who are your superiors and who have proclaimed God's word to you." We do not intend to speak here of those useless bellies who wish to be "the Reverend gentleman" whether or not this pleases God.

Rather, we speak of those only who preach the gospel. But later Paul says, 1 Tim. 5:17, 18, "Priests who are superiors and who administer well are to be held worthy of twofold gifts or honor; foremost among these, the people who work in word and teaching. For Scripture says, 'Do not muzzle the ox when it is thrashing.' And again, 'A worker is worthy of his hire.'" These words of Paul make clear that he understands Christ's words "A worker is worthy of his hire" as referring to every office which serves the teaching of God, for he says, "foremost, those who work in word and teaching."

On doctors and teachers I shall speak later.

Now, since we may note quite clearly at this point that those who teach and lead us by their good example are to be maintained by us, why then do these rebellious babblers go among simple [404] Christians, saying, "Whoever holds a prebend cannot preach the gospel and that it is popish to have a prebend when it is of God"? Can you prove to me that there are two kinds of gifts, honor or prebend and not just one?

What does it matter whether or not you call the support of a superior a wage (note how spiritual we are: Christ himself calls it a wage), a twofold gift, honor, or a prebend, if it is the income of a teacher who is appointed to be a superior? "Yes," they say, "a prebend is not to be endowed, but from whatever is given willingly one ought to live." Answer: the ordering of external matters is in the hands of the Christian congregation, "so that everything may result in peace and unity", as is written in Phil. 3:16, and as Paul did with the Lord's Supper, or memorial of Christ. There it was customary to eat the entire Lord's Supper together, as Christ had done. But when abuse began to grow in

the matter, Paul removed the meal in I Cor. 11:22, "Do you not have houses in which you can eat and drink?" And finally, "If anyone is hungry, let him eat at home." Similarly with benefices, we may readily deduce that benefices were established only when begging got to be too heavy and extensive. Now whenever benefices, i.e. specified sustenance, were established, it happened so that begging might not become established, though poor ministers, in the end, had to start begging once again because of their poverty. For the manorial lords gathered in the grain for themselves, leaving them the stubble. Let me cite an example. I have often been asked to give up my benefice for which an honorable city council would then give me one hundred guilders at least. This would have meant much more than before. (God grant me as much as these confounding liars set aside for me.) In addition, several citizens made me magnanimous offers. Friends, tell me what I should have done. I saw well that--had I given up my prebend--I would [405] have had to start begging. I know very well, indeed, what those devout preaching monks and master readers have amassed through begging. Further, specific private citizens assured me of far in excess of one hundred guilders per year. Add to that the one hundred from my lords and my falling back on begging, how much more profitable than a prebend would all this have been. But what would have come of it? All my successors would have had to go a-begging as I had to, and bold teaching would have turned into fawning. Now, since no one is wise enough or strong to resist greed (just as with other temptations), and God tests us in manifold ways, I contented myself with a modest canonry, since I could see it to be by far the best method to give a minister each year reasonable, steady sustenance. Then it is not necessary for anyone to supply extras on the sly. For one who is accustomed to begging always appears to have nothing at all and as a result grabs anything he can possibly get. But when he has an assured benefice, no one needs to feel sorry for him; for everyone knows well that he has an acceptable income. In this way harmful begging is eliminated.

Nor should the sectarian preachers laugh, as they might, when I point up this opinion. For I ought to know well when I say to them that in the mission they gave to themselves they robbed poor and simple people of their food and drink, though they themselves carried silver and gold in their bags. By contrast, I shall show to them how I always conducted myself whenever I preached in the country, and I am not half as holy as they. I paid for my food with my own money. And whenever I was offered money or other gifts, I refused them, though these were frequently offered to me. In short then, "If your eye is single, your whole body is light." Christ says so in Mt. 6:22 [406] with express reference to the danger of riches. Now if you are a faithful servant of God, you will use your benefice to God's honor. If you are not a servant of God, as will soon become apparent, you

will seek after base gain and alms. When that happens, you are like salt which has lost its savor, fit for nothing other than to be discarded. But greater fortitude is to be expected of one who is assured of a benefice, as long as he teaches rightly, than of a person who fears constantly that he might be expelled. I do not put any store by babblers who come along pretending not to be looking to any goods, when, in fact, they look solely to such goods. One may readily see this from their fawning manner and artful tricks. Unfortunately I learned to recognize them somewhat late. With the simple, I believed them to have spirit when it turned out to be greed [wordplay on Geist-Geiz]. In the same vein I also dislike greatly those spirituals to whom one has to give large sums of money before they will preach at all. I am not sure whether they are worthy to be called preachers at all.

Of that kind I don't know too many around here; hence, I shan't concern myself with them. The reason why we are accused here at Zurich of having large benefices stems from the fact that I wouldn't have made it to sixty guilders last year [in 1524] had not the provost and chapter granted me sixteen measures by way of a supplement. The others have little more, though they might have a bit more. Yes, that accounts for the three hundred guilders of which my lying enemies speak. That's how much of a benefice I have. I speak in the name of the one God who creates and sustains me so that I am satisfied with it. If I regret anything, it is only because of those poor people whom I was unable to help as freely as if I had had more. I should rather, were I to follow my carnal desires at all, do without any benefice, if that would get me out of having to preach; but circumstances and the talent which God has entrusted to me do not allow for this.

All this the quarrelsome [407] preachers force me to say against my will. Concerning my wife, Anna Reinhart, [11] they always announce how rich she is; yet, she does not have a nickle's worth more than four hundred guilders, not counting jewelry and clothes. Of those, she has not worn either silks or rings since she married me; rather, she goes about like the wives of other ordinary tradesmen. Her inheritance, which her children, the Meyers, conceded to her, she needs for her sustenance. She is in her forties [born 1484] and her children approach her daily for help; for which reason also I married her. Here they babble of her excessive goods and clothes; yet everyone knows that they do her an injustice. But at a distance it is easy enough to lie; the slandered [408] person is not likely to be there. Her children have sufficient property. May God grant that they use it well. But of all that property she does not get a single nickle, except for her clothes and jewelry and her inheritance which is thirty guilders. I agreed to have her add her dowry to this and I do not touch her property for even a nickle.

Paul frequently shook off the lies heaped upon him, for he saw these to cause the gospel a marked disadvantage. Similarly, I would gladly forego making excuses, provided the slander does not disadvantage the gospel of Christ.

Let us now go on with providing proofs that there were at the time of the apostles resident, benefited pastor evangelists, prophets or bishops. In the twentieth chapter of Acts we note clearly that Paul addresses, from Miletus, the priests in Ephesus who are bishops, guardians, evangelists and pastors of the church. There he calls all believers at Ephesus "church"; and it is good to remember that there was more than one bishop; for he does not say, "[I am sending] for the bishop" but "for the bishops and priests". [12] By this we see either that there was more than one minister in Ephesus or that there were many guardians, prophets and teachers in the church who were all concerned with oversight and teaching.

And after a long speech he says in conclusion [Acts 20:28], "therefore watch over yourselves and the entire flock of which the Holy Spirit has made you bishop (note that those whom he earlier called priests he now calls bishops), to feed the church of God which he has obtained by his own blood." Note here, you pious Christians, what took place at the time of the apostles. Apostles went through the unbelieving world and preached the gospel and wherever they planted the faith they set up guardians who confirmed by teaching again and again what they had planted. These they took [409] from among resident believers or (where there were no such), from among those who were with them, and appointed them bishops. After that they traveled on. Therefore Paul says, Tit. 1:5, "I have left you behind in Crete that you might establish those things that are still wanting." Note how he left his disciples behind. Here then he appoints bishops who were installed after he had planted the faith, namely those who had been set aside by the entire church, on the bidding of the Holy Spirit, to feed the Christian people. In this one may clearly see the difference between messengers and evangelists. One may also note that the order of pastor, bishop or guardian is instituted by God; for he says, "among which flock the Holy Spirit has set you," etc. Read the entire speech of Paul and you will find for yourself what I have just told you.

Again it is written in Acts 21:8, 9, "We came to Caesarea; and when we entered the house of Philip, the evangelist, who was one of the seven, we stayed with him. Now this Philip had four daughters who prophesied."

Firstly, we hear quite clearly from this that this Philip who was evangelist, guardian or bishop in Caesarea is not called an apostle, though he was one of the seven who had earlier in

Acts 6:5 been appointed servant. It should further be noted here that the name of the holy apostles or messengers was changed as soon as they settled down in a place when, for the sake of order or by reason of age, they no longer traveled. They were then called bishop. For example, James, whom we call the younger (one should not call him "the lesser" since minor in this context means younger), [13] was bishop in Jerusalem. Jerome and all other fathers call him thus, since he was resident there; for the apostles who traveled to other countries left him--who at one time had also traveled about preaching--behind in Jerusalem to [410] be a guardian and proclaimer of the word of God.

Similarly, John the evangelist suffered greatly, time and again, on account of his apostolic office. In the end he died a bishop, i.e. a guardian, in Ephesus in the sixty-eighth year after the ascension of Christ [cf. Jerome, **de viris illustribus**, cap. IX, Migne, P.L. XXIII, p. 635].

Such is the difference between apostles and evangelists; though it is not a distinction because of teaching but because of office.

Secondly, we hear regarding this Philip, that he had his own house, for Paul visited him with a large contingent. This is wholly contrary to those unworthy preachers who--wherever they go--undermine confidence in the bishops or ministers, who up to then had faithfully preached the gospel, and confuse their sheep. This is how they do it: they read out loud the tenth chapter of Matthew 6:42 and proceed to say, "Do you see here how they are to be guests without having anything of their own? Therefore peoples' priests or pulpit preachers (as they call them), are incapable of speaking the truth; for they have benefices." But their error lies in the fact that they fail to distinguish between apostles and evangelists or bishops. Such evil is gross ignorance. And as soon as you hold up to them--what is nothing other than the clear word of God--that the office of messenger and bishop is not one and the same office, they clamor that God said in Mt. 11:25 that he has hidden the secret things from the wise and learned, and revealed them to the simple. Therefore one should not turn to people of learning.

God has given his spirit equally to the Germans and to the Latins and Greeks. Yes, they shout, we have it in hand, honorable people; make sure that no one can take it from us.

I would love to give such people an apt reply, simply to unmask their pious spirit. However one must answer them as is appropriate for oneself and not as they deserve, [411] "Yes, indeed, God has revealed it to the simple and single-minded." But what does simple and single-minded mean in this context?

Does it mean foolish in understanding or singular and righteous in heart--not fraudulent, selfish or underhanded? If, then, you are so learned as to always quote Scripture, yet have been taught solely through reading and learning, why then do you count yourselves among the simple? Is it right to speak thus when I have begun something wantonly, for which I could find no basis in God's word, and the opposite of which has been pointed out to me, to thus cover up my error? "You are learned, but you ought to believe me; I am not learned, even though I know all of Holy Scripture." For I could then speak as I fancied and if someone objected I could reply to my objector that he is learned and incapable of knowing the truth; but I know it, for I am not learned. Now tell me, I implore you, is one to believe Holy Scripture in all things or just as you will? I hope that you will concede with a sense of shame that one would have to believe in Scripture not only when it serves to one's advantage, but always. Now if one is to believe it always, then it is right out of God's word, too, that evangelists must be well learned and not just beginners, skilled to teach others. They are to have their own houses and livelihood and, like the apostles, they are to undertake journeys without baggage and provisions [cf. Mt. 10:6ff.]. Why do you discredit godly evangelists? For I speak not of popish ministers, but of honest, faithful servants of the gospel. If you did not know the difference between messengers and evangelists, you left the nest prematurely and your spirit has not left you with sufficient food in your breadbasket. In that case your discrediting may be nothing other than ignorant presumption. If, however, you knew the difference but kept quiet in the matter, it is not without evil intent, and you were sent not by God but by a goddess called Eris which means quarrelsomeness. Note, therefore, righteous Christian, that Christ, when speaking of the little ones and the simple people in Mt. 11, does not mean those who are ignorant [412], otherwise I would have to be a great doctor--but rather, of the singular people who are not children of this age [Luke 16:8]. Their eyes of faith are singular. They are not wise because they are great in this world, but rather because they despise the greatness of humankind and are able to open their hearts before God. He has made the most learned into disciples: Nicodemus, Paul, Barnabas, Luke, Gamaliel, Ananias, Apollos, Agabus, Timothy, Titus and many others.

Now all of these had to become small in their knowledge, deny themselves and become like little children, etc., not to rely on their knowledge, not to twist God's word according to their own ideas nor to elevate the carnal meaning above the spiritual and not to be great in themselves but to be humble and obedient vessels of God. Now Christ's meaning is that the worldly-wise do not understand the business of salvation; rather, the farther they are from human wisdom, which is sheer deceit, the more clearly they know God's will.

It does not follow from this, of course, that therefore everything is true which is spoken by any fool and that such a one is called by God. I should very much like to hear from you why you praise your doctors so highly who are involved with you in the issue of infant and rebaptism. They, too, are preachers and beneficed. How then can these speak the truth? You cannot excuse your perfidy by claiming ignorance. To some God gives ten talents and it is so far from him to reject a person because of the extent of his knowledge that he gives him power over ten cities, in addition, provided he has acted faithfully. In all of this you may clearly see that the evangelists managed households and lodged people, as Paul indicates to Titus and Timothy. And there is no substance to what those confusing fault finders and hate mongers say: if they were of God, they could expound everything on their own quite clearly, though it may have weak support, and they would [413] be all things to all people solely to win them for Christ [cf. 1 Cor. 9:19-22].

If they are so pure that no one can touch them and what they say is spirit, I can readily see that their boasting must come under the same critique as the pope. I would certainly never want to protect these greedy and proud preachers of whom they seem to have more in these lands than elsewhere, as shall become apparent when they come forward with their baptism of which they boast.

Secondly, it is written in Acts 21, "Philip had four daughters who prophesied." These words further confirm that this Philip managed his house and raised his children after the manner of bishops, as is laid down in the appointing of bishops. Now I hear how some of these self-appointed apostles, in order to turn everything upside down, set out to say that it were better if priests had no wives. And these are the very same people who, a short while ago, demanded the marriage of priests. What do you think of that? Is it not high time to walk on one's head? Aren't you annoyed that everyone walks on his feet, you wise censors and fault finders, i.e. judges and critics. When are you going to concede that all your fighting is no more than quarrelsome, envious bitterness and not at all spiritual? You obnoxious wind bags. I do not doubt that it might be easier for an apostle or messenger to travel on behalf of the gospel without a wife. But if he is not continent, he ought to have a wife and take her around with him, as Peter and others have done, according to 1 Cor. 9. But bishops are not to be without wives so that suspicions may be avoided; plenty has been said on this. For suspicion is so dangerous and the flesh is so little to be trusted that the apostles demanded, nonetheless, that bishops have wives, though one may have grown children and hence be of advanced [414] years.

Now I should like to hear from these well-learned, confused

messengers what it was that these four daughters prophesied, since it is not appropriate for a woman to speak in church, 1 Cor. 14:34, 35. It must be noted, therefore, that in Scripture the term "prophesy" means on occasion as much as to hear a sermon or attend to the exposition of Scripture in church, as 1 Cor. 11:5 expressly states, where Paul speaks as follows: "Any woman who prays or prophesies without covering her head dishonors her head." One notes expressly from Paul's words, prior to and immediately following this, that he intends to say simply that a woman who prays in church ought to be veiled; similarly, if she sits to hear God's word she should be covered as well. On occasion, "prophesy" in Scripture stands for "to present the meaning of Scriptures", as is written in 1 Cor. 14:31, "You ought to prophesy one after another." This means: when the prophets who spoke first of the meaning of Scripture failed to bring out the right sense, and if God had opened the meaning of Scripture to someone among the listeners, it was appropriate for the same to prophesy, which was to speak of the meaning of the passage that had been read. Now we have sufficiently shown earlier which Scripture was interpreted in church in those days, namely, the writings of the Old Testament, as is well noted in 1 Cor. 14:34, 35. "Everyone has a psalm", etc.; for at that time the Scriptures of the New Testament were written in the hearts rather than in books. We learn from all this that the four daughters did not prophesy like prophets, neither as common people in the congregation; for women were not allowed to speak in church. Further, we do not find that they prophesied just anything. It would have to be then that Luke wants to say the following: Philip had four daughters who were learned in the Holy Scriptures and praised God in its words through psalms and other songs (these the women and their household were allowed to use). It is furthermore an ancient custom among Jews for [415] their women to learn to understand the Scriptures and therewith to praise God primarily in psalms.

Thus I have demonstrated well enough that these rebellious self-appointed apostles do violence to godly bishops and act against God when they say of them that they cannot have their own homes and assured livelihood and that when they have these, they do not speak the truth. Now I don't do all this for my sake; for, as I have indicated, my flesh desired to be free of the office of preaching and would undoubtedly be sustained, since he who created me would also sustain me; however, the very same does not allow me to leave my office. For years I have sought to be free of it; yet the longer the more he gives me work to do in his word. Praise be to him. Therefore let no one sour you on the support or benefices of evangelists, though one should work as much as possible toward removing other endowments, but peacefully and with due concern for those who hold them. [14] For if clerical benefices were discontinued today, our daily necessities would

force us to set them up once again. Let these disquieting people lead no one into ill-considered decisions.

Whatever they dream up they proclaim, saying that the spirit of God [416] had led them to say it. I might well respond with St. Paul, 1 Cor. 14:37, "If anyone thinks himself a prophet or spiritual person, consider what I write here and you will become aware that I write nothing other than God's commandments."

Thereafter Paul speaks further in Eph. 4:11, "some he appointed to be pastors and teachers". Regarding pastors, everyone knows that he means those who are guardians. Now this same office is connected, almost everywhere, with that of the evangelist. They are the true bishops and guardians to whom Christ speaks in Mt. 24:42, "be watchful, for you do not know when the householder returns." And to Peter in John 21:15-17, "If you love me, tend my sheep." He also speaks constantly of the pastor's office in John 10; and everyone knows well that the bishop's office is meant there. Similarly, in 1 Peter, chapter 2:25, he draws together "pastor" and "bishop" when he says, "You have now been converted to the pastor and guardian or bishop of your souls--meaning Jesus Christ, our Lord." Enough has been said of this.

It may happen, of course, that in large churches or parishes the care of preaching and looking out for every danger to the sheep is too much for one person. In such a case one might well assign to one person the concern for the growing dangers and open misdeeds and to another the task of preaching. As for example in our church, one person or even two or three would have more than enough in guarding [pastoral care]. And although the three of us are sharing the preaching, we have, nonetheless, plenty of it to do.

By doctors and teachers one should not understand those who run about in red caps, sporting gold rings, silken clothes and gilded shirts. Rather, one should either think of those who teach and who, in the other sense of that word, are prophets (as we have shown above), who teach everyone and of those who are being prepared to teach others in the languages or else, of all who are teachers, prophets and evangelists. Thus we note that Paul calls himself in 1 Tim. 2:7 doctor or teacher of [417] the gentiles, which is an apostle of the gentiles, as he says in Gal. 2:2. And here we may clearly see from the context that Paul understands by doctor primarily those who are learned, who taught in such a way that those were taught by them who thereafter taught others, as we may clearly see in Acts 13:1, "There were in the church at Antioch those who were prophets and teachers: Barnabas and Simeon who is called Niger, Lucius and Cyrene and Manaen, a sibling of Herod the Tetrarch and Saul." In these words we clearly note that there were, even at that time of the apostles,

many learned persons in large churches who were thoroughly instructed in the Scriptures and who taught the same to others as well, so that the Scriptures might not be misunderstood, as Paul indicates in 1 Cor. 14:5, "I wish or desire that you might be well informed in all the languages, but above all that you prophesy", etc. Paul desires here that Christians should be knowledgeable in all tongues for the purpose of prophesying. He knows well, of course, that not everyone is well versed in tongues; but he shows how useful a thing it is for Christians to know the languages in which God's word is written, when he desires such knowledge for everyone.

He desires this for the purpose of turning it to the aid of prophesying, i.e. the exposition of Scripture or preaching. Here the Anabaptists act rather wrongly when they denigrade languages, saying, "One need not have languages. We understand Scripture just as well as those who know many languages. It depends on the spirit and not on one's skill." Yet Paul does not desire in vain that everyone ought to understand the languages. Therefore the following ought to be noted: it is true and quite certain that human hearts are not turned toward God by anything other than God who draws them, so help me God, however learned a person might be; nonetheless, one must have knowledge of Scripture because of those [418] who do violence to it. For hypocrisy stops short of nothing. It dares present itself as if it were the spirit. But when one discovers afterwards that their speaking does not conform to God's word, one knows which is hypocrisy. For among the simple one soon reaches the point at which violence is done to God's word; they don't know what it is all about. Nonetheless, one has to probe for meaning, to find out whether it is thus. In this way a believer is well informed on whether or not the right meaning has been found. And there is no better way to do that than through languages. For just as in German nothing remains unknown to us when it is written out because we all know German, so--if we knew Hebrew as well as German--we should be able to fathom the Old Testament. Similarly, if we knew Greek as well as German, nothing in the New Testament should be hidden from us either. Therefore all commentaries and teachers are nothing when compared to the knowledge of languages. This may be clearly learned from Paul's word who does not say, "I wish you knew the rabbis or commentaries", but rather, "that all of you were versed in languages", meaning primarily the Hebrew tongue; but in our country that cannot be learned by ordinary people. Therefore it is essential that we have teachers in several places who are able to instruct others in the language. And this is not a new idea. We note that it began in Antioch in the days of the apostles and it is used in our country, too. Therefore you and other territories should--when the occasion arises--allow useless ministers to die off, with God's help, and apply a portion of their possessions to poor parishes and the other portion toward training

a few scholars in the languages for the good and benefit of your area. Otherwise there [419] is grave danger when reading (which in our day has become so popular), that--as may be clearly seen--a goodly number of those who read become merely more informed and eloquent than pious and god-fearing. Those very people burst forth with every nonsense which has no basis at all in the original language and context. These might possibly be convinced by the right understanding.

Not all of us ought to be preachers, as Paul indicates in 1 Cor. 12:29, "Are all of us apostles? Are all prophets? Are all teachers?" etc., as if to say, "No." Therefore it is gross arrogance of these self-appointed preachers to appropriate all offices to themselves and despise whatever they themselves can't do. Let me cite but two examples by which everyone may see how badly they would be misled, should the knowledge of languages ever be despised. I could cite more, but why? Everyone who hears them can see what presumption it is. There were several thousand believers in Jerusalem, but no more than twelve messengers. Here all of them are messengers. Whoever has gone to a German school and has learned how to spell gets up in front of the congregation and spells it out. I don't report common gossip; I know places [420] where they were unable to read Scripture. They stuttered over it so that it became apparent that they were just learning it.

The one story is as follows: a weaver in a certain place (I shall be gentle and not name it; perhaps they will recognize themselves) which has a godly, competent evangelist and bishop, boldly occupied the pulpit one Sunday. When the preacher arrived, the weaver announced that he himself would preach. The preacher agreed so as to avoid a disturbance. The weaver then began reading in 1 Tim. 4:2 which the good people had often heard before from their legitimate pastor; hence they complained because of the boldness of the weaver. Soon he came to the passage "their conscience is branded". He then said, "I do not understand this." Whereupon the minister retorted, "Stop then and I shall expound it for you." When this happened the good people shouted, "Bid him come down." The minister replied, "Had I ordered him down on my account I would have aroused suspicion, therefore, you bid him come down." Thus he finally came down. Now let all Christians discern the spirit. First of all, he elevates himself without any regard for the whole church. Secondly, he claims to be a divine spirit, yet fails to understand, though he is able to read. But the divine spirit instructs even the ignorant of his meaning and intention. Therefore it is evident that it is not a divine mission but something that is rhymed together and a skill that puffs up.

The second story is as follows: Whenever they teach

rebaptism they claim Mt. 3:7-12 in support. There, among other things, is a summary of John's preaching in which he allegedly called the Pharisees and Sadducees "you brood of serpents," etc. Now some of them explain this to the simple as follows: note the harsh manner with which John scolds the Pharisees for their refusal to be baptized. The simple then stand in amazement [421], not knowing what it is all about. Yet this is not at all the meaning of Matthew's words. Rather, he intends to summarize John's sharp sermons of admonition, showing him to have discerned the inward thoughts of the Pharisees who did not come to baptism in the right spirit. He therefore scolded them severely, albeit with additional teaching and words. For who can describe all the teaching which John ever undertook? Now if we have to fear such from people who know nothing but the letter, it is necessary, even more than ever before, to have some who can discern the actual meaning from the letter, too. Otherwise what might it be like some time hence when there are already so many different opinions at the very outset? Now if everyone can see how they deviously fail to understand the letter, yet pawn off their opinion as spiritual, we will know what sort of spirit it is: the kind of spirit that refuses to hear whatever is opposed to it, and which, with the majority of the rebaptized, seeks to shirk all obedience and responsibility. I speak the truth. It becomes apparent in much of their speaking and writing, but God, the true judge, shall reveal everything in his own good time. No good Christian would ever appropriate any of these offices to himself except he were either sent by God, chosen by the church or the apostles (which is nothing other than a calling and commission).

We shall make this clear with the aid of Christ Jesus the Lord, with John and the apostles and their writings and the Old Testament, too.

From the Old Testament we shan't cite more than one incident in Numbers 16. This choice will make it quite clear that no one in the Old Testament aspired to be a prophet without being called by God through wondrous signs or prophecies which coincided with the truth (as, e.g., Deut. 13:1), or to be priest; to this latter task the tribe of Levi alone was called. The gist of the story is this: when Moses, on God's bidding, made Aaron, his brother, High Priest, Korah, Dathan, Abiram and On from the tribe of Reuben rose up against both of them, saying, "Leave off; for the entire [422] congregation is holy and God is among them. Why do you set yourselves above the people of God?" When Moses heard this, he replied to Korah and the entire crowd, "Tomorrow the Lord will reveal those who belong to him; he shall bind to himself the saints, and those whom he shall choose shall come near to him. Therefore do as follows: let all of those who also desire to be High Priest take a censer, you Korah, and the entire crowd. Make a fire and place incense upon it." Now there were

two hundred and fifty of them. Aaron, too, had his censer. "When God had shown his glory, he ordered the multitude to separate itself from the rebels; he then opened the earth and consumed their tents and all their possessions. Thus they went to hell and the ground covered them." In this manner God punished all those in the Old Testament who rebelliously set themselves up on their own authority as the sacrificing priestcraft, outside God's order and that of Moses, in which there was much less danger than in their teaching.

Our savior Christ Jesus was proclaimed from heaven by the Father to be the true redeemer whom he sent to us, whom we are to hear when he said, "This is my beloved son with whom I am well pleased; hear him." Mt. 3:17 and 17:5. Later on, John proclaimed this to all the people when he showed to them that our Lord Christ Jesus was sent by God, the heavenly Father, John 1:32-34, "And John proclaimed, saying, 'I saw the spirit like a dove descend from heaven and hover over him. And I did not know him. But the one who sent me to baptize with water said to me, "he upon whom you shall see the spirit descending and resting, is the one who baptizes with the Holy Spirit." And I have seen it and testify to it that he is the son of God.'" Note how expressly St. John affirms the sending of Jesus Christ, our redeemer.

And that these words refer firmly to the election and sending of Christ is shown by St. Paul in Hebrews 5, "No one assumes this honor for himself, but [423] the one alone who is called by God, as Aaron was. Thus not even Christ himself assumed this honor of being a high priest. Rather, the one called him to that task who said to him, 'You are my son; I gave birth to you today,'" etc.

Our Lord Christ Jesus himself proves to the Jews in a lengthy speech that he was sent by the Father, John 8:12-58. In John 6:57 he says, "As the Father has sent me into the world, so have I sent them." In John 20:21, "As the Father has sent me, so I send you." Gal. 4:4, "God sent his son into the world," etc. From all these texts we may see that the sending is essential before anyone may publicly assume the task of preacher, that Christ Jesus himself makes frequently known the authority of his own calling by what he says and through other means.

The sending of John the Baptist God indicated through the prophet Malachi in chapter 3:1, as you will find in Mk. 1:2. The evangelist John, also, indicates it openly in John 1:33, "A person is sent by God whose name is John." John the Baptist himself, as we have just heard in John 1, "The one who sent me, etc., spoke to me", points to his calling in John 3:27, "A person cannot assume anything for himself, unless it be given him from

heaven." And again, there are words of John by which he seeks to indicate that no one is able to undertake anything with the word of salvation, except one to whom God has given it. In John 3[28] he says again, "You yourselves must testify that I said to you, 'I am not Christ, but have been sent as his forerunner.'" This again points to the sending.

Concerning the sending of the apostles we have just cited two texts from John 17:18 and 20:21 in which Christ says, "As my Father has sent me, so I send you." In Matthew 10:16 he says, "Behold, I send you as sheep amidst the wolves." In Matthew 28:19, 20 he says, "Go, and teach all nations." In Mark 16:15, "Go into all the world and preach, etc." All [424] these are words of commissioning. And he further substantiated the commissioning in Matthew 25:14-30 in the distribution of talents and in Luke 19:12-28. Here commissioning and mandate are the same thing. To this they clung so firmly ever after that they allowed no one to set himself up on his own authority. When Judas removed himself out of this life by hanging himself and broke the fellowship of the apostles, no one dared elevate himself to his place; instead, the entire congregation chose in Acts 1:15-26. Likewise, when there was a shortage of ministers, no one asserted himself by elevating himself to be a minister which might possibly have been to his advantage. Rather, the entire congregation chose the seven ministers according to Acts 6:1-6; all this was merely to look after temporal matters. Later, when the apostles learned that Samaria had accepted the word of God because of Philip's preaching, not everyone ran off to assist them; rather, they sent two, Peter and John in Acts 8[14]. When self-appointed servants came to Antioch and confused the believing community on the matter of circumcision (just as the rebaptizers do now), no one ran off to Jerusalem on his own account, but they delegated Paul and Barnabas, along with others, to go to Jerusalem, Acts 15:1-21. Similarly, when they were sent a second time, only those went with them who were delegated to do so.

Paul so clearly delineated his own commissioning that one can readily see that he had been maligned on account of the commissioning, as if he had set himself up, Gal. 1:1, "I, Paul, an apostle or messenger, not on account of people or through them, but through Jesus Christ, etc." By this he wants to show his calling to be from heaven, which is recorded in Acts 9:3-31 and is recounted again later in Acts 22:1-21 and 26:9-18. Likewise in 1 Cor. 1:17, "Christ did not send me to baptize, but to proclaim the gospel" indicates his commissioning. In like manner, he says in 1 Cor. 9:1, 2, "Am I not free? Am I not an apostle? Did I not see Christ Jesus, our Lord? [425] Are not you my labor in the Lord? If I am not an apostle like others, I am, nonetheless, your apostle; for you are the seal of my apostolic office." In all these texts we clearly see that the ceremonial preachers attacked him

as if he were not an apostle; for he had not been sent as others who were physically present with Christ and had been sent by him.

He indicates this in 2 Cor. 12:11 where he says, "I have done no less than the foremost of the apostles." And in 1 Cor. 15:10, "I worked harder than any of them." Likewise to the Galatians, again in the first and second chapters, he does nothing but point to his commissioning, that he is not self-appointed, though he was not one of the apostles who had been physically present with Christ. Nonetheless, he joined himself to them for the sake of those he had instructed, though that yielded him little benefit; for as soon as these realized that God had entrusted him with preaching the gospel among the gentiles, they extended their hands to him and Barnabas, as to their companions. All this serves to show that he wanted to verify his calling in this way: although his adversaries contended that he had not been sent, he sought to stress with the apostles that he was sent, etc.

This same Paul speaks generally of all servants of the word in Romans 10:15, "How are they to preach unless they have been sent?" By these words we clearly see that no one should undertake to preach unless he is sent. Not even at the time of the apostles did anyone set himself up to that. Those who set themselves up have always been looked upon as heretics, i.e. sectarians. In other places Paul speaks of those who have been called to the word, such as 1 Thess. 5:12, 13 and Hebrews 13:17 and 1 Tim. 5:17 where he says, "the priests and bishops who manage the office of leader well, ought to be considered worthy of twofold honor," as has been shown above. From all these references it becomes clearer than the light of day that no one must aspire to the bishop's office except one who has been sent and chosen for it. [426]

Therefore we must now speak of being commissioned or chosen. This may be readily learned from the above-quoted texts. It is certain from Christ's word [John 20:21], "As my father has sent me, so I send you", that all who presume to preach ought to have been sent by God, or else they are those wicked laborers of whom Paul speaks in Phil. 3:2. Furthermore, the one who is sent by God is, in addition, marked by external signs such as miracles or a clear election. For example: God chose Paul as his messenger, not only in his heart, but he marked him also by a wondrous conversion, while Mathias was chosen through election by lot by the entire congregation of Christians, Acts 1:26. Thus, without exception, from the time of the apostles to our own day, no one has elevated himself to the office of bishop until and unless he was chosen. I speak solely of genuine bishops or ministers who preach. Of the other tyrants, some of whom have instigated great bloodshed, I do not speak. That kind would undertake to wage war for the election to an episcopate.

Now again, election took place in three ways: on occasion, by the entire congregation, as we showed earlier in the case of Mathias; on occasion, by the apostles and not the entire congregation, as in Acts 8:14 when Peter and John were sent to Samaria by the apostles; and thirdly, by one single apostle, as Paul appointed and chose Titus in Crete, Titus 1:5.

In this connection it should be noted that with almost all Christians, election by papal authority has been perverted into violence and tyranny. For either the high bishops, abbots and manorial lords made ministers of their stable boys, cooks and pimps, contrary to the will of the congregation, or else, if the congregation had a choice, it intended to elect someone bishop as a favor rather than for the points and ornaments [of office] [427] which Paul lays down--all this without consulting with learned believers. Therefore, in matters of an election, there is nothing more in keeping with God's will than for the entire congregation to elect a minister on the advice of several godly, knowledgeable bishops or Christians, as we well noted Titus to have done.

Though Paul says "that you keep order" [Tit. 1:5], he, nonetheless, did not order on his own, as these tyrannical bishops wish to understand it. The reason: since the judgement in banning and teaching is always with the congregation, the choosing of a teacher [minister] even more so, ought not be in the hands of a proud bishop or abbot who is an outsider, but in the hands of the church which secures the advice of wise Christian prophets and evangelists. And ultimately it is not even the exclusive prerogative of an honorable single congregation, as may be clearly learned from Paul's teaching regarding the handling of the word in 1 Cor. 14 and from above examples. There the teaching of Scripture is not entrusted to the ordinary congregation, but to the prophets, interpreters and to those versed in the languages, though the congregation is permitted to have its say.

I now wish to turn to all commissions and whether or not these self-appointed messengers can be said to have been sent by God. Let us first consider the inner call.

Christ says [John 20:21], "As my Father has sent me, so do I send you." Now if Christ stirred up unrest for the sake of temporal goods, it behooves them also to rebel on account of interest taking and tithes. If this cannot be shown in any way whatever, it is apparent that they have not been sent by God either.

God's word bids us submit to the magistrate whether or not they are believers. Yet they teach that no Christian may be a magistrate, though the opposite is to be found, 1 Tim. 6:2 and 1 Pet. 2:13-18, Eph. 6:5-9. One may see by this that their

teaching and rebaptism runs contrary to God and Christian peace. And though they should swear a thousand oaths in denying it, it would, nonetheless, become apparent. As soon as the number of baptized people is large enough so that they might expect to save themselves by it, they would set themselves against all authority and refuse to render to Caesar (i.e. the higher authority) what they owe him. [428]

The third test by which one may see from the manner of teaching that they have not been sent by God is, for simple persons, the most correct and apparent. Paul says in 1 Cor. 14:33, "God is not a God of quarreling, but of peace," as may be noted in all Christian churches. Now if their baptizing and preaching serves only to bring about quarreling, they do not have the God of peace. I indicated that earlier. Then they say that Christ stated, "I have come not to bring peace but the sword" [Mt. 10:34]. Answer: the sword of which Christ speaks here is not to be between believers. Rather, Christ means that the sword shall be between believers and unbelievers. But they split believers for the sake of external matters, just as it was at the time of the apostles, as we heard above.

We shall now turn to outward signs; we might see in them whether or not they are sent by God.

If they are sent by God, God has revealed it to humankind through signs or through a clear election which no one may dispute. And if there are neither signs nor a duly arranged election through a congregation, they lack the external sign of the office of messenger or bishop. Therefore it is certain that they have not been sent by God. All this has been made clear enough in above-quoted passages of Scripture.

Let us look then at the offices to see whether they are in line with the offices which they have chosen for themselves. And again we find that they have not been sent by God. If they are messengers, it is their office to travel among unbelievers again and again, to turn them to the faith, just as we heard above of the way the apostles and bishops had conducted their teaching. But here is the difference between them: the apostle travels among unbelievers while the bishop remains stationary among those entrusted to him. But since they do not travel among unbelievers, but steal about among believers, confusing those who before were of one mind and peaceable, they are definitely not apostles.

Neither are they bishops; for they have not been chosen by any parish, as have all other excellent, well-spoken-of, believing bishops. [429] Much less are they prophets and teachers. Therefore it follows unmistakably that they are nothing but troublemakers.

At this point they raise two objections. The first is: "Does not Paul say in 1 Cor. 14:31, 'You are all to prophesy, one after another'? Which, in other words, is to speak on the meaning of Scripture before the gathered congregation." Answer: to prophesy is not customary in any of the churches nor will it now be begun with us here. Though a person may be able to speak in this manner, it does not follow, therefore, that he can elevate himself, on his own initiative, to the office of apostle or bishop. Neither does it follow that he ought to begin speaking before the congregation on his own initiative. Rather, he is permitted to speak only after the interpreters, prophets and those knowledgeable in languages have spoken. For this reason Paul earnestly warns here that all things ought to be done decently and in order. Therefore, no one ought, under any condition, appropriate the office of evangelist to himself, except the one who has been appointed and marked by God inwardly and externally. Not everyone is a bishop instantly just because he has expounded Scripture in the congregation, or else Paul would not have needed to make the many distinctions of office which he indicated not only here in Ephesians 4:11, but also in 1 Cor. 12:28 and Romans 12:7, 8.

The second objection is this: John says in John 3, "The one whom God has sent speaks the words of God." Hence, everyone who speaks God's words is sent by God. Answer: by this one word of God, every Christian may discern that they are not born of the Spirit of God. For these words refer, firstly, quite clearly to Christ. Yet they apply them to themselves. Though later on reference is made to those who have been sent, these words do not refer to anyone that has not been sent. For it is not one and the same thing to speak of God and to be sent as an apostle or bishop. More of this a little while later. Secondly, to say "the one whom God has sent speaks God's words" does not lead to "whoever speaks God's word has been commissioned to the office of apostle or bishop". In short, we are not boldly to set ourselves up as masters. [430] Yet every congregation ought to have a guardian or overseer so that the bold, reckless goats may be controlled by the authority of the church and not by that of the guardian. For if the office of guardian, i.e. bishop or minister, is thus forsaken and has gone to the dogs, so that anyone can set himself up to be a bishop whenever he pleases, there would soon be great quarreling among those who now set themselves up to preach. For just as they now set themselves up as teachers or apostles, so the day after tomorrow there might once again be a group that would dare teach in the same manner as today's sect, and after that yet another and there would be great dissention once again, for everyone would want to bend his sect to himself. Indeed, as many stubborn heads, so many sects and disorders. And I speak solely with regard to public teaching in the church. I know well that it is quite fitting for everyone to talk to anyone about God and to discuss matters with them. To consider it fitting for just

anyone to start whatever he wishes in his own corner without the consent and directive of the church, which should evaluate him and his undertaking, or to consider it fitting for just anyone to set himself up as a teacher or minister, who may stand up on his own authority in a church of believers (I do not call all those "believers" who claim faith in Christ, but those only who believe the gospel faithfully and allow it to be freely preached), I consider not only to be bold and wicked, but anti-Christian. For there would not be a little error if everyone in a city who is a citizen wanted to be mayor. And it is not at all in order when they object here with 1 Pet. 2:5, 9, "We are all priests", for I do not speak here of being consecrated or not being consecrated, but of the office of teacher. It is true enough, of course, to say that we are consecrated to the kind of priesthood which in the New Testament offers sacrifices, for that is none other than everyone offering up himself, Rom. 12:1. Yet we are still not all apostles and bishops, [431] 1 Cor. 12:29. Though one is a bishop, it is unfitting, nonetheless, for him to enter another's sheepfold or episcopate, just as he pleases. In Romans 15:20 Paul says, "I have preached the gospel diligently wherever Christ is unknown in order not to build upon the foundation of another." Thus it is never proper to go among another's sheep.

I speak always of only those pastors and evangelists who carry out their office in a godly and decent manner. Even for them it is not fitting to run about in other churches without permission and to stir up trouble against one another. For this reason I should like to admonish, for the sake of God and peace, all those who are so anxious to preach, to look seriously to the words of James 3:1 where it is written, "My brothers, not many of you should aspire to be teachers, since you know that those of us who are teachers shall be judged the more severely." Note, this godly, saintly apostle warns us not to take being a teacher too lightly, lest we set ourselves up, ill-prepared and poorly equipped. Yet there are many of those who, either from lust for honor or from hatred or from love of food, simply want to be considered as teachers when, in fact, it is clearly found that they sow nothing but discord and enmity. God help us. Do they think that their intention and undertaking is unknown to anybody, even though every believing, spiritual person knows and judges all things? We don't want to suggest that someone should be denied preaching because of consecration or for personal reasons, as long as he has been sent, i.e. duly installed as a bishop or sent as a messenger. In such a case, though, one should hasten to unbelievers and not confuse believers.

This self-elevation and confusing of others, the setting up of new, external things without consent of the Christian congregation, will never yield anything good, for it is not of God. The God of peace takes things in hand quite differently. He is not

as ungracious, bitter, quarrelsome as their own teaching often turns out to be now. It is found further that their work (i.e. those who heed their word) is to make contentious people who desire temporal things and become vindictive of those who before were remorseful, [432] god-fearing and peaceable. One may see by this that it is all sensuous desire and not spirit. And the devil comes so secretively, in such a bright appearance that the simple take him to be a spirit. Then again, many begin to see that it is all self satisfaction. May God remove all fog and deceit from our eyes that we might clearly learn to know and do his will.

I should like to have admonished as earnestly all workers in the gospel of Christ with the words of Paul in Col. 4:17, "Look to your office which you have received from the Lord, that you do justice to it. God has sent you to be guardians and pastors in the churches. Be alert and take care that the wolves do not tear them apart nor that dissention arise among Christ's flock." There ought to be no dissention among believers, though there is external warfare between believers and non-believers. But do not worry now when in all this the troublemaking baptists and preachers call you, and all who do not go it their way, "unbelievers", for each of you knows well how you trust in God. Now if they accuse one of you who trusts in God--of which there is no doubt--of being godless, you may see clearly that their spirit is that of the father of lies. Don't be scared off by the doctors whom they loudly acclaim to be on their side. We know well what the latter are capable of and whose spirit they have. Rather, consider that rebaptism can never be anything other than sectarian. Bold preaching will never lead to anything other than unrest, disorder and dissention. For rebaptism will always displease the majority of godly, quiet Christians because rebaptizers are immediately known to work toward community of goods and the abolition of temporal authority. Therefore it cannot become anything other than a sect which God tolerates until the elect and steadfast are revealed. Take heed that your flock stays clean of and walks free of adultery, immodesty, drunkenness, pride, blasphemy and every excess. Build up the faith, fear of God and love of neighbor. Teach that there is no greater worship than to honor him in purity. Teach [433] so that the eternal is not lost along with the temporal. For this you have clear testimony in Scripture. Do not get weary in well doing, for we have learned how much work it takes when they have been given too much consideration, as we have done. Yet they complain of harsh treatment. Now if they had been rewarded in keeping with their bold, dishonest talk, which they have engaged in and still do, we would undoubtedly be free of all unrest by now. Therefore, fight as worthy foot soldiers; do not leave your places and office.

The Lord comes soon; he is near. May he not catch us sleeping. Therefore be brave, be hopeful, and you shall, without doubt, overcome. God grant his grace. Amen.

In my work on baptism the entire sense has been distorted by one word. In M, on the second leaf, first part, line thirteen should read: "That the same had not been baptized with water earlier." [Z IV, 291 n. 8] Because of lack of time I have not had a chance to reread the booklet; others pointed this out to me. There may be many more mistakes; let everyone always look specifically to the context.

NOTES

1. Wächter [guardian] as pastor of a parish is a term Zwingli uses widely. However, he substitutes bishop or peoples' priest on other occasions. Cf. a treatise addressed to U. Compar of Uri in Z IV:150; **Der Hirt** (1523) in Z III:5ff. and **Eine Freundliche Bitte** (1522) in Z I:230.

2. Zwingli, a native of Wildhaus, in the Toggenburg, is aware of the need there to understand the Zurich reformation and its aim of providing a community of faith, solidly based on Scripture and informed by the norms of the early Church.

3. Removal of "Catholic" practices was slow enough. According to the **Kronik** of Bernard Wyss such removal did not come about until August 1528. Cf. Wyss, p. 97f.

4. Notable among Zurich Ananbaptists were K. Grebel, Felix Mantz, Georg Blaurock, W. Röubli and Simon Stumpf. After the initial adult baptism in Zollikon they spread rapidly to other areas of the Swiss confederacy.

5. Disputations of this kind were held on January 17, March 20 and again on November 6 and 8, 1525. Cf. Wyss, p. 79.

6. Some of the Anabaptists submitted to adult baptism since, they argued, that baptism in infancy could not be proved. Zwingli introduced baptismal registers to provide such proof for future generations of baptized infants.

7. Zwingli gives an assessment of the so-called Ittinger Uprising on July 17, 1524, in a Gutachten. Cf. Z III:511ff. The five inner cantons decided in December 1524 to demand restitution for damage done to the amount of twelve thousand guilders. Cf. EA IV 1a, p. 534f.

8. H. Bullinger, **Reformationsgeschichte**, three volumes, edited by J. Hottinger and H. H. Vögeli. See especially, I 237f.

9. Zwingli often uses the term Kilchhöre by which he understands a community of Christians, related to one another in an ordered structure with social, political, and spiritual dimensions.

10. On September 29, 1523, the counsel of Zurich issued an order for reform of the Grossminster. The Prophezei was officially opened on June 19, 1525. Lessons were given daily except for Fridays and Sundays and focused initially on the Old Testament only. Supplementary studies of the New Testament were offered by Myconius in the Frauminster across the river. Details are supplied by Wyss, p. 66 and by Bullinger, I:289ff.

11. A. Reinhard, daughter of a Zurich innkeeper, was the widow of Hans Meyer von Knonau since 1517. Zwingli "married" her secretly in the spring of 1522. The actual marriage ceremony took place on April 2, 1524. There were three children from the first and four children from the second marriage. Anna survived Zwingli by seven years; she died in December, 1538. Cf. Wyss, p. 33 and O. Farner, "Anna Reinhard," **Zwingliana** III/7-8 (1916):197-211, 229-245.

12. The R.S.V. translates v. 17, " . . . and called to him the elders of the church".

13. In Swiss German minder often means "lesser"; hence the qualification here.

14. A decree of September 29, 1523, stipulates what is to be done at the Grossminster. Note especially paragraph 4. Cf. E. Egli, **Actensammlung Zur Geschichte Der Zürcher Reformation, 1519 to 1533**, Zurich: Schabelitz, 1879. In 1973 a reprint was published by Nieuwekop Netherlands.

SUBSIDIARY ESSAY ON THE EUCHARIST

August 1525

(Z IV: 458-504)

Translated by Henry Preble

Revised and edited by H. Wayne Pipkin

Introduction

The **Subsidiary Essay on the Eucharist**, published in August, 1525, is one of the lesser known eucharistic treatises of Zwingli. Nonetheless, it played an important role both in the development of the eucharistic controversies and in the refinement of Zwingli's own eucharistic thinking.

There were two events of significance in early 1525 for the developing eucharistic controversy. First, in March, Zwingli published his well-known **Commentary on True and False Religion.** [1] In the **Commentary** Zwingli included sections on the sacraments and on the Eucharist. He asserted that he was going beyond his earlier writing, the **Exposition of the 18th Article.** [2] Especially important in his later treatment of the Eucharist is the affirmation of Christ as the food of faith, the interpretation of "is" as "signifies" and the prominence given to John 6 in understanding the Eucharist symbolically.

The second event was the April discussion before the City Council in which the second secretary, Joachim am Grüt, a pillar of the Catholic opposition in Zurich, accused Zwingli of heresy in his eucharistic views, while himself espousing a temperate Erasmian Catholic view of the Eucharist. The debate before the Council turned basically on Zwingli's exegesis of the words of institution and whether it was appropriate to interpret "is" as "signifies". [3] Am Grüt also questioned Zwingli's figurative interpretation of passages such as "the seed is the word of God" and "the field is the world". The importance of tropes for understanding Scripture became a fundamental theme in Zwingli's eucharistic writing.

The decision of the Council was to abolish finally the Mass and to institute the Lord's Supper according to apostolic custom. The vote was close enough to leave Zwingli concerned and he fretted about the question even in his dreams. In the early morning of April 13, Zwingli dreamed that the answer lay in the reference of Exodus 12:11 to the Passover. This passage then

was discussed in the School of Prophecy and thereafter became an important feature of Zwingli's eucharistic understanding. The reference to the dream became a matter of concern for other theologians and, as a result, many came to regard Zwingli with some suspicion because of it. [4]

Clearly Zwingli was concerned about the Catholic opposition at Zurich. His detailed response was the **Subsidiary Essay**. It is to be understood, therefore, as directed not against Luther but against the moderate Erasmian Catholicism of Joachim am Grüt and his followers. Insofar as the political motif is present, this treatise is directed to internal Swiss questions vis-a-vis Catholic Inner Switzerland. In addition, whereas the earlier eucharistic writings of Zwingli focused on an attack on aspects of Catholic doctrines such as transubstantiation and sacrifice, in this treatise Zwingli's thought itself became the focus of concern. Of necessity Zwingli had been forced to switch from the offensive to the defensive.

Published by Froschower in Latin in the fall of 1525, it was published in a German translation by George Binder the same year, and again in 1526. The treatise enjoyed an unexpected breadth of circulation, falling into the hands of friend and enemy alike. Several references by colleagues of Luther and by Luther himself reveal the first energetic reaction of the Lutheran camp to Zwingli's eucharistic thinking. Thus, although directed primarily against Zwingli's Catholic opponents, this treatise became a major factor in the eucharistic conflict between Luther and Zwingli.

HWP

NOTES

1. Cf. Z III:628-912 (tr. J III:43-343).

2. Z II:111-157. An English translation is found in Volume I of this set.

3. See Köhler, I:98ff.

4. See Köhler, I:110-111.

Huldrych Zwingli wishes grace and peace from God to the Distinguished Gentlemen, Bartholomew May of the Council of Bern, Wolfgang and Claudius, his sons, and James and Benedict, his grandsons, and to his great-grandsons and entire family. [1]

So great today is the audacity of false accusation under the pretext of serving Christ, most honorable sirs, that not a few both learned and pious men have been forced to hedge about on all sides anything that they inscribed to their friends, lest they should feel the bite of certain people who deny that a Christian can dedicate anything to another. This custom is to be left to the impious and the unbeliever, for they are always obtaining something out of the well-to-do by persistent flattery. I am myself not clear upon which class one ought rather to bestow to klaiein ("one's lamentations")--those harmless flatterers, unbelievers though they be, or these governors and censors of everything, who after all are aiming at piety in their own way, even if they are most biting. As if in fact the apostles Peter, John, Paul did not dedicate such long letters publicly to whole churches or privately to friends that they may fairly be considered regular books, not only because of their size but also because of the grandeur and importance of their contents! They wrote in such a way that their public letters benefitted all privately and their private letters benefitted all publicly. They made a letter what might have been made a book. So I might have made this whole booklet a letter instead of a book, preserving the same contents but not the same name. But I do not care to use this defense with these people who accept no explanation except that they say with their usual bold recklessness, "The apostles could do anything. Whatever they did was right and pious." I will accept their own theory while I send this little work to you. They say the reason why one may not indulge in such dedication is that those who do it are generally after something. If, then, I show that I am not after anything, I may properly inscribe the work to you. But, putting aside these Zoiloses, [2] lest I pursue them too closely, and someone may think they are of some account, [460] I will come to the real point. When this subsidiary essay, such as it is, was getting ready to come forth, you seemed the only suitable people to whom to direct its first flight, for the odor of piety is so thoroughly yours that no time can take it away. Moreover, the Church of Christ, also, has its models for posterity to observe and imitate, and how can these endure to posterity unless there be someone to commend them to the coming ages? Christ almost made it a law that the Magdalene's deed should come to all people's knowledge through

the words of the apostles. The apostles proclaim in their public letters those among the disciples especially distinguished for piety.

Now if I were commending you, most wise Bartholomew, because you long ago attained the rank of Councillor among the people of Bern, because you constantly display both wonderful wisdom and wonderful firmness, because you are surrounded by such cultivated children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren, all devoted to you and obedient to your slightest wish, because now that you rest from your activities they give great promise of great achievement, and show in the flower of youth what they will be by and by when they have closed your eyes for the sleep of blessedness, because a numerous and comely progeny is growing up unto you from them, because an abundance of all material blessings attends you, because you are loaded with the applause of the crowd, then, I say, those bitter critics might fairly attack me for commending you on account of such empty trifles (pardon the term) which any wind may blow away, since nothing human is perfectly secure. Moreover, since all persons proclaim your piety is so sound and your help so at the service of poor and struggling brethren in Christ, that it is clear you have not such a regard for the things I have mentioned, that you are in any way carried away by them. Rather, you bear in mind that you should cling to him who gave them rather than to these things themselves. Pious persons ought to be careful not to deprive coming generations of such an example.

These times are so tumultuous and hard beset that when persons of some future age shall gaze upon them, if indeed anyone shall depict them, I doubt not they will stand thunderstruck as in the presence of some sudden and vast storm, especially since all the disturbance takes its rise ar hestias ("from the hearthstone") of them that advertise--since they find no buyer, I will not say sell themselves as ecclesiastics. [461] This dumbfounded astonishment of posterity will be relieved by those exceptional examples rescued from the floods, for people will see that alongside the greatest wickedness the greatest virtue grew and fought. To you, therefore, I have determined to dedicate this little supplementary essay upon the Eucharist, not that it can worthily proclaim the glory you have in the gospel of Christ, but by just this fact that I have been freely permitted to inscribe to you a line of argument most offensive to the Roman party, I bear witness that you are such people as the words of the most learned ought to consecrate to all time. For there are some who violently reject the dedications of pious persons or of pious works. When, therefore, a thing so odious to the Roman party proclaims your names upon its very front, all will learn the unbroken and the unshaken power of your faith and integrity.

Brightly gleams the face of truth. It blinds the eyes of

the feeble-sighted so that they cannot bear to gaze upon it. Then the poor wretches strive not to cure the trouble, so as to be able to look like the healthy upon this pleasant light, but straightway cry out, "Away, away with the one who dares to bring forth this curse," that is, the light of truth. Therefore, whoever leaps forth to give help, and champions the light thus betrayed, will surely win the highest favor from the truth itself which is Christ. What, pray, is blinder, more dark or obscure than to suppose that in the symbolic bread of the Eucharist we eat the bodily flesh of Christ? What more foolish than to concoct with human rashness fictions with which to defend your utter madness, especially since neither the apostles nor the early believers in Christ so interpreted the words of the Savior as to allow us to suspect anything of the kind in them. But if you now bring out from the source of Scriptures that with which to set the truth most clearly even before the perceptions of sense, you expose yourself not to mockery and reviling but to manifold pains and deaths. If, then, some Theseus or Patroclus [3] should come forth who, far from deserting the cause, was ready to champion it, what could one call holier, more faithful, more worthy of a Christian?

There come forward in this time many whose impatience with idolatry makes them defend the truth. They teach that what is visible cannot be adored without impiety, that the flesh profits nothing [cf. John 6:63], that the bodily flesh of Christ cannot be eaten. If we refuse our aid to these champions, we shall not escape the reproach of being sluggish servants [cf. Mt. 25:26-30; Lk. 19:22-26], especially since some, while understanding the matter, yet take care of their skins by maintaining their silence, [462] and others have drunk so deeply of the mandrake of the soul that neither blows nor taunts can rouse them to any spiritual understanding.

Let us stand by the truth! However the coming ages shall treat her, let us at least not fail her! Fated to perish are the minds that rage for the sake of the flesh and find no salvation in the promise, but full of strength and destined to endure forever are those that cling to the abundant grace of the Crucified One. For they shall have everlasting life.

Read, therefore, this little supplement of mine and judge it by faith, nor fear them, that trusting in certain giants of other views, promise themselves a pitiable victory. I am well armed.

Christ keep you all safe!

Zurich, August 17, 1525.

SUBSIDIARY ESSAY
OR CROWN OF THE WORK ON THE EUCHARIST

by Huldrych Zwingli

I know there will not be lacking people who, as soon as they see the title of this pamphlet, will say it is quite right to send a subsidiary force to back up a feeble band, but I have no intention of replying to their pleasantries for two reasons. You can never say anything with such careful exactitude that they will not venture to ridicule it, and they upon whom the main army has not been able to make any impression will with difficulty yield to a subsidiary force.

Yet there are not a few who have been moved by my former treatise on the Eucharist so that they allowed into consideration a most evident thing, to which their ears were long since more closed than to incantations. It is for these that this subsidiary essay is intended, that what is incomplete in the earlier work because of the speed and haste of its publishing may here be in some part made good. Part others will provide. For I am the most unfortunate of men in publishing books, and that is brought about by the unkindness of the times. These are daily dragging me out of silence and hiding places for thinking, and compel me to write, yet meanwhile they persistently deny me the leisure and time for ripening. It follows that all my writings might more justly be called impulses than real books. But thanks be to God who teaches me by this sign, as it were, to refrain from any passion for glory and publish everything in simple faith, so that the further it is removed from the refinement and pride of art the more mighty it will be [463] for magnifying His glory, by which it is made clear to all people that my weapons are not of the flesh but are powerful through God. Having, then, quite a while ago dealt with the matter of the Eucharist along with other topics in my **Commentary**, [4] and having published the book, I afterwards

remembered certain things which I had intended to insert in the early part of the treatment of the subject. I also thought of certain new things which, if I had had time for really mature consideration, could not have escaped me as seasonable to put in before the end. In the meantime, various people have raised various objections, of which I shall deign to reply to those that either through their own obscurity or through the poisoning of the critics have seemed capable of producing an injurious effect.

But first of all I have determined to meet the slanders of certain people. For there are people who say that I published this exposition of Christ's words unseasonably, and there are others who call me a disciple of Carlstadt. [5] Let them hear, therefore, for Christ's sake, my reply to these strictures, which shall be as true as it is free from all bitterness.

I have been, for more years than it is now fitting to say, of this opinion concerning the Eucharist. I have published it in correspondence and in the **Commentary.** [6] It was my purpose not to scatter it among the public heedlessly, lest I might be casting pearls before swine, but to wait until I had conferred much with learned and pious men, so that a cause regarded by nearly everybody as of the greatest import might, when it was at length put forth, both have many champions and turn away that noisy ill-will by which its mere mad outcries frightens pious minds from reading, listening, and judging in such cases. The deliberation progressed satisfactorily. Those with whom I joined issue kept coming over to my side, nay, generally breathed in new life, like men freed from long imprisonment, who had come back from darkness and deep solitude into the light and arms of their friends. It was then Carlstadt came out with his exposition, a very violent one, as even devoted Carlstadtians declared after carefully considering the exposition of the fathers that I have restored to its rights. I have learned also that he determined to come to Zurich for no other reason than to confer with me upon a thing unfamiliar to the ears of the people, though the melancholic spirit of certain people so thoroughly frightened him away from association with me that he did not even call upon me. And he was so fortified and [464] strengthened by the drug that he did not confer at all with the ministers of the word upon this matter, either at Basel or at Strassburg.

Those people of whom I said a little while ago that they were imbued with a melancholic spirit, knew my view about the Eucharist, yet could not be induced by any argument to agree with it. When, however, they saw Carlstadt's exposition, they flew to Basel, and carrying his books upon their shoulders filled not only the cities, towns and cantons but almost all the farm houses with them. The harvest did not come up to their expectations. Few [465] accepted the view, though people were, I think,

frightened away by nothing but the harshness and violence of the exposition. What could I do next, I who am set over the preaching of the word at Zurich, since a great part of the brethren approved the doctrine in the main? They had all come to know in their hearts from faith and my preaching how extraordinary it is to look for flesh and blood here, when Christ has said that his teachings about his flesh and blood are spirit and life, and yet so violent an expositon was not acceptable to them. What, I say, could I do? Push them back into the old labyrinth contrary to my opinion in this matter, especially after I had seen the views and exposition of the fathers? I was driven to disclose forthwith the trope there is in the Lord's words, and I did it so successfully that the brethren understood almost before I had explained it, though they had recoiled violently from Carlstadt's exposition. This is the kind of disciple of Carlstadt I am. Not that I deprecate the use of the name of a man almost everywhere unknown, except insofar as I dislike all names of sects. I, who fill the position of minister of the gospel, ought more than others to refrain from stamping people with the names of sects, since there is such an abundance of people who dare to make of bad repute, by means of hated names of sects and men, the purest teaching and ministry of the gospel itself.

This is, I think, answer enough to the first slander also. How could I have come forth at a better time than when this matter was involved in an actually dangerous controversy? Nay, how could I have seasonably kept silence when the fire of contention had already begun to blaze? I had not promised to keep back this old opinion forever, but only so long [466] as should be necessary to guard against offenses and avoid an uproar. I am not ignorant of how the enemies of Christ abuse the simplicity of the people to provoke disturbances. There was also the promise of the **Commentary**, for I had undertaken with God's help to finish that for the spring fair at Frankfurt. Ought I then to have concealed what I really believed, or to have pretended what I by no means believed? Certainly I am not ignorant of the fact that a Christian Proteus [7] should be all things to all people, but I know also that divine providence lays his bonds upon us in such a way that whether we will or no, we are forced to bring out what makes for his glory and the use of pious minds, even if very great danger threatens us. I brought out, therefore, this true view of our thanksgiving, just when the situation demanded it, when Carlstadt was making a vigorous race indeed but altogether off the course. [8] Whoever, therefore, splashes me with his name simply show their own unfairness. For who is so mad as not to see that I should never have come to Carlstadt's view if I had not learned from other authors that there is a trope in the Lord's words here, not an amphiboly nor an apostrophe nor a metabola? [9] But I come back to the subject.

I have not thought it worthwhile to go deeply again into what I have brought out in the **Commentary.** I hope enough has been done for the really pious and strong in the faith who trust themselves to Christ in the deluge of today, as Noah once entrusted himself and his people and the remnant that was to survive the perishing world to the wonderful ark. [Cf. Gen. 7:1-9.] They that trust in Christ no longer demand Christ according to the flesh, for they know that the flesh profits absolutely nothing if you eat it. [Cf. Jn. 6:54, 63.] But at the same time it does not escape them that it profits very much if you believe that Christ was offered up in the flesh for you, [467] and trust in him. This is the cork by which they swim away. By this ark are they saved. They know that when Christ yielded up his life upon the cross, the veil of the temple was rent in two for this [cf. Mt. 27:51; Mk. 15:38; Lk. 23:45], that the believers might see all things laid bare and open that before had been wrapped in shadows and darkness. For when the light is at hand, that is, the thing itself which was prefigured by forms like shadows, it is not right that any darkness be left, unless indeed the light is so faint that it cannot penetrate such heavy obscurity. This is so untrue of Christ that no mind can conceive him as mingled with any darkness. Yet what darker obscurity was ever heard of, pray, than the notion that flesh and blood are eaten in that celebration (panegyric) in which the bread and wine are consumed? What nations, what peoples, what cities have anywhere since humankind was made, I will not say invented or accepted such an argument, but reported it as invented or accepted?

They, therefore, who trust in Christ, know that salvation rests upon this thing only--that they trust--and that salvation has nowhere been promised for eating. For what is written [Jn. 6:56], "Whoever eats my flesh and drinks my blood dwells in me, and I in him," they know is spirit and life, and they know that they abide in Christ by faith and, on the other hand, have him in themselves as a present giver of comfort and peace. Since, therefore, salvation has not been promised to carnal eating, they care nothing for this flesh, satisfied to believe that it was offered up for us, and to trust in him who was offered up in it. They know that flesh sits at the right hand of the Father and moves not thence until it comes back for the final reckoning with the whole world. [10] Salvation depends upon faith, not upon corporeal eating, and not upon the faith by which you imagine that you believe any imaginings of your own, but upon that by which you trust in the Son of God laid out on the cross for you. It has not, I say, seemed best to repeat what has been said at some length in the **Commentary** on this matter, since in the minds of the truly pious this doctrine is now securely established, that bodily flesh is not eaten here, but that there is a trope in Christ's words.

That this may be made plainer I will first pass to the

points that escaped my notice when I was writing the **Commentary**. To these I shall add those which afterwards occurred to me. Finally I will make answer to certain criticisms.

Two points escaped me, one concerned with the express words of Christ, the other consisting of an argument or line of reasoning deduced from his words.

The words of Christ are those given in Matthew 26:29 where, after instituting the Eucharist, he says, "But I say [468] unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it anew with you in my Father's kingdom." By these words Christ calls "wine" or "fruit of the vine" that very thing which he had just named figuratively his blood. Nor can it be argued that a new discourse was begun with this, since the conjunction "but" forces us to look to the preceding words and makes the meaning, "You, indeed, have eaten bread and drunk wine as a symbol of commemoration, but I did not drink and will not drink of it until it is filled with new wine in my Father's kingdom." And that Christ did not drink is clear from Luke [cf. Lk. 22:17, 18] who no doubt for this reason says that he did not allow himself to touch the wine before he instituted this festival and the Eucharist, in order that it might be plain that he abstained from wine when going to the altar just as much as in old times the priests had abstained from it when about to make offering.

We see that Origen [11] held this view in his Homily 7.1 on Leviticus. Whether, therefore, it was before ordaining the commemoration or immediately after the apostles had eaten the symbol that he declared he would abstain from wine, he certainly calls what they had drunk "wine". He never would have done this if, according to our visionary notions, he had given physical blood to be drunk or the apostles had believed that such was handed them or drunk by them. For what uncertainty and confusion would have arisen in their minds if he had not called "wine" as soon as they had drunk it what he had just named as blood. Would not every one of them have said to himself, "Please, wine is not blood. Why, then, did he call it 'blood'?" It is, therefore, plain from the very calmness of the disciples that they understood Christ's language rightly, but symbolically. Nor ought it seem to anybody absurd that the disciples, at other times rather dull, immediately understood this form of speech. They were accustomed both to Christ's language and to the symbol of commemoration. They had lived so closely with Christ that they could, by this time, estimate the force of his words from a mere gesture. They had celebrated the passover so often that what was instituted here had at once for them some likeness to the passover, where also the words "For it is the passover" [Ex. 12:11] had been used figuratively--of which a little later. We clearly see, therefore,

that what he had given them to drink was called "wine" by Christ himself, and that the disciples thought they drank wine, not blood. And it is exceedingly strange that we have all been so deluded in regard to this speech of Christ, "I will not drink of the fruit of the vine, etc." [Mt. 26:29] [469] that no one has made it out, when from this one fact we might have recognized the truth in this matter, as one can a lion from its claw. [12]

The other thing that escaped my notice before is an argument drawn from Christ's own words in Matthew 26:27-28 and Mark 14:24. Luke's words [Lk. 22:20] I have examined in the **Commentary.** [13] These words are, "Drink all of this, for this is the blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." Here I will note only the word to, which is equivalent to qui est ("which is"). It is clear to all who have a moderate knowledge of Greek that protaktikoi, that is, "prepositive words" coming after the particular word to which they refer pass over into hypotaktikous, that is, "enjoined words", or what we call relatives, although generally relatives in Latin have not so much force as these subjoined prepositive articles, except perhaps the one word ille when used as a relative. For prepositive Greek words of this sort, provided they are placed later than the words to which they belong, are used for qui est or quod est or the like, without a repetition of the word to which reference is made, while Latin relatives only recall the word to which they refer without including the force of the substantive verb. [469:18] When, therefore, in Matthew the designation of the symbolic cup is after this fashion: touto gar esti to haima mou to tēs kainēs diathēkēs, to peri pollōn ekchynnomenon [Mt. 26:28] etc., that is, "Hoc enim est sanguis meus, qui est novi testamenti, qui pro multitudine effunditur" ("for this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many, etc."). The second word to here has the force of qui est, so that Christ's whole remark means, "For this (the cup, namely that he was offering, as is easily seen if you examine carefully this conjunction gar, that is, enim ("for") and the word to, qui ("which") with haima, sanguis ("blood") before it) is my blood, which blood of mine is the blood of the new testament, which, that is, in that or so far as it is, shed for many." Here, therefore, this word to, qui est ("which is"), supplies a solid basis for my argument in this way: "The blood of Christ, insofar as it was shed, is the blood of the new testament." But when Christ offered the cup, his blood had not yet been [470] shed. Therefore he did not offer them the blood of the testament to drink.

It becomes clear, therefore, that this cup was not the blood of the testament, nor the testament itself, but a symbol of the testament. The first remark or proposition, namely, "The blood of Christ, insofar as it was shed, is the blood of the new testament," gains strength in this way. Christ himself explains

by his own words that this is the meaning when he says [Mt. 26:28], "which is shed for many for the remission of sins." The reason or purpose, therefore, of the shedding of blood is the remission of sins? It is. But the free remission of sins through the blood of Christ is the new testament, as Jeremiah 31:31 foretold and Paul explains in Hebrews 8:8 and 9:15 and Colossians 1:14. It follows, therefore, that the blood of Christ became the blood of the testament only when it was shed for us. For where a testament is, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator, Hebrews 9:16. The second proposition, namely, when Christ offered the cup, his blood had not yet been shed, is confirmed in this manner. In Luke 22:15, Christ says, "With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer." Since, therefore, he had not yet suffered, his blood had not yet been shed. For that he should die and suffer for us, and that his blood should be shed for us, are equivalent expressions, as I have abundantly shown elsewhere, and as may be seen from Romans 6:10, Hebrews 9:12 and 1 Peter 2 and 3. No doubt, therefore, the third proposition also, which, for example, is gathered from these: "therefore Christ did not offer them the blood of the testament to drink" stands so firm and unshaken that no skill and no force can overthrow or undermine it. Hence today we drink not the blood itself of the testament, but a symbol of the blood of the testament.

But lest someone find in another part a chink to break in by, saying, "Although we do not here drink the blood which the Jews drained on the cross, we yet drink that by which he lived. For he says, 'For this is my blood.' Since, therefore, it had not then been shed, and yet his words cannot be vain, it must be that blood is drunk, albeit, perhaps, only that by which he lived"--lest, I say, shameless contentiousness should hope in this way to make itself a path to physical blood, these words of Christ must be well weighed: "of the new testament". [471] For since they are not willing to admit a trope here, they are forced to confess that what is drunk is the blood of the testament. Since, therefore, the blood of the testament did not yet exist, because it had not yet been shed, they will be forced to confess that this speech of Christ is altogether vain and self-contradictory. And what can be said that is more wicked, impure and abominable?

And yet it is impossible to avoid being driven into this hole if one does not admit a trope. For when they stubbornly insist that this word est should be taken hyparktikōs, that is, substantively, so as to mean that what was offered really was the blood of Christ, this is opposed by what follows, namely that this blood was not the blood of the testament, for it had not yet been shed. It will follow, therefore, at the same time, that there was no blood there, for if the blood of the testament was not given then, absolutely no blood was given. For it is only this blood that is said to have been given then, if this word est is

taken in the substantive sense, as they persist in saying. And this could not be given because it had not been shed, and it was not the blood of the testament unless it was shed. So distinctly is it proved from these words of Christ that the blood of the testament was not given to the disciples at that time, however much my opponents rely upon these words for claiming physical blood.

I know that many darts can be thrown against me here, but they are vain. For instance, these words: "Although the blood had not yet been shed, it was shed in a little while and it could have been brought to pass by the hidden power of God that the apostles drank the shed blood, though it had not yet been visibly shed. All things are present to God," are a kind of extravagant tale or unsuitable place of refuge. But what reason is there, pray, why we are not willing to make up our differences and come to an agreement with the trope rather than weave an endless chain of contention? Everyone knows that a contentious person never lacks for an answer, yet everyone of clear and solid faith also knows that, however we pretend the contrary, such answers savor of quarrelsome shamelessness rather than unstained piety, even if we perjure ourselves by the altars of all the gods of heaven or hell. For if there is any remnant of truth in the human heart, we shall openly confess that this notion of physical flesh and blood has never been free from suspicion in our sight. When, therefore, certain people leap forward so shamelessly to champion it, they seem to mock at the judgement and faith of all, just as if nobody could see what faith was, or blindness, trickery, and philautia ("self-love"). But if we accept the trope, we now sail into port. [**14**] Everything is clear and secure, and neither faith nor the common humanity nor the spirit of Scripture, which is full of tropes, raises the least difficulty. [472] Let us, therefore, depart from destructive strife, which, when united with her pernicious sister, obstinacy, would sooner see all things fall to destruction, even the truth itself, than give in. Let us see, therefore, how Christ's words square, if we admit the trope. "This cup is a figure or symbol of my blood, which is the blood of the new testament because it is shed for the sins of many."

We find such tropes frequently in Scripture, and I will now speak briefly about them.

You find in the Holy Scriptures instances where things typified take the names of the things typifying them or the like. Thus when Christ says that he is the vine [cf. Jn. 15:5], he who on account of a certain likeness of characteristics may be represented by a vine as a sort of symbol is kata metaphoran ("metaphorically") called "the vine", though he was not really a vine if you insist upon the material substance of the vine, while he is very thoroughly the real vine of which we are the branches

in that we flourish in him and by his grace, and unless we are in him, wither and dry up and cannot bring forth any fruit. [Cf. Jn. 15:1-5.] Since, therefore, the vine displays a sort of type and image of God it becomes the name of that which it typifies, and Christ is called "the vine" metaphorically on account of kinship of characteristics, as has been said.

You can, on the other hand, find instances where the things that typify put on the names of the things typified, as when "sheep" is put for "the pious", or "wolves" for "the wicked" or for "tyrants" [Mt. 10:16], "the field" for "the world", "the enemy" for "the devil", the "reapers" for the "angels" in Matthew 13:38, 39. Of this kind of metaphor all the Scriptures and all discourses are full. [15] We cannot comfortably employ even everyday speech without them, calling one man a "pillar" or "the prow" or "stern" of the ship of state, another a "scourge", or a "devastating storm", or a "Catiline" or "Maelius". [16] When, therefore, you say that Camillus is a pillar of the city, or that [473] Cicero is the crowning ridge of the city you evidently speak figuratively. [17] For neither is a real, that is, a material pillar or ridge. Suddenly stupid people jump up and cry that the thing was not said by analogy or figuratively, but that Camillus was really a pillar, and men more senseless than stocks and stones make a statue of one, a gable-end or ridge-pole of the other. So also this, "The rock was Christ" is not to be understood in the sense that Christ is a rock made of stone, but since a rock has a certain likeness or resemblance to God, Christ is substituted for the name "rock". And when they say, "Christ was really a rock", they desire to impose upon our simple-mindedness. For this word "really" is ambiguous. It is sometimes used of that which is in substance or essence of so and so, or as they say, essentially so and so, and sometimes of that which is so and so kath' hyperbolēn, that is, by preeminence or beyond the ordinary. When, therefore, I say that a statue is really of stone, I mean that it is stone in substance. I do not thus mean that Christ is really a rock, that is, a rock in substance, but is really a rock, that is, beyond all rock in firmness, solidity, stability. But it is doubly a trope when I say, "is really a rock", and there are two tropes in this expression, "Christ is really a rock"--hyperbole and metaphor. Thus, therefore, faith or the fellow-feeling of the faithful cannot deny that the typifier has in the expression in question borrowed the name of the typified. [474]

This ought not to seem absurd to anyone, namely that a symbol or type should be used for the thing it typifies or of which it is a symbol, so that when we make commemoration in this festival by these symbols, bread and wine, of the body of Christ, his real, material body slain for us, and of his blood shed for us, we call the bread his body and the wine his blood because Christ called them so, and the disciples are clearly seen to have understood the matter so. Hereupon a certain person contradicts

in a pamphlet so excellent that if it had been offered to Sylla [18] it would have received a large reward from him, on condition that its author write no more--contradicts, I say, in this way: "This is metōnymia ("metonymy") whence this word est ("is") cannot be understood as significat ("signifies") but must be taken as hyparktikōs, that is, in the "substantive sense". What can you do with that kind of person, who in trying to defend himself by figures of speech which he does not understand, denies that a speech is figurative or tropical, when according to his own testimony there is a figure there? Is not metōnymia ("metonymy") a trope?

Come, let us see what metonymy really is, that you may yourself see, my fine fellow, that you do not understand your own cawing. There is a metonymy according to Plutarch [19] in the life of Homer, whom you, no doubt, have never even greeted from afar, when an expression which properly applies to one thing signifies something else through some relation or connection between the two. Thus we call wheat or bread "Ceres", wine "Bacchus" or "Lyaeus", because Ceres was the author of one [475], Bacchus of the other, and this implies an anaphora, that is, a relation, connection or analogy between them. But if in the expressions "This is my body" and "This is my blood" there is a metonymy, you obtain nothing, except, as it is said in trying to avoid Scylla, you fall into Charybdis. [20] For in your wish to deny that est is used for significat you make clear by your metonymy that the symbols bread and wine are no more themselves the flesh and blood of Christ than wine and bread are themselves Bacchus and Ceres. These are called so because Ceres taught to cultivate wheat as Bacchus taught the cultivation of the vine, and so also Christ instituted the Eucharist. Therefore these symbols, the bread and wine, are called Christ, the body of Christ, the blood of Christ, by metonymy, not because they are those things, for example, Christ's body and blood, but because they were instituted by Christ.

I called the figure a metaphor, because this trope is of the widest accessibility both in the case of nouns and in the case of verbs. When, therefore, I say that the trope in our expression should be explained as a metaphor, I make it free to you to explain by metaphor the nouns or this verb est or both. Take the nouns first: "This is my body," that is, "This bread is a symbol of my body." Now take the verb, "This is my body," that is, "This bread signifies my body, that is to say, given for you." Finally explain both noun and verb tropically: "This is my body," that is, "This bread signifies a symbol of my body," that is, "not otherwise than like a symbol, for I do not want to say a symbol of a symbol, it will constantly recall to you the memory of my body which has been offered up for you." And when you explain the expression by metonymy, do not both expositions aim to show that the bread and wine are in no way the body and blood but signs of these? Except that you say there is a metonymy where, properly speaking,

there is no metonymy. But now I will draw in my sails [21] as far as this argument is concerned. We can, I say, discover from the very words of Christ that they must be explained by tropes, as has now been shown in regard to the offering of the cup. He used such words that, unless you admit a trope, you are forced to confess that the words are not merely obscure but contradictory, vain and utterly inconsistent. While, on the other hand, if you admit a trope, everything is clear and easy to understand, and nothing is left which causes trouble. So much for the argument which is based on Christ's words spoken upon offering the cup. If they compel us to admit a trope here, as they certainly do, [476] there is nothing further to say of the words spoken upon handing the bread. For they are a part of one and the same institution. Therefore, passing over these, I go on to the other points.

And the points that occurred or were suggested to me as new are also two, of which one is testimony of Scripture, the other an argument based on Scripture, but I will reverse the order and put the argument in the first place here. It is not mine, but Heinrich Engelhardt's, once Doctor of Pontifical Law, now a poor disciple of Christ, [22] who when we were discussing on April 11 before the Council of the Diacosii, that is the Two Hundred, the question of the abolition of the Mass and adoration of the bread and wine, a certain clerk [23] (whether he be white or black it is not now my purpose to say) happened to get up and cry out in this fashion: "I do not, Gentlemen of the Council, occupy a rank or place that would entitle me to speak before you if a subject, however important, were under discussion that had to do with the administration of the state, but since the cardinal point of the salvation of souls is at stake here and faith itself in peril, I think it is every man's right to speak out what he thinks. I, therefore, firmly believing that in this bread real body and real blood are eaten, bear witness that I hold this opinion and shall not suffer myself to be torn from it, and I hope that you, Gentlemen of the Council, are not going to drive me in any way into Zwingli's opinion. And you, Zwingli," he said, "have most vigorously withstood the subtleties of the sophists, but now, to say plainly what I think, you seem to be trying to ensnare us again with the scoffing of the sophists."

And he made much other complaint as to the matter, and as he thought, cleverly and weightily. Then I answered those of his remarks which seemed worthy of answer, for example, that no one had ever been forced to faith at Zurich or to anything. Nor was it sophistical for anyone to explain the word est ("is") by significat ("signifies")--he had said this was sophistical. When, I say, I had made answer to the points that [477] have something of strength, he gave himself to this weapon, "This is what I believe and what the words 'This is my body' say. Est is a substantive verb; therefore it cannot have any other meaning than that bread

is flesh," and similar objections which the devotees of the flesh make.

Then, I say, Heinrich, a man of weighty judgement, said, "Listen a bit. I will show you abundantly from the Holy Scriptures that the bread cannot be the body of Christ." Then he talked in this fashion, or thereabouts: "Gentlemen of the Council, if in any matter we have ever been perniciously in error, it has been the case in the adoration of the Eucharist, and not only perniciously but also foolishly. For since by Christ's own admonition, who bids us examine the Scriptures [cf. Jn. 5:39], we ought to interpret Scripture by Scripture, what reason, pray, why we should not traverse the whole Scripture of the New Testament to make clear the various ways in which the body of Christ is spoken of in this passage? Now we find that there is altogether a threefold mention of Christ's body in the sacred writings. First we find that natural body spoken of which was born of the Virgin, by which he hungered and thirsted, felt heat and cold, was glad or sad, and which was finally slain upon the altar of the cross for us. Secondly, the body raised from the dead and purified from defects, which he presented miraculously to his disciples to touch. Finally, his mystical body, the Church. Let us consider carefully, therefore, which of these bodies is given here to the disciples. Not the first one, the natural body, for in that case it could not be eaten without being chewed and ground up by the teeth like other foods, and from this kind of eating Christ himself turned us away in John 6:63, when in answer to the Jews who were thinking of the eating of a material body while he was speaking of the trust to be put in himself, he said, 'The flesh profits nothing.' By this he was wishing particularly to show the error of their delusion as to corporeal eating. He profits nothing in this way, either ground by the teeth or digested by the stomach. Besides, if the disciples had eaten him in this fashion, they must have eaten in a different way from us, for when they ate he had not yet been slain on the cross. Furthermore, how could he have been eaten in the body who was to be stretched bodily upon the cross? Since, therefore, he says himself that he profits nothing swallowed in the body, it is established that the words 'This is my body' should on no account be understood of the natural body so that the bread is the body. For the body profits nothing in this fashion, since it is flesh. Nor were they able to have understood concerning the body in the second manner. First because the disciples would not have eaten him in the way we do, for when they ate he had not yet been slain, much less [478] raised from the dead. Secondly, because this body, which by rising from the dead he made absolutely pure and undefiled, he took to heaven where he sits at the right hand of God until that day when he will judge the world, waiting until his enemies be made his footstool, Hebrews 10:13. As to the mystical body which is the Church, the words of Christ cannot be understood of it. Were it so, the words 'This is my

body' would have no other meaning than 'this bread is my Church'. For the Church is not given for us, and there immediately follow the words 'which is given for you'. Since, therefore, Christ was given for us, not the Church (for what is the Church but ourselves?), we may infer that there is a trope in these words, and that they cannot be understood in any way as applying to the carnal body of Christ."

The aforementioned clerk objected that Christ was born of a virgin and that this was just as repugnant to our feeling as was the carnal eating. I made answer at the time briefly, but since I am going to treat the objection more at length later, I will say nothing on the point now.

But inasmuch as I have begun to touch upon the story, and it all makes for my purpose, I will continue it further.

After the altercation with the clerk, the Council decreed that after dinner four councillors--Leo, Megander, Myconius, and I--should hold a conference with Heinrich Engelhardt, and thoroughly [479] ventilate the important matter. [24] And this was done chiefly for the purpose of satisfying in every respect certain noisy people. We discussed the question for some time from various points of view, but (lest someone accuse me of betraying secrets) I will only say the result of the whole discussion was that on the next day, April 12th, the entire subject was again brought before the Council.

I will speak here in passing about the usage in regard to the Council of the Two Hundred, on account of which some people revile us because we allow things which ought to belong to the whole Church to be managed by two hundred, when the Church of the whole city and neighboring territory numbers seven thousand more or less. [25] Let these people, therefore, understand this: I who am set over the preaching of the word at Zurich have previously given free warning to the Two Hundred that I suffer the things that belong to the jurisdiction of the whole Church to be put in their hands for decision only on condition that their deliberations and decisions be under the guidance of the word, also that they themselves do not occupy the place of the Church except insofar that the Church itself has by silent consent thus far kindly accepted their enactments or decisions. I have published the same view among the entire Church. I have reminded the people at this time, when some are carried away by the most senseless feelings which they yet desire to have regarded as the Spirit, if it please the gods, certain things cannot safely be entrusted to the general congregation. Not that I am afraid that the Most High God will fail to direct his Church, but that the occasion for contention should not be brought in while the subject is still in its early stages.

I have, therefore, advised the people to entrust the decision in external things to the Two Hundred on the condition that everything be ordered according to the rule of the word, promising at the same time that if they began to scorn the authority of the word, I would immediately come forward and [480] proclaim it. The Church has until this day consented, though it published no decree upon the matter. By the quiet and calmness which it has thus far manifested, it shows its consent so clearly that one may be sure that it would take it very ill if anyone should try to block the advance of the gospel by cunning inquisitiveness. It knows at the same time that we ought so to use these things for the honor of Christ and ourselves, and that Christian peace shall be maintained. Whatever, therefore, comes up in regard to changes in rites and ceremonies is referred to the Council of Two Hundred, not without precedent, for Antioch sent only two to Jerusalem, Paul and Barnabas, and did not itself pronounce judgement as it had the right to do. [Cf. Acts 15:2ff.] The reason was that it feared unrestrained contention which is apt to be the more violent the bigger the assembly. That the Two Hundred act in these matters not in their own name but in that of the Church appears from this: that whatever is determined upon among us, for example, in the matter of images, the celebration of the Eucharist, and the like, they leave free to the churches in the towns and the outlying territory, where, doubtless, since the churches are not so very large, they see that there is no great reason to fear a flaming up of contentiousness. The plan has worked in such a way you can easily tell it is from God. Thus, before everything, I have been accustomed to instruct the multitude well in the questions which were to be considered by the Council. Consequently, it has happened that whatever the Two Hundred together with the ministers of the word ordained had already been decided in the minds of the faithful. Afterwards I have approached the Council of Two Hundred that in the name of the whole Church they might order carried out what circumstances demanded, so that all things should be done at the right time and with propriety. Therefore it has happened that the evil of contentiousness has been kept away from the Church at large simply because of its very large numbers and the recklessness of impulsive feelings, and was relegated to a place where it could be listened to without danger and overcome. For the ears of magistrates and judges become hardened to quarreling and strife. This is the way we employ at Zurich the Council of Two Hundred, our highest power, in place of the Church.

Now I return to the subject in hand.

When, therefore, on the twelfth day of April, I went back to the Council and worked to have the mass altogether abolished, our clerk stepped forth again and sang the same song, adding that I had, to be sure, taught that the word "is" in Christ's utter-

ance here was used for "signifies" [481] but had hardly proved by testimony of Scripture that it should be so understood. The expressions "The seed is the word of God", Luke 8:11, and "The field is the world, the enemy is the devil, etc.", Matthew 13:38, 39, had nothing to do with the case, for Christ spoke in these instances parabolice ("in parables")--the learned gentleman decked out his German speech with this ornament--but not so when he said, "This is my body." I answered him briefly in this way (and I make the same answer now to those who care for contention rather than truth, and have the audacity to hunt out in so plain a matter a tangled and dark spot in which to hide, displaying their own ignorance like our clerk, and saying that in the aforesaid passages Christ spoke in parables and there is a trope hidden in them): no one can deny that Christ put forth two parables, one in Luke 8 on the seed of the word, the other on the seed of the devil in Matthew 13. In these passages no one can help seeing that the language is figurative throughout the whole text of the parable. When the parable is finished, the disciples ask in one passage, "What is this parable?" and in the other, "Explain to us the parable of the tares." Christ, first saying, "it has been given to you to know the mysteries of the kingdom of God, etc.", thereupon discloses the parable and shows what each thing signifies.

Who then is so dull and stupid as to say there is a parable where Christ is avowedly explaining the parable? And when he says, "The seed of which I spoke to you just now is the word of God, etc.", who is so senseless as to say that the parable is still going on, when by the perfectly clear words of Christ and the disciples, it has been so evidently broken off? If there is a parable here also, where, pray, is the parable of the seed and the tares explained? Yet these people raise an outcry all the same, that it must be a parable, because the field is not the world nor a seed the world; therefore, the utterance cannot help being a parable.

This was just what I wanted, that you should display your ignorance, namely that you do not know the difference between a parable and a trope. A parable is an analogy or a comparison. A trope is the transferring and changing of a word from its natural meaning, and the adaptation of it to another having some affinity with it, as a plant is transferred from its native soil to another. [**26**] It is a parable when in Matthew 25:14 Christ says, "As a man traveling into a far country, who called his own servants, and delivered unto them his goods, etc." For this shadows forth the ministry and urgent promulgation of the word. It is a trope when he says, [482] "You ought, therefore, to have put my money at the exchangers," [Mt. 25:27] by which he signifies that they to whom that office had been entrusted ought to have persevered with the word. It is a parable when he says [Mt. 13:47f.], "The kingdom of heaven is like unto a net cast into the sea, etc." It is a trope when he says [Jn. 15:5], "I am the vine, you are the

branches." So also there is a parable when he says [Mt. 13:3], "A sower went out to sow his seed, etc." It is a trope when he says [Lk. 8:11], "The seed is the word of God." No seed, for example that of wheat or barley, is the word, but the seed of which he had spoken was the symbol of the word. Nor can anyone properly say that these examples from Scripture do not apply here because in them Christ is speaking in a parable. For he had already finished the parable and was plainly showing what he had intended by it. So also in our passage, "This is my body," the word "is" is put tropically for "signifies", so that the sense is "This signifies or typifies that my body has been given for you," or "This is a symbol of my body that has been given for you."

I answered, I say, to this effect, though less at length than here, and, putting away contentiousness, left the Council. The Council promulgated a decree [27] in the name of the whole Church after this fashion or thereabouts: "You shall celebrate the Eucharist hereafter, God willing, according to the institution of Christ and the apostles. The weak who are still in a crude state of faith may, simply on this account, employ the old way. The mass shall be altogether abrogated, abolished, done away with, and shall not be performed even tomorrow." Presently, and may it prove of happy issue, the whole Church gave thanks, save only a few of the weaker and more ignorant--to say nothing really harsh--who could not yet even bear to gaze upon the brightness of the new light. Christ Jesus, God and human, the true light, enlighten us all, so that whoever is under illusion may plainly see what is true.

Not the smallest part of my labor was still left--the bringing forward of illustrations not combined with any parable. I began, therefore, to reflect and to go over everything again, yet no other illustrations occurred to me than what are given in the **Commentary**, [28] or whatever came to mind was like those. But when the thirteenth day was at hand (I am telling what is true--so true that though I would gladly hide it, my conscience compels me to utter what the Lord has imparted to me--though I know very well to what insult and ridicule I shall expose myself) when, I say, the thirteenth day of April was at hand, I had a dream that I was again, to my great annoyance, contending with the hostile clerk, and that I had been struck so dumb that my tongue refused to fulfill its function and I could not speak what I knew to be true. This distress seemed to oppress me terribly, as dreams do sometimes mock us in the treacherous night (for it is nothing deeper than a dream that I am telling, as far as I am concerned, though it is no slight thing that I learned through a dream, thank God, to whose glory alone I speak of this.) Thereupon apo mēchanēs ("as by supernatural power") an adviser seemed to stand beside me (he may have been black or white, I cannot remember, [29] for it is a dream I am telling) who said, "Why do you not answer

him, sluggard, what is written in Exodus 12:11, 'It is the passover,' that is, 'the passing over of the Lord'?"

As soon as I had had this vision [484] I awakened and leaped out of bed. I examined the passage in the Septuagint, first from every point of view, and spoke upon it to the best of my ability before the whole people. When this sermon was heard, it scattered all the mist from the eyes of all the candidates in theology who, as I shall tell a little later, had thus far found something of a stumbling block in the parable matter. It happened that on those three days, Holy Thursday, Good Friday and Easter, Christ's passover was attended as I have never seen it, and the number of those that looked to the garlic and flesh pots of Egypt [Num. 11:4-5] was far smaller than I had expected.

But now I will take up the passage itself.

Not to make too long a story which I had yet reasons for introducing here, there is another illustration from Scripture, which occurred to me after the publishing of the **Commentary**, contained in Exodus 12:11, to this effect, "with your loins girded, your shoes on your feet, your staff in your hand: you shall eat it in haste; it is the passover, that is, the passing over of the Lord." In order to treat this passage more satisfactorily, I wish to go into the matter of the passover somewhat deeply. Paul writes in Hebrews 10:1 that the law had had a shadow of good things to come. Now, since among all the shadows and the things perfected in Christ none more plainly correspond to each other than the passover of the ancestors and the offering of Christ upon the cross, it happens that none of the apostles and none of the doctors hold any other view than that the passover is a most clear foreshadowing of the death of Christ. Christ himself is the true passover by which the sanctified are perfected unto eternity, that is, by which believers are freed from the slavery of sin and enter into heaven. Hence Paul says in 1 Corinthians 5:7, "For even Christ our passover is sacrificed for us, etc." Christ himself also shows this by both word and deed, saying two days before passover, "You know that after two days will be the feast of the passover, and the Son of Man will be betrayed to be crucified" [Mt. 26:2], meaning thereby that at this passover the lamb that takes away the sins of the world was to be slain. It is as though he said, "You know that after two days the feast of the passover is here. This is the passover at which the Son of Man will be slain." During the eating of the feast he thus displayed the depth of his feelings [Lk. 22:15]: "With desire [485] I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer." By this he sought to do away with the old festival and institute a new one, substituting for the commemoration of the deliverance of a single people from bondage to Egypt the commemoration of the redemption of the world from the power of the devil and

of death. He was slain in the very midst of the feast, that even the unbeliever might see that everything was regulated by the providence of heaven.

Since, therefore, no one denies that the festival which was in old days celebrated in memory of deliverance in the flesh passed over into our Eucharist, that is, the thanksgiving by which we express our joy--not that the flesh has been set free, but that the world has been reconciled with God through his Son--no passage from the Old Testament ought to be examined more for light upon the force and meaning of Christ's language than this in which the passover of old was instituted. For in the sacred writings similar things are somehow expressed in similar language. Thus when, in Genesis 18:9-12, Sarah is slow to believe that she is to be a mother, the Lord says, according to the Septuagint version, "Is anything impossible to the Lord?" With the same words afterwards the divine Virgin Mary is told that she and her kinswoman Elizabeth are to give birth: "for with God nothing shall be impossible." [Lk. 1:37] But why do I labor to bring forth illustrations when both testaments are here before us and one was the shadow of the other, and those men of old looked at everything through figures? Let us then, letting everything else go, compare the words about the old lamb with those about the new and everlasting one, that this matter we are disputing about may be clear.

When God had shown in Exodus 12:11 what sort of lamb or sheep they were to slay and in what manner, he added finally, "and you shall eat it in haste; for it is the passover, that is, the leaping or passing by of the Lord." The word "for" is used here to give the reason why it was to be divided in haste, since he had said "You will eat it in haste." This word I think was brought over from here and put into Christ's words by the Romanists when they said "For this is my body." Would that they had not at that same time passed over the force of the preceding "is" in regard to the symbol itself of the leaping! This word "is" is used in this passage without any suspicion of parable, for the causal conjunction "for" requires that this be understood in its proper signification--and yet not in a substantive sense even if what had gone before had been a parable. For it gives the reason why the passover is to be distributed in haste. If, therefore, we insist upon understanding "is" in a substantive sense, what, pray, can be said that is more ridiculous? For how could a lamb be a leaping when the leaping had not yet been made? For that passing by or leaping by which the first born of the Hebrews and not of the Egyptians were spared did not follow until the next night. Who, therefore, will be so slow, not to say dull or obstinate, as not to see [486] that "is" is used in this passage for "signifies" or for "it is a symbol" or "it is a figure of speech". That lamb, eaten by all the descendants of the Hebrews, signifies nothing else than that their fathers had been passed over when the Lord

slaughtered all the first-born in Egypt. "Is", therefore, cannot be understood in any other way than that mentioned, namely as for "it is a symbol" or "figure". Thus, the meaning is, "You will eat it in haste, for it is a symbol or figure of the Lord's passing over."

That this is so the Lord's own words bear witness, in which he gives the method of teaching posterity about that benefit and symbol in the same chapter, thus [Ex. 11:26, 27]: "And when your children say to you, what do you mean by this service? You will say to them, 'It is the sacrifice of the Lord's passover, when he passed over the houses of the children of Israel in Egypt, striking the Egyptians and delivering our houses.'" Lo, he now calls "sacrifice" "passover", that is, "passing over of the Lord" what he had shortly before called "the passover". It is not because it was the passover, but because it was the sacrifice or symbol of the passover! What reason is there now, pray, why some people's minds are unwilling to admit the same trope in the ordination of the new and eternal thanksgiving? Everything agrees and corresponds so thoroughly that he who is unwilling to yield seems to wish to destroy and not to build up.

A commemoration is instituted in the one case and in the other. In the one it is of deliverance in the flesh, in the other of reconciliation unto the Most High God. In the first case the symbol of commemoration was instituted before the thing had been accomplished of which it was to be the symbol in the fleeting ages. So in the other was instituted the symbol of the killing of Christ for us before he was killed, which was yet to be in ensuing time the symbol of his having been killed. There was instituted in the evening the figure of the deliverance which followed on the morrow. The type of the thanksgiving was instituted in the evening, though the reconciliation itself did not follow until the next day, when Christ the true herald proclaimed that all was finished. The Egyptians ran about in the old days, trying everything in vain as their slaves were escaping; when Christ died, the sun and the earth, the stones, the veil of the temple and the underworld itself were convulsed. [Cf. Mt. 27:51-53, Mk. 15:38, Lk. 23:45.] The former were indignant that their slaves abandoned their tasks, the latter that savage murderers had slaughtered the Son of God, who had reconciled his runaway slaves with the Lord of Heaven. The one went down in the deep like stones, the other came forth from the depths to be witnesses to the vivification of their souls. When in the earlier case the lamb had been devoured in the evening, in the middle of the night the angel of the Lord began to slay the first-born of the Egyptians and to pass over Israel. In the latter, when the bread and the wine had been consumed in the evening, in the dead of night the Only-begotten of God, our First-born, was taken, that the devil might be bound and death itself swallowed up, while God's avenging

justice spared those whose hearts had been sprinkled with the blood of Christ. But why do I attempt to compare the shadow with the substance in detail, when, [487] as soon as the name "passover" is heard, the faithful heart takes in the commemoration of Christ's death? Why, then, are we so bold as to deny in the light the trope that we see so plainly in the shadow, especially when the admission of the trope makes all things plain, while its denial obscures all things and makes all things troubled, confounded and hopeless? For who has never stumbled in this darkness? Or, rather, who has not always stumbled? We sometimes hold Eris favorably [**30**] which we want to have considered divine zeal, not foreseeing what an opportunity for protecting itself we leave to the kingdom of the papists by this monstrous opinion.

But here certain brawlers try to make the simple think the argument is punctured by this little pin-thrust: in the Hebrew the word est does not appear in this passage, as also in Genesis 41:26, "the seven good cattle are seven fruitful years," the word "are" does not appear. What wonder that all things are full of dissension, when everyone ventures thus to impose upon the untaught as suits his own whims, and that by the kindness of languages as if one had a right to abuse them for the defense of nonsense? Thus, being jackdaws, we would make ourselves eagles. We have scarcely learned the name of a language, and we boast of it as if we had spent all our life in the study of it, and, what is most reckless and shameless of all, we would make the untaught believe that those who are more learned than we, are ignorant of the language.

Suppose the Hebrew does not have the word "is" in the one passage, the word "are" in the other. Neither does the Greek have "is" in that passage, but esti, nor does the German have "is" but ist. And in the other passage, Genesis 41:26, neither the Greek nor the German has "are" but eisi, and sind respectively. If there are not in the Hebrew words equivalent to "is" and "are", why, pray, do we look for a knot in the bulrush? [**31**] As if everybody not ignorant of the Hebrew tongue did not know that the words hu [HÛ'] and hif [HÎ'] and hemma [HEMMĀH] and henna [HĒNNĀH] are constantly used for ipse or ipsum est, ipsa est or ipsi or ipsa sunt, ipsae sunt when they are not combined with a verb! Thus if the evangelists had written Christ's own words neither we should have "this is my body," nor would the Greeks, but bassari hif [BĔSĀRÎ HÎ']. And what is this, if you translate it, but what we now have? So, too, in that passage in Exodus 12:11 when we read in Hebrew paesu hu [PESAḤ HÛ'], what is this but "this is the passover"?

See [488] what these sciolists resort to, what twists they set up in order not to seem beaten. Does not Luke 22:20 also speak thus without any substantive verb in the handing of the cup, touto to potērion he kaini diathēkē en tō haimati mou

to hyper himōn ekchynomenon, that is, "this cup, the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you"? Yet, if you wish to explain fully all the articles here you must translate "this cup 'is' the new testament in my blood." How stupid, therefore, or rather, how unfair, to throw dust in the eyes of the untaught [32] with these linguistic tricks, when the meaning of the words is the same in both Latin and Hebrew! For what languages are so closely akin to each other that they use the same words?

Let us cease putting forth such subterfuges then, and yield to the evident truth. How senseless it is, when those people have been so dull they have not understood the trope in this speech, for us to defend their stupidity with the weapons of Chrysippus! [33] But it is well that they say the ingenious devices of Chrysippus prick but do not pierce. So also the tricks and artifices like the above do not pierce into the souls of the faithful, though they may prick and pinch them a bit. Or are we not unjust judges who formerly answered, when the battle over driving [489] images out of the temple raged, and the enemies of them made it a reproach that many worshipped the statues themselves, calling one St. Peter, another Wendelin, [34] that though we used the form of expression, "This is St. Peter," yet everyone knew that the statue was not St. Peter but represented him, or was an image of him? Behold we recognize the trope here, which yet consists in no other word than in the verb "is". These, then, are the things which escaped my mind when I was hurrying through the **Commentary**, or which occurred to me afterwards. If they had been put in then, perhaps they would have helped the effect so much that I should be living in peace and quiet now, the conflict over.

I will now hasten on to the points the adversaries make against me.

Some, therefore, offer this objection: "'Faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not appearing.' [Heb. 11:1] Let no one be astonished, therefore, that bodily flesh is insisted upon here, because it is abhorrent to all sense that a real and living body can be eaten. There is need of faith here to believe that this is so. For if we made the declaration on the judgement of sense, it would not be 'the evidence of things not appearing.' The senses themselves would perceive that the thing was so." To such I answer that there are as many errors in this objection as it takes words to utter it. Yet the whole misconception flows from the fact that we fail to understand properly the teaching Paul gives in Hebrews 11:1. We fancy faith is a sort of silly notion by which, with a kind of blind recklessness, we believe things which are altogether opposed to sense.

Men have always erred in this way, even among the gentiles, as, for example, when we say, "Socrates was killed because he made some rather rude jokes upon a multiplicity of gods."

Why, pray, did he not look out for his life, and believe [490] in the existence of this medley of gods? Because he could not. "Yet others believed," you will say. I answer, "Very few, though they wished to seem to do so." It is inconsistent with all senses for there to be many gods, provided that we understand by God that supreme good which contains all things and can do all things. It is impossible that the highest should be multiple. But those who demanded of Socrates that he should think with them that many gods existed were by their audacity rather more stupid than endowed with intelligence or faith. For if Socrates had said that he believed in a great crowd of gods, he would have matched the faith of his enemies. He would have confessed with his tongue a multiplicity of gods, yet would not have believed it in his heart any more than his adversaries themselves did, but with this difference, that Socrates would have known that he did not believe in the existence of many gods, while his adversaries, in consequence of their blind vanity, would never have reflected whether it was likely that there were many or not. They plunged head first into the defense of the commonly received error. Let us now accept this dictum, "There are many gods" and persuade Socrates to believe that there are many on the ground that faith is "the evidence of things not appearing." For Socrates has never seen that there are many gods, and faith applies to things not appearing. Therefore Socrates will never attain to faith unless he believes in what does not appear. Behold the dilemma into which we put ourselves when we maintain from these words of Paul about faith that there is bodily flesh involved in question; we really overturn faith completely just when we seem to be insisting upon it, and make faith apply to things that cannot be believed.

There is also another matter in which the uninstructed err, namely the meaning of the word "sense". They think that this word is put for the organs of sense or for the perceptions of the flesh when we say a thing is inconsistent with sense. Here they leap forth, crying, "Of course this thing is inconsistent with sense, for it is not perceived," or "Of course it is inconsistent with flesh, for flesh does not grasp the things of the spirit." [Cf. I Cor. 2:14.] But "sense" is here put for "mind" and "judgement", not that which belongs to flesh and blood, but that which comes from the Spirit of God and is contained in our hearts. When, therefore, I say that it is inconsistent with sense for bodily flesh to be eaten, I wish to be understood as meaning that every [491] mind, even the believer, is opposed to this notion. For what would be the use of speaking of the organs of sense or of the flesh, saying that these revolt at this notion? Everybody knows they do. Go and talk to the unbeliever about this eating of the bodily flesh of Christ. You will be laughed at not only because of the ridiculous statement but also because of Christ himself.

I want, therefore, to explain in a few words Paul's view

about faith. "Faith," he says in Hebrews 11:1, "is the substance of the things we hope for, the evidence of the things that are not seen." Everyone knows that "substance" is used here for that attitude of mind which every believer has--at least, everyone knows who sees how varied is the use among the Greeks of that word hypostasis ("substance"). Faith is, therefore, that general constitution of mind which a person has and feels that he has towards those things towards which we aspire, towards which we direct all our hopes. The words that follow are an explanation of the preceding: "the evidence of the things not seen." Elenchos is the Greek word, which the Latin translators rendered "evidence". Perhaps "experience" would square better here at this time when the barbarisms of sophistry cling to us and everyone interprets words in his own way, scarcely accepting their real sense. Now this is Paul's idea: "I have said that faith is not only this notion but the thing by which we cling to things hoped for." And, to speak more clearly, this notion is not something that consists in a human device alone or in a doubtful opinion; it is clear experience by which a person tests in himself how great the confidence is he has in things that are not seen. It is, therefore, a sure experience by which a person is conscious in himself of an infallible belief and confidence in regard to God and towards God, the object of his hopes.

When, therefore, our friends strike at us with "Faith is the evidence of things not appearing," I say they are guilty of manifold error. In the first place, some of them are so far from having a sound understanding that they imagine things set up for belief ought to be no way probable even to a believing mind. What can be said cruder than this? For "not appearing" is put for "not seen or perceived by sense". Erasmus renders the idea fitly by "things that are not seen". [35] Then they err in taking argumentum ("argument") for materia ("subject matter"), as when we speak of the "argument" of a book, that is, the mass of material which is treated. It is not used in this way, but for "the sure experience of which a person is clearly conscious in himself."

Finally, they err in fancying that faith applies to everything that is not seen. For Paul is not speaking of that kind of faith, since it does not make blessed nor render the mind tranquil. He is speaking only of the faith that saves, and faith makes no person blessed unless it be directed towards those things which alone ought to be hoped for. For he had said before that faith is that substantial basis which we have for things hoped for. Now he adds, "But the things [492] hoped for are not seen, yet though they are not seen, they are still present in the heart of the pious person by means of the sure experience of his soul." When, therefore, they say, "There is need of faith in this thing, for faith applies to the things which are not subject to sense," they betray that they are more eager to speak than to speak rightly. For it is

the faith in the things that ought to be hoped for by which we are united with the blessed, not by faith in the existence of things denied to the sense. Angels, demons, souls freed from bodies are not subject to sense, and we have faith that they exist (see how I now vary the meaning of the word "faith", as also they do and are deceived, for I now use it for credulity, not for confident trust). But these are not the things we are accustomed to hope in, and it does not make one blessed if you believe in the existence of angels or demons. So, too, in our passage, what need is there of this faith that bodily flesh is eaten, since such faith would not make blessed? For hopes are not put before us in this sense, so that if you believe that bodily flesh is eaten you are saved. Let no one, therefore, bring up against me any more, "Unless we believe that flesh is eaten thus, we shall be robbed of salvation." For faith has not to do with such and is not directed towards the things that ought to be hoped for. They therefore only envelop us in empty clouds who bring up these things so ignorantly. For the faith that we believe flesh is eaten, neither Christ nor the apostles anywhere teach is salvation-giving. This I have written more at length than I had intended, but these people are accustomed to twist themselves into all sorts of things.

Secondly, they urge that there are many things in the divine writings which are inconsistent with all sense, which you must yet believe or you are an infidel. For instance, that Christ was born a real man endowed with a real body from an undefiled virgin, that he walked erect and without sinking upon the waters [cf. Mt. 14:25-32], rendered himself invisible and went away through the midst of his enemies [Lk. 4:30], and that he came forth from the tomb the third day by his own power. To all this I easily make answer from the foregoing. For when they say it is inconsistent with sense that Christ should be born of a virgin, see how they vary the meaning of this word "sense", taking it for human sense-perception, and not for that judgement which the faithful mind weighs and balances according to faith. It is, therefore, not inconsistent with sense that Christ chose to be born of a virgin. For that is plainly recorded in the writings of the apostles. Therefore the faithful heart is not dumbfounded by it and does not draw back, for the faithful cannot help believing the clearest word. Matthew 1:20 says, "that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Spirit," Luke 1:26-27: "the angel was sent to a virgin," Luke 1:34: "How shall this be, seeing I know not a man?", and Luke 1:35: "The Holy Spirit shall come upon you, etc."

All these things are so clearly treated that no one can surmise that there is a trope or a riddle hidden in them. Then the pious mind finds wonderful delights in searching for the reasons why the lamb chose to be born of a perpetual virgin, but in this other case it finds nothing but a hopeless [493] horror. The birth from a virgin is salvation-giving, but there is no ground for hoping

for salvation if you eat bodily flesh. Birth from the virgin is so completely manifested to the sense of all the faithful that no pious person ever doubted it. For those who wavered here were not faithful, seeing that because they did not easily understand the mystery they failed to believe such clear scripture and the judgement of faith. That the symbolic bread is the flesh of Christ is so opposed to the sense of all the faithful that no one of us has ever really believed it, but rather we have either left it out of our thought through negligence or inertia, or have through folly kept ourselves from thinking about it. What better evidence could there be that this notion is not in accordance with the will of God? For if faith is there, the heart delights in things which are most strange to the flesh, as I said in regard to the birth from a virgin. Sweeter than honey is the word of the Lord taken into the mouth of the faithful soul. This word about the tearing of the flesh is so repugnant to the mind that it does not venture to eat it but casts it out of the mouth.

But here some rage more wildly than any Scythian that whoever is not charmed by this is an infidel, and they swear it by all the altars. As for me, if all the world adjudged me an infidel in this thing that I do not believe, that bodily flesh is eaten, I would laugh at their recklessness, for I am sure what faith I have in God. And yet, before I scented the trope, my mind always hesitated at that eating and my teeth recoiled. Briefly in the other passages mentioned, the clearness is so great that there is no need of a trope. They plainly display divine miracles to us. In this passage the obscurity is so great that unless you appeal to a trope you will never come out of darkness and the fear of despair. Nor has anyone right to reason in this way: Christ walked upon the sea by a miracle; therefore his flesh is eaten by a miracle. For in the same way it would follow that he is a real material vine, light, sheep--by a miracle--since he is said to be the vine [Jn. 15:5], the light [Jn. 8:12], and the lamb [Jn. 1:29]. But who has ever been so mad as to say that a thing was done by a miracle which is a trope? All these other things--being born of a virgin, walking on the sea, rising from the dead--have a certain analogy in the faithful mind, for we recognize in them the purity, grace and omnipotence of the Son of God. However, eating of bodily flesh can never be anything but cruelly hard. All these miracles and similar ones have also their analogy among the Jews, if only we can believe their histories. Among them the barren often gave birth, the people passed over the sea [494] [Ex. 14:15-31], a man killed by robbers came to life again at the touch of Elisha's body [2 K. 13:21], more than once David slipped through the hands of his enemies, Elisha smote certain men with blindness [2 K. 6:18]. In the other case you find nothing of the sort. For if you suggest manhu [MĀN HŪ'], this has an analogy in Christ, but only insofar as that he is eaten in the trusting heart of the pious, as he himself explains in so many words in John 6:22-65. For

we do not know Christ anymore according to the flesh [2 Cor. 5:16].

Thirdly, thus: "When Christ says, John 6:63: 'The flesh profits nothing,' 'flesh' ought not to be taken for bodily flesh, but for carnal feeling or understanding, because wherever in Scripture 'flesh' is used alone, it should be taken for carnal understanding." See, pray, what it is to be beaten: - just like drowning, by Hercules. For those who are drowning grasp at random at anything that presents itself, whether it is strong enough to get them out or not. So those who are getting beaten make a javelin, helmet, bracelet, leggin of anything that presents itself. They strip themselves of all real defense, so that they can without danger be driven into line. For what is this: in the statement "The flesh profits nothing," "flesh" is used here for "carnal understanding"? Are we not ashamed to make such a distorted answer, and to spoil the native flavor of Christ's words by clumsy decorations? Do people not see through the grating, as it were, what we have inside, whether it be piety or cunning? But it is better to leave off exclaiming and answer the objection raised.

When Christ, in John 6, had done his best to show that salvation depended upon our trust in him as having died for us, employing figurative language as to his body and blood, the Jews were just as much dumbfounded as ourselves at that language, and fancied that he was giving his flesh to be chewed by the teeth. [Cf. Jn. 6:52.] Then Christ came to their aid while there was yet time, though a large part of his disciples had abandoned him, and warned them that the flesh profits nothing. [Jn. 6:63] We must, therefore, admit that in his answer Christ had reference to the same thing to which they who were offended had reference. They had reference to bodily flesh, for they said [Jn. 6:52], "How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" It was this flesh at which they were offended. Therefore Christ also has reference to bodily flesh when he says, "The flesh profits nothing." But grant that "flesh" is to be taken for carnal understanding or feeling when it is used alone. In the first place, I ask whether it is a spiritual understanding when we wish to make it appear that we eat bodily flesh here. And is this fleshly body, about which we wrangle so unthinkingly, spirit or flesh? If it is spirit, why do we dream of flesh? And why [495] do we mix up names so as to say that what is spirit is also bodily flesh? If it is flesh, the victory is mine, for that profits nothing. Then I ask, since Paul in 1 Corinthians 8:13 says, "I will eat no flesh forever," ought "flesh" here also according to their canon be explained as carnal understanding, so that Paul shall say that he will never eat carnal understanding? See how this stupid class of people desire to be autos epha ("supreme authorities"), thus beautifully laying down canons first of all and then decreeing, according to law as it were, how the sacred writings ought to be falsified (I wanted to say "captured"). [36]

Fourth, they thunder: "You take 'eat' in John 6 for 'believe'; we will also do the same thing. When, therefore, Christ says [Jn. 6:58], 'If anyone eats of this bread, he shall live forever,' take 'eat' for 'believe' and the sense will be, 'Whoever believes this bread is my flesh shall live forever,' for the thing must be believed here which the Jews refused to accept." What do I hear? Are there two paths to life, one by which they that trust in Christ attain the heavens, the other by believing that the bread is the bodily flesh of Christ? Besides, if you explain "eat" in this passage as "believe", with their variation of the meaning "believe", all the force and sense of the words is destroyed. For if you say, "If anyone believe of this bread, he shall live forever," you upset the words, sense and all. Not that "eat" should not be taken for "believe" here, but it should not be taken for that kind of believing for which they take it. It is established usage that "believe" may be used for "trust", though, therefore, in this sixth chapter of John, Christ taught that all one's trust and hope should be placed in him, because that is salutary and like bread unto humans. Yet the translators have constantly rendered the Greek word pisteuein ("trust") by "believe", though the saying [Jn. 6:47] "He that believes on me" would gain somewhat in vividness if it were given "He that trusts in me" or "He that shall rely or lean on me." But those who made the translation in this way in order not to seem designedly to be introducing innovations everywhere, helped my side. "Believe" is used in this way, therefore, for "trust".

I said, therefore, that "eat" is used for "believe", but only on condition that you take "believe" in the sense of "trust". For this is the food and the nourishment of the soul by which it is reared for everlasting life, that it shall rely on Christ. But, as it is, when these take "believe" here in its native signification [496] of thinking so and so, or having faith, so far as faith is an opinion, it is surely possible for a blind man to see how they vary the meaning of "believe". For when Christ says [Jn. 6:47], "He that believes in me has everlasting life," he uses "believe" for "trust" as I also do when I say, "We, too, take 'eat' for 'believe'." They mean by "believe", "suppose, think, consider". For they say, "We believe that this bread is the bodily flesh of Christ." What is this but "we positively think" or "consider"? And what is this if it is not an evident paralogism? They that eat Christ, that is, believe on, that is, trust in Christ, have everlasting life, not that they believe the bread is his flesh. For salvation is nowhere promised to those of these opinions.

Fifth, they come out with this: "God, who is omnipotent, can cause the bread at once to be real bread and real flesh." Not to discuss how the omnipotence of God observes order in all things, I will say briefly in regard to this sturdy objection that I am nauseated by these objections that surpass the inert babble of all the sophists in clownishness, not to say silliness.

I ask: may we reason in this style, God can do so and so and so, therefore it is done? Can drain the deep; therefore it is dried up? Turn water into wine; therefore water is wine? If we may, I will say, "God can make a gourd out of an elephant; therefore an elephant is at once a huge beast and a gourd. God can make you to be a mule and a man; therefore you are at once a mule and a man." What, pray, can be said more reckless or shameless? Then I ask, where have they found in Scripture that one and the same substance was ever two widely different ones? For even in Christ, in whom are two natures, divine substance is not human substance nor is human substance divine substance. I use "substance" here after the fashion of the Latins, according to which it has approximately the meaning of "essence", for as far as substantial existence is concerned, I am not opposed to the view of all the theologians that the humanity of Christ did not exist by itself but in the unity of the hypostasis. When he made water wine, was it at once wine and water? [Jn. 2:1-11] When he made the dust of the earth a man, was it at once dust and human? See how shameless is the opinion of those who say that bread and bodily flesh are eaten together, nay, maintain that the bread is both of these things at once.

Sixth, they make this objection: "Did wisdom and foresight as to speaking distinctly fail God? Did he not know how the world was going to understand his words in the sense we give them? He would have foreseen, therefore, and guarded against this error by clear language if he had not meant [497] this to be the meaning." I recognize clearly that wisdom can never be wanting in God, for he is himself wisdom itself. But it is in ourselves that wisdom, nay, intelligence and sense fail. For things that were clear and obvious to Christ and his disciples are dark to us. They were accustomed to expressions like "This lamb is the passover", when it was only the symbol and figure of the passover. Hence both Christ spoke clearly and the disciples understood clearly what was said, for no hesitation, nor reluctance, nor questioning followed. But we, slower than any tortoise, fail to take in a trope that was perfectly familiar to them, for the reasons that the sacred writings are not perfectly familiar to us and that we do not labor so much to be pious as to seem pious by handling and eating sacred things. To the inattentive all things are dark, to the watchful and alert all things show themselves full of light. So long as we pursue piety alone with all our strength nothing escapes us; on the other hand, so long as we are given up to hypocrisy and are other than we seem, we also attribute to all things a different form and color from their proper ones. It is our own slowness or viciousness, not the obscurity of our words, that leads us astray. God has foreseen and guarded against many things which we yet scorn to notice as much as if they had been nowhere said or written. We have, therefore, no right to make the pretense of obscurity. Nothing should be accounted obscure, simply because Minerva [37] is not very kind to some people.

Seventh, in 1 Corinthians 10:16, Paul writes, "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" Here they come out with, "Behold how Paul calls them the communion of the blood and body of Christ, not symbols or figures!" "This one passage," they say, "is quite enough to prove that the blood and flesh of Christ are distributed here. Paul calls it the communion of the body and blood. What need have we of more testimony?" On this passage let them have this: Why do we fanatics still continue to work upon the minds of the simple with our tricks of loud shouting? Do we not understand what Paul is after here? Do we not see what "communion" signifies? Let the pious soul know, then, that Paul had taken it to heart that certain people were in the habit of sharing in the feasts of idols. He thought it wrong that those who with the rest of the brethren attended Christ's festival of thanksgiving should not keep away from the worship of idols also. He says, therefore, [1 Cor. 10:14-16, 21]: "Wherefore, my dearly beloved, flee from the worship of idols and judge what I now say. The cup of thanksgiving by which we give thanks (for this is [498] what I consider blessing, eulogia), is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? Why, therefore, do those who participate here approach at the same time the food of idols? Why, then, do you, who are partakers of the table of the Lord, also share the communion of the table of demons?" From this it is apparent in the first place that "communion" is not to be referred to the bodily blood of Christ, as if it was said that this was divided here, in the meaning, "Is not the blood of Christ divided here?" It is to be referred to those who drink together in this thanksgiving, in the meaning, "When we drink together the cup of thanksgiving by which we give thanks, are we not united into one body--all we who have been redeemed by his death and washed in his blood? Are we not a special congregation and society? Why, then, do we betray the companionship of the body and blood of Christ, that is, the church or communion which gives thanks that it has been redeemed by the body and blood of Christ, and desert to idolaters in their public gatherings?"

Finally, it is apparent that if "communion" were to be referred ever so to the blood of Christ, Paul yet understood "body and blood" only symbolically as Christ also did when he said, "This is my body." Paul shows this in so many words when he adds [1 Cor. 10:17], "For we are all partakers of one bread." Behold he calls it bread, not flesh, not body, that he says we eat of here. But if in the above discourse he had understood that the communion was the distribution of bodily blood, he would not have said in the last passage "we are partakers of one bread" but "of one body". They, therefore, that cling to this passage as to a sacred anchor ought to learn the Scripture idiom and not leap forth recklessly without at all examining the matter. For though they maintain most strenuously that such are the words,

yet it is incontrovertible that Paul is not speaking of the distribution of blood and body. He is calling those the communion of the body and blood who give thanks together that they have been redeemed by these, as these two sentences firmly establish [1 Cor. 10:17]: "We are one bread and one body" and "We are all partakers of one bread." Let those who fancy that we cannot penetrate to the real purport of Paul's words read the **Paraphrases** of Erasmus at this point. [**38**] [499]

Eighth, they bring forward Paul's words in 1 Corinthians 11:25, where he says, "This cup is the new testament in my blood." From these words they raise the objection: "What is offered here is the new testament; but the new testament is not a symbol, it is the blood of Christ itself. Since, therefore, this cup is the new testament, it is necessarily the corporeal blood of Christ, for that is the new testament." I am glad that this passage is brought up against me just for the reason that the variations in the meaning of "testament" that meet us here and there in the Scriptures may thus be examined a bit. The testament, as far as the present case is concerned, is nothing other than an agreement promised by God, as when the Lord struck a compact or covenant with Abraham in Genesis 17:1: "I am the almighty God," he says. "Walk before me, and be blameless. And I will make my covenant between me and you, etc." And a little farther on [Gen. 17:7, 8], "And I will establish my covenant between me and you and your seed after you in their generations by an everlasting covenant, to be God to you and to your seed after you. And I will give unto you and to your seed after you the land of your roaming, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession; and I will be their God."

Here we have nothing else than the covenant which was thought worthy by God in his grace to enter into with Abraham. What does this covenant contain? On what terms is it established? These are the terms: "I will be your God. You will walk before me most uprightly. I shall make you father of a great people. I shall give you seed by Sarah. I shall also be the God of that seed of yours which I promise you. I will give unto thee and unto thy seed the land in which you now dwell as a stranger." And these terms are the real covenant itself. But there are added to covenants signs, which though also called by the name of covenants yet are not covenants, as is plainly shown in the same passage. For there follows [Gen. 17:10]: "This is my covenant, which you shall keep between me and [500] you and your seed after you. Every male child among you shall be circumcised." Behold how he called circumcision a covenant here, though it was not a covenant but the symbol of a covenant, as the divine language itself shows in this way [Gen. 17:11]: "And you will circumcise the flesh of your foreskin; and it will be a sign of the covenant between me and you."

We now see that called a token of the covenant which was just before called the covenant. It is, then, clear enough that signs of covenants are not covenants, although they are sometimes clothed with the name of covenants, as when circumcision here is called the covenant, while it is only a symbol of the covenant. And "baptism" is used for "Christ" in 1 Peter 3:21 where he says that we are saved by baptism, though we are really saved by Christ alone. But baptism is just as much the symbol of the Christian people that has received from God the covenant that his son should be ours, as circumcision was once the symbol of that covenant that the Lord should be their God and they should be his people. I want now to pass over from the covenant or testament of Abraham to the testament of Christ. The covenant which was struck with Abraham is so strong and valid that unless you keep it always you will not be faithful. For unless the Lord is your God and you are worshipper of him only (for "you shall worship the Lord your God, and serve him only" [Dt. 6:13]) you have no reason to boast that you are faithful. But he whom you worship and adore thus is your God, that is, the supreme good, because he gives himself freely to you and casts himself into death for you by which he might reconcile you to himself. This grace had been promised by him who has given it, long ago, when our first parent transgressed his law, and he constantly renewed this promise to our fathers.

And the reason why he made the promise was none other than because blessedness could not come to us, however much we toiled and sweated, while the fall of the first parent had not been atoned for. But when Christ, slain for us, appeased the divine justice and became the only approach to God, God entered into a new covenant with the human race, not new in the sense that he had only just discovered this remedy, but because he applied it at the right moment, having prepared it long before.

This new covenant or testament, then, is the free remission of sins which God has bountifully granted us through his Son. They, therefore, that trust in God through Christ and lead their own to this trust (to say this at the same time) are themselves circumcised, just as Abraham and his seed were circumcised of old, but with the circumcision of Christ, which is baptism, Colossians 2:11. Our baptism, then, looks altogether to the same thing as did circumcision of old. It is the sign of the covenant which God has struck with us through his Son. Baptism, therefore, is the chief and special token of the new testament. Furthermore the festival of the Eucharist commemorates how that testament was perfected. Not, by Hercules, because it is itself the testament, but because the testament is renewed in it, and thanks are given unto the Lord for this generous blessing. What, then, [501] is the new testament? The free remission of sins through the Son of God. Hence it comes about that since this free remission of

sins was accomplished through the death and shedding of the blood of Christ, the death itself and the blood may perhaps be called the testament, although, if we are to speak clearly and literally, Christ is not the new testament, but the mediator of the new testament, as Paul says in Hebrews 9: "The testament itself is the remission of sins." [Cf. Heb. 9:16, 22.] But I do not say this with the idea that it is a sin to call the death of Christ or his blood "the testament".

I would spur on in friendly fashion our impetuous friends who are suffering from the disease of logomachias ("word-battling") to come to a clear understanding of these matters. Let me now go on further. Christ wished the remembrance of this blessing which he perfected by his bitter death to flourish among us forever. Therefore, with particular appropriateness, he instituted the festival of the remission of sins, as of old that of the deliverance out of the Egyptian bondage. And since the blood of the testament can be called "the testament", and we give thanks in this festival for the shedding of the blood by which the testament was perfected, it comes about also that we call "the blood of Christ" by which we only commemorate the shedding of the blood for us, and then, as we have called the blood "the testament", so also we name the symbol of the shed blood "the testament". Put all this down as old wives' tales if the words of the apostles do not support it. Paul teaches that the testament itself is the remission of sins, Hebrews 8:6-13. I Peter 2 and 3 and Paul in Colossians 1:14 remind us that this testament, covenant or agreement was won through the death and blood of Christ. Furthermore, none of the apostles calls the death or the blood "a testament", but the "blood of the new testament", though I had left it free for teaching purposes so that they could be called "the testament". Read over the words of the apostles. If, then, the blood itself which was shed was not called the "testament" but "blood of the testament", as that through which the testament of free remission was made and confirmed, how much more is this cup of the blood not the testament, but the symbol or figure of the blood of the testament?

The figure, therefore, receives the name of the thing typified, as has been made plain above. The sacrament, therefore, of the covenant and testament, if you use "sacrament" for the external sign of the chief covenant or oath, is baptism; the symbol of the passion of Christ, through which this covenant and testament was perfected, is the festival in which bread and wine are distributed to be partaken of with one accord by the faithful with thanksgiving for the commemoration of the death of Christ. We ought not, therefore, show ourselves so incompetent as to contend thus fiercely for the sake of nomenclature, one declaring that this feast of thanksgiving is sacramental, another denying this. For when we understand the thing itself clearly, why do we keep on

wrangling about names? [502] I am not anxious about what is written in the "Canons of the Apostles". [39] It is easy to see that they are not the work of the apostles but of some bishops perhaps who arrogated this name to themselves, and how much right they had to it anyone can see. Besides the works are eis korakas, relegantur, banished in the canonical Decrees, Dist. 16. [40]

I had determined to add to this little work the testimony of certain ancient writers, but since Johannes Oecolampadius, that incomparable man, has made a special book of this, let him who will hasten to it [41] and drink from its generous streams so much as he will. For this is not a new thing that I am maintaining here. The early writers held the view, and it is strange that their authority is put away by those whose sole cry is, "The Fathers, the Fathers."

As I sound the signal for retreat, [42] therefore, I beg and entreat, by the Christ whose glory and grace alone I preach, that no one will try with obstinate spirit to persist in refusing to admit into counsel things which deserve to be examined with painstaking care in this matter. Vast fires of discord arise from small beginnings, and when we are driven along by their fury all opposition seems a sin and a crime; we refuse to listen to any suggestion. But why do not pious men do the thing which the facts of the situation compel the cruelest tyrants to do? The spirits, when all things have been wasted and lost in their pursuit of wars rather than justice, are at length compelled against their will to return to the source of the trouble and embrace justice.

Since incurable error in regard to the Eucharist has flowed from ignorance of Scripture alone, why, I say, do we refuse to see clearly what the reason is for our having wandered so far from the goal [503] in order that this great carelessness, not to say folly or idolatry, may be removed from us? For I would not have those deluders listened to, who think that certain delusions must be allowed to the common people. Let concession be made in other points if expediency demand it, but be it a crime to make concession here. I recognize that the offering of victims, festivals, temple adornments, and countless ceremonials were conceded to the weakness of the Hebrews, but I find nothing of this kind foisted upon that most crude race. As the apostle Peter indicates, how much less should it be foisted upon us who have drunk of the Spirit! [Cf. Acts 15:7-11.] Or do we not tempt the Spirit of God when we thrust upon the palate of the faithful a thing so utterly strange to it, which we see plainly the apostles did not treat as we do?

There never was any religion or any school of philosophy which put away shadows and delusions and either set forth the truth more clearly or defended it more vigorously than the Chris-

tian. Why, then, do we act in such a way as to bring such a thick mist over this clear light--a mist that neither the winged Daedalus [43] could surmount nor the Delian [44] swimmer pierce? How many vain attempts have been made to penetrate the darkness! To pass by Scotus and Aquinas [45] and clever efforts like theirs, we have all tried something on our own account in order to overcome each his own incredulity and put it to sleep that it may never venture to murmur. And yet the citadel of faith has never really surrendered, and accepted anypokritōs, without dissimulation, the belief that there is in the bread [504] any such thing eaten as we have dreamed. I hear, to be sure, daily our friends saying (for they cry loudly enough), "Dear me! Listen to the recklessness of this impious fellow. I never doubted and yet he judges me. I am tremendously filled with joy every time I eat this flesh. He is ignorant and does not know faith." But I make of their outcries: if the gods had taken the advice of Momos [46] and put a window in the human breast, so that we could discover through it the cunning contrivances of the heart, I know what we should find in the hearts of them that make such outcry.

Hypocrisy is a slippery and crafty evil. It is unutterably clever in wearing an open brow while hiding the thought, and pouring together vast and deep rivers of holy and religious words by which the lighter-minded are carried from their moorings, but all that it twists into making you believe that you eat flesh is spurious. True piety knows in what you make your boast, though you boast forever, for it has a solid and infallible criterion by which it tries and knows all things. That rests upon two pillars, faith and innocence. Christ calls the latter "mercy and justice" in Matthew 23:23. Whatever sails, whatever breezes, then, speed us hither, guide our course and commerce rightly. For these things make one truly rich--faith, mercy and justice. But the mariner who pursues ought else touches at every shore, in order to boast at having seen everything and to tell tales for you to marvel at, not to profit by. That faith only profits then, and brings one into port, which trusts to the favoring breeze, that is, to the grace of the Divine Spirit, not that which believes whatever you choose to utter about maneaters. These wares only are profitable--justice and mercy that rest upon faith. We all, both teachers and pupils, fix our gaze upon this therefore, we shall easily see that is is ouden pros logon ("of no value") if we crunch not only the flesh but the bone of Christ. When we rant about this last, we make clear to the solidly pious what we are trying to do.

God Almighty give us light and peace, that we may see the truth and be restored to real peace and tranquility of soul. Amen.

NOTES

1. Bartholomew May (1446-1531) was a member of the Small Council (i.e. the Executive Council) of Berne and was perhaps the dominant political authority in support of the Reformation. He was head of a large clan whose descendants today come through his grandson, Benedict. See the family chart of the May family in Z IV:459. See also A. May, "Bartholomäus May und seine Familie," **Berner Taschenbuch** XXIII (1874):1ff.

2. Zoilus (4th c. b.c.) was a cynic philosopher of Amphipolis. He was notable for his attacks on Homer, Plato and others. OLD: 1225.

3. Theseus, legendary hero of Attica, and Patroclus are cited here because of their friendships: Theseus with Perithous, Patroclus with Achilles. Cf. OLD: 1311 and OLD: 1937.

4. The **Commentary on True and False Religion** appeared in March, 1524. Z III:628-912 (tr. J III:43-343).

5. Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt (1480-1541), here spelled Carlstadt in following the Latin/English spelling, became an early reformer and follower of Luther. He later developed into a radical opponent of Luther. His writings on the eucharist figured prominantly in the eucharistic debates between Luther and Zwingli. There are numerous studies of Carlstadt. See especially the following: Hermann Barge, **Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt**, 2 vols., Leipzig: Friedrich Brandstetter, 1905. Ronald J. Sider, **Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt. The Development of his Thought 1517-1525**, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1974. Friedel Kriechbaum, **Grundzüge der Theologie Karlstadts**, Hamburg: Herbert Reich, 1967. Ulrich Bubenheimer, **Consonantia Theologiae et Iurisprudentiae**. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1977.

6. Zwingli treats the Eucharist in the **Commentary** in Z III:773-820 (tr. J III:198-253).

7. For various references on Proteus, see Otto, 289.

8. For the expression extra oleas see Erasmus, **Adagia**, II.II:10 (Op. Omnia II, col. 451).

9. Amphiboly is a figure of speech suggesting double meaning or ambiguity. OLD: 121. Apostrophe is a rhetorical figure in which the speaker turns from speaking to the judge and addresses the opponent directly. Cf. Quintilianus IV:1:63ff., IX:2:38ff. Metabole is a transition or change into another sense or meaning. Cf. Quintilianus IX:3:38.

10. Zwingli is alluding to the Apostle's Creed in which it is affirmed that Jesus "ascended to heaven, sits at the right hand of God the Father Almighty, thence he will come to judge the living and the dead." John H. Leith (ed.), **Creeds of the Churches,** 3rd ed., Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1982, p. 24.

11. Cf. MPG 12:475-478.

12. For the expression ex ungue leonem see Erasmus, **Adagia,** I.IX:34 (Op. Omnia II, col. 347).

13. Cf. Z III:799:24ff. (tr. J III:228).

14. For the expression in portu navigare see Erasmus, **Adagia,** I.I:46 (Op. Omnia II, col. 47).

15. Metaphor is the use of a word in a transferred or figurative sense. The proper Latin word is translatio. OLD: 1105.

16. L. Sergius Catilina was a Roman patrician who headed a conspiracy against the state. Thus a Cataline is a revolutionary. OLD: 285. Spurious Maelius, in 440 b.c., was accused of aiming at supreme power and was put to death. OLD: 1060.

17. M. Furius Camillus was an exceptionally brave Roman dictator who saved Rome from the Gauls. OLD: 262. M. Tullius Cicero was perhaps the most famous Roman orator, writer and statesman. OLD: 313.

18. L. Cornelius Sulla (also written Sylla) Felix was Roman dictator c. 138-78 b.c.

19. The **De Vita et poesi Homeri,** spuriously attributed to Plutarch, addresses metonymy in Book I, par. 15. Cited in Z IV:474 n. 6. Metonymy is the replacement of the name of a thing by the name of its attribute. OLD: 1106.

20. There are numerous references to Scylla, the half-human sea-monster located in the straits of Messina, who snatched and devoured men from passing ships, and Charybdis, the whirlpool on the Sicilian side of the straits. Cf. OLD: 309, 1714. Erasmus, **Adagia,** I.V:4 (Op. Omnia II, col. 183f.).

21. For the expression vela colligere see Erasmus, **Adagia,** V.I:32 (Op. Omnia II, col. 1187).

22. Heinrich Engelhardt (d. 1551), Doctor of Canon Law, was stipendiary priest at the Fraumünster and one of Zwingli's closest companions and supporters during the Reformation. See Wyss, p. 17 n. 6.

23. Zwingli is referring to Joachim am Grüt, Second Secretary of the Great Council, a skillful and moderate opponent of Zwingli. He published a treatise against Zwingli's eucharistic views. See Wyss, p. 62 n. 2.

24. The reference to the Councillors is to the following:

(1) Leo Jud (1482-1543), Pastor at St. Peter's. See Leo Weisz, **Leo Jud**, Zurich: Zwingli Verlag, 1942. Also: Karl-Heinz Wyss, **Leo Jud. Seine Entwicklung zum Reformator 1519-1523**, Berne: Herbert Lang, 1976.

(2) Caspar (Grossman) Megander (1495-1545), a canon at the Grossmünster and a close ally of Zwingli. Cf. ADB 21:263-65.

(3) Oswald Myconius (1488-1552), teacher at the Fraumünster School, later Zwingli's first biographer and the successor of Oecolampadius in Basel. Cf. ADB 23:127-29.

25. Although there are no definite contemporaneous records to verify the report of Zwingli, Finsler concludes on the basis of what records report after 1525 that the number of 7,000 inhabitants is basically accurate. Z IV:479 n. 3.

26. For classical allusions to parable and trope, respectively, see Quintilianus V.11.1 & 23 and VIII.6.1ff.

27. Cf. Egli, nr. 684. See also Zwingli's **Action oder bruch des nachtmals**, Z IV:13-24.

28. See above, note 6.

29. For the expression ater sit an albus see Otto, 11 and Erasmus, **Adagia**, I.VI:99 (Op. Omnia II, col. 265).

30. Eris is the Greek goddess of strife best known for her part in starting the Trojan War. Her Roman counterpart was Discordia. Cf. Pauly VI/1:463ff.

31. For the expression in scirpo nodum quaeris see Otto, 312f. and Erasmus, **Adagia**, II.IV:76 (Op. Omnia II, col. 546f.).

32. For the expression os oblinere see Otto, 259.

33. Chrysippus was a Stoic philosopher of the 3rd century b.c., student of Zeno and Cleanthes. OLD: 312.

34. St. Wendelin (c. 554-c. 617) is reputed to have been a king's son who became a shepherd. Little is known about him, though he was one of the popular saints in the Middle Ages in the Rhineland and in Switzerland. See **New Catholic Encyclopedia** XIV:874.

35. According to the Vulgate, Hebrews 11:1 reads, "Est autem fides sperandarum substantia rerum, argumentum non apparentium." Erasmus in his 1522 Basel translation rendered it as "Est autem fides earum rerum, quae sperantur, substantia, argumentum eorum, quae non videntur."

36. Zwingli is making a play on words: "quomodo sacrae literae corrumpi ('capi' dicere volui) debeant." Z IV:495:8-9.

37. Minerva is the goddess of wisdom.

38. Erasmus published numerous paraphrases of New Testament writings, many of which were translated into Swiss German by Leo Jud. In 1524 he published in Basel a complete Latin edition of the New Testament epistles: **Paraphrasis in omneis epistolas apostolicas.**

39. The Apostolic Canons are eighty-five canons similar to conclusions of several fourth century councils. They form the last chapter of the Apostolic Constitutions. They are therefore not of apostolic origin, as Zwingli observes. Cf. Berthold Altaner, **Patrologie,** 3rd ed., Freiburg: Herder, 1951, p. 44.

40. **Corpus iuris canonici,** XVI:1.

41. This is a reference to the 1525 work of Oecolampadius which played an important role in the controversy between Zwingli and Luther: **De genuina verborum domini.** For a study of the role of the Fathers in the eucharistic thinking of the reformers involved here, see Gottfried Hoffmann, "Sententiae Patrum--Das Patristische Argument in der Abendmahlskontroverse zwischen Oekolampad, Zwingli, Luther and Melanchthon," Heidelberg Dissertation, 1971.

42. For the expression receptui canere see Otto, 295 and Erasmus, **Adagia,** III.V:88 (Op. Omnia II, col. 848).

43. Daedalus was the mythical Athenian hero who built the labyrinth. OLD: 483.

44. The Delians were renowned as swimmers. For the expression delius natator see Erasmus, **Adagia,** I.VI:29 (Op. Omnia II, col. 234).

45. Zwingli is referring to the great scholastic philosophers and theologians Duns Scotus, the Franciscan (d. 1308) and Thomas Aquinas, the Dominican (d. 1274).

46. Momos was the personification of the fault-finder with numerous appearances in classical literature. Cf. Pauly XVI/1:42.

FRIENDLY EXEGESIS, that is, EXPOSITION OF THE MATTER OF THE EUCHARIST TO MARTIN LUTHER

February 1527

(Z V: 562-758)

Translated by Henry Preble

Revised and edited by H. Wayne Pipkin

Introduction

Following the publication of the **Subsidiary Essay,** matters developed rapidly in the growing division between Zwingli and Luther. [1] In the fall, 1525, fourteen Lutheran ministers had met at Schwäbisch-Hall and formulated an essentially Lutheran confession. Authored by Johannes Brenz, and circulated first in handwritten form, the Swabian Syngramma was later printed in January 1526. A more significant edition was published in March by Agricola, containing a preface by Luther [WA 19:457-61]. In addition, in January of that year a letter of Luther to Reutlingen had been published [WA 19:118-25]. In both of these brief writings by Luther it was clear that he held the views of Zwingli to be a manifestation of the devil.

It was now time for Zwingli to publish his views on a wider front. To that end he published his **On the Lord's Supper** in February 1526. [2] Significantly, the treatise was written in German and answered the Catholics Eck, Faber and am Grüt. Zwingli turned also to Luther and his follower Johannes Bugenhagen. He dismissed transubstantiation and then turned to a discussion of the phrase, "spiritus est qui vivicat". Even more important was the lengthy Christological reflection in which Zwingli developed his characteristic thinking concerning the divine and human natures of Christ, the latter of which is to reside in Heaven until the Final Judgement--and therefore is not in the Eucharist.

By this time a full-fledged public war was raging over the proper interpretation of the Eucharist. To Christians of a later day it is a tragic scene. To the participants in the sixteenth century a question was under scrutiny that touched very nearly at the heart of the faith. Catholics, Lutherans, Reformed and Radicals--all entered the heated arena with charges, defenses, and counter-charges. Monthly, new treatises appeared, reiterating old arguments, developing new lines of attack. Few of the writings were characterized either by charity or understanding.

Zwingli came under increasing pressure. At home he was still under attack by the moderate Catholics. During the course

of 1526 the Catholic nobleman Jacob Edlibach joined am Grüt in attacking the Zurich reformer from a position that sounded very much like that of Luther. It was to prove decisive in shaping Zwingli's estimate of Luther. [3] Next came an important escalation in the level of the confrontation with the publication at the end of September or the beginning of October of Luther's **Sermon on the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, Against the Fanatics.** [4]

The entrance into the discussion of the Eucharist of such figures as Carlstadt and other radicals such as Schwenckfeld hopelessly clouded the clear lines of opposition between Zwingli and Luther. [5] Luther was to have considerable difficulty in sorting out many differences between Zwingli and the radicals.

Meanwhile Bucer, Oecolampadius and Capito were encouraging Zwingli to enter decisively into the controversy by writing in a firm and friendly way to Luther. [6] Eventually a publication date for the spring Frankfurt book fair, 1527, was projected. Apparently Zwingli wrote from mid-December 1526 to the end of February 1527. The printing was completed by the end of March and a copy was sent to Luther on April 1. [7]

Although designated "friendly," it sounds less so to modern ears, and was clearly offensive to Luther. It was, however, typical in tone for a treatise by a humanist-trained author. It is, as Potter states, "one of Zwingli's most serious and most characteristic writings, appearing at the very height of his powers." [8] It is marred by a less than adequate understanding of the Lutheran position, apparently basing some of the discussion on Luther's earlier 1521 response to Henry VIII [WA 10/2:180-222].

The writing is too long as well, overly technical and, at times, tedious. It is, however, perhaps the most important independent statement of Zwingli on the Eucharist.

It served to arouse the wrath of Luther to a fever pitch, though it advanced the Zwinglian cause in southern Germany. In June, 1527, Zwingli reached out to Philip of Hesse and sent him a copy. The treatise undoubtedly enhanced the developing relationship between the two.

The **Friendly Exegesis** then is of importance for two main reasons. It is perhaps the decisive document from the Zwinglian side in the eucharistic controversy. In addition, although imperfect in form, it sets forth with clarity the essence of the eucharistic position of Zwingli, a spiritual view characterized by the immediacy of the presence of Christ to the believer in faith, and, thus, not at all the "mere memorial" by which it is typically characterized.

The treatise has heretofore appeared in its complete form only in Latin, in the original 1527 edition published by Froschower and the later sixteenth century collection of **Opera Zwinglii.** This is the first complete translation of the treatise. It was translated by Henry Preble and revised by H. Wayne Pipkin.

HWP

NOTES

1. The standard work analyzing the development of the controversy between Luther and Zwingli is Köhler. A concise, helpful summary is Locher, **Reformation,** pp. 307-318. See also the insightful analysis of G. R. Potter, **Zwingli,** Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976, pp. 287-315.

2. **Ein klare underrichtung vom nachtmal Christi,** Z IV:789-862 (tr. LCC 185-238).

3. Locher, p. 309. See also the August 1526 **Responsio brevis Huldrychi Zwinglii,** Z V:317-358.

4. WA 19:469ff. LW 32:335-361.

5. In addition to the writings of Carlstadt mentioned above in **Matthew Alber,** notes 2 and 3, there were circular letters of Schwenckfeld on the Eucharist that were circulating in handwritten form. See Locher, p. 310.

6. Letters cited in Z V:548-9.

7. An excellent synopsis of the letter is found in Potter, **Zwingli,** pp. 303-306.

8. Ibid., 303.

Huldrych Zwingli to Martin Luther, grace and peace from the Lord. God, who directs and disposes all things, is in the habit of so deceiving or at least mocking human hopes, most learned Luther, that victory [1] often flies from the grasp of him who thinks he holds her by both wings, and, on the other hand, safety suddenly appears where there was least hope of it. It was this varied character of his plans that restrained me for some time from sending this exegesis of mine to you. For as often as I thought over the material, nothing seemed plainer or more securely calculated to bring me victory, but as often as I thought upon his will, I was afraid before the result, thinking, "What if he has determined not to bring forth this light yet? What if from this dispute a quarrel, not a friendly conference, should arise?" Hence, I not only restrained myself, but intervened with others also, to prevent them from writing in answer to or against you, whatever you might hurl out against us. Whereby after so many light skirmishes had been successfully fought, and you were not satisfied although you with impunity inveighed against us, but were said not even to take into consideration what is said in contravention of your way of thinking, I thought the Lord had given sufficient proof [563] of what he wanted done. For we know that all stubbornness is hateful to him, especially that which is unwilling to be guided by his word, as when a prophet is unwilling to yield and give way to another prophet at the time of his exposition [cf. 1 Cor. 14: 29-32]. Looking about long, therefore, upon all sides, and waiting, I finally break forth from my delay slowly and almost reluctantly, spurred on by more than one goad.

In the first place, I am moved by the consideration that the part of the opposing camp that is on the side of the gospel has long been comforting itself with the thought that when it comes to the real brunt of the battle, that is, when Luther puts his shoulder to the wheel, the opponents will turn and flee. Secondly, the affairs of the Papists, who have been filling every corner with their triumphant cry, "Luther is at variance with Oecolampadius and Zwingli in their matter of the Eucharist," seem to be much too involved to allow them to venture to plot any harm while we discuss the matter and come together. Thirdly, I am influenced by a desire for that full liberty in the Church in accordance with which Paul teaches that the individual has the right to speak in it, even if his seat is not among the prominent. [Cf. 1 Cor. 14:31.] For if we are true prophets we shall listen to each other, and if we are in error upon any matter we shall yield the point. And this possibility I think should be jealously guarded, to prevent

us falling into some tyranny. We ought not to look upon anyone with such extreme deference as to yield to his authority to the detriment of the truth and to our loss if he makes a mistake, however willingly and gladly we pay him the honor that is due, nay, vie with each other in showing him respect. It was for this that Paul opposed Peter [Gal. 2:11ff.], and Christ would not suffer himself to be called good by one who used the term wrongly [Mt. 19:17], that we might the more readily and freely contradict them that bring forward or defend what they know not of, reserving always the right of the Church to decide as it looks on at these contests. Finally, piety has admonished me (which, look, see how piously you deprive me) not to desert the cause of the truth. For he cannot successfully continue to seem, much less to be, pious, who not only does not join his forces with the truth, but even betrays it when in danger and leaves the victory to them that do violence to Scripture. For no man hides a lighted candle under a bushel, but puts it upon a candlestick, [564] [Mt. 5:15] and the servant who does not know nor do the will of the master is beaten with many stripes [Lk. 12:47].

We all know how sharply Paul rebukes the learned man who yet reckoned offerings to idols as things of no importance and so brought the simpleminded brethren almost to destruction [1 Cor. 8:7-13]. How much more we ought to show no hesitation here where no weak part of the faith is called into dispute and danger! For if faith alone be not absolutely sufficient to make blessed without the power of externals, then we fall back upon works. So many come forward and promise to make perfect by the power of the Scriptures, to which they yet do no small violence. If they could accomplish this, it would be finished with the noblest part of the New Testament. For take away the Gospel of John, and you have taken away the sun from the world. Moreover those who confuse the two natures in Christ, truly desiring to proclaim of the human what belongs only to the divine, and of the divine what belongs merely to the human, though not as a matter of change of attributes and exchange [2] of natures, such persons not only obscure and defile the Gospel of John but trample it under foot, as I shall show in due course.

I had no right to temporize, I say, in so serious a business. For how will he be acknowledged by the truth which is Christ, who, by deserting the truth, is shown not to have desired to acknowledge it? Besides these inciting motives there was another stimulus, albeit not strong enough to awaken me by itself--the exhortation of the brethren, one promising victory over the adversary, another offering for the dangers of battle the protection of the golden armor of Glaucus, [3] another, armor of bronze. That is, to put the whole thing plainly, some advised me to join battle with you sharply and steadily, others prophesied that more could be accomplished with you by gentleness and softness than

by force. [4] What I have done and what adviser I have [565] decided to follow you doubtless see much better than I could point out, for I follow natural temperament and Minerva, [5] that is, unless it offends you, the Spirit, without which all that one does is feeble and cold. I have thought, therefore, that neither are you so stubborn and implacable as to take offense, provided you read what I have written, nor am I so tender and incapable of fighting, thank God, that if you attack me sharply I am likely to abandon my post. Not with good omens have I determined upon war or come out into the field to single combat. I send you a fetial priest [6] in the shape of a book, who comes not to demand satisfaction, but to bring about an understanding. Hence I have attached to the book the name of an exposition, that it may expound to you in a friendly way my views and the basis in Scripture upon which I build, and not come to blows, as the Papists and certain biting but bad poets have for some time been anxiously hoping. For so far as I understand your position, you seem to be wholly ignorant of my arguments. For those which I have brought forward are enough to demolish, begging your pardon, without any trouble, all that you offer to the contrary. If you have examined them and intentionally passed them by, I am afraid that even an ajax could not prevent your enemies from fixing upon you the name of a deceiver of the people. [566]

But however that may be, I frankly call upon you to lend a kindly ear to what I am going to say very freely but at the same time fairly, and ask you to weigh it without passion, after the fashion of Alexander of Macedon, [7] who is said, by interposing a period of three days, to have become more fairly disposed to the man who had made an appeal from his anger to his calmed and quiet judgement. You have seemed to many, not yet having got over that wrath you were feeling towards certain persons, [8] to have treated a difficult subject in the heat of your anger, and not to have shown good and innocent men the consideration that was due to them and worthy of yourself. If this is so, my book will make an appeal from your wrath to your calm and favorable judgement. For you are aware how dangerous it is to admit into deliberation anger, petulance, stubbornness, jealousy and the like, that boldly and shamelessly gives themselves out for righteousness, courage, firmness and authority.

Show yourself, therefore, free and calm for a bit, and consider how careful men of piety have ever been in refuting errors, and how much they have helped the Lord's flock when they have weighed things without passion, and, on the other hand, how much harm has been done by those who have been unable to see clearly in a case under consideration because they were overwhelmed by their feelings. Everyone knows how much violence has been done to the Church by greed and ambition, by guile and hypocrisy, and are we to fancy that no harm will arise from

hatred, jealousy, contention, rivalry and even bitterness, anger and impulsiveness? Are these not passions? Yea, they are fiercer ones than the others. There is no cause, then, to boast greatly of the Spirit, if we are overborne by these. Let bygones be bygones, then, and let us begin our conference in a pleasant and lighthearted mood, helleborisamenoi ("having calmed our minds with a soothing draft") like Carneades. [9]

And do author, [567] lord and father of all things, breathe upon us with favor, and scatter from both sides all the mists of ignorance and passion, as you did once direct your strong wind against the sinister waters [Gen. 8:1], and put them to flight, thus giving the kind earth opportunity to put forth its shoots and buds. Put an end, I pray, to dissension and uproar and fierce raging. Rise, most pleasant morning star [Rev. 22:16]. Shine forth at once, sun of Righteousness! [Mal. 4:2] For when there is contention, the holiness which you especially require of us is disregarded. You see how we never come back better from contention. For it is the work of the flesh, from which none comes without blemish. On the other hand, they that have turned away from it, have ever been excellent. Keep us from it, therefore, that we may employ in the work of virtue all the strength that we otherwise devote to strife.

And oh you, my Luther, deign to be, as you are reputed to be, single-hearted, katharos and unruffled. For I shall offer to God things not sharp but sound, not trifling but vigorous, and if you accept them error will again be beaten back, Antichrist will fall, who is now seeking to lay hold of you for no other reason than that he fears that if you give up your opinion everything will collapse. That they will in any case I do not doubt, but after more of a struggle. I beg you to interpret what I have written in fairness with even greater fairness, as befits your learning and to think and carry out all things to the glory of God, as apparently as heretofore. Farewell and consider calmly. Zurich, February 28, 1527. [568]

To the Reader

I am not so dull, however simpleminded otherwise, good reader, as not to foresee what you are going to feel when you look upon this exposition of mine, written, if not against Luther, yet to him. You will be afraid that some cruel strife is going to arise between us, and give a handle for unkind comment to the enemies of the gospel. Put aside your fear. I shall moderate my words in such a way that Luther cannot take anything amiss, and the papists will not be able to discover any hope of regaining their power. Luther was openly expressing his disagreement with us and heaping maledictions upon all who bore everything for the sake of peace. Not one of us uttered a syllable, and there will be no recrimination even now. What will be new, then, if I put forth my exposition in answer to him by name? He has already shown himself not content to differ with me and simply reject my views, but must number me among the fanatics and tricksters, and that in published books as well as in the letter to the people of Reutlingen [1] and in the revocation of Carlstadt. [2]

I immediately [569] made my answer to his arguments and to the things on which he based them, just as I shall now do, but I did not mention him by name. [3] Luther, therefore, has written against me by name before, and I against him, but without mentioning his name. Now I am going to answer him by name, but without abuse. If he is angry with me, it will be nothing new. If I take good naturedly, as one inured to evils, the things he throws at me, it will again be nothing new. For I have stood up before the same weapons before without blinking. Be assured, then, that unless the Lord takes from me the mind that has thus far directed what I have written, nothing monstrous or unworthy of Christians will follow from this document.

It was sad that Luther could not recognize the truth--the Great Homer [4] sometimes nods--but it would have been sadder to abandon the truth on his account. Take what I have done, therefore, in fair and good part. I have entered upon this matter with the purpose of putting everything to the test rather than withdraw from so clear and plain an understanding of Christ's words (for not till that prevails can we say that the gospel [570] has been restored), and with the hope and firm expectation that when Luther sees my words he will give up the contest. If I am disappointed

in my hope yet I shall not be in a cause so sure and certain. Meanwhile, trust in the Lord, not in Paul, not in Peter [cf. 1 Cor. 1:12], and not in Luther and not in Zwingli, and be careful that you are most blameless in Christ your dress, if you have put him on [cf. Gal. 3:27], and without anxiety as far as this conference is concerned. For if you never eat the flesh of Christ, so far as it is flesh, your happiness hereafter will lose nothing thereby. Noah, Enoch, Abraham, Moses, John the Baptist, and all the thousands of the good and vast numbers of the fathers are above, yet they never tasted the flesh of Christ in a bodily sense. It is the mark of a slight, not to say, sluggish faith to ask, "Whither shall I turn if these men disagree?" For who are we that none should disagree with us? Is it not true that all people are liars? [Rom. 3:4] Adhere, therefore, to the Lord, and do his work zealously, and do not accustom any man, however learned and even holy, to venture to think it wrong for anyone to disagree with him. Be good and kind, good reader!

A Friendly Exegesis, that is,
Exposition of the Matter of the Eucharist,
addressed to Martin Luther by Huldrych Zwingli

Allow me, then, at the beginning of the book, therefore, to return to you, O Luther, in which I will first set forth the order of the things I am going to say. Since, therefore, in some of your writings you have proclaimed that you had no need to run to the support of tottering doctrines because so far was it from true that anyone had broken up the foundation you laid against Carlstadt that no one had ever shaken them, [1] I want to arrange my exegesis [571] in such a way as first of all to answer the points on which you rely, and afterwards add my own foundation arguments and my understanding of the words of the Lord. Meantime, however, you will find a large part of my foundation arguments scattered through what I say in answer to your points. Then, thirdly, after an epilogue, I shall set forth in precise terms the assertions

you make in this matter without Scripture authority. Finally, I shall add a brief supplement on confession and images. For in none of your discourses you seem to have made no slight mistake in teaching that the words of Moses are to be tested only by the basanon ("touchstone"): "You shall love your neighbor as yourself." [Lk. 19:18] And since [2] in the letter which you wrote to Herwagen some time ago an opportunity to take up the passage, "The flesh profits nothing" [Jn. 6:63], occurs, I shall avail myself of that early, but only touching upon the most important points, those you also consider such. Now I come to your utterances.

In that letter, after having expressed a moderate approval of Bucer's work, [3] you thus cry out, "But alas! In the midst of these triumphs and toils he has fallen by permission of God into that blasphemous monstrosity, the sacramentarian [572] spirit, and his fine gift of eloquence and understanding is suffering contamination, nay destruction, from this pestilential poison, etc." [WA 19:471:16-19]

It is not my purpose, my dear Luther, either to defend Bucer here (for I have not seen what he has added to your words) [4] or to dilute your maledictions. How deservedly they are cast at us, everybody knows by this time. My object is to point out to you how through the whole letter you are carried away by the violence of your feelings. For if Bucer did everything worthily, and yet stumbled in this one point, it was a case of smoking flax, which Christ forbids us to quench, and shows by example. [Mt. 12:20] For when Philip, having associated with him for so long, yet at length said, "Lord, show us the Father" [Jn. 14:8], he, though standing in relation of God to human and master to disciples, did not attack him as you, a mortal human, do a fellow mortal and a brother.

It appears that you either put the most important part of salvation in physically eating the body of Christ, or are carried beyond bounds by your feelings. For if you did not put the gist of salvation in the eating, this knot would not deserve to be cut with so viciously sharp an axe, [5] and Bucer would not deserve to have you flare up so hotly against him. If the other parts of your work which Bucer has translated do not contain the essentials of Christianity, you are right in praising the man, but if they do, your anger is beyond the merits of the case. I warn you here in the beginning not to bring abuse on perfectly solid arguments by false accusation. I am not going to say anything harsher of you. But things which had been said without full knowledge, due caution, or clear simplicity, I am going to enlarge upon plainly and without anger. St. John bids us test the spirits. [1 Jn. 4:1] Therefore, I shall properly discuss whether you did a worthy thing in thus attacking a brother, after I have faithfully examined the extent and importance of the matter. It appears that the essential

of salvation is not contained in the eating. For, otherwise, [573] the disciples of Christ would have already reached the summit in having eaten the body of Christ, and would not have required the tortures of the cross. The other alternative remains, therefore, namely that you were carried away by your feelings beyond prepon ("what is becoming"). And this grieves me very greatly, not only on your account, but for the sake of miserable humanity, because nothing is so perfect and solid that it has not a gap somewhere. Nothing is happy in all respects. I close an eye, however, to these attacks the more willingly because I see that whatever can happen to one man can happen to another. There are things numerous enough to make me infer that this disorder crept in unawares: the fanatics whom you call Suermeri ("the Gushers"), I by a Graeco-Latin term, Spiriteuseri ("the Spiritizers"). They form an evil just as troublesome to my party as to yours: unfit and early-ripe masters who proceed to teach what they have never properly learned; the shamelessness of the crowd who at every novelty become amazed and confused, as the Phaeacians did at the fortune of Ulysses, and with the same sort of result; the uncertain faith of princes, in consequence of which those who trust them most fall most grievously. These, I say, and other things (which, though they need not be mentioned here, cannot fail to be all the more distinctly present in our mind) were the causes of our letting loose the reigns of immoderate abuse. Pardon should be granted even to a heedless good-for-nothing, if he sins from foolishness and not maliciously how much more, then, to a promachō ("chief champion") of the gospel, if he has met with the ordinary human experience (for I do not think you think yourself in such a position that you are incapable of falling or stumbling) and yet has not betrayed the battle, nor could have if he had wished, since the leader, in whose sight the fight is carried on, has those to put into the place of the missing. Pardon will, therefore, be readily granted, if the fault be acknowledged, for the causes of the transgression are understood. But to refuse to acknowledge one's wrong and to rage more and more ought to be furthest away from any good man, much more from Luther, the master of integrity and piety. You ought not, then, to have attacked the faithful translator so fiercely. But you did it. You, therefore, did as humans do. Will you submit to this elenchon ("sort of judicial examination") of mine indignantly? Will you not listen to an advisor? So much in regard to the fact.

Now I will speak of your language, which, to speak frankly, seems to be mere speech, and not a reflex of your thought. For if I believed that you cherished such bitter and savage thoughts as come forth from your words, I never should have conceived the shadow of a hope of a return to friendship, nay, I should not [574] look for anything worthy of a man from you, if that flood had, alas, come forth from your real feeling. "Show me the wound," I would say, "that I may see how terribly you are hurt." The mind

is ill that at any little touch or blow cries out. If, therefore, Luther cries out ouk en kairō, when there is no occasion, he is ill. But how can the mind of a man so completely pious and learned fall ill? It must have had some disturbing experience. It thought a wound was inflicted when it was really given shelter and refreshment. Therefore it must be forgiven. Let us put away, I beg, those bitter and noisy words, and work with argument and Scripture. You have not yet proved that what you condemn in that excellent and highly learned man, Bucer, is an error, and you revile a man who deserves well of you as if no one could have hurt you more.

"He has fallen," you say, "into that blasphemous monstrosity, the sacramentarian spirit." [WA 19:471:17-18] Is it a monstrosity to rescue the Scripture from violence, or to thrust upon it an interpretation which even the ordinary understanding of the faithful does not accept? Bucer has not fallen, therefore, but he was lying down and has risen up. A blasphemy, properly speaking, is an insult to God. But what is in accordance with the natural meaning of the words of the Lord were an error, that would not make it a blasphemy. No one calls an error blasphemy in which there is no vicious intent. We have, therefore, been making the points of our words too sharp. The controversy is still awaiting the judgement of the Church, and we condemn without waiting for her decision. This would seem to be blasphemy, hybris ("arrogance"), and violence. The sacramentarian spirit is that which hangs upon the sacraments and attributes more to them and trusts in them more than is right, not that which knows how to treat the sacraments as sacraments. You used "sacramentarian spirit" as a term of reproach, but this reproach can properly be directed against those who seek in the sacraments what they do not contain. The people of Israel, having once suffered a great defeat at the hands of the Philistines, said, "Let us fetch the ark of the Lord, and it shall save and protect us," [1 S. 4:3] and when it was brought, suddenly they suffered a still more disastrous defeat [1 S. 4:10]. Why did not this sacred chest save them? Were not the rod, the manna, the tablets in it? [He. 9:4] But the box was not endowed with the power to save. Therefore, when they mistakenly attribute to it the power of saving, they are wrong. So the sacramentarian spirit is that which attributes to the sacraments what they do not contain, no, indeed, cannot even contain. The Lord's body, even if it were physically [575] eaten, would never yet bring with it what you declare, namely the comforting of the heart, the effective presence of the gospel, and the pardon of sin. This is brought from your own storehouse, not from the oracle of the divine word.

Furthermore, you think Bucer's "gift is suffering contamination, nay destruction, from this pestilential poison." [WA 19:471: 23-24] To us, on the contrary, to declare that the flesh of Christ

is physically eaten in the supper seems to be the really pestilential thing, through which as it sprouts and spreads the gospel is going to be laid waste. For if it would strengthen faith and remit sins, who would not return to the vomit of works? I confess clearly, by heaven, that if I were told by the word of the Lord that sins were forgiven through this supper, I would partake of it every time my conscience troubled me. Would not faith in works straightway come back? Would not those who attended to so sacred a business immediately be in high esteem? Believe me, the papists have scarcely any hope left unless they can keep live that superstition of the physical eating of the body of Christ.

For what do you suppose? That the Pope trusts to the promises and threats of certain princes? What do you suppose princes can accomplish by bloodshed and power if the people are on the other side? He feeds them on gifts and promises, but not for long. But if that forced interpretation of the Lord's words should prevail and flourish, he hopes to get everything back. Hence our friend Faber, that Vulcan of lies, [6] as the Diet of Speyer was on the point of adjourning, besought us with crocodile tears, [7] if nothing else could be done, at least to take care that Christ and entire salvation be not torn from us through the trampling underfoot of Christ's body, which was what those were after who denied that he was eaten in the sacrament. [576] To have faith in Christ, the Son of God, is the healing remedy against the wounds of sin, not to eat of his body. Salvation is promised to faith, not to eating, unless it be allegorical, which is nothing else than having faith. Hence it is clear that the teaching is pestilential which, defiling the name of faith, instead of trusting in Christ, draws one to the opinion that his body, as body, is eaten in the sacrament, and not to that one by which faith understands nothing but trust in the Son of God.

As to the things that you complain so loudly have been spoiled by the man in the Pomeranian's version of the Psalms, [8] I neither approve, nor disapprove, not having seen them, but as far as I [577] have heard from others, he kept his own remarks sufficiently separate from the Pomeranian's work and yours. Let each take out his own without insult if my advice has influence with you, or let what is in too deep to be easily taken out be set forth in the negative or the affirmative by notes of explanation and protest in language not calculated to injure. What is the need of such bitter outcries? For in your implication that certain persons have proclaimed their own view in regard to the Eucharist by making use of your arguments because they have none of their own, or that they have mixed their own in with yours, you take a wrong view of the business. For I see that both Bucer and Leo (who had turned himself into Leopold) wanted to prepare a way for you people (by which you could make a sudden retreat from your error, or could find a suitable opportunity to disguise it),

rather than to lean upon you. They did this out of love and zeal for your good name. For they saw that many do not see clearly in the matter, and that their teaching is thereupon brought into suspicion as being under a delusion in some points. Therefore they opened their arms to catch your fall, not to thrust upon you an error of their own, which certainly is no error, not to help a struggling cause by using your names, but to prevent your names from being ill spoken of. You yourself bear witness [9] that we are so fruitful and prolific that we can rain books, please the gods. This ought to be a reason to you for thinking, not that such men are agents of bad faith as if they trust to tricks, but truly of a good cause, which has such an abundance of rich material, that nothing can be said against it which is not immediately met. As to Leo, however, he did nothing but most faithfully quote your own words, as I, too, [578] am going to do with equal faithfulness. In the meantime, you see to it how consistent in every respect you are.

I am also going to reply to the book you wrote to the Waldensians on the adoration of the sacrament. [10] I shall equally destroy the force of that attack you make upon Carlstadt. [11]

You pretend that I said, "Luther is thus far silent." [WA 19:472:6] Would that you had been silent on this matter! We should not have been forced to swallow your loathsome stuff. You would have done an acceptable thing to me at least by keeping silence, since I am now summoned by outcries the timeliness of which I do not feel sure about into the dangers of a battle with you.

"What should I accomplish," you say, "if I should write a thousand books, among those deaf madmen? They neither hear nor see." [WA 19:472:7-8] We both hear and see, but as your shot was not very solid, however hot, we hoped that as soon as you came to your senses, you would retire from the battle of your own motion. But since you are becoming more and more violent, even we hear you at length perfectly, so you cannot still say we are deaf. Whether we are mad or not, we can, perhaps, not safely say. There are so many madmen, even among those who think they are equal to teaching Minerva herself, to say nothing of those who might more properly than ourselves be pronounced mad.

That the Swabian Syngramma [12] has been commended by you, truly grieves me, not so much on their account, as on yours and that of the Church. On that [579] of the Church, because if the rest of the bishops should follow the example of these, the teachings of Christ would be subject not to pontifical tyrants alone but to thousands and thousands of little tyrants. Brenz gathered to himself certain insignificant little bishops, and propped up by them, proclaimed without waiting for the judgement of

their churches, that that was an error which Oecolampadius, the teacher of the man (if, indeed, such an ungrateful animal is a man) asserted when he was sifting his opinion after the fashion of the ancients, [13] whose style of speech Brenz, in consequence of tender age and slender learning, has not yet mastered. Do [580] these dozen little fellows do right to get together and make a random pronouncement? And do five hundred bishops [14] in mitre and lordly attire not do right in accordance with the views of Christ and the apostles, when they determine a point without the authority of the Church? Where have we dropped the two-edged axe with which we used to sunder the chains and kloious ("dog-collars") of councils, that of the councils of those clad in purple are not the Church and nothing can be done by them to the prejudice of the Church of Christ? Why, then, did your men not explain the matter in controversy to their churches and await their judgement? For I have made diligent inquiry into the whole thing, while they were hanging up the spoils of triumph to Jupiter in their security, to find out how they went to work among their people, and I have been informed that they overwhelmed their churches with cries like this, "A new heresy is coming forth, the most pernicious of all. Close your ears, therefore," and the like.

They have not listened, and even now most of them do not listen, to "Prove all things; hold to that which is good" [1 Thess. 5:21], and, "If the true meaning of the Spirit shall be revealed into any one of the flock or of the audience, let him be permitted to speak in the church." [Cf. 1 Cor. 14:30-31.] Was not the course mentioned, my dear Luther, not only unwise but the worst example? How can we better prepare a tyrant's throne than in this way? Some crazy head raises an uproar before the Church, crying out such and such a thing is heresy or an error, when he has not yet discovered whether it be white or black, and when the Church desires to see what is true in the matter, he caws like a crow, "Don't touch. Don't take hold of it. Don't look at it." How else did the violence of the popes go to work? Let us, therefore, not approve so indiscreet and harmful a precedent, my dear Luther, lest we seem now to admire what we were once glad to throw eis korakas, [15] ("to the crows"). For if I restore what but a little while ago I was clearing away, I set myself up as a sort of sham [Gal. 2:18]. On the other hand, the commendation of this work grieves me on your account, [16] [581] because it grieves me that your reputation should suffer any decline. But it cannot help suffering such when you extol as if you were celebrating a victory of Caesar's, or the Combat of Hector and Achilles, [17] a book which is altogether feeble and barren. For if you look at the style, it appears infantile and without any solidity and strength, nay so hurriedly and indiscriminately acquired that the writers seem hardly to have had enough equipment even for this composition. If you look for arguments, nothing is weaker,

if for keenness, nothing is duller. It is so badly reasoned and so sluggish in penetrating to the inner meaning of things that it is not easy to infer on what they could have relied in venturing to undertake the task. If you desire clearness, do you not see that everything comes out of their hands more obscure than it went in? For this matter of the external word and the internal word and a thing which occupies a sort of third place so that both the external and the internal word symbolize it [**18**] (which appeals so strongly to your taste), is nothing but a hazy nonentity and a knot sought in a bulrush, [**19**] as they say. For what is the external word but the [582] idea of a thing corresponding to it?

Let us see, then, what these fine fellows deduce from this perfectly plain notion that all philosophers have accepted. "We preach the word of the gospel with the mouth," they say, "and this is the external word." This can be passed over in silence. "But what is believed in the heart and understood in the mind is the internal word." This also can be passed over without comment. "But the thing corresponding is neither the internal word nor the external, but the thing of which the internal and the external word are the idea, image, and as it were, painted picture." Here I can scarcely restrain myself from flowing over and saying, "Then they are distinguished in substance," but I will pass this also by without comment, that we may see into what pool of error these cuttle-fish plunge themselves. They go on to say, "When, therefore, the faith of a person is present, he has God immediately present. So, therefore, if he believes, he eats the body and drinks the blood (that is, believes), he must have the body and blood present. But who makes God present to faith but the word?" [**20**] and so forth.

You see, Luther, what their view is. First, they think that whatever one has faith, or plērophorian ("full assurance") about, is present in essence. Secondly, they think it is brought by the word. Finally, they vary the meaning of the terms "faith" and "presence of the body and blood". I come back to the first and ask: Do they think that in general the thing about which we have sure faith is materially present? If so, the whole Mount of Olives is materially present with Christ and the apostles [cf. Mt. 26:30ff.], nay also Judas with his treacherous caress and his accomplices, and Peter with his sword, in his fierce irritation. For I firmly believe that Christ was taken there, and that all the rest was done as it is written. Otherwise, what is their reasoning? For it doesn't the least follow that because God is present to the believer, therefore a created thing is present to the believer, to omit for the present the caveat in which they say, "We are not speaking now of the presence by which God fills all things, but of that by which he is present to the pious." [**20**] But the body of Christ is a created thing. Therefore, it is a non-sequitur

to say, "God is present to the believer. Therefore, he who believes that Christ suffered for us in the body has his body corporally present." [21] Pardon the subtleties, good reader. There is nothing that makes me more angry than this Chrysippus-like [22] hair-splitting into which these fellows drag one against one's will and efforts [583] to avoid it. I have proved before, by the testimony of the angel who said, "He is risen, he is not here" [Mt. 28:6], that the body of Christ is not everywhere, even if his divinity does fill all things, [23] and that, therefore, it is not at hand in bodily presence when Christ is believed in. For the pious women carried him in their hearts through faith, and yet the angel said, "He is not here," denying thus, by heaven, nothing but bodily presence. From the reasoning of our friends it would follow that Christ was present in bodily presence before he was clothed with body. For the fathers believed that he would come in bodily presence. [Cf. Jn.8:56.] Therefore he was there. For this is what they are trying to prove in general, that when faith is had the word forthwith makes present essentially and corporally that which is believed in. If they do not think in this manner their reasoning has no weight, but is trivial and inconsistent.

As to what they say in the second place, that God is made present to faith by the word, I ask again, "By what word? The external?" Why, then, do we not make God present to the tyrants and pontiffs? Is it the internal word? What becomes, then, of the sayings, "Unless you have believed you shall not understand" [Isa. 7:9], and "No man can come to me except my Father draw him."? [Jn. 6:44] From the drawing by the Father, then, comes our trusting in Christ, and not from the word, even the internal. For by the internal word they cannot understand anything else than plērophorian ("fullness") of faith. [Cf. He. 10:22.] Then they say only that faith is present through faith. For they say that God is made present to faith by the word. God, therefore, is made present to faith by faith. Faith, therefore, believes, and what it believes it makes present to itself. What did it believe, then, before it had this present? If it did not believe this, how could it be faith? If it believed it, how is it that what it believed was not present, since no one believes without the grace of God? If, therefore, it was present through goodness and grace before belief or at the very beginning of faith, it was no doubt present in the way that it regularly is present to the pious, as they say.

See what becomes of their sharp and clever reasonings? They make upon the untaught masses an impression of solidity and truth when they are nothing but the beard of the grain; they prick but do not pierce. But they have some power to deceive, especially if meantime I raise an outcry that those who do not understand these subtleties are fanatics, deaf, dullards, blockheads, and even madmen. For then everybody wants to seem to understand clearly what is claimed. But [584] it is not hard to tell what they

are after when they say that both God himself and the body of Christ are brought to us by the word as in a vehicle, even if they strenuously disguise it. They mean to say that to those who believe that they are going to eat the body of Christ in the sacrament he is made present by the utterance of the words. This becomes clear when they cry so loudly, "We must believe the plain and simple words of Christ, 'This is my body,'" in such a way as to understand that by the words themselves (they do not venture to say "when uttered" or "thought") the body of Christ is made present. What then? They beg the question at all points. For when we seek to trace the meaning in the word of the Lord, they come forth and say, what is eaten there is the body of Christ. If one asks why, since there are so many difficulties involved, they say it behooves us to believe this is the meaning. But they go to work cautiously, as I have said. Having said that the body of Christ is made present to believers by these words, they do not add "when uttered" or "thought".

Therefore I ask first whether the body of Christ is made present immediately upon the belief that the bread is the body of Christ or that it is in the bread. If so, then it is faith and not the word that brings the body. If not, they have proclaimed a falsehood in reiterating so often that if one only believes he eats the body, he does eat it. But some champion will come forward and say, "Faith and the word ought to come together at the same time."

I ask again, to come to two difficulties which they run away from, "What word ought to be thus coincident in time with faith, the word uttered or the word thought?" If the word uttered, I ask whether it is enough that it be uttered by the minister for all or whether the individuals must utter it. If the utterance by the minister is enough, it might readily happen that no one eats the body of Christ. For suppose the minister has not faith that the flesh of Christ is eaten on the occasion. Then the flesh of Christ will not appear there. If they say, "The faith of the partakers makes the flesh appear, not the words of those who repeat them," then the body of Christ is not made present by the word. Thus your coach in which you were bringing the body of Christ goes to pieces. If they say that it is in order for anyone to utter the sacred words, then the uttered words produce the body of Christ. But how can this be, since you said that it is made present by the faith of the believer. If it is done by faith, then the word does what has already been done by faith, which is like pleading a case already decided. If, on the other hand, the thing is done when the words are merely thought, the same thing follows, to wit, that thought does what has been done before by faith. And, what is most dangerous in the premises to leave subtleties at length and come back to the subject, is that when they discourse in this way about the power of words, as if they made the body

of Christ present, they restore and prop up the authority of the pope which had almost collapsed. [585]

But you may object, will he not also say, "By the words of the Lord, uttered over a believer, is not the thing which the words symbolize made present? Do you believe, therefore, that to the man to whom Christ said, 'Your sins are forgiven' [Mt. 9:2], his sins were pardoned or not?" I agree I believe so. He may then say, "So, therefore, are the sins of poor mortals forgiven when I say, 'Son, your sins are forgiven you.' For the words make the thing itself present and so forth." He may say, therefore, with these syngrammateusi ("memorialists") to all the blind and lame, "See" and "Hear", and may relieve their misfortune. [Cf. Mt. 11:5.] For the word will bring the thing itself with it. Nor can they say, "Christ did not bid us to do those things but eat his body. He commanded us to do this in remembrance of him." For Christ did not bid us to eat his body in commemoration of the body, but he bade us to eat symbolic bread and wine in remembrance of his body, that is, of his passion and death. It is to this that Paul has reference when he explains the words "Do this in commemoration of me" by saying, "As often as you eat this bread and drink this cup, you will announce the Lord's death." [1 Cor. 11:24f.] Therefore we must ignore that opinion of the pontiffs who used to teach that the words "This do in remembrance of me" should be referred to his body, "Produce my body out of or in bread in commemoration of me." For this word "this" does not refer to the bread or the body, but to the announcement, that is, the thanksgiving and praise, in the sense, "You shall thus give praise and thanks that I have given up my body for you," as is perfectly plain from Paul's words.

But, on the other hand, he bids the believers rescue their brethren from evils. For he says, "He enjoined upon them to care for all infirmity and weakness. Nay, he added this promise, 'These signs shall follow them that believe. They shall cast out devils in my name, etc.'" [Mk. 16:17] Whither will your syngrammateis ("memorialists") turn now? He has nowhere promised that when anyone said the words "This is my body" the body of Christ will be produced there, but he has promised and said that the faithful shall banish devils and disease. When, therefore, they do not effect that which has been promised if we believe, it is apparent that they do not have faith. How, then, will they make the body of Christ present, which God has nowhere ordered or promised that they can do or ought to do? [586] Yet, that no one may find a stumbling block in this reasoning of mine, it is necessary to meet the question at the start with the help of synecdoche, [24] and my reasoning is none the less strong. Consider carefully, good Luther, how empty and trivial is what they say of the vehicle of the word.

There remains now the third division of this section, namely the showing how they amphoterizõsi ("print both ways"), and apply different meanings to faith and to the presence of the body and blood of Christ. For when they say, "When faith is present to a person, he has God present," what else, pray, do they mean than that wherever faith is, there is God present, not only with that presence wherewith he permeates and occupies the world and everything else, but also with goodness and grace? As if there were a kind of presence different from that universal presence wherewith he is present everywhere! As if, for instance, in case God favored us, it was not enough for him to be present to us with the presence belonging to his nature, but he was more present in essence than if he did not like us. In this view they are in harmony with the error which thinks that God's grace is a sort of property which is to be held and possessed by a person when it is given to him, an error which I think Philip Melanchthon was the first to confute. [25] This, then, is my view about God's presence. As to the presence belonging to his nature, he is equally present everywhere, like the air we breathe. For he is the essential being and support of all things. It was apparently on this account that the Hebrews named him the Four-lettered, [26] because these letters are all breathing or spirit letters. But when he favors one more than another he deems him worthy of more gifts than the other He is not any more present in essence in the world than when the man endowed by him with so many gifts was not yet born, just as the Pope of Rome is not any bigger in physical sense with Eck [587] and Faber than with Luther and Zwingli, though he lavishes his favor upon them and hates us worse than a cur or a snake. [27]

But they will say, "'This is a hard saying.' [Jn. 6:60] Was he not more present to Paul than to you?" He was not more present in essence but in grace. Do you see, therefore, how you change the meaning of presence? If you take presence as grace or inclination, he was more present to David than to Saul. But understood so, it does not correspond with your postulate, with which you want to prove that as God is, or is made present by faith, so the body of Christ is made present in its essence by the same faith. Here in the earlier position you use "present" instead of "grace, goodness and favor," in the sense that wherever faith is, there is also God's favor. For if you try to interpret it otherwise, namely, as made present in essence by faith, you are not only wrong but crazy, as is clear from the above. For how can he be made present by faith when there is no faith unless given by his goodness? In the second place, the word "present" is understood of natural presence or presence in essence, so that the body of Christ is represented as made thus present by faith. But how, in the spirit and heart, or in itself and materially? If this presence of the body is spiritual, for example, if it means that we trust in our hearts in Christ as having died for us, then there is no further disagreement between us.

For we, too, assert such presence, knowing that it is the one thing needful in this matter we are breaking lances over. But if you assert natural presence, the whole hope of your argument vanishes. For as God is not made present in essence by faith, so is also the body of Christ not made present in essence by faith. But while the syngrammateis ("memorialists") assert all these things--"Faith makes God present," "Faith makes the body of Christ present," and the like--on their own authority without scriptural support, we must not act in such a way that the same may rightly be said of us, namely, that we want people to believe our statements unsupported by Scripture. When, therefore, I say that God is everywhere present in his essence or nature and power (essence and power the theologians used to call it), I do not put this forth of myself (though the contemplation of the Infinite leads one rather to such a belief), but I take it from the utterances of godly men. Jeremiah 23:23-24 threatens in the words of the Lord the wicked who refused to listen to his warnings, thus: "Am I a God at hand, and not a God afar off?"

"'Can any hide himself in secret places that I shall not see him? Do not I fill heaven and earth?' [588] says the Lord." But there are many whom God does not visit with his favor, for he has destined them to be vessels of wrath. [Rom. 9:22] Jeremiah, is, therefore, not speaking of the presence of mercy and favor, but of the presence belonging to God's nature, by which he is everywhere present and holds and regulates all things. Thus there is not even a devil save because God is. For in him we live and move, as Paul quotes from the poet. [Acts 17:28] Likewise in Romans 11:36, wishing to restrain the boldness of the disputants, Paul says, "of him, and through him, and to him, are all things" (where in ipsum ("to him") is a figure of speech for in ipso ("in him"), which the Romans also, especially the Law writers, use, saying in senatum ("to the senate") for in senatu ("in the senate").) For God is the being and existence of all things. Why, then, should we dispute with him?

So straightway they vary the meaning of faith about the body and blood of Christ when they say, "So, therefore, if he believes, he eats the body and the blood (that is, believes), he must have the body and blood present." [28] This is what they say. Weigh their crafty words carefully. For if in saying, "So, therefore, if he believes he (i.e. anyone) eats the body and blood, that is believes," they wish to be understood as saying that anyone who believes has the body and blood present, they say nothing different from me. For I do not even understand the notion of faith in Christ Jesus without the idea of his body and blood. For it was for this that Jesus was anointed Savior and Christ, that taking a body he might save us and through the fragrance thereof draw us to imitate his life. [Cf. Eph. 5:2.] But in this sense he is no more present in body than is Peter. He is only in the heart.

But they want also by this turn of their language to insinuate their view into the minds of the simple, so that while we think they are speaking of mental or spiritual presence, the untaught will understand bodily presence.

If, then, they mean to say, "He who has faith in Christ has the body of Christ present, i.e., does not think of Christ as Savior apart from his body," they assert the same thing that I do. For Christ Jesus was then first called the Son of God when he came forth clothed in the robe of the flesh. But if by these words (if he believes, he eats the body and the blood), they mean to say, "If he believes he is going to eat the body and blood physically," why do they explain the words "eats the body and the blood" from John 6:54 by saying, "that is, he believes"? Look, therefore, first [589] at these words again, "So, therefore, if he believes he eats the body and the blood (that is, believes), he must have the body and blood present." Do you see? What do you think their character is? I think it is such that they signify nothing more than that the faithful have the body and blood of Christ present in their minds. I assert the same thing. But according to what I have just said you see that this is not what they mean, but this: "He who believes he is going to eat the body, eats it." And if you do not yet see the deceit of these people, measure it by this. When they had said in the first clause, "so, therefore, if he believes," there was no need of adding as a second member of that sentence, "eats the body and the blood, that is believes". For the following part would have fitted on by itself in this way: "So, therefore, if he believes, he must have the body and blood present." For when they add under the form of a second member the words "eats the body and the blood" and explain them by "that is, believes", what is this but tautologia ("tautology")? It's just as if they said, "So, therefore, if he believes, so therefore if he believes."

Now I think you perceive the fraud, namely, that they were all ready to say that he who trusts in Christ and believes that he is eating his body and blood, eats it, and when this seemed likely to get them into trouble, they drew back, and explained eating the body and blood as believing. Still, they wanted to suggest this notion to the little taught and the untaught all the same, or the notion that has been sufficiently exploded already, that trusting in Christ renders the body of Christ present in bodily shape. For this is their doctrine, that a thing becomes present as it is in itself, if belief is had in it and at the same time the word is uttered by which we are told about the thing, a doctrine which involves so many difficulties and absurdities that it would be nauseating to mention them at length. I will mention one or two.

It will follow, then, that when I trust in Christ Jesus,

and say, "This is my body" [Mt. 26:26], even without the bread (for our sweet-tongued friends say that this word "this" does not mean the bread) [29] the body of Christ is at hand and is eaten. Then, as if it were not enough if you understand what Christ said of the Pharisees--how they devour widows' houses [Mt. 23:14]--as meaning that they extort the poor foolish women out of everything through the arts of hypocrisy and flattery, the Pharisees will have to have such enormous mouths and such teeth of iron and adamant that they can chew up and swallow down houses. [590] For this is the implication of their doctrine, that a thing, even if a matter of the intellect and belief, is yet made materially present by a word if you believe the word.

So, again, it will follow that the elect are not only to enjoy the most excellent possible life in heaven, but are going to eat and drink. For Christ said, "I have prepared a place for you, that you shall eat and drink at my table, etc." [Lk. 22:30] It is not enough that a trope be understood; we must go to the place itself. So much for the word as the vehicle of the body, and for the change of meaning of their words, that you may better see that they are logomachous ("fighters about words") [1 Tim. 6:4; 2 Tim. 2:14] and tricksters, who have imposed upon you when you were unaware and were under the influence of strong feeling. For while the orator [30] tells us that hapla kai saphē ta dikaia esse oportere ("the right ought to be simple and clear"), these aspirants for nothingness rather than rhetorical distinction make the holiest and clearest things involved and obscure. For what is the use of making up, after the manner of the Scotists, all these perverted distinctions--the external word first and then internal, then these as distinguished from the thing they represent, and finally from the thing brought in material shape to us, now by faith, now by the word--unless one has made up his mind to throw dust in the eyes of the simple? People who are sincere call ta syka syka ("figs, figs"), i.e., things by their right names, simply and clearly. This is the way they ought to have spoken, this the order they ought to have kept, as the apostles said, "God gave his son unto the world as a propitiator and intercessor." [Cf. Jn. 4:10] Here you have the thing, so that, if we are to take into account philosophical considerations, we may begin rather with the conception of the fact and the reason, than with accidents and afterthoughts. This is what the apostles believe and preach.

What they preach, then, is nothing else than the fact itself. For they preach the fact, not in order to show forth by the word the physical or bodily Christ (if they did that they would have to crucify him anew. For [591] he was born to be crucified, and if he were shown forth in the one character he would have to be in the other also), but that they have faith in him who was thus born, lived, and was nailed to the cross. And this cannot be attained through the word of the preacher, but through the

drawing of the Spirit. [Cf. Jn. 6:44.] They err, therefore, by the whole width of heaven when they think that either the thing itself or faith in it is brought about by the word.

Nor is what Paul wrote in Romans 10:14 contradictory of this, "How shall they believe what they have not heard?" For after hearing the word, no one goes away believing unless his spirit hath been drawn by the Spirit, so far is it from the truth that by the word either faith or the thing which is the object of faith is brought about. The thing is taught, and not all who hear receive it, but only those the ear of whom is picked by the Spirit.

Now it is plain that what is taught by the word ought first to be considered, and the second place only given to the word itself, which is nothing but the image of the thing. If this is received, God has opened the mind; if it is believed, the heart has been drawn to it. Here we have to halt. For neither the understanding of the word nor the word itself makes the thing present in any other sense than as knowledge makes anything present, nor does the spirit otherwise than with the certainty of faith. For if the thing became also physically present, we should have to eat the flesh of Christ in a material sense or run the risk of losing eternal life. For Christ says, "Unless you eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood, you have no life in you." [Jn. 6:53] Here, I say, if it is not enough for a trope to be understood in the sense that whoever does not believe when of course the gospel has been preached shall be damned, nor enough to be united to Christ in firm faith through the grace of the Spirit, but one must have the thing itself also present, then no one can attain salvation, unless he has the thing itself and eats. In that case, faith, to which salvation is so often promised in the Scriptures, is made void, and physical eating is set up so that by faith alone is not sufficient.

But I had almost forgotten how the syngrammateis ("memorialists") in this expression, "eternal word", are trying to find a dark corner in which to hide. For the simple fabricate wonderful images and meanings in this eternal word, when "eternal word" is a Hebraism by which "the eternal thing" is signified, and [592] "the Deity" or "his purpose". Thus, therefore, by saying, "There is the external word, and the internal and finally the eternal word which renders present the thing we believe," they deceive the unrefined listener who makes some kind of distinction between the thing we have faith in and the eternal word, just as if the eternal word were some special thing which produced before us and made present the thing we understand and believe, when they are really the same. The eternal word is nothing other than the eternal thing about which we are taught and in which we have faith when we have been drawn to it.

See now how unseasonably they exercise their cleverness when they say, "There is, besides, the eternal word which makes the thing itself present." For they want the untaught to get this notion I have mentioned, namely, that the thing in which we have faith is made present by the eternal word, when the eternal word and the thing, that is, God himself, are the same thing. But perhaps they would deserve forgiveness if they did not try to make out that they are so splendidly consistent with themselves that they have a right to despise everybody else. For their slip is due to ignorance, and comes from their not properly studying the ancient writers. For when they speak of the beginning of the Gospel of John, "In the beginning was the word" [Jn. 1:1], they all keep the hebraism and say, "the eternal word which was with the Father," or something of the sort, though they mean to say the same thing as St. John, who meant nothing else than, "This thing [593] that I am going to speak about is so thoroughly the Son of God as to be God himself." The meaning of the term for "word" among the Hebrews, moreover, is fuller and more splendid than that of rei ("thing") among the Romans. From this, therefore, they have, through ignornace, drunk in a notion wherewith they deceive themselves and others. For they are as much dumbfounded by a trope as the tiger by the footprint of a man. The ignorant person must be excused, therefore, but only as a private individual. If he makes himself public by writing, he must be sharply reproved for having ventured to teach what he has not yet clearly learned. The "thing", therefore, and the eternal word, are God and his purpose and all that he is. This is preached to us, that we may recognize it, and having recognized it, rest upon it. This is the godly and natural teaching which both reason and religion accept. But that "the word brings the thing" and speeches like that, are paint with which logomachōn ("fighting about words") and deceivers defile the truth. In so many words, much against my will, do these people who build upon words force me to discuss the matter with you. You see, therefore, what their clearness is, obscurity, darkness, nay, black night. The other things that I dislike in them--to wit, the pointlessness or unmannerliness of their irony and taunts and sarcasms--I need not go into at length, and will only add that they almost never quote the testimony of Scripture without violently distorting it. I am grieved, therefore, not, by heaven, because my feelings have got the better of me, but on your account and that of the Church, that you have so highly commended a book which bears the marks of factious wantonness and not pious learning.

You make it a matter of unfavorable criticism that that incomparable man, Oecolampadius, preferred to put forth modestly the things that contradict your assertions rather than to confute them with mention of your name. [31] You must yourself decide how sincere you are in this. I did the same thing, thinking it advisable not to come into collision with anyone by name unless someone wrote against me by name. But in the writings to which I refer,

I always brought out the things which opposed and removed what you had advanced. Mention, I beg you, anything from among all the things you have put forth anywhere in support of your view that has not been repeatedly answered already. Some people are so pugnacious and hot-tempered that they find more delight in what is [594] bitter and inimical, nay Scythian and deadly, than what is gentle and not cringing but vigorous and solid. If the gentlemen had been willing to listen, they would before this have heard what they would see was a confutation of their arguments, but they preferred to have their case knocked all to pieces with wounds and blows rather than to have the matter settled by careful and quiet consideration.

Bucer's argument that Christ nowhere performed a miracle that nobody saw, [32] you again meet with abuse more than with Scripture or argument. Mention a miracle that was not known to the perception of people. "He sits at the right hand," you say. This is a miracle, but did not the disciples see him ascend thither? Did not Stephen see him there? [Acts 7:56] I say nothing, meanwhile, about the great difference there is between the miracles that were put forth with regard to us and those which had to do with himself. But you say, "Well, we do not see him today." What of it? You believe today that he was seen in the past. Do we see today the dead raised in the body, do we see Christ rise, the dropsical cured, the blind restored to sight, and the man who had suffered from palsy rejoicing and going home with his bed on his shoulders in spite of the snarls of the haughty that it is not lawful to take up one's bed on the Sabbath? [Mt. 9:2f] Therefore, we do not see Christ's miracles today but we believe that they were seen in the past, and we believe Christ himself, who foretold in plain words that he should ascend, and the apostles who bore witness that they had seen him. Else how could we have faith in his transfiguration, or not we, but the nine disciples? [Mk. 9:2ff.] Only three [595] had seen it. You also put "reigning" among those miracles which are not seen, but indiscreetly, for it was that we might see that he was Lord of all things that he commanded the winds [Mt. 8:26] and the sun and the rocks and what not. And we cannot make a miracle fairly of his reign, for the philosophers reckon it no miracle that God reigns--unless with the Jews and the Arians we are going to deny that Christ is God. Nor again is it a miracle for God to live. But you say it is a miracle for a man to be a mortal and living. But if it is a miracle for the Son of God to live after human fashion, was he not seen to live whom the stones could not bear to look upon when he was dying? And if it is a miracle for him to be living now, he is also seen to have done this. For he rose again and appeared among his own for forty days. [Acts 1:3]

See again, my dear Luther, what happens to you when you thunder so loudly this synathroismon ("combination"), "thus

Christ sits at the right hand of the Father, reigns, lives, acts is false", etc. [WA 19:472:22-23] See these things you reckon up are miracles, but each one has been presented to human perception. But where has the body of Christ, whether eaten in the bread or as made from the bread, ever been in such guise that any mortal's perception perceived or saw it at all? Why has this one singly and alone among all miracles (so-called by us, not by Christ, or the apostles) nowhere been presented to our view? Or how is there a miracle where no one has perceived that anything was done at which he could marvel? For our teaching that a thing is accomplished by a miracle has the same sort of authority as the statement of the naturalists that the Phoenix is born again from his own ashes. [**33**] They say so, to be sure, but groundlessly. It would be a miracle then, if he were thus put together again, like Hippolytus, but since no man ever saw it, it doesn't make it so because you people so represent it. [**34**]

"Let him believe that these spirits teach the truth," you say, "if anyone takes pleasure in perishing, for they have taken up a doctrine that sprang from evident lies, they maintain it with lies, and spread it by faithlessly corrupting other men's books." [WA 19:472:23-26] [596] I have represented you faithfully I think in this, so do not accuse me again of faithlessness and lying. If I made answer to this stuff with equal heat, not to say howls of rage, what, pray, would be the result? A brawling quarrel. Lying has from my boyhood been so abhorrent to me, Luther, that no one has ever accused me of lying unless he was himself a consummate liar. As to the character of our people, I rightly esteem them on account of, and do not doubt, their marked learning and piety; as to yours, I care nothing. I desire to know from you what the lies are upon which we have propped up our care. If you still cling to the error of thinking that we are in error, why do you call that which is in error a lie? Are error and lie equivalent terms? I will tell you without lying who ought properly to be called liars: those who say that the truth is a lie; who declare to the world what they know in their hearts is not so, and say that it is their opinion; who attack the divine utterances with seditious outcries and slanders; who trust to their own authority in championing what is opposed to the authority of Scripture and thrust upon it a meaning which this same Scripture cannot admit. These are the people who can be said to deal in lies.

Now, then, examine us, and see whether you find anything forced or deceitful or cunning. Do we not fortify with the most unequivocal passages of Scripture the meaning which we maintain? Do we deny in one place what we have said in another? Or what, pray, have we done, that you rave so roughly against us? I have told you hundreds of times that the question was not put forth at random by us, but we found it flying about in nearly everybody's mouth, and took it up. Is it lying, then, to subscribe to other

people's opinions? It is evident that you just indulge your feelings when you are not satisfied to say, "You are in error" but had to add, "You're a liar." As to the propriety of the person who wants to perish believing "these spirits" understand this: there are not among us any who make frequent boast of the Spirit. How faithful we are to our Lord, moreover, in the management of the talent entrusted to us [Mt. 25:14ff.], and how active in every work by which we gain with it as much as possible, is not a matter for you to judge or decide. He knows with what sort of faithfulness we do all that we do, who alone knows the hearts of people. [1 K. 8:39] Even if we were ever so much in error in your opinion, yet we should be in error without loss of salvation, even in your judgement, since you relegate this question to a place among those which are raised by troubled and curious minds, and may be neglected without danger to salvation. For what else do you assert when you say that our utterances do not require controverting? [Cf. WA 19:123:18; 487:12.] If we are in error why should we not be proven so? If [597] not that, why should we not be questioned? It is apparent that you relegate the question to things indifferent. How is it that you charge us with treachery, as if, being sent to announce salvation, we preached destruction, when you yourselves in the early stages of the controversy have defined it as curious rather than essential? Whither will you flee for refuge? What blessing has been promised to physical manducation, to say nothing of salvation itself?

Why, then, do you accuse us of treason? Finally, as to faithlessness, since I see that this charge is aimed especially at Bucer though you put it in the general count. I will not take great pains to rebut it, since neither the Strassburgers nor they of Basel nor we brethren at Zurich have ever been accused of this crime. We fight faithfully for the truth. As to Bucer's having made some addition of his own to the Pomeranian's version of the Psalms, he did it not without his authorization. He had given the man freedom to put in and leave out things in the course of his translation. Thinking in his own sincerity that this permission had been meant seriously, he added what seemed consonant with the true view of the Eucharist. This he did openly and with the purpose of furnishing both Bugenhagen and yourself a way out. This you two, being faithful friends to him from whom he merited far other treatment in this matter than from me (for I had forbidden the man permission to make either a Latin or a German exposition, not without reasons), [35] proclaim to all the world as treachery. Why do we not see the meaning of the sayings "strife sows strife" [36] and "the weary man seeks a quarrel"? [37] When we are embarrassed in our cause we seek a quarrel. A fine cause, to be sure, for reproaching one with treachery, when, even if he is in error, he yet acts in all sincerity! [598]

You go on in the letter, speaking of us, "Then, while they

see excellently, these vicious disputants make us of metaphors, inferences, absurdities, and arguments from the particular to the general." [WA 19:472:26-28] These are your words, to say nothing of your style of speech meanwhile, which shows clearly enough how feeling has blinded your eyes. You think we rest upon metaphors? You are wrong, then, and, clever champion that you are, accuse us of the thing in which you are especially great sinners, thus getting the start in casting the dart, so that we shall think ourselves fortunate if we avoid your spears without returning them. How should we make use of metaphors when on your own showing there is nothing paradoxical in what we maintain? The great use of metaphors is when one is inculcating something unexpected, unusual, and out of keeping with accepted notions--unless perhaps you reckon among metaphors the collation and comparison of Scriptural passages. But that you rest upon metaphors and nothing else, instead of resting upon the clear testimony of Scripture, I shall show when we come to the discourse you published against the fanatics. [**38**] The use of inferences is so legitimate that the rhetoricians say the essential point of a situation can be based upon them, even if witnesses, accomplices, documents, and signs are lacking. Our use of inferences, therefore, should not have been criticized so tumultuously, but you should have taken pains to prove that the use of inferences was not legitimate in this controversy. For if it is demolishing my opponent's arguments in case I throw them aside instead of breaking them down, no one is so unskilled that one cannot answer everything that is said in opposition.

Since, therefore, Christ in many places used signs and inferences (for they are so closely related that you can sometimes hardly distinguish one from the other), as when he says, "If you will not believe me, yet believe me for the very works' sake" [Jn. 10:38], "If they heard not Moses and the prophets, neither will they believe if one rises from the dead, etc." [Lk. 16:31], why may we not also use them, especially when even people who do not rest their case upon them still avail themselves of inferences? There are eloquent reasons that can be defended in every case. Know, then, that we have used inferences, not because we had nothing solid to rest upon besides, but that the pious reader might see that even they were on our side. Are we to regard it as a trifling argument if one says, "The apostles did not understand in the literal sense the words of Christ, 'This is my body which is given for you.'"? [Mt. 26:26] I think not. But how is it to be proved? By the most evident inferences. [599] The apostles saw nothing to marvel at, though they were otherwise impressionable and simple before all such high things. You all throw aside the inference, not with argument but with your mere say-so, though that upon which it rests is solider than anything you bring forward in support of your whole case. Thus: the eating of Christ in the bread is generally considered the greatest of all miracles.

But the apostles saw nothing to marvel at. Therefore, they did not perceive that there was any miracle in it. What plausible reply, pray, can you make to this reasoning? You are constantly talking about it, but not to say anything that fits the case, only not to seem to have nothing to say.

The same point is likewise proved by another like inference, namely, the apostles did not worship the host. We do so. Therefore the apostles did not have the same view of the supper that we have. Likewise Christ does not upbraid them because they do not do so. Therefore nothing of the kind was demanded. For he nowhere kept silence where an error could arise. Likewise the apostles showed no hesitation, made no answer, asked no questions, and yet they did none of the things we do. They did not have, then, the same understanding of the matter that we have. Likewise Thomas refused to believe that Christ had risen from the dead. [Jn. 20:24ff.] But if he had believed that in the Supper he ate the body of Christ, he could not have been so obstinately incredulous. Likewise when James enjoins that if anyone among us fall sick the leaders shall go to him, pray for him, and anoint him [Jas. 5:14], why does he not say, shall partake of the body of Christ with him, especially when we declare that faith is established and sins are forgiven through this eating? Likewise "One faith," says Paul, "one baptism." [Eph. 4:5] Why does he not mention eating together the body of Christ? For if the eating of the bodily flesh of Christ were required in his Church, Paul would not have neglected to say, "And we eat one body of Christ, that we may be one body unto him." But I will say no more about inferences.

I will now speak of indications and documents. Throughout all the churches and basilicas this side of the Rhine, that none of the little houses [**39**] in which the sacraments are kept are more than two hundred years old or a little older is an indication [600] that all those years ago the sacrament was regarded in the light in which I regard it. When the altars were all removed in the ancient city of Zurich this year, there was not one found that had been raised at the same time as the church. [**40**] Well, is this not an indication that eight hundred years ago altars did not yet [601] exist? The fact that priests' missals, such as our people call Chaplains', others Vicars', are not found at Zurich or in all Switzerland or even as far as Strassburg, not having a greater existence than three hundred years, also belongs with signs. At Glarus and Zug missals have been found, [**41**] not fully three hundred years old, which contain rubrics of this sort: "And presently, when the infants have been baptized certainly let the bread and wine of the body and blood of the Lord be given them." [602] And this is the strongest proof by far of all that the men of that time did not feel about the Eucharist as we wish to seem to feel. Otherwise they would not have offered it to infants. [**42**] I pass over many things but not this, that in the Canton of Lucerne

in Switzerland, on the day we still call the Lord's Supper, the people in the Council House, the canons and councillors of the city, with the provost of the college, assemble in the banquet chamber of some hall. There a portion of the sacred writings or something from the discourses of the fathers is read. Meanwhile wine and unleavened bread are brought in, and when the proper time arrives, the Provost rises and blesses the bread with these words, "The right hand of God the Father bless this gift of love." Presently also the wine, in this way, "The right hand of God the Father bless this cup of love." Immediately those sitting there eat in a devotional spirit and offer to the bystanders, and at the same time people assemble in the church, and a great quantity of unleavened bread is carried around. Afterwards a sermon follows. [43] This also is an indication in regard to the supper in old times.

I have not written this because something similar is not found all about among the colleges, but to show the duller ones that they have at their own doors an opportunity to learn that our ancestors had no feeling that they were eating the bodily flesh of Christ in the bread, although, like us, they called the bread the Lord's body symbolically.

Our college at Zurich has documents more than seven hundred years old, in which there is no mention of a "mass". Monks of the Benedictine order and the order of St. Bernard are established at various places in Switzerland [603] in whose diplomas there is no mention of the Lord's body or of the "mass", though some of them have been established within three hundred years. [44] And all these things and others like them, though you reject them forever, are yet true and more valuable than anything any of you offer.

We are as free from arguing from the particular to the general as you are persistent in declaring that we do it [WA 19:472: 19-23], and I have repeatedly reminded you of that. We have never desired to argue thus: "The word 'is' is sometimes used instead for the word 'signifies'; therefore, it is everywhere used for the word 'signifies'." But everytime we try to guard against your saying so, you stubbornly charge us with arguing thus. I enter the same caveat now, even though you do not receive it. This is what we have desired to show, that the use of "is" for "signifies" is not foreign to Holy Scripture. Since, therefore, these words of Christ, "This is my body, etc." [Mt. 26:26] might seem to the simple to have been violently twisted, I explained them in this way without an example from Scripture: "The word 'this' indicates here that the body of Christ was slain for us." I wished to show from Scripture that it was permissible to explain the word "is" by means of the word "signifies". We say, for instance, "The word 'seeing' is repeatedly used in Scripture for the word for 'understand-

ing', as is also the case with secular writers both Greek and Latin." Now we give the example, "But when Jesus saw what they were thinking" [Mt. 9:7], that is, when he understood or perceived. We do not, however, mean to say that "see" is everywhere used for "understand" but that when the drift of the thought requires this, the reader need not shrink from such an interpretation, since Scripture is full of instances of the sort. Even you see now, therefore, that we are not arguing viciously, but that you people are charging us with what we have never been so naive as to think of doing, and it is for you to consider the propriety or the viciousness of your action. Why, then, are we so sharply attacked? Is it the mark of a good spirit not to listen to the word of a brother explaining and making clear what he means? You are the people, I say, who throw the universal upon us against our will and loud cries. [604] If you say, "We have won, then, because they cannot compel 'is' to be accepted as 'signifies' or as a 'figure of speech,'" I have already shown that this is unsound before by proving from other passages of Scripture (which make it impossible to accept "is" literally in this passage) that there must be a different exposition of these words. Thereupon some of you are unwilling to listen to a collation of other passages, and how dangerous and impious that is shall be shown by and by.

You add immediately, "But no one deigns to listen to the troubled cries of our consciences. When we say 'The words of Christ are clear and plain: "Eat! This is my body"' [Mt. 26:26], our consciences, I say, are held bound by this. We want a passage pointed out which compels us that our perception is false in regard to these words. But no one utters a syllable upon this in all their books." [WA 19:472:28-32] Such is the complaining of your consciences. I do not want to say anything unduly harsh or biting of you, Luther, although by these words you make applicable to yourself the fable in which the man is said to be looking about for the horse he is himself riding on. [45] Our one object is to collate the passages of Scripture and thus bring the whole matter to the point where it becomes apparent that these words cannot have the meaning which they bear on their face. And you say that you people want a passage pointed out which compels this? You stumble about, therefore, of your own will with your eyes shut at noon-day. Such passages are these and others like them: "The flesh profits nothing" [Jn. 6:63] (therefore, he did not give it to us to eat); "He ascended unto heaven, and sits at the right hand of the Father Almighty" [46] (therefore, he is not in the bread); again, "I leave the world" [Jn. 16:28] (therefore, he is not here). As far as his divinity is concerned, he did not leave it, and indeed he could not leave it; "It is expedient for you that I go away" [Jn. 16:7] (therefore, it is not expedient that he be here). And inferences, the testimony of the apostles, and all that has been so often said in one's everyday experience, all of which you people push aside with insult and censure. I shall speak more

at length of all these things below, even at the cost of repetition. Now I come back to you and to these further groans of your consciences.

"They throw at us that the flesh profits nothing, but we know that. We want something else, something, namely, upon this passage, 'This is my body.'" [WA 19:472:32-34] These are your words. A sick man must be very much out of sorts [605] when he won't touch or taste anything that you offer him. If, my dear Luther, you knew that the flesh profits nothing, how did you come to get the notion that Christ gave it to you? Why do you not stop there, if you know the flesh profits nothing? Or how is it you know it profits nothing, when you declare that through eating it faith is supported and sin forgiven? What are you rowing for? You are sailing in port [47] unless it is the case you do not understand "the flesh profits nothing" as we do. I will set forth, therefore, our understanding of these words, and when you have heard it, do not continue to argue, like the insolent ones. I do not suppose that you want me to go very deeply concerning the arguments or the material of the sixth chapter of John, for we are all agreed, I think, that in speaking there as he does of his flesh Christ wished to teach nothing else than that all hope and trust may be placed in him, the Son of God, because he was going to offer that flesh for us as a victim to satisfy the righteous wrath of the Father. And this allegory has a special charm over others in which he teaches the same thing because he maintains the exchange [48] of one for the other of his two natures and also because it mimics the Jews so finely who thought, or at least wished to seem to think, that he was nothing but a mere man. Reproaching them with error, as it were, he says that his flesh is meat indeed, not by Hercules, meaning flesh, but his superior nature which had taken on flesh in order through it to propitiate and satisfy the eternal righteousness.

He is speaking, by means of the exchange of his mortal nature, though thinking of the immortal. For he who trusts in that shall be blessed. The Jews, then, did not take this allegorical discourse of Christ's as he intended it, thinking it an absurdity that his flesh should be eaten, while he did not thereby understand flesh but faith in the Son of God. Thus they not only themselves found occasion to murmur and resist, but caused some of the disciples also to do so by saying, "How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" [Jn. 6:52] And many among the disciples, following their stubborn example, took advantage of the opportunity to rebel, and said, "This is a hard saying; who can hear it?" [Jn. 6:60] Seeing, therefore, that they murmured amongst themselves at it, Jesus said, [606] "Does this offend you? What if you shall see the Son of Man ascend up where he was before? It is the Spirit that makes alive; the flesh profits nothing: the words I speak to you are spirit and life." [Jn. 6:61-63]

The words of Christ, I say, we understand in this way, that to the error of the Jews through which they thought he had spoken of bodily flesh as if it ought to be eaten, Christ clearly answered that the flesh was absolutely useless to eat and not for faith either, if you considered it in a literal sense and by itself. For he says, "It is the Spirit that makes alive." [Jn. 6:63] It must, therefore, be the Spirit in which one must have faith. This understanding most of you cast aside, and say that Christ was speaking of the carnal understanding and natural quality when he said the flesh profits nothing, as Paul and Isaiah bear witness.

This error, concocted with more boldness than discretion, in order to save them from being pushed and driven away from the flesh of Christ to which they cling too closely, I have refuted with these considerations: [49] First, that the evangelist both before the words "The flesh profits nothing" and after them, has put many clear and distinct expressions from which it can readily be detected that the natural sense of these words is the one which we adopt. First among these is, "Jesus, therefore, seeing." For Jesus understood [607] what they were thinking of, and they were not thinking of the antagonism of flesh and spirit which our friends so untimely bring in here. Hence it is not likely that he ran outside the barriers, as they say, [50] but that he stuck to the same thesis until he had made plain to the disciples what was obscure. And the second is where he says, "Seeing that they murmured among themselves at it, Jesus said." [Jn. 6:61] Behold with what clear marks he indicates everything so that we may see that Jesus is still upon the same subject! "That they murmured at it," he says. At what? They were muttering things to each other through horror of the flesh. And since nothing is said here of the nature of the flesh and the spirit, these words, "that they murmured at it", cannot refer to the nature of the flesh and the spirit. And his adding the word "said" immediately shows likewise that he made answer in regard to the thing on account of which they were murmuring. The third is where he says, "Does this offend you?" [Jn. 6:61] What, pray, does "this" refer to here? To carnal understanding? Jesus had not spoken of that. How could it refer to that, then? It offended, therefore, that he had declared so often that his flesh must be eaten. The fourth is where, beginning to shed light on the matter, he says, "What and if you shall see the Son of Man ascend to where he was before?" [Jn. 6:62] By these words he reminds them that they do not now believe that he is the Son of God, but turn everything upside down, and make him refer to human eating of flesh. But when they shall see him ascend into heaven, then they will confess in consequence of their own experiences, both that he is the Son of God, and that he spoke of faith in himself and not of eating with the teeth the flesh which they see journeying to heaven. And though these things prove clearly enough that Christ stuck to his first hypothesei ("proposition"), yet the things that follow sweep away like a torrent

everything that seems to stand in the way. Fifth: "It is the Spirit that makes alive; the flesh profits nothing: the words that I speak to you, they are spirit, and they are life." [Jn. 6:63] Here you have the enlivening Spirit. Why, then, does he so often attribute life to the flesh?--"Whoso eats my flesh has eternal life, etc." [Jn. 6:54] For he was a God that makes alive whom they thought a mere man. Kat' ēthologian ("by impersonation"), therefore, and mimicry, which are varieties of substitutions that is, by that imitation which [608] consists in using the language and point of view of one's opponent, he employs the word "flesh" but means "Spirit", that is, his own Godhead, whenever he attributes life to the flesh. At length, therefore, when he had struck this divine chord for them in vain, he is made stern, as it were, by their stubbornness, and says, "O slow of heart, think you that life, which consists of spirit, can flow from the flesh? It must be the Spirit which can give life." It is the Spirit, then, that makes alive. The flesh profits nothing, namely, towards enlivening, if it be eaten. For they had thought he attributed enlivening to the eating of flesh. "The words that I have spoken unto you." What words? "My flesh is meat indeed" and the like. "They are spirit," that is, are to be understood of the Spirit, indicating, namely, that it makes alive. How people would rave, my dear Luther, if I explained this expression, "they are spirit" as meaning "they signify spirit," in the sense "whenever I have named the flesh, I have meant to indicate spirit and life." But why do you imagine it makes so much difference what shape we give our words if the sense remains constantly the same? I would not designate anything in a peevish or violent way, lest I be a stumbling block to any to prevent his coming to the truth. "For the flesh profits nothing," namely, when eaten, for it was at eating it that they shuddered. He frees them from this horror by a twofold antidote, one, that what gives life must be spirit, the other, that the flesh cannot make alive. Though in their conciseness these words savor of hebraism, they contain nothing at variance with the general feeling not only of the faithful but of all people. The sixth thing by which we detect that it was of his own flesh that Christ said it profits nothing (understand forever as far as eating is concerned), and that he stood by his thesis--the one he meant all along and which the Jews failed to understand--is the words he presently added, "But there are some of you who do not believe." [Jn. 6:64] If he had been speaking of carnal understanding and disposition when he said, "the flesh profits nothing," he would not say now, "There are some that do not understand." He is, therefore, discovered to be still teaching faith and combating the error through which they had fancied he had spoken of eating flesh.

The last thing that I want to use here, for otherwise my exposition would be crowded too full, is this: "Then Simon Peter answered him, Lord, to whom shall we go? You have the words

of eternal life, and we believe and are sure that you are the Christ, the Son of the living God." [Jn. 6:68] Peter did not say, "We understand how terrible a foe the flesh is, in that it not only profits nothing but even harms." He said, "We believe." Whatever, then, is said here by Christ has to do with the subject of faith and confutation of the error about bodily flesh. And this, too, must not be passed by, that if Christ were speaking here or elsewhere of the nature of the flesh, he would never have said [609], "The Spirit enlivens; the flesh profits nothing." For what attraction would there be in such a form of expression? Did Christ ever speak in such insipid fashion? He would have said, "The Spirit enlivens; the flesh kills," or something of the kind. For there is no pleasing antithesis in the sense suggested, indeed no antithesis at all. For the flesh not only profits nothing it even hurts; yes, indeed, it is nothing, or rather is the destruction and ruin of salvation. But in the proper sense, a very beautiful antipipton ("disjunction") appears. For, when, in order to do away with the error, he says, "It is the Spirit that enlivens," and the listener suddenly begins to work up such an objection as, "What about the flesh, then, of which so much has been said?" there follows in the very course of Christ's words, "The flesh profits nothing," namely, eaten for the providing of salvation.

But before I furl sail in this matter I want to satisfy the objection which states that if Christ had said, "My flesh profits nothing," there would not be any vestige of ambiguity, but inasmuch as he says as a general statement, "The flesh profits nothing," [Jn. 6:63] he seems to be speaking of carnal feelings. I ask, therefore, in reply, "What spirit, pray, do they understand when he says, 'It is the Spirit that enlivens'?" Is it not Christ's spirit? Why, then, do they not in the same combination or the same disjunction understand Christ's flesh? But the strongest argument of all is, as I have shown at length, that through the very contemplation of the discourse it becomes manifest that Christ is dealing with the same material throughout, that of teaching faith and overthrowing the error of the unskilled.

I will not pass over in silence those who have before myself explained this passage in this sense, all the fathers, Augustine, Cyril, and all who in our time have written on John, so far as I have had opportunity to see them. [51] Melanchthon is of this opinion, namely, that "flesh" in the sentence, "The flesh profits nothing," is not to be understood of carnal feelings, but of flesh as a thing that may be eaten, for he says, "And that eating is believing he himself sets forth in the beginning of his discourse, saying, 'Whoso believes in me has life' [Jn. 6:47], and later, 'The flesh profits nothing'." [52] Here [610] Melanchthon makes his second proof from the contrary. Luther is of the same opinion in the sermon which he delivered upon the words of Christ, "My flesh is meat indeed." [Jn. 6:55] He says there, "Christ himself

says, 'The flesh profits nothing,' and again, 'My flesh gives life.' How shall we put these things together to make them harmonious? The Spirit puts them together. Christ means that physical eating of his flesh is of no profit, and so forth." [WA 12:582:29-32]

Recall your words, Luther! I quote these words of yours for no other purpose that you were once of the opinion that Christ said, "The flesh profits nothing," here, not in regard to the carnal disposition, but to show [611] that his flesh was not to be physically eaten. Hence there is no reason for your people to make here the objection, "We understand 'physically' as meaning through the medium of the senses." I am not now examining that question, but freeing from a violent interpretation Christ's statement, "The flesh profits nothing," and doing it by means of arguments, inferences and witnesses.

Why, then, my dear Luther, does your school put forward different meanings to us? Or, rather, why do different explanations of the same words proceed out of your mouth, when the circumstances are not in the least changed. The Pomeranian says that a carnal disposition is condemned here. Melanchthon and Luther say that we are taught here that carnal eating profits nothing. How is it, pray, that you are not of the same opinion all along? If you deny that you have anywhere expressed the opinion that Christ spoke here of a carnal disposition (I do not know whether you have done so in so many words or not, for I am not as well acquainted with your works as would be necessary to enable me to go into that matter), yet you commend so highly the writing of the Swabians, which teems with this error, among others, then you seem to approve the explanation. If you do not approve it, you are wrong to commend so highly a biblion ("book") that does such violence to the Lord's words.

But however the case may be, whether you are at variance with yourself or whether, as you have boastingly declared [WA 18:472:4-5], you are everywhere consistent with yourself, I offer you this controversy as to the natural meaning of the words, "The flesh profits nothing," but, with this condition, that you decide without passion and with righteous judgement (which [612] you cannot do, unless you examine with unbiased vision the pros and cons upon both sides). The Pomeranian and the Swabians stoutly assert that carnal feelings are here condemned. By which arguments? None. On what witnesses? Isaiah and Paul. They certainly tell the truth unwaveringly and undauntedly, but they say nothing in the point before the court. On what inferences? None. What signs? None. What documents? None. What probabilities? None. We understand that the physical eating of the flesh is here denied. By what arguments? On this, that it is to the Spirit, that is, to God himself that he attributes life. It cannot, therefore, be his flesh. The eating of flesh, therefore, profits nothing. Also on

this, that throughout the whole discourse Christ means spirit, though he uses the word "flesh". Therefore, he uses eating for faith and rejects physical eating.

And on what witnesses? They have been heard. And the witnesses on the other side are such that we should be glad to believe them unsworn, if they would only testify about the matter we are at swords' points over. But they do nothing less than speak for themselves. On what inferences? That if Christ had wished to begin a new subject of discussion, the evangelist would have made it clear by evident signs and breaks. On what signs? That the disciples would not have thought of defection if Christ had begun to discuss the difference between flesh and spirit, and that it was Christ's habit not to allow one who strayed to go away unrecalled. What documents? The commentary of Philip and the Sermon of Luther. What probabilities? That though an immense amount has been said on both sides, no one on the other side has ever undertaken to break down our arguments or our testimony. Hence it is apparent that, being without any support, they do not even expect in their hearts that they will come off victorious. And it is most likely that they brought forward such an absurd explanation only that they might not seem to have thrown away their spear before the enemy came into sight, having been at the beginning of the war so confident that they offered their symmachian ("alliance") freely to others. I appeal to you, I say. You have no small inclination of the court toward your side and an advantage not to be despised. For you are at once judge and witness, unless you prefer to reject your own testimony. If you do so, we shall lose one witness but not the whole case. You see how this explanation (whether one chooses to say it is that of fathers or of more recent times) is so strongly fortified on all sides that it dares trust itself to the decision of the enemy. [613]

What need of many words, fellow citizens? The very hesitation of the judge in so clear a case shows which side is coming off victorious. But what am I at? He is on the point of himself pronouncing the psephisma ("concluding decree of the court"). (Pardon me, pray, for treating the matter a bit lightheartedly.) Resign the office of judge then. Now I will approach you again, not as an adversary, but as one troubled in conscience. I have perceived your anguished outcries. But it often happens that those who are terribly distressed hear the words of the consoler but receive them not, nor suffer their distress to be removed by an exhortation or persuasion. This is particularly your case. Do you people imagine that we are so inhuman that we will not listen to the difficulties of your consciences, when we have no other thought, no other aim, than to help the consciences of all people in this matter, and especially yours? For we do not unwillingly admit that you are of the first rank of the champions of the gospel, the Diomedes who dared alone to attack the Venus of Rome, [53]

the Jonathan who dared alone to assault the defences of the Philistines. [1 Sam. 14:1ff.] [614] But what can we do? Certain ones have fallen back to where they were not long ago that put their trust in ceremonies and works. Whatever was said to them, they cried out: "Why do you take from us the worship of God and the refreshment of our souls?" It was of no avail to point out that God could not be worshipped by such means; that he was too rich to need them, too high to be pleased with them. The words of the deity were of still less avail. They did not want to be weaned. So also you fill the earth with empty lamentations, like the papists crying, in impotent wrath, that the salvation of souls is taken away, Christ himself taken away, such insults were never heaped upon God, and the rest of it.

When we show that you are like people who, seeing in a dream the vision of an accident or wound, would cry out, and when awakened, hardly come to themselves so as to understand that it was a dream and not a reality, then suddenly you dash upon us like delirious patients upon their doctors. Imploring can accomplish nothing. An attempt to soothe is received like a gourd on a sword, reasoning and apodeixis ("proof") have the same effect as a very little water thrown upon a very big fire. Whatever we have tried thus far, in whatever way we have approached it, the fire has suddenly blazed up more violently than before. And how true all this is, to come back to the path, this passage of your letter shows, where you say, "They throw at us that the flesh profits nothing, but we knew that. We want something else, to be sure, on this passage 'This is my body'." Here I beseech you, by all that is divine or human, check your steps, and lay aside passion, and listen a bit. If you knew that the flesh profits nothing, why in other places do you say, not without danger to the simple, that the flesh strengthens faith, takes away sins, and makes present what is otherwise only taught in words? [54]

Perhaps you mean to interpret "this flesh profits nothing" as the Pomeranian does, [615] as the meaning that carnal feelings are harmful. But we do not offer this discourse under that meaning, and you cannot demolish this explanation of ours. It is apparent, therefore, that you do not shrink back from the common interpretation. Why, then, do you not suffer that so gentle and healing a remedy be applied to your wounds? Eating of the flesh profits nothing. Do not eat it, then, for it furnishes no nutriment. If, therefore, anyone takes it away, what harm does he do? If nothing of value is taken away, why do we lament? It is apparent that the things by which we are goaded to such pitiful complaints are shadows and images, since he who is the truth, and about whose flesh we are at swords' points, teaches: "The flesh profits nothing," [Jn. 6:63] and we declare we feel, on the contrary, how much good is received from the eating of the flesh, and cry out that those who say they do not feel so, not only err but are traitors,

liars, and heretics. What do you think now, Luther? Is it not manifest what is said with passion and what with judgement? As to the wounded state of your consciences, therefore, be at rest. They have nothing the matter with them. Those are images and phantasmata ("apparitions"), which you fancy are real things. For let no one fancy, perchance, that he who is the way and the truth and the life [Jn. 14:6] was himself the sport of a dream when he said that eating the flesh profits nothing. Since, then, we can be deceived, but he cannot at all, let us look with suspicion upon the notion that our consciences are deprived of refreshment when he says that no refreshment is derived from the thing in question.

As to those words, "This is my body," [Mt. 26:26] why do you not see that Christ did not give his body to be eaten, since the flesh profits nothing for eating? "But," they say, "this passage has nothing to do with the one 'This is my body,' for in John 6 there is nothing brought up concerning the sacrament, but only the rebuttal of a crude notion about the body or flesh of Christ." [55] To this I answer that it seldom [616] happens that a proposition says nothing in it, even if it says nothing solid. What does it say, then? Just trifles, that is, it strings together empty words, and twines a rope out of sand. [56] as they say. This is proved most emphatically at this juncture. For why do we seek the refuge that there is no question of the sacrament in this chapter, when in the sacrament there is question of eating the body of Christ, and the same in this passage? Is not the same question involved in both? If they admitted that the body and blood were a sacrament, and did not try to produce the thing itself out of the mere naming of it, we never should have fallen into this controversy about the eating of the physical body and blood. Since, however, through their ignorance and thickheadedness we are compelled to thresh out the question, what should prevent us from having recourse to the place where Christ cut this knot with an axe so sharp and solid that no person has any right to hope that these two pieces of it--body and eating--can be put together again? It is a constant law, whenever anyone raises this question, to bring him first of all to this discourse, "It is the Spirit that makes alive; the flesh profits nothing." [Jn. 6:63]

Go now, Luther, and complain that no poultice is applied to the wound of your consciences, when it is so perfectly plain that the flesh profits nothing for eating. But how is it that no one "breathes a syllable" [57] to you? Did you not demand a little while ago that a passage be brought forward that would force you to admit that your view is wrong? This one, this one is compelling, Luther. Do you hear? Check your steps. Do not ask for anything else. You are sailing in port. [58] Let this be a wall of bronze and phōnē d' arrēktos ("an unbroken voice"). [59] [Cf. Jer. 1:18; 15:20] You ask whether the words, "This is my

body" [Mt. 26:26] are to be understood literally and simply as meaning that the body of Christ is eaten, and Christ, the physician (for from this he is called Jesus, that is, Savior and Father of the land), replies, "The flesh profits nothing." Abstain from it, then, unless you want to disobey the physician. Learn that we use the name body [617] of Christ but it applies not so much to the festival as to the symbol we carry about in it. Learn that we have here a trope, not an atropon ("unturnable") or simple form of discourse. Augustine confirms this view, suggesting in a letter to Boniface [**60**] that it is the same with the body of Christ as with his resurrection or ascending into heaven when we say, "Today is the Resurrection of Christ", "Today is Ascension". Therefore we ought to consider this business a little more calmly before we indulge in that exoudenōsei ("annihilating") and turning up of the nose at with "We knew this, we want something else" and "This we knew, it is something else we want." Whatever is offered, you always want something else, a tree, perhaps to hang yourselves on, as they say. [**61**] But error must be vanquished, however much it twists itself and Scripture, and however much it resists and rages and struggles.

In this exoudenōsei ("annihilating") of yours you go on in this way, "They throw at us that it is absurd. But this, too, we knew." [WA 19:472:34-35] We assert it is a twofold absurdity, with reference to the thing and to Scripture. About the latter I am going to speak when I come to your "Sermon against the Fanatics". [**62**] Therefore, I will refrain here [618] and content myself with speaking of the absurdity with reference to the thing. It is apparent that all of you who are on the other side have made up your minds to charge upon us in the spirit of gladiators. For though we say so often that many absurdities arise from your saying that these words of Christ, "This is my body," [Mt. 26:26] cannot be taken in a figurative sense, you are no way moved, but go on with, "Then for the Son of God to be born of a virgin is an absurdity, for him to hunger, thirst, fear, suffer, die, likewise. For these the heathen would call absurdities." [WA 19:486:14-22] What then? Is this not obstinacy, not to say impudence? Here again, I implore you. We do not measure absurdities by the thing itself. We think nothing absurd that is taught by the divine utterances, provided the understanding of faith grasps its meaning properly.

I give an example: taught by the light of faith that Christ was born of a virgin, we know that it is so, that we have no doubt that those who have been unambiguously in error have tried to make a figure of speech of a real virgin, and we pronounce absurd the things that Helvidius [**63**] and others have invented about perpetual virginity. We are free from meaning to speak except with the perception of faith when we make the objection of absurdity. Nothing is absurd to faith if only you rightly understand the

things that are set before faith to be believed. And if anything is absurd to faith, then it is in very truth absurd. This is the hinge on which things turn. For if I do not rightly understand the divine utterances, I shall boast in vain that I believe, or I shall teach in vain, nay dangerously, my brother to understand and believe what is not set before us as an object of belief. Again I give an example: "Upon this rock I will build my church" [Mt. 16:18] is among the divine utterances. When, therefore, the Pope of Rome utterly refuses to admit here a kind of alloiōseōs ("exchange"). [64] namely, apostrophēn ("an apostrophe"). [65] and obstinately maintains that the words were used of Peter, do not a crowd of absurdities follow? And the same must be said of the keys. But understand the words of Christ properly according to the norm of faith, so that here by keys you understand metaphorically [66] the grace of the gospel [619] and in the other place by rock understand an allusion kat' apostrophēn ("by way of apostrophe") to Christ, not Peter, and no absurdity follows.

When, therefore, in order to frighten you off from the wrong view, we placed in front of you the absurdity which is inferred through collations of the Scriptures (about which, as I have said, I am going to speak in the appropriate place), you fled to this citadel: "There is no need of collation, indeed, we will not listen to it. We rest upon the perfectly clear and plain words of Christ, 'This is my body.'" [Mt. 26:26] Then we did as parents sometimes do, pretending for the moment to yield, in order to get what they wish on a more favorable occasion. For then we might have held up to the ridicule of the world men who reject Scripture collation, we pretended things were not as they were, being sure, that, if they took refuge in the citadel to which they have retired, they could be subdued more advantageously. These people are the cause of our having brought up all the machines of absurdity. For when they shut their ears to collation, and cried with stentorian voice, "The words are plain, sacred, clear, contain no trope. We cling to the word of God with unsundered faith. See what you will have to endure, fellow countrymen, if you admit a trope here. Nothing will be safe, hereafter, from these champions of tropes." [WA 19:483:22-29] And when they kept pouring out bold and indiscreet things of that sort in words not a foot and a half long, but plethriaiois ("a hundred feet long"), what else, pray, could we do than what good soldiers do when they see the enemy superior to them in position or any kind of weapons--discover a way by which they can get the same kind of arms and come out ahead, or can drive the enemy out of his position? Thus, therefore, we attacked your citadel.

If you persist in not admitting a trope on any account, these difficulties will follow, first, that the Pope of Rome is right in asserting that the bread is transformed into the substance of flesh. [620] For this demonstrative pronoun must point either

to the bread or the body or the festival in which the death of Christ is commemorated with symbols of the bread and wine. If the pointing to the bread and a trope, as you say, cannot be endured in these words, then the bread changes into the body of Christ, and that is suddenly body which but now was bread. But if the demonstrative is used to refer to the body, then the people win who say that Christ said, "This" (namely, what he points out) "is my body," which is the view you impute to Carlstadt. [67] It can have no other meaning than "my body is my body". But if it refers to the festival, that is, to the company giving thanks, then we have won. [68] Nor can you say that the pronoun "this" points to both the bread and the body of Christ, giving the meaning, "this bread is bread and the body of Christ at the same time," or the meaning "the words 'This is my body' are equivalent to 'My body is in this bread.'" For in either case you put a trope into the Lord's words, even though you do not notice it, just when you are refusing to admit a trope altogether. Indeed, the first of these explanations, according to which some say the bread is at the same time bread and the body of Christ, makes confusion of the Lord's discourse. For if it is bread, it cannot properly be said of it that it is the body of Christ.

But why do we not see that we thus just logomachein ("fight about words")? For if a trope is not to be admitted, then the difficulty follows that is involved in the teaching of the Pope of Rome, that the substance of the bread is transformed into the body of Christ. Also the further difficulty that the body of Christ will have to be eaten, handled, seen, tasted as a matter of perception through the senses. For he did not simply say, "This is my body," but, "This is my body which is given for you." [Mt. 26:26] Now it was given as it was at that time, that is, as subject to sense perception and suffering. Otherwise it would have felt no pain during the Passion, which it be far [621] from me to say. It must have, then, the same characteristics as to sense perception when eaten that it had then. I shall cry out just as they did, "The words are plain: 'Which is given for you,' he says." Thus, then, you will eat a man, as he was delivered up. For if his body must be eaten because he said, "This is my body," his body must equally be eaten as of the realm of sense, for as such it suffered wounds and death. Hence there will be the further difficulty that Christ will even have to suffer pain, being broken by the teeth.

Finally, though there are many others, we have this greatest difficulty of all, which you always brush away with words, that no understanding (I am speaking of the understanding which has faith) can take in, that bodily flesh is eaten here, for these two things, "spiritual eating" and "eaten as he was fastened to the cross" are so at variance that no understanding can join them together. I say nothing of the doctrine of Marcion [69] which will in no other way more easily return than if we confess that

we eat the body of Christ just as it hung upon the cross. And if you persist in this stubborn rejection of tropes, we shall have to say so, because he said, "which is given for you". And since, you know, we neither feel nor see anything (of the kind). Marcion comes out victorious with his view that Christ carried about a body incapable of suffering. We, therefore, "throw absurdities at you," partly because you do not admit a trope, while you never yet give an explanation without a trope, and partly because the words without a trope have to be so twisted that they are at absurd variance with other passages of Scripture. This will be treated below.

Now this which is also in the things you refuse to consider, you certainly ought not to have passed by, namely, "They throw at us the visibility of miracles. This also we knew." [WA 19:472: 35-36] These are your words, I think. For you are the ones who maintain that the whole thing is done by miracle. Now, therefore, I demand that you show us the miracle Christ ever did that no one saw and no one has told of. That he was born of a virgin has been so thoroughly set forth by all that even today when we read in Matthew, "Do not fear to take Mary as your wife, for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost" [Mt. 1:20], we both marvel and believe with unhesitating faith that at which we marvel. But you throw at us perhaps, that it is an unseen miracle, because faith is not from ourselves but from the inspiration of the Father. But who does not feel the inspiration of the Father in his mind and heart and in all the powers of his soul? And whoever felt the miraculous presence of the body of Christ? Or when did Christ ever say it was accomplished by miracle? Or what testimony to this miracle of yours [622] do you bring, may I ask, from Scripture? Do you not also call us away from the contemplation of physical eating? What kind of miracle is it that refuses to be looked at? The more faith examines and scrutinizes itself, the more it increases. Here they snarl out "faith" and frighten you away from looking. It is apparent that a merchant who objects to the viewing and inspection of his wares is offering for sale smuggled or damaged goods. Then some are carried along by their own words, and do not notice what a difference there is between the things that God does as to himself and to spiritual existences, and those that he does in the case of things clothed with body. For the things he instills or breathes into our minds are not reckoned among the miracles, but the things that are done in an unusual manner in the duller world, these are what we have seen fit to call by the name of miracles, though I should not be inclined to contend obstinately about the word "miracle".

Eating the body of Christ, then, does not belong to the things that are breathed or instilled into the mind, for that which enlivens the mind and penetrates to it must be spirit; it shrinks from feeding upon body. This bodily eating of theirs must, there-

fore, be relegated to the things which take place in an unusual manner. Let them show, then, that it is a miracle. For the mind of the pious feels no shrinking from the spiritual eating of the Son of God, nay, it feeds upon that and is filled, but it does shrink from sarkophagia ("flesh-eating"). They say this is done by a miracle. Let them show the miracle not to the eye, but to the mind and understanding of the pious, from the writings of the apostles and evangelists. So you would have done wisely if you had halted at the throwing of miracles, but my advice comes too late. For you continued after this sufficiently satirical--I will not say shameful--fashion:

"I ask one thing. They always cackle something different from what I ask. When I ask, 'What?' they answer, 'Rot'." [WA 19:472:36-37] What is the meaning of this, my good Luther? What have you ever asked? From whom and what have you asked? To be sure, you have in this letter bewailed the tortures of your soul in such a way that no one has imagined that as far as this subject is concerned there was any feeling to be found there thus far except impatience. For what have you hurled out upon us but words and exceeding bitter ones at that? Or what, may I ask, in this complaint of yours, do you ask for that has not been abundantly answered before, as is now manifest? If in the Church of Christ we are going to continue thus to hate, envy, revile, refuse to listen to anyone, fight with loud shouts, abuse each other, and maintain whatever we please out of our inner consciousness, into what condition are we going to bring things? And I should not like to say to which that word "rot" you took from the play [70] better applies, to us who [623] have never refused to give an account of our faith and our doctrine either to any one person or to all people collectively or individually, and that without wild and terrible insults, or to those who do nothing but blast out "Rot". At one moment they say that Christ is eaten, but in bread, then that it is bread and wine and also the body of Christ that is eaten, thirdly that nothing bodily is eaten here, but it is at hand, namely at the bidding of the words or the supper. And all this so insipidly and unseasonably that I could not say whether they are worse off or the slave who acquires acquittal with his "Rot". But if especially there are with you people who answer "Rot", you won't hear from us "Rot" but nai ("yes indeed").

Now I return again to the reviewing of your utterances. "And nevertheless they boast that I do not come forth and confute them." [WA 19:472:37-473:1] I, Luther, am so far from ever having boasted that you did not come forth, that every time you have come forth into this arena I have groaned. For I saw how you would march out to attack the thing, and I had some knowledge of your fists. There is no one among us who does not frankly envy your warfare. How, then, should we taunt you? But you deny that you have not confuted us, and say, both in your remarks

against Carlstadt [71] and in other books or letters, that you have planted your doctrine so solidly that anything brought forward against it must be the vision of a dream. Oh, I say! We are blind in our own affair? Let us trust it to a referee, then. To whom? To the Church, the wife of our king? Show that you dare, my dear Luther, what we have dared: let our books stand open in all the churches. For we have recommended in this matter that both yours and the books of the papists be read, that thus the victory of the truth may be the more genuine.

What you then go on to say for some time in your letter is all of the same flour. You reiterate that we have brought forward nothing solid or helpful, because, namely, we have not carried you off bound with a chain of well-welded arguments, or have not yet furnished anaphychēn kai paramythian ("relief and encouragement") [cf. 1 Cor. 14:3] to people's consciences. [624] How do you know? Know, then, that the Church will decide about the arguments, and that the arguments, and that the consciences even of some of whom you hope to find applauding and supporting you rejoice inwardly in their bosoms, as they say.

Again, you say further on (namely, speaking of Bucer), "in that he bears testimony in this very preface to the fact that I am a vehement opponent of his sect. Would that I had leisure to be more vehement." [WA 19:473:9-11] These are your words. We recognize no sect other than the way of Christ which is sometimes called a sect [Acts 24:14], both in a good and a bad sense. Those are the founders of sects, who forbid us to track out the truth in a case, and keep the churches from passing judgement. The fact that Bucer represented you as a vehement opponent, I have no doubt was done without vicious intent, and with a view to softening by such acknowledgment one who sometimes--be patient, I beg--seems to many rather more savage than is right. But you wish you had leisure to be more vehement. I wish you rest and relief from the passions that have so acquired the mastery over you in this whole picture that I grieve to have such a picture exhibited either to us or to posterity. Would that if we were wrong you would be more vehement not in pouring out insults and false accusations which are all that your letter contains, but in wielding the weapons of Scripture and argument.

After this you write, "nevertheless, he wishes to make this difference of view a slight matter involving no detriment to faith." [WA 19:473:11-12] These are your words. You do not think it is a slight matter? Add weight to it, then, that we may also perceive its seriousness, not with your cries of, "Satan, blasphemy, poison, lies, impiety," such as the documents of the papists teem with against us, but with solid arguments and Scripture. But Bucer's offense would have been against us rather than against you if the purpose of his action had not been to call you away

from your passionate attitude in some way. For it is not a slight thing to teach that by carnal eating of the body the conscience is strengthened, sin forgiven, the thing made present in actual essence that is taught by the word, and, what is most impious of all, that this bread or body or sacrament should be worshipped. For Christ has so often inculcated the opposite, saying, "He that believes in me has everlasting life" [Jn. 6:47] and that statement that by itself puts all your promises to flight, "He that comes to me shall never hunger; and he that believes in me shall never thirst." [Jn. 4:14] If you have come to Christ, your conscience will no longer need to be fed; [625] if you believe in Christ you will not thirst for the blood nor crave the flesh. "Without detriment to faith," he says, "one may hold different views in this matter." I do not agree in this, but I do not find fault with him for writing it. For the excellent man wished to relieve the disease by making it appear less serious. Now who has sure faith in God cannot be strengthened by anything save that from which faith is born. That is the Spirit of God, who is goodness and the light and strength of the conscience, and is alone this thing we are talking of. The pious heart cannot be fed or strengthened by a body. To believe, therefore, that by the eating of the flesh conscience is strengthened, does not involve detriment to faith. For it rests on no utterance of God, and, on the other hand, the person who believes in Christ does not hunger or thirst. Bucer, therefore, made you a very great concession in that remark.

Afterwards you go on, "For that spirit thinks faith is not destroyed if Christ is blasphemed as a liar in what he says which shows how highly they regard Christ and all his kingdom. For since on both sides we maintain that Christ says so and so, and these statements are contradictory, either we or they must be imputing lying and deceit to Christ. But if to represent Christ as a liar be not to deny Christ and blaspheme against faith in him, what, I ask, is to blaspheme against Christ?" [WA 19:473: 13-19] These are your words. So far is it from true that the pious heart imagines that faith is not vitiated, if the words of Christ are vitiated, that it does not reckon faith as faith unless it holds all the words of Christ inviolably sacred. For he alone not only teaches true righteousness, like other teachers, but he also bestows it bountifully. And here we must not fail to keep in mind what sort of righteousness he bestows or teaches. He teaches that internal righteousness, which is nothing else than the Spirit. This is faith and truth, and he gives it freely. He teaches also that there is an external righteousness, to exercise mercy, keep faith, give to every person their due. And this also he gives, for it flows from the first as from a spring. But for that righteousness which is supposed to come to us from outside or to be gathered from any bodily thing, and to be transmitted to us in an actual physical sense, purifying, cleansing or justifying, he has left absolutely no place.

We think, therefore, that faith is very greatly defiled if we return to the husks of externals, as they say. [72] We do not, therefore, say that Christ is a liar when we deny that the words "This is my body" mean that the supper is made of a physical body. We are assured by the rule of faith [626] and the simple knowledge of faith that Christ gave nothing physical here, for we are assured that justification can come from no use of bodily things. I beg your pardon. When we speak of bodily things, we do not mean in any way to depreciate Christ's body as a sacrifice offered for us. We only deny that the application of a physical body to the soul does anything towards justification, both because the mind cannot be fed by the flesh of the body, and because Christ himself has most effectively shown us that that which justifies must be the Spirit, while the flesh profits absolutely nothing. Hence when you maintain that the flesh is eaten, and eaten for the justification of the soul and to bestow strength and the rest, and we, on the other hand, deny all this, and show that it is altogether trivial, we do not thereby say that Christ is a liar, no indeed, we do not even represent as liars these who are in the wrong. So far are we from imputing anything of the sort to Christ. It is for you, therefore, to look to your own method of argument and inference.

We make our inference thus: you affirm that the flesh is eaten; we deny it. Therefore, one or the other must be wrong. We cannot both be wrong, since the controversy belongs to the category of contradictions, where one of the two propositions must stand as the other falls. But you make your inference thus: "We affirm; you deny. Therefore, you make Christ a liar." Why do you bring Christ in thus in the last term or conclusion when he has not been mentioned before? Do you not know even yet that you ought to have drawn the inference "Therefore, one side or the other is wrong"? But we have to rave atrociously and build on our authority, namely, when the truth fails us. In the second place, you fail to notice that our controversy is not whether Christ said "This is my body," for we are in complete accord upon this point, but whether by these words he meant to set before us his body to be eaten physically. Hence, what we are at swords' points over is not, as you say, whether he said so and so or not, but whether what he said should be understood in one way or another. No suspicion, therefore, of making out Christ a liar ought to be laid at our door. But your reasoning has a gap in it on another side--you fall into a begging of the question. For you make your onslaught thus: "You deny that the body of Christ is eaten. Therefore you make Christ a liar. For he himself said, 'This is my body.'" Here you simply rest your case upon the point in controversy. For the contest is whether Christ meant by these words to set his carnal body before us to be eaten. And though you have not proved that he meant this, and, indeed, cannot prove it, yet you lay it down as the foundation of your argument, saying,

"Therefore you make Christ a liar." Why? "Because he said, 'This is my body.' Therefore, if you deny that he is eaten, you impute a lie to him." But the question under discussion is whether the words should be tortured into such an unnatural meaning or not. Let us not boast our own spirit, therefore, my dear Luther, nor reject that of others, [627] so long as we are seen to be utterly victims of passion, and unwilling to listen not only to the Scripture, but even to reason.

Afterwards, your letter says, "And this is what I have always said, that by these sacramentarian heretics Christ is mocked and has never seriously been learned or taught of by them, however magnificently they boast that the gospel and the glory of God are what they seek." [WA 19:473:20-23] These, also, are your words. I reply to them as follows: your expression, "I have said," has the emphasis here. You want to seem to have given timely warning what sort of people the sacramentarian heretics were going to be. Therefore, you are a prophet. But you have not shown yet that these heretics treat Christ as you say. For it is plain enough by this time that what you allege cannot in any way be logically made out. Therefore, it is all recklessness. But I must not omit to say that they are the people that treat Christ en tēs prosthēkēs merei ("as an appendage")--I do not wish to say "mock" at him--who attribute to the flesh what belongs to divinity alone, such as strengthening faith, remitting sins (for who save God alone can remit sins?) and manifesting according to nature what is taught by the word. To what, I pray, do all these belong, save divinity, spirit, the more powerful nature? Those, therefore, who confuse the qualities of the two natures think it makes no difference how they predicate any particular quality of either. You see now, I think, what they make of Christ. We ought not to call people heretics whom we have not proved from Scripture to be such, and so far from getting the better of us by Scripture are you that, on the contrary, the whole force of Scripture is on our side, while you flee to feeble elements [cf. Gal. 4:9], namely, to similes and ordinary exhortations (as your discourse against the fanatics abundantly testifies), and to such audacity as, "The words are clear" (they are absolutely unclear if you look at the meaning) and "We do not admit a trope in so difficult a matter," while at the same time you use a trope to explain the words when you say, "The body of Christ is eaten in this bread." Consider now with a little clearer vision to which side this reproach of "sacramentarian heretic" more fittingly applies. And you say that Christ was never seriously learned or taught of by these heretics. Do you mean that seriously?

I will give you a brief resumé of how I learned to know Christ, having touched upon it a little while ago. I have learned to know that Christ is, in the words of the apostle in 1 Corinthians 1:30, "wisdom from God, and righteousness, [628] and sanctification

and redemption"; wisdom because he is by nature God, who not only knows all things but governs all things; wisdom from God, because the Almighty Father sent him to us (not that he was not in the world previously, but that I understand the word "send" in the sense of taking on human nature), that he might teach heavenly wisdom perfectly and clearly so that everything he taught should be a pattern of true wisdom. Whence also Paul confesses that he knows nothing but Christ Jesus and him crucified, which so prudent a man would never have said unless he were sure that "all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge" were in him, as he testifies in Colossians 2:3. "Wisdom from God," by which we may be sure that no externals are effective toward justification, as is made plain by all his life and all his teaching. For what externals did he not deprive of all power? Place? Why, even in talking with a woman he showed that he was not to be worshipped in Mount Gerizim and not at Jerusalem, but the true worshippers would everywhere worship in spirit and in truth [Jn. 4:21f.], and he warned his followers not to go to the places where people would send them to find Christ. [Mt. 24:26] Time? He bore witness that the Sabbath was made for human beings and not human beings for the Sabbath [Mk. 2:27], and taught that we should pray always. [Lk. 18:1] Personality? Why, "All that have come before me," he says, "are thieves and robbers" [Jn. 10:8], and he declared that the pretentious prayers which the clergy of the Jews made for individuals and for the crowd, not amisthōti ("without pay") were snares of wealth. [Cf. Mt. 6:5.]

In summary, his teaching was such that no one with a mind can help seeing that his sole aim was that we should have faith in the Lord, and worship with holiness and innocence of life. But since through the faults and disasters that have destroyed our nature in the bud, [73] as they say, we are so tied to our passions that we do none of those things worthily and as we ought that God requires of us, it comes to pass that God's righteousness fills us with terror. For, although we proclaim him merciful and good, we are yet forced to recognize him as at the same time righteous. Nor could that be really good which was without righteousness. That his righteousness might remain inviolable, and that the person who does nothing conformably to that righteousness yet not be forever deprived of God's companionship, he finds a way by which both his righteousness might be satisfied and miserable humanity restored to the companionship of God. [629] He sent his Son who became our righteouness, sanctification and ransom of redemption, and that to those only who, elected by God and inwardly taught by the Spirit, believe firmly that through the one way of God's mercy (for the appeasing of his righteousness through the offering of his Son is likewise a work of mercy) is the path open to everlasting happiness. His Son became the pledge and security of this mercy. For how will he not give us all things, who gave us his Son? [Rom. 8:32] Not to be eaten, but made the

foundation of our hope, not in that he is flesh, but in that he is the Son of God who has put on flesh.

Thus you have in a few words how I have learned to know Christ, as the light and supreme wisdom who so enlightened the world that it should see that God is propitiated by no other observance than that of innocence, that heaven is reached through no other price or tribute than the apolytrōsei ("redemption") of the Son of God, that no other stimulus rouses to the works of real virtue than the kindling of the Spirit, that through no other pipes does real refreshment flow into our hearts than through the irrigation and watering of the same Spirit. Thus I have learned to know Christ. If this is not to learn to know him seriously, I confess that I have not yet learned to know him. But when you say that he has never been seriously taught of by us, how, I ask, do you know? Have you heard us? Where do we betray real religion? Why do you judge the servant of another, Luther? [Rom. 14:4] For, whether we have rightly learned in our hearts to know Christ and teach him abroad is for him to decide, who alone knows the hearts of people. [1 K. 8:39] It is, therefore, apparent again that this word "seriously" escaped you imprudently, I will not say impudently.

"Let him who is going to destruction go," you say. [WA 19:473:25] Is that the way you let go the helm as the gale increases in violence? You see us so cruelly smiting the army of Christ, and yet say, "let it go to destruction"? Come forth, rather, and oppose to us the shield of truth, as we attack all your forces with thrust and cut! You are in harbor and see us drowning so many thousands? Throw out ropes, beams, sticks, everything you can lay hold of into the flood. Some will be saved, if not all. But take notice, do not hold out sawdust or stubble to them. So far [630] that has hindered rather than helped them. Solid and strong must be the things you want us to cling to to save us. Otherwise we will not even touch them.

That those are the sects that destroy which stubbornly refuse to receive the word of God, and cling to their own meaning or rather error, has been sufficiently shown above. We greatly wonder with what face some who boast of preaching the gospel venture to refuse to their churches a doctrine supported by so many columns of Scripture, when nothing is so fruitful and fertile in rebellion and dissension as obstinacy, and nothing brings forth so many sects. Therefore accuse those by the name of sect who put bit and bridle on the public freedom of the churches. For these are the leaders of sects.

You are right in your warning after the body of your letter, when you tie on the apostle's words, "'God will send to them the offerings of their error, that they may believe in iniquity,

who have not received the love of the truth.' [2 Thess. 2:11-12] This saying is beginning to be fulfilled and it will be fulfilled, that the elect may be approved and the unregenerate damned." [WA 19:473:27-29] These are your words. For you will see all the pious receive clear sight from this contest of ours, and on the other hand, you will see the hypocrites rave, and be torn and twisted, that the thoughts and designs of their hearts may be made plain.

So much for that letter of yours, which is so filled with black salt that if it contained an equal amount of solid sincerity nothing could be stronger and sharper. But by the eternal God, I never read anything of yours that was so utterly without force, scriptural basis or argument. No indeed, it is so without a spark of anything but the sum total of bitterness that unless my confidence in those who sent it to me and your universally known propensity to harshness had convinced me, I never should have believed that it came from your pen. Still I have made answer to it somewhat at length for a twofold reason: first, since it was bound to be published (for in our day the printers put into type whatever promises any gain irrespective of any satisfaction in it, not having in this due regard to posterity, to whom it is unsafe to leave such an example of bitter writing), there might be an antidote along with it; second, that the simple reader along with the light of the truth might detect the zeal of passion. You understand now that I am chiefly aiming to bring out here that the flesh of Christ profits nothing as far as eating is concerned. Hence it follows immediately that it was not given us to eat. Therefore the words of Christ, "This is my body" [Mt. 26:26], were spoken with another meaning than [631] that he gave us his body to eat. Accordingly, I shall have relieved the fevered condition in which you cried out, "They throw at us that the flesh profits nothing. But we knew that. We want something else." You will not need anything more. You will not attribute to eating the propping up of faith, not the remission of sins, nor the physical exhibition of the thing that is taught, and figments of that sort, but you will know fully that a trope will disclose and save the whole situation here. So we shall not be forced to be absurd in regard to any part of Scripture, nor to twist ourselves nor it, nor to concoct anything nonsensical. Therefore, confine yourself within these bounds, and suffer yourself to be brought into line.

In regard to the things Luther wrote in the second part against Carlstadt and the fanatics.

By your complaint that no one has replied to what you wrote against Carlstadt you have compelled me to devote several hours to the reading of that work. [1] But, good gods! How far from the truth is it that anything solid is found there! This one thing alone I have learned from that work--what sort of thing the battle of the Andabatae [2] [632] was. You both rush so blindly into battle. Carlstadt sees the truth, but, from ignorance of the power of tropes, he fails to arrange the words in the right sequence, and resembles more than anything else a raw recruit who lacks not courage or armor but is without skill in the use of armor and does not know which part of the body one ought to protect with the particular pieces of armor. He puts his helmet before his breastplate in place of a breastplate, binds the leggings round his temples, clothes his legs with the armpieces, makes a shield of his breastplate, a quiver of his shield, a bow of his javelin, and an arrow of his bow. Thus, I say, Carlstadt comes forth, brave enough and strong enough, but almost wholly destitute of training. You also march down at once into the arena (would it were not at once but after some delay, for time ripens all things!), absolutely unarmed, and first hold up our recruit to the ridicule of all with such a shower of irony, taunts, mimicry, sneers, and sarcasms that no eye could get by gazing upon him so clear a picture of him as is required by contemplation of your description. And when you have made him beautifully ridiculous, you cast upon the unwary fellow such a heap of dust, sawdust, earth and paint, that is, of insult, false accusations, reviling and abuse, that you take away the breath of the spectators, and make them uncertain whether to laugh at or pity the man. But he stands unmoved, does not yield and pays no attention to the laughter at his unskillful use of armor. They call out to him from the spectators to change about his armor, but in vain; he thinks he has every bit nicely fixed in its right place. They urge you, too (but equally in vain), not to hope to win the day by such unrestrained abuse--for I know what faithful advisers you have had--nor to defend the cause by weapons from which it is not likely to gain anything. For what can you do, since you do not have a spear that can inflict a kairion ("mortal") wound in this kind of battle?

You so crowd with paint and pitch of abuse all that you write or teach in this matter that those who are going to engage with you hesitate whether to wipe off the dust first or to join issues at once.

If they make no answer to your false accusations [633] they fear harm may come to some of the flock, but if they make answer, there is danger that they may seem to have gone into the contest through zeal for their own interests rather than for the truth. So much as a description of your battle hypotypōsei ("in outline") as it were, so that I shall perhaps have both of you unfriendly to me, if, indeed, you go on as you have begun, and I appeal to the fair-minded reader to judge whether I do unworthily in freely warning away from a precedent through which the sound teaching of the gospel can be brought to destruction. For each of these combatants fights to make himself famous through victory. One rushes into the contest, trusting to his armor and his cause, though deficient in skill; the other armed with skill alone, and without armor, provisions, or engines of war, although not wholly without money, for he had gold to buy an antimachon ("fighter"). [3] And each has the gladiatorial spirit, eager to fight to a finish. No thought is given to waiting to consider, so that one should reflect thus: "You have a good cause, but take care that you do not destroy it in action" or the other say to himself, "You are practised and skillful in battle and action, but what can an unarmed man do against even such a dunderhead when armed? Others will come after him into the field who know how to use their arms better."

But nothing of the sort takes place. They charge upon each other, clash, smite and destroy the foe with blow for blow. Meanwhile, to the people of Christ looking on, nothing of pleasure or profit accrues, but some damage is done. For, since you rave at each other with such a storm of unheard of reviling on both sides, every one of the crowd thinks that he can indulge in the same kind of brawling without any detriment to himself, since he sees the leaders [4] refrain from no sort of wrangling or abuse. [634] We ought not, therefore, fair-minded brethren, thus to wink at the shamelessness of any person, and suffer one unhindered and uncontradicted to do anything in the church of God by which not only is our character contaminated but also that of our descendants if we transfer to them such an example. Therefore, my dear Luther, it were well if the book to which you boast that no answer has yet been made had never been published, still better if it had not been made famous by your name. For what, I ask, do you do but angrily hurl upon the enemy anything you have got hold of? And when I carefully consider everything on all sides, I find that Carlstadt holds that true opinion which the sacred writings will everywhere bear, but that he violently wrenches apart the words which form the subject of controversy, and that

I cannot bear. You do not hold the true opinion, and even misunderstand the words, and are unwilling to have them treated so as to bring out their true meaning better, and this is least of all to be borne. Since in consequence of misunderstanding the words, stubbornness is increased (for they say, "We have the words"), the words must be snatched from their hands, and must be examined and considered in every part, that their error may be detected and their shamelessness turned to shame.

Therefore, when with great sorrow we read that book, the strength of which I now approach, I found nowhere in it anything that I had not answered three or four times, save only its false accusations, tricks, abusiveness, and that sort of bitter outpourings. Though I doubt not that all this was thus lavishly put forth by you in altogether wild and groundless rage (for we are human, and Carlstadt appears to me one who can easily be hit as well as hit), yet you should on no account have let your pen run away with you as your exasperation demanded, and should have considered not only what he deserved but what was becoming in yourself. Not having done this, you put forth a book that we are all glad is written in German, that such an example of abuse--for it is not parrēsia ("mere free-spokenness")--may not be set before people of other tongues. In this book you have so absolutely nothing that can withstand the force of my arguments that I feel no small wonder as to what you can have had in view when you threw out so confidently that what you had put forth there had not yet been answered. For the things you put forth against the violence which Carlstadt does to the Lord's words were so full of wormwood that even if they were wholesome they would make the reader shudder not a little. The point, too, about not confounding the words of the Lord might have been handled more temperately. But I come back to the subject. Having found, I say, in the whole book only one passage that needed an answer from me, I have determined to set it forth here. [635] You yourself regard it as a sort of axe of Tenes, [5] nay, as a thunderbolt, since you call it brontaxynēn ("axe of thunder"), [6] not content with plethriaiois ("hundred foot words"), [7] but giving us words of the measure of Jupiter also.

It is the passage of Paul, 1 Corinthians 10:16, "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communicating of the blood of Christ? etc." This passage you think such that by it all the ramparts and fortifications of the enemy are thrown down as by an irresistible engine of war. No, indeed, you shout in triumph, but evidently as the proverb has it, before victory is won. Omitting, therefore, what does not concern the subject--namely, what is between you and Carlstadt individually--I shall first make clear by solid exposition, not of my own devising but taken from the word of Paul himself, the points in which you are under illusion, and then I shall put together the natural meaning of Paul's words.

What you say of the breaking of the bread is well approved by all the pious. And would that all were so well taught Christianity as to have no curiosity about externals, [636] and to let each church have its own custom, providing the thing itself which is symbolized is treated in some sort of likeness or proportion externally to the original. For the Anabaptists have sprung up--a pernicious class of heretics. These we fairly call heretics, [8] for though confuted many a time and oft they are so far from coming to their senses that they have wanted to make, have indeed even made a secession, not from the impious who deny Christ or champion the Pope, but from those brethren and churches who most sacredly confess Christ and worship him by improvement of life, and they have done this for no other reason than because they say we must be baptized again, and our people shrink from catabaptism. What use is it here to mention other errors with which they confuse all things: that a Christian cannot hold a magistracy and that a Christian ought not to take an oath. What else is that than the destruction of government? For they preach the following doctrines among Christians: that all things ought to be owned in common, that it is not lawful that those who preach the gospel should live from the gospel, that spiritual marriages can be formed. Nay, they have formed not a few of these and the carnal children born of them cry at night, that they may be all the more spiritual, and hundreds of things of the kind, of which there is no end. For, as soon as they are worsted at one point, they get up a new fight with some other concoction.

These heretics, I say, on whom I have made this digression, accuse us of treason, now because we use unleavened bread, not ordinary bread, now because we sing hymns before we eat of it. For, they say, we read that Christ did none of these things, but simply presided over an ordinary meal. And they growl out countless things of the sort every day, though it clearly makes no difference whether you take the bread yourself and break off the necessary amount or whether you put into your mouth a piece handed to you by another. Let each church retain its own custom, provided the likeness to the original is preserved in the main, lest we become [637] more superstitious than the papists themselves. Though among them different customs were practised in different bishoprics in the matter of externals, yet no quarrel arose in consequence. These things are symbols, and, while we are bound to treat them with respect and reverence, there is no reason why, beyond that, we should get into an uproar on their account. The kingdom of God is righteousness, peace and joy, not food and drink. [Rom. 14:17]

It is the duty of the pious to live a holy and religious life, and to bend all their efforts to this end, and not to struggle fiercely about things with which righteousness is not concerned. Therefore, I regret exceedingly this contest with your party, albeit

the cause is one worthy of my taking the field for it. For such doctrines are impious as that sins are remitted through eating, faith strengthened, that made materially present which is only taught by the word, and your other doctrines of the kind. However, I still regret the quarrel. For meantime a large measure of the Christian love that had been kindled is lost to us. And this by no means escapes the notice of the Evil Spirit who knew well enough what means to take to extinguish the heavenly flame that was flaming up anew so well. Love and disagreement are inconsistent with each other. Therefore, he foments disagreement in order to drive out one nail with another. Our battle ought to have been with wrong, and all pure measures directed to the end that the exiled queen, Christian virtue and simplicity, be restored to her kingdom. As it is, we are fighting about symbols so cruelly that love has to stand very far away, especially when such bitterness raises its head, and where love is not, the frost of injustice and all unfairness straightway returns.

But you go on thus (I will translate your words faithfully from the German into Latin, if only I understand them quite rightly): "notice in the third place," you say, "what Paul plainly sets forth: 'This same bread that we break is the communicating of the body of Christ!' [1 Cor. 10:16] Do you hear, [638] beloved brother? The bread broken or divided into parts is the communicating of the body of Christ. 'Is, is, is,' says Paul, 'the communicating of the body of Christ.' Now what is the communicating of the body of Christ? It can be nothing else than that those who each receive their part of the bread that is broken thereby receive the body of Christ. Thus this communicating is the same thing as to be sharing, so that each one receives the body of Christ in common with his neighbor, as Paul also says in the same passage, 'We are all one body, because we partake of one bread.' Hence, even anōthen ("from the early days"), that is, from the times of our ancestors, it has been called 'communion'." [WA 18:168: 14-24] Such are your words. Here, my dear Luther, you are suffering from three delusions, first, in consequence of the strong feeling which is apt in any argument to seize violently upon those words which at first sight seem to be in one's favor, and put them into one's argument irrespective of what precedes or follows them, when, if their nature be examined, they will be found to be as sterile as a plant which propagates itself from a root is, when you try to transplant a shoot from it.

You ought, therefore, to have looked at what precedes and what follows. As to what follows I shall speak a little later in connection with your third delusion. What precedes shows thus what Paul was undertaking to show in this passage: in chapter 8 he had upbraided those smatterers who reckoned the feasts of idols among the adiaphora ("things indifferent") about like those who in our day suggest that the images set up for worship can

be endured. Learned men, certainly! "What is an image?" they say, when they have not brains enough to distinguish between images set up for worship (as almost all those in our churches are), and other images. These people, I say, Paul declares are doubly wrong, first because they sin against love to one's neighbor, for a Christian ought to give up those things which are free, if they offend one's neighbor. Now, even if to take part in the feasts of idols were ek mesōn ("among the middle things") which Paul [639] does not allow (though for the moment he concedes it, so to speak, for the sake of urging his argument from Christian love more strongly), these people would yet be guilty of no small sin, seeing that the feebler brethren were thereby offended.

Second, he declares they sin against religion and piety themselves. This point he treats, returning to his argument kat' analepsin ("in reiteration"), after having digressed to other but not irrelevant matters in the ninth and the first half of the tenth chapters. And this is a special characteristic of the holy apostle, he directs his arguments and efforts from externals and ceremonies to internals and to the thing he wishes to recommend, which is symbolized in the ceremonies. For example, he draws from marriage the most festive undertaking by which he encourages the observation of the fear of God, representing God as the husband and ourselves, both individually and the whole church, as his bride, that at one time contemplating faith, at another time conjugal jealousy we may be led to be ashamed to regard any but him who is wedded to our souls. Also, he uses baptism, in which when we are dipped we feel something of Christ's experience when let down into the tomb, and when we come out are compared to him as he rises from the dead.

When, therefore, Paul is going to demolish the objection of those impious persons who said, "If, then, sins are forgiven through grace and not because of merit, let us sin, that grace may flow more and more abundantly, for the more it forgives the more evident and bright it becomes." [Rom. 6:1f.] he thus proceeds, I say, from baptism, "Or do you not know that whoever formerly were baptized into Jesus Christ were immersed into his death?" For when we were plunged into the liquid, we were symbolically buried with him into the death of our own life, "that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life, etc." The pious reader should be warned here in passing that the Anabaptists twist this passage with great violence into harmony with their error, saying that infants cannot die unto the old life, since they are mere beginners in life. They thus show their own rashness and ignorance. Paul is not treating here with the reason for baptism but for a Christian life, and this he shows to be especially necessary to the person who boasts on account of Christ, both by reason of the formula of external baptism and the death and resurrection of Christ to which baptism has a certain analogy.

So also in this passage which we now have in hand, he is trying to pull away the Corinthians from the communion of things offered to idols by reproaching them with impiety and unfaithfulness. For having first proved that they offended against Christian love (see, [640] by the way, how not only in the present passage, but in all his teaching, Paul regulates all things according to the rule of the two chief commandments upon which hang all the law and the prophets [cf. Mt. 22:40; Gal. 5:14]), having finished, I say, the argument drawn from the law of love to one's neighbor, he comes back to the stronger one which is derived from the law of the love of God. And this he confidently believes is so strong and irresistible that he appeals to the judgement of those against whose knowledge he is battling. And thus he analambanei ("resumes") his argument: "Wherefore, my dearly beloved, flee from idolatry or from communion with idolatry itself. I speak to the wise; judge yourselves how what I say is true." [Cf. 1 Cor. 10:14-15.] Here, I say, you are under delusion from strong feeling, not noticing that what goes before shows that Paul is not in this passage treating of the Eucharist as his subject of discourse, but taking it as the basis and hypothesei ("groundwork") of his argument to drive away thus those smatterers from the communion of things offered to idols: "When you sit down to the meat offered to idols, do you not coalesce into one body, one communion with the idolaters? If, then, you are of the body of the idolaters, how can you be members of the body of Christ?" [Cf. 1 Cor. 10:20-21.] This, I say, is the argument that Paul makes in what I have mentioned as going before. If you had considered the situation a little more carefully, you could not, with your keenness of perception, have failed to see at first glance how in this passage "communion" and "body" are used not for the tearing apart of Christ's body, but for the people who sitting at the feasts of idols are one body and one communion with the idolaters, or in the supper of thanksgiving are made one congregation, church, body, communion with the worshippers of Christ. For he says that those who are of this body cannot be of another, as will be made plain from the third delusion.

I will call attention to this at the same time: by the experts in the law, "body" is also used for "communion". For instance, those who are of one and the same college are one body, those who are of one people are one body, those who are of one kingdom are one body, those who are of one place of assembly, voting precinct, church are one body. The law itself escapes my memory. Let the person who recalls it to mind point it out!

Secondly, you are under delusion in regard to the words themselves, not having studied them thoroughly. For since they read, "the cup of blessing, etc." and presently, "the bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? For we, the whole people of Christ, are one bread and one body: for

we are all partakers of one bread" [1 Cor. 10:16f.], how, I ask, you failed to see these two prosapodoseis, that is, repetitions of reason, which Paul has made so clear by marking them with words of meaning "for"? [641] For when he had said that the cup of blessing was the communion of the blood of Christ and the broken bread the participation in the body of Christ, he seemed to himself to have spoken a bit obscurely because of the compactness of the tropes. In order, therefore, to be more clearly understood, he explains what it is that he has called the cup of blessing and participation in the body of Christ. He says, as it were, "When I address you with such an exclamation as 'The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the participation in the body of Christ?' [1 Cor. 10:16], I wish to be understood in this way: 'The cup of blessing which we bless, that is, when we bless with the cup of blessing, is not this meeting of ours the communion, that is, the people, the church, the congregation of the blood of Christ? For you are the communion of the blood of Christ'--he left that clause about the cup anantapodoton ("without the corresponding clause"), but he put it in with the bread, and things which are equal to the same thing are equal to each other--'who drink of the one cup of blessing, and the bread which we break, is it not the communion, or body, company, people, church, congregation of the body of Christ? For we, because we partake of one bread and drink from one cup, unite into one body.' I am aiming at nothing else, therefore, than that you should understand me in this way: When you are unwilling to be torn away from the meat offered to idols on any consideration, why, I ask, do you not see how unfitting that is to those whose boast is in the name of Christ? For you might have learned from the very giving of thanks of what body, congregation, or church you are. For when you, the church of Christ, give thanks unto the Lord for the death of his Son, and drink thereby the cup and eat the bread of thanksgiving, [642] you see, of course, that you with the other members are the body, communion, and church of Christ, which church I call not inappropriately the communion, that is, the people of the blood of Christ and his body. For those who make use of certain particular ceremonies, sacred customs, and religious teachings, are also of the same confession and name."

"You, therefore, when you all come together for the giving of thanks because we have been redeemed by the body and washed by the blood of Christ, do you not see that you are the congregation and people of the body and blood of Christ? And what, pray, can the congregation of the blood of Christ have to do with the congregation of idols?" [Cf. 1 Cor. 10:21.] There you have, Luther, the aim of the apostle here and the source of his arguments and efforts. You ought to have discovered in the words themselves, in order to see better their natural meaning, this idea that hoi polloi is that we, the whole multitude or congregation, are one

bread and one body. For if we are one bread and one body, he calls us thereby the communion, that is, the people of the blood of Christ, and he did not say the blood was communicated, but that we are the body, the communion and company of the blood of Christ. Nor did he say that the body of Christ was participated in, but that we were the participation, that is, communion and company of the body of Christ. Thus, therefore, the argument is good: if you are the body of Christ, if the congregation of his blood, what, I ask, can you have in common with the body of idolaters? You are guilty of impiety and treachery if you keep not away from the feasts of idolaters. Besides, this yoking together of one bread and one body shows of itself how he wants body understood here. For they must be on the same footing. If, therefore, we are the bread, we are also the body. But why are we one bread? He gives the reason. Because we are partakers together of one bread. Therefore, the same reason we are the same body, because we partake of the one bread. He did not say, "because we are partakers of one body." We are, therefore, the communion, company, people, or body, or church of the body and blood of Christ. But what Carlstadt said does not deserve such violent attack. [9] [643] Paul showed plainly enough in the last passage that the body of Christ is not pulled apart in the supper when he said, "For we all partake of one bread" [1 Cor. 10:17] and not also, "We all partake of one body." For however foolishly Carlstadt acts according to you in other things, he yet saw what is in accordance with the facts here. For it is the final prosapodosis ("summing up of the reason") why he called the whole multitude "one bread and one body," when he says "For we all partake of one bread." But if the apostle had been of the opinion that by eating and partaking of one body of Christ we become one body, he would by no means have said in giving his reason, "We partake of one bread" but "of one body". For the words upon which the matter hinges must be definite and clear in the highest degree, especially when we serve them up again by way of epilogue. We are, therefore, one body. Of what? Of the body and blood of Christ. And why? Because we come together into one festival of thanksgiving, and break one bread together.

Thirdly, you are under delusion because you did not more carefully consider what follows. For in order to strengthen his point by a comparison also, the apostle adds, "Behold Israel after the flesh! Are not they who eat sacrifices koinōnoi, that is, partakers or sharers of the altar?" [1 Cor. 10:18] In these words, I say, could have been seen without any trouble in what direction Paul meant to turn the signification of "communion", "sharers", "participants". Those who are sharers or partakers of the altar are truly not such because they eat the altar, even though it has been built of the most perfectly smoothed stones. So those who are the participation of the body of Christ are not such because they eat the body of Christ, but because in regard to his

body, that is, in thanksgiving for his death, they eat the bread and drink the cup, and they are themselves the participation, that is, the communion or congregation of the body of Christ. For the same word, koinōnia, which a little while before the translator has rendered "communication", is in this passage, under the form koinōnoi, rendered by "sharers", whence you can see openly that "communication" does not fit the passage very exactly, but [644] rather "communion" as I have shown abundantly in correspondence with the Pomeranian and others. [10]

The meaning is, therefore, "Do you not see that those who eat together in the feast of offerings are made one body of people making offerings, that is, one company or congregation, so that they are called the company of peace offerings or of expiations, according to the kind of victim? Why, then, do you not see that you, when you are partakers of this supper, become the body and company of the blood of Christ? And again, as long as you attach yourselves to the company of the idolaters, why, I ask, do you not see that you are partakers and sharers with them and a congregation of idolaters? And this I would not have in the least, namely, that you should be of the company and participation of unbelievers. For you cannot at the same time be fellow priests or of the company of devils and of Christ, because you cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils." (See how he puts the drinking of the cup of the Lord in the communion, not the communication or swallowing of the blood of Christ, so that you can see that "communion" is used all through for us who are the "communion", not for the distribution of body and blood.) "Neither can you be partakers of the Lord's table and of the table of devils." Behold how his whole object is nothing but to show whose company or people they are. It is not permitted, therefore, for them to betray the Lord and sit like deserters at the banquet of unbelievers. So much for the refutation of the explanation which you thrust upon this passage. It is not necessary to bring forward the testimony of the Fathers here, for they have been abundantly heard already in my "Commentary", "Subsidiary Essay" and the letters to the Pomeranian and the brethren, Rhegius and Billicanus. [11]

Before, however, I lay aside the explanation of this passage, I must note the fact that the word for "to bless" is often used in Hebrew for "to extol highly" or "to give thanks". Thus in Genesis 14:19, "Melchizedek extolled [645] Abraham highly" (for not only the Romans but the other nations had the habit of praising before the assembly of the people, by way of giving him their thanks, the man who had exposed himself to danger for the public safety), and said, "Blessed be Abraham by God most high." Likewise in Genesis 47:7, "And Joseph brought in . . . his father, and set him before Pharaoh: moreover, Jacob blessed Pharaoh." In this passage the word for "blessing" is evidently put for "extolling

highly" and "giving thanks". For Jacob would not have been very polite if as soon as he had come into the sight of the unbelieving king he had muttered some sacred formula in a strange tongue. He did nothing of the kind. He praised the king and thanked him for all his kindnesses. In the Psalms this meaning of "blessing" is so frequent that there is no need of quoting passages. On the word "body" I have spoken a little way back, showing that it is used for "congregation" and "communion".

That, then, is the meaning of the apostle's words and arguments. But, to return to the point from which I digressed, I do not have the same feeling about the meats offered to idols that your little doctors have. For though I might allow them to be reckoned among things perfectly adiaphora ("indifferent"), love to one's neighbor and love to God are opposed to this. On love of one's neighbor I have said most of what I have to say. I will now speak on love of God, which is also sinned against here. He does not properly love God and is not really pious who, having professed the religion of Christ, and having become one body with the members of his church, returns to the ancient fellowship with idolaters and wishes to be one body with them also. I appeal to your own judgement. Judge, I beg, what I say. Is not that feast of thanksgiving and praise, in which the symbolic cup is carried round, the communion, company, body, or congregation of the blood of Christ? Is not the bread which we break equally the communion or congregation of the body of Christ? That is, to do away with all obscurity, when we break the bread together do we not unite ourselves with the congregation or people of the body of Christ? For we are one bread and one body for the reason that we are all partakers of one bread. It would be a small matter to put a morsel into one's mouth or to taste a cup with the edge of one's lips, but it is not a small thing to have done this in the church of Christ. Those who do this give evidence of themselves that they are of that body and people who have faith in Christ, the Son of God, [646] and who give thanks for the death which he underwent for us. He who shows the password to the enemy is adjudged worthy of the punishment of Mettius. [12] And whoever sits down at this banquet (which is not just a password but a public profession and sacrament), [13] and straightway does the same by sacrifices to idols, is that one not guilty of treason? Does this person not only betray the body and blood of Christ, to which he falsely pretends to give thanks for his redemption, but also that congregation which is distinguished by the name of the body and blood of Christ because of the public profession? Who is so dull as to fancy that one may be reckoned in two utterly different families? How much less may one participate in a feast where an evil spirit is worshipped, and also in that where the one and only God is worshipped and praised because he gave his Son for our redemption! This, good reader, is the meaning of Paul's words, not as evolved out of my thought, but

as weighed in a true balance, I think, with frequent readjustment of all its parts so they might not be too much or too little. You, Luther, fell upon it blinded by hatred of Carlstadt so that you did not see clearly. But the people of Christ cannot be prevented by any outcry or any device from accepting what is solid and sure instead of things which are concocted with great labor to prevent us from being convicted of error.

Now I hope I have blunted that keen-edged brontaxynēn, [14] that is, axe more terrible than thunder, with which you hoped you were going to scatter asunder all the engines of war that were brought up against your forces. The other points that you have made in that book will one after another be either dissolved with success or exposed by my exposition that I venture to say no one will ask for anything more. [647]

As to the Things that Luther Wrote in His Book On the Adoration of the Sacrament [1]

This book also is one that perhaps might better have been sponged out (I mean to speak freely but intend no insult), for it is stuffed full of such uncertain and careless teachings that it could teach what it is to teach that which you do not know, and to make people careful who are thinking of taking to the pen. I would have you frankly excused, however, on two accounts, because at the time you wrote the book you were so overwhelmed with various occupations that you had no opportunity to weigh this matter, or, perhaps, in those infant days (which needed milk and not solid food) [cf. He. 5:12] it was better to go a bit slowly, and because you may seem to have suffered, so to speak, as even the greatest men have.

Some have told us that Augustine had such a position of authority with many people that they drove him into writing against his will things that he had not thoroughly studied, partly because of his earnest demands and partly because he was a little ashamed to confess there was anything he did not know, lest he should lose a trifle of his authority. [2] For when the untaught multitude have bestowed such authority upon a person, they think he not only must know everything but will expound it according to their notions, and when that happens, they lean upon the authority of that one alone whom they have thus exalted. But what

can be more wrong-headed and dangerous than for those who know nothing of art, for instance, to attribute authority to those who know so little, and presently to prefer such to an Apelles or a Praxiteles? [3] And if some, having read this book of yours with judgement, [648] remind us that even you are human and liable to slip and make mistakes and be deceived, perhaps it is good that it did not fall a victim to the sponge. If, on the other hand, they are going to follow gladly your notions and the uncertainty you teach here, and cling to it tenaciously, it would be better, not that the book had been sponged out, but that it had been written on water. [4] For why, to begin with this point, do you proceed deliberately to teach the Bohemians [5] what you only just touch upon, and to plant it upon such a shaky foundation, or rather, upon no foundation? Why do you build up a worthless discourse upon an imaginary basis? For though you especially warn us that we ought to take faith as our teacher, and, consulting the articles of faith and putting aside preconceived notions, expound Scripture by collating Scripture, you yourself do nothing of the kind. For faith does not know that strengthening that you attribute to eating. The articles of faith protest, and yet a preconceived notion cries, "The words are so." Collation of Scripture is put aside. This is your only cry, "I will not admit a trope. Whatever is written anywhere ought not to modify the sacred words on any account so that they shall admit a different meaning from that which they bear on their face." But I shall deal more plainly in the second part of this exegesis with the whole subject of this law of yours and your injurious violence.

Why do you maintain so stoutly that the expression "Christ was the rock" [1 Cor. 10:4] is not figurative? [6] Do you not thereby make of the Son of God a stone or a brave [649] statue of Niobe, [7] perhaps, or Lot's wife? [Cf. Gen. 19:26.] But you say, "It has been said already that the rock is spiritual." [WA 11:435:32-436:5] But when I say, "Christ is the rock," I speak figuratively. Who does not know that there is no trope in the expression, "Christ is the spiritual rock," and, on the other hand, who does not know that there is a trope if you do not add the word "spiritual"? What is the reason that we are so ready to fight? When we say, therefore, "Christ is the rock," it is a trope, by Hercules, but when we say, "Christ is the spiritual rock," the trope is reduced to simplicity and made plain to every eye.

And while you were on this topic, why did you not see, I ask, first that it is one and the same church, one and the same testament, one and the same faith, whether of those who came before Christ at dawn, or at the third, or sixth, or ninth hour, or ours, who came into the vineyard at the eleventh hour and yet were received as liberally as those first workers, no indeed, were given our reward before them [Mt. 20:1f.], that the casting off of the Jews from the olive tree and the grafting of us upon

it might be made manifest? [Cf. Rom. 11:17.] If you had seen this you would not afterwards in teaching about the baptism of infants have been obliged [650] to say that baptism simply ought not to be given where there was not faith. For you would have known by the beneficent power of the testament the infant children of Christians are just as much enrolled among the people of God as are their parents. You would have seen, in the second place (since the fathers are said to have eaten the same spiritual food as ourselves), either that the food of faith is sufficient for salvation or that the flesh eaten profits nothing. [Jn. 6:63] For they certainly had such faith and so much of it that they are set up as an example to us by the apostle in Galatians 3 and Hebrews 11, and they are so far from having eaten the flesh that they never saw it. For Christ himself bears witness that Abraham desired to see his presence, but that he only saw it was to be and rejoiced. [Jn. 8:56]

Then having divided adoration into external and interior, or ceremonial and spiritual, [8] you continue thus: "He who believes not that the body and blood of Christ are in the sacrament does right if he adores it neither with external nor with internal adoration." [WA 11:447:5-7] And a little later (for it is not worthwhile to quote here all that you say, word for word), you speak thus: "I am forced to confess that Christ is here (namely, in the sacrament), since his body and blood are here." [WA 11:447:9-10] Thirdly, you say, "There is a difference between Christ's sitting on high in the heavens and his being in the sacrament and the hearts of the faithful. For he ascended to the heavens, no doubt, in order to be acknowledged and adored there, as almighty Lord over all things, according to Philippians 2:11. But he is not in the sacrament and the hearts of the faithful especially to be adored there, but to plead with us there and to help us, just as he came to us in the flesh, not to be adored but to serve us, as he himself says, 'I came not to be ministered to, but to minister [651] and to give my life as a ransom for many.'" [Mt. 20:28] [WA 11:447:16-25] Fourthly, you say, "But it does not follow from this that he ought not to be adored. For many adored him upon earth and he received them." [WA 11:447:26-27] Fifthly, "He must be here in the sacrament and in all the hearts of the faithful in this free way, so also that we may be sure that he gave no instructions as to his being adored in the sacrament or in the hearts of the faithful." [WA 11:447:32-35] This is what you say, and I think I have rendered it faithfully.

Now see, I ask, how many difficulties and inconsistencies follow from these utterances of yours, that you may see at length what it is to talk without scriptural support. When you say in the beginning of your remarks that he who does not believe that the body and blood of Christ are in the sacrament does right if he does not adore it, this adoration must be free. If the adora-

tion is free, then to believe or not to believe that the body is eaten here is also free. For if those who believe that it is eaten ought to adore it, and we ought to believe that it is eaten, then those who neither believe that the body is eaten nor adore it are guilty of twofold sin. For you cannot take refuge in saying, "I said they do right if they do not adore it, provided they do not believe; not as if one were permitted not to believe the body is eaten, but to guard against their slipping into the more serious sin of adoring it, when they do not believe it is eaten." For there is no danger that those who do not believe that the body is present will adore it with that true internal adoration and worship which are due to God alone. Hence it appears that when you wrote that book you were distinctly of the opinion that one was free to believe or not believe that the body is eaten. Why, then, do you call it heresy now?

When, in the second place, you say that you are absolutely forced to confess that Christ is in the sacrament since his body and blood are there, you talk in a way wonderfully inconsistent with yourself. For if Christ is there, how is it that those who do not adore him do not sin? I speak only of those who are counted by the name of Christ. And your remark that he came not to the earth to be adored is frivolous and brought out of yourself. And when you try to prove it on the ground that he himself said, "I came not to be ministered unto, etc.," you distort the Scriptures. For in this passage [652] he is speaking of that physical service which servants render to their masters, not of that adoration which is nothing else than confession according to faith, by which the apostles and all believers have always adored and worshipped. When they say, "You are the Christ, the Son of the living God" [Mt. 16:16], they worship. When Christ says, "Your faith has made you whole" [Mt. 9:22], he recognizes that those to whom he says this have worshipped. And you will never find anywhere that he did not ask this one thing, that he be worshipped, that is, recognized as the Son of God, which is the crowning point of adoration of him. And if you say that Christ's saying to Martha, "You are careful and troubled about many things" [Lk. 10:41], means that he objected to being adored, you are again mistaken. For he is disapproving here that excessive attendance and preparation by which Martha was wearing herself out. For presently he adds that there is one thing needful, namely, that which Mary Magdalene did when, listening to his words, she clung and worshipped him. [Lk. 10:42; Jn. 12:3f.] Hence Christ is not any place such a way that he is not to be adored. Moreover you refute yourself most plainly. For having, both in this book and in that which you wrote against the King of England, not only denied the concomitance of the divinity of Christ, [9] but exploded the notion, you yet confess in this place that you are forced to admit that Christ is here in the sacrament. And it is not beside the point that you are forced thus. For since you persist in maintaining that the

body and blood are here and are eaten, you see that it altogether follows that since the God and man are one Christ and both his natures are united by an indissoluble bond, there is not eaten here a body of Christ which is atheon ("without divinity"). [653]

Though, therefore, you cast out concomitance, you plainly bring it back here when you say that you are altogether forced to confess that Christ is here since his body and blood are here. What else is that than concomitance? Even if you do not introduce it by name, you confess it in fact. And you would do well if only the body of Christ were eaten here. For you say in your "Sermon Against the Fanatics or Gushers" that in this sacrament the thing is presented in its actual nature or essence which is elsewhere taught by the word. [10] Now no one at all except Arius teaches that Christ is only human and not both God and human. [11] If, therefore, that is presented before us here which is taught, the whole Christ is presented. What else does this mean than that the divinity of Christ is an inseparable concomitant in this sacrament and is equally the subject of eating? And this is still more strongly put by yourself. For you say in the same sermon (violently twisting the words of the apostle "that he might fill all things" [Eph. 4:10]) that the body of Christ cannot fill all things otherwise than as a sack is filled and distended with grain (a beautiful comparison truly). [12] Therefore it cannot be that the body is by its own nature so expanded. It would have to be made so by the divine nature. The divine nature, therefore, would be a concomitant of the human in this sacrament just as much as everywhere else where you assert the presence of the human. Do you see now how consistent you are? Do you see further, how many absurdities follow if we say that the body is dined on? Do you see that the papists are more consistent than your party? For having once fallen into error from ignorance of the idioms of the Hebrew tongue, they have not chosen to be so violent and [654] perverse as to deny what follows naturally. But you, on the contrary, at one moment deny the absurdity of the absurdities that you see follow and then presently relegate them again to the realm of absurdity, being orthodoxoi ("orthodox"), namely, while we are all heretics for being a little slow to assert what we yet see rests upon a solid basis, though according to the situation and the fear or favor of princes change about like a play actor without any shame whatever.

When, thirdly, you make a distinction between Christ as he sits at the right hand of God and as he is in the hearts of the faithful, and assert that he is above at the right hand to be adored, as many absurdities follow as there are letters in the words. Do you not extend to us in the sacrament the same Christ that sits at the right hand of God? They say yes. Why, then, if he is not to be adored if he is the same in both places? It is apparent that you are again wandering away from the concomitance,

and thinking that only the body of Christ is present in the Sacrament, not the whole Christ. For all reject adoration for the humanity of Christ. When, therefore, you refuse to adore Christ in the hearts of the faithful, it becomes plain you either do not know what you are saying or are now denying what you have but recently asserted, plainly being compelled to admit that Christ is here altogether. Do you see now what it is to talk from the point of view of humanity and not of Scripture? Where, I ask, in Scripture did you see that notion of his being above to be adored and below not to be? If Christ is God, is he not to be adored wherever he is? But he is everywhere. Therefore, he is to be adored everywhere, above or below, on the right hand or on the left. You see, further, how disregard of alloiōseōn ("exchanges") handicaps you people. If you noted them carefully, you might avoid all these slips that are so unworthy of you. It is the characteristic of human nature to be limited, to be tied to one place (his sitting at the right hand of the Father [Col. 3:1] does not alter the case) while it is characteristic of the divine to extend, permeate, be present everywhere, to hold, know, and dispose all things. When, therefore, you predicate adoration of Christ [655] only as sitting at the right hand, you limit the divine nature by the human. When, on the other hand, you say the body of Christ is everywhere and fills all things as barley fills a sack (I can hardly help laughing, my dear Luther, whenever your sack is mentioned), you expand human nature to the measure of the divine. Thus you bring back home by right of postliminium [13] all the errors of the Roman pontiff with this confusion of yours.

Speak, therefore, according to the canon of Scripture, not under my, but under its direction. As I shall clearly demonstrate by citing scriptural evidence later: "the body of Christ is tied to the right hand of God so that it cannot be anywhere else until the last great day of judgement. Hence it follows that it cannot be eaten in the Eucharist." Augustine had a view to this when he said, "The body which has risen must be in one place." [14] Secondly, thus: "Christ is God so that he fills all things, and is almighty, so that he regulates all things in person, etc. Hence also it follows that one and the same Christ is by virtue of his divine nature in the hearts of all, and one and the same is worshipped." [15] When Peter confesses and worships Christ in his heart, he confesses and worships the same Christ who is in the hearts of the sons of thunder [cf. Mk. 3:17], and he whom Paul honored and worshipped with all his heart is the same whom Luther now worships. Peter, therefore, worships him who is in the hearts of all, and all worship him who is in the former's heart, for he cannot be so limited by any heart that he is not to be adored because he is in that heart. This, too, must not be passed by, that in that third utterance of yours you did not speak like one versed in theology when you said [656] that Christ was not in the hearts of the faithful to be adored. For you seem thus

to limit him by our hearts even. Is he not to be worshipped in that he is in the air of heaven, in the waters, in the kindly earth, the sun, since he alone holds all these things? Why, then, is he not to be adored in that he is in the heart of man? "He is not," you say, "in the heart of man to be adored."

On the contrary, there is nowhere that he ought more to be adored. For those things that I have enumerated are very far from worshipping even though by personification they are sometimes represented by the sacred poets as worshippers. The human being alone worships, and unless he worships from his heart, he does not worship. But, perhaps someone will say, "Everyone worships, no doubt, in his soul, but one person does not worship because this one worships, but because that is God. See the syngrammatical cleverness! Turn about what you say, and I shall recognize the theologian, not a babbler. Shape your speech in this way: because Christ is God, he is in the hearts of all, nay he is worshipped for the reason that he is in the hearts of all. For whatever cannot be in the hearts of all is not God, and, therefore, should not be worshipped." I demonstrate: "The love of God is infused into our hearts by the Holy Spirit that has been given unto us. [Rom. 5:5] The spirit of all the pious is the same, the love the same. The faithful praised God for the increase of the church [cf. Acts 2:47] and this very thing was nothing but a giving of thanks in accordance with faith, which is also worship. A hundred brethren are given us for one lost [Mt. 19:29] and in them all we have the same spirit and by it worship the same God. So, therefore, Christ is in our hearts to be worshipped by us individually and by all, and he is to be worshipped not simply because he sits at the right hand, but because he permeates all things, nor is he anywhere in the world in any manner that he should not be worshipped, but he is therefore to be worshipped because he can be nowhere where he is not to be worshipped."

When, however, in the fourth place, you try to prove that it does not follow that Christ should not be worshipped, even if he did say, "I came not to be ministered unto but to minister" [Mt. 20:28] your suggestion is very good. For he is not dealing in that passage with the worship that comes from faith, but with the material ministration or obedience that we owe our masters. Many, you say, worshipped him upon earth, and he received them. What was the need of that, Luther, unless [657] you were going to make worship of the Eucharist adiaphoron ("a thing indifferent")? But notice how you do not do this! It was easy to prove that Christ received worship when it was given. Thus one part of the argument was established, namely, that Christ could be worshipped. But you ought to have proved the other part, namely, that he had anywhere repudiated true worship. For unless that be proved, the adoration of Christ is not among the adiaphora ("things indifferent").

Finally, when you say that we ought to be sure that Christ gave no injunction that he was to be worshipped in the sacrament or in the hearts of the faithful, you are arguing altogether to the effect that the worship is indifferent. But see how rashly you do it. It is nowhere taught that he should be adored in the house of Martha or of Simon the leper. [Lk. 10:38ff., Mt. 26:6ff.] Might he, therefore, have been worshipped there or not worshipped? You seem to be of the opinion that where a place was not marked off by unequivocal words for the worship of Christ, he could be worshipped there or not. What else is this than shutting up God in a place? For if you shut him out or leave him free in one place and not in another, you are evidently limiting his divinity. For you make him free or not in connection with place, and this is nothing else than to tie God to the narrow limits of places. We, therefore, do not do this, arguing from the finite to the infinite. We say Christ is everywhere and, therefore, is to be worshipped everywhere. We say also that the papists, when not understanding the words, "This is my body" [Mt. 26:26] figuratively, yet holding that divinity goes with the body by concomitance, they think more logically than you in denying concomitance in words but admitting it in reality--as I say you do for two reasons. First, because you confess that Christ must be in the Eucharist since his body and blood are there; second, because you teach that he may be worshipped in the Eucharist, although he is not there for the purpose of being worshipped. We say this, also, that his divinity is present everywhere where the body of Christ is, and, on the other hand, that the body of Christ is not everywhere where his divinity is, for the one is infinite, the other finite. You do not examine well, my dear Luther, this word "where", which is not predicated equally of the infinite nature and the finite.

We say, finally, that if the body of Christ is in the Eucharist, the whole Christ accompanies it, both as regards personality and as far as regards essence (for the divine and the personal or human nature are one personality in substance and one God), and that you deny this inseparable union of the natures of Christ when you deny concomitance. But, to pass to other things, do you sit down straightway and deck out another book for the Bohemians. For this [658] one will profit nothing with them towards the unification of the Church, so far as I understand the faith of the Bohemians from its fruits as you describe them. They know that it is written by Moses, "You shall worship the Lord, your God, and him only you shall proskollēthēsē, that is, cleave to." [Dt. 6:13; 10:20] And Christ repeated that this was to be taken in the sense that the heart was to cleave to no other thing save God alone. [Cf. Mt. 4:10] Hence the theologians, whether ancient or recent, have never admitted that it was right to adore the mere or naked humanity of Christ (as they put it), [16] and if any passage is found looking to that, they have held that it must

be understood to refer by figurative exchange to the higher, namely, the divine nature. If, then, the Eucharist is to be worshipped, it must be worshipped because Christ is here as God and human, and the Roman pontiff or Thomas and the Parisian theologians win, [17] and the concomitance which your party so abhors is restored. But let us give God the glory, and maintain nothing without the authority of his word. Then we shall know where we have fallen. For it is no light matter to teach what is to be worshipped. If we slip here and set up to be worshipped a thing which ought not to be, we desert to the impious. God only and alone is to be worshipped, not flesh and blood.

You have now with reference to this book things that show more clearly than the sun that it has no strength as of bones or even of sap or blood upon which you can rely in so difficult a matter. What you bring forward from Paul either has been explained or will be explained. Now I come to the sermon which you delivered against the Gushers, that is, the Fanatics.

In Regard to the Things that Luther Wrote in the Sermon against the Fanatics or Tricksters Whom He Calls the Gushers [1]

This sermon of yours is so full of inadvertencies that unless the thread of the discourse manifestly betrayed the fact nobody would believe it was yours. Since, therefore, many of the things in it [659] are so trivial that they can be answered by anybody without any trouble, I shall pass by these when we come to them, or shall touch upon them but briefly. And I shall number the individual points. [2]

I. In the beginning of the sermon you say, "In this sermon two things ought to be specially considered, one, what must be believed, the other, faith itself. The first can be called the object of faith, namely, that we believe in fact that the body and blood of Christ are in the bread and wine." [WA 19:482:15-23] This is the gist of your opinion. You see here, my dear Luther, that you vary [660] the meaning of the term "belief" just as the syngrammatists. If you take "faith" here in the generic sense, for example, for "Christian faith", the subject of faith is Christ, the Son of the living God. For upon this rock the Church is being built. [Mt. 16:18] But if you take faith for the opinion in accordance with which the body of Christ is eaten here physically,

why, I ask, do you call faith what is only an opinion? The object of faith is the thing on which alone faith rests safely and wholesomely. Eating the body physically or materially is not such that we rest upon it alone unto salvation. Otherwise there would be two roads unto salvation: one, the death of Christ, the pledge of the mercy of God; the other, physical eating. Then the disciples themselves, by eating the body, would have been redeemed before Christ died. Let us not, then, throw such smoke and mist into the eyes of the crowd: "the object of faith is the body and blood, etc." But you will say, "In this sacrament I maintain that two things are to be considered. It cannot be denied, therefore, that in this sacrament the object of faith is the body and blood. For this is what we are fighting about."

To this I answer that the case is still before the court and that the heavenly word is on our side--conjectures arising from ignorance on yours. How so? Listen! The object of faith in this sacrament is the death of Christ for us, for which we come together to give thanks. The witnesses are Christ--"This do in memory of me" [Lk. 22:19]--and Paul--"As often as you eat this bread, and drink this cup, you do show the Lord's death till he come." [1 Cor. 11:26] Since, therefore, you people say that this is the object of faith in this sacrament, the eating of the body and blood, bring on, I say, your witnesses. You have none at all. For Christ is on our side when he says, "This do in remembrance of me." For the words "this do" are not to be referred to eating the body, but to giving thanks, that we ought to do so plainly, in memory of him. For the apostle expounds them thus, "As often as you eat this bread, you do show the Lord's death." He did not say, "As often as you eat this bread, you eat the Lord's body." Therefore, the giving of thanks is the thing looked at here, and is the object of this sacrament. But for what are thanks given? For this, that Christ, the Son of God, died for us. The body of Christ, provided it be put for his death, is, to be sure, the object looked at in this supper, but not that it be eaten, but [661] that thanks be given because it was offered for us. I say constantly that it is slain that it profits, not eaten. But bring out the testimony by which you prove that corporal eating of the body is the object of the faith which is demanded in this sacrament. By the same token you will canal the Isthmus. [3] You are weaving ropes of sand. [4] How so? By your false hopes and the words with which you make big promises but you will never make them good.

II. You suggest that those who desire to run without stumbling in this matter ought especially to keep away from these fine drawn thoughts. [5] As if yours were plain: that the body of Christ is eaten here carnally, physically, or materially, although the bread remains bread, and that it is eaten in the bread, etc., while ours were obscure, by which we say that the commemoration

of the death of Christ is called the body of Christ here, just as the festival of his ascension is called the Ascension, though he does not ascend anymore! This you see much more stubbornly, clever rhetoricians you are, casting upon us all the faults that you were the first to typify. For what does all that you put your trust in amount to but subtlety?

III. You declare that we have followed unawares such thoughts as, "How can the body of Christ be in the bread and be eaten in so many places at once?" [6] Here again you are wrong by the whole width of heaven, and refuse to listen to the explanation of the brethren. [7] [662] It would be lucky and fortunate if it would be understood as it is meant, without any juggling whatever! I learned by faith that the flesh was not given us to eat, for I am assured by faith that we are saved through Jesus Christ, that all things are given us with him, that through him we have been made children of God. What eating of the flesh could do in addition to all this, I do not find in the divine utterances. Many men promise many things if you eat the flesh, but what they promise is not ratified by the supreme commander and judge. Besides, there was the repeated prediction of the going away of the flesh. These considerations drove me to look into the tropes and the nature of the Scripture a little more closely, and I thought, "What if the words of Christ, since the flesh profits nothing as far as eating is concerned, express, by an idiom of this tongue, a meaning different from this which is so vastly inconsistent with so many passages of Scripture?" I make a thorough investigation, examining the Hebrew, the Greek, the Latin, the old and the new. I find the fact is quite different from what we had all supposed, and that we had been misled through ignorance of the languages and the overconfidence that attended this. If we had reached our conclusion by following curious thinking, the inspired controversy would have been long ago. For there is no doubt that thoughts of the sort tortured the souls of the faithful centuries ago, [8] but faith and the unquestionable oracles which contradicted this meaning of yours, brought people to our conclusion, and, as I think, happily. And what you say of the fanatics, namely, that when they have got hold of some error or some dark obscurity they hurry to Scripture and seek to find confirmation of their error, [9] you should say to those who pretend that the soul is made firm by eating of flesh and the rest of their difficulties, [663] and who, when unable to defend their views from Scripture, thunder forth, "The words are clear: 'This is my body,'" [Mt. 26:26] and vary the meaning of faith as applied to the body of Christ. We have never asserted anything for which we could not give clear justification from Scripture. It is a great thing that I claim, but it is true. Moreover, the truth is great. Scripture is the guide by which we affirm or tear away.

IV. After this your nearly fanatical sermon against the

fanatics goes on thus: "But he who drinks in true faith from the words themselves believes this. Whether Christ creeps into the bread or cup, whatever he wants to do, as long as I have these words, I ask nothing further." [WA 19:485:6-9] These are your words. We think faith cannot be drunk in from words, but the words put forth are understood by the direction of faith. "Unless you believe, you will not understand" [cf. Isa. 7:9] and "No person comes to me, unless the Father who sent me draw him." [Jn. 6:44] And you yourself, in the work "On the Adoration of the Eucharist," lay down this law, "Let any word whatever be uttered in the natural meaning and let that meaning be kept unless faith suggests otherwise." [WA 11:436:21-22] This is the law passed when you were commander: words, therefore, yield to faith. Faith is the, the arbiter and interpreter of words. How, therefore, could we wait to drink in faith from words, when we ought not to approach the interpretation of Scripture unless fortified by faith? Gather yourself together, I ask. For however you take it, you have lost your bearings through strong feeling. How many troubles have you drunk in by that assertion that the Scriptures are to be interpreted by faith, coupled with your persistence in maintaining that faith is drunk in by words! You have forced the Roman pontiff to interpret by faith, "You are Peter and upon this rock I will build my church." [Mt. 16:18] Suppose he should now meet you thus: "I also wished, O Luther, to have no apostrophē ("apostrophe") sought in these unequivocal words 'And upon this rock'! I could easily see myself indicated from the command itself, but when you said that things must be interpreted by faith, I began to be insecure in my realm and my powers. Why, I implore you, did you not then cry that faith must be learned from words? When it was I drinking from the words, I was represented as Antichrist; are you to suffer nothing of the kind?" [664]

V. You then jest in this fashion, that if those words are not clear you do not know how to talk in German (that is, plainly). "For if anyone should hand me a bread roll, saying, 'Take, eat. This is a bread roll,' should I not understand what it was?" [WA 19:485:13-15] Such are your words. No one denies that the words are plain. We understand from childhood what they mean. But the very combination of the words gives a meaning that is absurd because it contradicts faith and Scripture unless you help it out with a trope, such as you yourselves are constantly using. Such expressions like these, "Christ is a calf, a serpent, a sheep," are perfectly clear as far as the words go, perfectly absurd as far as meaning is concerned. But when you have explicated the trope: "Christ is typified by the calf once offered for sins, [He. 9:12, 19] and by the brazen serpent, [cf. Jn. 3:14] or is like the sheep in innocence or when made a sacrificial victim," [1 Pet. 1:19] the whole thing hangs together. But it is strange that you are so utterly blind as to see absolutely nothing. You bring forward illustrations or comparisons without any judgement, as I shall

show both here and in the following. Yet what would you accomplish with them if they squared to a hair's breadth all points? [10] When you say, "Who will not know that it is a bread roll that I offer when I take the bread and say, 'Take, eat. This is a roll'?", you think you have brought forward something similar when it is dissimilar. You offer bread and say it is bread. Who would find anything absurd here? But in the Lord's words you offer bread and say it is the physical body, no indeed, is human, or rather, God and human, that is, Christ himself. If you wanted to present something like this you ought to have said, "Who does not know that the words are clear when I offer a bread roll and say, 'Eat. This is a watermelon or a cucumber'? Who, I say, does not know what I have offered is a watermelon or a cucumber?" I should say nobody would know it unless you should explain the things by some figure, for instance, that the bread roll [665] was spoken of as a watermelon or a cucumber from its shape, but was nothing but a bread roll, or that having been given the price of a watermelon, you had bought what was called a watermelon but was not one, or in some similar fashion. For that is the way in our passage that we say the bread or the festival itself is the body of Christ, when it is only the commemoration and symbolization of Christ's body.

VI. You next perform the function of a champion and set forth the basis of our case in this fashion: "They have two chief points with which they oppose us. First, they say it is absurd that Christ's body and blood should be in the bread and wine, and second, that it is not necessary to eat the body and blood." [WA 19:486:10-12] See, my dear Luther, what a champion of bad faith you are. You ought to have understood that we measure the absurdity not from the meaning as it appears to people but from the meaning as it concerns the thing involved, that is, of faith and Scripture. For the thing involved, that is, faith, sees without difficulty that it has no need of this bodily food. For faith makes happy. And it is enough for the festival if the hearts of the faithful offer their thanks which spring from trust in Christ Jesus. As to the external symbol, it is abundantly sufficient for the heart to have eaten the bread and wine as a proof to its neighbor of its faith and love and its belonging to the communion or Church of Christ. But Scripture and the very articles of faith are so at variance with your opinion that one or the other must fall, as will be made clear. For what you attribute to the body of Christ, namely, the being everywhere and filling all things, will be shown with perfect clearness not to belong to it. In the second place, we only say that it is not necessary that the body be eaten but that it is altogether impossible that it be eaten, for two reasons, as has been said, although Bucer and the other brethren of Strassburg first represented this matter from motives of policy as adiaphoron ("indifferent"), since as such they could call in question without an uproar. [11] But [666] listen to your

own words! You wrote early in the work on the "Adoration of the Sacrament", "For it is true as a general fact that you can live and become justified and blessed without this sacrament." [WA 11:433:18-19] These are your words. Why, then, do you now charge it as a crime that certain men have taught thus, fishing in your preserves, perhaps? Is this the way you show us your inspiration by the Spirit? For the things you attach to the word are empty pretense. For the word, the meaning of which you people vary so often, is nothing else than to believe that Christ Jesus, the Son of God, suffered death for us, not to believe that his body is eaten here. For faith in that has nowhere been proposed to us. The word that stands for the one faith we bring into the festival, that which stands for the other we do not drink from it.

The illustrations and similes you then bring forward all try to make it not seem absurd that the body of Christ be eaten. But you are only seeking to soften the meaning as it appears to people, when you ought to be trying to reconcile the contradictions between the heavenly word and the articles of faith on one side and your opinion on the other. As to this you are all sound asleep.

You throw out that by the same token it can be said to be absurd that he was born of a virgin. [12] But you do not reflect, first, that no passage of Scripture stands in the way of his being born of a virgin, no indeed, that this was announced and foreshadowed both by utterances and by acts of holy men and prophets. Second, that all that we believe about that miracle is written in transparently clear language. Finally, that to the virgin who marveled just as the disciples would have done [667] if they had understood Christ to be speaking of his bodily flesh, and said, "How shall this be?", the whole thing was explained: "The Holy Spirit shall come upon you, and the power of the highest shall overshadow you, etc." [Lk. 1:35] Here nothing of the sort was done or said, no promise given.

You add an objection as to the absurdity of the incarnation of Christ [13] which yet, as has been made plain, was foretold by the utterances of the prophets as promised by God. Not so with the eating of the body and blood.

You fancy that it is a similar case that the soul is in every part of the body at once and in the whole body, then the case is dissimilar. [14] It would be a similar case if somebody should be in many places at once. To be the soul in all the members is like that heavenly Spirit, which, though one, informs all the various members of the body of the Church, and yet remains the same spirit and mind of the same in all. This the physical body of Christ does not at all do. For it cannot be in various places and separate localities.

"My mind," you say, "can at the same time think, speak, see, hear, feel," [WA 19:487:22-23] yes, and loidorizein ("revile"), etc. If the body could do this, you would have a similarity. As it is, it is dissimilar as far as our present purpose is concerned. The similarity it has is to the Holy Spirit, which gives different gifts and functions to the members of its church, just as the soul performs various functions in the same body.

Your remarks about the fruits of the earth, that it is a wonderful thing that on one stalk such similar pods and shells should grow, and that the kernels should be so similar throughout, yet no one wonders at it, [15] you are indiscreet to station in your line, since [668] they make for us. Do you want to hear how? Thus: if these things are really wonderful, as by Hercules they are, and yet because of familiarity with them no one wonders at them, just think how much more vain it is to try to pass off as miracles things that no one has ever perceived or seen or believed, no indeed, that are nowhere depicted or described!

You have two eyes and take in many thousands of heads at the same time, and yet you are far inferior to the Cyclops [16] who with only one eye saw just as many things as you see with your two eyes. Hence it is no wonder that men have ceased to marvel at this power of yours. But what has this to do with our thesis?

You tell us also that one and the same voice can be heard by many people, etc., and that all the more can Christ do the same thing with his body, which is the same body, namely, in all the bread which is eaten in the supper. Again you bring forward a dissimilarity. You have not yet shown that anybody has ever been in various places at once, and all the things you bring out as similarities are really opposites. Body and spirit are opposites, but you transfer to body whatever applies to spirit. Of this kind also is it that by one breath and one [669] inspiration one and the same Spirit informs numberless hearts, as happened on the day of Pentecost. [Lk. 2] And you reason here from the possible to the actual, a proceeding you utterly tear to pieces in writing to the King of England, not in a very proper way perhaps, for he is anointed of the Lord. Here are your words: "With their lifeless explanations they simply beg the question most viciously, and the sum of their accomplishment is that things may be as they pretend they are, when they ought to have proved both the fact and the justice of their contention, that it is so and ought to be so. No one doubts that God can transubstantiate the bread, but they cannot show that he does so." [WA 10/2:206:35-39] These are your words faithfully copied from your book. Why, then, if it is such an indecisive proof to reason from the possible to the actual, do you now give yourself up to it so completely? Keep the law which you have laid down. I shall not let you escape.

If you continue thus to convict yourself, I shall make an Eck or a Faber [17] of you or some even greater monstrosity. For if argument from the possible to the actual is to stand, I shall say, "God make an Eck of Luther" and you may draw the proper inference. I shall aposiōpēsomen ("step aside in silence").

"When I bring Christ into the heart by my preaching, which is done by the bodily voice," you say, "so that now you grasp him in your mind, you must confess that you have the real Christ, not that he sits there as one sits in a chair, but as he is at the right hand of the Father." [WA 19:489:9-14] [670] See first here how uneducated your language is, second, what it savors of most strongly (for I do not want to say anything rough of you), finally, how consistent you are with yourself! If he is in the heart of a person just as he sits at the right hand, why did you teach that he is not to be adored in the heart of a person? And what you akribologizesthe ("put forth in minute detail") concerning the word, has already been proved unsound.

And presently you add that though Christ is thus in the heart of a person he is no less at the right hand of the Father, and that when this is believed, he is thereby acquired and possessed in the heart, and the heart of the one who has him thus is in heaven, not in appearance or in dream as it were, but in reality. [18] I do not know what you are aiming at with these words. For if the heart of the believer is in heaven otherwise than by sure hope and contemplation, why do you not prove it from Scripture? If not, what are you going to accomplish by this reasoning? It has long been acknowledged by everybody that Christ is really in us provided we believe, and that we are in heaven, but the first by virtue of his presence for he is God, the second, only in contemplation, faith, hope, Christian love. "The pious experience this," you say, "but they" (meaning us, of course) "perceive nothing of this." [WA 19:490:2-3] That is what you were going on to say, no doubt.

If, then, you perceive this, I implore and call upon you by everything in heaven or on earth, why do you want carnal manducation? [671] What else do you hunger and thirst for? Does not "by faith alone" suffice? You say, "The eating of the body comforts." This you say out of your own minds. Bring us the word of the Lord. You say, "We have the Spirit as witness of what we experience." I say, human beings are liars. [Rom. 3:4] It cannot be that you experience the virtue to have come to you from the eating which Christ did not perceive to have gone out of himself. And that he did not say so. For if he had wished any virtue to be imbibed from the eating of his body, he would have said so.

After all this you go on, "If, then, this great fact is so, namely, that by the voice of one man the whole Christ is

brought into so many ears, can it seem astonishing to anyone that he puts himself into the bread and wine?" [WA 19:490:10:13] Who denies that Christ, speaking absolutely, can do this or anything else? We ask that according to your own law you prove that he has done it. The question of the omnipotence of God is not now under discussion, but the question of physical eating of the body. When will you see that you are reasoning from the possible to the actual in your customary way? Since Christ, according to his own word (this the new school call his ordained power), [19] cannot be in the body anywhere except where he has described himself as being, it is impossible for him to be eaten in the bread. He is at the right hand; he has said that he is going to sit there until he comes again to judge the world. [Cf. Mt. 26:64.] "He can be in only one place" [20] as far as his human nature is concerned.

VII. You assert that it passes understanding how he gets into the bread, but you know the words are there, "Take, eat. This is my body [672] which is given for you. Do this in remembrance of me." [1 Cor. 11:24] "When we speak these words over the bread," you say, "then he is really there, etc." [WA 19:490: 14-20] Such are your words. Consider here first that you have the word, but not the understanding. We, too, have the word, but rightly understood, and the Roman pontiff has the word, but wrongly understood. No one denies the word is there. The controversy is about the understanding of the words. Do you see to what you are driven? To this, absolutely denying the possibility of any other explanation in order to guard against collation, because if you admit such collation it is apparent that you will come off worsted. It is stubbornness to say, "We have the words." Arius also has the words: [21] "The Father is greater than I, etc., [Jn. 14:28] Of that day the Son of Man does not know," [Mt. 24:36] and "Father, why have you forsaken me?", [Mt. 27:46] but though he has them, the orthodox church, on the other hand, has words which set up over against them bring out their meaning.

We have not only a few words, but all Scripture, religion and faith. Consider, secondly, how audacious you are when you say that as soon as we have uttered these words, the body of Christ is at hand. That is why the people used to talk who tried to palm off their own visionary words as divine utterances. Bring out the testimony of Scripture to this beautiful principle not of yours but of the Roman pontiffs. "This do," you say, "in remembrance of me." I have said hundreds of times that these words, "this do," refer not to eating of the body, but to the giving of thanks, according to the words of Paul, etc. "In the way," you say, "he comes into the heart and neither breaks nor destroys anything, but through the word alone is heard and grasped." [WA 19:490:21-22] Such are your words. [673] Where do you leave "No man can come to me except the Father draw him," [Jn. 6:44]

and "Unless you believe, you will not understand"? [Isa. 7:9] But you say, "This is only the first part of the comparison. Hear the other part also." "Speak," I say. Luther: "So also he comes into the bread in such a way as to make no hole." [WA 19:490:22-23] See how slow you are. When you say "heart", what, I ask, do you mean? The physical heart or the mental faculties? If you mean the physical heart, certainly nothing but what is bodily comes into that. If you mean the mental faculties, of which the heart is the citadel and palace, what does your comparison amount to I ask? Is it this: the knowledge of God comes into the mind; therefore the body of Christ comes into the mind? What is the similarity here? You do not mean, I suppose, that the body of Christ slides down into the belly. Where is it received? In the breast, they say. The physical? But nothing comes into that which has not previously been in the belly and throat. In the heart, that is, the seat of the mental faculties, which means nothing else than the soul? But this does not feed upon flesh; it lives by the Spirit alone. Does it eat spiritual flesh? It had eaten that before when it put its trust in the Son of God.

IX. Coming back to the birth from a virgin you say, "From whence does it come that a virgin conceives? The angel Gabriel brings the word, 'Behold, you will conceive in your womb, and bring forth a son.' [Lk. 1:31] With these words Christ came not only into the heart but into the body when she heard, kept, and believed them." [WA 19:490:24-33] This is what you say. Not to touch upon the subtle suggestion about the word here, by which it is hinted that Christ was brought by the word, I will ask you to show us any such promise as this: "Behold you will eat bread and in the bread the body of Christ, but you will perceive nothing of this. Yet whenever you utter the words, 'This is my body' upon the bread, the body shall be at hand." Then I will believe no less (if any may compare small things with great) than the holy virgin believed. I will even grant that which she was told when she asked the manner [674] in which the thing should be done, "The Holy Spirit will come upon you, etc." [Lk.1:35] I will ask nothing further, after you bring forth so unequivocal a promise, not from the chest of your minds in which you have the body of Christ laid away, but from that storehouse from which the faithful stewards bring forth things both new and old. [Cf. Mt. 12:35.]

With these and other comparisons both more crude and more inapplicable you not only pester the unhappy reader to death but shower contempt upon him, as if he had not intelligence enough to see what fits and what does not fit, and as if the matter should be dealt with by means of parallels and not by means of solid and clear testimony from Scipture. If this business could have been settled by comparisons and parallels, I should have abandoned the case long since, not frightened away or persuaded by these

half alive parallels that you bring up, but either by the old ones that sometimes amid the singing of the Psalms I used to understand the festival of the body and blood of Christ, in which were sung the praises of both the wood that softened the odor of the water of Marath [Ex. 15:23] and the wood that brought up the hatchet of the prophet, [2 K. 6:6] or by the new ones, which, though commonplace, are nevertheless more applicable to the matter in hand.

What ones for instance? These: one and the same sun and all of it is beheld by all, even if one looks at it with one eye only through a crack much smaller than the eye. The sun is made no smaller by looking at it, nor is it any smaller to whoever has but a very small space through which to contemplate it. If the word looks into one and the same mirror, each person sees one's own face reflected in it. We all breathe the same air (which fills the material world more thoroughly than the barley fills your sack), and there is enough for all, nor is it lessened by any space of time. We all drink the same water (nor does water nor any other element come into existence for us in new amount any more than the earth does.) It is not diminished by our use nor increased by our refraining from its use. All the rivers unload themselves into the sea, but it is not thereby rendered any bigger. It gradually sends through the earth, as if absorbed by a sponge, everlasting springs of water for us, yet becomes no narrower thereby. Wood drinks, and the trees, plants, [675] shrubs, grass, rocks even, and the earth drinks most of all. For what does that amount to which animals and people use up, these last scorning it in great part, content with what they extract from the vine? Yet there are so many copious drinkers that it is conjectured that more is drunk at every moment than the whole sea contains, and yet the amount of water is always the same, neither made greater by inflowings nor less by so much drinking. With these and like comparisons, which are far more learned and more applicable to the case than yours, I should long have been satisfied if anything could be gained by parallels.

But let us refrain from proclaiming marvels, like jugglers, where there is no marvel, where he who is marvelous in his workings, has promised nothing for us to marvel at, suggested nothing of the kind before he did the thing in question, and when he did it, no one marveled nor asked any question afterwards, though the apostles were still tarrying among people. What has become of your law that nothing must be maintained which is not set forth plainly in the sacred writings and ratified by the spirit of faith? He said, "This is my body." [Mt. 26:26] But did he say (even if we grant that there is no trope here), "Make my body out of bread or in bread"? For I have proved, crying until I am hoarse, that the words, "This do in remembrance of me" are to be referred to the giving of thanks, not to the making of body. For he bids us make festival and give thanks in remembrance of that which he did for us in dying.

And this I brought forth not from my own store, but from Paul's where he thus explains these words of commemoration, "As often as you eat this bread, you do show the Lord's death." [1 Cor. 11:26] Things such as I, too, have enumerated are miracles but they are performed with us experiencing and perceiving them. It is a miracle that we are made over by the Spirit of Christ, yet at least our mind perceives this. But what is perceived of the eating of the body? I know your reckless course here. It is pretended that something is perceived, but, I say: tell that tale to others! [676] I believe nothing of that sort unless it is confirmed by the word of the Lord. See, then, my dear Luther, who should rightly be called fanatics and jugglers, those who walk slowly along the ground and say that the festival is called the Body of Christ or even that the bread which is eaten in it is not ordinary bread, or those who soar aloft and put forth splendid promises without any authority from Scripture, as if I should swear that I was flying in the air, when yet the eyes of all men beheld me walking upon the ground, and pretty clumsily.

X. After these metaphors you come down to the oft mentioned remark about the filled sack. And you speak after this fashion: "Likewise we believe that Christ Jesus is in his humanity constituted in a way superior to all things and fills all things, as Paul says, Ephesians 4:10." [WA 19:491:17-18] These are your words. I had met this absurd suggestion kat' anthypophoran ("by raising it as an objection to be answered") in the early part of my argument, when I showed by the testimony of the angel that the body of Christ is not everywhere and is not stretched out into the largeness of the divine nature. For to the woman who sought his body (I use "body" emphatically, for they did not seek his divinity, inasmuch as it was because they believed he was the Son of God that they sought him) the angel said, "He has risen; he is not here." [Mt. 28:26] If he was not there, how can you say, Luther, that Christ even in his humanity fills all things? If you try to take refuge in the statement, "He was not there with the original crude style of bodily presence. His body had taken on another state," I shall bind you with two chains that you may not slip from my grasp: one, that the angel is speaking of the body which had risen again. For he says, "He has risen; he is not here," thus denying that the body which had risen again was there. Therefore, the body of Christ is not everywhere. The second is that Christ says, "This is my body which was given for you," [Mt. 26:26] not, "which has risen from the dead." If, as you are always clamoring, we must stick to the simple words of Christ, we shall be forced to eat the body of Christ as it consisted of flesh and blood and bone, and altogether as it hung upon the cross. Therefore, we cannot say on the authority of this passage of Paul that the body of Christ is everywhere. About the natural meaning of those words I shall have something to say presently. [677]

But if you proceeed to slip out by the other path, namely, by saying that the subsequent words suggested to you the grounds on which you say that he is everywhere, and if you wish to be understood as meaning that he, insofar as he is human, reigns everywhere, for you speak after this fashion: Luther: "He (namely, Christ) is, not only in virtue of his divinity, but also in virtue of his human nature, Lord of all things, holds all things in his grasp, and is everywhere present." [WA 19:491:18-25] If, I say, you try to escape by this road, I shall bind you with three chains. First, if you jump over to the divine nature, your reasoning is not valid, for the question is whether the body is eaten, and since I deny that it is eaten, supported by other reasons but especially by this reason, that this body cannot be in several places at once, even according to the testimony of the angel, it devolves upon you people to prove that his body is everywhere, not that Christ reigns everywhere. For he did that before he was clothed with body. Second, you give evidence of a manifest and new error when you say that by his human nature he is Lord of all things. Who, I ask, of the theologians has ever taught anything like this? How can he be less than the Father, as he himself says [cf. Jn. 10:29] and Athanasius confesses, [22] if in virtue of his humanity he is just as much Lord of all things as in virtue of his divinity? Speaking of the day of judgement in Matthew 24:36 and Mark 13:32, he says distinctly, "But of that day and hour no one knows, neither the angels of heaven nor the Son, but the Father only." Do you see, my dear Luther, how his humanity has the second place? If that were itself Lord of all things, how could the day of judgement be appointed for all flesh, not merely without its command, but even without its knowledge?

Let us not, I say, cast ourselves headlong into such manifest errors, lest we seem to subscribe to the teaching of Sabellius and of Marcion who sprang from his heresy. [23] Finally, a clumsy Vulcan, I will catch you again in the net of your own words. [24] For you say in the last part of this section, [678] "And he is everywhere present, namely, as to his humanity." [WA 19:491:17-18] Hence it appears that you are of the opinion that the body of Christ is everywhere just as much as his divinity. For you use up no small number of words to show that, though he is everywhere, he yet manifested himself especially in two places, for example, in heaven and in the Eucharist, in the one, to show that he was Lord of all things, in the other, to make us sure where to seek and to find him--but all this is mere human words, not in quotations from the divine utterances.

It has already been shown that it is not the province of humanity thus to reign even if the one that reigns is a person. That he ascended no one denies, but that he is besides in the Eucharist, so that we know where he is to be sought and found, is dis dia pasōn ("by twice the whole scale") at variance not only

with religion but with your own utterances. For you have said that he is in heaven and not also in the Eucharist to be adored, and now you point out that he is to be sought and found also in the Eucharist. For what, I ask? To be eaten. What is he going to do when eaten? Confirm the heart, remit sins, etc. But I have shown already that it is impious to attribute these things to physical eating. But to be eaten all the same. Perhaps you mean, "to fill the belly," for the mind is satisfied with the contemplation of him. See, my dear Luther, what you force us to endure and do. We are forced patiently to bear all these immense absurdities, and to reply to things so frivolously cunning that if anyone else had brought them forward nobody would deign to reply to them. But since your authority supports them and you are so far from desiring to return to the straight path that you even seem eager to stand on these things, I have a wolf by the ears. [25] It is painful that your authority should suffer any derogation; it is impious to betray the truth. Placed in such a position as I see that it is after all a smaller thing to sin against a person than against God, and though I regret exceedingly to make answer to these things, which have not even the appearance of foundation in the sacred writings, yet one is bound to guard against human wares being passed off as divine. Since, therefore, you pay too little attention to the exchange of the two natures of Christ, and yet frequently avail yourself of them in speaking to the general crowd who have no understanding of them, I have determined to note down here a few points in regard to them, [679] that no one may be imposed upon through lack of knowledge of them. For you jump craftily from one nature to the other, as when you say that Christ is in us and around us everywhere (a competence only of his divine nature), and at the same time wish to insinuate to the minds of the untutored that his natural body is everywhere, filling and surrounding all things.

On the Alloiosis of the two Natures in Christ [1]

Alloiosis, which I have interpreted as an expression involving a leap, is, according to Plutarch, [2] a trope by which an interchange takes place between members of a category or scheme of things where, namely, on account of some affinity in the grammatical phenomena, a leap or interchange is made from one to the other. Such interchanges or exchanges or leaps, which the holy men used freely in regard to Christ in view of the union of the two natures in him, nay, Christ himself used for agreeable variety in regard to himself (the theologians used not long ago

to call it exchange of attributes, that is, special properties) [3] -- these, I say, I have called alloiosis or leap, in order to make the grammarians more friendly. For all experts have the peculiarity of [680] being a little angry with a person who does not properly grasp the terms of their speciality. Alloiōsis, then, so far as our subject is concerned, is that leap or transition or, if you prefer, interchange, by which when, speaking of one of Christ's natures, we use the terms that apply to the other. [681] For instance, when Christ says, "My flesh is truly meat," [Jn. 6:55] the word flesh properly applies to his human nature, but by exchange it is used in this place of his divine nature. For in that he is the Son of God he is the food of the soul. For he says, "It is the Spirit that enlivens." [Jn. 6:63] Again, when he says that the son of the householder was slain by the husbandmen, though "son of the householder" is a characterization of his divinity, [cf. Mt. 21:33ff.] he uses it in reference to his human nature--for by virtue of that he could die, but not by any means of virtue of his divine nature.

When, I say, what applies to one of the natures is predicated of the other, this is alloiosis or exchange or change of attributes. It is so essential to know this and keep it in mind that one who disregards it or does not know it defiles not only the Gospel of John but also the others with extraordinary errors. The reason why they were all so much given to the use of this exchange or alloiosis of attributes is this: when he who is from all eternity Son of God put on humanity, he was made Son of Man also, not in the [682] sense that he who was Son of God lost the lot or condition of being divine, or was transmuted into the position of man, nor in the sense that he turned human into divine nature, but in the sense that God and a human being became one Christ, who, in that he is the Son of God, is the life of all (for all things were made by him [Jn. 1:3]) and in that he is a human being, is the offering through which the eternal righteousness, which is also his righteousness, is reconciled.

These two natures, however, he joined and united into one substance or person in such a way that they still always retain each its own character, with the one exception that the tendency to sin is utterly foreign to his humanity. For he was not born of corrupt seed but by the Holy Spirit's making fertile his virgin mother. But being thus without guilt he underwent punishments, sufferings, and distress to the day of his death, such as hunger, thirst, heat, cold, sleep, waking and all such things. So the holy ones of God sought out many images and marks to help them teach clearly this union. Some brought forth the comparison to a person who consists of soul and body (which seemed to me the closest comparison) and showed that the God and the human being in him made one Christ. Others brought forward a blade heated by fire. [4] For if you cut wood or any other body with it, both

a wound and burn are inflicted. By this parallel they wished to show the force, life, nature, character, working of the two natures. This metaphor you took from them if you confess it. If you deny it, you pilfered it [683] and twisted it to support the notion of the flesh in the bread, Luther. [5] That was not very clever, though, for as the heated sword cuts and burns, so the divinity of Christ performs miracles, enters the heart and dwells there, while his humanity hungers, suffers and dies. But what, I beg of you, has the bread to do in the soul, what the body of Christ physically eaten? But the comparison to a heated blade was not known to the people, and their wondering amazement before anything new flattered us into the hope that something could be accomplished with them by means of comparisons of this sort not thoroughly understood, since we were utterly without help from the Lord's word, and yet did not want to yield the victory and glory to God, because we were seeking the glory of humanity. But I come back to the subject.

I will examine several instances of alloiosis in John and elsewhere, that the simple reader may be made cautious about thinking that when he hears anything predicated of Christ or said by him that what applies to only one of his natures applies to the other also. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him, etc.," [Jn. 1:1] applies only to the divinity of Christ. So also that which Paul writes in Romans 11:36, "Of him and through him and in him are all things." "The Word was made flesh," [Jn. 1:14] "God was made human," are ways of saying by alloiosis that he who put on humanity is the eternal God, and after he put it on is eternally human also. For God was not made human in the sense that he who was God [684] was turned into a human being, but he who was not a human being before put on humanity.

We say, therefore, that God who made the humanity he put on was made human, meaning that human nature was put on by the Son of God. This Athanasius confesses, "Not by the turning of divnity into flesh," he says, "but by the putting of humanity upon God." [6] Yet no one is offended by the sharing of qualities when it is said, "God was made human," meaning "the human was made God," or "was taken upon the person of the Son of God." See what an inoffensive union! But see at the same time how we must not confuse the understanding of the properties, even if we interchange the names!--John 3:13: "No person has ascended up to heaven but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of Man which is in heaven. And as Moses lifted up the serpent, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up, so that whoever believes in him should have, etc." We have here "the Son of Man" twice, but not as a typification of the same nature. The Son of Man is lifted up and fixed upon the cross,

and the Son of Man is in heaven though he had not yet ascended. His divine nature, therefore, by which he is forever with the Father, is called the Son of Man exactly as his human nature is called God when we say that God was born of the virgin. It was in virtue of his divinity, then, not in virtue of his humanity, that he was the Son of Man in heaven with the Father who never abandoned him.--Jn. 5:17: "My Father continuously works and I work." Here "I" is said of Christ, but it applies only to his superior nature, which performs miracles and works all things equally with the Father. But a little later, when he says, "Truly, truly, I say to you, the Son can do nothing of himself, but what he sees the Father doing," [Jn. 5:19] he calls the assumed human being "the Son", and declares that he can perform no miracles. I would not contend with those who perhaps not impiously, but inopportunely, would say that "Son" is put here for the divine nature also, in the sense that the Son works nothing which the Father does not work with him.

I have enough testimony with which to show more clearly than day that things belonging only to divinity are spoken of, indeed as if they belong to humanity, but are not attributed to it. So far is it from the truth that you can expand Christ's material body so greatly.--In the same chapter: "And has given him authority to execute judgement also, because he is the Son of Man." [Jn. 5:27] Here "Son of Man" is put for his humanity, while earlier in this discourse ("the Son of Man which is in heaven") it was put for his divinity only. For it is the prosapodosis ("repetition of the reason") why the Son especially is [685] to judge the world, namely, because he is the Son of Man, that is, has put on human nature. In the same chapter: "I can of mine own self do nothing." [Jn. 5:30] Here "I" is put for his humanity. He denies it to the working of miracles, about which he was especially talking there.

And do you, Luther, attribute all things to it, infinity, power and what not? I do not object to taking "of mine own self" here in the sense of "alone", merely to avoid contentiousness, for what follows shows well enough that the phrase would be referred to the human nature.--John 6:55, "My flesh is truly meat." The passage shows incontrovertibly that "flesh" is used to mean the divine nature, for he himself had explained the passage as meaning that it must be the Spirit that enlivens, that the flesh profits nothing, [Jn. 6:63] about which enough has been said above. [14] And do you imagine he is speaking of carnal understanding, thus destroying this charming allegorical utterance and alloiosis?--John 7:16: "My teaching," he says, "is not mine." Why, good Jesus, how, then, is it with your doctrine, if it is not yours? But it was yours, for you are God, and all that the Father has is yours, and, on the other hand, all that you have is the Father's. But it was not yours because you are human. It is yours when you pass to your divine nature, not yours when to your human nature. It is

yours by possession, not by nature, if we look at the human in you. In this discourse you copy the portrayal or representation of your enemies who made you human only and not also God. And do you attribute all things to him in virtue of his humanity also, when he denies them to it?--John 10:18: "I have power to lay down my life, and to take it again," applies to his divinity, not humanity. For this latter said, "If it be possible, let this cup pass from me." [Mt. 26:39]

And in the same gospel: "I and my Father are one" [Jn. 10:30] applies to the divine nature. They were not one person but one substance. For though they were two, they were yet one thing, and he makes the Father and himself two witnesses, in order to do all things according to the law. John 8:16f.: "If I judge," he says, "my judgement is true: for I am not alone, but I and the Father that sent me. It is also written in your law that the testimony of two men is true. Therefore, I am one that bears witness of myself; the other who gives testimony of me is the Father who sent me." And you would confuse everything, attributing to his humanity what is peculiar to his divinity: [686] ruling, filling all things and other things of the kind? John 10:38: "That you may know and believe that the Father is in me, and I in him." Here "me" and "I" look to his divinity, for in virtue of that he is in the Father from eternity and the Father in him. John 12:23: "The hour is come that the Son of Man should be glorified or rendered illustrious," and a little further on, "Father, save me from this hour," [Jn. 12:27] that is, "Rescue me from this crisis." These are so thoroughly human that one may judge that he had no need of help, so far is he from ruling in virtue of his human nature. And if anyone says it was done by a dispensation, what then?

His sitting at the right hand of God until he comes to judge is just as much a matter of dispensation as what he now asks, nay, so is his whole putting on of human nature. In the same chapter, "Where I am, there shall also my servant be," [Jn. 12:26] and John 14:3: "I will receive you to myself, that where I am, there you may be also." Here "I" and "to myself" signify the inferior nature, for in virtue of the nobler he was always with them. And do you say that Christ's body is everywhere? It will follow, then, that wherever the humanity of Christ is, there are the elect also. And according to you, that is everywhere; it fills all things. Then the elect must also be everywhere. If, then, Christ is physically in the Eucharist so are also the elect. It is strange that these Christeaters are in no way repelled by this Christbearing Christopher, taller than the Colossus of Rhodes. [7] In the same gospel, [Jn. 12:32ff.]: "I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all people to me." This he said, signifying what death he should die. The people answered him, "We have heard out of the law that Christ abides forever: and do you say the Son of Man must be

lifted up? Who is this Son of Man?" [687] See how those thick-headed people were yet cleverer than we are at seizing the trope. They understood that in using the expression "be lifted up" he was speaking of dying. Unless, therefore, they deny that Christ can die, and he himself asserts it, it is evident that he is making the quickest possible transition from one of his natures to the other. For the expression "If I be lifted up from the earth" looks to his human nature, but the words that follow quicker than a flash, "will draw all people to me", beyond a doubt look to his divine nature, for it is the function of that to draw all people to it. As, therefore, even if one says hundreds of times, "The Son of God was slain," or "The Lord of Glory was crucified," we never understand that his Godhead suffered anything, only his humanity. So whenever power over all things and infinity are attributed to Christ, we never understand that his humanity has these things, even though we hear such modes of expression without offense. For as each nature is in him in its entirety, so each nature preserves its own character (as far as their boundaries are concerned). His humanity can no more reign than his divinity die--even though he who reigns is human, and he who dies is God.

We easily admit the expressions, "The Son of Man sits at the right hand and reigns" [Mt. 26:64] and "The Son of God died for us," [cf. 1 Cor. 15:3] because of the union of the natures, yet the understanding never confuses the two. And would you, great theologian as you are, confuse them? Far be this from Luther, who is thoroughly convinced that whatever he has taught is of divine origin and is incontrovertible. In the same gospel: "Whoever believes in me does not believe in me, but in the one who sent me." [Jn. 12:44] Here the first "in me" signifies Christ the God, the second, Christ the human being. In this sense, whoever trusts in me insofar as I am God, truly trusts, for no one trusts in that which is created. No one, therefore, trusts in me insofar as I am a human being. For all hope must be laid upon the one who sent me.

And do you attribute to his humanity infinity and supremacy over all things, when he so unequivocally puts them away from him? Who has ever taught that we must put our trust in the creature? We must lean upon God alone. If anyone says, "We must put our trust in the death of Christ, for he suffered it for us," I answer, we are indeed given assurance through the death of Christ, as a pledge of God's mercy, that the divine righteousness is appeased, but that which we must ever put our trust in is God alone. But I am not at all troubled by expressions of this kind to put trust in the death of the Son of God, any more than by any others that are used of either one of the natures in Christ, when they apply only to the other. John 13:33: "Little children, yet a little while I am with you." Here "I am" is said of his human nature, for we cannot say of his divine nature that it is not every-

where. [688] And do you venture to say that his body is everywhere, when he himself says that he will be with us but a little while? John 14:6: "I am the way, the truth and the life" is said of his divine nature only, for it is in virtue of that that he is all these things. Do you see again that the way, the truth and the life are applied to his human nature only by alloiosis? Yet you attribute to the body, even when eaten, the reinstatement of the tottering soul, the forgiveness of sins, and the rest of your things? Even if these things were anywhere attributed to eating by evident statement of Scripture, it would yet be by alloiosis, since they are peculiar to divinity.

When, therefore, we have no scriptural authority, what mischief does our recklessness mean when we assert on our own authority things that so plainly are at variance with real eusebeia ("piety") towards the one supreme God? In the same gospel: "If you had known me you would have know my Father also." [Jn. 14:7] Here "me" looks to his Godhead, for they certainly knew Jesus, the tektona ("carpenter", "artisan", etc.) but that he was the only supreme God they sometimes confessed and they sometimes hesitated to believe. Do not, therefore, pluck from this passage a reason for contending that he is Lord of all things just as much by his human nature as by his divine nature, for it is now clear what leaps he takes in speaking of himself. Indeed, he goes on immediately to speak in such a way as to make clearer what I am saying. In the same place: "Philip, whoever has seen me has seen the Father." [Jn. 14:9] Is the Father, then, of human aspect, as Melito is said to have thought? [8] By no means. For no one has seen God at any time. [Jn. 1:18] How, therefore, has the Father been seen when Christ has been seen? When Christ is known, the Father is known, not as a human being is known, but as God is known. For there is but one God. Whether, therefore, you know the Father, or the Son, or the Holy Spirit, you know God. Hence it is clear why the words above, "If you had known me, you would have known my Father also," cannot be understood of the knowledge of Christ's human nature.

In the same chapter: "I will pray the Father, and he will give you another comforter." [Jn. 14:16] He said another comforter should come to abide with them forever. Therefore, was he not to abide forever himself? He was, for he is everywhere present and a near God, but he was to lay aside the flesh until his appointed day. And do we straightway cry out that the flesh is there? In the same Gospel: "The word which you hear is not mine, but the Father's which sent me." [Jn. 14:24] He is evidently denying that the words are his as a human being, for as God he has all these things in common with the Father. For he says, "All mine are yours, and yours are mine." [Lk. 15:31] And do we attribute the kingdom to him otherwise than by alloiosis, when he says that the word he commends to us is not his? In the same

place: "These things I have spoken to you, being yet present with you." [Jn. 14:25] Therefore, he went away. [689] But he who is by nature everywhere present cannot go away.

Therefore, it was his humanity that went away, as is seen plainly by what follows, for he says, "But the Comforter, who is the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, shall teach you all things, etc." [Jn. 14:26] Here we have "but", that we may see the part that belongs to the Holy Spirit. "I shall go away," he says, "but the Holy Spirit will be with you immediately to make good my absence." This passage acts very strongly against you people, when you say of your own notion (as always) that all this going away (of which mention is made in these passages) is to be understood in the sense that he only took away the ability to perceive him. For it is plainly seen here that he promises that the Holy Spirit did not dwell visibly among them.

Therefore it follows at once that he was speaking of the going away of his body altogether and not of its visibility or invisibility. And do we attribute to the body that comforting which belongs only to the Spirit? What need of the sending of the Spirit would there have been if the bodily presence and the supper room furnished all things? In the same place, John 16:44ff., "These things I have told you, that when the time comes you may remember that I told you of them. And these things I did not say to you at the beginning, because I was with you. But now I go my way to him that sent me, and one of you asks, where are you going? But because I have said these things to you, sorrow has filled your heart. Nevertheless I tell you the truth: it is expedient for you that I go away: for if I do not go away, the Comforter will not come to you." He says that up to that time he had concealed from the disciples those violent and terrible things they were going to suffer after his departure. For they were not going to suffer anything while he was with them, that the saying might be fulfilled, no doubt where he says, "Father, of those you have given me I have not lost one." [Jn. 18:9] For he says, "Because I was with you." But after he was no longer with them, they were constantly dragged to punishment. But was he not there with goodness and protection? He was. They were, therefore, deprived of his humanity only. Again, "But now," he says, "I go my way to him that sent me." It is an antithesis: "Hitherto I have been with you, but now I go away." If he had been abiding with them but unseen, that would not have been going away, and the antithesis would not fit. He would have had to speak, or we should have had to explain his words thus: "Hitherto I have moved among you, but now I shall be unseen." For being present and being unseen are not opposites, but being absent and being present. But let someone say that the word here is "and", not "but"; it must be noted that the Greek has here nun de ("but now") which is the most unequivocal mark of an antithesis. There follows, "ut nemo

ex vobis interroget me: quo vadis," ("so that none of you need ask me, where are you going?") Here the Greek does not have ut, but et, but this et is put for ut after the fashion of the Hebrews, and this is of very frequent occurrence in John. The sense is, therefore: "But now I am going away in such a manner that there is no need of any question as to where [690] I take myself, for all will see plainly that I set out towards heaven."

As John 6:62 says, "When you see the Son of Man ascend up" (here, too, we suddenly have a twofold alloiosis) "where he was before," then, it is clear, you will not ask any questions. But if he had meant to lead his disciples to believe that they ate his body or had him physically with them, he would not have taken such pains to forewarn them of his real departure and disappearance in the body. For he is not absent who is present unseen. "But because I have said these things to you," he says, "sorrow has filled your heart. Nevertheless I tell you the truth; it is expedient for you that I go away: for if I do not go away, the Comforter will not come to you." Oh, worthy reason why the apostles should be sad, if they knew that only the sight of him was taken away, and even that was so liberally made good! For they were to have him with them in a far more special manner thereafter and with a closer presence than before, even if anaisthētōs ("unperceived") (provided it is such a rich and sweet thing as you maintain to eat him). But we ought rather, leaving the apostles free from suspicion, to observe how you people maintain anaischyntōs ("shamelessly") whatever comes into your heads, [9] even giving the Scriptures but a careless examination.

For when Christ here, in spite of their sadness, persists in thinking and teaching of his going away, and says, "Nevertheless I tell you the truth," why do we not see that he is speaking of a real going away? So gentle and kindly a teacher would not have allowed them to remain thus overcome with deep sadness, if he had not been really going away. Nor would he have said, "Nevertheless I tell you the truth, even though you do take my going away so terribly to heart," but, going away to punishment as he was, he would have applied to their wrenched understanding some such healing poultice as this: "You do not rightly understand me. I cannot be lacking anywhere since I have taught you to eat me. I was present before visibly but outside of you; now I shall be present within the chambers of your breasts, but invisibly," or the like. But so far is he from doing anything of the sort, that he impresses upon them that he is telling them the truth. And, by heaven, it would not be the truth if he were eaten in the bread by us, as you people say. For he is not truly absent who is present unseen. And to this refer his words, "It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I do not go away, the Comforter will not come unto you." If it is expedient that he go away, it will be of no advantage that he remain. If the Comforter does not come until

all the comfort of bodily presence is taken away, why do we not see that the eating of the body does not guarantee any of the things you maintain? "It strengthens the heart," you say. What, then, is the mission of the Spirit? He says it is such a necessary one that it is expedient [691] that he go away in order that it may come the more quickly.

Why, my dear Luther, do we not allow ourselves to be persuaded, since we see that the teaching of the Spirit is so perfectly uniform? He had said before, "It is the Spirit that enlivens, the flesh profits for absolutely nothing," [Jn. 6:63] showing that it must be the Spirit through which the heart is renewed, that the flesh can do nothing in this direction. Now he says, "If I do not go away, the Comforter will not come." [Jn. 16:7] What, I ask, does he say with that but what he had said before? "The flesh must be removed from us, for its presence profits nothing. Now there will be need of the comforting Spirit, which will immediately be present as soon as I go away. If I do not hasten my going away, it will delay its coming." See how necessary it is that his body be removed! Let us also remove this imagined eating of the flesh that we may receive the Spirit as early as possible. In the same place: "All things the Father has are mine." [Jn. 16:15] Here "mine" indicates his divinity as rightful possessor. For though Christ reigns, and lives, and enriches all things with the Father and the Holy Spirit, yet this is wholly because of his superior nature. It belongs, therefore, of right to him that all that is the Father's is also his, and when we attribute what we do to his humanity, we are not out of the way, for he who shares these things with the Father shares the nature of a human being with us also. But in reality expressions of this kind involve a leap and are not literal.

In the same gospel: "And I say not unto you, that I will pray the Father for you; for the Father himself loves you, because you have loved me, and have believed that I came out from God. I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world: again, I leave the world and go to the Father." [Jn. 16:26f.] How could he have come forth from the Father since he says, "No one has ascended up to heaven but he who came down, the Son of Man who is in heaven"? [Jn. 3:13] If he never abandoned the Father, how could he go away or come forth from him? It must be noted, therefore, that the speech is a kind of mimicry. He copies the custom of them that are sent somewhere. For they go away, and, having accomplished what they were sent for, return. For divinity cannot go anywhere, since it is everywhere and fills all things. Again, this expression, "I came forth" points to his divine, not his human nature. But the Son of God came forth, not with movement in space, but in putting on a nature hitherto foreign to him. Finally, the expression "I leave" refers to his human nature, since the divine can leave nothing. For it hates,

that is, neglects none of the things it has made. Here we have bold leaps indeed!

Secondly, we must consider here principally the circumstances of the situation. When he says, "I am not going to comfort you with the promise that I will pray the Father for you," we detect the characteristic and custom [692] of one no longer to be at hand. For the ambassador, who has finished his mission and is going away never to return, says, "There is no need of my recommending you to the king though you are not at hand, for you are thoroughly commended to him on such and such account." So in this passage Christ comforts them with the love of the Father, not with the eating of his body, nor with his personal intercession in the body with the Father. All this is the mark of one who is to be away.

Thirdly, he says, "I leave the world," not, "I deprive it of the sight of me." The word "leave" cannot apply to one who is present. Let us not make up anything imaginary here. He said, "I leave." He must leave, but he did not deprive the world of his power and goodness and mercy. Therefore, he left it in the body. Let us, then, suffer him to be away, until he comes, especially since we seem to have no need of his body, inasmuch as the spirit does all things better than any flesh can. In Luke 19:12, Christ said, "A certain nobleman went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom, and to return." This man is Christ. If he is here, how can he have gone away? And again, if he is here, how can he return? Let us examine the whole allegory (for I do not think those paradigms which are really allegories ought to be reckoned among the fables) and we shall find only that he is absent in body but very present in spirit, suggesting means by which we might gain increase with the sum entrusted to us, which is the word. There is no mention here of faithfully managing the body, but only the word. But how could he so recklessly have forgotten the body if such a harvest of blessings sprang up for us from the eating of it? How could the apostles have said nothing? He went away. Let us permit him to have gone. He will return. Let us await his coming. Let us not, I implore, be more cruel than Saturn and devour him as he reigns. [10] In John 17:3, he whose body you proceed to eat says, "This is life eternal, that they might know you, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom you have sent." See, if you please, first here, that life eternal comes from this, that we know the true God, not that we eat the body of Christ physically; secondly, that Jesus Christ is again put here by alloiosis for his higher nature, for by his human nature he is not God. This the apostles also recognized when they said, [693] "We believe you are Christ, the Son of God," for that was the way of salvation. They did not say, "We believe that your body is eaten physically."

Here again it is made manifest that we have put our trust in Christ, not because he put on human nature, but because he is the only true God. Hence if we find expressions of the kind, let us be careful to attribute to each nature, according to the rule of faith, what belongs to it. How, then, can we attribute to the eaten body the forgiveness of sins, the strengthening of faith and those kind of gifts, which belong to divinity or the Spirit alone?

In the same gospel: "I pray for them. I pray not for the world, but for those whom you have given me, for they are yours." And "All mine are yours, and yours are mine." And "I am glorified in them." And "Now I am not in the world, but these are in the world, and I come to you." [Jn. 17:9ff.] These things I will now treat separately, although all that Christ said in this chapter contributes to the present controversy. He now prays for his own, though he had said shortly before, "And I do not say to you that I will pray the Father for you." There he says he will not pray, though he is constantly interceding for us, as the same evangelist bears witness in 1 John 2:1, and these things make two questions for us. But, not to be carried too far afield, Christ intercedes for us, because he is the price of our redemption, for there is no need of much praying and weeping and beating of the breast and displaying of pledges. For he is the eternal wisdom, and therefore, by his nature, not only sees what ought to be done when we have erred, but foresaw before we were conceived the end and result of our acting and what we were trying to do. And his saying here that he was not going to pray for his own when he brought humanity as a friend to his Father, is a way of showing by hyperbole that they are always known and acceptable in the highest degree to the Father, so that they have no need of anyone to pray for them, though we all come to the Father through Christ only and alone. But now he prays for them, being still in the world, for the work which he had on hand had not yet been brought to its completion.

By this we, too, can see that we are not to put our trust in the prayers of those [694] who have been already received into the realms above, but that while we still struggle upon earth we should pray without ceasing. So much for the unanimous judgement of Scripture. Now I come back to the argument. "I pray for them, O Father, not for the rebellious world, for I know to what it inclines and to what it has been foreordained by us. For those, I say, I pray, whom you have given me, for they are yours, and all yours are mine. Yet I have called them mine, because they have preached me and are to preach me much more. But the reason why I am now so anxious to pray for them is that now I shall be no more in the world, but they will be in the world. In truth, I come to you, leaving them behind me upon earth. Hence it comes that I am solicitous for them." [Jn. 17:9ff.] I give here

a paraphrase of Christ's language without violence. We see before all things that every circumstance points to Christ's going away as he says.

Moreover the words are so plain by which he says that he is not to be now in the world that there is no need of special effort to show they mean this. "And now I am no more in the world" is a Hebrew form of expression for which we should say, "Now or hereafter I shall not be in the world." What shall we say here, Luther? He denies he will be in the world. He does not say, "I shall be unseen," but, "I shall not be in the world." We are forced, actually forced, by truth itself to flee to the protection of alloiosis, and confess that it is his human nature which is taken away by these words, since his divine nature cannot help being everywhere. For he adds only at the end as an epilogue, as it were, "And I come to you," to suggest where he is going to take himself. Nor is there any ground for our saying that in the discourse which Christ gave after supper he spoke only of that absence by which he was for three days in the hands of his enemies or in the tomb. What he said of that time and what he said about his ascension to the Father is sufficiently clear. What I have brought forward about his going away all applies to his ascension into heaven. In the same chapter: "Holy Father, keep those in your name whom you have given me, that they may be one as we are. While I was with them in the world, I kept them in your name; those you gave me I have kept, and none of them is lost but the Son of perdition, that the Scripture might be fulfilled. And now I come to you, and these things I speak in the world, that they might have my joy fulfilled in themselves." [Jn. 17:11ff.] Here you see that his statement, "While I was with them in the world, I kept them in your name," must manifestly be understood of his human nature. Therefore, [695] sometime he was not going to be with us. But as far as his divinity is concerned, he is not able to leave us who said, "I shall be with you even to the consummation of the ages." [Mt. 28:20]

It remains, therefore, that only his human part was taken away. And that this must be absent we see most clearly when he says, "While I was with them," and a little later, "And now I come to you." By this antithesis we easily understand, unless we will not, that he was once with us in human form, and is not so now any more. In Matthew 26:64, standing the next day before the high priest, he said, "Nevertheless I say unto you, hereafter you will see the Son of Man sitting on the right hand of the power of God, and coming in the clouds of heaven." And that this was fulfilled in this way we read as well in Mark 16:19 in the words, "And the Lord Jesus, after he had spoken unto them, was received up into heaven, and sits at the right hand of God," as Luke, both in his gospel, Luke 24:51, "And it came to pass, while he blessed them, he was parted from them, and was carried up into heaven"

and in Acts 1:9f.: "And when he had spoken these things, while they looked, he was taken up and a cloud received him out of their sight. And while they looked steadfastly towards heaven as he went up, behold two men stood by them in white apparel who also said, 'You men of Galilee, why do you stand looking up into heaven? This Jesus, who is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come as you have seen him go into heaven.'"

All these things I have brought out for proving the ascension of the body of Christ and its sitting at the right hand. See the first passage, how he proclaims that he will sit at the right hand until he comes again for judgement. Stephen saw him there, and the articles of faith bear witness to his being there, nor has there ever been anyone who had seen him descend anywhere as the apostles and Stephen saw him ascend and sit there. Your distortion, by which you would make out that Stephen saw him only with the mind's eye, is trivial. [11] Moreover, you have Acts 7:55f.: "But Stephen, full of the Holy Spirit, atenisas, that is, looked up steadfastly into heaven, [696] and saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing on the right hand of the power of God." Do you hear how he lifted up his face, how he directed his eyes? You imagine us so dull and stupid that we do not understand how God is seen with the mind's eye. In that passage are not described the lifting up of the mind to God and the contemplation of him, but a miracle by which Christ presented himself, in whatever shape, whatever way, tanquam, apo mechanēs ("with the unexpertness of the superhuman, as it were") to the first martyr.

Show us, I beg, that any such thing has been done in the sacrament. Where is our madness taking us? We even begin to take away from the divine miracles, in order to champion some imaginary miracle of our own. See also the second passage: "He was received up into heaven and sits at the right hand of God." and you will see that it can be understood only of his humanity. For how could the divine be received up into heaven? "Heaven is my throne," he says. [Acts 7:49] He sat there not only before his sitting there as a human being but before his human birth also. As a human being, therefore, Christ was received up into heaven, who as God had never gone away from there, moreover he sits on the right hand of God.

This you, Luther, reckon among miracles, though you ought not to have allowed the existence of anything miraculous, for from the corollary which you deny, no doubt because our friends in not very good Latin call it concomitantia ("concomitance"), you might have understood, since you say the body of Christ is everywhere and fills all things, that there is no cause for wondering amazement that it even sits at the right hand of God. In short, we know that he sits there, that is sojourns, is,

lives there, rejoices, and cheers his adopted brothers, and is so situated or circumscribed that he "must be in one place only." [12] Hence we deny that he can be anywhere else than where the Lord's word shows that he is.

We know that you would show him in the bread, but Scripture does not support you. Prove, therefore, by unequivocal passages of Scripture that he is in the bread, as we do that he is [697] in heaven. And that the human side of Christ (that we may not maintain anything not perfectly supported by Scripture) is so circumscribed or situated that it must be in one place only, we prove thus: Christ himself has circumscribed his body in very many passages, not a few of which I have already cited, first by its going away or sitting at the right hand, and he has done it so thoroughly that no teacher could by any philosophy better show that it was circumscribed. Secondly, Christ has also made manifest where he is to be until the day of universal judgement, and has nowhere hinted that he should have his place anywhere else than where he has shown he will be. But we must not be troubled about the right hand of God, in truth, since it is not circumscribed, and we may argue from that that Christ's human side cannot be circumscribed either! Although the divine nature is itself infinite, and certainly cannot be circumscribed in any way, yet all created beings having intelligence are in him just as we are, and are circumscribed. In that place or fashion, therefore, in which the infinite God offers himself to finite creatures endowed with understanding for their blessing and support, we recognize that Christ, by virtue of his humanity, sits at the right hand of the Father, circumscribed just as angels and people are circumscribed. All of this again we confirm by Scripture. "I will," says the Father, "that where I am, there my servant will be also," [cf. Jn. 12:26] and "I will receive you into myself, that where I am, you may be also," [Jn. 14:3] and "In my Father's house are many mansions." [Jn. 14:2]

Thirdly, we prove that Christ's body is finite and circumscribed because it even rose from the dead, as the angel said to the women, "You see Jesus the crucified. He is risen; he is not here." [Mt. 28:6] On this passage enough has been said above. Nor can we say that he is by turns sometimes everywhere, sometimes not, for the infinite cannot draw itself together so as not to be infinite and then spread itself out so as to be infinite again. Fourth, all the appearances by which he manifested himself after the resurrection prove our point. Raised from the dead, he determined to present himself in visible and tangible shape to his disciples, but he never appeared thus in different places at once, as we may see in the last chapter of Luke [Lk. 24], in John 20, and in 1 Corinthians 15 where we read that all his appearances took place in a successive series. And what is written in the last chapter of John, how he stood upon the shore when the disciples had been

drawing an empty net all night even unto the dawn, is a mark of circumscription. Fifth, passages like, "Where I am, there shall my servant be also," point to the same conclusion. [698] If they are where he is, in virtue of his humanity, namely, then, as they are circumscribed, so must he also be circumscribed. Thirdly, see the passage, Luke 24:51: "And it happened, when he blessed them (that is, bid them farewell in the Hebrew way) that he was parted from them, etc." See how everything that he does and says indicates going away and absence. He bids them farewell, comforts them, and commands them to stay together.

He uses these words, "I go away, I leave the world, I shall now not be in the world." So, too, the apostles: "He was parted from them;" "While they beheld, he was taken up:" "A cloud received him out of their sight;" "He was received up into heaven;" "He sits at the right hand." What will be sacred among us, my dear Luther, if we do violence to these words? Christ is said to have gone away somewhere in the body. We say that he has stayed. Why is not that confounding the Scriptures? See, finally, the passage of Luke in the beginning of Acts. "And while they looked toward heaven as he went up," (why do you not forbid them also to lift their eyes towards heaven as you have taught that Stephen need not have raised his eyes or his face towards heaven?) "behold two men stood by them, etc. who also said, 'You men of Galilee, why do you stand looking up into heaven? This Jesus, who is taken up from you into heaven, will so come in like manner as you have seen him go into heaven.'" [Acts 1:9ff.] You have here the circumscribed and visible going away of the body, nor is any return anywhere promised other than one circumscribed and visible. As we also see here plainly when he says, "shall so come in like manner as you have seen him go into heaven." But he was circumscribed and visible when he went away, to such a degree that they were forced to fix their gaze closely in order to follow him more easily as he went into the distance on high. Also in Matthew 26:64, "You will see the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven," and 24:30. "And they will see the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory." Behold how he is to return! In the same way he went away, visible and in the clouds with power and great glory. So, therefore, he will come as he went away, namely, visibly. Matthew 24:26: "Wherefore if they say to you, 'Behold, he is in the desert,' do not go out; 'Behold, he is in the secret chambers,' do not believe it. For as the lightning comes out of the east, and shines even unto the west, so shall also the coming of the Son of Man be." Here also there is an alloiosis in [699] the Son of Man. It is put for the human nature of Christ, for in his divine nature he is still with us silently and unseen. Some people spoil this passage by their interpretation saying that Christ spoke here only of sects, though a clearer and more unequivocal passage will not easily be found that says he will not come in any other way at all than

in brilliant glory. That he is speaking of his own presence in the body is shown by the prosapodosis ("causal resume") which says, "For just as lightning, etc." [Mt. 24:27]. This causal "for" shows sufficiently that in the preceding words the "corporal presence" is not spoken of when he adds on that he is about to return visibly and openly. He therefore warns them, lest they even believe those who say, "Here, or there, is Christ." For when he comes, his openness is to be so public, his unfolding so broadly radiant as lightning bursts forth. Nor is it in order even to speak so much of the public judgements caused by his coming.

He continues present in his teachings, which apply to the time between his first ascension and his return to judge the world, or that meantime he is to be present in the bread in some ineffable manner, as the Pomeranian says. [13] For in all the time which intervenes between his ascension and the judgement, he declares that he is not to be sought anywhere in the body, nay, he points out that they are false prophets who venture to attempt such a thing. Nor could he have made that assurance stronger than by that splendid promise in which he says that his coming shall be as the lightning. And do we maintain that he is here with unseen body? Have we not fear of the disgrace that threatens false prophets? I know that lightning and the other words can be understood figuratively, but elsewhere, in this passage not [700] easily, for the question is one of visible signs. Matthew 19:16f.: "And behold, one came and said to him," (namely, Jesus), "'Good master, what good thing shall I do, that I may have eternal life?' And he said to him, 'Why do you call me good? Only God is good.'" Behold how his human nature has the second place! The man, whoever he was, had called him good, though he had not recognized that he was the Son of God. Therefore, he rebukes him for the error. But is not the humanity of Christ anyway good?

It is good, but by grace, not in the way his divinity is good, by nature. Christ, then, wished to teach the man not to speak of anything as truly and properly good save God only and alone. And do we attribute to the eaten body what belongs to the one good being that is alone and truly good? When, I ask, will you calm down, Luther, and not so recklessly attribute to the eaten body what neither Christ nor the apostles ever attributed to it, especially when you see that Christ himself denied to his inferior nature so much that he did not bear it with equanimity that the man should on its account only call him good? For this is very strongly against those teachings of yours: "the human part of Christ reigns, fills all things," and others of the same stamp. On what is written in Matthew 24:36 and Mark 13:32, "But of that day and hour no person knows, no, not the angels of heaven, but my Father only," enough has been said above.

I cite it again here for two reasons, one, because it

acts against your doctrine of the kingdom of the human part of Christ, for how can you install in the kingdom that which Christ says does not know the exact time of the last day? The other, in order to note in passing that alloiosis occurs not only between the two natures in Christ, but also between the persons of the divine essence, so that sometimes the person is put for the essence, or, again, the essence is put for the person, as in this passage, "My Father alone knows." [Mt. 24:36] "Father" is put for the deity or Godhead itself, for the Son, insofar as he is the Son of God, knows all things just as much as the Father, and so does also the Holy Spirit know. I will now bring up more examples, for I am forced to be unduly long in spite of myself, as it is, you will find enough in the above and in the books of the New Testament themselves. Look there for them.

These two passages point to the same thing where he repulsed his loving mother. The one, when she came to the aid of the humble marriage feast and reminded her son [701] that there was no wine left, and he answered, "Woman, what have I to do with you?" The other, when she struggled to reach him through the crowd and could not, and he, learning that his mother was anxious to see him, stretched out his hands to his hearers and said, "Who is my mother, and who are my brothers, etc.?" [Mt. 12:48] I have no doubt that in these passages he did not mean to detract from the precept, "Honor your father and mother," [Ex. 20:12] but wanted to show that the human part of him, however high it might be, still never should be so much exalted by us that we should appeal to it alone, for all salvation must be looked for from the Deity. So much for alloiosis.

I have been so copious in its treatment as no doubt to have wearied the most patient reader. But the situation demanded it, lest I should seem to treat lightly a matter of great importance. For as humanity was put on by the Son of God that he who had been creator might duly become a sacrificial victim, and as this humanity, through the glory of the passion, death and cross, was raised to the throne of the supreme deity and sits at the right hand of God, so his divinity abides unchangeable, reigns alone, and alone governs all things. If through exchange of his natures we attribute such things to Christ the man, we ought to recognize without offense how this is done.

On Absurdities of Scripture

I have said above that a twofold absurdity drove me to examining more minutely the words of Christ about which I am weaving this exposition, one of faith or fact, on which enough and more has been said in its special place and elsewhere, and one of Scripture, concerning which I now begin. There are countless passages in both testaments which at first sight present the greatest diversity and the greatest opposition to each other, but when you compare them properly and without partisan bias, there is nothing more harmonious or plainer. The passage under discussion is one of these. When you first look at it, it seems inconsistent with so many passages of Scripture that you could not easily find another that meets with so much apparent contradiction. Please do not take offense that, in my effort to show this, I place the apparent inconsistencies in a series without separate names. For this conduces greatly to clearness in the case and to brevity, for which you have no doubt been longing for some time.

Luther: These words of Christ, "This is my body," [Mt. 26:26] are to be understood in their simple literal sense. [1] [702]

Zwingli: But from that will follow that the bread passes over into his body. Thus the transubstantiation of the Roman pontiffs prevails, and Paul seems to have done wrong when he called bread what was the flesh of Christ. 1 Corinthians 10:17: "We are all partakers of one bread."

L: They are not, however, to be understood in the sense that the bread passes over into the substance of the body of Christ. [2]

Z: Therefore, these words are not to be understood in their simple literal sense. For what do you suppose is indicated by the word, "this"?

L: It indicates both the bread and the body of Christ, in the sense, "This is bread and the body of Christ," or "In the bread is the body of Christ." (For you lay down both, my dear Luther.) [3] [703]

Z: Therefore, the words of the Lord are to be understood

not in a simple but in an evidently complex sense, if "this" is the bread and "is" also the body of Christ. But if the bread remains bread, while the body of Christ is eaten in the bread, again the words are not understood in their simple literal sense. We have a synecdoche. For Christ did not say, "In the bread is my body," but "This," namely, the bread, "is my body." What is the principle of difference by which we admit a synecdoche, but reject a metonymy, [4] which is just as good a trope as the other?

L: The bread is bread and is nevertheless the body of Christ, and both are eaten in this sacrament miraculously and in a way ineffable to us. [5]

Z: Christ ordered that he be judged by his miracles if the Jews would believe in no other way. [Cf. Jn. 10:38] Show us, therefore, the miracle! Christ also prophesied that false apostles would show such signs that even the pious would run the risk of being shaken in their faith. Hence if the friar preachers, who are especially given to getting up miracles, were now talking of some miracle, it would still not be safe to believe them. How much less [704] would we be influenced when things are pointed at as miracles which have never been done or said anywhere!

L: The body of Christ is not eaten in such a grossly material way, but in some way known to Christ only. We have no business to be curious in the matter. [6]

Z: But it must be eaten in the most grossly material way if the words are to be taken in their literal sense. For this is the meaning they carry: this bread is that body of mine which is given for you. It was given for us in grossly material form, subject to wounds, blows and death. As such, therefore, it must be the material of the supper. Otherwise, show us from Scripture in what possible way it can be eaten.

L: Christ's body is everywhere. For he reigns and fills all things. [7]

Z: The angel lied, then, to the woman when he said, "He is risen. He is not here." [Mt. 28:6] Christ will have lied since he has declared that as far as his human nature was concerned he would be no more in the world, and that so often that it would be a labor to reckon up the passages.

L: Though Christ's human nature is everywhere and fills all things as wheat fills the sack, yet he desired in a special way to place himself in this sacrament, and give himself to us, that we might know where we might find him. [8]

Z: The notion that Christ's body fills all things has

already been shown to be frivolous by the language of the angel and by his going away. The second part is contradicted [705] by his words with regard to the time between his ascension and the last great assembly, to which time we also belong: "Wherefore if they shall say to you, 'He is in the desert,' do not go out. 'Behold, he is in the secret chambers,' do not believe it. For as the lightning comes out of the east, and is seen even unto the west, so shall also the coming of the Son of Man be." [Mt. 24:27] It is contradicted by the articles of faith: "He sits at the right hand of God, the Father Almighty; from thence he shall come to judge, etc." We do not read that he is to come anywhere else or for anything else than to judge. It is contradicted by the words of Christ, when in Matthew 26:64, he says, "Hereafter you will see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand." Here we have the man. He sits at the right hand of God, there he said he should be, and he says "hereafter". Let us not, then, seek him elsewhere hereafter.

L: All these things are done invisibly. He does not now come down by stairs or a ladder and go back again. [**9**]

Z: But this is opposed by the words of the angels, "This Jesus, who is taken up from you into heaven, will so come in like manner as you have seen him go into heaven." [Acts 1:11] He is to come in plain sight of all.

L: He is come thus to judge. This passage has nothing to do with that presence by which he is in the Eucharist.

Z: He is not to come down for any other thing than to judge. He says he is not to be sought anywhere. He calls those false prophets who say that he is here or there, and says, "Hereafter will you see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand." We live in that "hereafter". Let us, then, see him where he is. To what end should his body be literally present in the Eucharist?

L: To strengthen the heart and faith. [**10**] [706]

Z: He says it must be the Spirit that enlivens the heart, that the flesh profits nothing. [Jn. 6:63] He promises that the Spirit shall come and shall do all things so that we need take no thought even of what we wish to say, etc.

L: "Sins are remitted through the bodily eating of the body." [**11**]

Z: That sin was atoned for by his death (for he was made a curse for us. [Gal. 3:13]) is set forth in so many places in Scripture that there is no need of quoting any of them here. If, moreover, sin is remitted through the eating of his body, the

sins of the disciples were remitted when they had supped upon the body. Does his blood purify thus, not only when shed, but when drunk? Why, therefore, was he fastened to the cross? Are there two ways to justification, one by faith, the other by bodily eating? Where are we going?

L: In this bread is made present what has been preached by the word. [12]

Z: What becomes of "He that believes in me has everlasting life" [Jn. 3:36] and "No one can come to me except the Father draw him"? [Jn. 6:44] If a man can make present what he has preached, why do we not make it present to them that hear the gospel and believe not, thus giving them in spite of themselves bitter things, indeed, but salutary?

L: You people are so stupid that being without the Spirit you understand nothing of those subtle things that have to be understood spiritually. Only they that believe eat the body of Christ. [13] [707]

Z: We, too, believe, but we do not eat the body in a literal sense.

L: We must believe that the body of Christ is eaten here. They that believe do thereby eat.

Z: There you are varying the words of faith and belief. Is it not faith unto salvation when we believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, and put our trust in Him? But where, pray, in Scripture have we been told to believe that the body is eaten or the blood drunk here? Why do you force the word "believe" into this meaning? What one of the apostles ever said, "We believe you are eaten in the body"? Did they not all say, "We believe you are Christ, the Son of the living God", according to John 6 and Matthew 16:16. These snares are laid for you, my simple-minded brethren. They speak of having faith in Christ according to Scripture, and presently leap from this kind of faith to the kind of belief in which they pretend it is believed the body and blood are eaten. I myself, I know, I say, brethren set over the ministry of the word in no mean city who, [708] not being able to retreat, shelter themselves thus: they hold up the faith to view which every pious person regards as the crowning point of all religion, and at the same time they vitiate the natural character of faith, which is simply trust in Christ as the Son of God, and instead of "belief" put into the minds of the simple "the eating of the body of Christ." In saying we must believe that it is eaten here because the words say so, they sin twice: they bid us understand words wrongly that they have not understood, and without authoritzation they set up for our belief what we have nowhere

been directed to believe. For we have nowhere been taught to believe that the body of Christ is to be eaten in a bodily sense, however much Christ must be eaten, that is, must have our trust put in him. Strange how they ekperdikizōsi ("flutter away like partridges") from what is taught in John 6 under the figurative form of eating the body. May the Lord give them knowledge of himself and of themselves. Amen.

These things about the absurdity which is detected (in your doctrine) by collating the Scriptures, I wished, most learned Luther, thus to go over with you, that the apparent contradictions might be the more clearly judged when thus placed in juxtaposition. It is for you now to examine thoroughly on what foundation your structure rests, and on what mine rests, and our intellects must be surrendered unto the Lord. [Cf. 2 Cor. 10:5.] You began with the spirit, unless, what heaven forbid, you have been deceiving us; do not end with the flesh. [Cf. Gal. 3:3.]

Now I come back to the path of the argument. When Christ is said by the apostle in Ephesians 4:10 to have "ascended above all heavens in order to fill al things," [709] you ought not to have fallen upon such an uneducated and uncultivated comparison as that even in virtue of his human nature he fills all things like grain fills a sack (I was expecting you to add another, such as, like a countryman fills his leggins, since you had opened the door to such crudities), but rather to have weighed the words again and again. For you would have met an alloiosis which, even if you had not seen the true sense, would yet have pointed out the way by which you could have come to understand that the thing must be explained as applying to the divine nature of Christ, even if you were pleased to take the word "fill" literally insofar as it is combined with the notion of quantity. As a matter of fact, it ought not to be taken in this meaning, but as used for "accomplish" or "correspond to", in the sense, "He ascended up far above all heavens, that he might accomplish all things that had been written of him," or, "that he might correspond in all things to that which had been foretold of him," just as it is taken in the expression, "so it is becoming for us to fill all righteousness," [Mt. 3:15] that is, to accomplish what it has been ordained that we should do (for it is a hebraism). And in 1 Corinthians 15:4: Christ is said to have risen again "according to the Scriptures," that is, as the Scriptures had prophesied. So also in this passage he is said to have ascended, that he might fulfill all things that the divine prophets and holy men had foretold of him. This is clear and plain from what goes before and what follows. For having quoted the testimony of Psalm 68:19, "Ascending up on high, he led captivity captive", and "he gave gifts to people", in order to point out the varied gifts bestowed upon us by God through Christ, he presently asserts that he ascended, both to satisfy the present passage and other passages of Scripture, and

to send down the gifts promised to us. For he proceeds at once to the gifts which he bestowed in sending the Spirit. "He made," he says, "some apostles, some prophets, etc." [Eph. 4:11] Therefore, if nothing can induce you to look more deeply into the matter of the Eucharist, such a crude distortion of this passage will surely at least have the power to make you say, "What, having been so blind where the light was so bright, do I not see that in this difficult and obscure matter I may be suffering the same thing as in the other case? Doubtless I have offended the Lord in some way, that he has suffered me to slip so disgracefully. It is a warning not to be so self-confident."

XI. You continue in the same discourse after this fashion, "Since Christ says so plainly, 'Take, eat. This is my body,' [Mt. 26:26] it is for me to believe these words as unhesitatingly as I am obliged to believe all the words of Christ. Even if [710] he offered only a bit of straw and uttered these words, it would be my duty to believe." [WA 19:496:15-18] These are your words. Your teaching is right, though your comparison is inelegant, but you do not hear the cry of the Roman pontiff, that the words of Christ must be believed in which he made Peter, the pontiff's predecessor, the foundation stone of his Church. If you say, "These words [i.e. Mt. 16:18] do not have that meaning, but must be treated in the light of faith, and compared with other utterances on this point. The Lord's words must, indeed, be believed, but when rightly understood," [14] why, pray, do you yourself not keep this law? The words of Christ are to be believed without fear, but not until their plain meaning has been plainly set forth as the judgement of faith and the harmony of the Scriptures show it. The point is whether the words of the Lord ought to be explained in the sense in question. And you, as if you had won the case, continue to beg the question and insist that the words are plain: "The belly is God," [Phil. 3:9] "An idol is naught," [1 Cor. 8:4] and "Luther is an axe." But in the sense they present on their face they are most absurd. When, however, you have explained the figure in this fashion: "There are people who worship the belly more religiously than they worship God." "An idol is, indeed, a material object, but he whom it represents is naught, or is no God." "Luther is an axe, yea a two-edged axe, more mighty than a thunderbolt to break the chains of the Roman pontiff." Then the words are really plain and clear. Everybody knows what "this" means, and "is" and "body" and "my", but the sentence is not necessarily plain because it consists of such plain words. But your discourse is full of the noisy shout, "The words are plain; we must trust the words; we must believe the words." You go on to say,

XII. "So also the baptism. Baptism is water, and the Holy Spirit is in baptism." [WA 19:496:20-21] What does this mean, I ask? Do you imagine I have not yet gone so far as to know what

baptism is, and how the Holy Spirit is in it? [711] How much nearer right were the teachings of the papists when they said that baptism consists of a material thing and form! They called the water the material thing, and the words, "I baptize you in the name of the Father, etc." the form. You say baptism is the material thing, namely, water, and that in the material thing is the Holy Spirit. I now ask you, therefore, which is the more excellent sacrament, baptism, or the bread and cup of thanksgiving? You will say, no doubt, the Eucharist (for that is the way you people are always naming it, as if it were a concrete object when it is only an action, the action, namely, of giving thanks, though I would not make a wanton uproar in the matter, so that we call the bread of the supper the Eucharist merely by metonomy). I shall answer, "In the Eucharist the sacrament is the bread, and the body of Christ is in the sacrament;" you say, "but in the water which is baptism is the Holy Spirit." By as much, therefore, as spirit is superior to flesh, the soul to the body, by so much is baptism more excellent than the supper. If you say that the Holy Spirit is also in the supper with the body, then concomitance prevails, the supper will have to be adored, Christ will be there to be adored, which you deny. Would that I had never come upon these things of yours or that you had never put them forth! For consider into what sophistries you drag us. Baptism is not the water but the act; so the Eucharist is not the bread or the body of Christ but the act of thanksgiving. What then? Do you deny that the Holy Spirit is also in water which does not baptize anyone? I think not. Why have you found the Spirit in the water anew for us? You cannot deny that you meant to say that the Spirit is either itself given in the water or gives remission of sins. For you declare that sins are remitted also by the body eaten in the bread. Are you, therefore, restoring the kingdom of Antichrist by right of postliminium? If in the water the Holy Spirit, and in the bread of the Eucharist the body of Christ, lavishes bounty upon us, who will not turn to externals? Oh theology worthy of a Luther! But do, O God, open his eyes, lest he more and more forget you and himself! [712]

XIII. As to your representation of us as the archgushers, that is, the chief of all fanatics and tricksters, stupid fellows and unworthy that you should join issue with us, we have long since pardoned your revilings. [15] For we pray, "Forgive us our debts, as we also forgive our debtors." [Mt. 6:12] But this point I do not wish to pass over, that having nothing substantial with which to meet us and sustain our attack, you cry out that we are unworthy that you should contend with us. The fable of the fox is not unknown to you, [16] and what is meant by the proverb that a tired man seeks a quarrel. [17]

XIV. Then you say a lot of things that I may properly pass by. They are so infantile and unworthy of a great theologian

that I should grudge the labor of confuting things that fall as they do of themselves, if I were not afraid that whatever I bypassed without answering, you would cry out, "Why did you not answer this point?" You say a lot of things I say, and then you come down to a feeble boast of this kind, "Of course his death should be shown. I, too, preach it, and more grandly than those fellows have ever done. If they did not have it from me, they would doubtless know nothing about it, namely, the preaching of the death of Christ." [WA 19:504:15-17] These are your words. The Apostle Paul, of whose measure we fall very far short, once quenched thus a flame of impudent arrogance and boasting that had flashed up. "Neither the one that plants counts for anything, nor the one that waters, but God, who gives the increase." [1 Cor. 3:7] As to myself, Luther, I always regarded my teacher as in the position of parents, especially those who advanced my study of sacred and humane letters. If something from that rich abundance that the Lord has given to you has found its way to me, why should I not acknowledge it? If I had learned the scheme of the gospel from you, why should I not confess it? I will point out frankly how the matter stands. There were many excellent [713] men who before the name of Luther was so famous saw upon what religion hinged, and they were taught at length by other teachers than you think. I call God to witness that I learned the essential purport of the gospel from reading the treatises of John and Augustine and from the diligent study of Paul's epistles in the Greek, [714] which I copied with my own hand eleven years ago, in the eighth year of your reign. [**18**] This essential summary [715] I committed to writing in such manner that many congratulated me. See whether you rightly grasp it yourself. For, by Hercules, you do not seem to understand the matter of the keys thoroughly yet, since you are constantly attributing some power to some sort of absolution. [**19**] I recognize no other than that of which Christ speaks through the metaphor of water, thus: "Whosoever drinks of the water I shall give him will never thirst, but the water I shall give him shall be in him a well of water springing up into eternal life," [Jn. 4:14] and, "Truly, I say to you, whoever hears my word, and believes in him that sent me, has eternal life, and will not come into judgement, but is passed from death unto life," [Jn. 5:24] and "Whoever eats my flesh and drinks my blood has eternal life," [Jn. 6:54] and, "Whoever eats this bread will live forever," [Jn. 6:51] and, "Whoever comes to me shall never hunger," [Jn. 4:14] "Whoever believes in me will never thirst," [Jn. 4:14] and "Whoever believes in me has eternal life." [Jn. 6:47] This, I say, is our absolution, expiation, satisfaction, and remission of all sins, when we believe in Jesus Christ, the Son of God, for I know [716] that all things are given to us with him and through him.

You, according to what I hear, still persist in the opinion that the conscience needs to be reassured by the formula of some

absolver. See, therefore, what your faith amounts to, and what your knowledge of the gospel. I have never taught that thing since I was regenerated in Christ. For the words "binding" and "loosing" are not to be taken in your sense; they mean nothing else than "believe" and "refuse to believe". I treat this in the appendix. [20] If it would not offend you, I would send you to my **Commentary** or to my **Exposition of the Sixty-Seven Articles.** [21] For by the blessing of God I have traced out so thoroughly the scheme of the gospel that pontifical keys, purgatory, and the pretended intercession of the saints, to all of which they say you cling in all your books, collapse utterly. [22] [717] How, then, can I have learned from you what I neither teach nor believe according to your views? When certain people (to whom I properly and gladly look up) have understood the matter of the gospel more clearly than either you or [718] I, how can they have learned it under your tutelage? You are perfectly right in teaching that salvation is won through faith in Christ Jesus, but why, holding this doctrine, do you attribute power to some sort of "keys"? Why do you not overturn purgatory? Why do you not recognize Christ Jesus as the one and only mediator between God and humanity? You sometimes forget yourself. When you were explaining faith and in the battle of indulgences always indiscreetly allowed some power to the "keys", you gave me a violent wrench, taught as I had been several years before by my teacher, that most learned and pious man, Thomas Wyttenbach, [23] now accepted of those above, [719] that the death of Christ alone was the price of the forgiveness of sins.

Faith, therefore, is the key that opens to the heart the chest of the forgiveness of sins. When that is at hand there is no more thirsting [720] or hungering. You gave me a wrench, I say, because you did not see clearly that the keys are nothing but faith in the gospel. But now judge how much more fairly I have done than you. I saw that though you had the true light you lacked some rays, yet, in order to give no occasion for a quarrel, I let it all pass, led by the hope that you would daily see things more clearly and more surely. I did the same in the case of the Eucharist, ceasing to call it a commemoration, simply not to seem to struggle against the authority of so great a man, like a goose flouting a swan.

But you, however much the brethren urged you by letter not to go too fast and to descend to that mad, ungoverned ferocity with which [721] you were heaping such atrocious abuse upon good and learned men, you did not suffer yourself to be restrained. [24] See in whose heart the desire for peace was more deeply rooted! But now I will curb my pen, lest it charge upon those unworthy revilings that you have been casting upon me in all your letters to friends, [25] and I will moderate it to the measure of respect due you from me. Though there were not a few, I

say, who had learned the essentials of religion, even if you do not admit better than yourself, yet equally well (for there are certain men whose friendship twelve years ago helped me in this [722] matter, [**26**] and stimulated my zeal), yet there was none from all the camp of Israel who dared expose himself to the danger, so afraid were they of the immense Goliath who threatened them with such a weight of arms and forces. Then you, the one faithful David, anointed unto this of the Lord, put on your armor. [Cf. 1 S. 17.]

First, according to their own fashion you proceeded to discuss with them, and to throw paradoxes and Gordian knots at them. [**27**] Presently you cast aside this baggage and chose stones from the river of heaven, and brandishing them, and loosening and twirling your sling, hurled them so forcibly against the foe that you stretched his tremendous limbs over a vast extent of ground. Hence the souls of the faithful should never cease to sing, "Saul smote a thousand but David ten thousand." [1 S. 18:7] [723] You alone have been the Hercules who, where there was any danger, rushed to meet it. [**28**] You have slain the Roman boar. You have crushed the earthborn Antaeus. Who has ever held out to us [724] from the fountain springs of the apostles the hostility of the flesh and the spirit in a purer and more transparent drink? You have dragged forth the Cacus who not only stole the oxen, driving them backwards, into his cave, but also robbed the houses of widows. In short, if you had removed the images that are set up for worship, if you did not eat in bodily sense the pretended body of Christ in bread, if you saw by the light of the gospel that purgatory was a net to catch money, and absolution or the "keys" but faith in the gospel, that the Son Christ Jesus was the only one God and mediator between God and humanity, you would not only have cleaned out the stables of Augeas, but have scaled heaven itself.

But look you! Have a care lest for love of a wanton hussy you lay down the leontēn ("lion's skin") and club. We have Busiris still to overcome and slay. Saul fell from his kingdom, because he forgot himself to the destruction of his power, and considered handing it down to his descendants against the will of the Lord. Hence, there came upon the man varied fears and alarms, hence jealousy and blind yielding to any impulse. Suspicious of everything, he recklessly killed innocent priests and prophets, and it is wonderful that he even spared his daughter who pointed out to her husband David a way of safety by flight. His heart could not be softened when only the skirt of his robe was cut off as he was relieving himself, nor when his spear was taken away when he slept, nor when the foreskins of two hundred Philistines were brought to him. [1 S. 18-24] Let this be an example to us, so that we shall not also, if we reign by the Lord's will, do anything tyrannikoterōs ("over-tyrannically") in the ministry

of the word. Let us, to whom the Lord provides his favor aphthonōs ("ungrudgingly") be envious of no one. We are one body; Christ is the head: Luther is one eye. Let him not envy the ear what belongs to the ear. In good faith, my dear Luther, haec allēgorizomai ("I indulge in this allegory"). It is for you to make the application in a spirit of sincerety. Now I come back to your utterances.

You seem not yet to have attained a clear perception of the sense in which the apostle [725] uses the word "proclaim", when he says "you will proclaim the Lord's death," [1 Cor. 11:26] for, as far as I can understand, you think it is to be taken to mean "teach the gospel", since you preach your own preaching so much. So that those who have sworn allegiance to you (for there are many so devoted to you that they would rather be wrong with you than right with the apostle), when they come down from the communion, say to the brother on the seat, "I proclaim to you, brother, the Lord's death." See what ignorance will do! It is so superstitious that, not seeing what the words of the Lord mean, it makes a ceremonial formula of what it does not understand. The point is proved abundantly by the whole matter we are treating, and especially by the failure to understand this word "show" and the conversion of it into a ceremonial formula. Now this word (like all the things in the entire New Testament, although it is written in another tongue), savors of the Hebrew idiom. The Hebrews very frequently use the word for "proclaiming" instead of the word for "praising" or "professing". Thus in Deuteronomy 26:3, "And you will go to the priest who will be in those days, and say to him, I profess today before the Lord your God that I have come into the country which the Lord swore unto our fathers that he would give us." While we have in this passage profiteor ("I profess"), the Hebrew has HIGGADĔTTÎ, and the Greek anangellō, both of which mean annuntio in the sense of "I profess, proclaim, praise, acknowledge, this day before the Lord your God that I have come into the country that the Lord swore to our fathers to give." What was the need of this confession? The thing was known to every tribe and neighborhood in the land.

The profession is, therefore, an act of thanksgiving, an acknowledgment and giving praise for blessings given. There follows a little farther on, "And now, behold, I have brought the first fruits of the land, which you, O Lord, have given me." [Dt. 26:10] So, in the present passage, [726] "The death of the Lord you proclaim, katangellete." (This use of imperatives for futures and the reverse is common in Hebrew.) That is, you will praise, give thanks, acknowledge, confess. Not that this solemn style of speech is required, for we should thus all be forced to raise our voices together in one and the same outpouring of praise, but the pious giving of thanks and the acknowledgment of what the Heavenly Father has in his generous bounty given us. The other things, for example, the going forward before the congrega-

tion, the carrying round of the symbolic plate and cup, we are not now discussing. [29] Judges 9:16: "If you then have acted truly and sincerely with Jerubbaal and with his house, then rejoice today in Abimelech, and let him also rejoice in you." Here where we have laetamini ("rejoice"), the Hebrew has SIMĔḤÛ, the Greek, eulogētheiēte ("praise", "bless"). Thus we readily detect that the word for "blessing" which the Greek has here, is sometimes used for the words for "thanksgiving" and "rejoicing". Hence also we say the "cup of blessing", that is, of thanksgiving, joy, and celebration.

Hence we detect further this also, that to "proclaim the Lord's death" is nothing else than to bless, that is, to give thanks and rejoice. For in this passage to commemorate and to proclaim the Lord's death are the same thing, for Paul explains one by the other. In 1 Peter 2:9, we have "that you should proclaim the praises of him who called you out of darkness into his marvelous light." What else, I ask, is to "proclaim the praises" here than to confess, acknowledge, give thanks, rejoice? So also in the present passage, "You will proclaim the Lord's death" is equivalent to, "You will acknowledge, praise the Lord's death, render thanks and hymns for it, rejoice and exult in consequence of it." [727] The Eucharist, then, is thanksgiving, exulting of the soul, confession. As also Christ in Matthew 11:25 and Luke 10:21 said, "I confess" for "I thank you, O Father."

Hence we brethren and ministers of the gospel at Zurich, when we restored it, omitted altogether those rules by which some make this act of thanksgiving disgusting and nauseous, threatening terrible things if any lewd person, winebibber, miser or slanderer come to it. For we hold that such are to be forbidden the Eucharist only when they have been openly found to be such. For, though we ought not to shut our eyes to such great wrongs, yet one's secret sins, which one has perhaps already washed away by repentance according to faith, ought not to be pursued with such terrible fierceness, both because God alone is the judge of the hidden, while a person sees only the surface, and because that practice opens the way to reckless hypocrisy. For you will easily find people who nourish in their hearts hatred, envy, greed and kenodoxian ("vanity"), yet who boldly come to the table of the Eucharist. Thus they would be judged to be the only good and blameless ones. As soon as that happened, the reward would be added, and then it would be all finished with the business of the gospel.

Let us, then, meet those things with excommunication that strict piety ought not to shut its eyes to, only when they have actually come to our cognizance, and meantime leave everyone to his own faith and conscience. For Paul in 1 Corinthians 5:11 speaks only of those wrongdoings which are so plain that

they can be detected by our power of judgement, and condemned without conscientiae diakrisin, that is, misgivings of conscience. Or, as seems to me more probable, Paul is not speaking there of excommunication, for that he calls "delivering over to Satan," [1 Cor. 5:5] but of the individual care with which every person keeps oneself away from those who is seen to be much addicted to these faults. For that I think is what is meant by "not to eat with someone like that." [1 Cor. 5:11] Finally, there are included in this passage certain faults which we never read were punished with excommunication and in which it is not easy to see the point at which they deserve to be excommunicated, like avarice and greed. The people most given up to avarice and greed try hard to hide and [728] conceal it from themselves.

And since finally there is an addition to the law to this purpose, "Put away from among yourselves that wicked person," which looks like excommunication, it would seem to be free for every person to indulge his own feeling in the matter. For these two considerations occur to me, that the words, "Put away, etc." may without violence be taken in the sense of a not unfriendly avoidance of the kind of persons referred to, and that with the apostles excommunication is exceedingly rare. But whatever the natural explanation of the passage may be, Paul nowhere expresses the opinion that we are to pronounce judgement except in cases so public that they cannot be denied under any pretence. Such he tells us are to be pierced with the sword of non-participation.

You have, also, many other things both vain and impotent in this treatise, such as that what had been taught by the word is presented in natural shape in this sacrament. [**30**] This is the function of the spirit, not of the body. That this sacrament is called the food of the hungry; [**31**] it is the food of those who have already eaten the flesh and blood and juices of faith. The fruits that you count up here are fruits of the Spirit and of faith, not of the supper. That it was instituted for the feeble only; [**32**] that we are not all one bread and one body. And all that class of things which, as I have said, are vain because they are supported by no scriptural authority, and truly impotent, because you hurl at us whatever your anger suggests, as if the thing could be disposed of by insult, reproach and abuse. The sensible reader will easily find answers for them all from what I have said already.

There remain the letters to the brethren of Strassburg [**33**] and to Reutlingen, [**34**] both of which are so devoid of anything but abuse that has not been met [729] in the above that I do not want to detain the poor reader with them longer. I think it has been abundantly shown how frivolous those things are which you people teach without any authority from the divine utterances, that the eating of the body strengthens faith, remits sin, makes present in natural form what has been proclaimed by the word.

I think also that those sophistries have been thoroughly enough exposed and more by which, from ignorance perhaps more than intention, you maintain that we must rest upon the words of Christ before collation of Scripture has shown whether they can bear the meaning which they present at first sight. Certainly his words are a sacred thing which should not be touched and violated by an audacious or profane hand, any more than the ark which slew Uzzah for his righteous zeal as he thought to prevent its falling by his hand. [2 S. 6:6-7] But they are sacred and inviolable when they emit to us the perfume of their true meaning. They do, indeed, emit the perfume of the same meaning, but our sense of smell is often so vitiated that it fails to scent the real perfume. In such case let us by no means cry out, "The words are sacred," with the purpose that the untutored shall rest upon an imperfect or incorrect understanding of them. So shall we be more riotous than the rioters. Let us drop this and proceed to Part Two.

Part Two

In dividing the subject I promised to explain clearly in this second part the words of Christ about which we are in controversy. This I am going to do, gladly and cheerfully, thanking God in the meantime that he has brought the ship through dark and rocky regions so successfully that it has not even a crack or a moan. So much by way of introduction.

But before I undertake the explanation of the words of the Lord, I shall have to say a few words upon the collation of the Scriptures, namely, that after the human tongue began, by means of tropes and figures and [730] varieties of expression, to season its speech with sweet smelling spices, or paint it with varying hues, as it were, then the divine Goodness (which everywhere babbles to us like parents to their infants, and uses our own language), condescended in talking with us, to use our own tropes and figures. Hence we learn beyond doubt that a knowledge of tropes and figures is above all things necessary to those who have determined to busy themselves with the sacred writings. Secondly, since they that use the charms of tropes and figures rather extravagantly are apt to put before us forms of speech that at first blush seem to be widely at variance and far from the truth, even though they are not always of varied import, I will give one example from the rich abundance.

Christ is said by Paul to have been born of the tribe

of Judah, [Heb. 7:14] and is said by the same writer to be neither Jew nor Greek. [Cf. Gal. 3:28.] Thus the same words are used in different passages in different principles and with different meanings. But the passages must be brought together, that no one may think that any lack of harmony can be found in the sacred writings. From this it appears again beyond doubt that collation of the Scriptures is just as necessary as the knowledge of tropes. And this you, too, most learned Luther, bore witness to in addressing the King of England in these words, "It is characteristic of the Thomists" (for what precedes does not apply here), "to disregard the canon of the understanding of Scripture, which is to note what follows a given passage, as well as the context, and what seems to contradict it." [WA 10/2:206:24-26] So much for your canon. Hence it would be extremely discourteous, to say nothing stronger, for you now to depart from that opinion or rather law, and rely upon such stubborn utterances as, "The heavens must fall sooner than they be explained in a different sense," and "They are too great to have to put on a different garb out of respect for others" (for some cry out that). How shall we remove that contradiction, inconsistency, or diversity? If they alone must not be weighed by the scales of faith, all else must be investigated in the light of their firmness and certainty. For nothing else shrinks thus from collation. Then will not only your canon go to pieces but faith itself also. For it knows that eaten flesh profits nothing.

[731] The third thing I have thought I ought to say is that there is nothing so difficult in the sacred writings that its expression has not been adorned with the coloring of tropes. I will give a few of the many examples. In the early part of Genesis there is such a varied mass of land and water and abysses of the deep, that unless you made your way through it by the aid of synecdoche, you could not get out even if you were the swimmer of Delos. [1] We believe in an omnipotent God. This omnipotence is mentioned by different writers with various kinds of tropes. One says, "Lord, all things are reckoned in your providence." Another represents him saying, "The heavens are my throne, and the earth is my footstool." [Acts 7:49] Another says, "You hold the earth in your hand." [Cf. Isa. 40:12.] Even the scheme of the gospel itself is taught at one time under the figure of the eating of flesh, [cf. Jn. 6:53ff.] that we may more successfully receive the force and nutriment of faith. At another it is taught the trope of a spring of water, [Jn. 4:14] that we know its refreshment and result. Again, under the figure of keys, [Mt. 16:19] that we may understand that absolution and freedom of the soul which is in Christ Jesus. The bitter death of Christ is foretold by trope: "If I be lifted up from the earth, etc." [Jn. 12:32] And, "Last of all the father sent his son, but they cast him out of the vineyard, and killed him." [Mt. 21:37ff.]

Why in the world, when God and even Christ himself

used a trope in regard to the supreme event itself, should we so obstinately shrink from them in the matters of the mere commemoration of the event? What are we coming to, when, if it suits our purpose, we advise, nay command others to collate the Scriptures, and then, when we are attacked with our own weapons and methods, we forbid that which we had taught? How ridiculous is a fencing master who has taught admirably how an adversary is to be attacked or evaded, what is in accordance with the art and what not, and who, when he is himself straightway attacked and hit, cries out that this is not in accordance with the art and cannot be endured! The dish we have made, as the proverb has it, we must eat up. Let us keep the law that we have laid down! Such is the audacity of the kenodoxōn ("vain fellows") that in the explanation of tropes a new disaster could arise, and all things be confused by means of tropes. [732] Hence it is thirdly true beyond doubt, that, since the highest things are taught even by the divine utterances wrapped up in tropes, it is necessary to consider under the guidance of faith what can bear a trope and what cannot. For if anyone proceeded to explain the statement of the Father, "This is my beloved son," he would proceed to be as impious as Arius was. He, again, would be more senseless than a stone, who should say that Christ was literally a rock or stone because in speaking of himself he said, "The stone which the builders rejected has become the head of the corner." [Mt. 21:42] Faith, therefore, must be our guide as to what words are to be explained by any trope. For not every trope discloses only hidden things.

Fourth, I set out a thing that corresponds to the second part of the subject, namely, to collation. For who is so dull as to think that any passage may be compared with any other? It is, therefore, fourthly true beyond doubt that the Scriptures are to be compared under the same rule of faith, holding fast to analogy in the comparison, and this exists between opposites just as much as between things that are similar. This will all become clear by examples. The parable of the ten virgins [Mt. 25:1ff.] and the case of Lazarus [Lk. 16:20ff.] are profitably compared through the analogy of similarity. They both tell of the condition of the soul after this life. That Christ was the son of a perpetual virgin and that he had brothers, although he was the only begotten, may properly be compared, even though to be a perpetual virgin and have had an only begotten son and to have brought forth several births are contradictory. For a comparison between the two is applicable through analogy. The perpetual virginity comes into question. It is explained by the idiomatic usage alone, by which it is common in Hebrew to call by the name of brothers not only those of the same tribe but those of the same people. Therefore clansmen are called brothers, not only those of the same parents. But it is not a sound comparison, if you compare the parable of the nobleman who went into a far country [Lk.

19:12ff.] with that which was written with reference to the calling of the Jews and the Gentiles, the one about the householder that went out at dawn and hired husbandmen to work in his vineyard. [Mt. 21:33ff.] For one was woven about Christ's ascension into heaven, and the commending of the gift of the gospel, the other about the rejection of the Jews and the election of the Gentiles. So also we should not compare "The Word was made flesh," [Jn. 1:14] and "This is my body," [Mt. 26:26] [733] for there is no analogy between them. The former tells that the Son of God put on human nature, the latter tells of the festival of praise and commemoration of his death, or, as our friends say, that his body is given us to eat.

But between these two statements, "Christ put on human nature," and "Christ gave us his body to eat in a physical sense," there is absolutely no analogy. Between these, however, there is an analogy: Exodus 12:27: "This" (whether the lamb or the assemblage or the festival) "is the passover," and "This is my body," put for "This ceremony, this symbolic lamb, this festival, is the commemoration of or thanksgiving for that passing over which I did in Egypt," and "This assemblage or festival, this symbolic bread, is the thanksgiving for or commemoration of my body which I have given for you." And also between these: "I baptize with water, but Christ with the Holy Spirit." [Cf. Acts 1:15.] Circumcision, then, which formerly occupied the place of baptism, was only an external act of ceremony, and the Holy Spirit was not given in that act any more than in baptism. For a human being performs both baptism and circumcision, but does not give the Holy Spirit in them. Likewise between these: "As within the Church and people of God were reckoned those who had been born of the seed of Israel, so within the Church are counted those who are born of the children of the renewed promise." For there is one Church, one faith, and God is not more angry with us and our children than he was with the Jews, whose children were just as much in the covenant and the Church as their fathers were. Here also there is an analogy: circumcision was given to the children of the Hebrews. Therefore, baptism ought not to be refused to the children of the Christians. There are also various other things demanded in the collation of the Scriptures, for instance, discrimination between words of promise and of command, between ceremonies and things that shape the character, and the like. On these points I have written at some length in German to Strauss, that bird of ill omen. [2]

Fifth, it must be set out that while it appears that Scripture is to be interpreted only under the lead and guidance of faith or anointing, there is yet no one who cannot by the aid of hypocrisy make a show of faith. For the human being sees only the surface, God alone the heart. [1 S. 16:7] What will not ambition dare? Hence I confess that there is no need of some

barriers within which we may be forced to keep those who are constantly [734] boasting the Spirit. For it is vain for me to boast to those who know the Spirit pretty well that this is the spirit which is mere stubbornness. And these barriers can be none other than the walls of Scripture. For even Christ confines himself within that when he says to the scribes, "you search the Scriptures, and they testify of me." [Jn. 5:39] He attributes more to them than to that miracle in which a man rose from the dead and testified of things in the other world. [Lk. 16:31] It is, therefore, in the fifth place, true beyond doubt that Scripture is the touchstone of our spirit. [3] By this we must prove all spirits. For just as a draught animal by itself without yoke or collar, straps or ropes, cannot even start its load and, on the other hand, ropes attached to the load as cleverly as possible likewise cannot move the burden without the animal, so if you expound Scripture without the Spirit or faith, you will accomplish nothing. On the other hand, if you assign to the Spirit what is not consistent with Scripture, you will introduce a confused and fanatical wonderment and make a mess of everything. Scripture is the rope, fetter, reins, yoke, straps, the draught animal is the spirit. The superior thing, I frankly acknowledge, is the spirit, but unless it be restrained by the reins and ropes of Scripture (I am speaking only of our spirit of faith), it will become headstrong and violent, and outstrip the choir and organ, as they say. And lest anyone should fail to understand me, I will use the illustration of the stonecutter or the carpenter. Neither of these approaches his material without chisel, axe, rule, plumbline, nor again does he send them to it by themselves, as if they could accomplish the work by their own efforts without labor of his. So our spirit is a stonecutter imbued with the heavenly Spirit, the word we preach is our material. Scripture is our chisel or axe; tropes are our rule and plumbline. The stonecutter is the chief thing, but unless these accessories are at hand, nothing worthwhile will be accomplished.

Setting all this forth, therefore, in order not to boast stubbornly of the Spirit, while not having the support of Scripture, I approach happily the actual exposition of the words of Christ. But, look you, I want to warn you first [735] not to forget this point about the collation of the Scriptures. For that is what brings me to my present course.

Consider the following words of Christ: "the flesh profits nothing" [Jn. 6:63]; "again, I leave the world" [Jn. 16:28]; "it is expedient for you that I go away, for if I do not go away, the comforter will not come unto you" [Jn. 16:7]; "for now I am no more in the world, but these are in the world, and I come to you" [Jn. 17:11]; "therefore, if they say to you, 'Behold, he is in the desert,' do not go forth. 'Behold, he is in the secret chambers,' do not believe it. For as the lightning comes out of the

east, and shines even unto the west, so shall the coming of the Son of Man be" [Mt. 24:26f.]; "after the Lord Jesus had spoken to them, he was received up into heaven, and sits at the right hand of God" [Mk. 16:19]; "and it happened, while he blessed them, he was parted from them, and was carried up into heaven" [Lk. 24:51]; "and when he had spoken these things, while they were watching, he was taken up and a cloud hid him from their sight. And while they looked steadfastly toward heaven as he went up, behold, two men stood by them in white apparel who also said, 'Men of Galilee, why do you stand looking up into heaven? This same Jesus, who is taken up from you into heaven, will so come in like manner as you have seen him go into heaven.'" [Acts 1:9ff.] While I say from these very distinct utterances I do not take away the natural meaning nor injure it, I am forced in the words of the supper not only to admit, but to invite the presence of a trope with which to explain them in the spirit of religion without injury to the divine utterances. For the Spirit that spoke all these things is one of harmony and unanimity, not one of contention and discord. They must, therefore, themselves be consistent, unanimous and harmonious.

How almost all kinds of figures are formed all through the Hebrew writers, I have often told elsewhere, and since it is only metonymy and catachresis that we have need of for the present purpose, I will speak here of these only. [4] Metonymy, according to the various significations of the preposition meta, which sometimes means "after", or "with" or "across", can sometimes be called "denomination", [5] or the substituting of one name for another, as when we put on an invention or an institution the name of its originator, and call it by his name. Thus we call wine, Bacchus; wheat, Ceres; the supper or symbol of commemoration, the body of Christ. Because Bacchus and Ceres were the originators, the one of wine, the other of grain, and Christ instituted the commemoration as a thanksgiving for the death [736] which he bore in his body (for his divinity was imperishable). Sometimes it can be called "cognomination" [6] or the applying of the name of a person (or thing) to something that represents the same, as when we call a statue Cocles or Cloelia, [7] because the statue represents one or the other. So "Baal" is applied to an idol or a demon by metonymy, that is, cognomination, and idols are called gods, and of this class is the expression, "An idol is nothing in the world" [1 Cor. 8:4], that is, the god to whom the idol is set up is nothing. So law is put for the work of the law, circumcision is spoken of as a covenant, when it is only the symbol of the covenant, and the cup is likewise spoken of as the testament when it is but a symbol of the testament.

Sometimes it can be called "transnomination", [8] or the exchanging of the names of things; when opposites are given the names of each other, as when law is put for the sin which

is committed against the law. And law writers speak of a person falling under the law when he has fallen away from the law or say that a person pleads extenuating circumstances for the law, when it is the thing done contrary to the law for which he pleads extenuating circumstances. So we have "sin" put for the offering for the sin; "abuse" for the person who has suffered the abuse; "the purchase of hunger" for the grain or corn supply bought to counteract hunger. See Genesis 42:19. Metonymy is spread so abundantly all through the Scriptures that it would be difficult to set forth all its subdivisions here.

Now catachresis must be considered here, because if anyone chooses to interpret the word "is" as "signifies", we can call in that variety of figure and quote passages from Scripture in which it is used in this way. Catachresis is a figure by which the literal and natural signification of anything is applied to a thing to which the literal signification does not belong. [9] I will not speak here of the battle I fought with Billicanus [10] as to whether substantive verbs admit tropes or not, for language existed before the name "trope" was invented. This word "is", then, is transferred from its natural signification to one not literally belonging to it, when I point to a statue of Caesar and say, "This is Caesar." For that by which we say a statue "is" what it is the statue of, is a different kind of "being" from the natural signification of "being". Therefore, I saw very clearly that there would be people who would take their stand on the word "is", and say, "Christ said 'is'. No one will mar that word, for it signifies being. Therefore, the bread is the body of Christ." I have brought together examples from all through the Scriptures to show that "is" sometimes loses its natural signification. From the Old Testament: "The seven fat cows are seven years of plenty, and the seven thin and the empty ears are seven years of scarcity and famine," [Gen. 41:26f.] [737] sets forth "are" incontrovertibly for "signify". From the New Testament: "It is Elijah himself," where "is" evidently is put for "is like". In Galatians 4:24, "these are the two covenants," is evidently used for "these signify the two covenants." And finally I have taken from the Old Testament an example which no one of you has ever been able to shake, "For it is the Lord's passover." [Ex. 12:27] Whether you say the lamb or the commemoration or the festival is the passover, yet no one of these is the passover but the sign of the passover. About the analogy of this a little later.

Now I would beseech you, my dear Luther, suffer me to admonish you. You bewail the untaught rabble, saying, "Behold how many sects have sprung up among the people themselves. One says, 'The word is takes the place of signifies,' another says, 'body is employed for figure of a body,' and they throw the shadow of a figure over us all in this light. Another turns the words about." [11] In regard to this lamentation of yours I would ask you in

a friendly spirit whether your conscience never suggests to you: you do a thing unworthy of you, when you make such an uproar before the people, for you know very well that there are not different sects among those people. They all declare that what the controversy is about are only symbols, but carry the names of the things of which they are symbols. They explain the terms, however, in different ways. If you say "no", I ask you again, whether you are not reminded by the same conscience that we are certainly not stubborn as you proclaim, casting us among people who should be avoided, though you have never proved us wrong.

Indeed, if what some say of you is true, you instigate certain princes to a policy of cruelty towards this opinion, and so will not have proclaimed the times of Arius in vain. [12] If we were doing anything [738] stubbornly, we should all have taken the cue from Carlstadt's words, and should be giving you noise instead of Scripture, as a certain crowd is doing. As it is, though one explains the matter in one way, another in another, yet no discord arises among us. I followed Hoen of Holland [13] (whose letter John Rhodius and George Saganus, men distinguished for both piety and learning, brought me), [14] in explaining "is" is used for "signifies", and I was not ignorant of tropes at that time. I had read Fabius [15] and Cicero [16] and even Plutarch as given in the introduction to Homer. [17] But that simple explanation which anyone could understand pleased me: "This bread signifies my body which is given for you." For everybody does not know what a trope is. I saw, also, that by whatever kind of trope we explain the words, the point is simply this, that the force of the word "is" undergoes modification and has the value, "is a signification or representation of". I followed the simplest course, therefore, and explained the thing as an example of catachresis. Oecolampadius followed Tertullian [740] and gave this explanation, "This is the figure of my body," in which he takes "figure", [18] not in the sense of a type or prefiguration or indication of things to be, but in the sense of antitypō ("an image"), that is, a representation or reflection of something that has sometime really been. For Jerome also used the word "representation" in treating of this subject. [19]

Tertullian and Oecolampadius, then, explained the words as a metonymy, of the variety cognomination, by which that is called the body which is an image or representation of the body, or a means of recalling it to remembrance. But here springs up a new conflagration. We evidently must disagree, for Oecolampadius [741] says this is metaphor, while I say it is metonymy. To this I answer, that one and the same form of expression may be explained by different kinds of figures, and these may also be considered from different points of view. Hence even among the rhetoricians we very often find the same form of expression elucidated by different tropes. I will give examples. "We are one bread

and one body, we, the whole communion and congregation." [Cf. 1 Cor. 10:17f.] I say we are called bread and body by a metonymy of the variety cognomination. What do I have in mind? The fact that Paul thinks we are named one bread because we eat of one bread, and body because by eating the symbol of the Lord's body we come together into the one body of the Church. And how can this be called anything better than cognomination? But by metaphor Oecolampadius calls us one bread and one body. What has he in view? The formation of the bread and the composition of the wine. For as one loaf of bread is made of innumerable seeds and the wine of as many grapes, so the one body of the Church is gathered together from countless members. A great reason, indeed why we should impute a quarrel to people, that, while espousing one and the same opinion, they explain words by tropes with different names! For when I say by catachresis, "This bread signifies, figures, represents my body which is given for you," and Oecolampadius says by metonymy, "This bread is a figure, a signification, representation, reminder of my body which is given for you," what difference, I ask, is there in the essentials of the opinion? Also, when I, looking at one thing, say we are called bread by metonymy, and Oecolampadius, looking at another, says it is by metaphor, both of which are consistent with the apostolic writings and with the analogy of faith, indeed, both look to the one and only union and harmony of Christ's body, why, I implore, do we slanderously accuse brethren of disagreement before the untaught people?

In like manner there is no disagreement when one by means of the pointer "this" indicates the bread, and says, "This bread represents my body which is given for you"; another directs the same pointer towards the feast days, and says, "This feast is a representation or reflection of my body which is given for you." Both mean that the thing in question is a commemoration with thanksgiving of the blessing bestowed upon us by the Lord, and both use the synecdoche in saying this. For the one who says, "This festival represents my body, etc." includes by synecdoche all [742] the things that are done here, the giving of thanks, the symbolic plate, and the symbolic cup. And the one who says, "The bread represents, etc., in part," understands in the symbolic eating by synecdoche the whole festival of praise and takes together, for example, the thanksgiving and the mystical cup. Happy and fruitful are those cases in which, however you explain them, unity and truth of meaning are preserved. Let us not then in such hostile fashion attack our brethren in the presence of the people of Christ to which we belong, nor denounce them with the cry, "They are at variance. They are a beast of as many heads as John fastened to a certain beast in the apocalypse. [Rev. 13:1] They are obstinate." [20] Let us call obstinacy (as is most proper, namely) the diligent study of Scripture whence we derive that

choice fruit of truth, by which our languishing hearts are refreshed after having been fed upon the husks of our own ignorance.

Driven thus to admit a trope in Christ's words, whether we will or no, and having explained the kind of trope not unsatisfactorily, as I think (for whether you explain "is" as used by catachresis for "signifies" or "represents", or take "body" by metonymy for "representation" or "reminder of body", the sense remains the same), I approach the sacred words with good auspices, as they say, with the favor, namely, of the dove that lighted upon the head of Christ and flew into the gathering of the disciples. [Lk. 3:22]

"And when the hour was come he sat down, and the twelve apostles with him." [Lk. 22:14] I have decided to treat the matter from the gospel of Luke and Paul for the sake of clearness. For Matthew and Mark were content with few words here, being persuaded, no doubt, of the knowledge of the matter among the people, for all the details were then so well known to the whole Church that a few words were enough for everybody. "And he said," (I come back to the words) "with desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer." [Lk. 22:15] Christ put the passover and his body together. Let us not, therefore, separate [743] in thought what he associated in fact.

Not that I mean that the lamb should be devoured in the Eucharist as the children of Israel once devoured it piecemeal, but I would keep the analogy, likeness, or correspondence, through which the passover and the commemoration correspond to and resemble each other. In the former thanks are given because in the slaughter of the first born, to which even the royal offspring had fallen a victim, the first born of the Hebrews had been spared. [Ex. 12:29ff.] In the latter, while the son of the most high king was slain, the world was passed by and saved entire. And this is again an analogy of similarity. In the former case the lamb or the festival is called the passover, though neither the lamb nor the solemnity was the passover, but a symbol and commemoration of the passing by or passover. In the latter case the supper or the bread is called the body of Christ though it is the commemoration and thanksgiving of his body, that is, of the death which he suffered for us in his body. There are many other things which lead us to see that Christ had in view the occasion and the analogy. For instance, being upon the point of not only celebration but of abolishing the old commemoration and instituting the new one, according to the prophecy of Jeremiah 33:31, he used the same kind of language and trope in the new institution which he had used in establishing the old, and, he especially instituted it at the same time. Here he said, "This do in my memory," [Lk. 22:19] just as he had said in the previous time, "When your children

ask you, 'What do you mean by this service,' you will say, etc.," as is written in Exodus 12:26. Hence we see that in both cases the commemoration and thanksgiving are chiefly looked at, not the thing that is eaten. I will go on, therefore, to the other points, keeping to the analogy. There follows:

"And he took the cup, gave thanks, and said: 'Take this, and divide it among yourselves. For I say unto you, I will not drink of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God will come.'" [Lk. 22:17f.] When certain persons consider this passage, they seize an occasion for contention rather than find a bulwark of any sound opinion. For, wishing to overthrow what is said in Matthew and Mark after the handing of the bread and cup, "I will not drink henceforth of the fruit of the vine, until that day, etc." [Mt. 26:29; Mk. 14:25] By this we readily discover [744] that Christ himself, after the bread had been eaten and the cup of blood had been drunk, called it wine that they had drunk, and not blood. And by this synecdoche it is further discovered without difficulty that the same view must be held of the bread, that it is not his body, even though called so, because eaten in commemoration of the death of Christ. Wishing, I say, to overthrow the natural force of that understanding, they say that this language of Matthew and Mark refers to the wine which had been drunk during supper, not to the cup which had already been called his blood, and they try to prove this from this language of Luke. For by him, they say, it was put before the mention of the supper, from which we see that it was not the symbolic cup, but the ordinary drink of the supper that Christ called wine. And in support of this they bring forward the fact that before these words he had said, "For I say unto you, I shall not anymore eat thereof, until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God," [Lk. 22:16] in which they refer the word "thereof" to the passover, so that Christ says he will not thereafter eat any passover, until it is fulfilled in the kingdom.

They show us thus in twofold manner their own negligent way of going to work. First, they do not see that Luke put these words before that they might forewarn and prepare the reader to understand the following as a trope and nothing else, that the bread remained bread, and the wine, wine, but in the meantime they were called the body and blood. They were simply what he had said, the body and blood. They were simply what he had said, if you looked at their substance; if you looked at the religious side of the matter, the ceremony and its meaning, they were something more. The other two evangelists, Matthew and Mark, put those words about the wine afterwards, as a metanoias, that is, a sort of correction. It was just as if they said that Christ had added these words in order that no one should believe that what he had drunk was anything but wine.

Second, they do not understand that Christ spoke the

words, "With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you," [Lk. 22:15] not so much for the sake of the eating of the roasted lamb as for the sake of the institution of the commemoration of himself. If they had not understood this, they would readily have seen that the words, "I will not eat anymore thereof" [Lk. 22:16], should be referred not only to the eating of the lamb of the old covenant, but to the whole matter of the supper. And this point also must not be passed by, that Luke, who wrote his gospel after the other two, and narrated everything with clearer detail, employed greater clearness in these words also, for the reason that his predecessors had said rather too little for the exigencies of the lapse of time, which brings everything into forgetfulness. Hence we see plainly that he anticipated kata prolēpsin, that is, by way of forewarning, what the other two placed after kata metanoian, that is, by way of correction. And this we readily perceive both here and in the description of the supper which he wrote in Acts 2:46.

There follows: "And he took the bread, gave thanks, broke it and gave it to them, saying, 'This is my body which is given for you. Do this in remembrance of me.'" [Lk. 22:19f.] Here I urge you first, Luther, [745] not to let the idiomatic usages of the Hebrew escape you anywhere, and especially in the present passage. You know how frequently they say, "This is the sin," for, "This victim is slain for the sin," and call sin that by which sin is removed and atoned for. You know how frequently they say, "This is such and such a thing," for "This signifies this thing." "The seven fat cows are seven years of plenty" [Gen. 41:26]; "This is Elias" [Mk. 6:15]; "These are the two covenants" [Gal. 4:24]; "An idol is nothing" [1 Cor. 8:4], instead of "Baal" or, "the god to whom the idol is set up is nothing." Then remember the analogies of the things under consideration here. The old supper is put aside and the new one substituted for it on the same evening. Who, pray, can he even surmise that he used a different form of words from that which he had used in the celebration of the old supper? In this the formula or reading was, "This is the passover," for, "This is the commemoration of the passover." So also, after that was finished, the fact itself suggests that when Christ used a similar form of words, he spoke in the same tropological sense also, saying, when he had taken the bread, "Take, eat. This is my body," (for: "This represents my body," or "This is a commemoration of my body") "which is given for you." [Mt. 26:26] For he adds immediately, "This do in remembrance of me." [Lk. 22:19] By this mark we perceive that it is the commemoration which is looked at here, not the eating with a view to strengthening the soul or faith. You see, therefore, how the very analogy of the supper works for us. But I beseech you, do not now burst out with, "See how they rest on grammatical dexterity." We do not rest on cunning, but now that, by reconciling apparent inconsistencies, collating the Scriptures, we have brought things to the

point that, whether one will or no, one is forced to admit that the words in question cannot have the simple meaning they present at first sight.

We explain the situation not only by cunning, but by examples, by the usages of the language which Christ spoke, and by the very analogies of the action and institution. For why should I now name faith again as the judge and guide in all these things, when I have perhaps spoken of her in the above more plainly and strongly than a not well-disposed reader can bear?

There follows: "Likewise also (he took) the cup after supper, saying, 'This cup is the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you.'" [Lk. 22:20] Such is Luke's statement, for the Greek article hē I have rendered by "is", not trusting to my own authority but to Paul's. He says, "This cup is the new [746] testament in my blood. Do this as often as you drink it, in remembrance of me." [1 Cor. 11:25] Consider here first the pains taken by the evangelist. Although he had said above, "This is my body," [Mt. 26:26] he now says, "This cup is the new testament," or, "the cup of the new testament, in my blood." [1 Cor. 11:25] He did not say, "This cup is my blood," in order to give a better clue for the judging and understanding of such points. He says it is the cup of the testament which had been ratified in the blood of Christ, not the blood, in order that we may more easily go up to the preceding and understand that what is eaten is only the feast of the new testament which had been struck and ratified by the death of Christ's body. But that no one may have any justification for contention on the ground that Paul really and simply called this cup the testament, and therefore it follows that it is the blood, if it is the testament, it must be noted that the blood of Christ is not the testament but the blood of the testament. For the testament or covenant is that Christ the Son of God is ours, and that through him we have been elected into the number of the children of God. And all this was accomplished and ratified by his death. Hence neither the body nor the blood is the testament, but the confirmation of the testament, as may be seen from Galatians and Hebrews, and indeed, from these words of Luke and Paul, who say plainly that the testament is in the blood, and do not say the blood is the testament. But if anyone obstinately persists that it is the testament, let him remember that circumcision is equally called the testament or agreement, when it is only the sign of the covenant according to Genesis 17:10.

It is, therefore, through the figure cognomination that the cup is called the testament, when not even the blood which the cup represents is the testament, but it is that through which the testament was made and confirmed. In this you, Luther, have always been under a delusion (for see, meanwhile, how patiently

we put up with that). You have always contended that his cup was the testament, when it is only the symbol, reminder, representation of the testament. Whether then you say, "This cup is the cup of the new testament, which new testament is consecrated in my blood," or "This cup is the new testament in my blood," [1 Cor. 11:25] the thing meant by both Luke and Paul is simply that this cup is a reminder of the new testament which has been made through the blood of Christ. Consider, secondly, that it is not beside the point that Paul added with each symbol, "This do in remembrance of me," [1 Cor. 11:24] which Luke was content to put after the symbol of the bread only. [Lk. 22:19] [747] He would, thus, namely, inculcate upon us more and more that it is a commemoration that he is speaking of here, not the consumption of a physical body.

"For as often as you eat this bread, and drink this cup, proclaim the Lord's death until he come." [1 Cor. 11:26] It is of no avail to suggest here that the apostle, after all these things on which you wish to seem to rest your case, calls "bread" and "cup" one of which he called "the body", following the evangelists. For so conscientious a man would never have done this if he had held the opinion that the bread was the body of Christ or that this body was eaten in the bread. And so to the showing of the Lord's death, how that it is to be understood as singing praises and giving thanks for it, has been set forth sufficiently already. Not that I would forbid the proclaiming of the Lord's passion in public discourse when the supper is to be celebrated, but the real meaning here looks, not to such proclaiming, but to what I have said. The churches retained inviolately the function and watching of God in having Christ's death shown to them at the season of the year in which the commemoration was celebrated. "Till he comes" refers to the whole time from the death and ascension of Christ till the last day. To "eat unworthily" is to approach without that faith which is demanded of those who unite in the body of Christ, as those did who as soon as they had partaken of the supper rushed off to the things sacrificed to idols. That, therefore, is called unworthy which is not done properly, as, on the contrary, that is done worthily which is done rightly as it should be.

Thus the holy one, the Baptist, says, "Bring forth fruits worthy of repentance," [Mt. 3:8] that is, such as are becoming to those who repent. St. Augustine [21] understood it in the same way in his tract on John 62: "'He shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord,' applies not to eating but to betrayal of him, through entering into the fellowship of the Church as if one were a Christian when one is not." So also St. Ambrose understands it, [22] "Not discerning the Lord's body," that is, not regarding what his body is and what his spirit. Augustine understands this in the same way if I remember rightly. I think the apostle

had reference to that body which a little before, in chapter 10, he said was put together firmly by eating of one bread. [1 Cor. 10:17] But if anyone objects to this view, he can yet see clearly from the above that "body" is to be understood of the commemoration of Christ's body, so that "not discerning the Lord's body" applies to him who has not sufficiently serious views in regard to the Lord's death, which is renewed by representation in the commemoration of the Eucharist. [748] He comes back to the same sense, which I gave a little while ago. For he who has no deeper feeling for Christ than to think that he may eat the supper in remembrance of him and may eat the things offered to idols also, plainly makes the commemoration of his body, that is, of his passion, of no more account than the woman who has intercourse with an adulterer makes her husband's honor. And that the body of Christ is to be understood of his death is clearly made out from the words of Paul. He commands us to proclaim the death of the Lord, and Christ directs us to do this in his memory. Therefore, the commemoration of the body is simply thanksgiving for his death. I have left more on this subject, with more testimony also, elsewhere in my writings.

•

These few pages on Part II, which I have reduced to very narrow limits because the subject in general has been so treated in the earlier pages as not to need lengthy treatment here, and because I do not doubt you will be abundantly content with the few words, provided you follow your judgement and not your feelings. But I send along a book written in German, which I have also called a clear exposition. [23] You will find in this, provided you read, will read it, the things that you will perhaps miss here. [749]

Epilogue to Luther

So much for my exposition of my opinion in the matter of the Eucharist, most learned Luther. All your weapons I think either have already been wrested from your hands or are on the point of falling from them of themselves. Some I have turned upon yourself in such a way that you must either give up your stronghold or convict yourself of error. And would that the friends who have read your words with some care had called my attention sooner to certain things, so that I might have put them in their proper place. For they say if one examines your utterances rather closely there is no need of my efforts. I begin to have some confidence in their statement, now that Henry Utinger, [1] that orna-

ment of our Church and friend faithful as Theseus to me, [2] has brought out a passage from a sermon of yours entitled, "On the Sacrament of the Altar and the Brotherhoods." [3] For in this, near the beginning, you say: "It is therefore called (this sacrament, namely) [750] the "gathering together" or "communion". And to communicate means to receive this communion, which in German we call "going to the sacrament." And this comes from the fact that Christ and all the saints are one spiritual body, [Rom. 12:5] just as the people of a city are one communion and one body, etc." And toward the end you prove this by the testimony of Paul in 1 Corinthians 10:17, in this way: "Paul speaks thus in the Epistle to the Corinthians, 'We are all one bread and one body, etc.'" [WA 2:743:24-26] If I had had this extract at the time I was rescuing these words of Paul from the violence you do them in your book against Carlstadt, what do you think I could have put in stronger or more effective? Here you admit that we are that body of Christ of which Paul says, "We are one bread and one body." In the other work, good gods, how you thunder and fulminate against this explanation coming near you, though you have previously put it forth both orally and in print!

I would not be thought to say this with a view to reviling you, by Hercules, but to offer you yourself, since Scripture has so far accomplished little with you, letters less, and silence least of all. But how can it be that when you are confronted with your own utterances you should not say, "I forgot myself"? How short, how human, nay, how salutary for the harmony of all the churches that little phrase would be! Would not all, whether high or low, say that it was natural and showed an honorable sincerity if your indignation was inclined to boil over in case anyone tried to bring your teachings into doubt? For what mortal was there ever of whom it could properly be said that he was aplakētos ("infallible")? You would be undergoing nothing new and strange if you should say, "I forgot myself." We all go wrong in many things. [Jas. 3:2] But you would undergo something quite unheard of, if it could be said of Luther, "He has nowhere slipped, nowhere made a mistake." Nay it would be blasphemy if we should in our folly attribute to you what belongs to the supreme divinity alone.

Remember how much tribulation you would save the poor peoples of Germany who all believe in their hearts what you either will not or dare not believe, if you would frankly speak this one little phrase. Our view is bound to prevail, beyond a doubt, [751] but the victory will be a harder one with your opposition, for it will have to be wrought out with travail, when we should just come upon it with universal rejoicing, if you should say, "I forgot myself." To err is human: [4] to slip, make mistakes, be deceived. Do you not hold that there is naught that is human which does not concern you? [5] Say, then, to yourself, "Suppose I forgot myself." Remember how much the Lord has wrought

for the world through you, all the glory which is dropping away from you because of your obstinate stubbornness in this one matter. He did away with transubstantiation of the bread into the body through you, for he saw that the idolatry of the body would go to pieces with it. Now he is destroying that idolatry through others. Will you, then, stand against the Lord? Do you fancy it is without a purpose that you are superior to all in that battle in which you maintain that nothing is without a purpose? If you believe, then, that this battle has been sent upon us by the Lord for our ill, it is your duty (if you are really a Christian, as I think perhaps there is no doubt) to take all precautions that it shall cause as little ill as possible. If it be for our good, it is your duty to promote that as quickly as you can by yielding first and then encouraging all to do the same; if it is to try us, it is yours to put away bitterness and fierceness, that we may see all things more clearly.

Has the Lord exalted you? Take care that no one shall find any trace of pride in you because of the honor of this distinction. To inveigh arrogantly against the faults of a brother ill becomes a Christian. How much further ought it to be from us to slash at each other with more cruel ferocity than any Lapithae or Centaurs! [6] Remember that God is looking on at this battle and sees more deeply into the spirit of all than do we ourselves. Remember that not only the great people of Germany but of the Christian world, not only the present age, but all coming ages to the end of the world, will be our judges. They will judge more fairly and righteously in the matter of this controversy by as much as they will be the less infected with those passions by which we are influenced now.

For what is the present age? It is thoroughly infected with passions. It is so seduced and debauched by partisan zeal, [752] that it bestows admiring honor upon the grandiloquence of a man rather than upon weighty celestial testimony. Very few hold sincere opinions. One is smitten with the disease called avarice, so that he will say or refrain from saying what he thinks acceptable to princes. Another is puffed up with the dropsy of vainglory, and would sooner see all things not only human but divine totter to their fall rather than his own renown. Another is torn with hatred, envy, rivalry, and cannot be placated by prayers or speeches sweet as the sweetest honey or by any subordination or concession. Thus are nearly all things pulled asunder.

I appeal to you, therefore, O time to come, to pronounce in the integrity of your judgement upon these doings of ours. For I do not doubt that something of this battle will come to you and that will be as little as possible under the conditions of this or that passion. See how our view is confirmed by the collation of Scripture, has the support of tropes, the favor of idiom, the countenance of analogy, and, what we think its crowning

glory, it subscribes to religion and faith, our guardian guide, dictates its acceptance. Yet so clear a case finds still no audience with certain princes, and snares are laid for it by not a few of the learned. Do, I say, O coming time, consider again and again what is true in the matter, and see that you are not so blind in this thing as we are at this time, though we see clearly enough, perhaps, in other things. I hand on the torch. [7] Farewell.

I come back to you, Luther. Take this epilogue, as it were, and consider it with neither negligence nor anger. You will not easily overcome the forces that have been led out here against the camp of your arguments. Grant that I have no right to expect to reach any height, [753] as I frankly confess, and that nothing ordinary is to be expected of you. Yet remember that the greatest heroes have often been conquered by ordinary people. I am the last of all to take up the conflict with you, and do it against my will, but do not think the war is over because I come so late. Remember the proverb, "A tired ox plants its foot more firmly." [8] And take all this kindly and in good part. I submit this exegesis to the judgement of all pious and learned people with the conviction that I have throughout honestly avoided trachytēta ("roughness") and unless you should be offended by the hipotypōsis ("outline") of your battle, which I gave not to expose you or Carlstadt to the laughter and sport of humankind, but to recall you by some means from that violent effect of passion which is carrying you astray and will destroy you if you do not give it up. Farewell in God, and be not hasty.

To the Reader

And I would not have you go away, good reader, without my warning not to undertake anything in partisan spirit, but to remember that no one conquers or is conquered except the Lord so wills it. You are for Luther. Know that he will not bear away the victory even though he fights most strenuously, unless it flies down upon him from above. [9] You are on my side. Beware of shouting "Ha, triumph!" because of this book, for if Luther continues to resist in his harsh way, though we shall beyond a doubt conquer, I fear the battle will be so hard fought that the victory will be, as the proverb has it, a tearful one. [10] Let us, therefore, weary God with constant prayers, not to abandon his cause, not to let so important a pillar in the Church fall to the ground, and so to enlighten the minds of princes that they will cease to tyrannize over the feeble multitude, [754] which is not so very

receptive of truth, and is in general pretty stupid. And if a contest with Luther proves altogether necessary, let no person form his opinion until he has heard both sides. And though, good onlooker or reader, you could conclude that things written in such a hurry in so violently disputed a matter must be pretty polemical whether we will or no, yet I think that these words of mine must be called cheerful and generous rather than bitter or polemical, and I can be said to have manifested the greatest admiration and regard for Luther, and am likely to do so always. Farewell to you, too, and show wisdom.

There follow now the things that Luther and his followers maintain without authority from Scripture.

The body of Christ physically eaten in this sacrament strengthens faith. It is an evident error, and, if one persists in it, an impiety.

The body of Christ physically eaten remits sins. It is an error, and, if one persists in it, an impiety.

The body of Christ is conveyed to us in physical shape by the vehicle of the uttered words. It is an error from the secret chambers of the Roman pontificate, and, if one persists in it, an impiety and the restoration of all errors.

When I offer the body of Christ to be physically eaten, I make the gospel familiar to him to whom I offer it, and give him the body and blood. It is an error and the height of thoughtlessness, and, if one persists in it, an impiety.

On Images

I assert distinctly that keeping those images which are set up for worship is idolatry. [11] The interdict against idols in the decalogue, whether it is the second commandment or a division of the first, should no more be thrown out of its place

than the command, "Love the Lord your God with all your heart, etc." [Mt. 22:37] Neither should all that is written in the whole Old Testament be considered in the light of the one commandment, "You should love your neighbor as yourself," [Lev. 19:18; Gal. 5:14] as they say that you maintain, Luther. For Christ [756] says, "On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets." [Mt. 22:40] In the scales of those two, therefore, must the whole thing be weighed. Now, since no one sets up an idol for worship (for I have no anxiety about the things that are not worshipped) without having first made a god of him to whom the idol is set up, an idol cannot be worshipped without treachery to faith. For Christ says again, "If you will enter into life, keep the commandments." [Mt. 19:17] Nor does Paul, in 1 Corinthians 8:1ff., hold that offerings to idols are among things indifferent, for he makes a sacred boast that he had drawn away the people of Thessalonica from the worship of idols. If this interdict be regarded as a separate commandment, the last two on covetousness will make one. This is the way St. Augustine divides them in his notes upon [757] Exodus. So that good-for-nothing Faber, [12] more foolish than Morychus [13] and more cruel than Phalaris, [14] need not be ignorant as to how many commandments there are in the decalogue. [758]

On Confession

A confession is made, O Luther, worthy of both yourself and God, when you address and worship the Father in your closet, and show him the troubles of your wounded soul. There you will be absolved by Christ Jesus whom you gaze upon with the eye of faith. For straightway when you look upon him with the contemplation of faith as he hangs upon the cross, your heart will be assured you that nothing can be denied by the Father who could bear that his son be crucified for your sake. And Christ panting in agony upon the cross for your sins will make you also carefully watch that you do not sin. This is the external sign that makes the heart sure, not the formula, "I absolve you." This is the net with which the apostles gather in souls. These are the keys with which are opened the bonds and prison of souls groaning and confined in guilt. But if anyone has not yet learned this, let him go to some person learned in Scripture, who will set forth the scheme of the gospel, and at the same time pray that the Lord will imbue the person with his own Spirit. So much as a brief summary of these two topics. Again farewell, most learned Luther.

NOTES

I. To Martin Luther

1. This is a reference to the winged goddess, Victory.

2. The term alloiosis may be defined as, "the transposed attribute, changing attributes of one property or nature of a thing or person to another." Potter, **Zwingli**, p. 312. This distinctive, favorite concept of Zwingli is similar to the communicatio idiomatum. By this figure of speech one is allowed to use attributes appropriate for the humanity of Christ when speaking about the divinity, and vice versa. See also Locher, p. 207: "Die communicatio idiomatum lässt Zwingli nur als 'communicatio naturarum' gelten; nur von der Person des Gottmenschen kann man 'per alloiosim' die Eigenschaften beider Naturen aussagen." The term will be translated here as "exchange".

3. Glaucus was a Lycian prince who assisted Priam in the Trojan War. He exchanged his golden armor for the bronze armor of his friend and combatant, Diomedes. The phrase "god for bronze" came to mean a bad exchange. Cf. **Iliad**, vi, 236.

4. Bucer and others encouraged Zwingli to engage Luther. For quotations by peers of Zwingli on this matter, see Z V:548-9.

5. Minerva was the Roman equivalent of Athena. Originally a goddess of handicrafts, she became in later times a goddess of war, encroaching on the territory of Mars. OLD: 1110-1111.

6. The fetial priests were a college of twenty priests who, among other acts, officiated on occasions by blessing peace treaties, truces and covenants. A fetial book, therefore, would intend to produce harmony or agreement. Cf. Georges I:2742-3.

7. Alexander of Macedon = Alexander the Great.

8. It is significant for the course and intensity of the debate which ensues that Luther had developed strong views over against Carlstadt because of the latter's rejection of Luther's eucharistic affirmations. See Köhler I:178ff.

9. Carneades (214?-129? b.c.) was a philosopher who headed the New Academy at Athens at the time of the greatest influence of anti-dogmatic skepticism.

II. To the Reader

1. This is a reference to Luther's **Antwortschreiben an die Christen zu Reutlingen,** WA 19:114-125. See especially 121:28-122:2.

2. See Luther's preface to **Erklärung wie Karlstadt seine Lehre von dem hochwürdigen Sakrament und andere achtet und geachtet haben will,** WA 18:453-466. See especially 454:23-26.

3. Zwingli refers here to his **Letter to Matthew Alber** and to the **Subsidiary Essay.** See above, pp. 131-144 and 191-227.

4. Cf. Horace, **Ars poetica** 359: ". . . Indignor, quandoque bonus dormitat Homerus." An earlier usage of the saying by Zwingli is found in Z IV:922: 4-5.

III. To Martin Luther

1. See WA 19:457:23-26; 472:2-5; 529:13-16. The writing against Carlstadt is **Wider die himmlischen Propheten, von den Bildern und Sakrament,** WA 18:37-214. See also Ronald Sider (ed.), **Karlstadt's Battle with Luther: Documents in a Liberal-Radical Debate,** Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1978.

2. For the letter of Luther to Herwagen, dated September 13, 1526, see WA 19:471-73. See also Köhler I:370ff.

3. Martin Bucer had published with Joh. Herwagen of Strassburg a four volume translation of Luther's **Kirchenpostille** in Latin in 1525-26. In Volume IV of the translation Bucer published a preface and a letter to the reader correcting some of Luther's views and especially contradicting Luther's exposition of 1 Cor. 10. Clearly Bucer identified himself with the Swiss. In 1527 the following appeared from the press of Herwagen: Martin Bucer, **M. Buceri in Quartum Tollmum Postillae Lutheranae, continens summam doctrinae Christi. Eiusdem, Epistola, explicans locum 1 Corinth. 10 . . . Epistola M. Lutheri ad Iohannem Heruagium superiora criminans. Responsio ad hanc M. Buceri . . . .** Strassburg: Johann Herwagen, 1527.

4. Apparently Zwingli did not see the Bucer comments until after the **Friendly Exegesis** was written. See Z IX: 71.

5. This is a reference to "cutting the Gordian knot," a proverbial term referring to a problem that is to be solved only by drastic action. According to one legend, Alexander, in 333 b.c., cut through the knot of Gordias rather than untie it.

6. Johannes Faber, Vicar-general of Constance, 1518-24, was at one time a friend of Zwingli. Later he was Zwingli's opponent in the First Disputation and a later opponent also of Luther and Hubmaier. He moved to Vienna in 1524,

becoming Bishop in 1530. ADB 14:435-441. The reference to Vulcan is to the destructive Roman god of fire.

7. For the expression crocodili lachrymae see Erasmus, **Adagia**, II.IV:60 (Op. omnia II, col. 543).

8. Cf. WA 19:471:24-26. The Pomeranian is Johannes Bugenhagen whose 1524 Latin exposition of the Psalms was translated into German by Bucer in 1526. Although Bugenhagen gave Bucer the permission to change as much as he saw fit, he likely did not mean for there to be substantial changes of content. When Bucer did in fact make changes to correspond with his and the Swiss views on the nature of the Eucharist, an uproar ensued in Wittenberg. See Köhler I:380-383.

9. Cf. WA 19:472:4-5.

10. In 1523 Luther wrote a treatise on the adoration of the sacrament against the Bohemian Brethren, whom he called the Waldensians: **Vom Anbeten des Sakraments des heiligen Leichnams Christi**, WA 11:431-456 (tr. LW 36:275-305).

11. Cf. Luther's assertion that no one had yet answered his attacks on Carlstadt. WA 19:457:23-26, 19:472:2ff.

12. See editorial introduction above, p. 235. See also WA 19:524-528.

13. Oecolampadius sifted through the opinions of the ancients in his September 1525 treatise on the Lord's Supper, **De genuina verborum domini, hoc est corpus meum, iuxta vetustissimos authores expositione liber.** See above, p. 231 n. 41.

14. Z V:580 n. 2 suggests that the 500 bishops to which Zwingli is alluding are the bishops of the Church before the 12th century who held, in Zwingli's mind, to a symbolic view approximating that of the Reformer. It was, then, only in the writings of Peter Lombard that the Real Presence was victorious.

15. Cf. Otto, 95.

16. The reference is to the **Swabian Syngramma.**

17. In the **Iliad**, Book 22, Achilles killed the deluded Hector, son of Priam.

18. The matter of the external and internal word appears only implicitly in the **Syngramma.** Zwingli had addressed himself to the issue in his response to Jakob Strauss. See especially Z V:531:24ff.

19. For citations of the phrase nodus in scirpo quaesitus see Otto, 312f. See also: Erasmus, **Adagia**, II. IV:76 (Op. omnia II, col. 546f.).

20. The quotation is not exact and may be a re-translation by Zwingli into Latin from the German translation.

21. This quotation, however, is taken verbatim from the **Syngramma**, C4vf.

22. Chrysippus, ca. 280-ca. 206 b.c., a Greek philosopher, was co-founder of Stoicism with Zeno and was its principal systematizer. See also Pauly III/2:2502ff.

23. Earlier attacks of the Lutheran view of ubiquity by Zwingli may be found in the following: Z IV:827:4ff., 904:27ff., Z V:508:3ff. For literature on the question of ubiquity in Luther, see Locher, p. 223 n. 292.

24. Synecdoche is "a figure of speech whereby a less comprehensive term is used to imply a more comprehensive one, or vice versa." OLD: 1896.

25. See Philip Melanchthon, "De gratia," **Loci Communes**, 1521. **Melanchthons Werke**, II/1. Edited by Hans Engelland. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann Verlag, 1952, pp. 85ff. (tr. Wilhelm Pauck, **Melanchthon and Bucer**, Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1959, pp. 86ff.

26. The four-lettered Hebrew word, technically called the tetragrammaton, is the Hebrew word for the God of Israel, JHVH, or Yahweh.

27. For a citation of the phrase cane peius et angui see Horace, **Epistulae**, I.17.30. OLD: 129.

28. This is a citation from the **Syngramma**. See above, note 21.

29. Zwingli is referring to Luther's 1525 treatise, **Wider die himmlischen Propheten**. See specifically WA 18:187:24-27.

30. By the "orator" Zwingli means Demosthenes (384-322 b.c.), the greatest of Greek orators. Fritz Blanke reports that a verbatim citation of this phrase in Demosthenes has not been found. Cf. Z V:590 n. 3.

31. For Luther's criticism of Oecolampadius, see WA 19:472:10-13.

32. Bucer advanced this argument in the preface to his translation of the four volumes of Luther's **Kirchenpostille**.

33. The Phoenix was a fabulous bird of antiquity, especially of Egypt, that, upon dying in its self-induced funeral pyre, produced a new Phoenix which rose from the ashes of the old.

34. Hippolytus, the son of Thesus, in Euripedes' tragedy **Hippolytus**, was killed when, betrayed by the unlawful passion of Phaedra, Poseidon sent a sea monster which frightened Hippolytus' horses, thereby dragging him to his death.

35. The letter of counsel by Zwingli to Bucer not to work on the Bugenhagen commentary on the Psalms or Luther's **Kirchenpostille** is not extant.

36. For the phrase lis litem serit see Erasmus, **Adagia**, II. X:41 (Op. omnia II, col. 693).

37. For the phrase a lasso rixa quaeritur see Seneca, **Dialogi**, 5. 9. 5. OLD: 1004.

38. Zwingli is referring to Luther's **The Sacrament of the Body and Blood -- Against the Fanatics.** WA 19:482-523 (tr. LW 36:335-361). Zwingli addresses himself to this later in the **Friendly Exegesis.** See pp. 287ff.

39. The tabernacle-house to which Zwingli refers was one form for preserving the sacrament in the Middle Ages, dating, in this instance, after the institution of the Corpus Christi festival in 1317. RGG^3 VI:598.

40. For Bullinger's description of the removal of the sacrament houses, see Bullinger I:367.

41. It is not likely that the parishes of Glarus and Zug would have their own individually produced missals, though it would not be unusual for the Bishopric of Constance to have such. The practice of infant communion, forbidden in 1215 by Lateran IV, did not apparently die out then. Cf. Z V:601 n. 4.

42. Oecolampadius made a similar point in his **De genuina verborum domini.** See Köhler I:119-120.

43. For a brief further description and for further references on this and similar liturgies, see Köhler I:477 n. 4. Köhler cites B. Fleischlin, **Beiträge zur schweizerischen Kirchengeschichte,** III (1903): 202f. as having proved that Zwingli was in error about the conclusion of this service.

44. Zwingli is referring to documents or diplomas which, since they refer to other business, would not be expected to mention the Mass. The argument is therefore curious, if not fallacious. Cf. Z V:603 n. 1.

45. See Wander III:1297, Nr. 397.

46. This is a citation from the Apostle's Creed.

47. For the expression in portu navigare see Otto, 285.

48. See above, note I:2.

49. See **Responsio ad epistolam Ioannis Bugenhagii,** Z IV:561:4ff. and **Ein klare Underrichtung vom Nachtmahl Christi,** Z IV:810:9ff. (tr. LCC 199ff.).

50. For the expression extra oleas see Erasmus, **Adagia**, II. II:10 (Op. omnia II, col. 451).

51. Zwingli earlier treated the matter of John 6:63 and made reference to the Fathers Cyril, Augustine and Chrysostom as well as his contemporary Erasmus in Z IV:561-562.

52. Zwingli is citing Melanchthon's **Annotationes in Evangelium Johannis** of 1523. See **Corpus Reformatorum** 14:1104:9-12.

53. Homer, **Iliad**, V:330ff.

54. There are several places to cite in Luther's 1526 treatise, **The Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ--Against the Fanatics.** Cf. WA 19:504: 20-27; 507:27-28; 508:22-24 (tr. LW 36:335-361).

55. Zwingli may be referring to the following sentence from Luther's **The Babylonian Captivity of the Church:** "In the first place, the sixth chapter of John must be entirely excluded from this discussion, since it does not refer to the sacrament in a single syllable." WA 6:502:7-8 (tr. LW 36:19).

56. For the common expression ex arena funem texere see Otto, 160.

57. See page 266 above and WA 19:472:31-32.

58. See above, note III:47.

59. The source of this phrase is **Iliad** II:490.

60. Augustine deals with the question of the body and the sacrament in his letter to Bishop Boniface in MPL 33:363-64.

61. For the expression suspendio arborem quaerere see hängen in Wander II:350, Nr. 28.

62. See below, pp. 287ff.

63. Helvidius was a fourth century theologian who denied the perpetual virginity of Mary and was consequently attacked in writing by Jerome and Augustine. Zwingli called him "ein irriger kempffer" in his sermon on Mary. Cf. Z I:402:6ff.

64. For Patristic references to the use of alloiosis see G. W. Lampe, **A Patristic Greek Lexicon**, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961, pp. 76-77.

65. For the concept apostrophè see Quintilianus IV. 1. 63ff.; IX. 2. 38; IX. 3. 24, 26.

66. For the concept metaphorice see Quintilianus VIII. 6. 4ff., IX. 1. 5.

67. The distinctive contribution of Karlstadt in the eucharistic debate alluded to here was his assertion that when the word "This (touto)" in "This is my body" was uttered by Jesus, he was pointing not to the bread, but to his body. Cf. E. G. Rupp, "Karlstadt's Eucharistic Rebellion," **Patterns of Reformation**, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969, pp. 141-148.

68. Luther stresses the community or gathering ofthe body of Christ in **Wider die himmlischen Propheten.** See WA 18:168:14-24.

69. Marcion was a second century theologian, adjudged by the Church to be a heretic primarily because of his Christological views and his belief that the God of the Old Testament was not truly the Father of Christ. Cf. RGG[3] IV: 740-742.

70. The utterance "Blę" occurs in a play by Johann Reuchlin that was published in 1507: **Ioannis Reuchlin Phorcensis Sergius uel Capitis caput cum commentario Georgii Symler.**

71. Zwingli is referring to **Wider die himmlischen Propheten,** WA 18: 62-125.

72. This expression has not been located in either the contemporary or classical literature.

73. The expression in herba perdere possibly finds its best English equivalent as "to nip in the bud". The exact Latin form has not been located elsewhere, though the phrase in herbis is found in Erasmus, **Adagia,** IV. IX:99 (Op. omnia II, col. 1164).

IV. Luther Against Carlstadt and the Fanatics

1. See above, note III:32.

2. The andabatae were gladiators who fought blindfolded. Cicero, **Epistulae ad Familiares,** 7. 10. 2. OLD: 128.

3. In August 1524, at the end of a confrontation with Carlstadt, Luther is reputed to have tossed a gold coin to Carlstadt, inviting him to write against him publicly and not merely to attack him in private. Cf. WA 15:339f.

4. The antesignani were originally troops in the front line of a legion. It later came to refer to protagonists or the leaders in a battle. Cf. Caesar, **de Bello civili,** 1. 43. 3.

5. The securis tenedia referred to the axe of King Tenes of Tenedos and became a proverbial symbol of decisive action. OLD: 1918.

6. In his treatise against Carlstadt Luther called 1 Cor. 10 a thunder axe (donneraxt) which would cut Carlstadt's head. Cf. WA 18:166:29-34. Zwingli graecized the original Latin term.

7. Blanke suggests that Zwingli is accusing Luther of escalating the warfare of words. No longer content with his "thunder axe" he is turning to measures worthy of Jupiter. Z V:635 n. 3.

8. Earlier treatments by Zwingli of the Anabaptists include the following: **Von der Taufe, von der Wiedertaufe und von der Taufe** (May 1525) Z IV:

206-337 and **Antwort über Balthasar Hubmaiers Taufbüchlein** (November 1525) Z IV:585-641.

9. Cf. WA 18:168:25-169:4.

10. Zwingli is referring to his **Responsio ad epistolam Ioannis Bugenhagii** (1525) Z IV:558-576. See also **Letter to Matthew Alber**, Z III:335-354, above, pp. 131-144.

11. **Commentary on True and False Religion.** Z III:628-912 (tr. J III: 43-343). **Subsidiary Essay on the Eucharist**, above, pp. 191-227, **Ad Theobaldi Billicani et Urbani Rhegii epistolas responsio 1526**, Z IV: 893-941. The letter to the Pomeranian is cited in the previous note.

12. Mettius Fufetius, a general of Alba, was torn apart by two wagons by Tullus Hostilius for disloyalty. Cf. OLD: 1106.

13. Zwingli made a similar point in his **Commentary**, Z III:758ff. (tr. J III:180ff.).

14. See above, note IV:6.

V. From Luther's Book on the Adoration of the Sacrament

1. An English translation of the treatise by Luther is LW 36:275-305. As Zwingli cites the writing by Luther, the WA reference will be given in the text. It should be observed that Zwingli is translating, and sometimes only paraphrasing. Paraphrases will be noted as such by giving the reference in the notes rather than in the text.

2. This reference in Augustine has not been located. Cf. also Z V:647 n.3.

3. Apelles was a famous painter of the fourth century b.c. Praxiteles was an Athenian sculptor, also fourth century.

4. For the expression in aquam scribere see Otto, 31.

5. The treatise by Luther which Zwingli is considering is addressed to the Bohemian Brethren. See the introduction to the English translation, LW 36: 271-274.

6. Cf. WA 11:435:10-31.

7. Niobe was the daughter of Tantalus, whose many children were killed by Apollo and Artemis because she boasted she was Leto's equal; she turned to stone with weeping. OLD: 1179.

8. Cf. WA 11:444:1-10.

9. The doctrine of concomitance is that Christ's body and blood are present in each of the consecrated species in the Eucharist. Also, due to the hypostatic union of the divinity and humanity of Christ, both are equally present in the eucharistic elements after their consecration. Cf. TRE 1:94:38ff. Also: Pelikan 3:193-94. The treatise of Luther against Henry VIII is **Contra Henricum regem Angliae** 1522, WA 10/2:180-222. Strictly speaking, Zwingli is not correct here, for Luther did not deal with the question of concomitance, though he did address the related question of transubstantiation.

10. Zwingli refers to Luther's **The Sacrament of the Body and Blood--Against the Fanatics**, WA 19:482-523 (tr. LW 36:335-361).

11. The heresiarch Arius (c. 250-c. 336) maintained a strict subordinationist position concerning Christ. He did not, however, maintain that Christ was only human. Cf. Pelikan 1:193-200.

12. Zwingli is referring, more sarcastically than sincerely, to the following statement in Luther, **The Sacrament--Against the Fanatics**: "Heaven and earth are his sack; as wheat fills the sack, so he fills all things." LW 36:343 (WA 19: 493:9-10).

13. Postliminium is the recovery or restoration of civic rights that had been held in suspension during exile, capture or other such crises. It is then a technical term for the return to the status quo. Cf. Apuleius, **Metamorphoses**, 3. 25.

14. In Augustine's tractates on John is an assertion of the localization of Christ which was important for Zwingli: "For the body of the Lord, in which He rose again from the dead, can be only in one place, but the truth is everywhere diffused." NPNF VII:186 (MPL 35:1632).

15. The two quotations on either side of the reference to Augustine are arguments of Zwingli which he is putting forth for purposes of establishing his point of view. They are not actual quotations.

16. The question of the worship of the humanity of Christ as over against the divinity was addressed by several scholastic theologians. See, for example, Thomas Aquinas: "The adoration of latria is not given to Christ's humanity in respect of itself; but in respect of the Godhead to which it is united, by reason of which Christ is not less than the Father." **Summa Theologica**, III. xxv. 2 (tr. Blackfriars 15:346).

17. Concomitance is asserted by Thomas in **Summa Theologica**, III. lxxvi. 1, 2 (tr. Blackfriars 17:285-290).

VI. What Luther Wrote in the Sermon Against the Fanatics.

1. Martin Luther, **The Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ--Against the Fanatics.** WA 19:482-523 (tr. LW 36:335-361). See also Köhler I:383ff.

2. The numerals, which were given in the Froschower text in the margin, will be given here with the paragraphs.

3. The reference is to plans that existed in antiquity to build a canal across the Isthmus of Corinth. Cf. OLD: 972.

4. See above, note III:56.

5. Cf. WA 19:484:1-5.

6. The quotation is based on WA 19:484:26-30.

7. Zwingli is complaining that Luther has failed to take seriously what he and Oecolampadius have written on the matter of the presence of Christ in the Eucharist. He made a similar complaint in the letter of 23 April 1527 to the mayor and Council of Ulm. Z IX:97:5-8.

8. Zwingli is likely referring to the ninth century controversy between Radbertus and Ratramnus over the question of the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist. The controversy emerged again in the eleventh century around Berengar of Tours. Cf. Pelikan 3:74-80, 186-202, 234-35.

9. Cf. WA 19:484:30-485:6.

10. Cf. Otto, 357.

11. For the question of the eucharistic thinking of Bucer and Capito to 1527, see Köhler I:210ff., 215f., 221ff., 290ff., 358, 364, 372ff.

12. WA 19:486:14-15.

13. WA 19:486:17-22.

14. WA 19:487:14-21.

15. WA 19:488:9-12.

16. Zwingli is referring to the one-eyed Cyclops, Polyphemus, in Odyssee IX.

17. Zwingli is referring to the Catholic opponents Johann Eck and Johann Faber.

18. WA 19:489:26-490:1.

19. The late medieval nominalists, that is, the representatives of the via moderna, characteristically spoke of God in terms of his "absolute power" and his "ordained power". This latter potentia was the way God had chosen to relate to the reality outside himself. For a discussion of these concepts, see Heiko Oberman, **The Harvest of Medieval Theology**, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963, pp. 30-56.

20. See above, note V:14.

21. The biblical texts cited here are those which Arius could use to support his subordinationist position.

22. Zwingli is referring to "Quicunque vult", the so-called Athanasian Creed. Written about 500, it was falsely attributed to Athanasius. The ideas which Zwingli is citing are not in the authentic Athanasius.

23. Sabellius, about whom little is known, was a third century theologian who lent his name to the modalistic form of monarchianism or "patripassianism". Marcion's Christology was docetic. Thus Zwingli is citing ancient heretics who depreciated the humanity of Christ.

24. The Roman God of Fire, Vulcan, sent his mother, Hera, a golden chair with hidden chains that caught her when she sat down. Cited in Z V:677 n. 6.

25. For the expression lupum auribus tenere see Otto, 199.

VII. On the Alloiosis of the Two Natures in Christ.

1. For later treatment of alloiosis by Zwingli, see **Dass diese Worte: "Das ist mein Leib" usw.** Z V:922f. and **Uiber doctor Martin Luthers buoch, bekenntnus genant**, Z VI/2:126ff.

2. Köhler cites Plutarch, **Moralia. De placitis philosophorum** I. 17. Köhler I: 479 n. 1.

3. In fact, the communicatio idomatum or "communication of properties," to which Zwingli is referring here by various synonyms in his discussion of alloiosis has ancient roots, as for example Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444). See Pelikan 1:249-51, 270-74. On the usage of the terms in the Reformation see R. S. Franks, **The Work of Christ**, New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1962, pp. 358-359. See also the extensive note by Blanke, Z V:679 n. 3.

4. The image of the blade heated by fire is cited elsewhere in Zwingli in Z IV:115ff. The image of metal and fire is of ancient vintage and was not an uncommon illustration among the Fathers. See, for example, Origen, "On the Incarnation of Christ," **De Principiis**, II. 6. 6 (tr. ANF IV:283). Also: Theodoret

in his dialogue "Eranistes II" (NPNF/2 III:197) and Letter 145 to the monks of Constantinople (NPNF/2 III:316).

Luther utilized the ancient image of the red hot iron to illustrate an understanding of the presence of Christ in the Eucharist. See WA 6:510:5ff. (LW 36:32).

6. Although not verbatim, and containing a slight misquotation ("in deum" for "in deo"), Zwingli is quoting from the "Quicunque vult". Cf. J. N. D. Kelly, **The Athanasian Creed**, New York: Harper & Row, 1964, p. 20.

7. Zwingli is making a pun which is lost in the translation. If the Elect are everywhere Christ is, then Christopher would be longer, taller than even the colossus of Rhodes. Surely that would frighten the Lutherans, or the Christ-eaters. The pun: why aren't the Christobori (the Lutherans) frightened by such a Christophoro?

8. Melito of Sardis, an apologist of the second century, was reported by Eusebius to have written a book "on the corporeality of God" which is now lost. Cf. Eusebius, **Church History**, IV. 26. See especially NPNF/2 I:204 n. 20.

9. The phrase loqui, quidquid in buccam venerit is a common expression in various authors and languages. See Otto, 59.

10. The cruelty of Saturn lay in his devouring his own children.

11. Cf. WA 19:491:22-29.

12. See above, note V:14.

13. Zwingli is referring to the letter of Bugenhagen which he answers in his **Responsio**, Z IV:558-576. Although the phrase modo quodam ineffabili does not occur as such, it is not necessary to ascribe the reference to Erasmus rather than Bugenhagen as does Köhler I: 480 n. 4. Blanke notes that Zwingli later puts the words in Luther's mouth in Z V:703:10. The idea is there, whether or not the words are exactly written. Cf. Z V:699 n. 2.

VIII. On Absurdities of Scripture

1. There are numerous places where Luther asserts a similar conclusion. E.g.: WA 11:450:7-16, 18:206:20-23; 19:123:26-31, etc.

2. Cf. WA 6:508:7-29 and WA 11:441:18ff.

3. Cf. WA 18:206:20f. and WA 19:499:32-33.

4. For synecdoche, see above, note III:24. Metonymy is "the replacement of the name of a thing by the name of its attribute." OLD: 1106.

5. Cf. WA 6:510:4-13.

6. Cf. above, note VIII:1.

7. Cf. WA 19:491:17-20.

8. Cf. WA 19:492:19-493:10.

9. WA 19:489:24-27 and 491:26-29.

10. Cf. WA 19:507:25-33.

11. Ibid.

12. Cf. WA 19:504:20-505:11.

13. WA 19:493:16-27.

14. For treatments by Luther of Matthew 16:18, see WA 2:183ff., 628.

15. Cf. WA 19:498:17-19, 28-29.

16. When the fox saw that the grapes were too high, i.e. beyond his reach, he said: "They are sour." Cf. Wander I:1242.

17. See above, note III:37.

18. See also Bullinger I:8: "Under anderen sinen Uebungen schreyb er die Epistlen Pauli graece ab, und lernt sy ussen." Zwingli also here identifies the beginning of the Lutheran Reformation with 1519, i.e. the Leipzig Disputation.

19. Zwingli questioned whether Luther kept too much of a Roman practice in affirming the value of confession. See Zwingli's exposition of the 18th article, Z II:148:6ff.

20. See the conclusion to this treatise, below, p. 369.

21. Z II:14:457. See Volume I of this set edited by Edward J. Furcha.

22. For a brief consideration of the appropriateness of this charge, see Blanke's comments in Z V:716 n. 5.

23. For Thomas Wyttenbach, see note above, p. 370 n. 4.

24. This letter has not been identified. Blanke suggests it may have existed only in rumor. Z V:721 n. 1.

25. Included among the writings of Luther to which Zwingli is referring are **Antwortschreiben an die Christen zu Reutlingen**, WA 19:114-125 and **Schreiben an Johann Herwagen**, WA 19:462-473. He may well have other published writings of Luther in mind as well.

26. Zwingli likely refers to Erasmus, the circle around him, and his own humanist friends at the time of his contact in 1516. Cf. Z II:217:8ff.

27. See above, note III:5.

28. Zwingli in the following makes several allusions to the labors of Hercules even as he applies the image to Luther himself.

29. Zwingli is referring here to certain specific practices in the celebration of the Eucharist at Zurich. Cf. Z IV:13-24.

30. Cf. WA 19:504:20-26.

31. Cf. WA 19:509:16.

32. Cf. WA 19:509:27.

33. Cf. WA 15:391-397.

34. Cf. WA 19:118-125.

PART TWO

1. Delos is an Aegean Island which was the mythical birthplace of Apollo and Artemis. Cf. OLD: 510.

2. Zwingli is referring to his writing on the Eucharist against Strauss, Z V:464-547.

3. The lapis Lydius is the touchstone found in the Lydia by the river Tmolus. OLD: 1055. Scripture as the "touchstone" is a common expression in Luther. Cf. WA 33:276:6 and WA 46:780:15.

4. Zwingli earlier addressed himself to metonymy in the following places: Z IV:474:17, Z V:476:19 and 477:15.

5. 735:28: denominatio.

6. 736:2: cognominatio.

7. Cocles was the cognomen of Horatius. OLD:341. Cloelia was a hostage who escaped from Porsenna by swimming the Tiber to Rome. OLD: 338.

8. 736:9: transnominatio.

9. Catachresis is "the improper use of a word." OLD: 284.

10. See Z IV:913:20ff.

11. For these charges in Luther, see WA 19:120:28ff. and WA 19:458:7ff.

12. Cf. WA 9:79:20ff.

13. Cornelisz Hoen, or Honius, (d. 1524) was called by Williams an "early sacramentist". He was the author of an important tract in which he interpreted the words of institution symbolically. It was published by Zwingli in 1525, Z IV:512-519. See above, p. 130 n. 2. See also: G. H. Williams, **The Radical Reformation**, Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1962, pp. 35-37, 87-89. Also: Köhler I:61ff.

14. John Rhodius (Hinne Rode) was rector of the school of the Brethren of the Common Life in Utrecht. See G. H. Williams, **Radical Reformation**, pp. 35-37, 86-89. George Saganus was a friend of Hoen and Rode. Cf. Williams, p. 86.

15. M. Fabius Quintilianus, born ca. 35 a.d., was a famous Roman educator and rhetorician. As such he provided one of the most valuable sources of ancient rhetoric, language and educational theory in his **Institutio oratoria**. See Pauly VI:1845ff. Zwingli and many other humanist scholars quoted from him extensively. See the discussion on tropes in Quintilianus, 8.6; 9.1.

16. For discussion of tropes in Cicero, see Orator, 24.

17. The **De vita et poesi Homeri**, falsely attributed to Plutarch, addresses tropes in Chapter 15. Cited in Z V:739 n. 3.

18. The Tertullian text which Oecolampadius utilized is taken from the **Against Marcion** I:xiv (MPL 2/2:287; tr. ANF III:281).

19. Jerome's **Commentary on Matthew**, MPL 26:202f.

20. WA 19:459:7-12.

21. Cf. MPL 35:1802.

22. MPL 17:256.

23. Blanke, Z V:748 n. 1, suggests that Zwingli is referring to his **Freundlich Verglimpfung über die Predigt Luthers wider die Schwärmer**, Z V: 771-794.

X. Epilogues

1. Henry Utinger (d. 1536) was an early friend and supporter of Zwingli in Zurich. Cf. Z II:763 n. 4.

2. Theseus, legendary Attic hero, was the slayer of the Minotaur and the husband of Phaedra. The expression "faithful Theseus" was used by P. Paninus Statius, **Siluae** 4.4.104.

3. Cf. WA 2:742-758 (tr. LW 35:49-74).

4. This well-known phrase comes from Jerome, Epistle 57:12: "To err is human and to confess one's error wise." MPL 22:578 (tr. NPNF/2 VI:118).

5. Otto, 165, quotes Terence as follows: "Homo sum: humani nil a me alienum puto."

6. The Lapithae were a Thessalian tribe, famous for their vicious fight with the centaurs. OLD: 1002.

7. Various references exist to "passing on the torch" as a figurative allusion to the Greek torch-race. OLD: 998.

8. This proverb is quoted by Jerome in Letter 102 in which he warns Augustine not to provoke him lest, as old as he is, he prove to be a dangerous opponent. MPL 22:831 (tr. NPNF I:325).

9. The reference is to the winged goddess Victory.

10. An exact proverb corresponding to this phrase has not been found. A similar expression, "Flet victus, victor interiit," is found in Erasmus, **Adagia**, II.VI.24 (Op. Omnia II, col. 591.).

11. Zwingli addressed the question of images in the **Short Christian Instruction**. See above, pp. 68-71.

12. The reference is to John Faber, Zwingli's opponent at the First Disputation. See above, note III:6.

13. Morychus represents in antiquity a figure of Dionysius. Cf. Z V:757 n. 2.

14. Pharlaris, a tyrant, gained notoriety for his roasting his victims in a bronze bull. OLD: 1372.

INDEX OF BIBLICAL CITATIONS

OLD TESTAMENT

Genesis

2:9f 51
2:17 50
2:24 9
3:4-6 52
3:15 135
6:3 51
6:5 51
7:1-9 197
8:1 241
8:21 . . . . . 38, 51
14:19 296
17:1 223
17:7, 8 223
17:10 . . . . . 223, 362
17:11 223
18:9-12 211
19:26 266
32:24 83
32:28 83
41:26 . . . . . 138, 213, 361
41:26f 356
42:19 356
47:7 296

Exodus

1:1-7 124
3:1-13 95
3:7f 83
3:11 95
5:1ff 82
11:26 212
11:27 212
12:11 . . . . . 189, 198, 210, 211, 213
12:26 360

Exodus – cont.

12:27 . . . . . 353, 356
12:29ff 359
14:14 104
14:15-31 218
15:23 316
18:21f 14
18:21-26 65
18:25-27 16
20:3 68
20:3ff 98
20:4 68
20:12 336
20:13-16 14
20:15 . . . . . 9, 12, 63, 66
20:17 . . . . . 9, 12, 53
20:23 68
20:25 18
22:1-12 15
22:11 15
22:25 . . . . . 16, 34
23:4f 16
34:12-17 68

Leviticus

19:4 68
19:13 26
19:18 . . . . . 18, 53, 369
20:7 7
20:10 15
25:36 16
26:1 68

Numbers
11:4-5. 210
16 175
22:24 137
25:4f. 68

Deuteronomy
4 70
4:2 27
4:3 68
4:23-28. 68
4:40 . . . . . .12, 18
5:6 68
5:7 68
5:7-9 68
5:8 68
6:13 . . . . . 224, 305
7:5 68
7:25f. 68
8:3 110
11:16f. 68
12:32 27
13 . . . . . .67, 121
13:1 175
13:1-5. 119
13:5 121
13:6-18. 68
17:5 15
19:19 17
25:4 163
26:3 347
26:10 347
27:15 68

Joshua
24:23 68

Judges
9:19 348
10:6-16. 68

I Samuel
2:22ff 28
4:3 246
4:10 246
7 68

I Samuel - cont.
14:1f. 273
15:1-30 97
15:33. 97
16:7 13
18:24 346

II Samuel
6:6-7. 350
11:4 98
12:9f. 98
18:33. 87

I Kings
6 70
8:39 . . . . . 262, 285
12 99
12:28-30 137
13 99
13:4 82
18:21 99
18:40. . . . . 121, 124
19:10 100
21:1ff 100
21:19, 23. 100
22:1-54 100

II Kings
6:6 316
6:18 218
10:15-28 124
10:15-30 68
10:29. 137
13:21. 218
18:4 68
18:33-35 68
23:4-15 124
23:4-23 68
23:24 124

II Chronicles
11:15 137
31:1-7. 68

Psalms
12:6 6
14:1 51
15:1ff 6
15:1-3 54
19:9 19
24:1 33
49:13 52
51:7 7
68:19 341
96:5 68
107:20 83
111:4 55
111:9 83
115:4-8 68
139:7 121
139:14 136
147:9 35

Ecclesiastes
10:16 24

Isaiah
1:17 28
1:22 25
1:23 101
3:4 24
5:20 83
7:9 . . . . . 251, 309, 315
33:14-17 6
36:6 123
40:12 351
42:1 9
42:17 68
44:9-20 68
53:2-3 56
53:4 55
53:7 9
54:13 133
55:10f 20
58:1 95

Jeremiah
1:7 95
1:9ff 93, 138
1:18 274
1:18f 102

Jeremiah
5:4f 101
10:2-16 68
13:10 : 68
14:13-15 120
14:15 92
15:20 . . . . . 102, 274
23:1 120
23:23f 254
25 102
29 102
31:31 200

Ezekiel
3:18 93
5:5-17 19
6 68
8:8-18 116
14 68
34:1-10 120
34:2-10 101
34:10 121

Daniel
1 15
3 69

Amos
1:1 67

Jonah
1:2 101
3:4 101

Micah
1:5-7 68
3 28
3:2 83
6:8 21
7 28

Habakkuk
2:4 63
2:18f 68

Malachi
3:1 176
4:2 241

Tobit
4:16 53

INDEX OF BIBLICAL CITATIONS

NEW TESTAMENT

Matthew

1:20 . . . . . 217, 278
1:21 56
1:21ff 29
2:27 284
3:2 . . . . . 90, 97
3:7-12 175
3:8 363
3:10 . . . . . 50, 101
3:15 341
3:17 176
4:4 110
4:7 50
4:10 305
4:17 90
5:7 67
5:8 7
5:15 . . . . . 96, 239
5:17 20
5:19 . . . . . 10, 91, 115
5:21-24 15
5:22 9
5:28 9
5:29 121
5:34 . . . . . 5, 11
5:34-36 5
5:37 9
5:40 . . . . . 5, 9
5:44 9
5:45 9
5:48 . . . . . 7, 37
6:5 . . . . . 13, 284
6:12 343
6:14 8
6:22 165
6:26 9
6:33 . . . . . 19, 37
6:34 89
7:12 53
7:15 . . . . . 82, 108
7:16 . . . . . 13, 58, 112
7:17-20 . . . . . 112, 114
7:19 121
7:20 58
7:27 22
7:29 10
8:18 122
8:23-27 122
8:26 260
9:2 . . . . . 253, 260
9:7 266
9:22 301
9:36 93
10 19
10:5-16 156
10:6ff 169
10:6-42 168
10:7 . . . . . 90, 103
10:7-25 102
10:10 . . . . . 103, 116
10:14f 103
10:16 . . . . . 177, 202
10:16-18 103
10:17 32
10:19 89
10:26, 28 104
10:27f 94
10:28 32
10:34 180
10:37 . . . . . 87, 114
10:39f 88

Matthew - cont.
11 169
11:5 253
11:25 . . . . . 168, 348
11:28 . . . . . 57, 61
12:20 244
12:35 315
12:36ff 10, 17
12:45 150
12:48 336
12:49 9
13 208
13:3 209
13:29 114
13:30 121
13:38 . . . . . 202, 208
13:39 . . . . . 202, 209
13:47f 208
14:25-32 217
15:9 65
16:16 . . . . . 301, 340
16:18 . . . . . 82, 110, 122, 276, 306, 309, 342
16:19 . . . . . 351, 355
16:21 95
16:23 95
16:24f 88
16:25 89
17:5 176
17:24ff 29
18:17 67
18:19 49
19:5ff 9
19:8 38
19:9 116
19:16f 335
19:17 . . . . . 239, 369
19:24 33
19:26 55
19:29 . . . . . 107, 304
20:1f 299
20:20-28 122
20:25-27 . . . . . 116, 151
20:28 . . . . . 300, 304
21:12f 95
21:33ff 320, 353
21:37ff 351
21:42 352
22:11-13 6
22:21 . . . . . 22, 66

Matthew - cont.
22:30 53
22:37-39 11
22:37 . . . . . 62, 369
22:39 . . . . . 10, 14, 62
22:40 . . . . . 11, 293, 369
23:1-33 . . . . . 95, 97
23:8 10
23:14 257
23:23 227
24:13 123
24:24 119
24:26 . . . . . 284, 334, 355
24:27 . . . . . 335, 339, 355
24:30 334
24:35 9
24:36 . . . . . 314. 318, 335, 336
24:42 172
25:1ff 352
25:14 208
25:14-30 177
25:14ff 262
25:26-30 193
25:27 208
25:41-45 21
26:2 210
26:6ff 305
26:26-29 73
26:26 . . . . . 139, 257, 263, 265, 266, 274, 275, 276, 277, 286, 305, 308, 316, 317, 342, 353, 361, 362
26:27-28 . . . . . 199, 200
26:29 . . . . . 199, 360
26:30ff 250
26:39 323
26:64 . . . . . 314, 324, 331, 334, 339
27:29ff 56
27:46 314
27:51 197
27:51-53 212
28:6 . . . . . 251, 333, 338
28:19f 157, 177
28:20 . . . . . 11, 331
28:26 317

Mark

1:2 176
1:15 50
2:27 284
3:17 303
4:21 96
4:22 116
4:35-41 122
6:7-13 102
6:8 . . . . . 28, 102
6:15 361
6:17-28 101
6:18 101
8:31f 138
9:2ff 260
10:18 6
10:25 33
10:28-30 107
10:35-45 122
11:15-18 95
12:31 18
13:9 32
13:32 . . . . . 318, 335
14:22-25 73
14:24 199
14:25 360
15:38 . . . . . 197, 212
16:15 . . . . . 90, 157, 177
16:16 . . . . . 57, 157
16:17 253
16:18 122
16:19 . . . . . 331, 355

Luke

1:26-37 217
1:31 315
1:34 217
1:35 . . . . . 217, 311, 315
1:37 211
2 312
2:10f 56
2:34f 87
2:48f 87
3:9 101
3:22 359
4:30 217
6:13 156
6:29 9
6:31 53

Luke – cont.

6:35 . . . . . 34, 35
6:44 6
6:45 6
6:48 59
6:49 59
8 . . . . . 19, 208
8:11 . . . . . 138, 208, 209
8:22-25 122
9:1-11 102
9:22 138
9:23 88
9:24 89
9:26 19
10:2-16 102
10:7 163
10:19 122
10:21 348
10:38ff 305
10:41 301
10:42 301
11:13 49
11:33 96
11:46 . . . . . 8, 123
12:3 20
12:4 . . . . . 25, 32
12:14 29
12:24-27 35
12:33 . . . . . 16, 20
12:42ff 92
12:47 239
14:21 6
14:26 88
15:21 57
15:31 325
16:8 169
16:9 33
16:15 65
16:16f 62
16:16 21
16:17 137
16:20ff 352
16:31 . . . . . 263, 354
17:10 57
17:16 55
18 162
18:1 284
18:10-14 59
18:25 33
19:12 329

Luke – cont.
19:12ff 353
19:12-28 177
19:18 244
19:22-26 193
19:45f 95
21:12 32
22:14 359
22:15 . . . . . 143, 200, 210, 359, 361
22:16 . . . . . 360, 361
22:17 . . . . . 198, 360
22:18 . . . . . 198, 360
22:19 . . . . . 73, 137, 139, 307, 359 361, 363
22:20 . . . . . 73, 139, 199, 213, 361 362
22:25 96
22:26 . . . . . 23, 116
22:30 257
22:31f 58
22:35 89
23:45 . . . . . 197, 212
24 333
24:45-47 157
24:47 90
24:49 90
24:51 . . . . . 331, 334, 355

John
1:1 . . . . . 259, 321
1:1-3 137
1:3 320
1:12 132
1:13 57
1:14 . . . . . 321, 353
1:18 325
1:29 . . . . . 57, 218
1:32-34 176
1:33 176
2:1-11 221
2:4 87
3:1-36 97
3:6 . . . . . 52, 133
3:13 . . . . . 321, 328
3:14 . . . . . 57, 309
3:19 118
3:27 176
3:28 177
3:34 181

John – cont.
3:36 340
4:10 257
4:14 . . . . . 281, 344, 351
4:21 284
4:24 112
5:17 322
5:19 322
5:24 . . . . . 57, 344
5:27 322
5:30 322
5:39 . . . . . 205, 354
6 . . . . . 129, 274, 340
6:22-65 218
6:27 135
6:29 135
6:33 135
6:35 . . . . . 132, 134
6:41 . . . . . 132, 142
6:41-44 133
6:42 133
6:44 . . . . . 3, 106, 251, 258, 309, 314, 340
6:45 . . . . . 64, 133
6:47 . . . . . 133, 220, 270, 281, 344
6:50 57
6:51 . . . . . 133, 138, 142, 344
6:52 . . . . . 133, 134, 219, 267
6:53 . . . . . 134, 135, 258
6:53ff 351
6:54 . . . . . 136, 197, 256, 269, 344
6:55 . . . . . 270, 320, 322
6:56 197
6:57 176
6:58 220
6:60 . . . . . 254, 267
6:61-63 . . . . . 135, 267
6:61 268
6:62 . . . . . 268, 327
6:63 . . . . . 135, 136, 142, 193, 197 205, 219, 244, 266, 268 269, 270, 273, 274, 300 320, 322, 328, 339, 354
6:64 269
6:66 135
6:68 270
7:16 322
8:1-59 97
8:3-11 122
8:12-58 176

John – cont.
8:12 218
8:16f 323
8:32 25
8:36 25
8:56 . . . . . 251, 300
10 172
10:1 . . . . . 61, 122
10:8 284
10:10 57
10:11 . . . . . 86, 95
10:12 94
10:18 323
10:29 318
10:30 323
10:38 . . . . . 263, 323, 338
12:3f 301
12:23 323
12:26 . . . . . 323, 333
12:27 323
12:32 . . . . . 57, 351
12:32ff 323
12:44 324
13:17 67
13:33 324
14:2 333
14:3 . . . . . 323, 333
14:6 . . . . . 6, 61, 135, 274, 325
14:7 325
14:8 244
14:9 325
14:16 325
14:24 325
15:25 326
14:26 326
14:28 314
15:1-5 202
15:1 138
15:5 . . . . . 201, 208, 218
15:13 10
15:18 103
15:20 103
15:31 325
16:7 . . . . . 266, 328, 354
16:13 137
16:15 328
16:26f 328
16:28 . . . . . 266, 354
16:33 104
16:44ff 326

John – cont.
17:3 329
17:9ff 330
17:11ff 331
17:11 354
17:18 177
18:8 95
18:9 326
20 333
20:21-23 157
20:21 . . . . . 176, 177, 178, 179
20:22 89
20:24ff 264
21:15-17 . . . . . 122, 172

Acts
1:2 108
1:3 260
1:4 90
1:9f 332
1:9ff 334, 355
1:11 339
1:15 353
1:15-26 177
1:26 178
2:1-13 108
2:41 107
2:46 361
2:47 304
4:19 . . . . . 25, 66
5:28 32
5:29 . . . . . 25, 32, 66, 97
6:1-6 177
6:5 168
7:49 . . . . . 332, 351
7:55f 332
7:56 260
8:14 . . . . . 177, 179
9:3-31 177
13:1 172
15 70
15:1-21 177
15:2ff 207
15:5 160
15:7-11 226
15:20 68
15:29 68
17:28 255
18:5f 103

Acts - cont.
20:28 167
20:34 164
21:8, 9 167
21:9 170
22:1-21 177
24:14 280
26:9-18 177

Romans
1:17 63
2:21-24 91
3:4 . . . . . 243, 313
3:8 57
3:12 51
3:20 53
3:23 51
5:1 136
5:2 92
5:5 304
5:6-11 8
5:12 51
6:1 57
6:1f 292
6:2 58
6:3-4 58
6:5 64
6:10 . . . . . 71, 200
6:12 60
7:7 . . . . . 12, 52
7:8-9 54
7:10 62
7:12 53
7:14-20 54
7:14 53
7:17 50
7:18 . . . . . 51, 52
7:21-25 54
8:2 64
8:9 64
8:10 59
8:17 108
8:18 55
8:26 60
8:28 59
8:31 60
8:32 . . . . . 58, 60, 284
8:38 105
9:22 255

Romans - cont.
10:14 . . . . . 106, 258
10:15 178
11:17 300
11:33-35 36
11:36 . . . . . 255, 321
12:1 . . . . . 72, 182
12:5 365
12:7f 181
13 66
13:1-7 23
13:3 26
13:4 23
13:5 29
13:6 30
13:7 . . . . . 33, 36, 67, 96
14:14 285
14:17 290
14:20 74
15:20 182

I Corinthians
1:2 110
1:12 243
1:17 177
1:24 55
1:27 81
1:30 . . . . . 60, 283
2:14 . . . . . 87, 215
3:7 344
3:13-15 160
4:15 92
5:5 349
5:7 210
5:10f 68
5:11 . . . . . 348, 349
7:9 26
7:12 35
7:20 27
8 291
8:1ff 369
8:4 . . . . . 342, 361
8:4f 68
8:7-13 239
8:13 219
9 170
9:1f 177
9:7-15 163
9:19-22 170

I Corinthians – cont.
10:4 299
10:7 222
10:13 122
10:14f. 293
10:14-16. 222
10:14-22. 140
10:16 . . . . . 140, 141, 222, 291, 294
10:17 . . . . . 141, 142, 223, 294, 295 337, 358, 364, 365
10:18 . . . . . 295, 358
10:19-21. 68
10:20f 293
10:21 . . . . . 222, 294
11:5. 171
11:22 165
11:23-26 73
11:24 . . . . . 73, 314, 363
11:24f 253
11:25 . . . . . 223, 362, 363
11:25-26. 74
11:26 . . . . . 74, 139, 307, 317, 347, 363
12 152
12:2. 68
12:6 21
12:28 181
12:29 . . . . . 174, 182
13. 70
13:4-8 105
14. 179
14:1 159
14:3 280
14:5 173
14:26-33 158
14:29-32 238
14:30-31 249
14:30-33 160
14:31 . . . . . 171, 181, 238
14:33. 180
14:34, 35 171
14:37. 172
15. 333
15:3 324
15:4 341
14:10. 178

II Corinthians
1:6 81
1:27 81
3:16 62
3:17 64
5:16 219
10:5 . . . . . 93, 341
11:29. 89
12:11. 178

Galatians
1:1 177
2:2 172
2:11ff 239
2:16 57
2:18 249
2:19 63
2:21 111
3:3 341
3:10 15
3:12 . . . . . 12, 18
3:13 339
3:27 243
3:28 351
4:4 176
4:5 10
4:7 108
4:9 283
4:24 361
5:1 68
5:14 . . . . . 18, 293
5:17 88
5:18 361
5:20 68
5:24 60
6:15 92

Ephesians
2:3 51
4:5 . . . . . 3, 264
4:10 . . . . . 302, 317
4:11 . . . . . 158, 161, 172, 181, 342
4:11-14 155
4:13 . . . . . 8, 19, 60
4:22 90
4:24 90

Ephesians – cont.
5:2 255
5:12 116
6 102
6:5-9 179
6:11 104

Philippians
1:6 . . . . . 84, 123
2:8 55
2:11 300
3:2 . . . . . 151, 178
3:9 342
3:16 164
3:17-19 152
3:19 153

Colossians
1:14 . . . . . 200, 225
1:22 72
2:3 284
2:11 224
2:18 153
3:1 303
4:17 183

I Thessalonians
1:9 68
5:12f 164, 178
5:21 249

II Thessalonians
2:11-12 286

I Timothy
1:9 63
1:9-11 12
2:1f 28
2:5 61
2:7 172
3:1-7 113
3:4 162
4:2 174
4:12ff 114
5:17 178

I Timothy – cont.
5:17f 164
6:2 179
6:4 257
6:12 179

II Timothy
2:7 131
2:14 257
3:16 92
4:2 161
4:5 161

Titus
1:5 . . . . . 167, 179
1:5-9 . . . . . 113, 161
1:7 113
1:16 91

Hebrews
1:3 56
4:15 56
5 176
5:12 298
6:4 57
6:18 50
6-10 71
7:14 351
8:6-13 225
8:8 200
9 56
9:4 246
9:12 . . . . . 200, 309
9:15 200
9:16 . . . . . 200, 225
9:19 309
9:22 225
10 56
10:1 210
10:13 205
10:22 251
11:1 . . . . . 214, 216
13:7 164
13:17 . . . . . 36, 66, 178

James
1:5 50
3:1 182
3:2 365
5:14 264

I Peter
1:12 56
1:19 309
2 . . . . . 10, 22, 24
2, 3 . . . . . 200, 225
2:5 182
2:9 . . . . . 118, 182, 348
2:13-15 66
2:13-18 179
2:16-17 66
2:22 56
2:25 172
3:21 224
4:1-3 90
4:3 68

II Peter
1:19 83

I John
1:1-3 137
1:8 63
2:1 330
2:1f 8, 61
2:27 64
4:1 244
4:15 106
4:16 . . . . . 18, 59, 106
4:19 58
5:21 . . . . . 68, 70

Revelation
13:1 358
22:16 241

INDEX OF NAMES AND PLACES

Aaron 175-176
Abimelech 348
Abraham 223-224, 243, 296, 300
Absalom 87
Adam 16, 50-52, 54-56, 57
Agabus 169
Agag 96f
Ahab 100, 124
Alber, Matthew 129, 144
Ambrose 363
Amos 67, 101
Ananias 169
Antioch 151, 160, 172f, 177, 207
Apelles 299
Apollos 169
Appenzell 81, 84, 110
Arius 260, 302, 314, 352, 357
Athanasias 318, 321
Augustine . . . 140f, 143, 270, 275, 298, 303, 344, 363, 369

Baal 99, 121, 124, 361
Balaam 137
Barnabas 169, 172, 177f, 207
Basel 49, 195, 262
Belial 25, 109
Bern 3, 191
Bethel 99
Bethlehem 29
Billicanus, Theobaldus 296, 356
Boniface 275
Brenz, Johann 248f
Bucer, Martin 244, 246f, 260, 262, 280
Bugenhagen, Johann (The Pomeranian) . . . 247, 262, 271 273, 296, 335

Canaan 223
Caesar 22, 25, 29, 66, 180, 249, 356
Caesarea 167
Carlstadt (Andreas Bodenstein) . . . 131, 137f, 142, 195-196, 242, 243, 248, 277, 280, 287, 289, 295, 298, 357, 265, 367
Cicero 357
Claus von Unterwalden 84
Corinth 103, 110, 151
Crete 151, 161f, 167, 179
Cyrene 172
Cyril 270

Dan 99, 137
Daniel 69
David 6, 19, 87, 99, 218, 254, 346
Domitian 25
Duns Scotus 142, 227

Eck, Johann 254, 313
Egypt 83, 123, 210, 212, 353
Eli 28
Elijah 99-100, 121, 124, 356, 361
Elisha 218
Elizabeth 211
Engelhardt, Heinrich 204, 206
Enoch 243
Ephesus 167f
Erasmus, Desiderius 216, 223
Ezekiel 18

Faber, Johann. 247, 254, 313, 369
Fabius 357

Gais 84
Gamaliel 169
Gerizim, Mt. 284
Glarus 264
Goliath 346

Haller, Berchtold 4
Helvidius 275
Henry VIII,
King of England 301, 312, 351
Hermann, Conrad 144
Hermas 81
Herod 101, 172
Hesychius 70
Hetzel, J. Hans Rudolph 5
Hoen of Holland 129, 357
Homer 203, 242, 357

Isaiah 6, 101, 268, 271
Ittingen 153

Jacob 83, 296-297
James 49, 156, 168, 264
Jehoshaphat 100
Jehu 124
Jeroboam 82, 99
Jerome 81, 168, 357
Jerubbaal 348
Jerusalem. . . . 67, 70, 90, 95f, 99, 151, 168, 174, 177, 207, 284
Jezebel 100
John, the Baptist . . 50, 57, 62f, 90, 97, 101, 117, 175-177, 243
Jonah 101
Joseph (OT). 138, 296
Joseph (NT). 87, 133
Josiah 99, 124
Jud, Leo 131, 206, 248
Judah 99, 351
Judas 140, 177, 250
Juno 119
Jupiter. 119

Korah 175

Lazarus 352
Levi 175
Lindach 4
Lucerne 264
Lucius 172
Luke. 169, 139f, 171, 361-363
Luther, Martin. . 238f, 241-244, 245, 248, 250, 253f, 260f, 266, 269, 270f, 274, 279-280, 283, 285, 287, 291, 294, 298, 303-304, 306, 309, 310, 315, 317-319, 321-322, 324, 328, 331-332, 334-335, 337-340, 342-344, 347, 351, 356, 361, 362, 364, 366-369

Malachi 176
Manaen 172
Marcion 277-278, 318
Mars. 119
Martha. 301, 305
Mary, virgin 7, 56, 87, 109, 112, 211, 278
Mary Magdalene. 301
Matthias. 178f
May, Bartholomew. 191f
Megander (Caspar Grossmann) 206
Melanchthon, Philipp. . . . 254, 270-271
Melchizedek 296
Melito 325
Meyer, Sebastian. 4, 166
Micaiah 100
Moses 38, 82, 95, 104, 122, 124, 132, 175f, 243, 263, 305, 321
Myconius, Oswald. 206

Naboth 100
Nathan 98
Nero 25
Nicholaus of Wattenwyl 3
Nicodemus 169
Nicholas, St. 69
Nineveh 102
Noah 197, 243

Oecolampadius, Johannes 226, 238, 249, 259, 357-358
Origen 143, 198

Paul 12, 18, 23f, 26, 27-29, 30, 35, 36, 52f, 57f, 58-61, 63, 66, 73-74, 81, 89, 91f, 92, 103, 105, 113f, 139-142, 151, 153f, 155f, 157, 158, 159-165, 167-173, 177-181, 183, 191, 200, 207, 210, 215-216, 219, 222-223, 225, 238f, 243, 253-255, 258, 264, 268, 271, 284, 289, 291-293, 295f, 303, 306, 314, 317, 321, 337, 344, 348-350, 358-359, 362-365, 369
Peter 22f, 28, 58, 66, 90, 95, 107, 110, 119, 122, 156, 170, 177, 179, 191, 214, 226, 243, 250, 255, 269-270, 276, 303, 309, 342
Phalaris 94
Pharaoh 82, 95f, 138, 296
Philip, the apostle 244, 528
Philip, of Caesarea . . . 167f, 170, 171
Philippi 151
Pilate 29
Plutarch 203, 319, 357
Pomeranian, the see Bugenhagen

Reinhart, Anna 166
Reutlingen 242, 349
Rhegius, Urbanus 296
Rhodius, John 357

Sabellius 318
Saganus, George 357
Samuel 96f, 98
Sarah 211, 223
Saul 96, 97f, 172, 254, 346
Schurtanner, Jacob 81, 83
Seneca 96
Simeon 87
Simeon, called Niger 172
Simon, the leper 305
Socrates 214f
Sodom 102f
Sodom and Gomorrah 156
Solomon 24, 70
Stephen 260, 332, 334
St. Gall 81
Strassburg . . . 195, 262, 264, 310, 349
Strauss, Jakob 353
Switzerland 264, 265

Tertullian 139, 357
Teufen 81
Thessalonica 369
Thomas 264
Thomas Aquinas 227, 306
Timothy 114, 161, 169f
Titus 122, 162, 169f, 179
Toggenburg 150
Trempen, Leonard 4
Trogen 84

Uriah 98
Utinger, Henry 364
Uzzah 350

Vadianus, see Watt, von
Valerian 4

Watt, von, Joachim (Vadianus) 81
Woelflin, Heinrich (Henry Lupulus) 4
Wyttenbach, Thomas 4, 345

Zedekiah 100
Zug 264
Zwingli, Huldrych . 4, 81, 129, 149, 150, 189, 190, 204, 238, 243, 254, 337 338-340
Zurich 4, 84, 85, 152, 153, 154, 161, 166, 189, 193, 195, 206, 207, 262, 264, 265, 348

INDEX OF SUBJECTS

Absolution. 344f, 346, 351, 369
Adam
born of 50
children of 51
death of 50f
fall of 50, 52
heritage of. 51, 54
sin of. 55, 56, 57
Adoration, see also Worship
external 300
internal 300, 301
spiritual 300
of Christ 300f, 303, 305, 313, 319, 343
of the body of Christ in the eucharist. 297, 300f, 318f, 343
of the humanity of Christ. 302, 305
Adultery 9, 14, 15, 16, 91, 98, 183, 364
Allegory. 247, 267, 322, 329, 347
Alloiosis. 303, 319-321, 322, 325, 327, 329, 331, 334, 336, 341

Anabaptists,
see also Fanatics. . . .151, 153f, 160, 173, 290, 292
the rebaptizers 160, 177
the rebaptized 175
catabaptism 290
rebaptism . . 150-155, 160, 170, 175, 180, 183
teaching of. 154, 180
Analogy. 218, 292, 352-353, 355, 358-359, 361, 366
Angel. 56, 217, 317-318, 335, 338f
Antichrist. 61, 241, 309, 343
kingdom of 343
Anti-Christian 182
Apostle
false 338
self-appointed 170-171
office of, see Office
Arians. 260
Armory of Christ. 102
Ascension 260, 266-268, 275, 308, 318, 321-322, 327, 328, 331-332, 335, 339, 341, 353, 363

Authority
temporal, see also Government, Magistrate, Sword and Temporal power 14-16, 17-18, 19f, 22-23, 24, 25, 28, 30, 31, 32f, 36-37, 39, 83, 95, 101, 102, 151, 179, 183
spiritual. 22f
Avarice 37, 67, 93, 95f, 109, 112, 117, 123, 162, 349, 366

Babblers 154, 164, 166
Babylonian Captivity. 121
Ban
see also Excommunication. .109, 179
Baptism. 136, 151, 152, 157, 170, 175, 180, 184, 224, 225, 292, 300, 342-343, 353
catabaptism, see Anabaptists
infant 152, 153, 170, 264, 300
rebaptism, see Anabaptists
Benefice 153, 165-166, 168, 171
Bible, see Holy Scripture
Blasphemy 66, 72, 82, 182, 246, 280-281, 365

Blood of Christ . . .71f, 108, 134, 139-141, 167, 198, 199-200, 202-203, 213, 222-223, 225, 289, 296, 340, 362-363
bodily. 222
corporeal 223
physical 198, 200
real 204
body of, see Church
communion of, see Church
people of, see Church
Blood of the (New) Testament 199-200, 225
Body of Christ, see also Flesh of Christ . . 73, 135-142, 202-203, 205, 222, 245, 247, 250-251, 256, 261, 264-266, 273-275, 277-278, 281-283, 286, 291, 293-296, 300, 302-303, 305, 307-308, 310, 312, 313-315, 316-318, 321, 325, 327, 329, 333-334, 338, 340, 342-343, 346, 353, 355-356, 358-365, 368
(i.e. the church), see Church
carnal 206, 282
communion of, see Church
corporeal 136
essential. 136f
material. 322
mystical, see Church
natural. 205, 319
people of, see Church
physical 136, 310, 311, 363
presence of, see Presence of the body of Christ
real. 136f, 204, 214
risen 205f, 303, 317
spiritual, see Church
This is my body, see also Words of consecration 137-140, 142, 203f, 205-206, 209, 211, 213, 223, 252-253, 257, 263, 265-267, 273f, 275-277, 282-283, 286, 305, 308, 314, 315-317, 333f, 342, 352, 361-362
Body and blood of Christ, see also Flesh and blood of Christ 24, 71, 73-74, 134, 140-141, 143, 203, 219, 222, 250, 254-256, 264, 274, 294-297, 300, 307, 310, 315, 340, 360, 362-363 368
communion of, see Church
people of, see Church
presence of, see Presence of the body and blood
Body of the blood of Christ, see Church
Bread 57, 73-74, 132-135, 137-139, 140-142, 144, 204, 206, 220-223, 227, 252-253, 257, 261, 263, 265, 266, 276f, 279, 281, 283, 290f, 293-297, 307-310, 312, 314, 317, 321, 327, 333, 337-338, 340, 343-344, 346, 356-361
symbolic. 193, 218, 353
unleavened. 290
presence of Christ in the, see Presence of Christ
worship of 281
Bread of life. 132
Bread and wine . . . 137, 197-198, 202, 212, 225, 253, 264f, 277, 279, 306, 310
symbolic. 253
Brethren, communion of, see Church
Bribes. 101
Bride of Christ, see Church

Calling (for the ministry).175, 179-180
Canon, of Constance 82
Canon law, see Corpus Iuris Canonici, also Papal law 111, 226
Canons of the Apostles. 226
Carlstadt, writings of 131
Carthusians 152
Chastity. 27
Children of Israel 30, 68, 83, 95 104, 212, 359
Christ (Jesus), see also Jesus . . .3, 5-8, 10, 13, 18-23, 25-26, 28-30, 32-34, 37, 38,

Christ (Jesus) - cont'd
49, 50, 52, 54-65, 67, 71-75, 86-95, 97, 99, 102-104, 106-112, 114-117, 119-122, 132-137f, 141-142, 151, 155-157, 163, 165, 169, 175-180, 189, 191, 192, 196-210, 207-210, 212, 217-221, 224, 226, 227, 239, 247, 250, 253, 255, 256, 260f, 263, 265-275, 277-285, 290, 292-294, 297, 299-315, 317-325, 328-338, 340-341, 344-348, 350-355, 359, 360, 369,
one 135, 320
the real 313
the whole 302, 313
adoration of, see Adoration
blood of, see separate heading
body of, see separate heading
example of 91, 122
flesh of, see separate heading
honor of 207
model of 93, 94
nature of, see separate heading
people of, see Church
presence of, see separate heading
return of 334-335, 339
Church . . 4, 69, 71, 108-111, 137, 142, 151, 155, 160-161, 162, 167, 171-173, 174, 180, 181-182, 191, 205-207, 209, 222, 239, 240, 246, 249, 264, 276, 279-280, 285, 288, 290, 293-295, 297, 299, 305-306, 309-311, 342, 353, 358-359, 363, 365, 367
body of the blood of Christ 295
bride of Christ 109
communion of Christ 293f, 310
communion of the blood of Christ 222, 293f, 297
communion of the body and blood 141, 222-223
communion of the body of Christ 222, 293-295, 297
communion of the brethren 144
congregation of the blood of Christ 294, 297
mystical body of Christ 137, 205
one body 3, 141-142, 152, 222-223, 264, 291, 293-295, 297, 347, 365
one bread and one body 141-142, 222, 293-295, 297, 349, 358, 365
papal 109f
particular 110
people of Christ 288, 293-294, 297, 358
people of the blood of Christ 294, 295
people of the body of Christ 297
people of the body and blood of Christ 294
spiritual body 365
true 110
universal 110
Church singing 112
Circumcision . . 27, 151-152, 177, 223-224, 353, 355, 362
Comforter, see also Holy Spirit, The Spirit 325-326, 327, 354
Commandment
of God . . . 5, 10-11, 14-18, 20-21, 25, 30, 32, 37, 39, 53-55, 63, 68, 88, 91, 96, 97, 99, 119, 121, 172, 293, 369
Commemoration, see Remembrance . . 73f, 139-140, 143 198, 202, 210, 212-213, 224-225, 253, 277, 307, 310, 317, 345, 348, 351, 352-353, 355-356, 358-361, 363-364
Commission 156-157, 177-178
Communion, see also Church. 144, 222-223, 291, 293, 295-297, 347 358, 365
of Christ, see Church
of the table of demons 222
with idols, idolaters, idolatry see Idol, etc.

Community of goods 183
Concomitance 302, 305, 332
Concubinage fee 27
Confession 65, 82-83, 109, 244, 347, 369
Congregation, see also Church 110, 150, 152, 159-160, 162, 164, 174-175, 177-182, 206, 222, 293-297, 358
Consecration 182
Contemplation 319
Corinthians 35, 92, 164, 293
Corpus Iuris Canonici, see also Canon law 31
Council 34, 124, 249
of Basel 34
of Constance 34
Covenant 223-224, 225, 353, 355, 356, 361-362
Covetousness 16, 20, 31, 52
Cretes 162
Cross, bearing of 89, 115
Cross of Christ, see also Death of Christ 124, 152-153, 197, 205, 336, 369
Cup 74, 143, 199f, 201 213-214, 223, 294, 296, 323, 355, 360, 362-363
mystical 358
symbolic 199, 297, 348, 358, 360
of blessing 140, 222, 289, 294, 348
of commemoration 141
of devils 296
of love 265
of thanksgiving 222, 343
of the blood 225, 360
of the Lord 296
of the New Testament 139, 214, 223, 362

Death 10, 25, 50-51, 54-62-63, 71-72, 98, 105-106, 121-122, 210, 212
Death of Christ, of the Lord, see also Cross of Christ 8, 108, 133-134, 139, 141, 143, 210, 213, 225, 253, 277, 292, 297, 307, 311, 323-324, 336, 339, 344-345, 347-348, 351, 355, 359-360, 362-364
Devil, see also Satan 58, 150, 183, 210, 212
Diet of Speyer 247
Disciples 11, 28, 73, 88-90, 95, 102, 107, 108, 116, 140, 143, 156, 163, 198, 202, 205, 208, 221, 245, 260, 267-268, 272, 307, 311, 326f, 333, 340 359
Divinity of Christ, see Nature of Christ
Doctrine 67, 113, 118, 140, 196-197, 243, 256, 261, 279-280, 285, 291, 345
Christian 84
of Christ 322

Easter 144
Eating 71, 73-74, 132-140, 141-144, 193, 197-198, 205, 210-211, 214, 215, 217-221, 227, 243f, 247, 250, 252-253, 256-258, 261, 264-268, 270-275, 277-279, 281-283, 286, 290, 294, 296, 299, 300-303, 306-315, 317-319, 325, 327-330, 336, 338-344, 349, 351-353, 359-364
bodily . . 135, 137, 140-142, 193, 197, 217-218, 278-279, 339-340, 346
carnal . . 197, 206, 271, 281, 307, 313
corporeal 197-198, 205, 307

Eating - cont'd
human. 268
material. 258, 307, 338
physical .134, 143, 244, 246-247, 256, 258, 262, 271, 272, 278, 282, 306-307, 314, 319, 321, 329, 353, 368
sacramental 137, 143
spiritual 134, 143, 277, 279
symbolic. 358
true 143
unworthily 363
Elect, the 119, 257, 323
Election. . .176, 178-180, 353, 362
Error. 131, 134, 136, 150-152, 154-155, 168, 182, 205, 214-216, 226, 238, 240-241, 246-249; 254, 258, 261-262, 264, 267-268, 270-271, 273, 275, 285, 289, 292, 302-303, 308, 318, 320, 335, 364, 368
Essence. . .202, 221, 250, 253-254, 302, 336
Eternal life . . .57, 107, 133, 135, 136, 270, 329, 344
Eucharist, see also Supper, also, Body of Christ
129, 140, 143, 189-190, 194-195, 198, 203, 205, 207, 209, 211, 224, 226, 238, 247, 262, 264, 293, 303-305, 318-319, 323, 339, 343, 348, 359, 364
presence of Christ in the, see Presence of Christ
real and essential nature of. . . . 140
Evangelist 86, 155, 156, 158, 160-163, 167-172, 174, 179, 182
office of, see Office
Evil 51, 83, 93, 101
Excommunication, see also Ban. 141, 348-349

Faith. 3, 17, 22, 27, 50, 58, 60, 61-64, 70, 84, 92, 94, 103, 104-105, 107, 119, 122, 132, 134-138, 139, 141-144, 152, 169, 183, 200f, 202, 204, 214-218, 220, 227, 239, 247-248, 250-256-258, 260, 264, 267-268, 270, 273, 275-276, 278-284, 286, 291, 297, 299-304, 306-311, 313, 314, 330, 337, 339-340, 342, 344-347, 349, 351-354, 362, 367-369
Christian. 27, 110
true 105, 110, 113
articles of. . .299, 310-311, 332, 339
fruits of 349
objects of. 306-307
rule of 282, 352
subject of. 306
Fall 38, 50-52, 55, 224
Fanatics, see also Babblers, also Squabblers. . . 222, 242, 245, 251, 263, 287, 306, 308, 317, 343
Father . . . 3, 7, 13, 20, 37, 49, 56-57, 61, 74, 81, 104-107, 118, 122, 133, 135, 150, 157, 223, 244, 251, 259, 265-266, 278, 284, 292, 309, 314, 318, 322-323, 325-326, 328-331, 333, 335f, 339, 343, 347, 352, 369
Almighty 266, 284, 339
Fathers, of the church
109, 110-112, 139-140, 143, 168, 195, 226, 243, 265, 270, 272, 296
Flesh, see also Body, also Body of Christ. . 91, 134, 136, 138, 193, 197, 205, 210-211, 217-220, 222, 256, 267-275, 283, 300, 317, 320, 322, 325, 353
(human nature), see also The flesh profits nothing
31, 50-54, 56-60, 64, 82, 88-89, 92, 103, 105-106, 133-135, 152, 170, 194, 212, 215, 218, 219f, 241, 268-271, 285, 346

Flesh - cont'd
(vs spirit), see also The flesh profits nothing
219, 267, 269, 271, 283, 315, 341, 343
Flesh of Christ, see also Flesh, also Body of Christ
91, 133, 138, 141, 193, 197, 218-220, 227, 243, 246, 252, 258, 266-273, 276, 281, 282, 286, 300, 308, 320, 322, 328, 337, 351
bodily...215, 217, 219, 220, 243, 264, 268, 270, 277, 311
spiritual 315
The flesh profits nothing
135-136, 142, 193, 197, 205, 219, 244, 267, 268-271, 273-274, 282, 286, 300, 308, 322, 328, 339, 351, 354
Flesh and blood (of Christ), see also Body and blood of Christ
73, 134, 135-136, 196-197, 203, 258, 305, 344, 349
Forgiveness 8, 14, 16, 157, 246

God 3-40, 49-72, 74-75, 81-86, 88-100, 102-124, 132-137, 150-173, 175-183, 206-209, 211-212, 215-216, 218, 220, 223-224, 250-251, 254-255, 258-260, 271, 273, 278, 283-286, 303-306, 320-325, 329-333, 335, 341-345, 351, 353, 363, 366
Almighty 118, 227
fear of... 39, 60, 94, 96, 118 154, 183, 292
glory of 241, 332
honor of... 12, 49, 64-66, 105, 108, 117, 154, 159, 183
people of 96, 110, 300, 353
power of 52, 58, 64
presence of, see separate heading
of peace 160
Godhead 269, 324, 336
Gods 68, 69, 119, 141, 215, 355
Good, the eternal 6
highest 37, 58, 107
supreme 215, 224
Gospel... 3, 4, 7-8, 30, 32, 37, 49, 54-55, 57, 67 82, 84, 90, 97, 103, 107, 111, 117-118, 123, 131, 135-136, 150, 154, 156, 157, 160, 163-164, 167, 168, 170, 178, 182, 192, 207, 242, 245, 250, 258, 272, 283, 288, 290, 339-340, 344-345, 346, 348, 351, 353, 368, 369
knowledge of 3, 345
teaching of 288
Government, see also Authority, Magistrate, Sword and Temporal power...26, 32, 65-67, 74, 84, 96-97, 290
Grace 19, 21, 30, 33, 37-38, 50-51, 54, 57-59, 61, 63-64, 90, 92, 132, 150, 193, 218, 223, 224, 227, 251, 254, 258, 276, 292, 335
Great Minster of Zurich 161
Guardian...23, 36-37, 60, 81, 94, 158, 161-163, 167-168, 172, 181
office of, see Office

Heaven ...133, 210, 285, 300, 313, 318, 321-322, 327, 328, 331-334, 339, 341, 351, 355
Heresy 249, 301, 318
Heretics...82, 178, 274, 283, 290, 302
Hermas, The Shepherd of,..... 81
Holy Spirit, see also The Spirit, also The Comforter
7, 56-57, 89, 108, 157, 176, 217, 278, 304, 312, 315, 320, 325, 328, 332, 336, 343, 353
Hope.... 59, 75, 112, 124, 133, 216-217, 220, 267, 285, 313, 324

Humanity of Christ, see Nature of Christ
Hymns 290
Hypocrisy . . 13, 39, 93, 95-98, 109, 112, 142, 153, 173, 221, 227, 240, 257, 348, 353
Hypocrite 94, 286

Idol 69, 91, 96, 100, 112, 119, 140, 222, 239, 293, 294, 342, 355, 361, 364, 369
communion with 293
feast of 292, 293
worship of . . 100, 141, 150, 222, 369
Idolaters 222, 293
body of 293, 295
communion with 293, 297
congregation of 295, 296
feast of 295
Idolatry . . 70-71, 97, 99, 116, 119, 140, 193, 226, 293, 366
communion with 293
Images . . . 65, 68-70, 112, 207, 214, 244, 292, 346, 368
Incarnation of Christ 86, 311
Indulgences 65, 94, 112, 114, 345
Intercession, of Christ 329, 330
of the saints 345
to the saints 65
Interest 33-36, 109, 179
Interpretation of Scripture, see Scripture
Israel 156, 212, 295, 346
people of 22, 246
Israelites 100, 102, 123

Jerusalem, true 67
Jesus (Christ), see also Christ . . 3, 7, 8-10, 37, 56-57, 60,-63, 74-75, 84, 86-87, 92, 106, 109, 111, 119, 156, 172, 175, 177, 255, 266-, 268, 308, 329, 331, 333-334, 339-340, 344-345, 355
Jews 17, 27, 32-33, 36, 38, 68, 93, 99, 103, 132-135, 142-143, 157, 171, 176, 218, 220, 260, 267, 269, 284, 299, 338, 351, 353
Judgment 14, 123, 144, 332-333
Justification . . . 59, 136, 281-282, 340

Keys,
the power of, . . . 276, 344-346, 351
of binding and loosing 103, 157, 345
Kingdom of God . . . 6, 19, 29, 37, 50, 62, 103, 115, 208, 290, 325, 360
eternal 55
of Christ 281
of heaven 33, 91, 156
Knowledge of Christ 219
Knowledge of God . . . 35, 49, 90, 106, 118, 124, 154, 155, 315, 329

Languages 92
knowledge of . . 158f, 161, 172-173, 179, 181, 213, 308
Law 12, 14f, 16, 17f, 20, 21, 31, 38, 52-54, 57, 62-65, 67, 91, 119, 163, 210, 223-224, 355
canon, see separate heading
divine 16, 27f, 31
human 27, 31
of love of God 293
of love of neighbor 293
of nature 18, 34, 52
of sin 64
of the spirit 64
and the prophets . . . 11, 62, 293, 369
Lawsuits 9
Life, Christian . . . 39, 84, 150, 141, 292
godly 7, 111, 139
holy 290f
Loans 34, 35
Lord (God) . . . 35, 51, 55, 68, 96, 104, 105, 119, 121, 122, 131, 136-137, 175, 209, 210-212, 223, 224, 255, 305, 347
Lord
(Jesus Christ) . . 32, 37, 54, 56, 59 63, 73, 81, 86, 92, 97, 109-111, 112, 119, 133, 139, 172,

Lord (Jesus Christ) – cont'd
175, 177, 183, 237, 244, 269, 300, 325, 331, 341, 355
Lord's Supper, see also Supper.....139, 141, 164, 264
Love.....18, 104, 105-108, 291
Christian 23, 49, 291-292, 313
true 49
of God .11, 12, 18, 49, 58, 60, 62, 70, 94, 105-108, 112 122, 293, 296, 304, 369
of neighbor ..10, 12, 14, 18, 49, 58, 60, 62, 97, 144, 183, 243, 292, 293, 296, 369
Lucifer.....124
Luther, Martin,
writings of.. 242, 243, 248, 274, 283, 297-303, 306-319, 347, 349, 364

Magistrate (magistracy) see also Authority, Government, Sword and Temporal power
4, 13, 14, 17, 18, 21, 23, 25-29, 31-32, 34-38, 152-154, 179, 290
Marriage.....26, 292
spiritual.....290
of priests 109, 170
Mass.....24, 32, 49, 65, 71-74, 109, 112, 132, 143, 265
abolition of 204, 207, 209
Mediator.....61, 225, 345, 346
Melanchthon, Philipp
writings of.....271
Mercenary service 84
Mercy of God ..10, 21, 50, 59, 90, 284, 307, 324
Messenger...20, 23, 25, 156, 158, 167-169, 171, 174, 177, 180, 182
self-appointed 179
office of, see Office
Metonymy.....204, 358-359
Minister...158, 163, 165, 167-168, 173-174, 177-179, 181-182, 195, 207, 252, 348
Miracle.. 218, 260-261, 263-264, 278-279, 311-312, 317, 321-322, 332, 338, 354
Missal 264
Monk.... 25-26, 30, 39, 65, 91, 98, 109, 112, 165
Mother of God, see also Our Lady, also Mary 69, 109

Nature of Christ.....
divine.. 221, 239, 251, 266, 283, 301, 303, 305, 317-319, 320-323, 325, 328-336, 341, 355
presence of the divine, see Presence of Christ
human..9, 56, 155, 221, 239, 284, 302, 303, 305, 314, 317-325, 328-336, 338, 341, 353
two....221, 239, 267, 283, 302, 319, 320, 323, 324, 329f, 335-336
exchange of the two.....239, 267, 319-321, 326
union of the two 304, 319-320, 324
adoration of the humanity of Christ, see Adoration
New Testament
48, 66, 69-70, 86, 119, 151, 158, 160-161, 171, 173, 182, 205, 239, 336, 347, 356
New testament, of the blood, of Christ, see also Testament 74, 139, 214, 223-225, 362
blood of, see separate heading
Nun 25-26, 30, 39, 65, 98, 109, 112

Oath..... 5, 9, 11, 290
Obedience... 21-25, 29-30, 65, 96, 97-98, 304
Oblations..... 83
Office... 86, 94, 155, 161, 164, 168, 171, 174, 175, 179-180, 182-183

Office - cont'd
preaching .. 89, 150-151, 154f, 171
of apostle. .155, 162, 168, 177, 180
of bishop ..113, 115, 161-162, 168 172, 179, 180-181
of evangelist. 161, 162, 181
of guardian 181
of messenger 168, 180
of prophet. 161
of pastor. 161, 172
of serving the gospel. 22
of shepherd. 86, 107, 113-115
of teacher. 182
of teaching 121
Old Testament 48, 62, 65, 71, 81, 86, 151, 158, 160, 171, 173, 175, 211, 356, 369
Omnipotence of God 37, 218, 220, 314, 351
Oppression. 96, 100
Order 39
divine 23
of St. Bernard 265
of the Benedictines 265
Ordinances 14
of God 10, 18
Our Lady, see also Mother
of God 69, 83, 112, 117

Papacy. 151, 159
Papal gang 94, 97
Papal laws 65, 82
Papists . . .10, 22, 27, 29, 30, 94, 98, 100, 109, 110, 112, 117, 119, 120, 238, 240, 242, 273, 280, 290, 305, 343
teaching of 97
Parable. 208-209, 211
Parish. . . .67, 74, 110, 114, 121, 153, 155, 158, 172, 173, 180
Parisian theologians 306
Passover . .198, 210-211, 212-213, 221, 353, 356, 359, 360-361
Pastor. . . .97, 111, 113, 161, 163, 167, 172, 174, 182
office of, see Office
Payment 106-107, 115, 119
Peace 14, 101, 120, 160, 180, 227
Pentecost 312
Persecution . . .87, 89, 94, 95, 107-108, 116, 122
Pharisee 8, 59, 175, 257
Piety 39, 227, 292
Poor, the. . . .16, 17, 20, 67, 73, 94, 109, 114, 117, 166
Pope, see also Roman Pontiff. .3, 22, 24, 26, 28, 29, 31, 32, 39, 95, 98, 110, 119, 170, 247, 249, 251, 253, 254, 276, 290
teaching of. 277
Prayer. . . .49, 123, 284, 329-330, 343, 367
Preacher. .24, 48, 74, 86, 117, 165, 168, 170, 174, 176, 177, 183
friar. 338
quarrelsome 166
sectarian 165
self-appointed 173
Preaching. .19, 21, 25, 32, 67, 81, 89, 91, 92, 97, 102, 107, 109, 111, 115, 118, 123, 150-151, 152, 154, 155, 157, 164, 166-167, 168, 172, 177, 180, 182, 183, 196, 206, 257, 285, 290, 313, 330, 340, 344, 347
office, see Office
Prebend 164
Presence of Christ 302-303, 305, 313, 314 319, 326, 329, 331, 333-335
in bread and wine 314
in the bread 335
in the eucharist 305, 318, 339
in the sacrament 300-301, 303
of the divine nature 303, 305
Presence of God . . .250, 251, 253-255
universal 254
Presence of the body of Christ. . .251-256, 301-303, 308, 310, 314-315, 317-319, 323, 325, 332, 335, 337-338, 339, 349
actual 306

Presence of the body of Christ cont'd
bodily . . 251, 255, 317, 326, 328, 335
corporal 251, 335
essential 251
material 257, 291
natural 254
physical 257, 323, 326, 368
real 314
spiritual 254, 256
in essence 251, 254, 281, 302
Presence of the body and blood . . . 250-254, 255-256, 300-302, 305-306, 310
Priest . . . 24, 26, 30, 32, 65, 66-67, 69, 71-72, 74, 86, 93, 95, 97, 99, 101, 121, 124, 150, 153, 161-162, 164, 167, 170, 175, 178, 198, 346
false 34, 100
people's 168
Priesthood of all 182
Prince 24, 25, 32, 34, 82, 94, 96, 100, 103, 106, 115, 116, 118, 123, 245, 247, 302, 367
princes and rulers 82
Promise . . . 104, 107, 192, 223, 224
Prophesy 171, 173, 181
Prophet . . . 62, 86, 99, 101, 102, 119, 120, 138, 155, 156, 158, 160, 167, 171, 172, 175, 179-181, 238, 263, 311, 346
false . . . 86, 92, 100, 108, 119, 120, 335, 339
true 160, 238
office of, see Office
Providence . . 83, 86, 196, 211, 351
Purgatory 65, 160, 345, 346

Real presence, see Presence, also Body of Christ
Reason 52, 63, 226, 282
Rebellious spirits 4, 151
Reconciliation 133, 211, 212
Redeemer 75, 118, 176
Redemption . . . 54, 56, 63, 83, 90, 123, 136, 210, 284, 330
Religion . . 259, 284, 292, 314, 344, 367
essentials of 346
Remembrance, see also Commemoration 73, 138, 224, 253, 307, 314, 316, 357, 361, 364,
Rents 66, 114, 120, 153
Repentance 13, 90, 348
Resurrection of Christ 275, 292, 338, 341
Right hand (of God), sitting at 89, 197, 205, 260, 261, 264, 266, 302-303, 313, 323-324, 331-333, 339, 355
Righteousness 6, 7, 10, 12-13, 14, 16-17, 19-20, 21, 26, 28, 35, 37, 53, 54, 55, 59, 63, 70, 97, 240, 267, 281, 283-284, 290, 341
divine, of God, his 3, 5-6, 7-8, 10, 12-16, 18-19, 21, 31, 36, 37, 55, 62, 284, 320, 324
human . . 3, 6, 12-13, 17-20, 21, 26, 29, 30, 33-34, 37
of faith 12, 59
Roman pontiff, see also Pope 253, 303, 306, 308, 314, 337, 342, 368
Ruler . . . 23, 66, 82, 94, 96, 101, 118

Sabbath 284
Sacrament, see also Lord's Supper . . 74, 131, 134, 137, 139, 140, 142, 143, 225, 246-248, 252, 264, 274, 281, 298, 300, 302, 307, 311, 332, 338, 342, 349, 364
presence of Christ in the, see Presence of Christ
Sacramentarian heretics 283
Sacramentarian spirit 244, 246
Sacred writings, see Scripture
Sacrifice . . 24, 32, 62, 65, 71-74, 96, 97f, 211, 282,

Saints 70, 110, 155
Salvation . . 8, 10, 17, 18, 38, 51, 56, 57, 61, 63, 72, 74, 90, 91, 92, 96, 110, 117, 123, 133, 136, 138, 141, 156, 169, 193, 197, 204, 217, 219, 220, 244, 247, 258, 262, 270, 273, 300, 307, 329, 336, 340, 345
essentials of 245
Samaritans 156
Sanctification 283, 284
Satan, see also Devil 95, 349
Savior 56, 61, 63, 75, 86, 90, 119, 176, 255, 275
words of 193
Scripture (Holy), see also Word of God
8, 22, 23, 25, 27, 28, 32f, 34-35, 48f, 63, 67, 72, 92, 110, 120, 131, 134, 136, 138, 142, 157-161, 162, 164, 167, 169, 171, 173, 181, 183, 193, 201, 204-205, 208, 210, 217, 218, 219, 221-222, 226, 239-240, 244, 246, 255, 258-261, 263, 264-266, 275-276, 278, 280, 282, 285, 286, 288, 299, 301, 303, 308-311, 313-315, 327, 330, 331, 333-334, 337-340, 342, 351-357, 361, 365, 368
authority of 261
collation of . . 276, 299, 314, 341, 350-354, 361, 366
foundation of 8
interpretation of 205, 309, 353
knowledge of 49, 173
teaching of 179
as touchstone 354
Sect 23, 39, 153, 181, 183, 196, 280, 285, 334, 357
Sectarian 165, 183
Sectarian preacher, see Preacher
Servant, of God . . . 4, 15, 23, 28, 82, 93, 103, 284
of the gospel 168
self-appointed 177
Shepherd . . 23, 81, 83, 86-87, 89, 90-93, 94-96, 98, 100-102, 103, 105, 107, 111-112, 113-117, 121, 153
faithless 94
false . . . 81, 84, 108, 111, 112-116, 117-120f, 123
real 114
true (good) . . 81, 84, 108, 112-113, 116-117
office of, see Office
Sign 74, 135, 140, 151, 180, 203, 223, 225, 253, 263, 335, 356, 362, 369
Sin, see also Weakness
7, 10, 13, 17, 22, 24, 27, 29, 30, 34, 35, 39, 50-59, 63-66, 71-72, 90, 95, 97, 116, 118, 121, 133, 136, 143, 157, 201, 210, 253, 292, 319, 320, 339, 340, 355, 361, 369
hereditary 51
original 50, 51
secret 348
forgiveness of 32, 157 264, 266, 281, 292, 325
pardon of 247
remission of . . . 199-200, 225, 247, 283, 286, 291, 319, 339, 343, 344, 349, 368
source of 50
Sinecures 109
Sinner 13, 16, 30, 50
Son of God . . . 8, 10, 11, 55, 56, 63, 81, 86, 90, 92, 106, 107, 122, 133, 134, 136, 139, 155, 157, 176, 197, 212, 218, 224, 247, 255, 258, 260, 267-269, 275, 278, 284, 297, 299, 301, 307, 311, 315, 317, 318, 320-322, 324-325, 328-329, 335-336, 340, 344, 353, 362

Son of Man... 20, 134, 210, 224, 258, 267-268, 314, 320-324, 327-328, 331, 334, 339, 355
Soul 33, 88-89, 94, 133, 216, 282, 308, 315, 342
Spartans 102
Spirit 133, 136, 197, 219, 267, 278, 353
(vs flesh, body) ...88, 134, 219, 267, 271, 274, 313, 322, 328, 341-343, 346, 349
The (including: Holy Spirit, Spirit of God, Divine Spirit) see also Holy Spirit, also The Comforter 51, 60, 64, 132, 135, 142, 152, 171, 206, 215, 226, 227, 240, 249, 258, 267, 271, 274, 281-282, 284, 311, 313, 320, 322, 328, 330, 339, 342, 343, 349, 353
teaching of 132, 328
of Christ 64, 317, 329
Spiritizers 245
Spirituals.....23, 30, 36, 101, 166
Squabblers..... 162f
Stealing.... 9, 12, 14, 31, 38, 63, 66, 91
Superior, the...14, 22-24, 26, 28, 30, 33, 35, 66, 164
Superstition.....290
Supper, see also Lord's Supper 74, 247, 264, 295, 312, 343, 349, 355, 359, 361
of thanksgiving 294
Swabians.....271
Swearing..... 5, 9
Swiss confederation 81, 84
Sword, see also Authority, Government, Magistrate, and Temporal power 23, 28-29, 37, 66, 94, 120, 121, 180, 183
Symbol ...87, 139, 140, 193, 198, 199, 201-203, 209, 211-212, 218, 221, 222-223, 225, 253, 265. 277, 289, 290, 292, 310, 353, 355, 357-359, 363

Taxes 23, 29-30, 36
Teacher...15, 16, 67, 115, 155, 164, 172-173, 179, 180, 181, 182
false 89, 92
rebellious 154
office of, see Office
Teaching..4, 23, 24, 49, 61, 90, 111-113, 115, 117, 150, 154-156, 159, 160, 163, 167, 168, 172, 179-180, 181-183, 276
Christian.....36, 151
human ..4, 49, 65, 86, 91, 96, 118, 120
pure.....154
of Christ....4, 25, 26, 49, 248, 283, 322
of God.....17, 50, 65, 84, 163
Temporal goods 20
Temporal power, see also Authority, Government, Magistrate and Sword 22
Temptation ... 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 18, 28, 39, 50, 53, 55, 58, 59, 119, 122
Tenth, the, see also Tithes 31, 32, 34, 36
Tertullian, writings of.....139
Testament, see also New Testament
of the blood.....73, 299, 355, 362
Thanksgiving ... 143, 196, 211-212, 222, 224, 253, 277, 294, 295-297, 304, 306-307, 310, 314, 316, 342, 347-348, 353, 355, 358, 361, 363-364
festival of 222
The flesh profits nothing, see Flesh of Christ
Theologians ... 91, 133, 141-142, 304, 318-319, 324, 343
This is my body, see Body of Christ
Thomists 351

Tithes, see also Tenth
31, 32, 16, 114, 153, 179
Toggenburg, town council of 150
Transformation, see also
Transubstantiation..... 136, 276
Transubstantiation, see also
Transformation, also Presence
of the body of Christ ...136, 312,
337, 366
Trope....196-197, 200, 204, 208,
212-213, 218, 221, 257,
258, 275-278, 283, 286,
294, 299, 308-309, 316,
319, 324, 338, 350-352,
354-358, 360-361, 366
knowledge of.....350
Trust (in God, Christ, the gospel)
57, 58-60, 63, 68, 74, 90,
94, 100, 106-107, 110,
141, 152, 183, 197, 220,
224, 243, 247, 251, 254,
256, 267, 310, 315, 324,
330, 340-341, 342
Truth 5, 25, 49, 67, 82, 97, 112,
118, 131, 132, 135, 137,
150, 155, 160, 168-169,
171, 175, 192f, 199, 201,
207, 213, 226, 227, 239,
242, 258, 259, 261, 271,
273, 280, 281, 285, 287,
308, 319, 325, 326-327,
331
Turks 66, 67
Two natures of Christ, see Nature
of Christ
Tyrant ...8, 33, 93, 96, 100, 108,
117-119, 157, 178, 248,
251

Ubiquity, see Presence
Unbeliever....29, 89, 103, 152, 191
Unity 49, 141, 152
of faith.....155
Usurer 17, 36, 72, 162
Usury 16, 36, 66, 96, 112

Vice.....11, 15, 22, 59, 72, 93, 95,
97, 101, 112, 113, 115f,
118, 158
Virgin birth ... 205, 217-218, 275,
278, 311, 315, 320,
322

Waldensians 248
War..... 24, 93, 101, 115, 120, 178
Weakness, see also Sin ...31, 50-51,
52, 54, 56,
64, 70, 156
Will of God, divine
8, 10, 19, 20, 33, 37, 39,
53, 57, 62, 91, 92, 123,
159, 169, 179, 182, 218,
238
of the Father 20
Wine 198-199, 358, 360
Wisdom, human.....19, 169
Wisdom of God, divine...55-56, 60,
86, 283, 284
Wolves... 82, 84, 103, 108, 111-113,
115-118, 121-122, 177, 183
Word
eternal.....258, 259
external 250, 251, 257, 258
internal 250, 251, 257, 258
Word of God, divine, his, of the
Lord, see also Scripture
5, 6, 10, 19-20, 22, 24,
25-27, 29, 32-33, 35-37,
38-40, 49, 55, 57, 60, 61,
65-67, 69, 72, 74, 83, 84,
86, 88-89, 91-94, 95, 96,
97, 100-101, 105, 108,
110-111, 113, 117-118,
120, 123, 136, 138, 144,
150, 152, 157, 164, 168,
169, 171, 173, 179, 181,
206-208, 276, 285, 306
Word(s) of Christ, of the Lord, his
3, 5, 10, 20, 34, 61, 65,
73, 106, 109, 110, 112,
114, 133, 136, 137-139,
142, 163, 178, 195, 196,
197, 198, 199-201, 204,
205, 208, 211, 213, 219,
242, 247, 252, 263, 265,
266, 271, 275-276, 281,
286, 289, 301, 308, 310,
314, 315, 317, 321, 337,

Word(s) of Christ - cont'd
339, 342, 347, 350, 354, 359
Words of consecration, see also Body of Christ, This is my body 137
Words of institution, see Words of consecration
Works ... 8, 11, 26, 57, 58, 67, 70, 111-112, 114, 118, 247, 273
Christian 113
good 23, 26
pious 192
Worship .. 69, 112, 136, 224, 264, 273, 290-292, 301f, 303-306. 369
true 284, 304
in spirit and in truth 284
of idols, see Idols
of the bread, see Bread
of the host 264
Worshipper 284, 293, 304
Wrath of God 8, 54, 75, 123, 267
children of 51

Zurich, city council of
48, 165, 204, 206-207, 209
Zwingli, Huldrych, writings of,
21, 22, 27, 67-68, 111, 155, 194-198, 209, 210, 214, 296, 344-345, 353, 364

DATE DUE

NOV 23 2011			

Demco, Inc. 38-293

DATE DUE

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

CINCINNATI CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
3 4320 00215 3361

230.42 Z98h 1984 v. 2
Zwingli, Ulrich, 1484-1531.
Huldrych Zwingli

04/11/2014
317147 5 24 00
HF GROUP - IN