

JUDGMENT
OF GEORGE CALIXTUS,
DOCTOR AND PROFESSOR OF HOLY THEOLOGY,
MOST CELEBRATED IN
THE JULIAN ACADEMY,
ON
THEOLOGICAL CONTROVERSIES,
Which arise
BETWEEN THE LUTHERANS AND THE REFORMED,
And on the
MUTUAL BROTHERHOOD OF PARTIES
and tolerance,
because of
CONSENSUS IN THE FUNDAMENTALS.
"Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called sons of God."
Matthew 5:9
Bind up the testimony, seal the law among my disciples.
Isaiah 8:16.

Frankfurt, Printed by JOHANN FRIEDERICH WEISSIL
YEAR 1650.

To the Reader.

In the previous year, a very significant booklet was published that greatly engaged a renowned figure among the Roman princes, distinguished in Theology, Philosophy, and, if it can be said, in the Christian knowledge of State Affairs. The author of this booklet is Ernestus de Eusebius, a Roman citizen. He, evidently, who affirmed the German violence, the Greek piety, and the Roman faith: And he wanted the title on the front page to be "Theological Judgment on the Question of Whether the Peace Desired by the Protestants is in Itself Lawful." He added this commendation: to those who handle public matters, care for their own conscience, or direct the conscience of others, this is useful and necessary to read. To resolve the problem, he appended rules, fifteen of which state that it is not lawful to grant the same freedom, improperly conceded to the Augsburg Confession or Lutheranism, to Calvinism. For since it is a heresy of a different kind and much worse, a new injury would be inflicted upon the Creator and true Religion; and this would be cast into greater danger. From these words, one may first understand that Lutherans, unless they return to the Roman Sacred Rites, are held in the same regard as Calvinists. Moreover, while those good Romanists clash heads, the Calvinists are most highly condemned as being very much alien, although somewhat closer in ceremonies. Where it is permissible to borrow from Virgil (for he is sacred and inspired by a certain divine spirit), the oracle which Bohemia does not vainly prove: "I will not differentiate between Trojan and Rutulian." The day will teach more, if we stumble upon the same stone and diverge in spirit. The moderators of the Republic bolstered the ruins, fearing that the change in the Empire would follow; they opposed the raw decrees of theologians or, should I say, the vain declarations, sanctioned by no votes except their own. Thus, the hand of association, public peace, even heaven itself (which is the house of God alone) was denied, and indeed unfavorably and rashly. But if you consult those who have been long in office, you will read this verdict: That has long since subsided, and with a mind purified, as one close to heaven, he uses judgment of which it is not regrettable to have. Donauverus once saw the moments of affairs, others saw them too; who, imitating students of Law, judged it disgraceful to pronounce anything without having read the whole law; who clean the other ear of the judge, but easily. Truly amazing, you demand honest and proven money, the loss of which is so small; but not so with sacred things. Thus, one might call marriages fatal and, in his own sense, foolish. Read these, and you will depart more learned and better (I assure you). Farewell and often.

JUDGMENT
OF Mr. GEORGE CALIXTUS,
HELMSTADT THEOLOGIAN,
ON
Theological Controversies, which
are debated between the Lutherans and the Reformed.
AND
ON THE MUTUAL BROTHERHOOD OF PARTIES and tolerance, because of consensus in

the fundamentals.

I.

Whoever desires to be a Christian, or to be considered one, should not hate or detest any mortal who is also a Christian, whether they have adhered to Christ as their true and living head. It is not right to hate those alien to Christ, such as Jews, Muslims, or even pagans. Rather, we should pity them. If we can, by some means, save them from destruction, we ought to give our efforts and help. But there is a greater and more perfect charity by which we are bound to pursue those who, like us, are children of the Heavenly Father and members of Christ, not only as men and creatures of God but as brothers, joint members, and co-heirs. A unique connection exists between us and them under the head of Christ, and thus, a unique love and mutual affection should also exist. The Savior, near to death, which redeems us, says, "I give you a new commandment, that you love one another; by this, all will know that you are my disciples if you have love for one another." Hence the Apostle, particularly beloved by Him, says: "We know that we have passed from death to life because we love the brothers. Whoever does not love remains in death. Anyone who hates his brother is a murderer, and you know that no murderer has eternal life abiding in him." Therefore, let it be far from us to hate, detest, or shun any Christian who has not ceased to be a Christian, a child of God, and thus our brother, a member of Christ's body with us, and a co-heir of eternal salvation. Let it be far from us to shun the fellowship of anyone whom Christ has accepted into communion. Let it be far from us to say to anyone whom He will say, "Come, blessed of my Father," to say, "Depart, you cursed, into the eternal fire."

II. Therefore, when we speak of restoring friendship and union with the Calvinists (as they are called), we must consider whether they are still in the state of true Christians, children of God, and heirs of salvation, or whether they have fallen away through capital errors or certain sins so that they can no longer be regarded as genuine Christians, children of God, members of Christ, and co-heirs of the Heavenly Kingdom. If the latter is true, we have done right to leave them to their own devices, but not without the care that Christians should extend to those who have gone astray, to bring them back to life. If this is not the case, we cannot please or be approved by God if we hate them, avoid them, and refuse to associate with and cultivate fellowship with them. If God acknowledges them as children, we must love them as brothers. If He admits them to the fellowship of His kingdom, we should not exclude them from our fellowship on earth, nor shun those with whom we will converse eternally in heaven, as was said earlier.

III. Not every error in matters of religion disturbs the state of grace or disqualifies one from the inheritance of the heavenly kingdom; otherwise, hardly anyone could hope for salvation. We speak of errors that remain in the understanding and diminish its perfection. For if someone defends an error known to be false, asserting it as true, it is a crime of the will and a sin against conscience, regardless of the matter at hand, whether motivated by love, hatred, hope, or fear of affirming the false and opposing the true.

Therefore, those to whom God forgives errors, we must also forgive, so they are not deprived of divine grace or Christian communion due to their errors. We must assume that they err without malice, unable to think otherwise, either due to lack of opportunity to learn the truth, being entangled in seemingly plausible but insufficient reasons they cannot explain, long-standing habits of thinking, or the authority of their parents and teachers. Such bonds often bind tightly, making it difficult to break free.

IV. However, it should also be noted that some things are so necessary to believe for salvation that ignorance excludes one from salvation and leads to damnation, and no valid excuse can be made. For example, whoever does not believe, or does not know or denies, that the only-begotten Son of God became man for our sake will be condemned. Nor will it excuse them that they lived without the means of learning, like those among barbarians and idolaters, or were taught by their parents and teachers to deny it, which applies to Jews. For according to the order of means by which, by God's good pleasure, human salvation depends, and by which the understanding must be instructed and informed, failing in such knowledge results in the loss of salvation. Other acts required of a man to be saved, and to elicit prior knowledge, will either not be done or be done wrongly. How can someone place the trust and hope required of a Christian in a Savior they do not know or deny is the only-begotten Son of God and true God?

V. What can be unknown without the loss of salvation, error about it is harmless. Thus, if it were not necessary for salvation to know or believe that Christ is true God. If the knowledge of Christ's divinity did not direct any practice or act of a Christian to be rightly performed, it would not be necessary, i.e., it would not contribute in any way. Consequently, denying or ignoring it would no more impede or remove such acts than knowing it would. Similarly, it is not necessary to eternal happiness to know that there are fixed stars and planets in heaven. Thus, it does not matter if you do not know or believe there are more or fewer stars than there are. Nevertheless, when we speak of matters of faith and religion, it is true that from an explicit denial of a truth, even if not fundamental, it is more likely to lead to an argument against a fundamental truth than from simple ignorance.

VI. Errors that directly subvert the foundation must be distinguished from those that do so indirectly or by consequence. The latter should be judged more leniently than the former. Those who directly deny a fundamental article thereby fall from salvation, but not those who, through error not yet noticed or understood, hold something that indirectly implies denial of a fundamental article. Such individuals still retain the foundation, adhering firmly to the fundamental article while unaware of the error or its inconsistency with the foundation. If they saw and understood their error, they would not hold both at once but would either abandon their error or subordinate the fundamental article to their opinion and explicitly deny it, as happens with some.

VII. An example is Matthias Flacius Illyricus, who, in a dispute against Victorinus Strigelius in the sixties of the last century, asserted that original sin is substantial and

continued to assert it. He did not realize this implied that God, if not the author of sin as he denied, was not the Creator of all substances and things, thus implying two creators and two gods. Flacius did not understand or admit that this followed from his premises. It is unjust to say that Flacius held there were two gods, although this could be deduced from his opinions by sound consequences.

VIII. The nearer an error is to subverting the foundation or the closer and more readily it can, by fewer and clearer consequences, subvert the foundation, the more pernicious it is and to be avoided. Though one who errs through mere ignorance and without malice is not to be condemned to hell for that error, he should not be admitted to a teaching office in the Church. Certainly, he should not be allowed to disseminate his error or teach it because of the danger we mentioned, that the error admitted could subvert the foundation. Even if he himself does not progress to that, he opens the way for others, making it a deserved fear.

IX. Finally, we note that if a doctrinal statement, as commonly or generally known and used, is agreed upon, even if there is a discrepancy in scholastic terms, there is no reason to consider it a disagreement on the foundation. Just as a doctrine must be presented and believed by the people, so the consensus on it suffices for salvation. Using and applying scholastic and disciplinary terms is only for the learned. If others understand and apply them differently, the Church should not be disturbed, and the unity and concord of believers should not be broken. It is easy today for the said terms to be understood differently and applied to things since philosophy and disciplines have been variously taught for some time, and the new and improper Ramist institution has partly abolished old terms and partly taught them differently. Thus, some may not understand the terms or take them differently from their nature or previously received usage.

X. If I say that God, pitying mankind, who through their own crime and the devil's deceit have fallen into sin and destruction, sent His only-begotten Son. He became man for the sake of men, suffered and died, rose again, and ascended into heaven, obtaining remission of sins and eternal life for them. This great benefit of His Son, God makes known and proclaims to men through the preaching of the Gospel. Those who acknowledge and grieve over their sins, assent to the Gospel, believe in the Son, and trust in His merit and death, are reconciled to God, obtain remission of sins, and are transferred from a state of wrath and damnation to a state of glory and salvation, in which they will remain and surely become partakers of eternal glory, if, since they have believed and been reconciled to God, they strive to observe the divine commandments, do not live according to the flesh, and, with the help of divine grace, avoid committing sins against conscience. Thus, a man will be justified in this life and glorified in the future. If, I say, we use such words, taken from common usage and easily understood by anyone, there can be no disagreement among pious and gentle Christians about the doctrine. No one of them, unless afflicted by a vile and malicious urge to contend and quibble, will question this. But if I say, this is the principal efficient cause; this is the proximate principal cause; this is instrumental on the

part of God, this on the part of man; this is merely a disposition; this is the formal cause itself; this is material, this necessary per se, this according to the hypothesis, if I start speaking this way, then it may easily happen that some will misunderstand or plainly not understand me, or interpret me differently than I intend; and thus, a controversy will arise over the use and application of such terms, which is purely scholastic and should not be given such importance that it disrupts the bond of Christian love and concord.

XI. With these things prefaced, let us approach a little closer to the matter of reconciliation and the war that is openly waged between the Lutherans and the Calvinists (as we may now call them), whether to settle or mitigate it, starting from the controversy over eternal predestination or election.

XII. We first assume that God does not require a man to understand and penetrate the eternal decree of predestination or election exactly but that a man can be saved as long as he follows and keeps the order by which God leads us to salvation in time. He need not be overly concerned with the decree made in eternity: namely, he should hear and accept the Gospel, believe in Christ, resist the desires of the flesh, and withdraw obedience.

XIII. The formula of concord itself holds this view: Let us not attempt to scrutinize the abyss of the secret and hidden predestination. Also: The Lord has kept and concealed many things about this mystery, reserving them solely for His wisdom and knowledge. Again: The curiosity of our corrupt nature is such that we delight more in investigating hidden and obscure things than in knowing what God has revealed about this matter in His Word. Especially since some things in this mystery are so intricate and perplexing that we cannot reconcile them in our minds with the sharpness of our understanding; but neither is this required of us by God. Therefore, if it is neither commanded by God nor necessary for our salvation to reconcile the eternal decree of election with those things we otherwise know, whether about those whom God saves in time, then they will not be deprived of salvation if they attempt to reconcile them and err in doing so, as can be understood from what was said in number V. The same formula forbids us, when thinking of eternal election, to attempt to scrutinize the naked, hidden, and unexplored providence of God by necessary reason. It holds that it is not necessary for those dealing with predestination to be overly concerned with accurately explaining and applying divine foreknowledge to this matter. Therefore, errors here, committed without fraud and malice but due to the weakness of the human mind oppressed by the magnitude of the matters, should be forgiven by God, as we too should forgive.

XIV. However, there seems to be a straightforward way to reconcile the eternal decree of God concerning the salvation of men with its execution, or the actual procurement of human salvation performed in time. If we say, as we should, that God confers salvation on men in time in no other way than He decreed from eternity, and He decreed from eternity in no other way than He acts

and executes in time. Since He saves no one in time without a requisite condition that He requires on the part of man, which is faith in Christ, so also from eternity He decreed to save no one except the believer in Christ. Therefore, the decree of eternal election is not absolute or made by the absolute will of God, i.e., a will that requires or considers nothing in the electing; but conditional, i.e., considering some condition on the part of man, and indeed the very one which, according to His good pleasure, He wanted as the means on the part of man, whereby, being put and present, they would become partakers of salvation. However, neither men nor their faith were present in eternity, yet they could not be unknown to God, but through His foreknowledge, which escapes nothing, He certainly knew in eternity, just as if they were actually present, who among men would in time obey the Gospel and believe. Thus, election was made according to this foreknowledge, as the Scripture itself clearly states. 1 Pet. 1:2; Rom. 8:29-30.

XV. And this was the view of the early and primitive Church and all writers who touched on the doctrine of eternal election, including Augustine, until the rise of Pelagianism, whose heresy began to emerge at the beginning of the fifth century. He not only denied original sin but also the necessity of divine grace for men to be converted, believe, and be saved. Augustine, to demonstrate and emphasize the necessity of grace against him, went so far as to attribute to divine grace not only the ability to believe and turn to God but also the determination to believe and turn to Him, so that they could not but be converted and believe. This, however, depended on the absolute decree of salvation, namely, that God willed absolutely to save certain men from eternity and, therefore, bestowed on them determining grace, but not on others; and thus, according to the absolute purpose or decree of God concerning their salvation, they were necessarily saved, while the rest perished. Thus, Augustine, to assert the necessity of grace more strongly and press his opponent, was the first to enjoin an absolute decree to save certain men, excluding the rest. With which, because it could not stand that God wills all men to be saved, as the Apostle clearly teaches, he began to distort and, if I may say so, corrupt those words.

XVI. This view, since it seemed to greatly exalt the magnitude of divine grace toward the saved and take away all that Pelagians attributed to human strength, was embraced and followed by many eminent men in the Latin Western Church, especially Prosper and Fulgentius, Bishop of Ruspe in Africa.

XVII. However, some have gone even further. Believing from Augustine's view that it pleased and had always pleased God and was decreed by Him that certain men would sin and incur damnation by sinning (such were the monks of Adrumetum, and those called Predestinarians, mentioned by Arnobius and Sigebert of Gembloux in the year 415, as well as Lucidus Presbyter, against whom Faustus of Riez wrote, and Gottschalk the monk, condemned by Rabanus and the Council of Mainz in 848), some tried to impute this harsh opinion to Augustine or at least deduce it from his premises, to which Prosper responds.

XVIII. Meanwhile, the view of Augustine prevailed among many, indeed most, in the Latin Church, also accepted by the Master of Sentences and Thomas Aquinas and the better Scholastics. When God saw fit to bring about the long-awaited and greatly necessary reformation in the Western Church, especially by its authors and administrators, against some Scholastics who diminished divine grace and attributed too much to human strength, thereby being prone to Pelagianism, they not only followed Augustine and derived determining grace for certain men from the absolute purpose of salvation but also accepted the additions of the Predestinarians concerning men destined by God to commit sins and undergo damnation.

XIX. Philip Melancthon, in his Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, asserted that Judas's betrayal and Paul's conversion were works of God. In his *Loci Communes* of the first editions, he plainly abolished contingency: "Divine predestination," he said, "took away liberty from man. For everything happens according to divine predestination, indeed both external works and internal thoughts in all creatures." What could be clearer than this statement: "The Lord has worked all things for His own sake, even the wicked for the day of evil." Luther saw and approved of this, for he prefaced these very *Loci* of Philip with his book *De Servo Arbitrio* in 1525, pronouncing them worthy not only of immortality but also of the ecclesiastical canon. And in that book, he subsequently proposes, asserts, and defends similar things: "This is the highest degree of faith," he said, "to believe that He is merciful who saves so few and damns so many, to believe Him just who by His own will makes us necessarily damnable, so that it seems He delights in the torments of the miserable and is more worthy of hatred than of love. If I could understand by any reasoning how this God could be merciful and just, who yet shows wrath and iniquity, there would be no need for faith. Also, God hidden in Majesty neither deplores nor removes death but works life, death, and all things in all. He does not will the death of a sinner in words, but He does will it by that inscrutable will." Speaking of the words "I will harden Pharaoh's heart," he does not admit interpretations excusing God, unless God Himself is the author or cause of our hardening; in vain, he says, is anything said in defense of God and against free will. Likewise, God foreknew Judas would be a traitor; therefore, Judas necessarily became a traitor and could not have done otherwise or changed his will. Also, God by His mere will hardens, damns, and rejects men. Again, if it pleases you that God crowns the unworthy, it should not displease you that He also damns the unworthy. If He is just there, why is He not just here? There He spreads grace and mercy to the unworthy. In both cases, He is excessive and unjust to men but just and true to Himself. How this is just, that He damns the unworthy, is incomprehensible now but is believed until the Son of Man is revealed. Many similar things occur in that book, which is entirely aimed at making all human actions and their dependent events be believed to happen not otherwise than they do, not by human will and free choice, but by the sole and mere will, disposition, and ordinance of God. Thus, he speaks in the end: "If we believe it true that God foreknows and preordains all things, then nothing can fail or be impeded by His foreknowledge and predestination; nothing happens unless He wills it, which reason itself compels us to concede. At the same time, reason itself testifies that there can be no free will in

man, angel, or any creature." Finally concluding the book, he says: "I have not argued but affirmed and affirm in this book, and I want no one to judge it, but I advise all to obey it."

XX. What Zwingli, Calvin, Beza, and their followers have taught in this double effort to amplify divine grace and diminish human strength is too well known, as is the fact that for this reason they are disliked by moderns.

XXI. However, due to the contentions with the Arminians in Belgium, many if not most have discarded those harsh additions to Augustine's doctrine and have returned to his teaching. According to Augustine's doctrine, God indeed saves some from the human race, fallen into sin and destruction by their own fault and the devil's deceit, by His absolute will and decree, but He does not similarly decree and preordain others to sin and damnation.

XXII. Some of our people, who once approved of the absolute decree, have gradually returned to the opinion of the first four centuries, namely, that the decree was made according to foreknowledge. Much and commendable work has been done in this regard by Giles of Viterbo. However, it is difficult to propose this view without appearing to lean towards Pelagianism, as indeed Hunnius was accused of Pelagianism by both the Calvinist Daniel Tossanus and the Jesuit Adam Tanner.

XXIII. Today, opinions on predestination have been reduced to two: one from the first four centuries, which our people support, and the other from Augustine, which the Calvinists favor. As these two opinions have been tolerated together in the Church for over a thousand years, and as the dissenters have mutually tolerated each other, so should we among the Reformed. Those who adhere to Augustine's view do so with the intention of defending the grace and glory of God, not understanding or accepting any other way to escape Pelagianism.

XXIV. The harsh and dreadful expressions used on both sides should be buried in silence. It is enough that no one today approves or imitates them. As it is in human nature to wish to maintain the honor and reputation of one's masters and leaders and to avoid turning any thoughtless utterance made in the heat of contention into a reproach, we should do the same. We should recognize that even great men can err and strive to emulate their virtues rather than expose their faults.

XXV. We will attempt to present an example or illustration of the difference between opinions on predestination, election, and reprobation. Let us imagine a large lake; many children play on its shore. A traveler comes and drives them all into the lake, where they would surely perish. However, he enters the lake and saves some of them from destruction, those he chooses to save according to his good pleasure. He does not save the others but leaves them in the same state of destruction. This is similar to the opinion of Zwingli, Calvin, Beza, and others. God, from eternity, foresaw the human race before its fall or in its integrity before the fall. In Belgium, these are called infralapsarians or supralapsarians. He decreed and willed that they should fall and become subject to damnation. Then, according to His good pleasure, He decided to save some and devote others to eternal damnation.

XXVI. Augustine's view can be illustrated differently. Imagine the children by the lake, through their own mischief and recklessness, fall into the lake. A strong man sees them, and,

noticing the imminent danger of drowning that threatens them all, enters the lake. Though he could save all, he chooses, by his own will, to save some and leave others to suffer the consequences of their recklessness and insolence. Similarly, according to Augustine and most of today's Calvinists, God did not cast men into the lake of sin and damnation; they fell into it by their own fault. But He chose, by His good pleasure, to save some to show His kindness and left others as an argument of His severity and justice. How much gentler this view is than the previous one, and how much less it impinges on God's goodness, should be clear to anyone. Though it cannot be reconciled with the statement that God wills all men to be saved and none to perish, it strives to exalt divine grace and was invented and tolerated for that purpose, just as it was in Augustine and his followers for over a thousand years, even approved by many great doctors of the Church. I also note that Luther held a much harsher view.

XXVII. Let us apply the same type of our opinion and that of the first four centuries. Since this can be proposed in two ways, one involving and suggesting Pelagianism and the other having nothing in common with Pelagianism, we will propose it in the former way first. We wish it to be conceded to us that we may imagine and assume that all the children fallen into the lake are so weakened and broken that they can move their limbs in the water and use their hands and feet, but they cannot lift even a finger above the water or raise their eyes to see anything. This itself illustrates that, by the fall of the first parents and the original sin derived from it, men have retained the faculty of understanding and willing what can be judged by the natural light of reason but cannot comprehend the mysteries necessary for salvation, nor can they desire and choose supernatural goods.

XXVIII. The former type, that the immersed children move their limbs within the water, illustrates that they cannot raise their hands or eyes above the water's surface. God Almighty looks upon this vast lake of the world and all those floundering in it, heading toward the depths of eternal destruction. He pities and wishes to save them. He sends His only-begotten Son, who enters the lake as a mighty giant with the intention and desire to save all. However, it pleases the Father and Him to save them in a particular manner suitable to rational creatures, namely, not without their recognition and cooperation. He wills that all should be saved but not with an absolute will, as this would necessitate the salvation of all. Instead, He wills it conditionally, i.e., He subjects it to certain conditions and an order. He promises all and each one liberation and salvation if they raise their eyes, look at the Savior, and reach out their hands to the hand He extends to pull them out. That is, they must acknowledge the Savior, believe in Him, and obey Him.

XXIX. Here the Pelagians teach that all can achieve this without needing special help or divine grace. They deny that all strengths are broken due to the fall into the lake, so that they cannot raise their eyes or even a finger above the surface of the water. They deny that the fall of the first parents resulted in original sin spreading to all, and that all are deprived of the powers initially given to Adam to perfectly keep God's commandments and to do all things necessary for salvation. However, this opinion has always been condemned by the Christian Church and labeled as heresy. Without special divine assistance and grace, no one can believe in Christ or

live a truly Christian life. To adhere to our analogy, no one can be saved from the lake and its destruction unless they see the Savior who entered the lake and reach out their hand to the one He extends. But no one can do this by themselves; it requires the Savior's grace, which enables those immersed in the water to raise their eyes above the water and extend their hands.

XXX. Here arises the great difficulty of explaining how it is consistent that God wills all to be saved, and yet does not grant faith and grace to all without which they cannot be saved: according to our analogy, the Savior wills to save all who have fallen into the lake, and yet does not save them unless they look and extend their hands, which they can only do if He grants it to them. Some, unable to resolve this, deny that God wills all to be saved and introduce an absolute will regarding those who are actually saved. Others lean towards Pelagianism. In our analogy, Pelagianism would be saying that the immersed are not so broken in strength that they cannot, if they wish, lift their eyes above the surface of the water. But what is it to be human even after the fall, and to retain human faculties of understanding and choosing, which are within the bounds of nature and subject to the judgment of reason? To believe in Christ is to constantly suppress the desires of the flesh so that they do not reign in our mortal bodies, which is not within the power of nature but something supernatural. Pelagianism in our analogy would be to lift the eyes and hands higher than the water and its surface.

XXXI. Given this, let us outline how, while most perish, it is not to be attributed to God and His divine will as if He refused to save them, but to those who perish themselves. Likewise, it should not be attributed to those who are saved that they acted by their own powers beyond their limits, but to the special grace and operation of God.

XXXII. Our mighty one says: "Indeed, I wish to save all of you who are immersed and in mortal danger. But since you are humans, I wish to save you in such a way that your action responds to mine. Therefore, simply look at me and extend your hand to mine, and so I will rescue and save you." However, they must confess that they cannot do this, being so weakened in strength that they cannot see anything above the surface of the water or reach it with their hands. Our mighty one replies: "Let it be so; thus is the state. See, I will provide a remedy. I will pour into the waters in which you are submerged oil, endowed with miraculous and supernatural power by me, which, diffused throughout the lake and the places where you are, will, upon touching any body, not impose necessity but provide the ability to see me and grasp my hand extended to pull you out." This oil is the Gospel preached everywhere, which is the divine instrument destined to impart faith and salvation to humans, accompanied by divine supernatural grace, through which it is accomplished that man, who previously could not give assent and faith by himself, now can. He gains the ability to believe, which he lacked before, though he is under no necessity, for he can resist and oppose the Holy Spirit and repel the word of God, just as Stephen the Protomartyr and the Apostle Paul complain. Therefore, the fact that a man hearing and considering the Gospel believes and can believe should be attributed not to the powers of nature but to the grace connected with and supplied through the Gospel; yet he can resist this grace, which should be attributed to his innate depravity and inclination. For although God's

grace is effective and operative, it does not work by absolute power but admits conditions and order, so it can be frustrated in its success and result.

XXXIII. It should also be noted that, given that God has revealed the Gospel and causes it to be preached everywhere among men by men, it is not beyond the power of nature for anyone to hear, understand, and consider the Gospel and compare it with what is proposed as divinely revealed by others, such as Jews or Muslims. This is not lifting the eyes or hands above the water but merely skimming the surface. The oil poured in by the Savior flows freely and washes over those immersed. Even if it is somewhat distant and sticks in nearby places, it nevertheless floats on the very surface of the water and can be seen by our immersed ones, who can move within the water to those places where the oil floats and wash themselves in its contact. When this happens, they gain the strength and ability to lift their eyes and hands above the water, look at their Savior, and grasp His extended hand. Nevertheless, even if the oil has flowed and they are sufficiently washed by it, they may still not lift their eyes and hands. For it imparts the ability to lift, but it does not impose necessity. They can repel the flowing and approaching oil by agitating their hands in the water, and prevent it from touching them. They can withdraw when they see it approaching, or crawl away from places where it is abundant to others where it is not found. Therefore, those who do not gain the ability to lift their eyes and hands above, or who do not use this ability even when they gain it, or who discard it again and thus perish, should blame their own obstinacy and perversity, not accuse our mighty one or Savior, who is ready to help all. Those who are saved by raising their eyes and grasping His hand should attribute their salvation and what brought them salvation—namely, that they looked at the Savior, grasped His hand, and were able to look and grasp—to the kindness of the Savior and the oil He devised, brought, and poured out, not to their own abilities as they were when lying in the lake.

XXXIV. Thus, as far as we can see, Pelagianism is avoided, and nothing is attributed to the powers of nature beyond what is appropriate to them. Who denies that things can be accomplished by those powers within their sphere of action and as long as they do not exceed their limits? But it was not easy for Augustine to explain and defend the conditional decree of God concerning the salvation of men and the necessity of grace simultaneously. Therefore, in disputes against the Pelagians, to avoid appearing to derogate from this or to attribute anything inappropriate to human powers, he chose to reject it and convert it to an absolute decree. Thus, the avoidance and hatred of Pelagianism and the desire to affirm and exalt God's grace gave rise to the absolute decree. And certainly, both aspects are commendable and deserve favor, for, as we have said, it is an arduous task to explain the conditional decree without seeming to attribute too much to man and his powers before supernatural grace is bestowed. In this very difficult and perplexing matter, God does not demand from anyone an exquisite explanation under the penalty of losing eternal salvation, as long as they conduct themselves so as not to make God the author of sin and destruction and acknowledge the necessity of grace. Even if they doubt in other things that need to be accurately explained and combined, as they are more remote from our understanding due to its weakness, they can and should tolerate and love one another with mutual equanimity and charity, as befits Christians.

XXXV. We have said more about predestination than we initially intended. Let us move on to the doctrine of the personal union of the two natures in Christ. Both sides believe that one and the same person is truly God and truly man, that is, one person who is God and man, consisting of both divine and human nature united according to hypostasis, so that it can and must be most truly and really said of God that He is man, was born, suffered, was crucified, died, and also of this same man that He is God, eternal, immense, the Creator of heaven and earth. And to this one person belong both divine properties in respect to the divine nature and human properties in respect to the human nature, both united inseparably, inconvertibly, and indivisibly through one personality. To know or believe more than this concerning this article, God does not require of man in order to admit him to His communion, enjoyment, and eternal glory. Therefore, if God admits him to our society and friendship, how can we, preserving the charity we owe to God and our neighbor and the obedience we owe to divine commands, hate and reject him whom God loves and admits? Nevertheless, we should not attribute to our speculations, subtleties, and sequences, built on the foundation we have just expounded, any certainty, as human constructs are often fallible, and exclude from the communion of the faithful on earth and the blessed in heaven all those who doubt their certainty and truth. God has not given us such power; it is neither His will nor His pleasure that we should exercise such unjust and unlawful usurpation.

XXXVI. It is added that even if there were those in the past who said, "Man is God, He is the Creator of heaven and earth; God is man, He is dead," and similar statements, they considered these expressions only verbal. Today, however, no one speaks this way without admitting they are real. Both the Calvinists and our own people, moved by the anathemas of the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon, which prescribed these formulations for speaking about this mystery not to laymen but to the very doctors of the Church, embrace them and reject and condemn all heresies like those of Nestorius, Eutyches, and the Monothelites.

XXXVII. The question remains concerning the attributes and exaltation of the human nature, either by the personal union itself or by the subsequent exaltation, glorification, and sitting at the right hand of God, so that abstractly, as it is said, they may be declared. All admit that they are greater than human intellect can comprehend or tongue can express. And if we cannot comprehend them, why do we scrutinize them? Why do we not rest content unless we have attained a distinct and perfect knowledge of that which we admit cannot be distinctly or perfectly known by us? We all confess that divinity and its infinite and uncreated power operate through humanity, not in the same way as through the Prophets and Apostles, but as its own proper organ personally united to it. Nor is it taught by our side that divine attributes, which formally belong to humanity in itself, should be declared of the humanity. This can be seen in the Saxon Confession. Therefore, since it cannot be declared formally according to its intrinsic divinity, it should be declared according to extrinsic attributes, which I believe the Calvinists will admit. But how many are there among them who desire to hear this and understand it? One can easily find out by asking good Christians and faithful ones who, without doubt, are in God's grace and walking rightly and happily on the path of salvation. Many, if not most, will answer nothing at all and will not know whether they should affirm or deny. Or if they try to answer,

they will hardly ever say anything that hits the mark. However, it is fixed and firm that God does not exclude anyone from His grace or heaven due to such ignorance or error, and we also should not withdraw charity, fellowship, and Christian duties from anyone. Those who are friends of God should be our friends too, lest we cease to be friends of Him whose friends we hate, against His will.

XXXVIII. But what shall we do about the unfortunate dispute over the ubiquity or omnipresence of Christ's flesh, or humanity, which not only has clashed with Calvinists but also with each other? Indeed, many have been compelled to declare it, preferring to side with the Calvinists. The first man who, as far as I know, invented and proposed it to the Christian world was Jacobus Faber Stapulensis, who at the beginning of the previous century, in his Commentary on Chapter 12 of Corinthians, wrote as follows: "The body of Christ fills heaven and earth, for wherever the word of God is, there is also the flesh." Take care that your bodily imagination does not deceive you here by multiplying places and extending spaces. Here, neither multiplication of places nor extension of spaces is understood, but fullness without place, above all place, below all place, outside and inside without any space. Above and below all space, outside and inside all space. And the body of Christ, by that spiritual manner which is without manner, is comparable to none, proportionate to none, but in the bodily manner in which it was seen on earth, it is comparable and proportionate." He admitted this from the assumed infirmity and mode and comparison and proportion, but that from the assumed virtue, he escaped mode, comparison, and all proportion. Reason joined with imagination does not attain it, nor does it speak rationally while remaining in itself, but speaks and imagines absurdly on both sides; but escaping beyond itself superrationally, infused with superior virtue, where neither places, nor spaces, nor numbers, nor multitude, nor time are thought of, it feels and speaks the truth. It speaks, indeed, as inexpressible, incomparable, and disproportionate things can be said, and in a certain manner inexpressibly. But elsewhere, if God has inspired, he will speak more of this matter.

XXXIX. Some argue that the novelty of the opinion and the nature of the author's ingenuity loves insolence and novelty. He also invented several other novelties against the unanimous sentiment of the ancient Church in those same commentaries. In Chapter 5 of Romans, he established original sin solely in the necessity or obligation of dying. Against him, the censures of the Parisians and the pen of Natalis Seddæ were provoked, but he was defended by the patronage of King Francis, as can be understood from the fifth book of Sleidani. Writing on Chapter 14 of John, he repeats the same thing twice: "Great is the faith," he says, "that Christ is corporally present where He is sacramentally present. But greater is the faith to recognize Him as absolutely corporally present everywhere. For this is to know without mode, the other with mode. Faith which is without mode is greater than that which has mode, and the latter is in a certain manner for the sake of the former, so that the contracted is for the absolute."

XL. Another besides Faber Stapulensis who asserted the omnipresence of Christ's flesh was Martin Luther. When Zwingli objected to the presence in the Holy Eucharist, saying that Christ had ascended into heaven with His body and sits at the right hand of God, Luther, in the heat of the dispute, tried to invert the objection and from the divine session at the right hand to

derive the omnipresence of Christ's body, and the presence of the flesh in the Holy Eucharist. For if the body of Christ is present everywhere by virtue of sitting at the right hand of God, it is certainly present in the Eucharist. His words are in the book "That the Words 'This is My Body' Firmly Stand," written in the twenty-seventh year of the previous century: "If we take the same sword and cut off your head with it and prove to you with the same saying that Christ's body must be in the sacrament, would you not consider it a valid argument? See and hear: Christ's body is at the right hand of God, that is known; but the right hand of God is everywhere, so it is certainly also in the bread and wine, over the table; where the right hand of God is, there must be Christ's body and blood. What will come of this? It will come to this: When Christ said these words at the supper, 'This is My body,' He had still been seen, so these words force this point, that Christ's body and blood must be there as they are everywhere." And later: "So Christ also says in John 3, 'No one has ascended into heaven but He who descended from heaven, the Son of Man who is in heaven,' thereby indicating that His body is at the same time in heaven and on earth, already present everywhere." Thus, in the heat of the debate, the omnipresence of Christ's body first arose and was heard among the Reformers, as we said in 1527. A response to this book by Luther was written by Johannes Oecolampadius, and another by Zwingli, addressed to John, Elector of Saxony, directly rejecting that statement of Luther, "Christ's body, just as His divinity, is present everywhere."

XLI. The following year, Luther published his larger confession concerning the Lord's Supper and fiercely attacked Zwingli and his followers, and among other things, defended the manner of asserting the presence of Christ's body in the Eucharist through its ubiquity as proposed in his previous book. However, he did not precisely affirm that this ubiquity was necessary for the presence in the Eucharist or that without it, that presence would be impossible. Rather, he demonstrated that the presence under discussion, which opponents considered impossible in any way, was indeed possible by this manner. His words are: "I proved that Christ's body is everywhere because God's right hand is everywhere, not because I definitely claimed that this way of showing it was necessary for the presence in the Eucharist, but to show that in some way God might achieve it, for we do not yet know all His power." In his earlier book "The Firmness of the Words," he speaks thus: "We believe, teach, and also affirm that in the Supper we truly and bodily eat and take Christ's body. How this happens or how it is bread, we do not know, nor should we seek to know. We believe God's Word, and we do not know or seek to know more."

XLII. Nevertheless, let us confess the truth: in that larger confession, Luther established three modes of presence: one local and circumscribed, which pertains to bodies according to their nature; another definitive, which belongs to incorporeal spirits; and a third repletive, which belongs to God who fills heaven and earth with His immensity. This last mode pertains to the flesh of Christ through its union with divinity. "Since He is a man who is supernaturally united with God in one person, and besides this man, there is no other God, it must follow that He is also present everywhere in the third supernatural way, where God is, and all through where Christ is, even according to His humanity. After much, besides the creatures, He is nothing but

God; and this humanity is thus also outside the creatures, just as God is outside, so it is not lacking; essentially, however, it cannot be God, but since it is in God, who is essentially over all creatures, it must at least be personally God and thus also be everywhere where God is." But what am I talking about such things, which are indeed unspeakable and unnecessary for the simple, and quite useless for the disputants? Certainly, as the omnipresence of the flesh of Christ from Stapulensis to Luther has been unknown and unheard of in the entire Church; and now further, as it was constructed on a solid foundation, it could have been ignored and its necessity to believe could not have been imposed on the ignorant or the learned.

XLIII. There are, however, two or perhaps one or certainly principal places we mentioned, in which Luther supports ubiquity, as we have shown, by doing so fervently, trying to establish the presence of the Lord's body in the Eucharist in every way. The book "That the Words 'This is My Body' Firmly Stand" came out, as we said, in the twenty-seventh year of the previous century. A larger confession followed in the twenty-eighth year, and in the twenty-ninth year, there was the colloquium at Marburg, under the auspices and care of the illustrious Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, in which Luther and Zwingli agreed on other articles except for the Eucharist. The second and third articles of the written articles there deal with the incarnation and person of Christ, on which there was agreement between both sides. Therefore, Luther did not have or urge ubiquity as a dogma that required assent. The next year, the Augsburg Confession was presented, whose third article also deals with the same mysteries, with no or very slight mention of ubiquity. Nor did ubiquity ever come into question or controversy in any colloquia and disputations held between the Evangelicals and the pontificians either at that time or after. Luther thus allowed it to be neglected and buried in silence. Indeed, in the year thirty-seven, when he wrote the Schmalkald Articles, he clearly stated that there was no controversy between him and the pontificians on the articles concerning the Trinity, incarnation, and the person of Christ, since, he said, both sides confess them. What the pontificians have taught or do teach on these articles should be known from their writings, especially the unanimous opinion of the scholastics. Since none of these mention ubiquity, it is evident that Luther also dismissed it and did not contend over it with those who did not know or admit ubiquity.

XLIV. His words in the collection of the sayings of friends, included in the eighth German volume, p. 340, support this. "How can Christ be bodily in the sacrament when one body cannot be in many places at once?" Hereupon I answer thus: "Christ has said He wants to be there, therefore He is truly in the sacrament and bodily. Therefore, He is truly there and no other cause of such bodily presence should be sought than this: the words thus say it, therefore it must happen as they say. As for the body, Christ can be everywhere whenever He wants, therefore there is another meaning with His and our body being everywhere or in all places; it should not be disputed, it is quite another matter in these things; and even the school theologians here say nothing about being everywhere but keep the simple understanding of the bodily presence of Christ." Martin Chemnitz concurs in examining the first canon of the Council of Trent on the sacrament of the Eucharist. He says that Luther reminded them that the foundation of the presence of Christ's body in the supper should not be placed in the dispute about ubiquity

but in the truth of the words of institution. We mentioned this so that it would be clear that Luther ultimately dismissed ubiquity; he certainly did not contend over it with anyone.

XLV. From that time, while Luther was alive, that contention remained quiet, but several years after his death, around 1550, some who had almost buried it in long silence resurrected it from the ashes, among whom Johannes Brentius and Jacobus Andreae were prominent. It is neither necessary nor appropriate to recount the entire history here. However, it is clear that the latter spared no effort to persuade or impose ubiquity on others. Nevertheless, he could not persuade all who embraced the Augsburg Confession, known as Lutherans: not the Danes, not the Holsteiners, not the Nurembergers, not the Helmstadters, and not many others. Thus today, at least some who are called Lutherans stand against ubiquity; against it is whatever remains of Christians in the whole world, including Easterners, Greeks, pontificians, and Calvinists. It is not without reason that a man of great judgment, M. Anton. de Dominis, wrote in his seventh book, chapter 11, n. 5, "The ubiquity of Christ's body is even more absurd and impossible than transubstantiation; every good theologian will always reject it. To assert it is not the work of a good philosopher or a good theologian."

XLVI. We hope, however, that those who still favor ubiquity are more prudent and moderate than to claim it as an article necessary for salvation or to condemn to hell those who dissent. They will hold it, I believe, as an opinion derived from the believed personal union or session at the right hand of God, with the help of conclusions drawn by sharp and perceptive minds, penetrating deeper into the mysteries than the common faithful usually do. However, those who place little value on such acumen and rational negotiation regarding the article of faith and its consequences should consider and weigh whether those conclusions are valid and whether they infer and effect the opinion in question. Even if it could be proven (which doubtless it cannot), anything elicited by the keen-minded, yet not understood by the slower minds, should not be referred to among the articles of faith and imposed upon these at the cost of Christian communion. Those who side with Calvin, as far as we understand, though they consider ubiquity erroneous, are ready to tolerate it without harm to Christian union and charity, provided they are also tolerated. When hatred and fervor of contention have subsided, time and effort spent examining opinions and further referring them to Scripture and the unanimous consent of venerable antiquity will alleviate or amend many things. Although ubiquity is approved by some and rejected by others, it does not seem to prevent Christians from cultivating charity, peace, and concord among themselves.

XLVII. We have said that in the heat of the disputes over the presence of the Lord's body in the Eucharist, Luther, while fervent and striving to press adversaries from all sides, let slip the new and inconvenient opinion of ubiquity. Now let us approach the very controversy that first caused the schism and is likely to remain a perpetual foment unless God averts it, and therefore should be given principal consideration. The sacrament of the Eucharist was, up to this point among the pontificians, deformed by many and gross abuses and superstitions, and scarcely any other head of religion experienced similar calamity: they removed the consecrated bread from abuse, believing it to be nothing but the very body itself, they adored it, and publicly proposed it

for adoration, and they held and offered it as a propitiatory sacrifice (understood in the strict and formal sense of the word). And so they frequently celebrated private masses, as they called them, without communicants, rarely, however, with communicants present. The primary leaders and authors of the Reformation were intent on abolishing these errors and perversions, which was entirely right. However, such is the weakness of human ingenuity that not all of them provided equally well how this should be rightly done in those beginnings. Some therefore lapsed into thinking that the abuses, as mentioned, could not be wholly abolished as long as the body of the Lord was believed to be present in the Eucharist. They almost persuaded themselves that it was necessary to deny that presence similarly in order to abolish the abuses. But when the full and clear words of Christ stood in the way, they boldly set about twisting them, which they did not do by any one method.

XLVIII. What the character and intention of Andreas Carlstadt were, who was the first to begin denying, twisting, and perverting, I can hardly explain. Philip, indeed, in a letter to Frederick Myconius, describes him as "a wild man, without ingenuity, without doctrine, without sense; whom we have observed to understand or perform no act of humanity; so far is he from noticing any sacred sign; indeed, he constantly shows manifest signs of impiety." These and more in the same sentiment Philip wrote, although Carlstadt had once been the highest friend of Luther, who had conferred upon him the title of doctor and had associated with him in the disputation against Eck in Leipzig in 1519. In that same year, Luther dedicated his commentary on Galatians to Carlstadt, whom he called the principal defender of sincere theology and his greater teacher in Christ. However, after the Diet of Worms, while Luther was hiding in Wartburg, Carlstadt, who had meanwhile married, innovated many things in Wittenberg, administering the Eucharist under both kinds, abolishing its elevation, and removing images and statues from the churches. Luther then left his retreat and returned to Wittenberg, reprimanded and restrained Carlstadt, hence began the animosity and discord between them. Luther himself writes to Caspar Gutrolius in this way: "On Laetare Sunday, 1522, I offended Carlstadt by annulling his ordinances, although I did not condemn his doctrine, except that it was displeasing in ceremonies and externals alone. He labored with a lot of zeal, but neglected true doctrine, that is, faith and charity. By his inept teaching method, he led the people to believe they were Christians through these insignificant matters: if they communicated under both kinds, if they touched, if they did not confess, if they broke images. See the malice of Satan! He tried to overturn the gospel through new species. For I foresaw this, that consciences would be freed from these contrary forces, and the thing would fail by common consent. But he desired to become a new master suddenly, and to establish his own ordinances among the people, pressing my authority."

XLIX. Therefore, Carlstadt, becoming more alienated from Luther, left Wittenberg and went to Orlamünde in Thuringia to take up ecclesiastical duties. Meanwhile, he meditated on how to overthrow the presence of the Lord's body in the Eucharist and the simple sense of the words pertaining to it. Nor did he conceal this, but often made it known and disseminated it among the people. In the following year, 1524, when a peasant uprising arose at the Saale,

Luther was ordered by the Elector to go there, teach the people with sermons, and bring them to modesty. Thus, he went to Jena and gave a sermon on the 21st of August, which Carlstadt attended. When Luther, speaking to the people, connected the sacrament-degrading spirit and the statue-demolishing spirit with the seditious spirit, saying they were one and the same, Carlstadt, thinking this referred to him, demanded a colloquium with Luther. Given the opportunity, Carlstadt approached the inn named the "Black Bear," where Luther was staying, spoke to him in front of many witnesses, and affirmed that he was not seditious but did indeed think differently about the sacrament than others. Among other things, he said, "I know, truly, that no man has written or taught about this matter from the apostles to this way, and I freely acknowledge this. If I knew that you would be pleased with it, you would have it." Luther replied, "Write against me openly, not secretly." Carlstadt said, "If I knew that you wanted this, you should have it." Luther said, "Then do it." Carlstadt said, "Indeed." Luther said, "Do it; I will give you a gold coin for it." Carlstadt said, "A gold coin?" Luther said, "If I do not, then I am a scoundrel." Carlstadt replied, "Give it here, and I will truly take it." Then Luther reached into his pocket, took out a gold coin, and gave it to Carlstadt, saying, "Take it and come at me." Carlstadt took the gold coin, showed it to all present, and said, "Dear brothers, this is a pledge that I have authority to write against Dr. Luther, and I ask you all to be witnesses." Luther said, "It is not necessary." And Carlstadt put it in his pouch, shook Luther's hand, and Luther offered him a drink, which Carlstadt courteously accepted. He then said, "Dr. Luther, I ask you not to hinder me in my work, and not to persecute or obstruct my livelihood, for I intend to earn my bread with the plow, and what the plow will provide, you will surely see." Luther replied, "How should I hinder you if I desire that you write against me?" The princely preacher said to Carlstadt, "The doctor will not damage or harm your livelihood." Then Carlstadt said to Luther, "Now I commend you, and let it be at my peril," and thus they shook hands.

L. This was the outcome of that colloquium and the beginning of an unfortunate, pernicious, and so far implacable discord, combined with no less shame for those adhering to the superstitions of the pontificians, than scandal for the weak, grief for the good and moderate, and a hindrance to the whole reformation. Thus, often from a small spark, a great fire arises not only in the republic but also in the church. Carlstadt was indeed expelled from the jurisdiction of the Electoral Saxony not many days later, urged on by Luther, whose book against the heavenly prophets was seen shortly after this event began. Carlstadt, in exile, went to Strasbourg, and at the end of the same year, he opposed Luther's book, which was entitled "Against the Heavenly Prophets," as we have already mentioned. In his letter to Nicolaus Hausmann, Luther defers writing about the Eucharist until Carlstadt has published his venom, as he promised me, even having accepted a gold coin from me. Although I already possess most of his arguments, Zwingli, along with Leo Judä in Switzerland, agrees with Carlstadt on this matter, so that this evil spreads widely.

LI. Indeed, Zwingli and Oecolampadius already contemplated how to counteract the superstitions of the pontificians, by which the sacrament of the Eucharist had so far been contaminated. Therefore, they readily accepted Carlstadt's denial of the presence of Christ's body

in the Eucharist, although they did not approve of his interpretation of the Lord's words but devised their own more coherent explanations. Luther, indeed, writing around this same time to Georg Spalatin, admits that he himself had once been strongly tempted regarding this matter, and in a letter to the Church of Strasbourg, he said, "I cannot and will not deny that if Carlstadt or someone else had persuaded me five years ago that there was nothing in the sacrament besides bread and wine, he would have rendered me a great service. For I was very anxious about this matter, seeing clearly that this could greatly inconvenience the papacy."

LII. Therefore, Zwingli and Oecolampadius, being dedicated to thoughts of inconveniencing the papacy, took the opportunity of the publication of Carlstadt's writings to bring their ideas to the public in the year 1525. Zwingli did so in his Epistle to Matthew, another Reutlingen ecclesiast, and in his Commentary on True and False Religion, followed shortly by his treatise on the Eucharist. Oecolampadius wrote a book titled "On the Genuine Exposition of the Words of the Lord, 'This is My Body,'" addressed to beloved brothers in Christ throughout Swabia, announcing Jesus Christ. At the end of the same year, fourteen congregated in Halle, Swabia, responded to Oecolampadius with a synodical letter, which is believed to have been authored by Brentius. They handled the matter calmly, affectionately, and honorably, addressing Oecolampadius as "a father in Christ to be honored" and "a most beloved brother in Christ," and referring to their disagreement as an amicable dissent. They expressed their sentiments early in the letter: "Most esteemed Oecolampadius, we are fully persuaded that you, with the modesty and Christian candor you possess, will tolerate us dissenting from your opinion on the bread and wine of the Lord's Supper until the Lord grants us and you the same understanding. If so, tranquility in the church and the concord of Christians would be ensured." Oecolampadius had previously written to them, "An error can be forgiven, provided there is faith in Christ; let us not shed blood over our disagreement but expiate it." Oecolampadius was indeed an outstanding man, knowledgeable in languages and ecclesiastical antiquity, and possessed of various learning and humanity, as Luther himself wrote about him. In the book, "[Greek text] Dem Oecolampadius hat Gott viel geben," Luther praised him above many others. In a letter to Nicolaus Hausmann, Luther expressed sorrow over Oecolampadius, saying, "I am deeply sorry that such a noble man is captivated by frivolous and worthless arguments." And in another letter to the same, he said, "It deeply grieves me that Oecolampadius, a most noble man," etc. Theodore Bibliander, in his preface to Oecolampadius and Zwingli, stated, "Zwingli had a fiery and vehement nature, while Oecolampadius was mild and therefore tranquil. Zwingli, then, seems to have had a Swiss nature, that is, fiery and vehement, which Luther indeed reproaches with his Saxon nature."

LIII. But perhaps some other human element intervened, offending minds and exacerbating the contention. Zwingli writes in his work explaining the articles, chapter nine, that he began preaching the gospel in the year 1516, at a time when Luther's name was not even heard in our regions. Hence, Conrad Gesner writes in his Bibliotheca, "Around the year 1516, Zwingli in Switzerland, seized with zeal for the Lord, began to lay the foundations of the gospel, and with divine grace gradually achieving so much in a few years that to this day the sincere

preaching of faith progresses freely." Indeed, after many years, Zwingli's grandson dared to write in the Continuation of the Genealogy of Peter Pictaviensis Gallus, book 4, page 180, that his grandfather had already begun purely preaching the gospel among the Glarus people before Luther came into the public or his name was mentioned. While many can disdain all other things, even fortunes and life itself, often they cannot ignore glory, which is its sweetness and human weakness, and they cannot accept that others share in the honor that they believe belongs solidly to them alone. The greater one's magnanimity, the more eager they are for praise and the more indignant they feel when it is attributed to others rather than themselves. Therefore, it is not surprising, nor is it alien to a high-spirited nature like Luther's, that he wrote to the ministers of the Church of Strasbourg, "We dare to boast that Christ was first proclaimed by us," but now Zwingli accuses us of this denial (perhaps of glory or negotiation). He also wrote, "It is intolerable to be silent about these slanderers (Zwingli and Oecolampadius) who disturb our church and diminish our authority, conceding to them: let them think that if they fear and do not want their teaching authority to be diminished, neither should ours be diminished." Finally, in a vehement outburst, he exclaimed, "In summary, either they or we must be ministers of Satan; therefore, there is no place for counsel or compromise here."

However, let's return to the synodical letter of the Swabians. It is difficult to understand precisely what they state about the presence and consumption of the Lord's body since they often obscure the matter. Certainly, I do not see them teaching anything other than that the Lord's body is consumed by faith, not by the mouth, as they never affirm but rather deny repeatedly. They assert that the body itself is present to our faith according to its substance when faith apprehends it or consumes it. In this assertion, they differ from Zwingli and Oecolampadius. But let us cite their words and leave the judgment to the reader. When Christ said, "This is my body, which is given for you," and "This is my blood, which is shed for you," does he not in this word include his body and blood to such an extent that anyone who grasps and believes this word, holding it by faith, receives and has the true body and true blood of Christ, which was given for us, not spiritually but carnally? For the blood was not shed for us spiritually but carnally. Now, since the word alone is of such great efficacy and power that it brings to us the corporeal body of Christ, which was given to us, and the corporeal blood, which was shed for us, why would it not retain the same power when it is attached to the bread and the cup? Shortly after the middle of the book, they state, "We do not believe that anyone would be so impious as to deny that faith drinks the blood and eats the flesh of Christ, for John 6 says, 'My flesh is true food, and my blood is true drink.' Whose? Faith's. For faith eats the flesh of Christ and drinks his blood while believing. Now, if faith eats the flesh and drinks the blood, it must be present to faith; if it were not present, it could not be eaten or drunk, or believed. For no one can eat God, that is, believe in God unless God is present to him. To the impious and unbelieving, God is absent; therefore, they do not believe in God. In short, faith must have God present to believe in him, just as to eat the body and drink the blood, that is, to believe, the body and blood must be present. What makes God present to faith, if not the word? For when the word offers God to faith with all his benefits, why would it not do the same with the body and blood of Christ, since these are our gifts by which we

are delivered from death, sin, hell, and even Satan's jaws? John says, 'The blood of Jesus Christ cleanses us from all sin.' If the blood cleanses us, it must be present to us, for an absent thing does not cleanse. What brings the blood to us, if not the word? Faith, he says, brings the blood to us. But from where does faith receive the blood if not from the word? For faith is not faith unless directed to the word. The word is the object of faith; the word brings to faith whatever it receives or believes. Likewise, faith makes a thing placed far away in the world's view very present and visible to itself. After some more statements, they say, "When we assert that the body of Christ is eaten by the flesh, it may be permitted that, out of humanity, you do not take this otherwise than with a clear interpretation. For we eat the body and drink the blood, not to crush and break the body of Christ, as in the revocation of Berengarius, but we handle, break, eat, and grind with the teeth the very bread that is bread; however, we receive the body as we receive the word, 'This is my body,' as someone beautifully said, 'What we eat enters the stomach, what we believe enters the mind.' Furthermore, if the body is to be eaten and the blood to be drunk, nothing is taken from the bread that it is not the body. For Christ did not lack flesh because Peter or another apostle ate him spiritually, nor should it be denied that the body of Christ is in the bread because it is to be eaten spiritually; just as no one is so foolish as to deny that the word of the Gospel is to be received spiritually, that is, by faith, even though it is received with the bodily ears. And as the word of faith, which is captured by the ears, is received according to its nature by faith; would the external Gospel not be the Gospel because it must be heard spiritually? Thus, someone might argue that the bread of the Supper is not the body because the body of Christ must be eaten by faith."

LIV. These and many similar things are in their Syngramma, in which the Swabians, although they urge and affirm the presence of the Lord's body in the Eucharist, everywhere declare that it is eaten by faith and nowhere say that it is taken and eaten otherwise. Although what is properly and not figuratively eaten can only be eaten by the mouth. Nevertheless, this writing pleased Luther so much that he wanted to translate it into German, but someone else had already done so. He adorned this translation and edition with a preface in volume 3 of Jen. p. 285: "It is a Latin work called Syngramma, published by the preachers in Swabia, which pleased me so well that I intended to translate it into German."

LV. Indeed, I am easily persuaded that Brentius is the author of the Syngramma, as I see that two years later he published an exegesis on John, in which the same things are said, sometimes more clearly, as in the Syngramma. There are many things he says in the same sense, of which I will write only a few. We do not ask whether the substance of the bread is changed into the substance of the body, so that apart from the accidents, as they call them, nothing remains in the bread: Nor do we ask whether the body subsists carnally in the bread, as human reason tends to imagine a small body in the bread. Thus, we only ask whether in the bread and wine of the Lord's Supper the body and blood of Christ are distributed and given to our faith. If this is confirmed, it will become clear why the bread is said to truly be the body of Christ, and the wine truly the blood, not just to signify. Therefore, I think no one of such deplorable faith would deny that the body and blood of Christ are our gifts. For if life is given to us through

Christ, if the remission of sins is given, how could not also the body and blood be given to us. Therefore, if the body and blood are given, according to the reason of the gifts, they are distributed to our faith. For the gifts of God are given to us believing through the word and the sacraments of the word. Therefore, just as the body of Christ is communicated to us through the word, so it is also communicated to us by the bread of the Supper through the word. And as the blood is given to us through the word, so also it is given to us by the wine of the Supper through the word. With some insertions, the flesh and blood are truly spiritual food and drink: Therefore, just as the body and blood are offered and given through the word to the faith, the external man receives the external things, bread and wine, the internal man, however, the internal and spiritual things, the body and blood given in mystery. The mouth of the body receives the bread and wine by sense, beyond bread and wine it feels nothing else: the mouth of faith receives the body and blood with its sense, so that the body has the sacramental signs, and faith has the spiritual, that is, the thing itself and the truth. When it is sufficiently manifest that the body and blood are distributed to our faith through the bread and wine of the Supper: Let us now see why the bread is said to be the body and the wine the blood, not just to signify or shadow. For the bread is not therefore said to be the body, because it is changed into the body, as the Papists dream, or because a small body subsists in the bread, as previously said. It remains that it is therefore called the body of Christ, because the body is distributed to our faith through the bread. Likewise, it must be said of the wine: therefore the wine is the blood because the blood of Christ is given to our faith through the wine. The bread is now called the body, not because it only signifies (thus the body would be absent) but because it is made the instrument and medium by which the body is truly and presently given and distributed to our faith. Again: In the Supper, the word over the bread distributed his body to the faith of the Apostles, not to the sense of their bodily flesh; therefore, it was not necessary for the mouth and throat of the Apostles to feel the presence of the body in the bread, nor was it necessary for the bread to be sensibly changed into the body, but it was enough to feel the body by faith. These and many similar things Brentius inculcates in his exegesis on the 6th chapter of John, which he briefly and concisely proposes at the end of the chapter. The bread of the Supper, he says, is called the body of Christ, not by changing the bread into the body or by a carnal imagination of a small body lying under the bread, but by distribution and present exhibition, the body of Christ is given and distributed to our faith through the bread of the Supper. And after a few things, it is very true that the body is signified by the bread, but it is not true that it is thus signified so that the body is not presently distributed to our faith.

LVI. These are indeed such that the Calvinists might hardly explain their opinion differently in words. He is cautious about saying that the body of Christ is eaten by the mouth, avoids asserting it; but teaches that it is offered to faith, and received by faith, and therefore is present to faith. This is also contended by the Calvinists with perhaps this one distinction, that they state faith perceives and embraces the body of the Lord present in heaven. Brentius, however, teaches that it is present and exhibited to faith here on earth. Brentius' exegesis was published in the year 1557, the same year Luther published his book [Greek text] or "that the

words of the Lord (this is my body) stand firm," in which it is astonishing that Brentius loved and approved of the Swabian Syngramma, and in which he calls Zwingli and Oecolampadius enthusiasts, blasphemers, idolaters, plagues of souls, organs, and ministers of the Devil. Yet he restricts the controversy of the eating of the body of Christ to faith no less than Zwingli and Oecolampadius. The following year, he issued a larger confession, which was no better towards them. In both writings, in the heat of contention, he inserted the concept of ubiquity as previously explained. The year 1529 was notable for the Marburg colloquy and the declaration of agreement on all other articles of faith except the Eucharist. They agreed on the Trinity, the incarnation and person of Christ, original sin, faith and justification, the efficacy of the word, the sacraments and ministry of the Church, and some other articles on which Zwingli was thought to hold problematic opinions. There was silence about divine providence and foreknowledge, and the resulting necessity of doing good and evil, about which they agreed.

LVII. Concerning the Eucharist, they speak in article XIV and lastly in this manner, "We all believe and feel the same about the Supper of our Lord Jesus Christ, that both kinds should be used according to the institution, that the mass is not a work by which one person impetrates grace for another, whether living or dead: that the Sacrament of the altar is the Sacrament of the true body and blood of Christ and that the spiritual eating of this body and blood is especially necessary for every Christian. Likewise, they feel about the use of the sacrament as the word of God is given and ordained to excite weak consciences to faith and love by the Holy Spirit. And although we have not agreed at this time whether the true body and blood of Christ is present corporally in the bread and wine of the Lord's Supper, yet one part will declare to the other the Christian affection as much as each one's conscience will bear, and both parts will diligently pray to Almighty God that he may confirm us in the true sentiment by His Spirit. Amen." The signatories were Luther, Melanchthon, Justus Jonas, Andreas Osiander, who came from Nuremberg, Brentius from Halle, Swabia, and Stephan Agricola from Augsburg: from the other side were Oecolampadius, Zwingli, Bucer, and Caspar Hedio. The matter was concluded on October 3rd, and the articles were soon printed in Wittenberg, inserted both in the German volume IV of Luther's works and in the Latin history of the Augsburg Confession edited by Chytraeus.

LVIII. I did indeed desire that Luther would acknowledge and regard us as brothers, but this I could not achieve. Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, under whose auspices this was conducted, did not cease to urge the matter even at the renowned Diet of Augsburg when the Confession was to be presented. Bucer, more than anyone else, was most eager for concord and undertook great labors for its sake, trying to show that the difference was not in substance but in words and modes of expression. He even tempered his formulas and confession, which he was writing on behalf of the cities of Strasbourg, Memmingen, Constance, and Lindau, to be presented to the Emperor, so that it could be acceptable to both parties. Then, before the end of the Augsburg Diet, he went to Luther, who was residing in Coburg at that time, to discuss concord with him. He based the foundation of reconciliation on ambiguous formulas, where one party would accept a figurative, spiritual, and present mode of eating, not necessarily carried out by faith: while the

other would accept a proper and oral eating and true presence of the body (namely, the body in the category of substance). This way, if the words were attended to superficially, they would appear to agree, or at least seem to agree to those who considered merely the words and were not particular about the defense, even if they did not actually agree in meaning and intentions. This method of seeking concord was justly rejected and disapproved by Luther and most prudent people on both sides.

LIX. Nevertheless, Bucer did not cease his efforts. In the following year, 1531, he sent letters concerning concord to Ernest, Duke of Brunswick and Lüneburg, who had subscribed to the Augsburg Confession the previous year. The Duke wrote to Luther, who responded on February 1st, among other things, in this manner: "What Bucer says, that the dispute is only about words, I would wish to be true even at the risk of my head and life. Indeed, if this were the case, this controversy would not have lasted so long, nor would it have begun at any time. Certainly, concord is as dear to my heart as it is to his, as he understood abundantly from me at Coburg. Therefore, I now judge it sufficient (until God grants more) if we can achieve this one thing: that both sides, being sufficiently warned and understood by each other, abstain from writing for and against. And since the Lord has granted this grace that they concede Christ's body to be present in the sacrament, I hope with good faith that, with the progress of time, they will also concede that it is present externally in the bread, as I see no reason or obstacle preventing this. And indeed, if divine grace grants this consensus, I shall gladly die and bid farewell to this world, God willing." These words are drawn from the history of the Augsburg Confession, written in German by Drs. Timotheus Kirchner, Nicol Selnecc, and Mart. Chemnitz, and translated into Latin by Jacobus Godfridus Chemnitz, published in Leipzig.

LX. In the following year, Luther, consulted by Albert, Duke of Prussia, responded that if he wanted to rightly counsel his people, he should not tolerate the followers of Zwingli's opinion in his lands. He wrote and immediately published a letter, which is available today at the end of volume V of the Jena edition. From the beginning, he declared that he would no longer deal with them on this controversy: "I wanted to let this go to print to show the enthusiasts once and for all that I do not intend to deal with them any longer on these matters." He added that the devil was their teacher, and they would do nothing even if they were convinced and afflicted. He referred to the defeat that the people of Zurich had suffered near Kappel, where Zwingli had fallen in the previous year at the hands of his own Catholic countrymen. "Since then," he said, "God has so powerfully demonstrated and condemned this error with punishment and confirmed our faith, it is time to cease doubting and disputing."

LXI. In 1533, Luther sent another sharp and severe letter against the same people to the Senate and people of Frankfurt on the Main, which is found in volume VI of the Jena edition.

LXII. Nevertheless, Bucer continued to leave no stone unturned to prevent hope of quelling discord and strife from being lost. There was a meeting in Constance, driven by his influence, where once again the matter of achieving concord was discussed, as Lavater recalls. He also published a declaration that pleased Luther so much that he again conceived hope for concord and wrote kindly and gently to the people of Strasbourg and Augsburg. Meanwhile,

Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, who had called Bucer and Melanchthon to Cassel at the end of 1534, did not remain inactive. Melanchthon brought with him Luther's counsel, summarized in seven articles. First, he rejected the idea that the controversy was merely a matter of word battles, as some had not understood each other until now. Second, he rejected the invention of some middle opinion, which would not satisfy the conscience of either party. Third, he explained that the true presence of the body is made clear by the text of the Gospel and the consensus of antiquity. In the fourth, fifth, and sixth articles, he dealt with some sayings of Augustine that seemed to favor the Zwinglians. Finally, in the seventh, he said, "If these points are left intact and whole for me, there is no need for many prayers. God is my witness, that if possible, I would redeem this discord with my life and blood: But what can I do? Perhaps they are constrained by another understanding with no ill conscience. Therefore, we will tolerate them gladly if they are innocent and pure, for Christ will easily liberate them. Meanwhile, I too am constrained by my own good conscience, unless it happens that I do not recognize myself. Therefore, let them tolerate me as well, just as they cannot come over to my opinion." These things can be found in the history written by Kirchner, Selnecker, and Chemnitz, mentioned earlier, from which those who desire to know what Bucer reported to Philip and what Luther thought of them can learn.

LXII. Letters that Philip wrote on this matter after his return to various people are also found among the counsels edited by Pezel. To Camerarius: "Yesterday, that is, on January 9th, 1535, I returned home from Cassel, where Philip, the Landgrave, had summoned Bucer and me, so that he might hear the opinions of ours and his followers [Greek text] on that widely known cause. Do not inquire about my opinion now: I was the messenger of another, namely the one we said was written by Luther." To Brentius, on January 21st: "You have written to me several times about the Sacramentarians and have warned against concord, even if they incline towards Luther's opinion. My dear Brentius, those who differ from us on the Trinity or other articles, with them I will have no alliance and consider them accursed. However, I hope that none of them are present in the churches of those cities that are united with ours; otherwise, nothing has yet been done about concord: I have only reported Bucer's opinions here." And in another letter: "I was instructed to write to you and many others and to seek your opinions, whether you think those who hold and teach such opinions should be tolerated. Therefore, I ask you to respond to me." To Bucer himself: "I have presented the formula of concord written by you to our people as you remember. I also gave Luther your letters and writings. First of all, let me confirm that Luther now speaks kindly of you and your colleagues. Secondly, he does not condemn the formula or opinion, but he does not yet want to make peace; he thinks we should deal with Osiander and Brentius and others to see if they like it. Moreover, he believes that the will of the preachers in your cities should be explored. I indeed explained to our people what you told me about the Swabian preachers. He is therefore more lenient, but still wants to deal with the matter." (As the history of the three doctors tells us) he himself, having given the pastors of the church of Strasbourg very kind letters, asked for some meeting to be established where matters concerning discord and other internal affairs would be handled, making it possible for the time and place to be set in Hesse or Coburg. These letters were given on October 5th, in the year 1535.

LXIV. Therefore, the churches of Upper Germany, having heard that a meeting was to be held in Eisenach in Thuringia, attended by Luther and the theologians, sent Wolfgang Capito and Bucer from Strasbourg, Boniface Lycophenes and Wolfgang Musculus from Augsburg, Martin Frecht from Ulm, and others from elsewhere, after first notifying the Swiss, who, however, were excluded due to the timing and because they were not invited by public authority, did not add anyone from their own, though they carefully recommended the matter of concord. When they arrived in Eisenach and did not find those they were looking for, they went to Wittenberg in May, and after various meetings and discussions, they agreed on a formula written by Melanchthon, in which they confessed that with bread and wine truly and essentially present, exhibited, and taken is the body and blood of Christ. By this sacramental union, the bread is the body of Christ, that is, with the bread and wine given, truly the body and blood of Christ are exhibited, and the unworthy truly and effectively receive it, when they observe the institution and command of the Lord. However, since only a few of us have met at this time, and this matter must be referred to the rest of the preachers and magistrates on both sides, we cannot yet conclude this concord until we have also referred it to the others. Those mentioned above signed, as well as Luther, Cruciger, Bugenhagen, Melanchthon, and others. These acts took place in May, on the 28th day of which Bucer preached a sermon, and the next day he and his colleagues signed and prepared to depart. This is how these things are narrated by Ludovico Lavatero in his sacramental history.

LXV. He adds that at the beginning of this year, the Swiss, celebrating a synod in Basel, wrote a confession in which they spoke in this manner. In the Eucharist, bread and wine are signs: but the reality is the communication of the body of Christ, salvation obtained, and the remission of sins, which are indeed received by faith, just as the signs are received by the bodily mouth. The mystical supper is in which the Lord truly offers his body and blood, that is, himself, to his own, so that he may live more and more in them and they in him. Not that the body and blood of the Lord are naturally united to the bread and wine or are locally included in them, nor that any carnal presence is established here: but that the bread and wine, by the institution of the Lord, are signs by which, through the ministry of the church, the true communication of his body and blood is exhibited, not as food for the perishable belly, but as nourishment for eternal life. Lavater said they wanted to temper this article on the Eucharist so that it would not provide material for contention and that Luther would not disapprove of it. However, this confession presented to Luther by Capito and Bucer was received on May 27th, and they say that he praised the effort for concord and promised his goodwill as far as his conscience permitted, according to the authors of the Neostadian admonition in the book of concord. Luther approved of the Basel confession, finding nothing in it to criticize, which is not credible. Bucer and Capito, however, eager for union, reported upon their return that Luther did not dislike the confession, as Lavater and the ministers of the church of Zurich mention in their orthodox confession, which they published in Latin and German in the year 1555.

LXVI. Upon returning, they certainly spared no effort to persuade the Swiss of the Wittenberg Articles. However, these articles seemed obscure and ambiguous to the Swiss and did not entirely agree with the Basel Confession. Bucer tried to demonstrate through a lengthy

explanation that they were consistent and contained the same doctrine. He was instructed to put his declaration in writing, which he complied with. It is included in the theological advice edited by Philipp Melancthon and Pezel. However, he continued to speak in such a way that it could be interpreted by either side, essentially playing with the ambiguity of eating, which anyone could understand in their own way—some as simple oral eating, others as figurative and metaphorical eating, which is done through faith and the presence of the thing believed in, not requiring anything more than metaphorical presence, just as anything understood is somehow present to the mind, not in its real being but in its intentional being or intelligible species.

LXVII. The Swiss, however, were more straightforward and sincere. They sent Bucer's declaration, which he had put in writing, to Luther, asking whether he would accept the articles in that sense; but they added their own explanation, explicitly stating that they understood the articles in such a way that they did not deny our Lord Jesus Christ when the Holy Supper is rightly celebrated and distributed to the faithful according to his institution, to be truly apprehended, partaken, and perceived by the mind. They further explained their understanding of the ministry of the word, sacraments, and baptism. And when they spoke of the Eucharist, they said there is nothing in heaven or on earth that could nourish or satisfy our souls except the Lord himself alone. Thus, the body of Christ is truly eaten, and his blood is truly drunk in the supper, but not in that gross and carnal manner that the Papists have taught, that is, substantively, but spiritually, that is, in a spiritual manner and with a faithful mind. For we apprehend and receive the promises and heavenly words of God with true and proper faith. By the same faith, the Lord is beneficially eaten, so that he now lives in his own and his own in him. They hoped that this kind of declaration would ensure perfect concord, which they wanted to be accepted in such a way that all churches would still have their freedom to speak about this most holy matter as seemed most advisable to them.

LXVIII. This letter (for it was indeed a letter to which the declaration was attached) was written in Basel in November 1536 and presented by Bucer, who, along with Paul Fagius and Boniface Lycos, went to Schmalcalden in February of the following year, at the celebrated convention there, to Luther. However, Luther's illness and severe pain from kidney stones prevented them from bringing a response. Nevertheless, at the end of that year, in December, it was written and finally sent to the magistrates of the cities of Zurich, Bremen, Basel, Schaffhausen, St. Gall, Mulhouse, and Biel.

LXIX. That response is excellent and worthy of note. At the beginning, Luther excuses the delay, rejoices in the zeal for concord observed in the Swiss, and prays for success from God. Then he says: "Therefore, my friendly request is that you and yours will strive earnestly to ensure that those who oppose us and concord abstain from their own mischief and simply teach the people, leaving this matter of concord to those who are called and competent for it. And first, I humbly ask that you reconcile yourselves to me as one who sincerely means well. As much as is possible for me, nothing shall be lacking on my part that serves the promotion of concord, as God, who I take as a witness upon my soul, knows. For the discord has helped neither me nor anyone else but has caused much harm; certainly, nothing useful or good has come from it." He

then adds the declaration of the articles, which the Swiss had attached to their letter. Concerning the first article, about the preaching and ministry of the word, he says he desires nothing more. Not even in the second, concerning baptism. As for the third, which we are now considering, we provide his exact words: "The third article about the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, we have never taught nor do we now teach that Christ descends or ascends from the right hand of God, neither visibly nor invisibly. We firmly hold the article of faith that he ascended into heaven, sits at the right hand of God, and leaves it to divine omnipotence how his body and blood are given to us in the supper, where we come together according to his command and hold his institution. We do not think of any ascent or descent occurring there but remain simply and plainly by his words: 'This is my body, this is my blood.' As I have said above, where we do not fully understand each other, it is best to be friendly to one another and always presume the best of each other until the troubled waters settle. Thus, Dr. Capito and Mr. Bucer may give good counsel here if we only gather our hearts and let go of all ill will, allowing the Holy Spirit room to perfect love and friendly concord, as we for our part, especially myself, have let go of all ill will from the heart and mean it sincerely with love and loyalty. For even if we strive earnestly for the highest good, we still need great help and counsel from God, as Satan, our enemy and the enemy of concord, will undoubtedly find his own ways to throw trees and rocks in the way so that we need not add quarrels and suspicions against each other but instead extend our hearts and hands to each other equally and firmly, so it does not become worse afterward than it was before."

LXX. The entire letter or response can be found in the sixth volume of Luther's works in Jena. Regarding this matter, I find nothing else in those writings. However, in the inscriptions of the Calvinists and the history of the three theologians, I read that the Swiss responded to Luther from Zurich on the fourth of May, 1538, speaking about the entire matter, especially about the Eucharist, in this manner: "Since we see that Your Reverence has found no discrepancy or absurdity in the articles concerning the external word and baptism (nor can we see any), and at the same time understand that you neither taught nor now teach that Christ descends from heaven or from the right hand of God the Father or ascends again, neither visibly nor invisibly in any way, but firmly hold (as we do) the article of faith that he ascended into heaven, sits at the right hand of God the Father, and from there will come to judge, etc. You also do not think of any descent or ascent occurring there. Finally, you do not establish any such presence and eating of the body and blood of Christ in the holy supper that would contradict or be contrary to the assumed humanity of Christ, his ascension into heaven, his heavenly glory, or any articles of the Christian faith or other places in Scripture. Nor do we, on the contrary, wish to establish in the supper merely empty and vacant signs, but we also acknowledge that the body and blood of the Lord are truly received and eaten there (so that they are truly apprehended and perceived by the faithful mind) according to the tenor and manner set forth in our said confession and the declaration sent to you from Schmalcalden, in which we still firmly and immovably stand. From all this, we cannot perceive or feel anything else but that there is unanimous consent between us (thanks be to God) about the sense and true substance of this article, and we have achieved the

best peace among ourselves without any further controversy, finally leading us to this true concord, for which we give the highest praise and thanks to God forever."

LXXI. They also mention that a response to this letter was returned by Luther in the following June, on the Thursday after the Feast of St. John the Baptist. "I received," he says, "your letter dated the fourth of May, from which I was pleased to learn that all of you are very inclined towards concord and that my writing was welcome to you. Indeed, what we teach here is not that any ascent or descent occurs in the sacrament of the Lord's supper, although the true body and true blood of our Lord Jesus Christ are taken with the bread and wine. What cannot be comprehended in writing, I trust Dr. Bucer and Dr. Capito will better explain in person, to whom I have entrusted and committed all these matters with many prayers. And since I have no doubt that you have an excellent congregation, seriously inclined to doing well and taking the right path, I have conceived great joy and hope in God that, if we deal rightly with the tender and weak flock, although one or another may incline somewhat in one direction or another, God will nevertheless provide aid to remove all obstacles with a happy outcome. Amen."

LXXII. If only perseverance, charity, and concord had prevailed on both sides, if right hands and minds had remained united, even if, as Luther says, we did not fully understand him, or if there had already been some obstacle somewhere else, and if there had not been renewed quarrels and contentions, indeed, even condemnations. I would not lightly say whose fault this was. Lavater narrates that Christopher Froschauer, a citizen and printer of Zurich, sent Luther a copy of the new translation of the Bible, without doubt, the one he himself had published in the year 1543, and that the ministers of the Church of Zurich, especially Leo Jud and some others, had worked on it; but Luther replied that henceforth he should not send him anything originating from the ministers of the Church of Zurich, for he had no commerce with them, and would neither accept nor read their books. For the churches of God could not communicate with them. They endured many labors but in vain and futile. Since they are already condemned themselves and also lead other miserable people with them to hell. Therefore, he did not want to share in their damnation and blasphemous doctrine, but as long as he lived, he resolved to oppose them both with prayers and writings. It is also mentioned that these were written by Luther's own hand and sent to Zurich, and the ministers of the Church of Zurich themselves complain in their confession published two years later. If these things are thus, it seems that Luther could not bear that the Zurichers assumed the authority to translate the Bible. Nor are there lacking those who attribute this renewed attack of Luther and the irritation of his mind and style to the instigations of Nicholas Amsdorf, who had much influence with Luther. Bucer blames the Zurichers for not accepting a simple formula of agreement, even with ambiguity remaining and without a declaration.

LXXIII. Whatever the case, it is clear that Luther, in his minor confession on the Holy Eucharist, which he published in the following year 1544, wrote, which I now submit: "Because so many great warnings and admonitions from God were in vain and lost on them; for my writing went out 17 years ago (Τῆτι γὰρ τὸ ῥῆμα βεβαία ἐστὶ). I can with good conscience and strong faith praise the divine admonition, besides the other two admonitions (the book against

the heavenly prophets and the major confession), I do not consider it too little that they should let themselves be admonished by me, whom they highly esteem. For I am also a servant of Christ as well as they, and have worked in his church no less than they, though I do not wish to boast too much: I must let them go and avoid them as the αυτοκατάκριτοι who knowingly and willfully wish to be condemned, and have no fellowship with them in letters, writings, words, and works, as the Lord commands in Matthew 18. Steinfels or Zwingel or whatever he wants to be called, I reckon them all in one kitchen, as they are, who do not want to believe that the bread in the Lord's Supper is his real, natural body, which the godless or Judas also receives orally as well as Saint Peter and other saints; whoever does not want to believe this, let him leave me in peace with letters, writings, or words, and hope for no fellowship with me; there will be nothing else. After some interjections: The fanatics will not help by making a great deal of fuss at the sacrament about the spiritual eating and drinking of the body and blood of Christ, and about the love and unity of Christians: for these are all mere fig leaves with which Adam and Eve wanted to cover and adorn themselves so that God would not notice their nakedness and sin. Much less will their great effort to teach and write, with earnest and pious conduct, help: that is still all heathen stuff. Furthermore, it is lost that they believe in God the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, with Christ the Savior; all I say is lost: with all the articles, no matter how right and powerfully they name or give them with a blasphemous mouth; because they deny and lie against this one article in which Christ speaks in the sacrament: Take, eat; this is my body, which is given for you."

LXXIV. Philip, who regrets the breaking of concord, meanwhile leaves the battle and writes to Heinrich Bullinger. "Perhaps," he says, "before these my letters reach you, you will receive Luther's most atrocious writing, in which he renews the war against the Swiss. He has never pursued this cause with greater vehemence. Therefore, I cease hoping for the peace of the churches. Our enemies, who defend the idols of the monks, will rejoice, and our churches will be more divided, which causes me great sorrow. If we believe the letters that have been published, both Philip and Caspar Cruciger were so affected and distressed by these affairs that they contemplated leaving Wittenberg. But when the thirty-two articles of the Louvainians, concerning the old errors and superstitions, were brought to him the following year and shortly before his death, Luther, very upset, opposed them with seventy-six articles, of which twenty-eight also attacked the Zwinglians; concerning these he pronounced in these words: 'The Zwinglians and all sacramentarians who deny that the body and blood of Christ are taken orally in the venerable Eucharist, etc.' These articles are found at the end of Volume 1 of Jena and in German in Volume 8 of the German works."

LXXV. We do not wish to deny that we are pleased with those things that Luther wrote to the Swiss in 1537, and some of them have been mentioned and produced above: For if they could have treated him in this way at that time, so that contention and discord would have been soothed, right hands and hearts joined, why can this not be done now, especially since they have since fallen into worse opinions than they held then? Indeed, some have even corrected themselves and in some things have come closer or fully embraced the truth. But here we do not

consider the error they still hold about the Eucharist. If it is not so great and serious that on account of it God would exclude them from his kingdom and eternal life, but rather (assuming they do nothing with malice and against conscience, which we suppose here) that he accepts them as his children, as heirs and co-heirs, and members of Christ, we should consider them not as anything other than brothers, co-heirs, and members of the same body of Christ with us under the same head. If we act otherwise, we will sin against the charity that our Savior so greatly commended to us and which we owe as Christians to other Christians who are truly such and have not ceased to be by flagrant sins or denying the fundamental articles of faith. This we have explained in many words from the beginning of this discussion and laid as a foundation for the decision of the question.

LXXVI. We wish now to consider whether the knowledge which is necessary for some practice or for directing practice can be as necessary as the practice itself. And if it sometimes happens that without jeopardizing eternal salvation, the practice itself is either omitted or wrongly instituted; then it can likewise happen that if an error arises in the knowledge that directs this practice, it will be harmless. If knowledge is for the sake of practice, then the correctness of the knowledge, as it is in the mind, cannot be absolutely necessary if the practice for which it exists is not as necessary as the act and exercise itself. Everyone admits, and no one denies, that it can often happen that a faithful person is entirely deprived of the Holy Eucharist without losing salvation. The practice or administration of this sacrament can be morally impossible, as they say. So, it can also happen that the knowledge which directs this practice to be done rightly, or to remove any major and entrenched error, is not entirely possible: namely, if the mind is attached to prejudices and sincerely desires the truth, but is weaker in removing all obstacles, which are often many and great. Just as the desire for the Eucharist does not harm salvation if it is impeded, so also the desire and effort to know the truth about this sacrament will not harm salvation, even if the person is unable to extricate himself from difficulties and objections and perfectly grasp and hold the truth we spoke of. There cannot be a greater necessity for knowing the truth that directs practice than for the practice itself. Therefore, just as it is necessary for salvation to know and believe that the only-begotten Son of God became man for us, suffered, died, and rose again, so it is not equally necessary to know and believe that in the Holy Eucharist, the substance of the body of Christ is eaten. We exclude malice and persistent assertion or profession of something that is known to be false, for that would be attributed to the depravity and perversity of the will, not to the weakness of the intellect. Nor can there be any doubt that those who knowingly teach or defend error against their conscience will bring upon themselves God's wrath and damnation. To those who are known to us to be such, we can with Luther say: "We must ask for their conversion from the Christians against the heretics and have nothing to do with them." But for us who are not granted to examine and see into the secrets of hearts, it is not proper to accuse anyone lightly of such a crime, especially since there were and are men among them not lacking in meekness and virtue.

LXXVII. However, we must admit that there are many difficulties from which the Saracens should be freed. Those who are opposed to this opinion today have received it from

their elders and teachers and have been taught it from a young age. When such things are deeply impressed upon the mind, they are not easily shaken off. To be silent about the fact that this mystery involves things that common reason abhors, such as one body being present in many places at once, yet not being measured or sensed everywhere. Although in the mystery of the Trinity and the Incarnation, there are many things not only equally, but even more difficult. Moreover, there are ancient authors on this mystery who, out of religious reverence rather than curiosity, did not always speak openly and uniformly, and who seem to favor the opposite opinion, particularly Augustine among the chief ones. Those who first began to deny the true presence in the previous century thought that there was no other way to purge this sacrament of papal errors and superstitions, such as adoration, processions, offerings, and the propitiatory sacrifice. This opinion, namely the denial of the true presence of the true body, seemed to them advantageous, and since it involved nothing contrary to common sense and seemed almost openly proven by some of Augustine's sayings, they embraced it out of convenience and were overcome by difficulties, from a weakness common to human nature, which is neither new nor rare.

LXXVIII. Additionally, this matter has often been conducted with such bitterness and accumulated insults that it could disturb the minds of dissenters and alienate them from the truth, which would otherwise be true, but was presented in such a manner. Although the truth should not displease because of the added insults, the human mind tends to reject the opinion that is perceived to be forced upon it with reproach.

LXXIX. Moreover, the good cause has not always been defended with good and valid reasons, but sometimes with such arguments that have made the opinion itself, which they were intended to support, suspicious. Luther himself in his early writings (on the firmness of words and the major confession) advocated the ubiquity or omnipresence of the body of Christ, which was previously unknown in the Church except for some comments by Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples. Although, as we noted earlier, he later abandoned this as either a foundation or a support. Nonetheless, subsequently, there have been those who built the presence in the Eucharist upon omnipresence as a foundation and denied that it could exist or be defended without it. Thus, they weaken rather than strengthen the presence we are now discussing.

LXXX. The thesis itself, which is controversial, has not always been conveniently proposed. The Savior says: "Take, eat; this is my body." Therefore, what we receive and eat is the body of the Lord: truly the body as the words sound, not a mere sign or symbol of the body, nor the fruit or effect of the body. This thesis should be adhered to in disputes against dissenters. Since even St. Paul, when he changes the subject, namely the word "this," also changes the predicate: he does not say "bread is the body of Christ," but "bread is the communication of the body of Christ." Philip Melancthon rightly wrote to the Bremer people, which Joachim Corz has appended to his exposition: "We have heard that the scholars in the Saxon lands have used these words: bread and wine are essentially the body and blood, but this form when bread is taken is common and conforms to this form, bread is the communication of the body of Christ."

So he says. He likewise complains somewhere about Osiander, who has progressed so far as to defend this proposition: "This bread is God."

LXXXI. Both ancient and recent writers use this expression, "bread is the body of Christ." However, it should be explained by metonymy, and indeed a rather harsh one, so that the body is taken for the symbol of the body, not only signifying but also exhibiting. Thus explained, it can be admitted as a church phrase. However, in disputes, especially against dissenters, it would have been better to speak simply and use expressions that Scripture uses, namely, that what we receive and eat when blessed bread is taken and eaten is the body of Christ. Likewise, bread is the communication of the body of Christ. Thus, they would have nothing to quibble over, nor fear from transubstantiation or local inclusion or durable retention outside of use, from which they rightly abhor as manifest errors and long-standing superstitions and corruptions of the Papists.

Therefore, Oecolampadius in a certain letter said: "I call it intolerable speech to say that bread substantively is the body of Christ."

LXXXII. Furthermore, to return to the previous points, those who cannot yet see and accept the truth of the presence of the body and blood of the Lord in the Eucharist due to these difficulties will not fall from God's grace and salvation any more than those who are hindered from partaking of it due to impediments they cannot remove. How close the Swabians came to the Zwinglian opinion in their Syngramma and Brentius in his Exegesis on John, we have long since explained, yet no one condemns them to hell for it. They say they changed their opinion. But even then, when they thought so and before they began to speak otherwise, around the year 1527, anyone could easily affirm that they were not outside God's grace and in a state of damnation. Let us not be harsher to others than we are to ourselves and our own. It is known that the Waldensians or the Hussites of Bohemia and Moravia denied the presence of the true body in the Eucharist. However, Luther spoke kindly and gently of them in the preface he wrote to their confession in 1533. Among other things, he said: "Although I do not know how to accept the way of speaking of the aforementioned brothers, I will not cover them with a blanket nor force them to speak my way, as long as we otherwise agree and remain of one mind until God sends something further according to his will. Since we do not intend to persecute or destroy each other but to support and help, as St. Paul, our mediator, says in Romans 14: 'Receive one another, just as Christ also received us, to the glory of God.' And again in Romans 15: 'Receive the weak in faith, until everything becomes clear and perfect.'"

LXXXIII. Furthermore, it is no lighter an error against, or indeed contrary to, the institution and command of Christ to admit the use of one kind than to deny the true presence of the body. Yet in the Saxon Visitation of 1538, Luther explicitly said: "Where there are weak ones, who out of weakness and fear of their conscience cannot receive both kinds, they may be allowed to receive one kind for a time, and if they desire it, a preacher or pastor may well give it to them." Philip in the Common Places published in 1543 under the title "On the Abrogation of the Law" says: "He errs who thinks it impious to eat pork; he also errs who thinks it impious to abstain from pork. These are middle matters and left to our discretion. Thus, I judge about the

Eucharist, that those who knowingly and believing in this liberty use either part of the sign do not sin, which we and ours indulge in, whom we find to err concerning this sacrament."

LXXXIV. There is something, if not the whole, which distinctly does not deny nor affirm the presence of the body and blood of the Lord, but if we attend not so much to what they say, but what they mean, it is certain that they do not admit the presence of the true body and blood according to substance. It would have been more correct for each party to simply and sincerely profess what they believe rather than imposing ambiguous phrases on each other. The method of preaching adopted long ago by Philip and Bucer was to write formulas whose words both parties could embrace, but each would take and interpret them in their own sense. Although this endeavor was carried out with a pious and heartfelt desire and effort for concord, it did not achieve any success. We prefer, as we said, that both parties sincerely and openly express their minds; and even if they disagree, they should put aside hatred and hostility and the desire for reviling and condemning, and foster and exercise mutual Christian charity, as befits Christians, until the matter is thoroughly and calmly discussed and debated among the learned, and God grants fuller and more perfect agreement. For if we treat and consider each other as Christians despite our controversies and errors, which each side imputes to the other, and believe that through human weakness the mind may err in difficulties, and thus lay aside hatred, which often disturbs minds and hinders the recognition of truth, and calmly confer among ourselves and seek the truth, there is hope, not small, that with the help of divine grace, which loves to assist the meek, it will finally be found, and that disagreements can be removed, settled, or at least diminished. But if we continue in mutual hatred, detestation, and execration, the eyes of the mind will be clouded, and we will be unable to see either truth or concord.

LXXXV. However, I do not deny that until a more perfect consensus is established, the ecclesiastical ministry cannot be admitted among us that has persistently asserted and defended the Zwinglian opinion. Nor does there appear to be much hope of bending the Puritans, as they are called in England, a turbulent and seditious race of men, to moderation and mutual tolerance. Their spirits are too lofty to concede anything to others besides themselves; they are more eager for novelty than for antiquity, and more prone to wild behavior than to seeking tranquility. What can be truly said of them today could also have been said of the Flaccians in the past.

LXXXVI. We conclude with the words once used by the distinguished David Chytraeus on this very matter. "Far be it from me to condemn the churches, princes, or peoples who differ in any way, or to consider them worthy of being condemned or subjected to flames and punishments. For I see that Paul himself, although he gravely refutes and condemns certain errors of the Galatians and Corinthians, does not therefore condemn the churches of the Galatians and Corinthians, nor does he hand them over to be massacred by heathen persecutors, but instead embraces and cherishes them most lovingly. Indeed, with all my heart, I approve and require in others that moderation and gentle tolerance towards the churches of distant nations, which my teacher Paulus Eberus declared in the preface to his assertion on the Lord's Supper. I call upon God, who searches the minds and hearts, as my witness. Therefore, I grieve that so many are inflamed with bitter and virulent hatred against our confession's adherents, fueled by

vain and empty calumnies, condemning all foreign churches, kings, princes, and peoples who differ on the Eucharist, and handing them over to the devil, or deeming them less tolerable than Turks and Scythians. These cruel judgments, which I believe do not enter the mind of any sane person, I have always condemned and abhorred with all my heart."

Finis