

ON THE LORD'S SUPPER TO the objections which Murmurer partly fabricated against the truth of the Gospel, and partly gathered from the Bishop of Rochester and other enemies of piety.

Response of Martin Bucer

Translated by Sollie

Translated using chat GTP-4

Original language Latin

MARTIN

BUCER TO THE PIOUS Reader: Grace and peace from God the Father and our Lord Jesus Christ.

We have undertaken to preach Christ here, and by no means men, having been admitted thus far by the gift of the Spirit imparted to us, so that we propose nothing to the people except the divine Scriptures, as these alone rightly testify of our Savior. Man is a lie and vanity; therefore, we receive nothing human, to whom this task has been given, that we may imbue our listeners with divine truth. It matters not the slightest to us that many embrace human matters rather than our divine ones, for Christ Himself testifies that we know only a few are chosen, and that the Church is like a lily among thorns. It matters as much that there has been error among the multitude for many centuries as that the son of perdition. The mystery of iniquity began to work in the time of Paul, and John openly testifies that many Antichrists had already arisen. In these most recent and perilous times, namely in the last eight hundred years, during which, as they boast, in Rome—the Church cannot deny—men who are lovers of themselves, covetous, proud, blasphemous, and adorned with the other qualities Paul mentions in the second letter to Timothy, chapter 3, have reigned. He recounts, who, I ask, would be surprised that many things have crept in—not merely unworthy of the Christian name but outright opposed and intentionally contradictory? They have forbidden holy marriage and the undefiled bed by vows and precepts, condoning not only obscene fornications and adulteries but even things that modesty forbids to name. They have imposed a selection of foods and demand it more strictly, while at the same time avoiding no drunkenness or revelries, and embracing luxuries. Even though Paul so openly called these doctrines of demons and predicted that in the last times, men would depart from the faith and listen to deceitful spirits, these doctrines have found a place in what is called the Roman Church. They believe today that all holiness almost lies in that condemned celibacy and the selection of foods—whoever in Rome acknowledges their head. Let those who wish now go and prove the impossible, that through human traditions, tares have been mingled with wheat without the doctrine, relying on the Word of God alone, which the enemy man has oversown, oppressed, and almost extinguished. Let such arguments be scorned, unworthy of theological discourse. Few stand with you; show us who, within the last thousand years, has been a guarantor of your faith for the next six years. Furthermore, we ask what Christ meant when He said, “When the Son of Man comes, do you think He will find faith on earth?” False prophets shall arise, deceive many, and perform great signs and wonders, so much so that, if it were possible, even the elect would be deceived. Also, unless those days of the Antichristian kingdom were shortened, no flesh would be saved. Therefore, either they are insane. They are either utterly insane or exceedingly

impious, who, though we have the prophetic word more fully confirmed, as St. Peter says, shining as a light in a dark place, urge that we should pay attention to it and judge and establish all things accordingly, only to embrace what many approve or what has been observed for a long time. Far more have worshipped impiety over many centuries than piety; what madness, then, to appeal to the multitude, which is greater under the Turk than under the Pope, or to longevity, when for much longer the entire world has served idols rather than the true God? Therefore, let those stand who wish to engage in battle with us, who rely solely on the Scriptures, being the sheep of Christ who refuse to hear the voice of strangers, since the word of the Lord endures forever, and we cannot be torn away from it, no matter how many, great, or ancient opponents may rise against us. That Scripture is the Word of God is agreed upon, even among those who merely claim the name of piety. Who among humans, whether of the past or present, can pronounce, when all deeds are in the hand of the Lord, and no man can know who is worthy of love or hatred? There have always been a few pious ones in the Church, for Christ never abandons His bride. And even if Elijah felt alone, deserted by all worshippers of God, though he was clearly a spiritual man able to judge all things, the Lord had preserved seven thousand for Himself. It is astonishing that we should seek not many but a few, who maintained our Faith centuries ago, when he lived in a time and kingdom unknown to us. did? Therefore, while everything is filled with the darkness of impious doctrine and there is nothing not filled with offenses, we look to the lamp of God's word, shining in a dark place; that is, instructing us while everything is blind, whether in the wisdom of the ancients or the recent, however much it may be, while reason sees nothing and the mind is astonished, we look to the word of God and demand that all else, including the rites and doctrine of the Lord's Supper, conform to it. Thus, since Scripture in no way calls it a sacrifice, we challenge those who make it into a sacrifice; however, concerning its title as a testament, so far as Scripture permits, we freely acknowledge it. And as Scripture commends us to remember Jesus Christ in His death, we cannot detest those who, having made all things troublesome and remedial, madly attempt to establish a market out of it. Thus, what the Scripture has handed down concerning the Lord's Supper, which the people commonly call the Mass, we carefully instill in the people; whatever greed or disorderly religion men have brought in its place, we have taught should be rejected. By the reasonings of fools, it has not lost some to the idle flock, from where men have been lightly moved against us, whose god is their belly. Many, driven against us by fury, took up arms, but the Word of the Lord prevailed, as was fitting, and will forever prevail, against the gates of hell. After many notably deluded individuals, Thomas Murner eventually came forward, attacking the Evangelical doctrine, and previously somewhat renowned for the fame of the Mass, claiming to prove that it is a sacrifice, having solemnly demanded of us by writings and that we respond to attack us through the Holy Scriptures. He finally asserted with great insistence that we could by no means be excused from neglecting the glory of Christ if we also refused to provide a reason for our faith in writing.

We, who have taught nothing other than what is plainly read in the Holy Scriptures, considered it unnecessary to again present the same in our writings, especially since Murner demanded it, who, if he could have adhered to the truth, would have already learned it from the very Holy Scriptures

themselves, both in this matter and in other mysteries of our religion, as can be found in the numerous excellent and clear expositions of Luther and other professors of the Evangelical truth. And those are conveyed through words, when he himself continually attacks our teachings in his grand lectures, we, eager to test what new thing he had found in the Holy Scriptures, invited him in many ways to a friendly discussion, ultimately establishing this little dispute. But our themes, opposed to his dogmas, could not be presented by him for challenge; he claimed that he had first provoked us, not us him, and so it came about that, whatever themes I had undertaken to protect, they were themselves his, which were initially to be challenged by him, and by what success, let it be heard by those who were present.

From this dispute, at last, he handed over the book of his lectures to me, which he had promised the day before but had later refused under pressure from his followers. So, may it not be in vain that we have resisted, so that we defend ourselves with our writings against him, and let not the followers of Antichrist boast, we respond to Murner did not dare to engage in this matter, finally desiring to act on behalf of this is, with so many godly learned men, both in explaining the reason for the Lord's Supper and in refuting the arguments that the impious have devised against us, once again repeating to Murner in brief, although there is little hope that he will be brought over to the words of truth, so foolishly he sophisticates, wavering over questions and empty verbal conflicts. Perhaps the Lord will grant that someone else will read these writings of ours for a long time, who may strive with vain and childish trifles, as such a great defender of sacrifice, abandoning the impious rites, will turn to the signs of Christ. If he does so with all his heart, I will have well earned the great effort of writing these things.

However it may turn out, I am certain that I have undertaken this task for the defense of the glory of Christ; therefore, I have no doubt that with the Lord's favor, it will not go fruitlessly. If only it would return to Murner, and all of his ilk who have incited this situation, in a manner suitable for them, as was appropriate. We are stirred against them with such hatred. You, kind reader, pray to God and our Father for us, through Christ the Lord, that He may render His knowledge of the Word, which He has granted, effective in us, lest, while we preach to others, we ourselves be found reprobate; grant that we may burn with zeal, so that we may rightly and usefully shine for others; but for our adversaries, may they at last have a better mind, lest while they oppose Christ, they commit a sin unto death, realizing it too late under a dreadful Judge, whom they once expected to be a kind Savior. May His Spirit keep you. Amen.

And now to you, Murner, may the Lord grant you ears to hear and a heart to understand. So far, you seem ratherTherefore, seek not so much to speak against us, but rather to speak truthfully and in a way that promotes the edification of the Church. You have begun to attack our Mass — that is, the manner of the Lord's Supper, as we both teach and celebrate it, the way it was handed down by those who received it from the Lord — with the most frivolous objections, constantly raising many issues, while clearly demonstrating by both your words and writings that you have understood none of these things. For this reason, I will first explain briefly how we have learned the Lord's Supper from the Apostolic writings, and then I will respond to those arguments

you think you have against us, whether they were devised by yourself or borrowed from your Bishop of Rochester and the King of England, and I will do so as concisely and openly as I can, as the speech flows into my pen: without any display of learning, which surely cannot be displayed by me, and without insults or bitterness in my words, for which I have no delight.

Paul, whom it is sufficient to have mentioned alone, writes thus to the Corinthians: "For I received from the Lord what I also delivered to you, that the Lord Jesus, on the night He was betrayed, took bread, and when He had given thanks, He broke it, and said: 'Take, eat; this is My body, which is broken for you; do this in remembrance of Me.' In the same manner, He also took the cup after supper, saying: 'This cup is the new covenant in My blood. This do, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of Me.' For as often as you eat this bread and drink this cup, you proclaim the Lord's death till He comes." From these words What we certainly believe as divine, we have learned, so that when we wish to celebrate the Lord's Supper, first of all, the words of Christ, which both Paul and the Evangelists have left written in their books: "Take, eat, this is My body, which is given for you or broken for you." Likewise, "Take and drink from it, all of you, this cup is the new Testament in My blood, which is poured out for you." Let us recount, with the bread and wine present, those words of the Lord you have reviewed; as they sound, we do not doubt that it is His body and blood. Then, in remembrance of Him, we eat this bread, which is truly the Lord's body, and drink this wine, which is His blood; we proclaim, as these represent, the death of our Savior, which was endured for the remission of our sins, by which we may already boast as victors over sin, death, and hell, so that it may be permitted to serve the Lord in joy, no matter how much sin in the flesh may oppress us, and we may be exercised by the cross, carrying the mortification of the Lord Jesus in our body, so that the life of Jesus may also be manifested in our body.

Behold, this is the sum of our Mass, and thus we conduct the Lord's Supper. For if we add anything beyond these things, we derive it from the evangelical histories or other books of the Holy Scriptures for the edification of the Church: If, however, our evangelical Mass, which has everything that the evangelical writings handed down to us about this matter, and nothing whatsoever of human origin, cannot be said to be so, I do not know what other evangelical tradition you might provide us. Certainly yours, which has so many human additions. rejected, or that impious and absurd canon, and he takes as his own what the Lord never instituted, namely, to sacrifice Christ again, for it is no less appropriate to call the Mass a sacrifice made than to name it evangelical.

Now, about to instruct the people, with Luther we teach the substance of the Evangelical Mass, that is, what has been handed down to us in the Evangelical writings, which the Gospel most clearly illuminates, for us, the body of the Lord delivered, and His blood shed. We do not only hear it, but we also take this body and, by drinking the blood, we feel it. The two are set in the words of the promise and in the signs of bread and wine, so that if you have firm faith in these and receive them with faith, you attain all the benefits of the Christian Mass. Do we not recognize the great promise that the Lord said, that He gives His body for us and sheds His blood so that we might be forgiven of sins? Then, the magnificent signs of this grace, the bread and wine, which are the

body and blood of the Lord, we have considered, and as He Himself commanded, we receive them in His memory. The Lord promised Abraham that He Himself would be the God of him and his seed, and to confirm this faith more firmly, He added the sign of circumcision. Likewise, He promised here, by the sacrifice of His body and blood, the expiation of our sins, for which, that we might have more certain faith, He commended to us the signs of bread and wine, that is, this holy bread, His body, and the wine, which is His blood, for us to receive. Who, in memory of our Savior, would eat this bread and drink the cup, if he does not have that faith, like a seal of some promise? of the mission, as we have heard expressed in the words of the Gospels, namely, that His own body and blood, offered to the Father on the cross by Christ Himself, would thus achieve the abolition of sins and attain eternal life.

To this, when we commemorate that incomparable benefit of the Lord's death for us in the Lord's Supper, so that faith in God, with whom by this death we have been reconciled, this is the new testament, the new and eternal covenant between us and God, sanctified and sealed, that we, now His children and heirs, may invoke the Father with utmost confidence and wait with eager spirit, while Christ appears in His paternal glory, and then we, like Him, will appear in the glory of the children of God. It is confirmed, and we call the Lord's Supper a testament, not without the authority of Scripture, even if in the words of the Lord's Supper, this name were scarcely read. For circumcision in Genesis 17, which was a sign of the Testament, and even itself (היא), is called Testament or Covenant, so if we called the reception of the body and blood of the Lord a Testament, we would have no reason to say otherwise. Therefore, we should carefully avoid considering it otherwise. Now we do not say this, but since the Lord's Supper is both the promise of Christ to us, that His body and blood are delivered for us, and the eating of bread and drinking of the cup, which the Lord instituted, and since we have these as what the Lord promises to us, and what He commands of us, we have it wholly complete in we have in the Lord's Supper the meaning of the Testament or covenant.

The covenant was a pact between God and Abraham and his seed. Here the Lord promised Abraham and his seed that He would be their God, and would give them the land of Canaan; He uniquely demanded of them that every male be circumcised. So here it is promised by Christ, with His body and blood, which He offered on the cross to God the Father, that our sins would be cleansed, which does not happen without faith (for by faith hearts are purified), which is certainly that knowledge of God, of which Jeremiah chapter 31 speaks: "Not without the Spirit of God, which is that law which God has promised to inscribe on our hearts." What is uniquely required of us is to do this in His memory, for what else belongs to the meaning of that new and eternal Testament? We know that all these things stand by faith, and are removed from every obscurity of time, and are therefore accomplished when they are believed. For, in my case, the Lord's body was not delivered unless I believed it was delivered for me, because no benefit of it can return to me except through faith. Therefore, that promise in the words of the Lord's Supper is not fulfilled on the cross, nor were we at that time washed of sins, for we were not yet, but we are washed now, when we believe. But we believe where this promise of the Lord is preached to us in the Mass, and therefore now the

Testament of the Lord is confirmed, and the covenant between us and God becomes eternal.

But why use many words? St. Paul says in Galatians 3: "The promises were made to Abraham and his seed," and soon after, "this is what I say: the Testament confirmed by God." See concerning calls this mission the Testament, and it will be an atonement. According to Murner, the Lord's Supper, in which is found the sum of all promises ever made to humanity, divine protection, namely, for sins, by the offering of the body and blood of the Lord, is what completely cleanses us, for Christ Himself called it the Testament, saying: "This cup is the new Testament in my blood," without a doubt meaning this. This cup, my blood, which is poured out for you for the remission of sins, so that, purified by it, you truly become the people of the Father, and He Himself is God and your Father, now a new covenant is established between you and my Father, indeed in an eternal bond. For the Lord's body was not delivered for us except when He poured out His blood, then He offered Himself, therefore the blood of the Testament and the Testament itself are called, that is, the new covenant, between us and God, not because the delivery of the body, which was certainly made by the shedding of blood, does not pertain to this, and is expressed in the name of the Testament. Now, as it was also said above, all these things are ours when we believe, as we have faith in the promise. Therefore, the Lord's Supper, that is, when the said promise is heard in faith, and then these things, by the taking of the body and blood, are strengthened, and being purified by faith, we certainly know that God has adopted us as His children, and rightly we call it the new Testament, since clearly everything conforms to what is written of the new Testament in Jeremiah 31. Indeed, the blood of Christ, by His Spirit, inspires us that through this we should believe Him to be gracious towards us from the least to the greatest, all recognizing the Lord, for He is good and merciful, having fulfilled the entire law of liberty, which is inscribed by the Holy Spirit in our hearts; thus, we prepare ourselves to proclaim the virtues of Him who has called us into His marvelous light.

Moreover, in comparing the Lord's Supper to testaments made by men, in which their inheritance is bequeathed to their heirs, this is not at all a human fabrication, but rather is introduced by the authority of Scripture. It is written in the ninth chapter of Hebrews that, where there is a testament, it is necessary for the death of the testator to intervene; for a testament is confirmed by death, otherwise, it is of no value while the testator lives. Just as the author of this epistle alludes to testaments, in which men appoint their heirs and designate their goods, no pious man would judge this to be blasphemy. Christ is the testator to us, granting the remission of sins and the grace of the Father and eternal life, which we would never have attained had not our Testator died. He died for our sins and rose for our justification, and the testament was confirmed, and we inherit this legacy if we believe. I do not see, indeed, what here anyone could complain about as contrary to the scriptures or as a human commentary. These are what we have learned from the Sacred Scriptures about the Lord's Supper, and we teach them to the people with utmost confidence, not deeming it worthy of condemnation to say anything contrary to this or to have acted differently. Now, in response to Murner's arguments, from which one may discern which support he can claim, if he collides with

ours, when not he does not understand, nor knows what he speaks, nor what he affirms. Fighting in the manner of an Anabaptist, unless he wished not to seem to understand, in order to make the Papists appear somewhat more just, is judged that he attacked our position, while he himself attacked his own insane thoughts.

Therefore, firstly, after he approved the reasoning of the Mass, which Luther wrote to the King of England, in his second reading, Rossensis added with an exclamation against Luther, saying that no word exists of the divine promise, from the sacred writings, from Christ, of the Mass, or rather the Lord's Supper, as Paul calls it, and added these words of his: he demands that Luther teach differently. And when he replied to himself, from the Babylonian Captivity, he mentioned that passage from Matthew: "This is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins;" he adds: What else does Matthew testify here, but that Christ said, his blood must be shed for the remission of sins? Do we say anything different, Murner? It would have been fitting for a Christian man. And for a man with such a zeal for sincerity, as you claim to be, not to attack anything he had not yet understood. If you had ever deemed it worthy, my friend, I do not say with me, but with any of our listeners, to comment on these matters, you could have learned that Luther taught quite differently than you have imagined: But in this way, you would have gained little approval from your Papists, if you had preferred to learn the truth with us, by which you would also refute them. But see for yourself, may God scatter the bones of those who please men. What kind of conflict is it, which you immediately present? For here, you surely say, the remission of sins is promised not through participation, but through the shedding on the Cross. Did anyone ever claim to teach you otherwise? I ask, who has ever dreamed that anyone obtains remission of sins through participation? Certainly, our position directly opposes this, as we attribute the remission of sins to the grace of God and the merit of Christ, and to no merit of our own. But I am grateful that you still admit that, according to these words, the remission of sins is promised, and you are not against us when you add that it is not through participation, which is something no one of ours has ever even dreamed of, but through the shedding on the Cross, which we readily admit with you, except that we add that the remission of sins occurs when it is believed to occur.

But how does this agree with what you have issued yourself, denying, namely, that there is any word of divine promise connected with the Lord's Supper from the sacred writings? For these words are appended from the institution of the Lord: "This is the cup of my blood of the new covenant, which is poured out for many," with these words you yourself confess that the remission of sins is promised. By what face, then, do you dare to deny that any divine promise is connected with the Mass? What you say is that the promise is not given through participation, but through the shedding, which we freely admit as well. Is this not then the promise? Is it not, then, from confidence in the Gospel, that you laid aside your cowl as being free from human traditions, but what you have seen fit for yourself, that you might be able to defend it by your rule? Did you not, then, lay aside the cowl? For the sake of the weaker brethren, I answer you here, and not since I consider your arguments worthy of a response, I nonetheless answer. Father Churrardus Treger, an Augustinian,

is said to have desired dialectic from us, though he himself recently inferred that the Church cannot err in delivering the articles of Faith. Therefore, even if it prescribes something outside of scripture, it should be heard with little dialectic, as if it could invent some article of Faith not contained in scripture. He, I say, appointed this Logic Father, when he himself in all his works is skilled in dialectics, so that he would have appointed him as a teacher for you and your Roessent, so that you might be more surely led to gather what you are going to write and read against us.

However, it is much more ridiculous, the reasoning you add. For, by virtue of the effusion, you say, many who have never drunk that blood have obtained the remission of sins. What does this have to do with Murner's strings? If we were to say thus, for those who partake and consecrate (which is your term) the grace promised, by the words of the Lord's Supper, on account of their work, what still would it have done against us, that many have obtained remission who have not drunk the blood of Christ? I will argue similarly that many have obtained complete remission of sins without your confession, oblation, indulgences, and all the other things that your synagogue possesses; therefore, no remission of sins should be expected from any of these. I think you would laugh at one beginning thus, but you and your Roessent, raving like this, are laughable, not to be imitated. And with this one word, I would gladly point out to you if I had been willing to hear, nor is it necessary it would have been appropriate, wretched with these trifles, which are more childish than anything, to waste paper.

It is equally witty, what you added in your fourth reading, in these trifles you repeat there from your Roessensis: Why, you say, would it have been superfluous to invent another sacrament for the remission of sins, after Baptism has already removed original sins, and penance abolished all other actual crimes. As you speak, first you indicate that you do not know what either original sin or actual sin is, and finally, you forget that it is an anathema to us, whoever attributes any remission of sins to sacraments. Lastly, to accept these trifles of yours, Baptism which removes original sins and penance, which you have contrived as sacraments, for actual sins, would not be superfluous, neither would it have been for the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, that we should seek the remission of sins from it! Since you even attribute remission of sins to your blessed water, and I do not think you deny it to be true, in any form, you for sins, by prayer, by remission of fraternal injury, and by many other things, sins are accustomed to be forgiven.

Therefore, unless the Lord has completely denied you ears to hear, listen briefly to the matter as it is. When the Lord says, "This blood of mine will be poured out for you for the remission of sins, this body of mine is given for you, this is the new covenant in my blood," two things are said: one, that the body is given, the other, that the blood is shed, and from this very pouring of blood, the testamentThe new covenant is confirmed, but the other, which is the body given for us, is surely for believing that the blood is poured out for us, surely for cleansing, which is the new covenant with us, rightly established by this blood and tradition, so that having obtained the remission of sins, if we are sons of God and heirs, who would deny that the body has already been handed over on the Cross, the blood of the covenant shed, and who would not

consider that the remission of sins is to be expected from here? But we are by no means asserted, we are cleansed by none, we do not attain the new covenant unless, hearing that Christ promised this body to be given for us, the blood to be shed that we might obtain remission, we have firm faith in these things.

Therefore, if you look to Christ and the Father, who predestined us before we existed, He has already clearly provided it long ago, namely on the cross, as He promised in the words of the Lord's Supper, but if you attend to us, who obtain the fruit of this sacrifice, then we obtain it when we believe. However, faith comes from hearing, not from the words of the Church, but of Christ. Therefore, we rightly say that in the words of the Lord's Supper there is a promise. For although you may say that what Christ promised at the supper was fulfilled on the Cross, it has not yet been fulfilled for us, but we receive it daily by faith, and for this reason, we daily also repeat that promise, until, with the last enemy destroyed, which is death, and sins completely cleansed, we feel that God is all in all.

Therefore, what you also admit is promised in the words The remission of sins in the Lord's Supper is not obtained by the reception of the elements, but rather, it is achieved by the shedding of blood on the Cross. You clearly agree with us, if you only acknowledge that the shedding was truly beneficial to us, when we hold faith in the words Christ proposed to us at the Last Supper. Thus Paul writes in Romans 3: "Justified freely by His grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God has set forth as a propitiation, through faith in His blood." Here you see that through the merit of Christ's blood, and by God's grace, we obtain redemption and the remission of sins, but not without faith.

And this is beautifully indicated by St. Peter in the salutation of his first epistle, writing: "To the elect strangers, according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, in sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ." Here you see that, first and foremost, we must be chosen according to the predestination of God, then we are sanctified by the Spirit's influence, so that we may obey the Word of God through faith; then finally we are sprinkled with the blood of Christ, that is, we are cleansed by Him. For otherwise, no matter how much His blood was shed on the Cross, we would never be cleansed by it. Therefore, since we are among those for whom His blood was shed and His body was given, the promise will not be fulfilled in us until we obtain the fruit of the Lord's death through faith. This comes by hearing the promise of God. We always repeat this in our celebration of the Lord's Supper so that our faith, which, as we act here, is always lacking, may be increased.

Therefore, who among you, so blind, dares so shamelessly to deny any word of divine promise added to the Lord's Supper, which, I say, you nonetheless again concede, and even openly admit? If you understand no grace or forgiveness of sins to be promised to those celebrating or partaking of the Lord's Supper, you should have stated this openly in clear words, for this is also what we confess, bringing the remission of sins not to the consumption but to faith. But now you not only fail to understand what you boast will

overthrow us with grand and lofty words, but instead, in place of the doctrine of piety which you wretchedly reject, you have set up idols for yourselves in the deranged thoughts of your own minds.

For it is not so much impious as ridiculous, as if you were sounding a retreat, as you say, like one who is already defeated. Therefore, the word of the promise of the divine Mass, which is joined by Christ the Savior, to be part of the substance of the same Mass, is elicited by no sacred scripture nor confirmed by canonical scriptures. Therefore, you should place the first part of the substance of the Mass, believed in the faith of the Church offering and receiving it, as grace, and not published in any sacred writings or instituted and promised by Christ. These are your words, Murner, as Latin as they are theological. Where, O mighty warrior, are your arms here, drawn from the armory of the scriptures? From where was this produced? You say grace is believed in by the faith of the Church offering and receiving, and that the first part of the substance of the Mass must be placed there. But why is this necessary, and what words of Scripture have compelled you to this point? When will you prove that the Church offers anything in the Lord's Supper? The Church's faith, which is the true Church, holds that it is certain that grace is obtained from God for the forgiveness of sins, yet this relies not at all on the words of the Church but on those of God.

For how could the Church, that is, godly men, promise divine favor unless they have the Word of God promising this, as indeed they clearly do? But this faith relies on the Word of God, not because of the Church, but because God Himself has spoken it. Yet, why do I labor to draw out something from your words when you yourself are altogether uncertain as to what they mean?

If there were any place among you for further exhortation, I would exhort and strongly urge you to deny yourself, and to let no one interfere with your wisdom, placing all your confidence in God, and acknowledging that a natural man cannot understand what pertains to the Spirit of God. You should ask and pray to the Father through Christ that He would grant you the Holy Spirit, for what currently agitates you against the holy Gospel of God is not good. You should then read the Scriptures alone, not imposing what pleases you, but rather learning from them what the Lord approves.

For in this way, you could indeed be saved, whom now I have no more doubt that you will precipitously fall into hell than I am certain that Christ, my God, died for me. Truly, truly, the Pope has no paradise, nor do his legates, or that arrogant Faber, who perhaps puffs you up with empty promises and drives you to kick against the pricks.

But lest I detain the devout reader, it is time to respond to what you seem to have objected to against what we say regarding the other part of the Evangelical Mass, the sign of bread and wine. First, you say, according to your custom, that this must be firmly denied by us, with no substance of bread or wine remaining there (to use your words again), when Christ shows the bread and says, "This is my body." What an argument indeed, if it were impossible for God to make it so that there should simultaneously be true bread and the true body of the Lord, true wine, and the true blood of Christ.

Why do you not give this glory to God, that since it is written, "He took bread, gave thanks, and broke it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, 'This is my body,'" this indeed, which I hold in my hands, this bread. Allow us to believe that by His power, God makes it so that there is both true bread and nonetheless also the true body of the Savior. Nor, I think, will you say that it is impossible for God that a man should at the same time relinquish true bread and yet give his true body to be present. Thus, your argument is similar to that of this Murner, who took on a pilgrimage to a certain statue of the Virgin. Virgin, and the quartan fever left him, thus now he is free from the fever's heat. Nor does he sweat blood while he delivers his lecture on the Mass, which he recently spoke of in a crowded assembly, even though nothing of the sort appeared in him. You might say immediately, "It is possible that I was freed from fever, and yet it returns to me in such a way that, now defending our sacrificial Mass, I truly sweat blood, and you do not see it."

Then, as to the place in the Acts of the Apostles, where it is written: "They were persevering in the doctrine of the Apostles, and in the breaking of bread." Also, a little later: "They broke bread from house to house," Acts 2. You say these things are ambiguous and sound more about a common meal than a sacrament. I would not argue much with you on this point, but your Bishop of Rochester is so undoubtful about these things concerning the body of Christ that he tries to prove from this that the Pope has rightfully forbidden the laity one species of the Eucharist, as you speak. From this, even though you have changed, yet to those two disciples who, on the day of his resurrection, journeyed to Emmaus, Christ gave them His body only under the species of bread, I wonder why you differ from him here.

But to the point, and with certain arguments, Christ, holding true bread in His hands, said, "This is my body." Similarly with wine, it is possible that the bread remains, and yet the true body is present: Just as it is true, God is man, and simultaneously, and yet truly, God and truly man. Thus, without reason and without Scripture, you invent your dreamed-up transubstantiation. Then Paul clearly calls the bread the body of the Lord and the blood. Wine, the cup, not once but twice, namely 1 Corinthians 10 and 11, where metonymy is used, substituting the container for the contained: therefore, when we name the bread and wine, we speak like the Apostles; when you affirm that there is nothing left here of bread and wine except the accidents, you speak like the Thomists; or if you would most wish to clear yourselves, this is proven by Ambrose or the Fathers.

But regarding Matthew, or rather your interpreter of Matthew, whom you mention, who translates the bread as 'supersubstantial' in the Lord's Prayer, and contend, with Paul, that the bread is still called the body of the Lord, must be understood as supersubstantial bread—even if he translated it correctly, where in Scripture do you prove it, that Paul's words should be taken thus? Here he says, 'The bread which we break,' (indeed), even supersubstantial bread is broken. If you bring again the Lord's words saying of the bread, 'This is my body,' it is already answered that the body of the Lord does not need bread to be absent, for both can be, since even nature believes it much more easily than that the same is God and man.

But I pity your impudence, or shall I say your madness, you who have dared openly to accuse Luther here of forgery because he translates 'supersubstantial bread' in Matthew 6 as 'daily bread,' when your own interpreter likewise renders the very word in Luke 11 thus, and thus you sing the verse in your Masses, and teach in your sermons. Nor will it excuse you that a man and most learned person, Emer, was previously slandered by this name; for it behooves the judge of truth, Christ to Following the truth, not Emser, constructed from lies.

But utterly laughable are you, who from Erasmus, whose words you have by no means understood, consider his canon to be constructing Scriptures for us, and that being declared, as you say, by Matthew. For you say, wherever and in whomever's sacred Scriptures bread is mentioned, this undoubtedly, Matthew declares, is heavenly bread and supersubstantial. We owe you thanks, such a great Theologian, who has introduced such elegant and universal a canon, light to the holy Scriptures. Now we know that the seven and five loaves with which Christ fed such a multitude were heavenly and supersubstantial. And those two hundred loaves which David brought to Abigail in the desert, were heavenly. O stupidity, O the delirium of quartan fever, or rather, O the lamentable blindness and shamelessness of your mind. Even if what you dream were very true, namely that heavenly bread should be understood, would it therefore not still be bread?

Then you boldly forget that what is called 'the breaking of bread,' in Acts 2, just above, was rather said to be a common meal than the communion of the sacrament. Therefore, your canon does not hold in this place. The Kingdom of Antichrist must have defenders like these, who make themselves even the laughingstock of children.

Therefore, with Paul, you would have us cease to call it bread and wine, lest we speak falsely, and also with consecration, as you call it, lest you indict us for idolatry from this. For just as we call it bread and wine, so also at the same time, the true body and true blood. we confess the name of our Lord Jesus Christ. We call them signs, because they plainly signify to us, and strengthen our faith, which, as it were, defends us and firmly confirms that Christ our Lord suffered death to redeem us, and offered himself to the Father on our behalf, as he himself commanded, that we should take them in remembrance of him. They bring to our remembrance that most holy sacrifice by which we are redeemed. And certainly, in Murner's judgment, it is contrary to the Gospel to have called the signs the body and blood of the Lord. But you ask, the sign of bread and wine, you say. And what is this absurdity? Do you call the sacrament of baptism a sign for this reason? Not, I suppose, because it signifies baptism, but because it is baptism itself, which signifies that we are baptized inwardly by the Spirit. You mock men with the word of God in great vanity. Reconsider this nonsense, Murner; your judgment remains undoubtedly yours, and will be unbearable to you in time to come.

We, with Paul, call bread and wine the body and blood of the Lord, these great signs, not to signify bread and wine, nor indeed the body and blood of the Lord, but our redemption and salvation — who could deny it? This is as foreign

to the Gospel as, to use your words, a demon is separated from its creator. Truly, a demon stirs you, compelling you, with such insane twists, to blaspheme the holy mysteries of God. For if even a basic sense of nature were intact in you, you could not make yourself so laughable to all those for whom the Gospel has been greeted, while you impute you yourself testify that you never understood, and I shall remain silent about the fact that you play so impiously, and to your own everlasting destruction, with the most sacred rites of Christ.

Here I set aside your countless insults and your opinions, as impious as they are foolish; I also set aside your twice foolish philosophy about signs, so that your book may grow large, and there will be no lack of further absurdities for your swine to hurl against. I will only respond to what you say in the fourth lesson.

I now clearly see how prudently you have acted by advising the people not to carry around the consecrated host for veneration on the feast of Corpus Christi, since, according to your Mass, it has no part in the substance, as if the consecrated host is not to be revered, even if, as you feign, it was instituted for another use. Is this not Murner's most clever trickery? But we have established that the holy bread, the body of the Lord, was instituted for another use than for you to parade it around with worldly pomp. Who is he that said: 'Take and eat, do not parade around adorned with silk, crowned, with sounding cymbals, with flowers strewn, with burning candles, with roaring voices, and with proud companions?'

Indeed, the war you bring up is worthy of such a heroic fighter. But you show from the Gospel that the consecrated host is not to be adored or venerated. I answer, first tell me in which place in Scripture you learned that the bread which we break is called a consecrated host, rather than you call it the body of the Lord? Then, from the writings of Paul and other Evangelists, we have the body of the Lord. the Lord is to be eaten, and His blood to be drunk, in remembrance of Him; this is, by eating this bread and drinking the cup, which is the only external use of this mystery, as we have received from the Lord's hand, we proclaim the Lord's death. For, I do not see what can equally oppose this proclamation as much as your exceedingly worldly pomp. But, of course, worldly things must please the worldly. Finally, judge for yourself, unless you are completely out of your mind, which of these institutions has a better reason: we, who take the bread and cup of the Lord in memory of the Lord's death, or you, who carry around the Lord's body with boots on your feet and with enormous pomp, adoring it. What we do, the Lord instituted; what you do, Thomas Aquinas dreams. We listen to what the Father of the doctors commanded us to hear, Christ; you listen to the Pope, who promises indulgences, whom you do not know. We have the Word of God, from which our mysteries are founded in Faith; you, having followed the word of man, build on the sand.

But I would like to hear how you would respond to the question: how is it that the Lord's body, which is to be venerated so much by you, is preserved in the temples for a whole year and worshipped so negligently? Indeed, these things are outside the institution.

Therefore, I proceed to the third point which you attack, namely, that the Testament is the Lord's Supper. I would like first to ask where you have learned that the words which are to be proclaimed at the Lord's Supper, which you make the third part of your Mass, are words of consecration, and not more of promise, since you yourself admit that the remission of sins is promised in them, especially even in the words of the cup, the Scriptures do not mention anything about consecration, nor do the words themselves suggest such a thing, especially if the idea of transubstantiation pleases us. For what is consecrated remains the same; what was once profane is now made holy, that is, set apart from common use. Thus, among us, the bread does not remain but is changed into the body of the Lord. Therefore, you would properly speak of the words of transubstantiation, not of consecration. But it is characteristic of you not to know what you are saying or what you are asserting. So, putting aside your dreams, I will deal with what has been established; that is, I will show, and you will foolishly argue, while you think you are attacking what we call the Mass Testament.

For the first thing you object to, works most in our favor. You say, then, let it stand for us according to an infallible and Christian teaching that there is one New Testament for us, which is the Gospel of Christ, confirmed and established by His death. You then bring forth testimony from the Epistle to the Hebrews, citing the passage from Jeremiah, chapter 31, clearly indicating that you have not yet understood what you are asserting or quoting. Therefore, the New Testament is indeed a covenant that God makes spiritually with the true Israelites: He places His Law, which nature hates, in their hearts and inscribes it in their minds, so that all their will is now in the law and teaching of Himself. He will be their God, and they will, in turn, be His people; all will now know, but what is the cause of all these things? Because, He says, I will be merciful to their iniquities, and their sins I will remember no more. And why is this so? Certainly, it is because of the blood of Christ: in whom we have redemption, through His blood, as stated in Ephesians 1. In Him, the Lord laid upon Him the iniquity of us all, He was offered because He willed it. Therefore, since the tradition of His body, this holy offering, has been made, the shedding of blood has been rightly and significantly added as the designation of the Testament to the cup, which represents the shedding of blood, not because the body does not pertain to this, for whose blood would be shed, but because the offering of the body is completed by the shedding of blood.

To these points, now, if you consider this New Testament to be a covenant between God and us, just as He acknowledges us as His people, so we recognize Him as our God, which cannot be except through faith, and this indeed cannot happen unless I believe these words of His: 'For I will be merciful to their iniquities,' which I cannot believe if I look at my merits, and not only, as it is said, the blood of Christ shed for us, you will easily understand that the Lord's Supper is most rightly called a New Testament. For however merciful God is, and He gave His Son for us in death, unless I believe these things, certain for me on account of this all sins are forgiven, this new covenant is not yet made with me. For I do not yet acknowledge God as my savior, but I tremble before Him as a condemning judge. In the Lord's Supper, Christ

speaks thus: 'Take and eat, this is my body which is given for you; take, drink, this is the cup of the new Testament in my blood, which is shed for you.' Who, if he should say, 'Have confidence if indeed you are born children of wrath, and your wicked life has grievously provoked the wrath of my Father against you, nevertheless, take comfort, he says, because behold, this is the body given for you, this is my blood shed for you. If you believe, it is the New Testament, and it is now established for you in my blood, which, though it was shed once on the cross, is still poured out for us whenever we believe, because our sins, unless we believe, cannot be washed away, for by faith are hearts purified (Acts 15).

This confirms that, at the present time, the Lord spoke, as both the Evangelists and Paul testify: 'This,' he says, 'is my body which is given for you;' Paul adds, 'is broken.' 'This is the cup of my blood, which is poured out for you,' so that you may understand that these things occurred when they are believed. For what Murner says, that the present tense is used instead of the future because of the certainty of the matter, is not proven anywhere in the New Testament. The prophets have their own manner, but in the New Testament, everything is spoken clearly and distinctly, without confusion of times.

Therefore, we who have Jesus as our High Priest, have not merely had Him, but are certain, as He remains with us until the end of the world, whenever, in our Lord's Supper, we either recount these words of Christ or hear them, we do not doubt that Christ speaks to us in the present; to not believe this would be supreme impiety. We firmly believe, as He says: 'This is my body, which is given for you; this is my blood, which is shed for you for the forgiveness of sins,' so that even then it returns to us the fruit of this tradition and outpouring, namely the forgiveness of sins, so that we may truly acknowledge God as ours, which happens through faith. The Father, through the blood of Christ and by His Spirit, writing His Law indeed in our hearts, has infused it: Now, when we have such faith in the words of Christ in the Lord's Supper, and for the purpose of confirming this faith, we receive His body and blood, the New Testament is established, renewed, and confirmed with us.

So, what blindness, Murner, in these words, if the Mass is the New Testament, is impiety, that you order yours to flee from here, as if from the most immediate poison? I admit, for kitchens and your stomachs, this doctrine is harmful: but to pious minds, nothing can be proclaimed more salutary.

But since you are completely astonished at the holy things of Christ, you undoubtedly cannot grasp this, although it is repeated again now: therefore, I press you with the clear words of Scripture. You confess that the New Testament is the Gospel, but there is no more plausible Gospel than this: This is my body, which is given for you: this is my blood, which is shed for you. For what could be broader than to hear that we are redeemed by such a great sacrifice, undoubtedly from sin, death, and hell? Therefore, if the New Testament is the Gospel, and this is it, then our Mass is it. It is indeed the sum of all the Gospels, that Christ offered His body and blood for our redemption; the Mass is surely the Testament. Then Christ, according to Luke and Paul, said: This cup is the new Testament in my blood, and as we said a little earlier, this is not excluded, but included including even the tradition of the body, for

we do not separate these things, which we have received together from the Lord. Therefore, by calling the Mass the Testament, we follow Christ, not the figment of our own hearts, as you do when you call it a sacrifice.

But if you object using Matthew and Mark, who call it 'the blood of the testament,' not the Testament itself, I reply that this is a Hebraism, just as 'son of perdition' is used to mean 'lost son,' and 'the poor of the saints' means 'the poorest among the saints.' Likewise, here it makes sense to understand 'the blood of the new Testament' as being the new Testament itself, not by itself, but insofar as we are sprinkled with it through faith. And this in the same way that Christ is called our righteousness and sanctification: 1 Corinthians 1, as He is the author of our righteousness and sanctification. Furthermore, if I were to press you with words, they would sound more in our favor: namely, if we interpreted it thus: 'The blood of the testament' means 'of the Lord's Supper,' whereby it indeed obtains the reality and name of the Testament, of which I have spoken above. For truly, as long as we celebrate the Supper of Christ in the way He instituted it, a pact, covenant, and new, eternal Testament is established, renewed, and confirmed between us and God.

Therefore, your impudence is great, for at the end of the third part of your reading you dared to say: 'Therefore, that cup is neither new Testament nor ever was, but rather representative or confirmatory through the blood of Christ.' These words of yours are abominable: Christ says, 'This cup is the Testament. Murner, however, denies that the cup is the New Testament, and if it is. May God destroy and confound you, impure mouth, so that you may repent. Do you dare, most impiously, to contradict our Christ, God? With the same impiety in the fourth lesson, you babble much about the nominal and moral Testament, and you deny that Christ established any nominal covenant, because he had no temporal goods. Who would not swear to send you, in your wickedness, to Anticyra? Are only temporal goods considered? He testified and declared remission of sins to believers and eternal life, and do you deny that He instituted the nominal Testament? But I recognize the cunning - that jurists have remembered nothing of these things, as they were carnal, they were ignorant of such a naming, so, according to Murner, Christ ordained nothing: see how you attack with firm arguments.

It is equally vain when you then object with Roffensis, that if the cup is the New Testament, it is excluded from the Sacred Mass of the body. For I have already twice reminded that we do not separate these things, nor did Christ separate them. Indeed, because the cup is the Testament, in His blood, the body must be present, whose blood otherwise would not be shed, if it is so absent that it is excluded. But it is even more ridiculous, what you add a little later, that if the Mass is the Testament, it was of no value before His death, because a Testament is confirmed by death and does not have force while the Testator is alive, Hebrews 9. What, I ask, is this against? The Testament certainly has no effect, so that its legacies may be granted to anyone, unless the Testator has died. with the testator dead, therefore it is not a Testament that is established while living? We do not receive the eternal life bequeathed to us by Christ until His death has been fulfilled in all His members, where death has been swallowed up in victory; thus, shall we deny that it is a testament and a promise to us? What could be more foolish than what you add to these

trifles in the sixth lesson? If, you say, Christ had left a nuncupative testament, its legacies would demand a right to be claimed from the heir, that is, from us as the heir. What, then, if someone names me as an heir in a testament, and after the testator's death, I immediately inherit his goods, would this not, therefore, make the testament a nuncupative one, where no other heir receives the legacy? I see, along with the learned and those skilled in divine and human law, that you are ignorant of both. However, in matters concerning human testaments, it was necessary also to discuss this divine and spiritual one, to compare spiritual things with spiritual things. 1 Corinthians 2.

Finally, you repeat the same refrain, namely that there is one new Testament, which is the Gospel, not realizing that it is for us, who hold the highest summation of the Gospels, that is, the promises of divine grace in the Lord's Supper, to which we must firmly believe; moreover, also in the most holy form of bread and wine, which is the body and blood of the Lord. This one and eternal Testament, this new covenant, between God and us, is based on nothing else but His promise and our faith. Where these are joined, truly, He is our God whothat His people; we receive so many good things from Him, as much as we can believe.

But regarding the several passages of scripture you cite, first from Isaiah: "I will make with you an everlasting covenant, the sure mercies of David"; another from Hebrews, where Christ is called the mediator of the new Testament; and third from the same Epistle, chapter thirteen, where it says, "The God of peace, who brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, the great shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant," etc. You say: Are these and similar citations from the sacred writings not to be understood concerning the Mass? Read about Christ, and proclaim the Testament, and the doctrine of the remission of sins? I reply that these very much pertain to the true Mass. For in this is proposed the redemption through Christ, which is the sure mercies of David promised to the faithful. By this same mediator, the eternal Testament is established for us, through His own blood, for the remission of sins, which may be clear enough to any pious person from what has been cited above, and indeed no one except you and your blind Papists could fail to understand. But responding to your foolish arguments too much, is a waste of time and paper, which even a simple rustic boy, who had heard our sermons for just half a year, would criticize without hesitation.

After this, as if you had not yet introduced enough nonsense, you bring in your Roessen against what we say, that the reason for the sacrament is sufficiently established by the promise of God and the institution by His sign, and that it is enough if you believe in the promise, to obtain grace if you accomplish them, you argue that almsgiving is promised for the purification of the soul, and that the remission of all sins is granted due to prayer being heard, and once more for the forgiveness of a brother's injury. Finally, you add that no matter how much you believe, if you do not do these things, you will never attain the effect of the promise. Murnerus and Roessensis, truly marked by remarkable bitterness, the distinguished pair of the Pope's defenders, argue this: Christ says, 'He who believes in me has eternal life.' Where that is present, I suppose sins are forgiven, and the soul is purified. But if Roessensis is the author,

Christ is lying, because, as Roessensis says, no matter how much you believe, you will never attain the effect of the promise unless you do these things.

O blind minds! Where do you find the scripture that shows any promise from God is based on your deeds? He said, 'Forgive, and it shall be forgiven you,' but nowhere does He say, 'Because you forgive, you shall be forgiven.' Christ indicated the consequence by His words, not the cause. For you cannot forgive your brother's injury from your heart in a way that is pleasing to God unless you are first endowed with charity, which is a gift of God, who was merciful to your sins beforehand and through His spirit has infused charity into your heart. Therefore, your sins must be forgiven before you forgive the offenses of others from your heart for God's sake. Hence, it is far from the case that the forgiveness of your own sins depends on your forgiving others. Faith works through love, and not the other way around; therefore, your heart must be cleansed by Faith before anything you do is right. Thus, it is said, "Ask, and you shall receive," but not because of what you ask, but because a merciful and kind Father has promised to hear us when we pray. "By grace, you have been saved," says St. Paul, in the second letter to the Ephesians, "through faith, and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God, not of works, lest anyone should boast." And yet, it is said to the lawyer, "Do this, and you shall live." For if true faith is present, it will be effective through love and will not lack good works, but not because of these things, but because of the grace of the Father and the merit of Christ, we shall live, and nevertheless, truly good works will follow.

He reveals the same madness, when he claims that a visible sign is required for something to be truly called a sacrament, but it is instituted by divine authority to strengthen our faith. Even your indefatigable and most learned father and lord, John, Bishop of Ross, in his discourse on making a sacrament, assigns a visible sign to a movement of labor, or a lifting of hands. In almsgiving, what is given to the poor is a visible sign. And when injury is forgiven to a brother, it is also accompanied by certain indicators and signs, whence these must be considered sacraments, since each has its own promise. Twice foolish and blind are we to speak of signs added by God Himself to His promises to confirm faith in them, and you, as you are accustomed to do, make whatever is visible into a sign for us. God promised victory to Gideon, to whom He added the sign of the fleece to strengthen his faith, thus He gave us the baptism of the Spirit, by which by which we are baptized internally by the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, to strengthen our faith. He added an external Baptism as a sign, in the same manner that He has promised us an eternal and new covenant in His own blood, so that we might hold this firmly convinced: He instituted the taking of His body and blood as a sign and seal, in bread and wine. Produce now, wretched ones, the passage where Christ, to be heard more surely in prayer, ever assigned the movement of hands or the elevation of arms as a sign. What vain babbling is this which teaches what Luther teaches so frivolously, as if even idiots could understand, while you, as usual, clutch at straws and still dare to oppose them? But if you are of evil intent, how could you ever fare well? Woe to you, so shamelessly blaspheming the Holy Gospel of God: calling good evil, and evil good, making darkness light, and light darkness, bitter sweet, and sweet bitter. Woe to those who are wise in their own eyes and prudent in their own sight. (Isaiah 5:21)

Now, finally, it is necessary to respond to the arguments by which Murner wishes to prove that the Mass is a sacrifice, though he himself has not yet given birth to them. Like an elephant in labor, struggling with slowness: but what will it bring forth? The mountains will be in labor and a ridiculous mouse will be born. This he made his cause, this title he inscribed on his book, to prove that the Mass is a sacrifice, and with so many inanities and frivolities, gnawing away, now at this, now at that of Luther's teachings, patching them together in his readings, scarcely ever with one word or another. mentions this, but nothing through the scriptures, to which alone he resorts to cast us down. We do not find any scripture concerning the Lord's Supper or word in the New Testament, except those four places, in Matthew 26, Mark 14, Luke 22, and Paul in 1 Corinthians 11. Unless, in what is here in chapter 10, there is one word of his commentary, but in these places, there is no syllable that signifies that the Mass is a sacrifice, let alone suffice our answer to be completed, with one and another little argument by which he seems to oppose us.

He himself denies that any word of promise is attached to the Mass, when the words of the Mass are, "This is my body, which is given for you, this is my blood, which is shed for you," which he nevertheless admits contain a promise, except he adds that it was completed on the Cross, as if, even if it were so, the words of promise would already be nullified thereby. He denies that bread and wine remain in the Mass, when Paul clearly calls the Lord's body bread and His blood wine in two places, nor does he call it false. He denies these to be signs, when the Lord instituted them to be taken in memory of Himself, which certainly cannot be done without the testimony of our redemption. Finally, he denies that the cup is the Testament, while in two places of scripture, Christ says this in clear words. Why then should we admit to him, who, relying on no scripture at all, imagines that the Mass is a sacrifice, especially when, in it, they sacrifice to God, offering Christ anew, indeed, even sacrificing Him. Otherwise, even in the Lord's Supper, memory may be considered the memory of the most holy sacrifice, in which Christ offered Himself to the Father for us, and all the fruit of this returns to those who piously partake in the Lord's Supper. We do not deny that the Mass can be called a sacrifice, but not in the sense that a sinful priest offers something to God, but rather in the sense that, by recalling Christ's unique sacrifice with faith, we obtain that eternal testament, that we may be cleansed of sins and become children and heirs of God.

But let us hear how these clever men provoke us with our own words. 'Luther,' they say, 'states that a Testament involves the death of the testator.' 'This,' says Murner, 'we accept wholeheartedly.' For if Luther insists that priests cannot offer because Christ did not offer in the Supper, he recollects his own words, that a Testament involves the death of the testator, and does not assume force and strength, and is not fulfilled in total perfection until he who has made it dies. For this reason, it does not solely pertain to what was done at the Supper but also to His offering on the Cross, for on the Cross, He completed the sacrifice that He began at the Supper, and the commemoration of the whole matter, namely the consecration in the Supper and the offering on the Cross, is celebrated and represented in the Sacrament of the Mass. This, Murner eloquently states. But he does not see, poor man, that this does

not help his case in the slightest. We willingly admit that a Testament involves the death of the testator, and we thank you, who have finally returned to the path, and you confess the Testament with us; in turn, we grant you that a Testament is confirmed by death. testament, as a legacy, cannot in any way be obtained by the heirs before the death of the testator; we affirm this without hesitation. And so, it is clear that the offering on the Cross also pertains to the Testament, in such a way that it is based entirely on what was promised at the Supper: the remission of sins. But what does all this have to do with making the Mass a sacrifice, something that you claim to sacrifice? Indeed, you might say: He completed on the Cross the sacrifice that He began at the Supper. Prove this from the Scriptures, Murner, that a sacrifice was initiated at Christ's Supper. Truly, He instituted a memorial of the sacrifice, but did not begin a sacrifice.

You add that the whole commemoration, namely of the consecration at the Supper and the offering on the Cross, is celebrated and represented by the Sacrament of the Mass. I would prefer that you speak of promises, not consecrations. But let us grant you this—what do you infer from it? The memory of the eternal sacrifice, that is, the one by which Christ has perfected forever those who are sanctified, as stated in Hebrews 10, is to be accomplished in the Lord's Supper, and we teach that ourselves. Yet, if this one offering is sufficient for us to be sanctified forever, how will you prove that it is permissible for us to sacrifice Him again? And what you added afterward, that death is more truly represented than the Supper—to whom, I ask, are you speaking? Who ever dreamed that the Supper is represented, while it is death that is represented, and Paul rightly exhorts us to proclaim this. If the objection did not remain in your mind: If death is represented, then also the sacrifice in the Lord's Supper is represented. If everything were done in the Lord's Supper as is promised and represented, it would indeed go very well with us, for even sinners the complete remission of sins, which we shall not attain except by death being swallowed up in victory, we would perform ourselves, or certainly receive from the Lord. For it is promised, and Paul commands us to proclaim the death of the Lord to raise this hope, until He comes.

I hear that in your lectures you have given different times, and finally brought them together, claiming that a priest in the Lord's Supper performs what Christ did on the Cross as well as what He did at the Supper, and thus that the one celebrating the Mass sacrifices because Christ sacrificed on the Cross. O foolishness and impiety. Why then do you not, in your grief, offer the bodies, since He did it, why do you crucify His body so many times? To this, if you thus conjoin the offering made on the Cross with the Lord's Supper, that you assert this should be done again by the priest, why do you not also conjoin the resurrection, the ascension, the sending of the Holy Spirit, and, finally, the Last Judgment, for all these necessarily pertain to this, that our sins may be fully remitted, which is what is promised in the Mass. For He died for our transgressions and rose again for our justification; neither can happen to us unless the Holy Spirit has been sent. He could not send Him unless He first established His kingdom, after He ascended into heaven. Finally, we obtain complete redemption only when this mortal body has put on immortality. Therefore, in this way, we would perform in that Lord's Supper all things, namely consecration, offering, reception, death, resurrection, ascension, and

judgment and the Last Judgment, and will we say that priests consecrate, offer, eat, mortify, raise from the dead, ascend into heaven, send the Holy Spirit, and bring back to the judgment of Christ. O lost minds, who have enslaved yourselves to impiety, attempting even impossibilities with such great disgrace to yourselves. For it is as possible to prove that the Mass is a sacrifice from the Scriptures as it is to prove that Christ is not our supreme and eternal Priest, who alone succeeded in all things temporal and eternal, who entered once for us into the heavenly Holy of Holies and prepared eternal redemption for us. For this is indeed what you are attempting, so that by excluding Christ, you may reign, as you have done, in the hearts of men, well-fed on the sweets and delicacies of the stomach. But put away the hope of recovering this kingdom; Christ, by the spirit of His mouth, has begun to destroy your idol. Endure a little while; the Lord is coming, is coming, with the light of His coming; He will utterly destroy your kingdom. Amen.

After this, as if to refute us, he mockingly laughs at the argument by which we prove that nothing is offered in the Mass when Christ said, 'Take,' because he who receives does not offer, since to offer is to give something. Our Murner perhaps dreamt in his quartan fever that to offer is not to give but to provide, as in German, as if to provide were to distribute, not to give at the same time, even if it gives nothing of itself. I will leave these and similar trifles untouched, as they are utterly unworthy of any response. He delights in them, as well as in his listeners, for whom these lettuces are most fitting. I will add just one thing: the fruits obtained from the Papist Mass, when he counted the fruits of our Mass, he declared that the Mass is not a good work, that it is not a sacrifice, that it benefits only the priest, is useless to the people, brings no benefit to the dead, nor is it salutary to the living; it is impious, and for any need to read the Mass, which all are written as ours are, we know to be true, and they will prove otherwise; six hundred Murners.

For in the Lord's Supper, we receive, but we do not work for God, as when I give alms to a brother; therefore, since the priest alone performs the Lord's Supper, the benefit returns only to him, not to the people, at least from the priest's work; it does not go to the dead, nor to the living who do not participate together. Hence, it is not only impious but also insane to offer the Mass for any necessity.

Moreover, now listen in turn to the fruits of your Mass. First, you deny that the promise and the Testament are present, which strips it of every spiritual benefit.

To deny that bread and wine remain is to accuse Paul of lying and to set up the idols of human commentaries to be worshipped as the oracles of the Holy Spirit.

But because you make it a sacrifice, it exhausts the wealth of the world, devastates all honor, destroys all piety, and unless it returns, fills the world with its enemies. To this, in fact, all scriptures being contrary, we owe this sacrifice, every kind, the rites, which, living in the deepest idleness and greatest luxury, not only remove the decency of the world, killing the bodies of the poor, but, lying in corruption, bring ruin to all integrity and safety. They,

having claimed all power for themselves or made it certainly subject to their desires, not only sin with impunity, but cause that almost only here is honesty and piety to be found. Hence, too, purgatory is constructed, and a fire, to be matured, often with profit, for sacrificing; hence finally, that most sordid and infamous celibacy of the shaven ones, by which the dignity of the sacrifice, under the guise of false sanctity, is bought at a higher price, and meanwhile, the worst of crimes against them leave nothing unattempted in their lust. Hence so many superstitions have been invented, by which, mad with senseless religion, they have made this sacrifice more convenient, a crop most fertile of briars. Hence those shameless sales, equally wicked, by which the insatiable sacrificial priests, selling the wealth of the rich, turn away the wretched from God, and make them trust in nothing, to lean on a reed-staff. Hence, that most harmful tyranny has prevailed, whereby they have begun to oppress our consciences cruelly, sacrifices being so holy, indeed, and so beyond the human condition, who have falsely claimed that they alone can sacrifice, for any human necessity, happens. Hence also the destruction he has been consecrated, with all the knowledge of God, for the Mass should be removed, so that the common people would not understand what is said in it, a foreign language has been adopted for all sacred things. This is such that not even the priests themselves understand; they have nevertheless removed, under this pretext, not only the ability of the laity to judge but also to read the sacred texts, so that it immediately became that they were as suited to them as a donkey to the lyre, so that to us all the mysteries of Christ have been: like the words of a sealed book, which were completely unknown to both the literate and the illiterate, indeed it has even come to pass that human deceits have seized everything, to such an extent that no account at all has been taken of the sacred books of the Bible, indeed many today are ridiculed, who nevertheless make use of them. Behold the fruits that your illustrious Mass owes to the world, which you seem to demerit while laboring to restore it in its entirety.

Although you may more easily obtain pardon for this, because your endeavor is more ridiculous than harmful. To whom indeed is yours, if not to folly or to an utter rejection by the Lord, would you approve more than childish commentaries?

But if you are willing to hear, I will briefly explain to you the fruits of our Mass. First, we acknowledge the promise and the Testament of the Lord's Supper, so wonderfully; as we received from the Lord, we raise faith in our hearts to God, by which, being righteous, attributing truth and mercy to God, and extending charity to our neighbors, we now live not for ourselves, but for the Lord. For when those hear who are ordained to life, Christ, their body and blood, has promised the sacrifice; by which all their sins are atoned, and they become eternal partakers of the Testament as sons and heirs of God, who, without placing all trust in God, do not truly invoke the Father with faith, and completely depend on Him, are plainly blessed from this point. For when they understand how much they have been redeemed for and raised to this dignity, nothing is as hateful to them as sin, which they strive in every way to subdue by the desires of their flesh, in which they find nothing good, so that they may show themselves grateful to their Redeemer and Father, at least in part, since they recognize that nothing else is pleasing to God the Father and

our Lord Jesus Christ than to act toward their neighbors just as they confess has been done to them, willingly making themselves servants to all, seeking nothing in return; freely discharging their duties as best they can. Finally, they recall in death their Master and Lord, whose servants and disciples they find it wrong to reject; they are thus encouraged to bear their cross with greater courage. As the fruits of their faith thus increase, so all the adornments and fruits of piety—modesty, self-control, love, kindness, patience, and strength—become more abundant and resplendent in them.

Then, concerning the bread and wine remaining, we affirm it signifies the unspeakable goodness of God to us with certainty, first attributing glory to God rather than detracting from ourselves, then proceeding in wisdom without straying beyond our bounds obedience to God, whom we know with certainty speaks to us in the Scriptures, we capture our understanding, lest we, blinded by our own thoughts, worship idols. Finally, free from these empty thoughts, such as how the bread is transubstantiated, with its accidents remaining, or under what quantity the body of Christ is contained here, or at what instant He is present here, and similar innumerable questions with which you trouble yourselves, we more deeply consider in spirit which bread we break, and which cup we drink, namely, of the Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, whose most delightful remembrance cannot be expressed, so that it may cheer us, make us eager for every good work, and console us, even if one is endangered in the midst of death and hell.

Finally, what we reject is the sacrifice, the false and most pernicious trust in human works, we remove it, so that the world may be freed from all these useless burdens. Indeed, from these plagues, that is, from impious sacrifices, we show the way, and not without success; having removed this erroneous judgment, we show the path to both priests and laymen, whence the true dignity of the priesthood remains, especially for all those who have faith in Christ. And to put it in one word, we have persuaded everyone that the Mass is nothing less than a sacrifice, but rather a testament and promise, so that by the clear words of God, more than is necessary, we have already convinced you of the deceptions and all superstitions, the impious tyrannies of the shaven heads, and the entire sea of crimes which has flooded the world through them, we have removed and defeated them. These are the fruits of our Mass, Murner, which, even if your clergy seeks the fruit of the present life that you inquire about, should they lose it when they measure it by luxury and delights (for no one takes away from them their necessary sustenance), still, the people whom the Lord, inspired by His Spirit, has made to approach our Mass, will abundantly receive the fruits of future life. For what Christ has instituted cannot but be most fruitful. Already, in our Masses, we neither say nor do anything other than what Christ, whom we believe, commanded to be said and done. The offering of His body and blood promised for the remission of sins—we repeat and embrace this promise in faith. He reminded us of this testament with this offering, and we replicate and believe it; the bread, which is His body, is to be eaten, and the cup, which is His blood, He provided to be drunk. Receiving these, as He commanded, we eat and drink in remembrance of Him, who commanded us to do this, thus ensuring that in remembering His death, which we proclaim, being confirmed, we entirely trust in Him, prepared to die to sins henceforth, and to live to future righteousness.

As for what else we may do in the Lord's Supper, no Scripture teaches us, and we, as Christ's sheep, should not heed strange voices. What, then, I ask, do you desire from the evangelical Mass in this our practice? Or what reason have you to write so shamelessly that our Mass reeks of Evangelism, as is common with stinking yew and lascivious arugula, and more? You are like hemlock, asafetida, stinking and reeking of bitter herbs. These words of yours, in the fourth festive reading, where they appear, might perhaps smell of nothing but incense to you. But truly, to every pious reader, they will smell of dung, intolerable both in madness and impiety.

What, I ask, does your Mass smell like, which, to honor it with some loftier title, you have named the Mass of Jesus Christ, as if another could exist apart from the Evangelical one? Which of the Evangelists, I ask, left behind the terms of consecration, gift, offering, sacrifice, and the like fabrications of yours in Scripture? If your Mass is that of Jesus Christ, why are you not content to say only what He said, and why do you presume to offer what He commanded be given to the disciples to eat and drink—His body and blood? But which canon, the whole of it, do you attribute to the most holy authorities? And finally, for whose memory did Christ institute this Supper to be celebrated, if not His own? How is it that you have made it a remedy for all inconveniences and set it up for gain, so that nothing more impure could be imagined in the world? Your wicked Mass smells of the filth of human traditions and the filth of hell itself, referring back to the most Antichrist, whereas ours does not deviate by a hair's breadth from the institution of Christ, nor do we add any word not drawn from Holy Scripture. Nothing can breathe except that which is Evangelical, and it refers back to our Lord Jesus Christ, whom I pray you would reveal concerning your Mass. horrible abominations, which have already begun; make it so that everyone feels what they truly are, that is, nothing but sheer and confessed idolatries and blasphemies, plagues, and the destruction of all piety and honesty. O Lord and our Savior, act quickly so that this sacrificial Mass, more than suffused with the purest elements of the Antichrist's reign, may utterly fall, be crushed completely, and vanish away, so that, as we have received from you, all who are considered by the name Christian may eat the Lord's Supper, not offer it, so that their faith may be heard, more and more effective through charity, and may abundantly bear the fruit of good works to all forever. Amen.

These things, Murner, so you cannot complain in vain, that you have besought us that we respond to your objections in writing, nor can the enemies of piety boast that we also dared not to engage with you in writing. Indeed, lest it be said that we see nothing worthy of your favor to undertake, who, although you preach everywhere, added only one barrel to your words, and gave me these, I say, as plain as they are crude, if you consider human knowledge as makeshift as you see fit to your readings which you handed over to me to read. They are plainly crude and uncultivated, if you require either human learning or eloquence, but if you demand a sacred form, they are plainly unjust to you and your entire Antichristian realm. My fellow servants, who labor here with me in the Word of the Lord, could have done this much more learnedly and clearly, but when your arguments are so frivolous, that by them like a reed, you attempt to cast down the firmest tower of David, so that anyone among our

people, even an unlearned one, could sufficiently refute them; indeed, I wanted to free them, occupied with better and holier matters, from this burden, this time. Hereafter, you and all your arguments will be utterly disregarded, since it has been clearly revealed in this disagreement how alien you are to the knowledge of God and the understanding of the Scriptures, seeking only battles of words, and that with the utmost impudence, in a matter of such significance that I can no longer doubt that you are a person to be avoided, as Paul commands. You have been admonished not once but repeatedly, almost daily, more than seven times, and yet you do not heed these warnings, remaining ensnared by the devil's snare, held captive by his will; therefore, it is evident that you are completely overthrown and condemned by your own judgment, continuing to sin. Therefore, consider these my final words to you; do not expect a jot more from me after this unless you have first learned to honor the canonical Scriptures, acknowledging that no interpretation of Scripture is to be made by private interpretation, as Peter says, in the second chapter of his second Epistle. Learn from the Scriptures themselves; do not compare yourself as if to instruct the Holy Spirit, bringing your dreams into them, as you often do. As in that statement in your first lecture, where from this word of Christ to Peter, "I have prayed for you, Peter, that your faith may not fail," you collect the entire burden and business of the cause of faith to be cast upon Peter, which is a matter common to all believers might be a cause and an equal confession of faith for everyone, and that the defense pertains as much as the faith itself. Just as recently with that: "You are my friends if you do what I command you," you grasped at, implying that adults should cooperate with grace and salvation, as if it were not God who works in us both to will and to do, and to do what the Lord commands, being a sign of us being friends of God and nothing less than the cause. In all these things, you could have been admonished with a word or two; indeed, in half an hour I could have satisfied you in the whole controversy, as I offered to do several times. But you conduct everything in such a way, and with such an attitude, that you seem to flee from the truth and seek contention. The Church of God does not follow such manners; therefore, we will let you be.

Now, as for calling you idolaters, impostors, and devourers and ravagers of the poor, while you prefer human commentaries to divine oracles—that is, worshipping man in place of God, and making a profit out of it—do not bear it indignantly, for it is not harmful to be called such, but rather to be such; and it is our duty to harshly rebuke those who boast the name of Christian, that they may be sound in faith and not attend to Jewish fables and the commandments of men that turn away from the truth: Titus, first chapter. The rest should be kept under discipline, as Christ did, and the Apostles, lest anyone should deceive and mislead the flock of Christ. And let it not offend that some of us hereWe were not born for this; since we are a new creation, we are reborn, born again through the Spirit; we ought to care about where we are, not in the places where men, that is, sinners, are born, and think much of it. We cannot ascribe to you the zeal that Paul ascribed to the Jews, because, unlike them, you do not adhere to the scriptures but openly prefer human commentaries over them, so much so that you utterly condemn even what scripture teaches. You have dared to call the author of our Mass a wicked demon, while in it we say and do nothing other than what Christ himself commanded us to say and do. As for your Mass, you claim it must be a sacrifice, which no scripture

supports, but human insatiability has devised this impiety, which, under the pretext of this, has made the laziest men, sacrifices, not only of things but also of consciences, and has brought about the ruin of all piety and honesty, proposing it for our worship. These things cannot be attributed to the zeal of God but to the Antichrist. For if you were zealous for God, such cheap words as these could not be most sacred to you. Therefore, expect from us whatever it is proper to expect from those who are most eager for your salvation; but that we should call your impiety zeal, or that we should not oppose it with all our might, do not expect. We can and desire even to die for your salvation, but as for not fighting your contrivances against the truth, we can no more do so than deny Christ, much less flatter you. Do not expect from us any patient effort of affection. We shall cease to criticize your piety only when we cease to live. But we shall use only the powerful arms of God, solely the Word of God, I mean. We have thus far exhorted the laity, whom you have irritated in various ways, to the best of our ability not to be troublesome to any of you, which they themselves also greatly desire. So far from fearing anything from them, we, far less, relying on their hatred, shall attempt anything against you. Amen.

But you, with your citizens and your brothers, have certainly shown the worst kind of gratitude for their modesty toward you and your fellow attackers of evangelical purity. You wrote in your book that after one of your lectures, some two hundred seditious men surrounded you, verbally abused you greatly, and that you would have lost your life if a certain noble young man, Ludovicus Pelsith, with sixty men, had not rescued you and led you to your home. This is a lie, both glaring and shameless, even according to the witnesses among your own faction, especially the same Knight Ludovicus. There was no one present who was not most hostile to any seditious person, nor was anyone in any word even slightly reproachful to you. Only a few had closed the doors and were calling on you to answer us, those whom you continuously slandered with impious lies in your lectures, and you could not be compelled to respond to those refuting you. Now far away from it that anyone has laid in wait for your life or attempted to do you violence. Nevertheless, since you do not only utter these things in your conversations but also commit such open and foul lies to writing, your innocent fellow citizens are slandered in the meantime. The homeland has a bad reputation under the name of sedition, although it is truly most peaceful, and the citizens who have received the word of the Lord are the most tolerant of all, who patiently endure and digest countless daily false accusations and injuries from those who are indeed the cancers of the Papist flock, and are nothing but malice.

But it is well, for Christ declares blessed those who are slandered for his name; however, judgment awaits the blasphemers and liars, the same judgment as for the devil, who is both the father of lies and the father of their lies. It is not new for the professors of truth to be maligned under the name of sedition. What else did Moses hear from Pharaoh? What did Elijah hear from Ahab? What did all the prophets hear from the leaders of Israel? And by what other name was Christ fixed to the cross? Did not all the Apostles perish under this title, along with the multitude of martyrs? While all their adversaries boasted themselves against God, their maker, and against His holiness. Likewise, with the Rastians, who have invaded Christ's empire and established themselves in His holy place as objects of worship, and against the laws of God and

nature, they have blasphemed the majestyBlasphemy, as Peter says, acknowledging no power whatsoever: wherever the kingdom begins, the true King would claim his own, and by his most powerful word, he would cast down tyranny, which they call conspiracy, sedition, faction, and what not? For, as the Lord says through Isaiah, all that this people speaks is conspiracy, but at his command, we do not fear their fear, nor are we afraid: we sanctify the Lord of hosts, who is our fear. Indeed, have no fear of us, except only the word of God, which is the sword we have drawn against you until now, and we will continue to draw, yielding all else. Let your secular arm be yours; we trust in the arm of the Lord: armies, iron, fire, cannons, princes of this world, wealth, glory, and all the power of the flesh, let them be with you; but the Lord is with us. As for your blood, there is no one in our camps who seeks it: whoever would pour out their blood for you, if it could bring you salvation, we have accepted: no one covets your goods, for we have renounced our own; we desire none of your glory, having chosen to be mere beggars; only that your power should not extend against the word of the Lord, none of us will resist, who have wholly consecrated ourselves to the divine will, by which all powers are ordained. Only allow us to trust in Christ, and depend on his word alone, and do not prefer your dreams and fantasies over his most holy laws, and nothing will be done by us that is not already settled in your own domain. May Christ look upon you.

Link to original

https://download.digitale-sammlungen.de/BOOKS/download.pl?ersteseite=1&letzteseite=60&id=00029860&ersteseite=1&letzteseite=60&vers=d&nr=1&abschicken=ja&captcha_z eit=00029860&xdfz=2&dafoemail=