

I. N. J.  
DEFENSE OF LUTHERANISM  
On the Holy Eucharist  
TO JOHANN BERG,  
An appendix to the Scholastic Exercise,  
unsuccessfully attacked,  
THE ANTI-BERGIAN STRONGHOLD  
On  
the substantial presence  
and oral reception of the body and blood of the Lord,  
still demonstrating to persist unmoved.  
WHICH IN A SOLEMN DISPUTATION,  
for obtaining the Licentiate of Doctorate,  
PRESIDED BY ABRAHAM CALOV,  
Doctor of Theology, Pastor, Consistory Assessor,  
Electorate of Saxony General Superintendent,  
publicly on October 22, in the morning and afternoon hours:  
in the Main Auditorium will be defended by  
M. CHRISTOPHER DANIEL SCHREITER, Wurtzen, of Meissen,  
Pastor of the local Church, Consistory Assessor there, Superintendent of the Meissen  
Episcopate.

WITTENBERG. In the year 1657.  
Printed by Johann Haken

I. N. J.  
ΕΙΣ ΜΕΤΡΩΝ ΒΕΡΓΙΑΝΟΝ  
completely ἄμελεν  
by which he attempted to overturn Lutheranism concerning the Supper with great, but  
undeserved effort.

§. I. Just as JOHANNES BERGIUS vainly opposed our Summary Refutation in the Preface to his Scholastic Exercise on the Lord's Supper: which we trust has been demonstrated in a special treatise with clarity: so with equal success he has risen up with an addition from the carelessness of John, indeed, and plainly against our Stereoma, indeed against the whole of Lutheranism concerning the Supper. For it is a small matter for this Hercules to try against one or the other; he is persuaded that he can easily overthrow all of Lutheranism, and thus all Lutherans, with a single blow, and for this purpose he judges that no treatise is needed at all, if only he himself would put his hand to it. Immediately Lutheranism will be leveled to the ground, if he had attempted it even with some mere addition, attached to a childish Exercise. Such a braggart is he, but in his own eyes!

§. II. And so he attacks Lutheranism, that is, in his own interpretation, the doctrine of those theologians concerning the Holy Supper, who profess to follow Luther's opinion on the oral eating of Christ's body: which interpretation is both sophistic and not without calumny. It is sophistic that Lutheranism is explained by the doctrine of the Supper concerning the oral eating of Christ's body: because Lutheranism comprehends many more articles of faith, even as it is opposed to Calvinism, such as on the Person of Christ, on Predestination, on the Word of God, on Baptism and many others: and in the article on the Supper it does not only depart from Zwinglian Calvinism as to the oral eating of Christ's body, but also as to other controversial points about the foundation of this doctrine, about the meaning of Christ's words, about the substantial presence of Christ's body and blood, about the eating by the unworthy, then also about the fruit and efficacy of the sacrament, and whatever else is disputed. But it smacks of calumny, that he says theologians alone follow Luther's opinion, indeed that they alone profess to follow it, as if they did not follow it at all, but only boast of it, or pretend to; and that this is peculiar to theologians, but not to the whole Lutheran Church: when he knows well that the faith of the hearers in our Church is no different from that of the teachers. But by what spirit now does Bergius call us Lutherans, our doctrine Lutheran, when otherwise he proclaims these names contentious and schismatic, and judges them forbidden by the Word of God, and is not ignorant that his associates impute to blessed Luther inconsistency and diverse opinions in the doctrine of the Supper, and an approach to the dogma of the Reformed towards the end of his life. The Apology of the Formula of Concord has refuted eight calumnies about Luther's opinion being so often changed in chapter X.

§. III. But this is what Bergius wants to show, that our doctrine of the oral eating of Christ's body is in no way founded in Christ's own words, nor in their proper and literal sense, nor in an interpretation consistent with the true and native sense, nor in any consequence. He rashly opposes Christ's words to their proper and literal sense and to an interpretation consistent with their true and native sense. For if it is founded in Christ's words, surely it must be founded in the true and native sense of Christ's words. If in their proper sense, surely in Christ's own words: indeed since our Stereoma has demonstrated that the proper and literal sense must be retained here; and that it alone is to be held as true and native in the words of Christ's Testament, about which there is controversy, this opposition is also vain. Then when he removes consequence, and says it is not founded in a true and firm, much less necessary and evident consequence, which could be deduced either from the proper or from the Synecdochical sense, he again rashly opposes necessary consequence from the Holy Scriptures to what is true and firm; because every consequence from Holy Scripture, which is true and firm, is therefore also necessary: and also the proper and Synecdochical sense, which we so call: Because that Grammatical Synecdoche does not oppose propriety, but preserves it. What then? He says our doctrine is founded on that single paralogism, which is the fundamental syllogism of all Lutheranism in this doctrine, and goes like this:

That which Christ gave in the Supper, he commanded to be eaten by mouth.

That which he gave is the body of Christ.

Therefore, he commanded the body of Christ to be eaten by mouth.

He therefore takes this syllogism to be examined, and shows twelve faults in it, and declaims about them quite prolixly.

§. IV. But this is truly to fight with shadows and wrestle with spectres, or as Homer has it,

"to wage a fruitless war and fight a useless battle."

For he can show from no approved Doctor that this is our syllogism, much less the fundamental one of our opinion, or the syllogism of Lutheranism, as he himself has formed it, so that he might have something to attack, or with which to play, no differently than boys, who form little men for themselves, which they may attack and overthrow. And if this is our single fundamental syllogism, why then, Bergius, did you peddle a quite different one in the preface in its place as our fundamental syllogism: or if you hold that one in the preface, "That which Christ gave us to eat by mouth. That which he gave through the medium of bread, is his body. Therefore, he commanded us to eat his body by mouth through the medium of bread, although not in an oral manner, but in a hyperphysical way," to be not different, but the same as this most recently proposed, truly you show that you understand the doctrine of syllogisms excellently. There is no need therefore for such a laborious refutation. We acknowledge that both of those syllogisms are most faulty. Both that one from the preface, whose faults we pointed out in the vindication of our Summary refutation: and also this one proposed in the Addition. But we deny that they are ours; and so that we may grant this favor to Bergius, who most laboriously dissects this latter paralogism, and yet does not touch on the true fault in it with a single word, come, let us place before his eyes the fault from which it chiefly suffers, if indeed he is ignorant of it along with the most ignorant, in a similar formula. For in the same way someone would conclude:

That which Bergius gave in the Supper, he wanted to be eaten by mouth:

[unless perhaps he only proposed food to the guests by the will of a sign, or instituted to feed them by mere figurative representation and fantastic celebration of the Supper.]

That which Bergius gave to the guests in the Supper is Rhenish wine.

Therefore, he wanted Rhenish wine to be eaten by mouth.

[Which I do not believe he intended, unless he wanted drink, which is to be drunk, to be eaten, and food, which is to be eaten, to be drunk.]

Or if he prefers, in this way:

That which he gave to be eaten is beef.

That which he gave to be eaten is pork.

Therefore, pork is beef.

Or, if it pleases to remain in Eucharistic matter:

That which Christ gave in the Supper, he commanded to be eaten by mouth.

That which he gave is the blood of Christ.

Therefore, he commanded the blood of Christ to be eaten by mouth.

Likewise; That which he gave is blessed bread.

That which he gave is a blessed cup.  
Therefore, the blessed cup is blessed bread.

Or, if Papist concomitance is to be constructed, what will be easier than to conclude in the same way:

That which he gave is the blood of Christ.  
That which he gave is the body of Christ.  
Therefore, the body is the blood of Christ.

Behold concomitance, or even transubstantiation more than Papist! And into what form could Bergius himself not be transformed, if such a logical form were true and truly syllogistic!

§. V. Now, if he does not yet notice the fault, let him have the rules about the third figure more correctly explained to him by the sons of logicians, and let him learn the art of disputing better, before he commits himself to arduous disputation. For he has not been mistaken in this one way alone, but we have observed in the Summary refutation, and also in its Vindication, that more syllogisms faulty in form have been produced by him, even when he has argued from his own mind and for obtaining his own opinion.

§. VI. But while he learns this, let us plead our case: which certainly needs no syllogism, but is contained, as they say, in terms in Christ's own words. For when Christ distributed the blessed bread, he said, "Eat, this is my body": here if you ask, what is it that he commanded to be eaten, when he distributed the blessed bread, Christ's words are engraved with the rays of the sun: "Eat, this is my body": and thus they testify with a sonorous voice that Christ commanded his body to be eaten. Who here will desire the formulas of logicians, where the meaning of Christ's words is clear? Who will require consequences, when our faith is exhibited in the proper and native sense of the words themselves! No other consequence is needed than this general one: What Christ said, this is true and must be believed without doubt, however much reason may contradict. But Christ said that this, which is to be eaten by mouth, according to the word of command "Eat", is his body. Therefore it is true, and must be believed without doubt, that this, which is to be eaten by mouth, according to the word of command "Eat", is the very body of Christ. Not arguments, but only faith to be applied to Christ's words is needed. "Eat," he says, as Anselm's paraphrase has it, in 1 Cor. XI, "what I give, this is my body. To the outer senses it seems to be bread, but know with the senses of the mind, that this is my body, not another, but the same substantially, which will be given to death for your redemption." Let Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem, be heard here from the Greek Church, Catechesis Mystagogica IV: "When Christ himself here affirms and says of the bread, 'This is my body,' who thereafter would dare to doubt? And when he confirms and teaches, 'This is my blood,' who, I say, would doubt and say that it is not his blood? Therefore do not consider it as mere bread and mere wine: for it is the body and blood of Christ according to the Lord's declaration; for even if sense suggests this to you, let faith confirm you. Do not judge the matter from taste, but be fully assured by faith, without a doubt, that you have been granted the body and blood of Christ." If only the Calvinists would be obedient to this saying, there would be no need for syllogisms, nor would they continue to weave ropes from sand, and speak against the sun of truth.

§. VII. If, however, the opponent of Lutheranism absolutely desires a syllogism, let him take this one: Whatever Christ gave to the disciples in the first part of the Supper, he commanded to be eaten by mouth. But the Body of Christ is what Christ gave to the disciples in the first part of the Supper, as Christ's words testify: "This is my body." Therefore, the Body of Christ is what he commanded to be eaten by mouth. Let him go now, and attack his own paralogism, the offspring of his own brain, while that argument of ours stands unshaken, or rather the unshaken saying of Christ's words, "Eat, this is my body," remains unmoved in this cause of Lutheranism, as founded solely on the most solid rock, on the word of the most wise, most truthful, most powerful Christ.

§. VIII. Now we could dismiss Bergius with his Addition, since he only beats the air, but since in doing something else he both attacks our faith and plucks at and tears some parts of our Stereoma, which he did not dare to attack as a whole, we will dedicate this work to him, and under Christ's auspices, we will review it in order. But Bergius's response to the aforementioned paralogism is completed in XII members, to which it seemed good to attach a conclusion: about which therefore we will pursue him step by step.

## SECTION I. RESPONSE I. concerning the changed genus of predication.

§. IX. First, therefore, he sends the miserable Lutherans to the schools of logicians, and indeed to a rule known to boys, as he says: and he judges this response to be the briefest and simplest: "With the genus of predication changed, the consequence is not valid." Most inept application of a logical rule: and therefore this is a most inept response. For the genus of predication is changed either formally as to the logical diversity of predication: which cannot be shown here: or materially, as to the things themselves, which certainly must be changed in the Major and Minor proposition. If Bergius denies this, he renders more and more testified that he is ignorant of the very principles of Logic, as he truly is ignorant.

§. X. But let us hear him explaining himself. In the major, he says, there is a proper, common, usual predication, about properly called food, or bread, about properly called oral eating, natural, visible, palpable, which is predicated about that food or bread. In the Minor, although they contend that the predication is likewise proper, and not figurative, yet all confess that it is mystical and sacramental. But here that crass ignorance reveals itself. For he confuses formal respects with material ones, and mixes them up shamefully: it pertains to the formal, when a predication is said to be proper, or improper, that food is properly called, eating is properly called, or improper: but to the material, when a predication is common and usual about natural, visible, palpable food and eating, or when the predication is mystical and sacramental. What therefore is plainer, than that this Man thinks it is not permissible to subsume a mystical minor under a usual and common major proposition, and that the genus of predication should not be changed either formally or materially, which is mere ignorance of Logic. I will illustrate the matter

with an example: If it is concluded thus: Every man consists of a soul and an organic body: The Son of God is a man. Therefore, the Son of God consists of a soul and an organic body. Are you going to say that there is a logical fault in the Syllogism, because the genus of predication is changed: In the Major the predication is common and usual. In the minor mystical, unusual, and personal: But with the genus of predication changed, the consequence is not valid. Absurd! Therefore Bergius's first simplest response falls.

§. XI. In which he again reveals ignorance, when he asserts that we say the minor proposition, "This, which he gave, is the body of Christ," is both synecdochical and unusual. For we say that proposition of Christ, "This is my body," is synecdochical: But not that Bergian one, "This which he gave, is the body of Christ": which are ignorantly confused. Nor were our Doctors to be sent here to the boys of Rhetoricians and Grammarians. Even Tyros of Theology know that there is one Grammatical Synecdoche which boys learn from Grammar; but there is another Synecdoche, which Luther and other Theologians call Sacramental; not because it is proposed in grammatical elements, but so that they may distinguish it from the trope of Rhetoricians, and designate the reason why they so name it, namely by reason of Grammar or the Etymological origin of the word synecdoche, which has place in exhibitivae, complexivae propositions. For what else is synecdoche in the Grammatical sense, or by force of the Etymology of the word, than complexion? Therefore I do not see what forbids calling a complexion, in Greek synecdoche, when a complexivae proposition occurs. This was already explained thus in our *Stereoma* p.70. 149. ff. but Bergius preferred to replace his calumny, rather than to acknowledge it.

§. XII. Furthermore, we do not call that proposition unusual, "This, which Christ gave is the body of Christ," but that ecclesiastical one, "Bread is the body of Christ," just as in the article on the person of Christ, not that proposition is called unusual, "This is true God." 1 John V. 20. but this, "Man is true God." Nor do we call it unusual because of the combination of predicate with subject in that proposition, "This which he gave, is the body of Christ." For this combination is by no means unusual: but we call unusual the union of bread and body, about which there is no word in that argument. We refer the sarcasm about momentary union and about the conclusion, which is comprehended by mouth, to Bergius's witticisms, who whether he wishes to comprehend propositions by mouth or by hands, if he should give faith to them, since both the mouth and hands of a Calvinist are keen-sighted, this is nothing to us.

## SECTION II. Another Response about four, or more terms.

§. XIII. In the second place Bergius responded, the syllogism consists of four terms, indeed of more, whether the terms are explained in the true and genuine sense, or in the Lutheran, which however is his third response. He teaches that in the genuine sense they are to be explained thus.

1. This, which Christ took with his hands from the table, which he blessed, which he broke, and gave to the disciples, namely bread.

Response: 1. What construction, Bergius, is this, "This bread"? The sons of grammarians will correct you. 2. Did Christ command only bread to be eaten by mouth, Did he not testify about this, which he was commanding to be eaten by mouth, by the word "Eat", "This is my body"? Who therefore can doubt that he commanded his body to be eaten by mouth! 3. Who has ever explained that term GAVE by Synonymy, according to Logicians, in this way, who will permit it to be explained thus? Gave, that is, took with his hands from the table, blessed, broke, and thus gave? Which of the Logicians taught Bergius, when he wants to explain the middle term in the genuine sense, to make more from one middle term, and to confuse them among themselves? Let him know this is the mark of Sophists or those ignorant of Logic, not of disputants, such as this analyst presents himself to be. 4. If this is the genuine interpretation of the major. This, that is, bread: thus the argument will have:

Christ commanded bread to be eaten.

Bread is the body of Christ.

Therefore, he commanded his body to be eaten.

Who does not see here that it is a different Syllogism, and that the middle term has been changed, not explained?

§. XIV. But let the illustrious analyst proceed, in the resolution or explanation of the premises.

2. It is eaten by mouth, or commanded to be eaten, namely in its substance naturally, visibly, palpably, so that it is cast down through the mouth into the stomach.

Response: where is that "eaten by mouth", according to this mode in the words of the Supper? Christ commanded to be eaten by mouth. We accept this confession of Bergius. But that what he exhibited in its substance naturally, visibly, palpably, and to be sent down into the stomach, he commanded to be eaten by mouth, about this there is nothing in the words of the command: nor does "to be eaten by mouth" import this by itself. Angels ate by mouth, when they appeared in visible form, even Christ after the resurrection. Did they eat naturally, so that they sent the food down into the stomach?

§. XV. Let us hear Bergius further narrating his own sense concerning the minor proposition.

3. This, which he gave by hand, which he commanded to be received by hand, to be eaten by mouth, namely the bread itself not in its substance, but in this sacramental and mystical use.

Response: 1. It has already been noted before that "this" is not understood demonstratively as bread. 2. Why did Bergius now add a different gloss to "this" than in the major, what is its necessity! In this way he will be able to find more than three terms in almost every syllogism. 3. That "not in its substance, but in sacramental use" by no means pertains to the subject, but to the predicate: since such determinations, as is known from Logic, concerning the nexus of the predicate with the Subject pertain to the predicate. 4. Where in the words of the Supper is it

found here, that Christ commanded to be received by hand, and that therefore it is necessary that what is offered by Christ be received by hand, not immediately by mouth.

§. XVI. Now Bergius also peculiarly modifies the copula in the Minor proposition.

4. Is, not naturally, substantially, but essentially, or hypostatically, not through transubstantiation, or consubstantiation, inexistence, coexistence, or bodily contact, but sacramentally and mystically, or through and because of sacramental union, Lutherans at least confessing this in word.

Response: 1. Since the Subject has already been modified, to sacramental and mystical use, why is the copula also modified thus by battology? 2. It is most inept to imagine that the copula "is" is taken otherwise and otherwise in the propositions of the Syllogism, when its office is only to join the predicate with the Subject. Here again he stumbles against the principles of Logic. It is equally pertinent to the copula IS in propositions, whether the proposition be Essential, or accidental, nor are four terms thereby introduced. Will you imagine four terms in that argument; Every rational animal is risible; Peter is a rational animal. Therefore, Peter is risible, for the reason that the major proposition is paronymic, but the minor is synonymic? and so in others. This is childish and quite inept! 3. This, which Christ gave with the bread to be eaten, is altogether the body of Christ substantially and essentially, or rather is the very body of Christ itself, as to essence, not indeed through sacramental union. Although in the Subject sacramental union is indicated, the predicate however exhibits the very essence of Christ's body, according to our opinion. But where do Lutherans confess that this, which is exhibited with the bread, is not substantially the body of Christ itself, but only through and because of sacramental union? They say bread is the body of Christ through sacramental union; but they deny that bread is constituted in the place of the subject here. 4. But, as I said, no sane person has ever dreamed that the word IS in the words of the Supper is taken either naturally, substantially, hypostatically, or even sacramentally, mystically. Here Bergius only reveals the crassest ignorance of Logic. The word IS, which I have mentioned once, functions only as the office of the substantive copula. Will Bergius learn from the Logical copula the reason for the nexus of the predicate with the subject, or the foundation, or mode, why, or how the predicate is said of the Subject? Even boys know that it only copulates the predicate with the Subject, it performs nothing else.

§. XVIII. The analyst also modifies the Predicate of the Minor, in this way.

5. The body of Christ itself, which then was sitting at the table, was speaking to the disciples, was offering the bread and cup, indeed as the ancients wished, and the Pontificals concede, was eating and drinking from the same bread and cup, certainly could eat and drink from the same, which by the same death was delivered the next day crucified, now gloriously exalted in heaven above all things.

Response: 1. If such varying determinations immediately produce more terms in a Syllogism, what syllogism can be given, to which it is not permitted to assign more terms? 2. These



determinations are accidental, and make nothing to Christ's proposition. 3. Some are also false. For the body was not speaking to the disciples, or offering the bread and cup, but this was done by Christ the man, or the God-man. But Christ's proposition was this. This is my body, not indeed that one, This is I, or this is my human nature. 4. To eat and drink sacramentally does not belong to Christ, nor can it belong, because Christ ordained for us the cup of the Testament in his blood shed for us, which cup certainly he himself neither had need of, nor could enjoy, just as he could by no means shed blood for himself: Meanwhile we acknowledge that there is only one body of Christ, but we are ignorant of another body of his. That Christ ate of the Eucharistic bread, drank of the consecrated wine, who among the ancients maintain this, will scarcely be found, if perhaps you except Chrysostom relying on a false hypothesis, (that the words "with desire I have desired to eat the Passover" speak of the Passover of the New Testament, which expressly sound of the old passover): We do not wonder at or delay over other Scholastics and Pontificals, who have the Eucharist for a sacrifice, and have devised that Christ as a Priest ate his body, and thus consumed the victim in a bloodless manner: although they do not agree on this, whether Christ also received his body and blood spiritually, which seemed good to Thomas part. 2. p. 81. art.1. or indeed only Sacramentally, as Ludolph the Carthusian wanted. For the rest, it is manifest from Luke XXII.18, that Christ after the Paschal supper protested that he would no longer drink wine, which protestation Christ would have violated, if he had drunk from the Eucharistic cup. But he was so far from wanting to drink from this, that he also alleged this cause, why he does not drink from the Eucharistic cup, containing wine Matt. XXVI.29. namely because he had once protested that he would no longer drink of wine. But let us here set Bergius against his Zwingli in the Subsidy of the Eucharist, denying that Christ drank from the cup of the Supper, and also against Musculus, who in the Common Places does not at all dare to affirm it. But when St. Jerome in Epistle CL said that Jesus himself was both guest and banquet, both eating and being eaten, he can be explained as having partaken of the bread and wine, which were afterwards distributed for the Eucharist, not however under that aspect, by which bread and wine is the communion of his body and blood, but as that eating and drinking was rather consecratory of the elements for the distribution of heavenly things, just as he consecrated our baptism by his own. Certainly the Calvinists themselves do not teach that Christ spiritually perceived his own body, in the way they want it to be perceived by us.

§. XVIII. Now let Bergius proceed to the subject of the Conclusion.

6. Therefore the invisible body of Christ, uncircumscribed, not having parts, not figure, not distinct members, not giving bread, but given in bread, and at the same time united indistantly to innumerable other breads, wherever the holy Supper is celebrated.

Response: 1. Bergius had promised here to explain the terms in their true and genuine sense. Does he therefore acknowledge himself some invisible, uncircumscribed body, etc.? 2. But we do not acknowledge one and another body of Christ, but we touch here on Bergius's calumny about a double body. 3. The affection or accident of some thing does not vary the thing itself, much less does it produce a plurality of terms in the propositions of a Syllogism. While Bergius has opined this here, he can be chastised by beginners. 4. No one denies that the body of

Christ which is exhibited to us by Christ has parts outside parts, figure and distinct members. Therefore this is mere calumny.

§. XIX. Now let him also add the predicate of the Conclusion.

7. It is eaten by mouth, supernaturally, insensibly, incomprehensibly, by a momentary eating, of which no example, no mention occurs anywhere.

Response: 1. It is sufficient for us to infer from Christ's words that Christ's body is eaten. As for the mode, whether it happens supernaturally, insensibly, etc., these are questions arising alongside, and the thing itself is not to be denied due to our ignorance of the mode, even if we should be utterly unable to explain all those things. 2. But Bergius is inept again, when he infers that mode, of which there is no mention in the premises, to the Conclusion. In the Major there was simply talk of oral eating: and thus the conclusion also inferred: Therefore in this no fault was committed. But what kind of mode the eating of Christ's body is, is to be learned not from that Syllogism, or those premises, but from elsewhere, and therefore it is ineptly added to the conclusion.

§. XX. But that the reader may understand the ineptitudes of the man even more rightly, I exhibit a similar formula of arguing, which could be given of this kind, e.g., if someone equally with Bergius would want to be inept in analysis:

This, which the Baptist showed, is the Holy Spirit.  
This, which the Baptist showed is a Dove.  
Therefore, the Dove is the Holy Spirit.

Or even such:  
This, which the Baptist showed, descended.  
This, which the Baptist showed, is the Holy Spirit.  
Therefore, the Holy Spirit descended.

Now let the Bergian artifice be applied, and seven terms will be noted in that Syllogism equally:

1. This, namely the dove.
2. Descended, in its substance, visibly.
3. This, namely the dove itself in that peculiar use.
4. Is, not naturally, but mystically through mystical union.
5. The Holy Spirit, who is one with the Father and the Son, and is gloriously in heaven.
6. Therefore the Holy Spirit who was in the dove, visibly and indistantly united to it.
7. Descended, supernaturally, insensibly, etc.

But I stop with such things. For how easy it would be to exhibit equally many terms even in the most legitimate Syllogisms and superior to all exception, if we wanted to be inept with him.

## SECTION III. Third Response about more terms in the sense of the Lutherans.

§. XXI. Now therefore Thirdly also in the sense of the premises, which, as Bergius says, modern Lutheran Theologians, and among them Calovius, attribute to them, a plurality of terms is shown in this way:

1. This, which he gave, that is, that whole complex, namely both the bread, which he visibly took and gave, and the body, which he expressed in the predicate of the promise, and invisibly gave.

Response: But who of Our People, Bergius, concluded thus; This (the whole complex, which Christ gave) is eaten by mouth. This, which he exhibited under bread to be eaten by mouth, is eaten by mouth. Therefore the body of Christ is eaten by mouth. Who has ever trifled so ineptly? You fight with the spectres and shades of your little brain, not with Lutheran Theologians.

§. XXII. Now as to the predicate of the major proposition:

2. It is eaten by mouth, or commanded to be eaten, namely by the same organ and act of the mouth indeed, but in a most diverse way:

Response: This is quite ineptly (from our sense) joined with the whole complex. For who of Our People explains this thus? that the whole complex is eaten by mouth, by the same organ and act of the mouth indeed, but in a most diverse way. That mode now does not pertain to the whole complex, but to the distinct parts of the Sacrament; namely the earthly and heavenly matter. And therefore it is rashly and ignorantly added to the major proposition, if its subject is the whole complex taken συμπλεκτικῶς, as one sacramental thing, and thus not as resolved into parts.

§. XXIII. Furthermore in the Minor proposition the Analyst proceeds thus:

3. This, which is exhibited to be eaten by mouth in, with, under this bread, or as others say, this whole complex, namely bread through and because of sacramental union, but what is exhibited in the bread, through substantial identity.

Response: 1. The Minor has thus: This which he gave, is the body of Christ. Which if you explain thus, this which is exhibited or commanded to be eaten by mouth in, with, under this bread, is the body of Christ, the terms will be openly confused, and what ought to become the conclusion (Therefore he commanded the body of Christ to be eaten by mouth) will be assumed in the minor: which is to be taught to be done by ours. 2. But who of the Lutherans has ever handed down that other gloss of the Minor, this whole complex, bread because of sacramental union, that which is exhibited in the bread, through substantial identity is the body of Christ; Indeed we do not deny that what is exhibited in the bread is the body of Christ itself, through

substantial identity: but we deny that this resolution of the Minor proposition is handed down by Our People.

§. XXIV. The interpreter also expounds the word IS in Our sense, but without the vote of Our people and senate.

4. IS, not by essence or existence, or even by some durable union, but only momentary, in that single moment, while the bread is taken by mouth, before it flows down into the stomach.

Response: But Bergius again dreams this most inept paraphrase of the substantive verb: which has not even come into the mind of ours in a dream. The word Is, which we said before, sustains the place of a copula, it does not express the Mode of union of the predicate with the subject. Then if through substantial identity, as Bergius said just now, this which is exhibited, is the body of Christ, how therefore would it be denied by essence and existence, how would it be said to be the body of Christ by some union, and that momentary! Which calumny about the momentary union of the body noted above, is here plainly also about the saying. For this, which Christ exhibits, is the body of Christ, not only for that moment in which it is received by mouth with bread, in our opinion, but as the body of Christ never ceases to be, nor is there, except one body of Christ, so when that one incorruptible and true body of Christ is exhibited, how would it exist only for a moment? Which although it is united with the Eucharistic bread only in the sacramental act, yet through this sacrament it is spiritually united with us, not only for a moment, but if you look at Christ's intention, so that it ought not to be separated.

§. XXV. Now the analyst harasses the Predicate of the Minor.

5. The body of Christ indeed the same, which was sitting at the table, was speaking, and which was given for us, and now exalted, but as indistinctly and incomprehensibly united to the bread for that moment, and exhibited to the mouth of the communicants.

Response: We do not repeat what we noted before about the predicate of the Minor in the preceding Section. Here we only note in addition the vain opposition of the Body, which was given for us, and which is united with the Eucharistic bread. For it is one and the same body in our opinion. Then also the Zwinglian hypothesis, according to which in Zwingli's Logic (which was once noted by the Great Luther) the "which" is changed into "insofar as", or "of what kind", Christ exhibits the body which was given for us, not of what kind or insofar as it was given, which words exhibit not the quality, but the truth of Christ's body described from the individual property, given for us. Finally, the most inept sense, which he ascribes to us. Who has ever been so inept: This, which is exhibited in and with bread is the body of Christ, insofar as it is exhibited to the communicants in and with bread, We leave those absurdities to Bergius their author.

§. XXVI. He expounds the subject of the Conclusion newly thus.

6. Therefore the Body of Christ, as without any quantity, quality, figure, form, parts or distinct human members, is in the bread.

Response: 1. Those are brain-born inventions of Bergius. We have never dreamed of such a body, nor do we acknowledge except one body of Christ. 2. If you say that the mode of being in bread, or of exhibiting with bread is designated, what man of such foolish mind, that he would refer these things to the mode of being in, or allow them to be referred! 3. Since before the body of Christ was designated in the fifth term, as incomprehensibly united to the bread, why do you feign a sixth term from it here! unless perhaps you are eager to act the part of a comedian rather than an analyst.

§. XXVII. Finally he did not want the predicate of the conclusion to be dismissed without mockery.

7. It is eaten by mouth, but not in an oral manner, not so that it is ingested through the mouth into the stomach (which is properly eating for us) but in a plainly hyperphysical manner, which is neither sensible nor intelligible to any men: which therefore Calovius in his *Stereoma* confesses cannot be sufficiently defined or described under some common and abstractive concept of proper eating, because the hyperphysical reason is inexplicable.

Response: We noted the calumny about that non-oral mode, and the inept opposition of the hyperphysical mode in the examination of a similar paralogism in our vindications. But whether that mode of eating is sensible or understood, or not, that certainly does not make for proper eating. I do not believe the mode of eating of Angels in assumed bodies or of Christ after the resurrection is intelligible to Bergius, which nevertheless he does not deny was proper. What he babbles about the abstractive concept, teaches that Bergius still ignores what an abstractive concept is, and discusses abstraction, like a blind man about colors. It is one thing, Bergius, to have an abstractive description of eating prescinding from natural, sacramental and other modes if there are any: another to have a description of sacramental eating, which you ignorantly confuse with an abstractive and common concept. Moreover it is one thing to have the eating itself, another the mode of eating. Sacramental eating is true and properly called eating, and therefore is altogether oral, even if the mode of that eating is inexplicable according to that saying, we know the thing, we are ignorant of the mode, we feel the motion, we believe the presence. But if this is new to Bergius, that abstractive concepts are sometimes unknown, where one must prescind from mysteries, and natural things, let him tell me, what is the common concept of generation, which prescind from natural, and supernatural eternal, which he himself has not been able to give so far, even though when he was pressed in the Königsberg disputation, he sweated greatly. Therefore let him cease to wonder that the abstractive reason of eating cannot be sufficiently defined. About which more in our *Stereoma* page 94. Nor indeed have we denied that proper eating can be described in some way in the abstract, just as Marbach has already described it in 1. on the Supper against Pezel. p. 180. To eat properly signifies nothing else than to receive something (namely food) into the mouth, and being received to be nourished by it: such also is this description. To eat is to receive an edible thing by mouth, and to take it into one's body: eating is the taking into the body of an edible thing

perceived by mouth. Which general definition expresses both the matter or object, which is the edible thing, whether it be food, or medicine, or whatever may take the place of an edible thing: and the form, to which I refer both the proper act, or formal perception, and the taking into the body, and the proper organ of eating, the mouth of the body. The end, which is not one of eating, and from the ends of proper eating generally one common can hardly be abstracted, is not expressed. Which description applies both to natural oral eating, which happens by swallowing the edible thing, or passing it into the stomach, and infers the conversion of the food taken into substance: and to supernatural, both economic, such as was that of Christ after the resurrection, and of Angels in assumed bodies, who neither ate for the sake of nutrition, nor converted food into substance: and sacramental, by which according to Christ's institution with the blessed bread the body of Christ perceived by mouth is taken into the body, for the vivification of soul and body.

§. XXVIII. Therefore we willingly leave the judgment to all whose mind's eye is not completely blinded by prejudices and emotions, whether these are not empty games that Bergius has played here. Which Senesius, lest he not amplify, beseeches the reader, whether that is the proper and native sense of Christ's words, which he has indeed proposed for the most part not from our sense, but calumniously through seven points. As for the first, about this whole complex supernaturally, and yet united through bodily indistance:

Response: We do not say that this whole complex is thus united, but that the whole complex infers and designates, or supposes union: as when, upon seeing a dove, it was said, "This is the Holy Spirit", the subject "this" taken complexively inferred or designated the union of the Holy Spirit with the dove: when Jesus of Nazareth standing in the Jordan was proclaimed from heaven: "This is my Son", the union of the divine nature of the Son of God with the human in Jesus of Nazareth was inferred or supposed. So when Christ said of the exhibited bread, "This is my body", some complex or one sacramental thing was inferred, consisting of blessed bread and the body of Christ, as the Holy Church has believed hitherto with Irenaeus. For the rest, the parts are usually said to be united, but not some whole is said to be united, but results from union. Let the sons of Metaphysicians correct the Reformed Doctor here.

§. XXIX. The second point is about oral eating, which is indeed proper, and happens by the same act and organ, but nevertheless in a way more than wholly different, indeed adverse.

Response: Oral eating, because it has one sacramental thing as its object, happens by the same act and proper organ of eating: but because in that one sacramental thing both earthly matter and heavenly bread, namely bread and the body of Christ, concur, hence a different mode of eating arises, so that bread is perceived in a natural way, the body of Christ in a supernatural and mystical way, from which truly no adversity or contradiction should be imagined: because these modes, natural and supernatural, are subordinate here, not contrary. Just as there is one hypostasis, by which the divine and human nature of Christ subsists. Although the divine nature subsists by that hypostasis in a way far different from the human, that by itself and through itself, this through the grace of communication, nevertheless no fight or adversity should be imagined here: but one and the same subsistence, one and the same

personal act should be believed: So here there is one eating, of the heavenly thing and the earthly thing; but the mode is diverse.

§. XXX. The third point is about a single predicate, which in the same proposition is attributed to the whole complex Subject in a double mode of predication, namely partly through extrinsic union, partly through substantial identity. Response: This is an invention and calumny of Bergius: in Christ's proposition, "This is my body", as the predicate is single, so the mode of predication is also single, not double. For how was this, which he was exhibiting with bread, the body of Christ? Certainly not through union, but through substantial identity the very body of Christ, as the Syrian expressly noted in his translation, and the emphasis of the Greek articles imports; This is THAT body of MINE, WHICH is given for you. The reason is different for the Eucharistic proposition: bread is the body of Christ: where the mode and foundation of predication should be sought in Sacramental union.

§. XXXI. The fourth point about corporeal inexistence and union scarcely momentary is a cuckoo's cry, often dispatched. It is not a corporeal union, if the mode is to be distinguished, although one extreme of the union is Christ's body, namely united with the Eucharistic bread. And although the union with Eucharistic bread lasts only in the sacramental act, nevertheless the spiritual union with the faithful man, which is its end, does not cease: since through the sacrament Christ wishes to be united with us by his body and blood, and to remain in us.

§. XXXII. The fifth point about the Body of Christ existing simultaneously in the most diverse, indeed plainly contradictory modes, in the most remote and innumerable places at the same time, so that it is eaten in many thousands of breads, and yet is not eaten in itself in heaven, is mere sarcasm, and truly impious. A most diverse, yet not contradictory mode of existing must certainly be attributed to Christ's body, unless you wish to become a fugitive into Nestorius's camp: namely both natural act and existence, and also that personal act, by which it subsists in the Word, and enjoys its subsistence; What therefore hinders attributing to the same both local and illocal presence, since it certainly is not in the Word as in a place, or locally: both human and natural, and divine, supernatural. There is no contradiction here. So when it is said to be present in heaven, not indeed as in a place, but in something, as far as natural presence; but it is said to be present on earth, as far as supernatural presence, as certainly it was, when it appeared with its body to Stephen, and to Paul on earth, in the midst of the seven golden candlesticks, even with its body, there is no contradiction here, unless you feign a crude and gross presence, which the Calvinists imagine for themselves. But that besides the circumscriptive and definitive mode of presence, there is also a repletive mode, by which Christ according to human nature is present, the Apostle testifies, when in Eph. IV. 10 he says that he ascended above all heavens (which certainly happened according to Human Nature), that he might fill all things. For the rest, although the body of Christ is present both in heaven and on earth, it is not necessary that it be eaten in itself in heaven, as it is given to be eaten on earth with Eucharistic bread. Because the Eucharist is not to be celebrated in heaven, but on earth. Is it because Christ's body is spiritually perceived on earth, and united to us, but not likewise in heaven, that you will attribute contradictory modes to Christ's body, Bergius, or will you deny spiritual perception and union; or because the Holy Spirit was present in the dove, and was

seen on earth, but was not present in the dove in heaven, nor was seen, will you assign contradictory modes to the Holy Spirit, or will you deny the truth of Scripture about the appearance in the form of a dove!

§. XXXII. The sixth point about such a body of Christ to be eaten in bread, which he never had, is calumnious. For it is the same body of Christ, which he gave for us, and which he exhibits to us in the Supper. He gave it to death to acquire for us the remission of sins, but he offers that same body in the Sacrament to apply the same.

§. XXXIII. Finally, the seventh point about such an eating of the body, which indeed ought to be and be called proper, and yet as to its first reason not only cannot be sensed, but neither understood, nor defined, and of which no similar example is given, has already been dispatched. Will you deny that those things are properly called, and are what they are said to be, whose proper reason you can neither comprehend by sense nor by intellect, nor can sufficiently define, and which are truly unique, and without example. Thus you will easily deny all mysteries of faith, as they are above mind, above reason, above all comprehension of created nature, not only human, but also all created, even angelic nature, and which have no similar, but are plainly unique and without example. But this is the first falsehood of the Calvinist Spirit, not to believe those things which you cannot comprehend by reason, as is most well-known from the solemn voices of Zwingli and others.

## SECTION IV. Fourth Response scrutinizing the Subject This.

§. XXXIV. But it might seem that Bergius has only played so far, although in a serious matter; Now perhaps he will deal with that matter more seriously. For he now approaches to scrutinize more carefully, as he says, the Subject THIS explaining at the beginning our opinion, but perversely, and not without calumny. That the Lutherans do not deny that it is said first and per se of bread, and in this they rightly dissent with the Reformed from the Pontificals: and indeed in the major of that syllogism, about bread as to substance, but in the minor not as to substance, but as to sacramental use, yet they want it to be said not of bread alone, but of the whole complex, namely of bread as it is united to the body. These are Bergius's words: But we utterly deny that the pronoun THIS is said of bread per se and primarily in Christ's proposition, "This is my body". Bergius imagines this gratuitously: How could the Subject be said gratuitously of bread, when this very thing, which Christ designates through the subject THIS, he says is his body: If the Calvinists say this, as Bergius says here, it is necessary to acknowledge that they also say that pronoun is said of something else although not first and per se, and thus of the body of Christ, which nevertheless they otherwise strenuously deny. How he wants to take THIS in the informal Syllogism either in the major or in the minor proposition, who fabricated it, is nothing to us. But what he sprinkles in, that we cannot deny that the most proper saying of Christ's words here imports, that the substance of bread is the substance of Christ's body, in this



Bergius deceives and is deceived: since neither is bread the subject in Christ's proposition: nor are only synonymic predications proper, and to be taken according to the saying. Then if the Lutherans want the body of Christ to be predicated of the whole complex, therefore not of bread: because bread is not the whole complex; When I say, this is wine, demonstrating and offering wine with a cup, do I by that very fact say that the cup is wine. You are inept, Bergius, concluding from the whole complex to the single parts, or even all, but apart from the complex.

§. XXXV. But it is well, Bergius acknowledges, that this is not our meaning, that this whole complex bread and body, or bread united to the body is the body of Christ. (For who would approve such an inept analysis!) he acknowledges that this analytical interpretation is brought forward by us, in, with, under this bread is the body of Christ: or that the order of subject and predicate in Christ's proposition may be preserved, this which is exhibited in, with, under this bread, is the body of Christ, which we profess to be our analysis, provided it is observed, that that THIS is expressed more distinctly, and is not reduced to bread, thus it is expressed more correctly, This, which I exhibit to you in, with and under bread, is my body: which sense results without impropriety, difficulty, or perplexity from Christ's words according to natural understanding: which we have demonstrated in the Stereoma by invincible reasons to be also the proper analysis and interpretation of complex or comprehensive, and exhibitiv propositions, that they are not expounded otherwise than through vocabulary noting with. And for this reason we call them Synecdochical, that is, complexive, not because in the subject the whole complex is designated through the demonstrative THIS, but because some complexion is inferred, as also happens in the most usual examples, as when showing a jug I say, This is wine, or a sack, this is wheat, or a purse, this is gold, then a complexion and comprehension of wine and jug, wheat and sack, gold and purse is inferred: when upon seeing a dove it was said, This is the Holy Spirit, or of the visible species in which an angel appears, This is an angel; or of the human nature of Christ, This is the Son of God; Some complexion is inferred, of the Holy Spirit with the dove, of the angel with the assumed species, of the Son of God with the assumed flesh, or human nature. All of which are solidly proved in the Stereoma from the nature of the predications themselves. Therefore by no means in those examples, as Bergius trifles, do we place the prow and stern of our cause, but by the same we only illustrate the matter, and finally from the induction of all examples in complex propositions, we have established the truth of our analysis.

§. XXXVI. But here Bergius, having deserted his own paralogism which he had taken up to be attacked, that is, the offspring of his own brain, attacks the Lutheran analysis of Christ's proposition, with great, but vain and futile effort. First, those things which we have handed down about complex propositions do not please Aristarchus: He alleges that rules are feigned without the votes of Dialecticians, sending us back to the Masters of that art. But it was your task, Bergius, to refute those rules, if you could, who believed that the prow and stern of our cause was placed in them. Now in that which by Your judgment is chief, you fail, and send us back to other Masters. But truly those things which we have handed down in the Stereoma about these are so firmly founded, not without the votes of Dialecticians but from Logical and Hermeneutical principles, approved by the calculation of all, that Bergius does not dare to open his mouth against them, nor do they fear anything for themselves from Calvinists more learned than

Bergius, whether Logicians or Theologians. But that one thing, which Bergius notes here, is utterly false; namely that we first feign and presuppose a peculiar mode of complexion and union, which consists in bodily indistance, and indeed such, by which both united things are taken once by mouth, which we show by no reason from Christ's words. For we do not suppose these things, but deduce them from Christ's words, which taken according to the saying import that union and eating of the earthly and heavenly thing, not from those words alone, This is my body, as Bergius feigns through an outstanding fallacy of division, but with the word of command joined, Eat. Therefore Bergius is in vain, when with our analysis admitted, this, which is exhibited in, with, under this bread, is my body, he asks, from where finally we will prove, that this is inexistence, coexistence, or subexistence (the Mocker feigns these terms, both to mock the use of those prepositions, which he knows has been received from antiquity and does not entirely reject, and to ascribe to us monstrous opinions in those terms feigned by himself with in, with, and under) by which what is exhibited to the mind and sacramental faith by this promise, is at the same time ingested to be eaten by the mouth of the body besides and against the nature of all Sacraments. It is not ingested to the mouth of the body, as Bergius profanely says, but is exhibited, offered, and communicated by Christ's most holy ordinance, to be eaten by the proper organ of eating, in one and the same eating with the Eucharistic bread, by force of the word of command, Take, Eat: This is my body. Which when Bergius says is a mere begging of the principle, he accedes to those who from their flock impiously say that Christ's words are common, and that nothing but a mere begging of the principle is committed, when Christ's words are adduced. Bergius will never teach from the nature of Sacraments that bare symbols only representing or figuring something to the mind are exhibited in sacraments: Therefore it is not against the nature of Sacraments, that the heavenly thing is exhibited together with the earthly, which is certain also happens in Baptism: then if this did not happen maximally in other sacraments, is not the nature of each sacrament to be learned rather from the proper seat of institution, than from the general nature of sacraments, which general reason of Sacraments is also to be drawn from the induction of individual Sacraments, as they are described in their proper seat. But Christ's words in the proper seat of this sacrament do not indeed make bodily vessels the bread and wine of Christ's body and blood, as Bergius cavils, but neither do they establish figurative Symbols of an absent body, blood, representing those only to the mind and heart. For where is that representation in the words of institution! where in them is Christ's body commanded to be sacramentally accepted and eaten with that symbol in mind and heart? Certainly it is not commanded by the words take, Eat, Drink, Bergius himself acknowledges by that very fact, that we are commanded to take with hands, to eat to drink by mouth, by force of the same. Whence, omitting those, he here flees to the words Do this in memory of me: but those in memory of me pertain to the end, not to the substance of the Supper, but the words Do this look back to the superior, in which if that mental acceptance and eating was not commanded, neither could it be designated by these words. Christ does not say, Do this THROUGH remembrance of me, but TO remembrance of me, by which words he openly distinguishes the sacramental doing, or act of sacramental eating and drinking from remembrance as from an end, to which that doing should be directed. But that those ancients accepted those particles in, with and under, in the Calvinist sense, will be proved at the Greek Calends: whose sayings, as also most other things from Chemnitz, and others Calovius transcribed, while Bergius cavils, I willingly suffer, that with my writings and Bergius's compared,

judgment may be made, which of us has more diligently thumbed the very monuments of the ancients, and from their constant mind has brought forward their opinions well weighed. But whether Dr. Calovius himself observed the sayings of the Ancients, or others before him observed the same things, he judges that it makes no difference to our cause, and with a generous spirit he despises, as is fitting, the judgment of a proud spirit.

§. XXXVII. Then and secondly Bergius again urges, that the demonstrative pronoun THIS, whatever we may pretend about the complex proposition or its analysis, (which indeed as most well-founded he does not dare to attack) looks to bread first and per se. He asks therefore, what is properly predicated of the bread itself! But if it looks to bread first and per se, I ask, what else does it look to? Explain, Bergius, and you cut your own vines. And from where will you prove that THIS looks to bread first and per se. Let us hear the proof: For certainly Christ through the demonstrative THIS showed the bread itself as if with a finger and first and per se, designated that blessed and broken bread should be in this use. An excellent proof of the same by the same! You say that Luther urged this against Carlstadt. But you wanted to convince this from the clearest words of the text: now you flee to Luther: who indeed only taught against Carlstadt that bread is not excluded, nor is the body sitting at the table demonstrated, which we freely grant. You insist: But is not the bread itself THIS, which is exhibited to be eaten by mouth? RESPONSE: There is no doubt that bread is exhibited to be eaten by mouth, but that bread is THIS, which Christ demonstrates with the pronoun THIS, and indeed first and per se, this was to be proved; which Bergius indeed says I confess, but in his usual way, against the truth. And what, I ask, is that consequence, which you commend as direct and evident: bread is THIS, which is exhibited to be eaten by mouth, Therefore the bread itself is the body of Christ, according to the immediate meaning of Christ's words. Here is no evidence, no inference standing the Bergian sense. Let an argument be made from that Enthymeme which will be such. THIS, which is exhibited to be eaten by mouth, is the body of Christ, Bread is this, which is exhibited to be eaten by mouth. Therefore, bread is the body of Christ. How else Bergius could form it, he himself will see. Indeed from that argument the Ecclesiastical proposition is proved from Christ's word: which far be it that we should deny: but not immediately do Christ's words infer that meaning, but mediately and consequently (because an argument is needed) by this very fact it is clearly taught. For the rest, thus the Calvinist opinion cannot stand, but ours must be assumed as indeed the major proposition exhibits purely and expressly. Let Bergius admit this, and there will be no need for a fight.

§.XXXVIII. But what I warned about the whole complex with our Theologians, and about the other most usual mode of predication of united things expressed in Christ's proposition, is to be taken thus from our mind, not that this whole complex is the body of Christ, as Bergius cavils, but that the whole complex is inferred in that proposition, as is wont to happen in similar complex propositions; for which reason also that proposition is called usual, not because the thing itself is usual (for it exhibits a tremendous mystery) but because the mode of predication is usual, and ought to be explained from the most usual manner of speaking, that the native sense may be closely guarded. On the contrary, we call the Ecclesiastical proposition unusual, Bread is the body of Christ, because a disparate is predicated of a disparate, which is not wont to happen in the usual manner. Bergius on the other hand cavils that the former is rather unusual,

because it is not only rarely, but never used: But this is to be called most usual with Augustine, he says, because it is said of visible Symbols, that they signify to the mind and exhibit from promise. But as here he presupposes mere signification, if indeed that exhibition is only placed in the representation of an absent body, which the Calvinists make absent, fighting as for altars and hearths, which indeed was by no means the opinion of St. Augustine, as is clear even from that of Augustine in Prosper's Sentences, The Eucharist is made of two things, consists of two things, the visible species of elements, and the invisible flesh and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ. So in the Biblical proposition that sense is inferred, that in bread is the body of Christ, or this, which is exhibited with bread is the body of Christ, Bergius himself is forced to confess, while he praises these words of mine: when a vessel filled with wine is shown, it is indeed truly said this is wine, where in the place of the subject cannot be substituted vessel (an absurd predication would arise) or wine, (a tautology would be committed) or both jointly (for who would bear such an inept resolution, vessel and wine is wine?) but the sense is, in the vessel is wine. To these things adduced from my Stereoma Bergius adds, Rightly indeed! Let him therefore now apply those things drawn from the most usual manner of speaking, and its necessary resolution, which he proves as correct, to Christ's proposition, exhibiting indeed an unusual and mystical thing, but in the most common manner of speaking, that it can be understood by all.

§. XXXIX. Although indeed, as you chatter, the Apostles by no means looked at the bread as some vessel, in which the body of Christ was physically or hyperphysically contained, nevertheless Christ's words with the distribution of bread, commanding and testifying, take, eat, this is my body, according to the natural and ordinary mode of understanding, they could not take otherwise, than that with bread the body of Christ is exhibited, by a union, not indeed natural, or in the manner of a vessel, but mystical, in the manner of a sacrament, consisting equally of a heavenly and earthly thing; which sense indeed the words immediately generate, so that there is no need here to recur with Bergius to that, in memory of me, which everyone sees pertains to the end, not the substance of the Supper. Nor was it for the Apostles to think what is suitable to the nature of bread, what to its ordinary use, if indeed this bread was separated from ordinary use and consecrated to mystical and Sacramental use, by Christ's blessing: But to add faith to the most clear words of the most wise, most truthful, and most powerful Christ; which if the Calvinists did, they would by no means batter the clear sense of Christ's words with the subtleties of blind reason.

§. XL. Thirdly therefore Bergius retreats to that Ecclesiastical proposition, Bread is the body of Christ. For although again he contends, that it is Christ's own, and that the demonstrative particle looks first and per se to the bread itself, with us confessing, (which he has now so often repeated) yet he has produced none of ours, who confesses this, nor has he proved it by any argument. But as he says that predication is figurative and improper, so he ought not only to say this, but to teach it. But here he says the question always returns: What then is properly predicated of the bread itself in this sacred use, or what properly is that use of sacramental bread? If this is skillfully explained, that finally will be the true resolution and interpretation of that proposition. Response: Thus the proposition of Christ exhibiting and explaining what is offered in the Holy Supper is confused with the question about the Sacramental use of bread, which emerges only consequently from Christ's proposition. Which therefore if it is explained,

indeed the immediate sense of Christ's words will not be had, meanwhile we do not deny that that explanation makes for the illustration of this controversy. But there is no need to recur to figures, since bread is and is said to be the body of Christ not figuratively, analogically, representatively, but truly, properly, exhibitively, for declaring which exhibition those words are sometimes wont to be used, that it is the organ, medium, and vehicle of Christ's body, which is exhibited, communicated and perceived through bread. But we do not say this is the proper and native and simplest, or immediate sense of Christ's words, as Bergius here trifles, but thus from Christ's words we explain the Ecclesiastical proposition, Bread is the body of Christ, that is, the exhibitivum medium of Christ's body, with the Apostle leading, bread is the *κοινωνία* communion of Christ's body. 1 Cor. X.16.

§. XLI. But Bergius excepts against that explanation 1. That it is deduced by no reason from Christ's words. 2. Nor is any other example given, where disparate substances are predicated of each other, as if I should say, a barrel is wine, a chariot is a charioteer. 3. There is no necessity or evidence of such an interpretation. 4. That it irreconcilably repugns the articles of faith, and the nature of bread and Christ's body. 5. That it cannot be sufficiently explained, in what sense bread is called a medium or vehicle. Response: Thus therefore Bergius disputes against the opinion of the Ancients, who ratified that interpretation, indeed against Christ's own words. For what 1. is clearer, than that it is taught by Christ's words, This, which is exhibited with bread, is the body of Christ, and therefore bread is the medium of communicating Christ's body, as also the Apostle testifies 1 Cor. X. 16, the bread which we break is it not the communion of Christ's body of which words Edmund Albertinus praised by Bergius, the hyperaspist of Calvinist orthodoxy, renders this meaning 1.r. on the Sacrament of the Eucharist c. XII. p. 75. namely that bread is the medium of communicating Christ's body: In the Apostle's place, he says, is designated, not what is the nature of Sacramental bread, but what is its efficacy, namely that it may be communicative of Christ's body to us. (2) But examples are here vainly desired from nature; because as it is mystical, so this union is unique. Nevertheless we have given similar ones from Scripture E.g. Man is God, and God is man: Where likewise a disparate is predicated of a disparate. 3. The necessity of our interpretation is this: because thus without doubt the Ecclesiastical proposition is to be explained, that it may be conformable to Christ's proposition. Who will deny this? But that interpretation of ours is conformable to the same. 4. Therefore the oppositions of other articles of faith are vain. For Scripture and faith do not fight with themselves. The antitheses of the nature of bread and Christ's body are vain. Because here the nature of bread is not attended to, or of Christ's body, in itself, but the ordination, institution and economy of Christ, in which we must acquiesce. 5. In what sense bread is called a medium or vehicle, or what it serves for the supernatural use and eating of Christ's body, is to be learned from Christ's institution: namely that truly with bread, and through bread, Christ's body is both exhibited and received, and therefore eaten by the communicants, and that partly for the sake of Christ's body, since it is not received and eaten in its substance immediately, (which would be Capernaïtic butchery) but through blessed bread, partly for our sake, that through this medium we may be rendered partakers also of spiritual communion: By no means indeed, as Bergius babbles and cavils, that Christ's body constrained or sustained by that medium and vehicle may be apt to be eaten by us. For we feign no constriction, no sustentation, nor is there either need of it, or is it necessary, that we should take refuge in the significative sign of the Calvinists, since

it can truly be an exhibitivite and communicative medium without any constriction, To feign here a sign of Christ's absent body is to contradict Christ himself, who testifies, This is my body, which words all laymen and idiots understand to infer not declaration, but truth.

§. XLII. You say: it is not a sign of the body eaten or to be eaten by mouth but given for us, absent indeed as to place by bodily natural essential presence, but most present, as to virtue and efficacy.

Response: Who says bread is a sign of the body to be eaten? It is indeed a medium of eating the body, but not a sign, such as Bergius understands, that is, significative. But whether Christ's body to be eaten is absent, as to substance, or present, let Christ himself define, who says, Eat, This is my body: certainly what is absent cannot be eaten by mouth, but that the word Eat infers oral eating, not even Bergius himself denies, nor does he doubt, that it is referred to Christ's body: although then he feigns another signification to it, than when it is referred to bread here figurative, there proper, which is so absurd, that even in Calvin's School Sadael exclaims in the book on Sacramental Eating. p. 158. Will it be a figurative locution with respect to the mind, and not figurative with respect to the body? whence so great a difference? where is the reason for so great a difference? Behold the dreams of men! Christ does not say, This is the virtue and efficacy of my body, or a sign of the body, but This is my body. Nor indeed can virtue and efficacy be abstracted from Christ's body itself: because where the efficacy of Christ's body is present, there Christ's body itself must be present: which Bergius also acknowledges: From which, he says, it is most foolishly inferred, therefore not Christ himself or his glorious body, but only his death and efficacy will be present to us: since rather this should be inferred. Therefore Christ himself is most present by his body and spirit through this his virtue and efficacy. Most rightly so far, that the very presence of Christ's body is required, and that in the Holy Supper he is most present by his body, but this falls with those; Christ's body is as far distant as the highest heaven is distant from earth, to which Bergius applauds in the preface, Christ's body not only in glorious state, but also LOCALLY or WHERE, certainly not within, but without and above this visible world is, which he says he indubitably believes with Catechumen boys; how is Christ MOST PRESENT by his body in the Supper, which is to be celebrated not above, but within this world? How is the body most presently present, when immediately here Bergius proclaims a feigned indistance, or adessence of the body, and calls it inefficacious and idle, than which nothing is more unworthy of Christ. Whence it is clear, that Bergius only gives words, and what presence he truly establishes, when he says Christ's body is most present, namely not of indistance and essence, but of removal and absence of the body itself; which truly is a contradiction in the adjective. Let Edmund, his own, to whom he has sent me back, explain Bergius's mind, who 1.i. on the Sacrament of the Eucharist c.xxxi.p.222. says, There is no other union between bread and wine, and Christ's body and blood, than that which arises from relation, according to which the image of the king although absent, and the King are said to be one - But that Christ is absent according to body from earth and world AND EUCHARIST is proved from this, because Scripture testifies that he has departed. These are Edmund's words: But if he does not establish virtue otherwise present, it must be truly absent: but if it is truly present, it will be separated from the nature itself, whose virtue it is. But it is absurd for virtue to be separated from the nature, whose virtue it is, and separated and abstracted to be present,

where that is not present. Then if that virtue and efficacy is exercised through Christ's body, how can Christ's body be established as absent? For where efficacy is exerted through some organ, there that organ must be present. And what virtue, tell me, please, Bergius, do you understand is Christ's body present by finite virtue, or indeed infinite? If the latter, it must be that infinite virtue is communicated to it, that it may be able to exert it in the sacrament, which is denied by you, which if Christ's body exerts there, it is necessary that human nature itself also be present in its substance, since divine presence imports both substantial indistance, and effective energy; if the former, how can Christ's body be present in innumerable places by finite virtue, how can it vivify to eternal life by finite virtue?

§. XLIII. Bergius also excepts to the Examples, namely 1. if it is said of the dove species, or Christ's breath, or the tongues as of fire distributed among the Apostles: This is the Holy Spirit, the invisible signified is predicated of visible signs. Response: If those are called signs, they will certainly be signs not purely significative, but truly exhibitiv: not only signifying, but exhibiting, as truly the very substance of the Holy Spirit was exhibited present to them, not only efficacy, which two Bergius rashly and inadequately opposes to himself, the Holy Spirit is said to be present either as to essence, or as to peculiar efficacy, when it should be added, or both reasons simultaneously: thus Christ did not signify e.g. by breath, that he would breathe into their minds internally, as Bergius wants, but by the very act through breath, he was communicating to them even then the Holy Spirit, and its efficacy. You say: that essential presence cannot be attributed to Christ's body in bread, unless you attribute to it infinite essence! I add: or infinite hypostasis. For presence follows subsistence. Since therefore human nature subsists by infinite subsistence, why can it not be present wherever the Word is, whose subsistence it is: indeed, where there is true, real, substantial and total union, there one of the united things should not be imagined outside the other: where the hypostasis of human nature is, there the nature itself subsisting by the same hypostasis is present, it is not to be denied. You insist: No substantial union of the Holy Spirit with those Symbols is inferred; only efficacy is signified by this for those to whom he was testifying this his presence. Response: What is more certain, than that a peculiar presence and union with those symbols is also inferred! If indeed the Holy Spirit assumed the species of a dove's body, and appeared in that same assumed, which assumption imports some parastatic union. So the Holy Spirit also united itself with the divided tongues, and also with the breath which was communicated with the disciples. Thus therefore equally Christ's body is united with Eucharistic bread, that thus it may be the communion of Christ's body.

§. XLIV. (2.) Which is also declared from the visions of Angels, when namely they appeared in visible species, whom Bergius does not deny to have been present in their substance among the living, and to have spoken and operated sensibly under the assumed species before men: but he retorts that that visible species was not properly the Angel, nor substantially united to the Angel, but only accidentally and extrinsically for this end, that by this sensible sign he might testify his presence. But Christ's body does not descend from heaven into bread, nor operate anything sensibly in bread, or through bread in the mouths of men, but its operation is merely spiritual, and therefore also the symbols are signs of spiritual presence and operation. Response: Although the visible species was not the angel himself, yet under the visible species,

and in the same the angel was truly present in those appearances, and was truly united to the assumed species, although the union was only extrinsic, and made for declaring presence and operation: truly therefore, if a collation of examples is to be used, also Christ's body as to substance is present in the Eucharist under the visible species of blessed bread: but for which presence there is no need of any descent, since it can be where and how it wishes, by force of communicated divine majesty. Did it descend from heaven, when it presented itself to Stephen Acts VII. or to Paul Acts IX and XXII, and was present! Does it need descent, that it may be present to us, and in our midst, as he promised, Matt. XVIII. 20! Or is it so enclosed in heaven, that it can be nowhere, unless through progressive motion, or it wishes to be present on earth through descent from heaven! Although Christ's body does not operate sensibly, when it is communicated to us through blessed bread, yet therefore its presence is not idle and inefficacious: but it performs, that this blessed bread may truly be a metadotic and salutary medium, that perceived with the same it may yield to us, as many as approach with true faith, in spiritual and salutary communion. Therefore bread is not only a mere sign of spiritual presence and operation, but an efficacious and salutary medium, but true not as bare bread is viewed, but as blessed bread becomes the communion of Christ's body. That spiritual efficacy and operation cannot be attributed to bare bread; but to the body of the Lord, which given for us is truly vivifying, of which bread is the exhibitivum medium.

§. XLV. As for 3. that voice of God the Father, This is my Son, if it is adduced for sacramental union (he calls it consubstantiation, and calls us Consubstantiators from it, the poet asking pardon for the calumny: let it be permitted to call it thus, that is, let it be permitted to thus accuse), it will not be necessary to resolve it thus, in, with, under this man, but if those particles inferring synecdoche are used for the reason of hypostatic union, this analysis will have to be used: in, with and under that human flesh, or nature, which is seen in the Jordan, is my Son, so that Nestorianism is by no means to be feared from here, which analysis Scripture also shows e.g. When God is said to be manifested in flesh 1 Tim. III. 16. when in him is said to dwell all the fullness of Deity Col. II. 9. when God is said to have been with Jesus of Nazareth, Acts X.33. Thus therefore according to Scripture's lead sacramental propositions can be explained, as the reason of sacramental union bears, just as it explains personal propositions, for the reason and nature of personal union: by no means indeed through mere signs and symbols, unless the Calvinists also say human nature is only a sign and symbol of divine presence and operation, without any indistance or union, inferring the indistance of the united natures, lest namely consubstantiation be inferred here, by which means the mystery of hypostatic union is overthrown from the foundations. You say: the reason of sacramental predication is other, other of personal. Response: The specific reason is altogether diverse, yet as to the generic reason both agree best among themselves, because a true and real union is inferred by both, indeed by personal propositions a union of two natures to one suppositum, whence those predicationes are proper, not figurative, God is man, and man is God, and the Son of man is the Son of God and vice versa, which indeed Bergius can by no means resolve or express rightly, since he denies the communication of subsistence with his associates: But by sacramental propositions bread is the body of Christ, wine is the blood of Christ a union of two substances to one sacramental; since indeed the sacrament consists of an earthly thing, and a heavenly; the visible species of bread and the invisible flesh of Christ, as the Orthodox teach with Irenaeus, Augustine, Prosper.



Whence equally those propositions are proper, not figurative, which the Calvinists do not resolve rightly, because they do not sincerely believe that bread is the communion of Christ's body. You say: Since not even there by force of hypostatic union are natures said of each other, namely that divinity is humanity, or humanity divinity, how much less in the sacrament is bread properly said to be the body of Christ? But Bergius is deceived, when he opines that this proposition is abstractive: so that of the substance of bread the substance of Christ's body is predicated synonymically, if that predication is proper: since indeed it is only paronymic, and therefore imports this sense, bread is united to Christ's body, because it does not explain what bread is in its nature, but what it is in sacramental union: just as indeed not even personal propositions explain what GOD is, or the Son of God in his nature, but what by force of hypostatic union when I say God is man, the Son of God is the Son of Mary, or vice versa. If Bergius says with his Edmund 1. 1. on the Sacrament of the Eucharist c. XII. p.811. in the proposition God is man, the predication is usual of species of individual: and therefore Synonymic, although in the other, Man is God the predication is of a certain proper of individual he will be quite absurd: because as there is one foundation of each predication, so one and the same reason of predication if the former is Synonymic, the latter also must be such: if the latter is paronymic, it is necessary that the former also be Paronymic. The foundation of both is personal union. In usual Synonymic predication the predicate is of the essence of the subject in paronymic outside the essence. Will man therefore be of the essence of God. But God will be not of the essence of man, but outside the essence? Who will admit that humanity makes for constituting the essence of Deity, who that Deity is a proper accident of humanity or man? And if it is proper and singular to this man, that he be God, as Edmund ineptly argues, is it not proper to this person of Deity the Son of God, that he be God? Therefore by the same argument Edmund will be bound to say, that the proposition, God is man, is a predication of a certain proper of individual. But thus it is necessary to be inept, who prefer to subscribe to moderation, than to truth.

§. XLVII. And thus Bergius thinks he has said enough about the Subject THIS, when yet he has only excerpted a few things from our Stereoma, has responded nothing to most things, and so much also to those which he has snatched here and there. How worthless and trivial his little exceptions have been, I think is now clear. What he added about the Pontificals, that they come much closer to the literal and proper sense, and can more easily defend it, he added without doubt against truth and conscience. For I do not think he will be of such foolish mind, that he seriously establishes that transubstantiation is inferred from Christ's words properly understood. Therefore he assumes a hypothesis here: If namely transubstantiation is presupposed, already made by Christ's tacit will, before the pronunciation of those words, then finally the proper and literal sense will be this This, that is, this substance is my body. The Lutherans on the contrary cannot even with consubstantiation presupposed say this of the whole complex in any literal and proper way. But this is inept, nor will any of the Pontificals easily be so inept in their hypothesis, as Bergius here. For they want to prove transubstantiation from Christ's words, they do not presuppose it already made, and who would concede such a presupposition, or hypothesis to them? But that our Theologians likewise presuppose consubstantiation, is a calumny of Bergius. For we do not establish consubstantiation, but sacramental union which although it couples two disparate substances to one sacramental, yet no more therefore ought it to be called consubstantiation, than personal union, which likewise couples two disparate substances to one

person: Nor do we suppose that union, but we prove it from Christ's words. Add, that the pronoun THIS which we have said not once, cannot be taken of bread, neither by force of Grammatical construction, which is not to be considered here nor by force of the fiction of the Papists, who foster various opinions and contests about the pronoun, nor do they find in which they may safely fix foot. But as to our opinion, although nothing seems to hinder, that the body of Christ may be predicated of the whole complex, and therefore of disparate substances, but united, but in union: for why could it not be said: The whole sacramental, which consists of Eucharistic bread and Christ's body, is the very body of Christ in sacramental union, or united to Eucharistic bread: as Christ the God-man is God, not outside union, but in hypostatic union, namely united to human nature, or assumed flesh! Nevertheless the proper analysis of exhibitiv propositions is preferable; What is exhibited in and with blessed bread, is the body of Christ: What is seen in and with flesh is the Son of God, God blessed forever: as 1 Tim. III.16. God is said to be manifested or conspicuous in flesh.

§. XLIX. But we note here a contradiction of Bergius. For in the preface of this little Exercise lit. c. §. The same of the same, he professed that the explanation of the Pontificals is proper, and alien from all trope and figure, but here he asserts that they depart from the literal sense: But as the Pontificals, he says, while they want those words to be not only significative, but effective, by that very fact they depart from the literal sense etc. Let someone reconcile those The sense of the Pontificals is alien from all figure and trope and proper: The Pontificals depart from the literal or proper sense. Bergius will not extricate himself from contradiction.

§. XLIX. But while he cavils that the Lutherans go somewhat further from the letter, by what argument, I ask, will he confirm this? Let Bergius show the trope or figure, which is introduced to Christ's words by our opinion, or let him acknowledge the calumny. But while he imputes contradictions to us, that far more absurdly than the Papists, and repugantly not only to reason, but also to the articles of faith, we constitute Christ's body without its accidents, indeed as if without body, whole without any parts under bread, he acts according to his genius, and repeats cuckoo-cries often repeated in the Summary refutation already routed, only that he may fill his mind with calumnies. It is ours to despise such things, which obstreperate against the saying of Christ's Testament words, and not to give faith to any subtleties of reason before the clearest words of institution, however maximally we may not grasp the mode of presence, nor extricate ourselves from all objections of reason. These argumentations if reason could not refute, faith ought to laugh at, says Augustine 1. XII. on the City of God c. 17. Bergius presupposes as if we establish consubstantiation, by which Christ's body is reduced with bread into one mass, or into one substance, and the substance of Christ's body is commensurated to the substance of bread, therefore he asks where the head, chest, hands, feet are under the disc of bread: but this is a mocking calumny, not the opinion of our Church We believe a true Union of the heavenly and earthly thing, but we commit the mode of union to the wisdom of the divine Testator: But it will be for Bergius, when he says that the spiritual eating of Christ's body is nothing else than to recollect with grateful memory his head crowned with thorns, his chest and side transfixed with a lance; his hands and feet affixed for us, to demonstrate that this is proposed in those words Eat, this is my body: which he will perform at the Greek Calends.

§.L. These therefore against the quibbles of Bergius about the Subject THIS. to which as we observe in the last place, Martin Bucer cut the nerve, when he confesses, that by THIS is signified bread with body, and wine with blood, because of sacramental union, and thus it happens in all locutions, by which through signs insensible things are promised, and exhibited, that the sense may be: This, which I give to you with bread, or with this sign, is my body. Let Bucer therefore acknowledge, that locutions of this kind are usual: he acknowledges that they are used, when insensible things are promised and exhibited through external signs, he acknowledges that they occur in sacramental proposition, he acknowledges that the subject THIS is taken complexively, and by it bread with Christ's body and sacramental union is intimated: he acknowledges, finally, that this analysis is to be admitted, This, which I give or exhibit to you with bread, is my body, all of which exhibit our opinion impugned by Bergius. See Synopsis of purer Theology Leiden disp. XLV. th. LXX. But however much Bucer still injects his Zwinglian dogma, that it is not necessary that both bread and Christ's body be constituted substantially present, but only really, so that bread is demonstrated to sense, body to mind, nevertheless he confirms with his vote our analysis of Christ's proposition, which Bergius so greatly harasses, and when this which Christ exhibits with bread, he commands by the word Eat, to be eaten, which cannot but be taken properly of oral eating, with the Calvinists confessing, what is more evident, than that he instituted his body to be eaten by mouth!

## SECTION V. Fifth Response concerning the Copula IS.

§.LI. Now therefore he also begins to vex that, to render doubtful the saying of Christ's words. Although indeed many things were said about the copula in the Stereoma, to which the antagonist is completely silent, only repeating his own opinion, as if it were the edict of a praetor, as if it is held in that place among the Calvinists, let him know that among us it is of no authority without proof. I have said, he says, and I say; the copula IS cannot be understood here either essentially about one essence or existence of subject and predicate, or hypostatically about the same suppositum, but only sacramentally and mystically. Therefore not properly. Which indeed I have not without reason called Bergius's perpetual cuckoo-cry, and the same quite inept, which even tyros of Logic understand: which equally ineptly he also ascribes to us, that we continually sing that sacramentally, and about sacramental union, again and again, as he says; which indeed has plainly no commerce with Bergius's cuckoo-cry about the sacramental thing, improper, or figurative nowhere not exploded by ours. For sacramental, which I repeat here again, that the reader may see the impotence of mind and lust for calumny of our antagonist, to Bergius is that which is involved in tropes and figures, and affected by that sacramentarian metonymy, by which a representation of an absent body is feigned, bark without kernel is left; likewise sacramentally is nothing else to him than spiritually, by which Christ's body is represented to the minds of the faithful. Which from Bergius's German treatise and constant opinion are clearer than the sun, so that I cannot wonder enough at the brazen face of the man, that he proclaims that I representing these things to him represent not Calovius but Cavillovius, and Calumnovius by that very fact: which unbridled lust for calumny, and for perverting the names of honest families, deservedly to be restrained by civil penalties also, I do

not doubt all sensible people will detest. For however much Bergius protests that he has not even dreamed that the sacramental or sacramentally consists in the bare signification of an absent thing, not in the truth of the thing, or true exhibition, yet the thing is certain, that Bergius, equally as the rest of the Calvinists, makes Christ's body absent in the truth of the thing, as to substance, but not present: as also in the German treatise p.47. he explains that bread is spiritually the body of Christ, no otherwise than that bread represents Christ's body to the minds of the faithful, which he strives to prove also from the nature and analogy of sacraments, indeed here also he concludes, the copula is taken sacramentally. Therefore not properly; And he interprets the words, This is my body, thus, this bread is a sign of my body: which he says is absent in local situation, and as to its where, not within, but without above this visible world constituted. Which as they clearly enough manifest Bergius's opinion, and altogether absolve me from calumny; so it becomes even clearer from the Calvinist confessions, to which Bergius has subscribed, and which he professes to receive. The Helvetic Confession, which holds the first place in the Syntagma of Calvinist Confessions, art. XXI. says, We do not so join the Lord's Body and his blood with bread and wine, that we say the bread itself is the body of Christ, except in a sacramental manner: Christ's body is in heaven at the right hand Therefore hearts are to be lifted up. The sun absent from us in heaven, is nevertheless efficaciously present to us: how much more the sun of righteousness Christ ABSENT FROM US IN BODY in heaven is present to us indeed not corporeally (or by body) but Spiritually through vivifying operation. Therefore the Calvinists believe Christ's body no more present in the Holy Supper, than the body of the sun is present on earth, that is, as Theodore Beza vol. II. of Theological works p. 204 ingenuously professed, they believe the body of Christ now to be AS FAR ABSENT from the place, in which we celebrate the Lord's Supper, as heaven is distant from earth. We have therefore from the Helvetic Confession, what the Reformed establish about the presence of Christ's body, which confession are said in the Syntagma of Confessions to have approved also the Reformed Churches of England, Scotland, France, Belgium, likewise of Poland, Hungary and Germany. But in the Edinburgh confession not only transubstantiation, but also real presence of Christ's body in the elements is expressly called, A BLASPHEMOUS OPINION. But if the Lord's body is not present in the elements, it is necessary that bread be a bare sign, or an element empty of the Lord's body. What therefore remains, than that if perchance the Reformed seem to assert the presence of Christ's body somewhere, they explain the same only through representation and signification. Which is to be seen in the Belgian Confession approved by all the Reformed in the Synod of Dort, when it says that bread does not exhibit, but REPRESENTS, what Christ effects in us: and therefore it makes bread and wine bare signs: which only testify about those things, which Christ communicates: Art. XXXV. But that Christ might REPRESENT to us this spiritual and heavenly bread, he instituted earthly and visible bread as a SACRAMENT of his body, wine, as a sacrament of his blood, that he might TESTIFY to us by these very things, that as truly as we receive this SACRAMENT with our hands and hold it, and eat and drink it with our mouth, from which afterwards our life is sustained, so truly also we by faith (which is our soul's hands and mouth) receive in our minds the true body and true blood of Christ our savior for our spiritual life. Furthermore it is most certain that Christ has not commended his sacraments to us in vain. Wherefore he effects all that in us, whatever he REPRESENTS to us by his sacred SIGNS. What else is attributed here to bread and wine, than REPRESENTATION, TESTIFICATION and ANALOGICAL adumbration, or signification? How

otherwise are sacraments explained, than through various signs representing to us, approving and testifying only that which Christ effects? Therefore the spiritual effect is attributed not to bread and wine, which are bare signs, but immediately to the operation of Christ. The Sacrament of bread and wine is said only to represent and testify, but not to effect anything else. And thus also the sacramental is explained in the Basel Confession, that Christ in the Holy Supper is present to all truly believing, SACRAMENTALLY namely, and THROUGH MEMORATION of faith, which lifts man's mind to heaven, and does not draw Christ according to humanity from the right hand of God. Nothing therefore else than the sole memoration of faith is left, Christ's body truly remaining in heaven at the right hand of God, in the highest PLACES, as it says afterwards, Held in Heaven until the times of the restitution of all things. Therefore in the Lord's Supper only with bread and wine the true body, and true blood of Christ is said to be PREFIGURED and OFFERED to us through the minister of the Church, but not exhibited. In the same confession, as in Baptism, as it itself has, ablution from sins through the minister is OFFERED, which nevertheless is PERFECTED by the FATHER, Son and Holy Spirit ALONE. Finally the ends of the Holy Supper are constituted as none other than memory, thanksgiving, and testification, but not true and real exhibition or collation. We confess that the Lord Jesus instituted his holy Supper to remember his holy passion with thanksgiving, and to testify Christian charity with true faith. Nor otherwise the French Confession, which although bread and wine are said to become spiritual nourishment, yet this is explained through mere analogy and figuration testification and sacramental signification Art. XXXVI. We affirm that the Holy Supper of the Lord namely the other sacrament is to us a TESTIMONY of our union with our Lord Jesus. This sacrament does not make the medium, but only the testimony of our union. Which is explained Art. XXXVII. We believe as has been said before, both in the Supper, and in Baptism God gives us in reality, that is truly and efficaciously, whatever he there SACRAMENTALLY FIGURES, and therefore with the SIGNS we join the true possession, and fruition of that thing, which is there offered to us. Thus we affirm that those, who bring to the Holy Table of the Lord pure faith, as a certain vessel, truly receive, what the SIGNS there TESTIFY. The confession indeed acknowledges, that the fruition and reception of spiritual goods happens to the faithful: but it does not attribute this to the sacraments; but to the immediate operation of God: It says that the Sacraments Figure SACRAMENTALLY, and Testify as Signs, what God gives; but by no means that they themselves communicate those things which are given, that is, it wants them to be only significative signs, but not metadotic. What do the sacraments, or those sacramental signs testify? Namely that the body and blood of Jesus Christ are no less food and drink of the soul, than bread and wine are food of the body. Here is bare analogy, mere representation or figuration. Therefore it is further added. We say therefore that the element of water, however perishable nevertheless TRULY TESTIFIES to us the interior ablution of our mind in the blood of J. Christ through the efficacy of the Spirit Rom. 6.3. Eph.5. 16. Likewise that bread and that wine, which is given to us in the Supper, TRULY BECOMES to us SPIRITUAL nourishment: But how are they TRULY spiritual nourishment? INSOFAR namely as they as it were present to our eyes to be seen, that Christ's flesh is our food, and his blood our drink: Thus we reject all those fanatics, who repudiate these signs and symbols, since Christ our Lord has pronounced, This is my body, and this cup is my blood John 6.51 1 Cor. 1.24. & 11.24. Behold the bare representation, bare analogical signification, or figuration of sacramental signs and symbols, by which even Christ's words themselves: This is my body are explained. The Anglican Confession

agrees, to which the Eucharist is to be a SACRAMENT, to be a conspicuous SYMBOL of the body and blood of Christ, in which is subjected in some way to our eyes (but how, unless representatively adumbratively by analogical signification; which namely the Calvinists feign here!) the death of Christ, and his resurrection, and whatever he did in human body. Finally lest anyone ascribe to the sacraments, as they call them, or those sacred signs, what God effects, namely the communion of spiritual goods, the Calvinist Confessions take care diligently: when they have distinguished the actions of the Minister exhibiting those signs, from the immediate operations of God himself, which in the French and Basel those things which have been adduced will teach but in the Helvetic is read expressed even more clearly, which most openly makes a divorce of the distribution, which is done by the minister, and that which is from Christ: That bread is offered outwardly by the minister and the voices of the Lord are heard. Take eat, this is my body, etc. and that which is given by the minister is received, the bread of the Lord is eaten, and is drunk from the cup of the Lord. Meanwhile internally from Christ through the Holy Spirit is also perceived the flesh and blood of the Lord Art. XXI. Let Bergius now go, and complain of injuries, or calumnies when we have said that he explains sacramentally through bare prefiguration of Christ's body truly absent, and makes bare signs from the sacraments. That this is most truly attributed to him is most clear, both from his writings, and from the public Confessions, to which he himself has bound himself in the Apostolic Rule, about which he also testifies disp. on the foundations of faith th.16. that the public confession of all the Reformed is held in this syntagma of confessions: to all of which we now finally add the Harmony of Confessions of the French and Belgian Churches edited in name in which a similar explanation of this term SACRAMENTALLY is expressly read: We affirm that these things signified the body and blood of Christ are conjoined with the SIGNS NO OTHERWISE than SACRAMENTALLY; of which indeed SACRAMENTAL CONJUNCTION the truth is not situated in this, that wherever the SIGN IS PRESENT, there also the THING REPRESENTED BY THE SIGN IS PRESENT, but in this, that with the sign added God himself promises, he truly gives that which is to be taken. Therefore we say that the body of Christ is present INDEED neither IN, nor WITH, nor UNDER the bread otherwise, than by THIS SACRAMENTAL reason. In observ. sect. XIV. observ. 1. they see that the Harmony acknowledges no other presence of Christ's body, nor is the sacramental explained otherwise, than that those signs bread and wine indeed represent the things signified, but those are not present, where the signs are present, nor are they distributed IN, WITH, and UNDER the signs in reality, but are exhibited and offered by God himself (namely immediately).

§.LI. However much Bergius may use rhetoric or protest, he leaves no other sacramental reason for sacramental signs than figurative, significative, representative, and analogical, and thereby renders the sacred symbols bare and empty signs, merely significative not metadotic. He indeed appeals to German tract c.viii.p.50, that he called them spiritual signs and seals of the divine covenant, through which promised heavenly goods are signified and sealed, and exhibited, or given and appropriated to minds or hearts. But the question is not about those spiritual goods, but about Christ's body present or absent: since now the sense of Christ's proposition, this is my body, is being investigated, and specifically the meaning of the Copula IS, which Bergius says is taken sacramentally. What therefore do heavenly goods, remission of sins, eternal life have to do with the matter, does Bergius perhaps understand those goods

through Christ's body, which is the predicate of the sacramental proposition? Nor is the question about whole Sacraments, but about those sacramental symbols, about bread and wine, whether, according to the Calvinists, they are Christ's body only significatively, or figuratively, or indeed through true and real union, which infers true and real communication? Sometimes they also ascribe exhibition to whole Sacraments, because namely God in Sacraments, not through Sacraments, or sacred Symbols, exhibits heavenly goods. But they make bread and wine only significative and figurative, or representative signs, and for that reason they want IS to be taken significatively, or what is the same to them, sacramentally. Finally when Bergius says that heavenly goods are signified, sealed and exhibited and given through signs, his mind is to be explained from the analogy of Reformed Confessions, lest he contradict them: namely that those signs are not indeed exhibitiv media, nor does God exhibit those goods through media, which rather he himself effects immediately in us, but that through those signs they are signified and sealed. For I do not think Bergius will oppose the public Confessions, to which he has given faith. Whatever therefore he declaims about exhibitiv signs, will have to be explained congruently with the Reformed Confessions: however much he may proclaim them, that they are federal seals, sealing and exhibitiv Divine Promise Signs, Covenant Signs, Testament Signs, Delivery Signs, he does not ascribe exhibition to sacramental signs, but only teaches that it happens with signs, that namely those goods are indeed signified, confirmed, and sealed by signs, but in reality are immediately performed, exhibited, and given by God alone, to whom, when and how he wishes from absolute good pleasure. Therefore Bergius excuses himself in vain through those things which he repeats here from German tract if we were to take nothing else than bare signs not only empty, but altogether false signs, false seals they would be: namely if heavenly goods were not given by God, heavenly goods could not be signified and thus sealed through signs and seals which nevertheless hitherto are truly bare and empty signs, because they themselves only signify and seal goods conferred by God, but do not exhibit, or confer them. Nor do those things which are added there want anything else; but because they are divine signs, and indeed promissory, necessarily indeed to the faithful that very thing, which is promised and signified, is at the same time as certainly, and truly exhibited, as God himself is truthful: If anyone should call this into doubt, he makes God a liar, that he either does not wish or is unable to perform, what he has not only holily promised by words but also wished CONFIRMED and SEALED by these visible SIGNS. He attributes only confirmation and sealing to signs: to God alone exhibition, namely through immediate operation.

§. LII. We now commit judgment to the Reader, which has cast off shame, whether Calovius objecting to the Reformed mere Chartine signs bare significations, analogies, representations, prefigurations, or indeed D. Bergius himself without any shame objecting such things, accused. I still say bare signs, that Bergius with the rest of the Calvinists leaves them is so clear, that nothing can be clearer. Bare from the body and blood of Christ, which they assert are only represented, signified, prefigured through bread and wine, and in that constitute the whole sacramental, as has been shown hitherto: because they confine Christ's body and blood only to heaven, and deny that they are really present to sacramental symbols. Who therefore will not wonder at Bergius's face, when he asserts that the Reformed establish signs to be merely significative and exhibited by unanimous opinion! But he himself (D. Calovius) requires signs not purely significative, but metadotic and offered: as if any of ours would deny this, as if not I also

very many times in most express words and ALL, as far as I know, of ours have taught by UNANIMOUS CONSENT signs at the same time both signifying and sealing and exhibiting. Do all Calvinists thus teach by unanimous consent, Bergius, that bread and wine are signs, not purely significative but metadotic and offering of Christ's body and blood, or even of spiritual goods, remission of sins and salvation! Have you also taught the same very many times in most express words! but where in what book, or on what page? Do you acknowledge for yours Zwingli, Calvin, Beza, and other Heroes, your lights, names dear to heaven and earth, according to the proclamation made in the Synod of Dort? But what does Zwingli say, and indeed in the Confession sent to Augsburg to the Imperial Diet, art. 11. I believe, indeed I know, that ALL Sacraments are so far from conferring grace, that they do not even bring or dispense it. And in response to Luther's Confession. Sacramental essence is, not that true essence of some thing, but nothing else, than the sign and representation of that other and true essence. Whence Joach. Cureus, certainly more candid than our Bergius in Exeg. p. 88. does not deny that Karlstadt, Oecolampadius and Zwingli, attenuated sacraments too much, as if they were only external signs, or notes of profession or representation of absent Christ as of Agamemnon on stage: What does Beza say response to Mompelg. Colloq. part. II. p.116. which writing the Heidelbergers translated into the German language! That it is a palpable error drawn from the fetid lakes of the Scholastics, when, as they speak, causative power of conferring grace is attributed indeed principally to God, but sacramentally to Sacraments. And that they are greatly deceived, and injurious to God himself, who think that God attributes even a little of his divine virtue to men for renewing, and preserving in eternal life in Christ, either to men, through whose mouth he speaks, or to God's external word itself, or to sacramental signs. And page 118. that that said ordination and instrumental cause is nothing else, than the sacramental signification of the promise joined to sacraments from divine ordination and through the analogy of signs and things signified, represented to the minds of those approaching Sacraments. What does Joh. Jac. Grynaeus say preface. Theor. I assertively affirm, that it is ignorance unworthy of Christ's servants, not to know that through the Gospel and sacraments the Lord so instructs us, that we believe ourselves to be saved not through the Gospel and sacraments, but through Jesus Christ alone. Likewise: Remission of sins is attributed to the Gospel, Baptism, Eucharist, faith, as the catachresis of words bears, which is so arranged, that to instruments (by the same grace of HONORING) are attributed effects, which otherwise are proper to the efficient cause. What does Joh. Piscator say? who in German Bible on Acts VII. doct. 1. denies that the efficiency of saving is in Sacraments, because it is situated in God alone. What does Calvin himself say, the primary Patriarch of the Reformed sect. IV. Instit. c.14. Sacrament is an external Symbol, by which the Lord SEALS to our consciences the promises of his benevolence towards us to sustain the weakness of our faith, and we in turn testify our piety towards him. Which definition he calls simple and perfect. Nothing here about exhibition in the very definition of sacrament: Only bare sealing is expressed: With which others agree. To Bucanus sacrament is a testimony of divine grace towards us confirmed by a visible sign. To Polanus and Sadeel an external sign, in which earthly things are used for signifying and sealing and recalling to memory heavenly and spiritual things, which pertain to eternal life. Nor does the Palatine Catechism ascend beyond sealing: when it defines sacraments as sacred and visible signs, and seals instituted by GOD for this cause, that through them he may more declare and seal to us the promise of the Gospel. Nor do the Calvinists indicate anything else, when they constitute the form of Sacrament in the



similitude of sign and thing signified, with Polanus, and describe it through divine order between external thing, subjected to sight, as sign and between spiritual thing as thing signified with Keckermann, and make its form analogy, and similitude of sign to thing signified with Calvin, Beza, Grynaeus, Trelcatius, the Marburgers and others by which very thing they remove offering, and exhibition from sacraments. For that sacramental analogy is defined by the Reformed, that it is similitude, convenience, congruence, proportion of sign to thing signified, because of which similitude they also so greatly urge bread-breaking, which some also therefore refer to the essence of the Supper. But offering and exhibition does not pertain to that place of similars, but to instrumental cause. Whence in the exposition of the words of Institution: This is my body, most explain IS through signifies, or certainly the body of Christ through sign of body, but by no means do they want exhibition or offering of Christ's body to be expressed by the same. To which is added, that through sacrament they do not understand in the Holy Supper, except bread and wine, as is known from Beza, Musculus, Martinus, D. Schönfeld, Faculty of Theology and Ministry of Marburg, and others. But how will they ascribe to those external elements, bread and wine, which are consumed in the very use, either sealing of spiritual union, or of spiritual communication of Christ's body and blood, not to say offering and exhibition of spiritual goods.

§.LIII. If these things, although quite clear, do not yet suffice for someone, not a few other things also more, and in the very terms as it is said, affirming that which Bergius, for his candor, denies to be affirmed by his own, can be adduced: such as that of Zwingli Tom. I. in Epist. to a certain German City. p. 296. that bread and wine, in this Supper, are nothing else, than ONLY SIGNS. Tom. II. book on Baptism. p. 70. Moreover it is certainly established that the filth of the soul can be washed away and taken away by NO SACRAMENT, for Sacraments are external things. And in Epist. to the Princes of Germany p. 549. Sacraments neither confer, nor dispense grace. And in reason of faith to Emperor Charles V. art. vii. From which it is gathered that sacraments are given in public testimony of that grace, which is previously present to each private person. And in resp. to Luther. Confess. p. 476. For what else is it to be united by sacramental union, than to refer the image or mystical figure of some sacred thing, where nevertheless the sign is by no means the sacred thing itself, but because it signifies it, the name of the thing signified is attributed to the sign itself. And that of John Calvin in Epist. p. 180. to Clarenburg, in sum, unless it be pleasing to overturn all principles of religion, it will be necessary to confess, that the salvation of the infant is not founded in baptism, but only sealed by baptism. Then this of Sadeel to art. cont. Burdegal. p. 462. From these therefore we see, that sacraments are instruments only of God's grace, and indeed are not conferred by them, but by Jesus Christ, who makes us partakers of it through his Spirit. And also of Ursinus Tom. I. in alter. argum. propodobaptism. defens. p. 1693. We know that grace, that is, remission of sins and heavenly benefits are not placed in Sacraments, but we also know that SIGNIFICATION, DECLARATION AND TESTIFICATION of those benefits is placed in the word and Sacraments, which we also comprehend under the name of grace of the N. T. Likewise of D. Conr. Vorstius, when he was still held orthodox among the Calvinists, Anti-Bellarm. contract. p. 355. Sacraments are called signs of the divine covenant. Therefore they do not contain in themselves the grace promised in the covenant, or confer it to us by their power, but ONLY signify, and seal it already perhaps conferred, or even to be conferred afterwards. For signs and seals are not wont to have other

effects, than of signifying and sealing, as indeed they are not antecedent causes, or operative instruments of divinely promised grace but certain consequent adjuncts, as is also known about the general nature of signs from Philosophy.

§.LIV. It would be too prolix to adduce each thing: the Confessions relieve us of this work, as the public doctrine of the Reformed Churches, from which we have already shown in part the same opinion, that Sacraments only signify, represent, testify and seal grace. So that nothing is more certain, than that Bergius is deceiving the Reader, and when those things are not unknown to him from the writings of the Reformed whether private, or public, that he might be able to calumniate D. Calovius, fraudulently dissimulates all those things, and without shame asserts, that ALL the Reformed by UNANIMOUS CONSENT make sacraments signs at the same time both signifying and sealing and EXHIBITING? unless perhaps he sophistically and illusorily explains exhibitiv signs, with his Piscator Apol. against Röderus on Holy Baptism p. 436. He sneaks in this proof with an absurd contrast, in that he says, Baptism is not only a signum significativum, but also a signum exhibitivum, this sounds just as if he said, this is not only a narrans narrativus, but also a narrans commemorativus For commemorare means the same as narrare: thus exhibere, when it is said of signs, means the same as significare: for a sign does not exhibit otherwise, than by signifying. That is, a sign does not present the thing signified otherwise, and does not place it before the eyes, than by designating, or signifying. Excellent exhibition this, situated in representation, which whether Bergius wishes to approve, he himself will see. Or will he follow the explanation of his Bullinger! in the House Book in the 47th Sermon p. 403. Those who say that the Sacraments divide, and give grace, as which have in themselves the things which they signify, they object to us, as if we should annihilate and empty the Sacraments, and teach the faithful, that they receive therein, or thereby nothing else, than bare water, bare bread, and bare wine, and thus God is accused of lying by us. To which I briefly answer thus: If they see the empty so opposed to the full, that the Sacraments are empty, when they do not have enclosed in themselves what is signified, I will rather freely confess that they are empty, than that they are, so to speak, full, but if through the little word empty they understand, what is unholy or common, that is what has no difference from common signs, and through bare signs inefficacious and effecting nothing, so I expressly confess, that we hold the Sacraments for Holy and not for unholy or common, for efficacious, not for inefficacious, honored by GOD, and not for bare, and therefore for full and not for empty, or vain signs. Thus therefore they will not be empty signs, because not common or profane: not bare, because not altogether inefficacious; meanwhile they are and remain empty, because they do not exhibit, or communicate grace. But what kind of operation or efficacy sacraments provide, Gutberletus explains in vindic. p. 23. The organ by which we obtain salvation gained for us in Christ, is faith alone, but sacraments testify about this thing and confirm faith: Sacraments therefore are organs NOT OF COLLATION but OF CONFIRMATION. But lest they concede too much operation and efficacy to sacraments even in this CONFIRMATION, they take care diligently. Eilshemius is a witness in Jewel p.83. Finally the Catechism says, that the Lord's Supper testifies, assures, and seals to us our blessed communion with Christ, which does not happen thus, as if there were a hidden power in bread and wine, through which our hearts should be assured of it, as there is power in a medicine, to strengthen the heart, but it happens, (as the Catechism speaks) through the power of the Holy Spirit, who is present at the use of the Lord's

Supper, and works in the hearts of the faithful, as such a Spiritual communion with Christ is presented before eyes and testified through the eating of the bread and drinking of the wine. What is attributed here to Sacraments beyond REPRESENTATION and TESTIFICATION?

§.LV. But this representation and analogical adumbration through bread and wine, if the truth must be told, is merely imaginary and fantastical, since not even an apex of it is found in the words of institution, indeed in the whole of Holy Scripture, nor does the representation of Christ's body given for us and blood shed for us befit the external symbols of bread and wine, which B. Luther has already excellently demonstrated against Oecolampadius in the Confession on the Supper T.III.Jen.f.473. ff. that there is no similarity of the body given for us with bread, or of the blood shed for us, and wine; nor can it be sought in that as bread is eaten, so also the body is spiritually eaten, as bread is broken, so also Christ's body is broken, because the Sacramentarians do not place the trope in the words, take, eat, or even broke, but in the words This is my body which is given for you, whence the similarity is not to be attended to in eating, breaking, but in bread, with Christ's body, as it is given for us, and wine with blood, as it is shed for us, which similarity they cannot give: How will the wine be a similitude of Christ's shed blood, for our sin, for drinking is a similitude not of Christ's shed blood, but of spiritual drinking, that is, of faith, as they themselves teach. Here stands the poor cup of wine, so bare in all shames, that it could not stand more shamefully, as it does not even have one great similitude on itself, and yet should be and be called a similitude of Christ's blood shed for us. They are indeed solicitous, they seek, and investigate, in what they may place the similitude The Helvetic confession says to be represented outwardly through the minister, what is performed inwardly through the Spirit. The Basel with bread and wine the true body and true blood of Christ to be prefigured and offered through the minister but how the body and blood of the Lord are prefigured, and represented, they do not explicitly explain. But the French explains it more clearly, while it asserts not only that Baptism and the Supper truly and efficaciously give, what it figures Sacramentally, and that pure faith receives what the signs testify, but also explains the testification and figuration, namely that Christ's body and blood is no less food and drink of the soul, than bread and wine of the body. Similarly the Belgian says that earthly bread represents to us spiritual and heavenly bread. But the Scottish seems to look to the breaking of bread, and to place the analogy in it, while it says, that faith effects, that we eat of the body, and blood of J. Christ once shed and broken for us. But because they do not place their trope in those things, which the Lord did, not in breaking, or distribution nor in the words Eat, Drink, but in the words, This is my body, which is given for you, This is my blood, which is shed for you, it is necessary that they show the similarity, not in the natural eating of bread with the spiritual of Christ's body, not in nutrition, as neither in the breaking of bread, or pouring of wine (although that does not happen in the Holy Supper) but in the bread itself, with the body as it is given for us, in the wine itself, and blood of the Lord as it is shed for us. But here the water sticks. For they can give no similarity: as B. Luther rightly says of them: It goes with them just as with that fool, who built a water mill on a mountain, when the mill was ready, one asked him, where he wanted to take water, he said, See there I have truly never thought of that. So also the enthusiasts are so hasty after the interpretation, and similitude, that they can think of nothing for it, when one now would gladly want to give them won, and accept and desire such similitude, that they teach, wherein such similitude of the bread with Christ's body is, they must also say, See, there we have truly

never thought of that, as we meant, when we named similitude, so it would stand there, for our spirit has from the beginning wanted to be God, that all should be, what he speaks, See, that is called running oneself down with one's own words. These are B. Luther's words.

§.LVI. What that it is mere Calvinist fantasy, that through some strong imagination it feigns to itself, that what is absent is really present to faith. Indeed we do not deny that something can be made present to faith, by which we conceive it in faithful mind. Whence we return that sarcasm to Bergius, that we hold for imaginary, what are spiritually exhibited to the minds of the faithful, and accepted by faith alone, and what it pleased him to connect to these to the most moderate Theologian, about the Theologian inexperienced in spiritual goods, which are not ingested to the mouth etc. But that faith makes a thing substantially and really absent, really and substantially present, is a vain and inept imagination of the Calvinists: Nor is the question about spiritual and heavenly goods and gifts, remission of sins, righteousness, life, and salvation etc. But about Christ's body and blood, whether these although confined only to heaven, are really present in the Supper, and substantially, when faith places them to itself, and when they are accepted only with faith? Which portentous dogma and pseudo-wisdom, indeed antipathy Bergius and others, attributing more to their faith, than to God's omnipotence itself, which they do not believe can make Christ's body really present in one place present also really and substantially in other places, protect and defend. For Bergius said Christ himself most present by his body in the Supper Castellani in exchange writings, p.271. substantially: Perkins in Catech.p.630. they say Christ's body is most substantially present, which body nevertheless they all believe to be truly absent from earth, and present only in heaven.

§. LVI. But what do those things have to do with the substantive word IS, about which we must speak here! Namely Bergius concluded thus: The word IS is either taken essentially about one essence or existence of subject and predicate, or hypostatically about the same suppositum (which both are also wont to be called substantially, or existentially) or sacramentally and mystically. In the German treatise he had said the word IS is taken either substantially and existentially, or significatively and significatively: I warned in the Stereoma that it is a strange opposition, that the word is is not taken substantially, that it may explain what the element is, but sacramentally, what it signifies: because 1. The members do not exhaust the whole. 2. the members do not agree with the whole, 3. the members do not disagree from each other. To which Bergius responds nothing: he only now adds a third member, or rather from those, which he held for one, substantially, and existentially, he makes two, that he may correct the error, and supply the imperfection of the members. But error is only enriched by error, not corrected. Because through IS nothing else is noted, than the truth of predication and attribution, or nexus of predicate with subject: But the mode of predication is by no means determined by the little word IS, which Bergius was warned to learn from Piscator in Stereom.p. 133. But he erring on the same string, and although convicted he confesses Q.1.f... But we, that IS of the third added has no other reality, than that it is a copula, or nexus of predicate with Subject; here nevertheless contradicting himself, he ineptly babbles that IS is taken either substantially, or hypostatically or mystically, by which way many more, if the signification of IS is to be sought from the matter, which comes into predication, should be recounted that it is taken either divinely, when the discourse is about God, or humanly, when about man, or diabolically, when

about the Devil, and so forth. Who will not laugh at such ineptitudes? But if it pleases to determine altogether the signification of the substantive verb IS from the mode of predication (although not even tyros of Logic will admit this) then indeed that opposition of substantial, hypostatic, mystical predication will be null. Logicians make predication essential or Synonymic, or accidental and Paronymic. Is essential therefore opposed to hypostatic, is this the same as paronymic! And what then does mystical sacramental, or significative, as he called it before, want for itself! Will you also make significative predication, and oppose it to essential, and hypostatic! What is more certain, than that IS when it joins predicate with subject in propositions; cannot be taken significatively. i.e. be the same as SIGNIFIES, because it only joins subject to predicate.

§.LVIII. Nevertheless Bergius persists in error, whether this is to be ascribed to supine ignorance of Logic, or to the obstinacy of the man: and when I wanted to lead him here to its recognition from the genuine principles of Philosophy, because the first falsehood of Bergian sacramental error and depravation of Christ's words consists in the perverse interpretation of the copula, Bergius renders insults for gratitude, I seem to have scarcely anywhere spared shame, or conscience less, but to have gone further from sound mind r.s. Therefore I read again, and reread my treatment of the copula, and find no cause for such exaggeration. Whence I am more and more confirmed about Bergius's practice, that namely he turns to insults, where he is convicted of errors, so that he can respond nothing. He who cannot answer, is angry, and rages rightly, as that Mother taught her Child, dear Child, when you cannot win, so bring in strife, says B. Luther in Confess. On the Supper T. III. Jen. f. 451. But let Bergius show, if he is a man, where I mix anything adverse to shame, to conscience, to sound mind, or let him acknowledge without any shame, and against conscience that he has smeared this on papers, and return to sounder mind.

§. LIX. Therefore he wants the question finally to return here: Whether the copula IS or connection of predicate with subject is proper, or figurative! We note first Bergius's own confession; that all question here returns to this, whether the proper, or figurative signification of the word IS obtains? Figurative according to the Calvinists, proper according to us: by which very thing he acknowledges, that we retain the propriety of the words of Institution, which nevertheless he had denied before; he acknowledges that that question is not indifferent, whether the locution, or predication is proper, or improper, but that in that question all the hinge of controversy turns, or certainly the greatest moment is situated here. We note also, how ineptly he himself forms the state, and proposes my opinion. He himself, he says, asserts it to be indeed mystical, but nevertheless proper. But where, Bergius, did I say the copula, where the connection of predicate with subject is mystical, but proper? Never have I been so inept with you, that I have said the copula or connection of predicate with subject, whether proper or figurative. Therefore you should say that the question is about the signification of the substantive verb IS, when it functions as copula, whether it is proper, or figurative, not about the connection of predicate with subject; for propriety, or trope befits words, not things themselves. We note in addition the futility and ἀτοπία of the question itself. For since the copula IS is never and in no proposition taken figuratively, always properly, since it is altogether incapable of trope, what does it matter to ask, whether here in Christ's words it is taken figuratively, before it has

been shown, that it is capable of trope? We note finally Bergius's open contradiction, which as I had placed not one in this very cause before his eyes, so by his silence he confirms my accusation, and tacitly confesses himself convicted. For the thing is clear: since indeed in the Frankfurt disp. on the Supper held in the year 1619 he acknowledges, that trope is to be constituted neither in the Copula with Zwingli, nor in the predicate with Oecolampadius, nor also in the subject: But now he contends that the sacramental proposition is figurative and improper. But that whose single parts are proper, that whole also is proper, as Piscator says resp. to Hoffm. p. 43. Moreover let him now contend, that the copula is figurative, which he had denied before, which again is open contradiction. He conceded that trope is not to be sought in single words; nevertheless he modifies each, IS through signifies metonymically, body he explains through sign or memorial of body, whence I recalled to him the judgment of B. Mentzer: It is just as if someone should say, Man is thoroughly altogether healthy, but in his body he has not one healthy vein, or drop of blood. Finally when he had confessed, that such a trope is not given, as the Rhetoricians describe, and therefore had introduced impropriety of predication, which is a Logical trope, I warned the man, that Logical trope is an iron-wood, and why does he not also constitute triangular trope! To which things let him still respond, if he can, and explain his opinion to minds.

§.LX. But let us see, what new thing Bergius perhaps brings forward here about this question. He first opposes to my opinion the Tübingens, authors of the Refutation of Orthodox consensus: that I indeed make the connection of predicate with Subject mystical, but nevertheless proper. But the Tübingen gentlemen make it neither proper, nor figurative but intermediate, and that mystical; which opinion nevertheless he says is absurd enough, that it establishes a medium between contradictories. But Bergius perverts both my, and the Tübingen gentlemen's opinion, and constitutes a vain opposition here. I said the signification of the substantive verb is proper, but not the connection of predicate with subject. Again I said this connection is mystical, but not the copula The Tübingen gentlemen also openly distinguish c. VII. q.2. p. 445. between proper signification of vocabularies, and proper predication. Therefore, they say, (which is especially to be noted diligently by the pious reader) there is a huge difference between proper signification of vocabularies of Subject, and predicate, and between proper predication, which is examined according to the course of nature and Dialectical rules. Therefore they make the signification of copulas and remaining words in sacramental propositions altogether proper, they deny figurative: but they say predication is not proper according to the customary rules of Dialecticians, but mystical and unusual. Therefore a medium is not feigned between contradictories, proper and improper predication but proper is distinguished, as it is either opposed to improper, in Rhetorics, or to unusual, and mystical in Dialectics.

§. LXI. Here Bergius further asks: by what reason do we demonstrate oral eating of the body from such a mode of predication or union, which we ourselves do not understand! But Bergius is inept again and again. For the question is not now about EATING, but about the Copula IS. Eating is demonstrated not from the words This is my body, but from the mandate adjoined to them, and therefore from that whole sanction, Take, Eat, this is my body. But if through corporeally not the mode of presence, but only the Subject is denoted, if the mode of union with bread is not somewhat corporeal, then neither will corporeal eating, which happens by mouth of

body, be able to be deduced hence in any way. Response: Why not! for if Eat is to be taken properly, and this which is exhibited with bread, as object of eating, is Christ's body, it is necessary, that Christ's body be eaten by mouth of body with Eucharistic bread; even if it is not present there locally, corporeally, circumscriptively situationally, extensively, naturally: provided only that it is truly present really, and substantially, and therefore is truly distributed with the bread itself, which the words κατὰ ῥῆτόν infer. You will say: The Reformed also acknowledge that truly simultaneously with bread and properly Christ's body is exhibited to us with all merits and benefits, yet not exhibited to mouth of body. Therefore if that is to be established, it must be said that Christ's body is present in corporeal mode. Response: Excellent indeed argument convincing us from the Reformed opinion. We deny, that Christ's body is truly and properly exhibited with Eucharistic bread according to Reformed doctrine, because it is not present to Eucharistic bread, but is most far distant from it. Therefore according to their opinion it is not exhibited to mouth of body with bread, which is so far distant from bread, not wonderful: but when, according to our opinion, Christ's body is exhibited with bread, and indeed to be eaten by proper eating, there is no need, that it be present corporeally, provided only that it be truly and really united to bread, and be distributed with it: because the eating is not natural, but Sacramental, and mystical. But how will the Reformed believe Christ's body to be properly exhibited, by force of Christ's words, This is my body, since, as Bergius here intimates, they understand the predicate my body not properly, but tropically, not about the substance of Christ's body, but about Christ's body with all merits and benefits, For what now does the word body taken properly note body with all benefits merits!

Perhaps he will also say body is taken properly, when through it he understands Deity itself. German Tract. p. 51. thus collecting: We must also believe, that the bread is not bodily, not essentially the body of Christ, lest we make a God out of the bread. Which consequence would be null, unless the word body also inferred Deity in Bergius's opinion, or Christ's body were held for God.

§. LXII. As the whole matter concerning the substantive verb EST would be explained, its genuine use and Calvinist abuse were noted in its Stereoma. The distinguished refuter picks out something from both, leaving the main points and passing over them with a dry foot. I said there was a triple use, namely that this word is employed either for the enunciation of one thing about another, or for the explanation of obscure expressions through clearer ones, or for the prefiguration of the antitype through the type: however, I added this last member more from the opinion of others and through a kind of liberal concession, and I do not think it should be insisted upon so much, if the Reformed wish to turn it to their advantage, since the first two easily exhaust the genuine use of the word. Bergius picks at these points, because as for the first use, it is used in predications to join those things which are one either by the essential unity of substance, or by the existential unity of existence; either on account of essential unity, or on account of any real union, albeit extra-essential, and he asks first whether I establish bread and body as at least existentially one, by the unity of existence! He says this doctrine is entirely new to his ears. It is strange that such a great refuter of Lutheranism is ignorant that bread and the body of Christ are constituted as one, which does not indeed pertain to one essence or substance, as he himself is accustomed to calumniate, but they come together into one

compound of another kind, which whoever calls one existential thing certainly does not introduce a new doctrine, but explains the doctrine of the Church, indeed of Scripture, concerning sacramental union from the nature and foundation of predications, because one sacramental thing imports a certain unity of existence. This is the foundation of affirmative predication, that whatever things are enunciated about each other, they are either predicated of themselves on account of essential unity, which happens in Synonymic predication, which accordingly we call one by the unity of essence or essential, or on account of union or any real and extra-essential union, which happens in paronymic predication: for the foundation of this is some union e.g. of accidents with a subject, or of accidents among themselves etc., which accordingly are called a certain existential one, by the unity of existence, as diverse accidents exist simultaneously in the same subject, simultaneously the accident is with the subject etc. But from this I by no means construct an unusual existential hyparetic union, as this man, stupidly acute and morosely facetious, not grasping even the first principles of Logic, trifles. Not in sacramental things, nor in these alone, but in any paronymic predications the foundation is not essential unity, but some extra-essential union, so that the subject and predicate are a certain one thing in existence or existentially, which if he has not yet learned from logic, the old man must be sent back to school: or since this is now less suitable for his age and function, let him cease from disputations, which no one institutes without Logic except irrationally. Therefore there is no reason for him to doubt whether other Theologians will admit these things, since no one who understands our meaning contradicts, I will not say from among our own, but also from Doctors of other parties, whether Theologians or Philosophers.

§. LXIII. Then he wants me to show that, on account of union or any extra-essential union, the united parts are predicated of each other in the nominative case through the copula EST. But since I did not speak of united parts but of subject and predicate, that they are predicated of each other, not indeed in the nominative case and synonymically, but paronymically, on account of any real and extra-essential union, if Bergius is ignorant of this, or denies it, I do not see how one can dispute with him any further: for one must not argue against someone who denies principles. Whether this is mere stupidity, even novices of Logic may judge, who understand these things more correctly: namely that Bergius pronounces that scarcely anything can be said more absurdly or falsely than that in affirmative propositions predication is made, not of parts about each other, but of the predicate about the Subject, either on account of essential unity, or on account of any real, albeit extra-essential union. But the fact that you introduce united parts here, about which not even a single word was mentioned, is due to your desire to calumniate, from which you further conclude with petulant audacity that Calovius's soul is his body, that the head is the feet, the brain is the heel, mixing in the wit of your biting tooth, due to your notable lack of self-control and old habit of calumniating, and lest you be believed not to be acting seriously, you contend that not even in mystical matters do enunciations of one of the united things about another hold true, since I do not say, Christ's humanity is divinity, and not even in the highest unity of the Trinity is the Father the Son, and thus you conclude that the foundation of proper predication collapses, and indeed the whole Calovian Stereoma.

Who would not marvel at Bergian acumen! What Calovius deduced from first principles about the union or unity of predicate and subject as the foundation of affirmative predication, the



Sophist undermines by substituting united parts for predicate and subject, as if either in Synonymic predication the subject and predicate were united parts, or also always in paronymic predication, or when it is sometimes established that one of the united things is predicated of the other on account of union, it is necessary that this always happens, and indeed in any union, in the same way: all of which are inventions of Bergius's stupid acumen, not our assertions. Away, therefore, with those trifles, that the soul is not the body; because no one has ever dreamed that united parts are predicated of each other synonymically: but you will not deny paronymic predications e.g. that the soul is in the body, the body is animated, or endowed with a soul. If the head, brain and heel are united in Bergius, who considers them united, what is that to Dr. Calovius! Let him see, therefore, whether he carries his brain in his heel. If these are so conjoined in him, then indeed, by virtue of that conjunction, Bergius's brain will not be said to be the heel synonymically, but paronymically it will have to be said to be in the heel. In mystical matters indeed, humanity is not called divinity synonymously, because they are not one by essential unity, meanwhile because they are truly one by the unity of existence and by virtue of real union, man is truly called God, not identically, as Bergius wants here, (which nonsense we refute elsewhere, namely in the Examination of Reformed Doctrine on the Person of Christ) but paronymically; because human nature is indeed not divine, but truly united to divinity, with mutual communication of properties, which is expressed in this personal proposition. The Father indeed is not called the Son, because although when Father and Son are considered with regard to essence, they are one, and thus the Deity of the Father is the very Deity of the Son, yet when they are considered personally, as Father and Son are opposed relatively, they certainly are not enunciated affirmatively about each other, but negatively, the Father is not the Son, and the Son is not the Father. For it is known in the trivium that opposites are predicated not affirmatively, but negatively of each other. In sacramental propositions, bread is not the body of Christ through unity of essence, as neither does this happen in personal propositions, yet it is truly called the body of Christ: it is necessary therefore that this happens through and on account of true and real union. Which predication, however, if examined logically, is not paronymic, nor does it happen in the nominative case, but it is paronymic, and there occurs there, if not in sound, yet in sense, a difference of case, as paronyms are defined by the case. For the substance of bread is not the substance of the body of Christ, but bread is united to the body of Christ. Which being carefully observed, most of the sophisms of the adversaries can be refuted without difficulty, as I warned in the Stereoma, so that Bergius may sing triumph here before victory, since the said foundation of proper predication cannot collapse unless the foundation of all our knowledge collapses.

§. LXIV. I said the second use of the copula EST is when it is used to explain words or obscure statements. Where because he hears that "this is" is the same as "this means", "this is the sense", Bergius immediately seizes upon this for this cause. But quite ineptly. Why so indeed! you ask. I had already given the reason; why are you silent about it? It was this: because here no exposition of any statement is sought or given in Christ's words, no declaration of the word 'bread' is given here, namely what the word bread means. For who will say that the sense of the words "bread is the body of Christ" is this, that by the word bread the body of Christ is understood, or that bread is the same as the body of Christ? Bergius on the contrary: Are not also the sacramental signs, in Augustine's judgment, a visible word, which needs explanation.

Why therefore should they not also be said to be that which they signify, since it is proper to words to signify, and what clearer, simpler, more certain exposition of that visible word can be offered than Christ's own, This is, or this signifies my body? Behold a new specimen of Bergian acumen! The word "is" sometimes denotes the same as "signifies", namely when some word or sentences need to be explained. But sacraments are a visible word. Therefore also here in Christ's words about the sacrament EST is the same as "signifies". It irks me to dwell on recounting, let alone refuting, the man's nonsense. Did Christ here act as some metaphrast or paraphrast? Did he interpret some preceding sentence or word with the words "This is"? Let such things provoke laughter in readers, even Calvinists.

§. LXV. Thirdly, I said the substantive verb EST is used for the prefiguration of the antitype through the type, as if I should say, Noah's Ark is the Church, that is, it prefigured the Church, or was a type of the Church. Bergius therefore dismisses his exposition of the visible word, than which nevertheless none is clearer, simpler, and more certain, and seizes upon this about figure, because he is especially very delighted with figures and types. Here therefore he now seemed to himself to have found, not what boys find in beans. Namely because both the Subject Ark and the predicate Church are taken in their proper sense, but in the copula, in my opinion, no trope occurs: he asks, is Noah's ark properly called the Church? But in what way I brought in this third use, we have already noted before. We deny however that the predicate is taken properly; for the ark is not the Church itself, but a type of the Church, and similar to the Church. There is therefore a metaphor here; since not the Church in reality, but according to similarity is understood, namely that Noah's ark was a figure of the Church, or similar to the Church. But this has no place in the words of the Supper. For Bergius confesses that the body of Christ is taken properly there, nor is there a typical prefiguration here, and therefore neither does that use of the substantive verb have place here. He says: if it has place only in prefiguring signs, such as Noah's ark was; how much more in the sacramental signs of the N.T.! But here the question is about the meaning of words. You however compare sacramental signs with figures, you slip from word to thing. And was it Christ's purpose to explain what the Eucharistic bread prefigured in the Last Supper, that you adduce here that use of the word which is employed for the prefiguration of the antitype through the type. Bergius is certainly very blinded by prejudices and emotions, while he compares that typical predication, Noah's ark is the Church, with the sacramental, bread is the body of Christ, and here also invents a prefiguration of the antitype through the type. If however he wishes to quibble much about that use of the substantive verb concerning the prefiguration of the antitype, we can easily dismiss it, which as I said, I adduced in abundance and from the mind of others. Since otherwise we freely grant that that predication Noah's Ark is the Church is not logical. Hence it is rashly and ineptly compared with that deictic, This is my body.

§. LXVI. Moreover, the Tropist does not acquiesce even in this signification. He contends also that the copula EST is used in the enunciation of the signified about the sign. But how can the signified be predicated of the sign? You say, as the antitype of the type. But we have already said that this predication is improper: and then not in the copula is there metonymy, but in the predicate there is metaphor. Is bread indeed the Body of Christ through similarity and

Metaphor? Why therefore do you contend that there is a trope in the copula, and do not place it rather in the predicate?

§. LXVII. We therefore said that the Calvinist abuse of the copula EST is that they modify it with a trope; which opinion we refuted with many arguments, and not a few even of the Reformed themselves refute. For it is so inept that it could not approve itself even to the greatest and most important Tropists, Oecolampadius, Calvin, Zanchi, Bucanus, Crellius, Goclenius, Keckermann, and others. We now produce Gomarus, who recently in Belgium routed the trope of the COPULA in disputation XXXV in his Theological works, p. 139. He says: "Others think that the trope consists in the copula EST placed for 'signifies'. But this mode also seems to agree neither with Rhetorical nor Logical principles, nor with the confessed hypothesis of sacramental metonymy. For first, where the signified subject is not put for the adjoined sign, nor the contrary, there is not that Sacramental metonymy: But where EST is used for 'signifies', the signified subject is not put for the adjoined sign, nor the contrary. Therefore it is not Sacramental metonymy. Then no EST as a predicament, or compound added in the third place can be the seat of a trope. Which proposition is thus demonstrated. What signifies no thing besides the circumstance of time, and the connection of terms or the affirmation of the attribute about the subject, that cannot be the seat of a trope. But EST added in the third place signifies no thing besides the circumstance of time and the connection of terms (whence it is usually called a verbal copula). Therefore EST added in the third place is not the seat of a trope. Quintilian's definition of trope confirms the stated proposition. Aristotle teaches the assumption; and the simplicity of that copula demonstrates it: because all verbs are resolved into it, and into some thing (from which two their signification is conflated). E.g. LIVES, SIGNIFIES. For in the former is contained IS LIVING, in the latter IS SIGNIFYING." What that Bergius, convicted by my reasons, although he contemptuously calls them argumentative demonstrations, now obscurely acknowledges that the copula does not sustain a trope: which nevertheless he previously asserted, and contended at length, with various examples brought forward, which we discussed in the Stereoma. He says indeed that *rò est* of the third added, since it has no other reality than that it is the copula or nexus of the predicate with the subject in whatever habit or respect they have between themselves, can be applied to both proper and improper enunciations: but who doubts this? The question is not whether the copula EST is used also in improper enunciations even then when speech is about things instituted by divine or human will alone for signifying or operating something: but whether the copula itself is affected by a trope? The question is, of which I solidly proved the negative, as Bergius now acknowledges. But he contends about bread, as a sign, because bread is a sacramental sign not merely significative, but also exhibitivè from promise, that the body as signified is predicated whether one calls that predication proper, as Bellarmine and Vasquez want, or improper. But the question was about the copula EST, whether it is the same here as SIGNIFIES, and thus is affected by a trope, as Bergius had contended? But now it is indifferent to him, whether the substantive verb *est* is affected by a trope, or is taken properly, indeed whether that proposition, bread is the body of Christ, which nevertheless the words of institution do not have, but rather this: This is my body: is called proper or improper as long as bread is called a sacramental sign, albeit not merely significative, but promissory and exhibitivè. But as we freely confess that bread can be called a sacramental sign that is metaphorical and exhibitivè, not of merits or bare efficacy, but of the

very body of Christ itself, and of the same not absent, but present, so this makes nothing to the rhombus, when the substantive verb is disputed about, as happens here. And how, I ask, is bread a promissory sign! Does bread promise something? How exhibitiv: when Christ's body is absent in the opinion of the Reformed? Then, where is that promise: Is it in those words This is my body, or in other words? Others do not pertain here to the present disputation about the copula. But if in those words the body of Christ is promised to be exhibited with bread, (however those words are not properly promissory, but deictic metaphorical dispositive, and exhibitiv,) it is necessary that *EST* be understood properly, as it sounds, not indeed explained through *SIGNIFIES*, and that also the predicate *BODY* be taken not about the sign, type, figure, memorial of the absent body of Christ, nor about the efficacy, and virtue, or merits and benefits of Christ, but as it sounds, about the very substance of Christ's body, which Daniel Chamier proves at length about the predicate against the tropes of Oecolampadius and others, at whose name Joseph Hall, Bishop of Exeter in England in an Epistle to D. Berald. Montalban, Professor, with William Rivet praising and supporting in Apology to Thomas Rossel, exclaims with stupor: "Good God! what a man and how great! He was alone the whole cohort of Davidic nobles, the whole armory of the tower of David, the whole army of Israel. I can scarcely contain myself, when mention is made of that divine [for so he was] satellite: So I am accustomed to admire the fiery genius of the man, his manifold knowledge, his singular acumen. The Church of God will need no other athlete henceforth, as long as your Chamier, that Wonder of the world, shall survive (and he will survive eternally)." See Panstratia on the Eucharist: book X. ch. IV. §. vi. "If it is so," he says, "that the predicate is taken for the sign of the predicate, certainly long ago the rock was in reality a sign of Christ, although Augustine denied that it was then, which is said. Then a figurative body is not a body. Thus this Enunciation would indicate no body of Christ in reality, but something similar to the body of Christ, although Paul said that the bread is the communion of the body of Christ. Moreover what kind of trope will they say?" After he had demonstrated that metaphor and synecdoche have no place, he thus dissolves the metonymy asserted by Oecolampadius and others of his own: "metonymy remains, which if you establish in the body, therefore it will be necessary to say this either of its cause, or of its effect, or of its subject, or adjunct. But who can explain the reason, by which it is said, this bread is that cause, which produces my body, say, my mother, or is the effect, which is produced by my body say eternal life, Or is the subject of my body, namely heaven, or the adjunct, say celestial glory? Finally, this reason will not terminate the relation of the sign to the body of Christ itself, which nevertheless is necessary: but to that, to which the body of Christ is referred, so that the proposition is again identical, as when we say of a picture. This picture is Hercules: the sense is: This picture is a picture representing Hercules: so here, bread signifying the body of Christ. With too diluted a sense, and very close to the delirium of the Anabaptists, ascribing no peculiar efficacy to the Sacraments in the thing signified." These are the words of that Wonder of the Calvinist world. But because Bergius himself acknowledges that there is no trope in the predicate, as neither in the Subject, which he now at last understands to have no place in the copula, what remains, except that the words be taken properly, as they sound, and that be inferred from them, which we Lutherans have hitherto contended, and Bergius is now forced to confess; That what Christ offers IS truly THE VERY BODY of Christ and that bread also is an exhibitiv medium of the body of Christ. Thus therefore Lutheranism now triumphs, which the Calvinist had undertaken to attack.

§. LXIIX. But whatever may be the case with the opinion of Bellarmine and Vasquez, Bergius will never obtain that we acknowledge that interpretation in Christ's words, This is, or signifies the body of Christ, as the proper sense of the words: which Bergius confesses that he himself has hitherto considered improper although now doubtful through our arguments, where he finally fixes the impropriety. "Therefore," he says, "we will give thanks, that he has judged our sense to be proper, which we ourselves thought should be called improper, if not on account of a trope in the copula, or in the extremes, at least on account of the improper habit of the subject to the predicate." Thus indeed the Tropist now sticks, where finally the trope sticks in Christ's words, whether in the copula, or in the extremes, or finally in the habit of the subject to the predicate: indeed he now acknowledges that it cannot be placed in the copula, although hesitatingly: nor does he dare to place it in the extremes, and therefore he retreats to another xenonymy, but far more absurd still. For although the copula EST, as a transcendental most general predicament, in itself and through itself perhaps DOES NOT SUSTAIN a trope, although also each extreme separately retains an entirely proper sense: yet from the very improper habit of them among themselves we thought that necessarily also some impropriety of predication or connection through the copula follows, about which however we permit Dialecticians or Rhetoricians to dispute among themselves. Which opinion he says he asserted as the most inept of all not only in the disputation of 1619 cited by me, but also in 1617 in the disputation on fundamental dissent. But who does not know that a trope is a turning or change of words? which is not unknown even to boys from Rhetorical Schools. How therefore will the very habit of things be affected by a trope! Will you assert that the very connection of things can be turned and changed, as words are accustomed to be turned and changed! Hear your former teacher Keckermann 1. 1. Syst. Log. sect. 11. c. 2. "A trope does not regard the disposition of things themselves or things, but words, for things themselves cannot be turned, as they do not depend on human nature." And will you imagine an improper predication, which is affected by no trope, whose individual words are taken properly! Thus it is necessary for Calvinists to undermine both Rhetorical and Logical principles, at least so that they may overthrow the lucid words of Christ from their tropical sense and admit τὸ ῥητόν of the words of the Testament! Behold the efficacy of error: behold the self-condemned mind of man. I now repeat the inference of our blessed Luther from the Confession on the Supper T.III.Jen. f.472. "Herewith I think Oecolampad's (the Leiden theologians in the Synopsis of purer doctrine, disp. XLV. th. LXXII. and others) Trope and Sign-making should be so powerfully taken away, as from Zwingli (Bergius, who follows Zwingli here) his interpretation, and from Carlstadt his τοῦτο is taken away, that none of them has his text, nor can have, and thus they all go naked and bare in the Supper without Text: if they now have no Text, so they can also have no Sense nor Understanding. - Thereupon we conclude thus: The Enthusiasts themselves do not know what they have in the Supper. O what a fine spirit, O what a beautiful Supper! That is truly called, sitting rightly in darkness, and eating, where one does not know what one eats, or where one sits. O dear give for God's sake a penny for light to the poor Spirit."

§. LXIX. What is that! that I cannot deny that the very τὸ EST although transcendental is affirmed LESS PROPERLY (he wanted to say, I think, MORE PROPERLY) of sacramental signs, that they are mystically sacramentally, than that they are φύσει and naturally. τὸ EST

does not affirm this; because it is transcendental, nor has it any other reality, as Bergius confessed above, than that it is the copula, or nexus of the predicate with the subject, but what sacramental signs are, and how they behave, must be learned from its proper seat. But if the copula affirms MORE properly of sacramental signs, what they are mystically and sacramentally, than what they are φύσει and naturally, Therefore the copula will certainly affirm, at least less properly, what sacramental signs are φύσει and naturally. But we by no means want to be taught by Christ's words what the sacramental signs, which Bergius calls bread and wine, are in their nature, but we entirely deny that bread and wine sustain the place of the subject in Christ's words. We believe, sanctly asseverating to Christ, to whom whatever reason may snarl against, it is impiety to contradict, that This which he exhibits with bread, and with wine, is truly the very body of Christ, the very blood of Christ. What he cavils about the sacramental mode, which he says should rather be called by us SUPPER MODE, as if the Supper were not a sacrament, or the heavenly thing were exhibited with the earthly matter in the Supper alone, here he obstructs again, namely that we suppose that besides spiritual exhibition it consists in bodily indistance, and indeed such that both of the united things are eaten together by the mouth, we affix that sense to the copula, these are mere nonsense and ineptitudes vainer than Sicilian trifles, which certainly demonstrate Bergius to be neither intellectually learned, nor spiritually good. Whether the body of Christ should be eaten by mouth, or not, does not lie hidden in the copula EST, whether it be taken tropically or properly, nor in that whole proposition, this is my body, as which indeed infers the true and substantial presence of Christ's body; but defines nothing about oral eating, but in the word of command EAT, joined to this proposition, this is my body. But we by no means establish a sacramental mode, which consists of both spiritual and bodily exhibition. Indeed we distinguish sacramental eating from spiritual, namely that this happens also outside the sacrament, and that without it sacramental eating is given in the case of the reprobate: and finally that sacramental eating is sanctioned by the words Eat, this is my body, and has it as a means, but spiritual eating is its end, and is defined by other words.

§. LXX. And these are the things which Bergius replied to our Stereoma, concerning the copula EST. But with what faith and conscience he now calls those Calovian theorems, by which he himself was convicted and forced to abandon his opinion, and as far as the COPULA is concerned to subscribe to the truth, let the judgment be with the Reader: which if formerly despised by Bergius, that nevertheless they were of such energy and efficacy, that they could produce Bergius to the acknowledgment of truth, in this point at least, I congratulate myself: not to myself, but to the Church of Christ I would congratulate more proluxly, if he who acknowledges that the copula in the words of institution cannot be modified, nor also that a trope has place in the extremes, would dismiss that inept escape, entirely alien from all saner Philosophy, that the habit of the predicate to the subject is improper, of which no example, either from nature, or from Scripture, no vestige in the Schools of Logicians, or learned Philosophers, no document or solid argument can be adduced, indeed which repugns to the first principles of knowing, namely that impropriety should be placed in the very things in the mutual habit of things, and that they are affected by tropical modification, and on the contrary would acknowledge to the truth, that since Christ's words are not improper or tropical, τὸ ῥητόν should be retained: Which I do not need to decree from the supreme tribunal of the Theological forum, as Bergius cavils; Bergius

has a domestic tribunal, he has an internal judge, his own conscience, by which he is now convicted, so that unless henceforth in such great light he wishes to err self-condemnedly, he will be entirely inexcusable before the supreme tribunal in the future.

## SECTION VI. Sixth Response Concerning the Fallacy of Composition and Division.

§. LXXI. The Sophist nevertheless proceeds, accusing us of mutilation and separation of Christ's words, because we join the words "This is my body" with the words "Take, Eat", but separate them from the following "which is given for you". First, however, he accuses me of declaring these to be manifestly heterogeneous, which he considers to be hardly more absurd than could be said, so much so that he thinks my mind is not sufficiently sound: since those words are the most essential part of that promise, by which the essence of the Holy Supper is constituted, the very formal reason, under which the body of Christ should be considered, as a victim about to be delivered, because we ought to proclaim the Lord's death. These are Bergius's words, which I repeat here for his sake, so that it may be clear; which opinion, mine or Bergius's, should be rejected, and which of us here has a sound mind! I noted in Stereom. p. 26. that Bergius confesses "I know very well that one must base oneself mostly on the essentials" and therefore I chastised him for establishing, against his own conscience, the principal foundation of the words of the Holy Supper, indeed of the entire doctrine of the Holy Supper on page 65. Thus, I say, Bergius not only contradicts himself, namely while he tries to persuade others that he primarily adheres to Christ's essential words, nevertheless he relies chiefly and primarily on words describing the fruit and purpose, but he also argues foolishly, while he proceeds from another means partly, partly inadequately, which is very familiar to him. Surely one who seeks the main foundation of his assertion from the description of the purpose of the sacrament, does not at all acknowledge the words of Christ describing the integrity and essence of the Sacrament as the principal foundation of his opinion, however much he may profess it. Again. One who constitutes as the foundation of the entire doctrine of the Supper those words of institution which pertain only to the fruit of the Supper, argues from an inadequate means. For the description of the purpose does not exhaust the entire doctrine of the Sacrament. Finally: One who in the controversy about the integrity of the Sacrament accepts not so much the words describing its nature, but others concerning the fruit as the mass and principal foundation, proceeds from an alien means: for the End is outside the essence of the thing. But Bergius seeks the principal foundation "The right main reason" of the entire doctrine of the Supper, and the primary demonstration in the controversy about the essence, from the words: "Which is given for you, shed", by which it is certain that not the essence, but the fruit of the sacrament is designated. For these words "for you" lead us into consideration of Christ's immense love towards us, and the benefits which he acquired for us by his death, on which depends the end and fruit of this sacred feast. For these words describe the body and blood of Christ from the meritorious passion, to determine the purpose of the Sacrament, namely the application of the remission of sins, and its sealing in the Holy Supper, by participation in the body and blood of the Lord, not the Object of the Sacrament itself, so that in vain is the principal argument in the

disputation about sacramental perception and its object taken from there. Wherefore it is most manifestly evident that Bergius proceeds from an inadequate and heterogeneous means.

§. LXXII. This is what we said there: But Bergius argues against it that those words, "which is given for you", concern the most essential part of the promise, and the very form under which the Lord's body is exhibited here. Response: We will not say here what some do, that the words "This is my body" should not be indicated as words of promise. But they distinguish these as testamentary and dispositive from the words of promise signifying use: The question is about the essential part, not of the promise, but of the Holy Supper, whose form lies in eating and drinking, and matter in the earthly and heavenly thing. But it is too obvious that neither is expressed by those words "which is given for you", since they signify neither form nor matter; How therefore would it be the most essential part, unless perhaps Bergius, inverting the principles of Logic and Metaphysics at will, thrusts upon us another part more essential besides matter and form.

Furthermore, how, I ask, will he prove that the formal reason, or as he says afterwards, the uniquely proper and formal attribute of Christ's body is contained in those words, which he also strongly urged in the Regiomontana disputation? Certainly that argument from the prescribed proclamation of the Lord's death is irrelevant. Because that proclamation pertains to the end: but here the question is about the formal reason and the most essential part. Or is the end the formal reason and of the essence of the thing in Bergian Metaphysics? I therefore invert the argument: Whatever pertains to the end of the Lord's Supper is not the formal reason or essential part of the same. But those words pertain to the end of the Lord's Supper, to which undoubtedly that commemoration of the Lord's death belongs. How then can you think Bergius's mind is sufficiently sound, referring these same things to the formal reason!

Furthermore, what is more obvious than that by those words the truth of the Lord's body and blood in the Holy Supper is described, namely that the very body is exhibited to us in the Holy Supper which was given for us, the very blood which was shed for us. Therefore, the body and blood are as truly present with the bread and wine as truly as the body was given for us, the blood of Christ was shed for us, unless someone wishes to detract faith from Christ's words. For that is given to us to eat in the Holy Supper which was given for us unto death. And the true body of Christ was given unto death for us. The same should also be held concerning the blood of Christ.

Then indeed, even if the preciousness of the heavenly thing is described by those words, because as by the words "this is my body" it is designated that the Son of God's own body is provided here, subsisting in the person of the Son of God, endowed with divine qualities, and thus endowed with divine power, so by those which are added, "which is given for you", it is expressed that it is that body which as the most precious ransom was given unto death in our place, so that forgiveness of sins and eternal life might be acquired for us, just as it is added concerning the blood "which is shed for us for the remission of sins": yet this description is added, not so that the formal reason according to which Christ's body ought to be perceived in the Holy Supper would be properly designated by it, but so that with the truth of Christ's body



the use of the exhibition might be insinuated, that that giving for us, the remission of sins acquired for us on the cross, is here applied to us through eating not of bare bread, but with the bread of the very body of Christ itself. Which application indeed pertains to the utility of the Holy Supper, not to its formal reason.

Moreover, the body of Christ is not exhibited here insofar as it was given for us, or insofar as it is dead, or viewed in the state of humiliation, nor is it exhibited insofar as it is resurrected again, and considered in the state of exaltation, but inasmuch as Christ willed it ordained for us, so that received with the blessed bread it might serve us as spiritual nourishment, which power it has because it is the Son of God's own body endowed with his divine life-giving power, which as it exerted when it was given for us, acquiring life for the human race, so it also exerts when it is exhibited to us with the blessed bread in the Holy Supper, applying to us the salvation acquired. For it does not have that infinite power of conferring salvation on us from the fact that it was given for us in death, but because it is the body of the Son of God himself, although in that giving it explained the same, since only the body of the Son of God could be an equivalent ransom.

If Christ's body is exhibited in the Supper insofar as it was given for us, or insofar as it is dead, then certainly neither in the first supper was Christ's body exhibited, because then it was not yet dead, nor is it now exhibited in our Supper, because it is no longer dead, nor does it die again, Rom. VI.9. or the Supper will be celebrated without the most essential part, and formal reason, as Bergius calls it. But also the Apostles, if they had celebrated the supper during the three days of Christ's death, would have received Christ's body, which was then dead, yet truly life-giving, since the personal union, from which the life-giving power flows into Christ's body, did not cease, but they would not have received it insofar as it was dead, but insofar as it is the Son of God's own body, which was then given unto death to be later vivified, but never was it not endowed with life-giving power: because it is the property of the one who vivifies all things.

If Christ's body were received here insofar as it is living and resurrected, certainly the Apostles would not have received Christ's body in the first Supper, because then it was not yet resurrected. What more? Since it is most clear that Christ does not distribute his body here as if it were one thing that was given unto death, another that is revived, nor does he determine the mode under which Christ's body should be eaten, by force of the command "Eat", as if under this formal reason, insofar as it was given unto death, it ought to be eaten, but not insofar as it is resurrected, or insofar as it subsists in the hypostasis of the Son of God, but he describes the truth of his body, as much as pertains to the substance present with the blessed bread, to insinuate here the preciousness of this sacramental thing, since not even the Reformed themselves propose to their spiritual eating only the body of Christ insofar as it was given unto death, but as is evident from Bergius's declaration, also insofar as it is revived.

§. LXXIII. But he says that Dr. Calovius departs not only from Christ and the Apostles, but also from his Luther, who said this is the head and sum or principal part, "the true main piece". But who departs from Christ? who certainly does not say, This is my body, INsofar AS it is given for you, as if to insinuate some formal attribute, but which is given for you. I believed that in the

predicate was described not the mode, or formal reason of perceiving Christ's body, but the truth of the thing to be perceived there: and I have often warned that a leap should not be made from the predicate of substance into quality. Who from the Apostle! Demonstrate, Bergius! But to those things about Blessed Luther a response was already given on p. 36. Those things are said to be the head and sum together with bodily participation, "alongside the bodily eating", and this most correctly; because they show the fruit of that participation, since through those words forgiveness of sins, life, righteousness and eternal salvation are given to us in the sacrament, as Blessed Luther says. Therefore the words "FOR YOU" are principal, but in relation to designating the salutary fruit of the sacrament, because bodily eating and drinking do not simply effect this, but by virtue of the words of promise, by which forgiveness of sins is applied to us, when we embrace the same with faith. But here the question is about the nature and integrity of the Sacrament, which even a blind man would see is contained not in these, but in the preceding words, "Eat, this is my body". Which response of ours Bergius conceals; as if it were enough merely to repeat his cuckoo-song: and what impudence of the man it is, he still cavils that Luther's successor disagrees with him.

§. LXXIV. You say: it is most manifestly false that by those words "given for you" the fruit of the sacrament is designated, because the giving of the body for us is not the fruit of the sacrament, or of Christ's body eaten, but a proper affection of the body to be eaten. Response: I did not say the fruit is designated by these words, but INCLUDED or CONTAINED, at least implicitly. For from those words the fruit of the sacrament is rightly inferred, just as Bergius himself tries to demonstrate its use in the Supper from here. For when we receive here in the Holy Supper that very body which was given for us unto death, Christ wishes to apply to each individual who comes to the Holy Supper, by that offering of his body, what he merited for all by the giving of the same on the cross. We certainly concede that the giving is an affection or passion of Christ's body, but not as it is to be eaten, not as it is viewed in the Supper, but as it is viewed on the cross, as Bergius himself confesses here. We acknowledge that the meritorious giving is not the fruit of eating. But from that giving flows the fruit of the sacrament: as Bergius says faithful eating is the fruit of that giving, by which we apply to ourselves the sacrifice accomplished on the cross, and are made partakers of its fruits. From which it by no means follows that those words "which is given for you" are the formal and proper reason of the object or body to be eaten, or pertain to the essence of the Supper. Namely the object of eating, Christ's body, is viewed either materially, or formally, as it is the object of eating, and indeed of Sacramental eating, which is distinct from spiritual; being given unto death can be called an affection of the object of eating the body, in the former respect, as it is considered materially; but not formally, insofar as it is the object of sacramental eating. For it is not offered to be eaten insofar as it was given unto death, or under this formal reason, although it is that very thing which was given unto death: which although it has been inculcated to Bergius to the point of nausea both in the Stereoma and in the act of the Regiomontana disputation, I know not whether it is the stupidity of the man, or rather pertinacity, that he again confuses these things among themselves, and builds his Supper upon this confusion.

§. LXXV. Indeed he is forced to confess, which we accept here with both hands, as a testimony wrung from the very truth of the enemy, that neither the form nor the mode of eating is directly

determined by those words; although previously he openly contended in the German Tract. R.54. that the Mode of perception of Christ's body and blood is described here. He acknowledges without doubt the force of our argument: namely that the mode of perception pertains to the words of the mandate, not to the words of the promise: He is therefore forced here again to give up his hands in defeat, however much he tries to escape in another way, but in vain: When he contends that the formal and proper object is expressed here, namely the body AS a victim given for us. For what else is this than to fall back into the same error! For Christ does not say he gives his body for us, determining the formal reason of the object to be eaten, AS A VICTIM to be given unto death, but only designating the truth of his body, that he exhibits here to be eaten that very body which is to be given unto death, so that we may more religiously estimate the dignity of the benefit and fruit of this most sacred supper from there.

§.LXXVI. Therefore the chief argument of Bergius falls, which he almost solely urged in the Regiomontana Colloquy, about which he says again here: And this indeed I had said is the PRIMARY foundation of our doctrine and faith concerning the Holy Supper, and I still say so. Let us therefore hear the primary foundation of all Calvinism in this cause:

As is the object, as is the food, so also must its eating necessarily be.  
But the body and blood of Christ not as to bare bodily substance, but as a propitiatory victim and blood of the covenant, as to the virtue and merit of his sacrifice is promised in the Holy Supper, and exhibited by its Symbols. Therefore it neither ought, nor can be bodily, or by the mouth of the body, but by faith alone spiritually, accepted and eaten.

Good Jesus! if this is the primary foundation of Calvinism, how miserable, how sandy and straw-like it is! That syllogism is entirely faulty, whether it is examined as to form or as to matter. First, since the conclusion follows the weaker part, and that is negative, the minor must be negative. But even Calvinist tyros of Logic will chastise a negative minor in the first figure! For I do not believe you will fabricate another Logic, in which a negative minor has a place in the first figure, although I see you often employ such syllogisms. Then indeed, how many terms are contained in this syllogism: Collect, please, and count them. I do not wish to fill the paper with recounting them. Thirdly how excellent is the Major "as is the object, as is the food, so also is the eating": For how will you prove its necessity! Why do you not also conclude, because the food is heavenly, the eating is heavenly, because it is, according to you, sacrificial, (for it is offered as a victim) the eating is also sacrificial, because the object is of death (given for us) the eating is also such? Finally, what will you respond, if someone subsumes, because the object is a true body, the eating is also truly bodily!

Fourthly, in the minor there is a Sophistic opposition: But the body of Christ not as to bare substance, but as a victim is the object and food, for thus the Minor ought to be subsumed. Which is understood either in an exclusive sense, that the substance of the body is not received, but only the propitiatory victim: which sense shines forth from the conclusion, because it is concluded in an opposite and exclusive sense. Therefore not bodily, but by faith ALONE it is accepted: or in an inclusive sense: that indeed the substance of Christ's body is the food and object of eating, but not bare, but along with the substance also its virtue and efficacy, as it is an

expiatory victim. Therefore the subsumption is instituted with ambiguous, fallacious and merely sophistic terms in the fundamental argument of Calvinism. In the former sense the minor is manifestly false, and diametrically contrary to Christ's words: For Christ does not say, Eat, This is an expiatory victim, or the virtue and merit of my sacrifice, but Eat, this is my body. How therefore can the substance of Christ's body be excluded! The latter sense likewise had to be solidly proved. But here there is merely a begging of the principle. The substance of Christ's body and its efficacy, insofar as it is a victim, are most distinct: nor are they joined in Christ's words so that his body is offered to be eaten, also as it is a victim, or as to the virtue of the sacrifice: The Eat, which Christ commands, or sacramental eating, according to Christ's words, only respects Christ's body, and has that for its object, as it is exhibited with the Eucharistic bread, but by no means the virtue or merit of Christ, which who will say is offered to be eaten with the Eucharistic bread!

"The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" says Paul 1 Cor. X. 16. but not, is it not the communion of the merit of Christ? and the Eucharistic bread is openly distinguished from the blessed wine for this reason, that with the bread Christ's body, not blood, with the wine Christ's blood, not body is offered; but if the merit and efficacy of Christ were understood, not truly the substance of Christ's body and blood, in both cases the object would be the same in eating namely and drinking, which is contrary to the institution. If the formal and proper object were constituted as the propitiatory victim, or even the virtue of the sacrifice, the same formal and proper object would be of drinking, which is of sacramental eating, which is contrary to Christ's Testament. Therefore fifthly the fundamental argument of Calvinism commits the fallacy of division, because when Christ names both his body and its giving for us, the substance of Christ's body is excluded in that argument, and bare giving unto death is received. Sixthly a Metabasis eis allo genos [category mistake] is committed, while THAT is changed into AS or INTO WHAT KIND, substance into quality: as if Christ said his body is exhibited, OF WHAT KIND, or AS it is given for us, or AS it is an expiatory victim. Seventhly again the fallacy of composition is committed; when Christ only proposes his body itself to be eaten indeed true, namely which is given for us: it is imagined that the body and the merit and virtue of the sacrifice of Christ's body are given to be eaten, about which nothing is in the substantial words of institution, which nevertheless Bergius confesses should be respected here, or rather only the merit, which truly is exhibited under symbols, whence will it be taught! We leave it to the Calvinists to consider, whether and how the merit of Christ under the Eucharistic bread distinctly, and virtue under the blessed wine likewise distinctly are proposed to be eaten and drunk! Eighthly there is more in the conclusion than was in the premises. The conclusion perhaps should be inferred thus, if only from an ill-formed syllogism anything can be inferred: Therefore such eating is also to be understood here: Which namely befits Christ's body, as it, as a victim, and as to its merit and virtue is exhibited under symbols. But the fundamental Syllogism of Calvinism concludes thus: Therefore it neither ought, nor can bodily or by the mouth of the body, but by faith alone spiritually be accepted and eaten. What if it is said that sacramental eating also befits Christ's body, as it is a victim, by which under blessed bread and with the same the substance of Christ's body is perceived by the mouth, not absolutely, but (if we so put it) as it is given as a sacrifice for us, so that thus Christ's body is truly exhibited and received here, although not as bare substance alone is viewed, but as along with substance respect is had to

expiatory giving! If you say, by consequence the Bergian conclusion is deduced from the conclusion of the principal Syllogism, another argument will be needed, by which, how from the former conclusion the latter is deduced, may be demonstrated; about which it will still need to be considered by the Calvinists. Behold on how solid a foundation Calvinism rests! which whether that foolish architect (this is not mine, but Christ's judgment Matt. VII. 26.) can prop up with a new support, or base, let him see for himself.

*(Numbering is what it is in the manuscript)*

§. LXXI. But Bergius tries to prove that the formal object of eating is contained in those words "which is given", and this by this argument; namely what is taught, not only what it is materially in respect to substance, which is exhibited here, namely the true body of Christ, but what it is formally in respect to office, as a victim for sins, and by that very thing a proper food. Excellent proof of the same by the same! That Christ's body is viewed here formally in respect to office, as a victim for sins, is no less doubtful than that the formal object of eating is Christ's body as a victim, indeed these are truly the same. For what else is it, the formal object of eating is Christ's body, as a victim given for us, and Christ's body, as it is viewed here, or proposed to be eaten, under that formal aspect, is proposed as a victim for sins. And this is the proof of the principal foundation!

§. LXXII. But that some weight may be added to this from calumny, the Zwinglian criminales, that we consider the body of Christ neither as what, nor of what kind, nor as it ought, not as a true body, but without body or with another body, not as an expiatory victim, but as a sacramental pledge and seal, not as it is to be remembered in the Supper, but of what kind and as it exists in bread. The first calumny arises from perversion of our doctrine. For Bergius knows as well that our Churches believe the same body present which was given unto death, not a body without body, not another body, as he knows himself to be a calumniator in imputing the contrary to us. The second is born from a vain opposition: For that Christ's body is an expiatory victim, namely as it was given unto death for us, and that the same is also a pledge and seal of our salvation, as it is exhibited to us with the Eucharistic bread, are not opposites, but harmonious, just as in the Zwinglian School, that bread is broken in analogy to the breaking of Christ's body, and that bread is a sacramental seal, are by no means opposed; nor in the School of Christ, that the Holy Spirit is the author of salvation, and that the same is also a pledge and earnest of our salvation. The third is joined with confusion of the substance and end of the Eucharist. For to commemorate the giving of Christ's body or death pertains to the end of the Eucharist: but that Christ's body is offered to be eaten with bread concerns its substance. But the end is not rashly opposed to the essence of the thing.

§. LXXIII. Moreover, Bergius is deficient not only in the proof of his heterodoxy here, but also unwillingly subscribes to our thesis, when he confesses, as we also noted in the Stereoma p. 165: that both the substance of Christ's body and blood is exhibited to us, and also its efficacy. For we confess and teach that this sacrament was instituted so that we truly receive the substance of Christ's body and blood through bread and wine, in order that we may also be made partakers of the efficacy of his merit. But Bergius contradicts himself when, trying to prove

that Christ's body and blood are not truly and properly received in the Holy Supper, he attempts to demonstrate this from the fact that we ought to receive not only the substance of Christ's body and blood, but also his merit. An open contradiction: Christ's body and blood are not received in the Holy Supper truly and properly. And the substance of Christ's body and blood is not received in the Supper truly and properly. He also contradicts others, who expressly deny that substance is denoted here and leave only a certain separate virtue. But here Bergius, himself a sophist, calls me a sophist, indeed accuses me of calumny because I attributed to him that Christ's body is not truly received in the Supper. But I spoke about the eating and drinking of Christ's body and blood, which I comprehended in one word of perception: and I respected the truth which Scripture hands down, which infers the true, real and substantial presence of the Lord's body and blood.

But does not Bergius deny in his entire Hysterema that the body and blood are truly and properly eaten and drunk! Does he not with all his strength attack the true and real and substantial presence of the Lord's body and blood! He also accuses me of calumny, that I attributed to others that they deny substance is denoted here. But did I not expressly prove this from Grynaeus? Thus he says, "The BODY and BLOOD of Christ not in respect to SUBSTANCE, but the former, insofar as it was given for us, the latter, insofar as it was shed for us, provide heavenly nourishment for us." With what forehead then do you repeatedly cry calumny, Bergius! Does not Grynaeus most openly deny in these words that Christ's body provides nourishment for us in respect to substance? And will you still deny that Grynaeus denies substance is denoted, or that he separates virtue from it!

But by what argument! Most inept indeed, because namely a separate virtue was not given for us, but the substance itself. Will you then deny that Grynaeus excludes substance, although he excludes it with a sonorous voice, asserting that Christ's body provides nourishment not in respect to substance, but as it was given for us? Thus Bergius can make white from black, and unless others believe him pronouncing black white, but assert that it is entirely black, he exclaims with a stentorian voice: What is to cavil, what to calumniate, if this is not! Let the Reader judge; He who says Christ's body is not eaten in respect to substance, but as it was given for us, does he not exclude the substance of Christ's body from eating?

Bergius will demonstrate that Christ taught such a thing, when he says that his flesh is truly food, because it was given for the life of the world, when he teaches that the explanatory particle "BECAUSE" and the "INSOFAR AS" are the same. Christ's body is food also in its very substance, not only INSOFAR AS it was given for us, although the reason that it is food is that very meritorious giving; for unless it had been given for us, it could not be food for us. But who would say the same about bodily food, that bread or meat does not nourish, not insofar as it is substance (as Bergius sophistically changes the words, for who will say that all substance nourishes!) but in respect to its SUBSTANCE (as Grynaeus's words had it about Christ's body) but that meat and bread nourish, insofar as they have nourishing power, he would surely perversely oppose the nourishing power to the very substance of bread and meat and consider it separate from the substance. I will see whether Bergius will deny this, and whether others will

judge that one denying it has the brain of an ostrich (he himself is so facetious in inventing proverbs).

With what conscience, finally, does he so prolixly object calumny to me here, that I said the sacramentarian Calvinists leave only a separate virtue alone: since he himself contends that Christ's body is contained in substance alone in heaven above and outside this world, but on earth where the supper is performed, only its virtue and efficacy is present, using a SIMILE from the sun, which though absent in body, is nevertheless present to the earth by its virtue. Is this not to separate virtue from the substance of the body! How then does he now say that virtue is not exhibited or accepted without substance, if the substance is only in heaven, but virtue alone is exhibited on earth!

§. LXXIV. Meanwhile Bergius seizes upon what I said, that Christ's body in the Supper is to be accepted not only in respect to substance alone, but also of the salutary efficacy of merit, of benefits by right: Only the faithful and by faith alone thus accept it and have such communion in fact, although it is proposed to all to be thus accepted. He acknowledges that all these things are said truly and rightly. But I said this for this reason, not to confuse, but to distinguish sacramental and spiritual eating: That Christ's body as to substance is offered, and by sacramental eating is received by all together with the blessed bread: that all may also become partakers of the salutary efficacy, with spiritual eating added; of which however only the faithful become partakers in fact. If Bergius admits that all these things are said truly and rightly, as his words have it, why does he still attack the oral eating of Christ's body! If he seizes upon only some things in his own sense, how then does he assert that ALL these things are said truly and rightly?

§. LXXV. But because Bergius again returns to his primary Syllogism, the chief foundation of Calvinism in this cause, to which he himself attributes wonderfully much, come, let us follow him, although the Sophist has chosen the order of confusion, seizing upon some things here and there, and now rushing here, now there, without proper method. He complains that I attribute a false Syllogism to him. The syllogism which he himself has for the chief foundation of his cause is entirely false: But formed by Bergius, not attributed to him. We will recite the same in the author's own words from the German Tract. p. 65:

"From which we now conclude, and this should rightly be the true main foundation of the entire doctrine of the Holy Supper from the words of institution: The LORD Christ has promised us in the Supper His true body and blood, not only according to the bare substance and essence, but also according to His power and merit, as the sin offering that was given for us on the cross, as the blood of the New Testament that was shed for our sins. We must also consider and accept Him in the promise of the Supper thus, not according to His bodily substance and essence alone, but at the same time also according to His saving power, merit, and benefits. Now it is quite certain that no one has part in the body and blood of Christ as our sin offering that was given for us, and thus also in His saving power, merit, and benefits, except only believers, and only through faith. It follows irrefutably that He is also given in the Supper to no one except only

to believers, also accepted by no one except only through faith. If we had no other proof, this alone should be enough."

Let us now add our response from the Stereoma p. 167, so that we may consider what Bergius desires in it. Bergius's argument is such: Christ in the promise of the Supper is to be accepted not only in respect to substance, but also of salutary efficacy, merit and benefits. But only the faithful and through faith alone have communion both of substance and of salutary efficacy, merit and benefits of Christ; Therefore, in the supper Christ is given to none except the faithful, is accepted by none except through faith alone. This is that irrefutable argument which the adversary urges so greatly, and holds in place of all. But in vain. For lest we seem too rigorous in examining the form, we recall the ill-formed Syllogism to this form: Those who receive in the Supper the body and blood of the Lord, they ought to participate in Christ both in respect to substance and efficacy. But the unfaithful do not participate in Christ in respect to substance and efficacy. Therefore, the unfaithful do not receive in the Supper the body and blood of the Lord. From which the Elenchus of four terms is apparent. For the Major speaks of right, that we ought to accept Christ in the Supper; the Minor of fact, how the unfaithful participate in Christ.

It is true that by Christ's institution, the sacraments are ordained to benefit all for salvation. But those who use the sacraments unworthily, although they receive the entire sacraments, nevertheless do not become partakers of their salutary fruit. The unfaithful receive the whole Eucharist consisting of the earthly and heavenly thing, but for judgment, not salvation; by their own fault, not by Christ's ordination, so that by unworthily eating the body and drinking the blood of Christ, they become guilty of the body and blood of Christ. 1 Cor. XI.27. The Minor is ambiguous, as it is formed by the adversary, That only believers have part in Christ, as propitiator and his merit. For if this is understood in respect to divine intention and Christ's acquisition; I simply deny it; because the whole Scripture teaches the contrary. But if it is explained concerning the application made through faith of the salutary benefits acquired by Christ's death for all men, I freely concede it. Thus namely the impious are not partakers of Christ's merit on account of their own malice: and those using this sacrament unworthily do not receive the benefits of Christ, who do not believe the word "for you", although they participate in the substance of Christ's body and blood, which is proved in its place.

§.LXXVI. These things were said by us there. But what does Bergius say to these? He approves the rest, as truly and rightly said: he only denies that the unfaithful receive the whole Eucharist consisting of the earthly and heavenly thing, pretending that thus the heavenly thing is mutilated and the virtue of the sacrifice is separated from the sacrifice itself and the blood of the covenant. But there is no mutilation here, the heavenly thing is Christ's body in one, his blood in the other part of the Supper. For Christ does not teach that he exhibits Body and virtue of sacrifice with the Eucharistic bread, likewise his blood, and virtue of his sacrifice with the blessed wine, and he does not even teach that he exhibits himself as a sacrifice: indeed sacrifices are offered to God by us, not to men by God; but he simply teaches that his body is offered with the blessed bread, his blood with the blessed wine; although he wishes that through this sacrament, all who approach may become partakers of the efficacy of his sacrifice.



Nor indeed does Bergius's Consequence hold here, if both are exhibited to all at the same time by the same promise, through the same symbols, necessarily both are accepted together, or if one or the other is not accepted in fact, both are rejected. For many things are offered simultaneously by God, which are not simultaneously rejected: are not the grace of God offered simultaneously on God's part with the word and Baptism of water, which although it is rejected, or not accepted through faith, by hypocrites, it is nevertheless not necessary therefore that the word itself, and the baptism of water be rejected, or not accepted, which is evident from the example of hypocrites hearing the word of GOD, receiving the Baptism of water: unless perhaps it pleases Bergius to say with the Socinians that grace is offered to them only by the will of the sign, not truly by the will of good pleasure. Although not even the antecedent should be admitted: which Bergius says is admitted by me, he does not prove. The fruit of Christ's sacrifice is not exhibited through bare symbols, (Where did I ever say this!) but through the entire sacrament, as it is the divinely ordained means of applying salutary fruits. But that the unworthy become guilty not by receiving Christ's body and blood, but by rejecting them, is a manifest depravation of the Apostle's words 1 Cor. XI. For those who become guilty of the very body and blood of the Lord by eating, they become guilty not by rejecting, but by unworthily receiving the body and blood of the Lord. Because the action, by which guilt is contracted against some object, must concern that object, but in such a way that guilt is incurred by its unworthy treatment. But that action is the very eating of the unworthy in the sacrament, as it is that by which guilt is contracted against Christ's body as the object; therefore the unworthy eating must necessarily concern Christ's body. It is certainly indubitable that the action concerns the object against which it sins. But the guilt of Christ's body and blood is contracted not in any way, but by unworthily eating and drinking, and therefore it is necessary that the eating and drinking of the unworthy concern Christ's body and blood itself. Who also eat and drink judgment to themselves, because they do not discern the body and blood of the Lord. Concerning which guilt the ancient Greek Church, as is clear from Chrysostom on this passage, thought entirely the same, that the unworthy incur it, not by rejecting, but by unworthily receiving the body and blood of the Lord. Let us hear Chrysostom: "He will be guilty of the body and blood: Why? because he sheds blood, and presents not a sacrifice, but a slaughter: for just as those who at that time pierced Christ, not that they might drink his blood, but that they might shed it, the same indeed does he who drinks Christ's blood unworthily, and receives no fruit from his drinking." These are St. Chrysostom's words.

But if the unworthy regard the Lord's blood as profane (although this is said specifically about sinners in Holy Scripture, which nevertheless Bergius draws here from Heb. VI. and chap. X.) because they drink unworthily, and do not discern the Lord's blood, it is necessary that they receive Christ's blood by drinking, although for judgment. Although therefore the Eucharist is ineffective for the unworthy, (which is their own fault,) nevertheless their unbelief does not nullify the Lord's faithfulness, that they receive the whole sacrament, which certainly is not whole without the heavenly thing. Therefore it is certain that they also receive Christ's body, since neither does faith pertain to the integrity of the sacrament, nor does unbelief take away its integrity. For they do not receive Christ's body only sacramentally, which is Bergius's gloss on Augustine's opinion, although it is certain that they do not perceive the thing of the sacrament, or its virtue and efficacy, since they do not receive the Lord's bread with true faith. Let us hear

Augustine himself on this, tract. xxvi. on John: "The Sacrament is taken from the Lord's table, by some to life, by some to destruction. But the thing itself, of which it is a sacrament, is to every man for life, to none for destruction, whoever shall be a partaker thereof." Which thing of the sacrament he also called truth Sermon 2 on the words of the Apostle: "Then indeed this will be life for each one, the body and blood of Christ, if what is visibly taken in the sacrament (with visible bread) is spiritually eaten in the very truth." What is that which is thus visibly taken in the sacrament, and ought also to be spiritually eaten? certainly bread is not spiritually eaten, it remains therefore that Christ's body is understood to be received with visible bread. What is clearer than that I.v. against the Donatists c.8. "As Judas, to whom the Lord gave the morsel, not by receiving a bad thing, but by receiving badly, gave place in himself to the Devil, so anyone unworthily receiving the Lord's sacrament does not cause that because he is bad, it is bad, or because he does not receive unto salvation, he has received nothing; For it was nonetheless the BODY and BLOOD of the Lord even to those of whom the Apostle said: He that eats and drinks unworthily, eats and drinks judgment to himself." In sum, says St. Augustine I.11. against the Donatists c. xiv. "It matters not, when the integrity and sanctity of the Sacrament is being discussed, what he who receives the sacrament believes, or with what faith he is imbued; it matters indeed very much for the way of salvation, but for the question of the sacrament it matters nothing. For it can happen that a man has the entire sacrament and a perverse faith." If it pleases Bergius to read more on that opinion, he will be able to find it in the same Doctor of Antiquity I. IV. c. X. I. vi. c. I. II. X X V. I. VII. C. XIX. XXXIII. LIII. and also against Petilianus c. ult. f. xx1. on G.D. c.xx, etc.

Finally, how can the reprobate become guilty of rejecting Christ's body and blood, according to the Calvinist opinion, if indeed according to them, Christ's blood was neither shed for them, nor is it distributed to them or offered to them in the Holy Supper! And since Bergius compares Baptism here, what will he say about hypocrites! Do they receive the entire baptism, or not! If he affirms, therefore they are not washed by water alone, which certainly does not complete Baptism, but the heavenly matter must be present at the same time, although its fruit does not redound to them due to lack of faith. If they deny, therefore hypocrites will have to be rebaptized at some point, as they have not hitherto received true baptism, which certainly is not true unless it is entire.

§.LXXVII. As a final point, it pleased Bergius to reduce his irrefutable argument, which he had produced twice in monstrous form, to another form, and to extend it also to the word and sacrament of Baptism. Wherever Christ is proposed to be accepted not only as to the substance of body and blood alone, but as to the virtue, merit and efficacy of the same given and shed for us, there He neither ought, nor can be accepted by mouth or bodily organ, but by faith alone. But nowhere in the word, or sacraments is He proposed as to the substance of body and blood alone, etc. Therefore, nowhere by mouth or bodily organ, but always especially in baptism and Holy Supper through the external use of Symbols by faith alone both ought He, and can He be accepted. But that argument, IRREFUTABLE to Bergius, to have been so thoroughly refuted in the Stereoma, not indeed by a futile, but by a solid refutation, that it still stands entirely unshaken, I entirely trust the reader who has compared these things will judge. For what is its support, if not confusion of the heavenly thing of the sacrament, and the fruit, which belongs to

the sacrament, as a salutary means divinely ordained? as if all who participate in the heavenly thing, without which the sacrament is not complete, also become partakers of the salutary fruit! We have previously uncovered more of its faults, from which the Calvinist will never extricate himself. That in this third, likewise ill-formed form, because there is more in the conclusion than in the premises, as in which no mention was made of the external use of symbols, it should be specially observed, that the sacramentarian spirit by this argument now not only confuses Sacraments among themselves, and with the word of God, as if the heavenly thing is the same, as in the Holy Eucharist, so also in Holy Baptism, namely the body and blood of the Lord, proposed to be accepted in the same way (although under different symbols) nor otherwise in the Holy Eucharist, than in the word of God is offered, which is a palpable error; but also in a fanatical manner denies that spiritual goods can be accepted by a bodily organ, that is, by the ear with the word heard; by which means faith will no longer be from hearing the word, nor will the word, which is spirit and life be perceived by the ears, but only the external sound: indeed not even the use of external symbols will be a means of perceiving spiritual goods, since they are perceived by faith alone, which is a fanatical enervation of the word of God and sacraments, and opposition of saving means. For to this at last the Zwinglian Spirit goes, which is proved more extensively elsewhere. He also confuses here, which is to be noted lastly, the divine exhibition and acceptance on the part of man: For through sacraments as divine saving means, God's giving hand, spiritual benefits are exhibited together with the sacraments themselves; but the sacraments themselves are accepted by hypocrites, but because they are destitute of faith, as the receiving hand, the benefits, which God wanted to be conferred on them through those, are by no means received by them, but are rejected through unbelief. Spiritual benefits are accepted by faith alone: But that the heavenly thing of the sacraments is proposed to be accepted by faith alone, is the thing to be proved. Therefore the primary foundation of Calvinism is nothing else than a begging of the principle.

## SECTION VII. The Seventh Response Concerning the Fallacy of Division.

§. LXXIIX. Although it does not appear, how that fictitious fallacy of composition, about which we have already spoken, or the fallacy of division which now follows, in any way pertains to the paralogism, which Bergius fabricates against us: yet because we have once begun to tread in the footsteps of the erring one, it is pleasing to persist in the same, since he has chosen the same things for this purpose, so that from here and there he may seize upon ours from the Stereoma however they may not pertain to the masked Syllogism, and mangle them, which are therefore to be vindicated. But he makes this a fallacy of division, that he thinks the words, Do this in remembrance of me, do not pertain to the essence of the Supper. Is it so then Bergius? Will you refer those words, IN REMEMBRANCE OF ME, to the essence of the Supper? Is not this a notable fallacy of composition, to draw the end to the substance of the thing, the external cause to the internal constitution of the thing! But to Bergius this is a slight thing, to change square things for round, to confuse external causes with internal, provided that he deprives the

Sacrament of the heavenly thing, and in place of the body of Christ a bare memorial of the body of Christ suffices.

§. LXXIX. This therefore is the reason, that he contends, that the PROPER REASON is explained: why Christ called the blessed bread and cup his body and blood, namely from the proper use and end, because they ought to do this, that is, to eat the broken bread, to drink the cup of blessing in remembrance of his own body delivered for us, blood shed for us, just as those eating the paschal lamb were said to eat the passover, that is, the passing over, because they ate in remembrance of the passing over. Beautifully indeed, and most excellently! I do not repeat, that Christ said that what he exhibited with the bread, was his body, not the bread; I at least ask this; whence Bergius may want to prove, that by the words, IN REMEMBRANCE, the proper reason is rendered, why the bread is, or how it can be called the Body of Christ? that is, that the bread is called the body of Christ for this reason, because it is a memorial of the body of Christ. Is this not the most inept begging of the principle. For this was to be proved, that this is the proper reason, or of this proposition THE BREAD is the body of Christ, or of that, This is my body: that namely the bread is a memorial of the body of Christ, which he assumes without proof, and thus freely imagines that reason which the Zwinglian spirit has devised to be the proper one then to be explained by the words of the command, Do this in remembrance. But on the contrary it is clearer than the sun, that the proper reason of the words Eat, this is my body is not explained here. By which words it is taught only, to what end we ought to eat this, which Christ sets forth to be eaten, by force of the words of the preceding command and ordination of Christ, Eat, This is my body, certainly by those words the formal reason itself, or the proper one either of the eating, or of the object to be eaten, or why the bread is called the body of Christ, is not expressed. But by those words do this IN REMEMBRANCE OF ME it is taught only, to what end we ought to eat this, which Christ has set forth to be eaten. Therefore. More briefly: Whatever only proposes the end of the Supper, that surely by no means exhibits the proper reason of the quiddity of the sacrament, or anything pertaining to the essence of the sacrament.

§. LXXX. What is inserted in passing about the Passover arises from a change of the word: For they were not ordered to eat the Passover, that is, the passing over, but when the Passover is said to be eaten, the name Passover is taken not for the passing over, but for the Paschal lamb by Metonymy, because around the time of the passing out of Egypt the eating of the lamb was instituted. But what does this have to do with the proposition of Christ: This is my body, unless through begging the principle you suppose, that the predicate body of the Lord is put by metonymy for the memorial of the body of the Lord, which hypothesis however is opposed to your concession, that both the subject and the predicate here are taken properly, and also to the prior disputation, that 'IS' is to be explained by signifies: unless perhaps you may want to give this explanation: This, that is the bread, IS, that is, SIGNIFIES, my body, that is, a memorial of my body. Thus we will have in the New Testament in place of the type of Christ the paschal lamb, a type and memorial only of another type, or memorial of the body of Christ.

§. LXXXI. You say: But from the commanded use and the sense and scope of the promise it must be especially judged, according to the rule, nothing has the nature of a Sacrament outside the commanded use. Resp. The commanded use is now confused with the end of this use: The

use of the sacrament commanded, outside of which a sacrament is not given, is included in the words Eat, Drink: But the end of the Sacrament, which itself consists in that commanded use, if indeed it is in the category of action, is the memory or remembrance of the Lord's passion: which indeed can be absent, and more often is absent, with the substance of the Supper preserved, as when unbelievers use the Holy Supper, and thus does not pertain to the PROPER and FORMAL REASON of the Sacrament. Therefore Bergius asks in vain: what is that sacramental use of the body delivered for us? Christ nowhere instituted this use of the bread, much less by these words, IN REMEMBRANCE OF ME. For here there is no discourse about the use of the bread, but about the end of the sacrament, but the sacramental use of the bread the preceding command, and testamentary disposition of Christ had indicated. Take, Eat, This is my body: by force of which the bread is exhibited not in remembrance of the absent, but as the communication of the present body of Christ, so that namely with the blessed bread as a xovorin means we may receive and eat the body of Christ. This use is proper to the bread in this sacrament, which we call sacramental not because it is common to other sacraments, but from this sacrament of the Supper, whence the cavil of Bergius, about the use of the Supper. But when Bergius confuses the end of the sacrament with the use of the blessed bread in the Holy Supper commanded, does not the Sophist most wickedly deceive and is deceived! For who does not know, that the sacrament with respect to substance, can be whole without a confident memory, or without the faith of those using it!

§. LXXXII. You retort: without that use the whole action of the Supper, would be neither sacred, nor sacramental, nor pleasing to God: but merely profane, nay hypocritical, and abominable to God. Resp. The action of the Supper is viewed either on the part of God dispensing this sacrament through the minister in the Church, and thus, where the whole action is performed in the Church, according to the institution of Christ, it is always a sacramental action, and pleasing to God, and therefore to say that the whole thing is merely profane, and abominable to God is not of a pious heart: or it is viewed on the part of the men approaching the Holy Eucharist, and especially of the unworthy: and thus indeed the communion of hypocrites, as such is not pleasing to God, but abominable: who also incur a grave judgment, because they do not discern the body of the Lord, which is dispensed to them here, nay they become guilty of the body of the Lord, because without faith they partake of it, and persisting in sins, they do not fear to touch the most holy body of the Lord with an impious mouth and profane tongue.

§. LXXXIII. And so Bergius endeavors to prove, that this command about the remembrance of the Lord pertains to the essence of the Holy Supper in this way: Either by the substance of the Holy Supper is understood the action itself, or the object. If the former, surely the action itself is not the substance, but its essential reason consists in this, that it is engaged about the sacred object for a sacred end. If the latter, this way of speaking is indeed awkward, yet because that object is twofold, an earthly thing, and a heavenly thing, also a twofold eating is to be established, a corporeal and a spiritual one: the former is contained in the first command Eat, the latter in the latter, Do this in remembrance of me. Resp. to the substance of the Holy Supper both pertain, both the action or form of the sacrament, namely the sacramental eating and drinking, and the object, or the matter, the earthly and heavenly thing, But by no means the end: because this is outside the essence of the thing. The action itself indeed is not SUBSTANCE, or

in the category of substance: but who does not know, that the word substance is used for essence? in which sense the action of the sacrament is altogether the substance or essence, because the sacrament consists in the action. For what is more certain, than that the substance, or essence, or essential reason of the sacrament, which is not in the category of relation, but of action, is situated in the action instituted by Christ, which indeed is engaged about the sacred object, and indeed for a sacred end, if you regard the author, who dispenses these good things entrusted to the Church through the ministers of the word, even if that sacred end is not always intended either by the dispensing minister, or in the person of the one receiving; for neither is the sanctity or dignity of the sacraments to be suspended from the intention of the dispensing ministers or users. But this sacred action does not take its character from the end of the users, but from the divine institution, by which as a sacred means it was sanctioned by Christ. Whence a distinction must be made between the sanctity of the means, or of the sacrament itself, which depends on the institution, but not on the faith of the users, and the sanctity of the receiving subject, which without faith is none. In respect of the former the Supper is called sacred Coadas, in respect of the latter symbebēkotōs. Furthermore, the object of the sacramental action is indeed twofold considered auses, but if it is viewed oikeiōs, it is one, because the earthly and heavenly thing constitute one sacramental thing. It is certain that the earthly thing is sanctified by the word for this use: but the heavenly thing in this use sanctifies us not alone, but as the same united with the earthly thing constitutes the matter of the sacrament, and is viewed in the commanded use of eating and drinking, so that the effect of sanctification may be ascribed to the whole sacrament, not to either matter, nor to the matter alone. But indeed we establish a twofold mode of eating, which happens in the sacrament, since one is the mode of eating the earthly thing, another of the heavenly thing, but we assert that there is only one sacramental eating, as the object is one sacramental: and therefore it is said in vain, that we establish the twofold mode of the sacred action so connected among themselves, that the external corporeal and natural eating of the earthly thing, is ordered to the proper eating of the heavenly thing as a means to the end from the institution of Christ; because by one and the same act of eating both the earthly thing and the heavenly are perceived by our opinion. How therefore would we say that the one obtains in respect of the means, the other of the end; as if the external eating of the bread was directed to the eating of the heavenly thing of the body of Christ, as a means to the end! When on the contrary we believe that the communion of the blessed bread is the communion or participation of the body of Christ itself, and by one act, also by one organ of eating the body of Christ is eaten with the blessed bread. Therefore it is most false, that by the first command, Eat, only the eating of the earthly thing was commanded: For if the reception of the bread was instituted here separately, surely the eating of the heavenly thing will not be sanctioned by the words Drabetinois IESINOIS, Eat, this is my body, which Bergius acknowledges to be essential to the Holy Supper. Which [is] toton. It is also most false that by the latter command the SACRAMENTAL eating of the heavenly thing was sanctioned: Do this in remembrance of me; if indeed by the same only the end of the sacramental eating again commanded (by force of the words Do this) is expressed, just as the words themselves teach, For my remembrance, designating expressly the end, to which the eating ought to be directed, so that in that way that sacramental eating, not indeed of the blessed bread only, but also of the body of Christ (where did the Apostle interpret, do this, that is, eat this bread only, as the eating of the bread is opposed to the eating of the body of Christ!) is sanctioned to be done in

remembrance of the Lord's passion. But if by the former words the eating of the body of Christ as of a heavenly thing was not sanctioned, certainly neither will these latter words, DO THIS, Do this in remembrance of me, enjoin the sacramental eating of the body of Christ: because these propose nothing new, except that they define the end of the sacred action previously commanded. Which when Bergius well understands that by the promise itself, This is my body, the eating of the heavenly thing was sanctioned, he affirms. But in what way by that promise, in which by no word is mention made of eating! Bergius responds: Because that promise requires faith. A notable proof! Thus by every divine promise will be sanctioned the eating of the heavenly thing or body of Christ: because no divine promise does not require, or require faith, or so that I may speak more rightly, is to be received by faith. For Bergius knowingly prudently deceives by the word REQUIRES, when he wants to prove thence the sanction of the eating of the heavenly thing. For a promise is certainly one thing, a command another, Not by the words of promise, but of command the eating of the heavenly thing must be sanctioned! Who will admit that those bare words: This is my body are the sanction or institution and command of the sacramental eating of the body of Christ. If they are abstracted from the word of command Eat, and this is drawn only to the bread! But on the other hand what is more clear, than that by the word of command Eat, with the words joined, by which the object of eating, and indeed the heavenly thing is expressed, This is my body, the sacramental eating of the body of Christ is sanctioned, and instituted. Deny this Bergius, and you will have denied the whole sanction or institution of the sacrament, which is none without the sacramental eating of the body of Christ, and indeed cannot be. In faithful remembrance indeed of Christ delivered for us consists the spiritual heavenly eating, but this remembrance is not commanded by those words This is my body, as they contain no command. Bergius is absurd, feigning a command in the words of promise, and seeking it there, where there is no imperative, and nothing of a command is had. But thus the dipnosophists invert all things, making a command from the words of promise, plucking away the words of command added to the promise from the same and separating the object about which it ought to be engaged from the action commanded: which indeed clearly prove that they err most perversely. Nor indeed in that remembrance is situated the eating proper to this sacrament, or sacramental, of the heavenly thing, or as Bergius loves to speak, the supper eating. Because the remembrance of the Lord's passion can also be celebrated outside this sacrament, and ought to be, and thus also is celebrated by the faithful. But that the eating of the heavenly thing proper to this sacrament be celebrated outside this sacrament, [is] most absurd. Therefore the sacramental and spiritual eating are most wickedly confused, which are especially distinct, since the latter also had a place in the Old Testament, and is necessary to all who are to be saved, and happens outside the sacrament, also by those who cannot yet use the sacrament, the former however is proper to the sacraments of the New Testament, nor does it have a place outside it, nor is it absolutely necessary to all, as both infants, and often others lack it without loss of salvation.

§. LXXXIV. It is now evidently clear, how futile was the proof, which Bergius sold for EVIDENT, that the remembrance or spiritual eating is the principal, and most essential part of the Holy Supper. Which he will then persuade to the prudent, when he will teach, that the end of a thing is an essential part of the same, that is, he will change the natures of things, and from an external cause he will make an internal one. He says, that the remembrance is indeed the

proper end and correlative of the external eating and drinking of the Sacred symbol but by that very thing it is the principal part of the whole action of the Holy Supper! But where is the remembrance constituted the end of the external eating of the bread alone! The end indeed is of the sacrament itself, or of the Holy Supper, Christ being witness: Do this in remembrance of me. For what did Christ order to be done? Was it only to eat bread, to drink wine? But that happens outside the sacrament and without a peculiar command. What then? Surely the disciples are ordered to do this in remembrance of Christ, which they had then done. But the disciples of Christ had not then only eaten the earthly thing. Therefore they are not ordered to eat only the earthly thing in remembrance of Christ, as Bergius foolishly says. Therefore the remembrance is not only the end of the eating and drinking of the symbols or of the earthly thing, but of the whole sacred action, which the disciples had celebrated there, and which we are likewise ordered to celebrate.

§. LXXXV. Moreover, Christ ordered to do that in remembrance of himself by the latter command, Do this in remembrance of me, which he had commanded by the former command, that they should do: But by the former command he had commanded not only the eating of bread, but also of his body. Eat, this is my body, which Bergius himself is compelled to acknowledge, unless he wants to establish most absurdly, that by those words no eating of the body of Christ was commanded. Therefore he commanded that not only the eating of bread, but also of his body be done in remembrance of himself. Which argument is truly irrefutable. Whence constrained by the evidence of the matter Bergius was compelled to confess, that here the end and scope not only of the bread, but of the whole sacramental action is proposed German tr. p. 82. When we now also consider the end in itself, to which we should do it, there the Lord Christ himself will show us the most certain, most sure explanation. For in that he says: Do this in remembrance of me, he teaches clearly, to what end he properly instituted the whole Supper. These things Bergius! If this is the scope of the whole Holy Supper, surely that remembrance is not an essential part of the Supper: because the scope and end of a thing cannot be an essential part of the same. If he instituted the eating not only of bread, but also of his body sacramentally in remembrance of his passion: discourse Bergius, how the remembrance of the Lord's passion will be the sacramental eating itself of the body of Christ. For did Christ order to eat his body sacramentally, unto the sacramental eating of his body!

§. LXXXVI. Nor does Calovius dream, that he shakes the walls of Calvinism as with a ram, but he truly so shakes the same, that Bergius has plainly despaired to sustain them with some obstinacy. He argued in this way. If the eating of the body of Christ is not commanded by the word eat (let us set aside for a while that, whether it is taken properly or not) nowhere will the same be commanded in the essential words of the Supper since, neither a command of it, nor any promise exists, (in the sacrament) there will also be no faith of it, whence he not undeservedly exclaimed, O men of no faith! For truly there is no faith of which neither a command nor a promise exists. How does Bergius here succor his ineptitudes! O man, he exclaims, either of no forehead, or of an unsound brain. I will suffer that judgment to be made about me, if he can solidly respond. But if not, let him be judged to have exclaimed without a forehead, without judgment, from mere impotence of mind, and let him remain a man of no faith. What command therefore, what promise does he adduce? That I may pass over this command



about the remembrance of Christ, or the Catechism may teach, that the words of promise themselves require faith. The command about remembrance is rightly passed over, because it follows after the whole Holy Supper has been sanctioned, as far as the essentials: nor does it concern the essence of the sacrament, but its end, as has been most clearly proved so far. Nor is there another command of sacramental eating in the words of institution, than what is contained in the word Eat. The words of promise, which he calls, This is my body according to the Calvinists I do not know whether they should be called words of promise Because they infer nothing else, than This is a memorial of my body, or This signifies my body. But I ask you, what kind of promise is it that the bread is a memorial, or sign of the body of Christ! But how do those words command the eating of the body of Christ: Did he command the eating of his body, because he said that the bread signifies his body, or is a memorial of his body! Thus someone may say, this bread or food will be a remembrance of my person to you, when I will be absent at some time: Does he by that very thing command some eating of his body! There is need of divine faith for any promise, no one doubts: but I ask, does any promise command something, and is it to be held for a precept! It is therefore clear, that the Calvinists have no command of the eating of the body of Christ in the Sacrament, whatever Bergius may declaim, that he has stuck here again, is too manifest. In the German treatise indeed Bergius had retreated more safely to the word Eat, by which the sacramental eating is altogether commanded, although he rather absurdly imagined that one word sustains a twofold signification in the same place, both a proper one in respect of bread, and an improper one in respect of the body p. 42. but because now about the absurdity of that twofold explanation, as it appears, convicted by our arguments, he attributes only a proper signification to the word Eat, and yet does not want to concede a place to the truth, that the body of Christ is properly eaten; by force of this command, hence he no longer dares to derive the command of the eating of the body of Christ from the word Eat, and relinquishes his former opinion, contending that only by the words of promise, and by the latter command, Do this in remembrance of me, the eating of the body of Christ was commanded, but by the former command only the eating of bread was commanded. Which is a clear indication of our orthodoxy, which while the adversaries do not want to accede to, they are compelled not only to contradict themselves but also to seek absurdities, by which they are more and more entangled.

§. LXXXVII. It therefore remains unmoved, what we have pursued at length in the Stereoma with the last words of the command, to which Bergius has thus either become mute, or convicted indeed has deserted his opinion, but with other sought subterfuges no less, if not more absurd. Let the reader compare our Stereoma, with this Bergian apology, and he will see, that nothing, or if anything can be less than nothing, has been responded to most things; but whatever has been responded, convicts the man himself only of autokatakrito [self-condemnation], who would rather involve himself, than subscribe to the manifest truth. It is pleasing to show this by one or two examples: for if all things should be adduced, the whole Stereoma would have to be repeated. I had shown a contradiction to Bergius Stereomat. p. 99. That the scope of the sacrament (by the latter command) is defined, is our opinion. Bergius professes the same with us p. 82. who nevertheless unmindful of himself preposterously draws this to express the essence of the Holy Supper. But the end and scope of the sacrament does not pertain to the integrity of the sacrament. What does Bergius convicted of this contradiction!

He became mute, nor did he respond a word. I had shown, that it is diastron that by the words (of the latter command) describing the salutary use of the sacramental eating and drinking the preceding words of command concerning the essence of the Supper are declared: the diverse commands of Christ speak diverse things, one about the essence, the other about the scope or end of the Holy Supper. The manifest truth compelled Bergius to confess this. These are not to be confused with each other, so that one is an exposition of the other. For the essence and the end of the sacrament are most distinct, but Bergius holds these for the same. From the notation of the end of the sacrament he seeks the cause of the sacramental union of bread with body, and wine with blood of Christ. Christ describes the scope of the institution; Bergius contends that the object and form of the sacrament are explained, yet he does not dare to deny that here the end of the sacrament is described. What now does Bergius say to those things! he only involves himself, and contradicts himself. He says that the remembrance of the Lord's passion is the end of the external eating of bread, not the end of the whole Holy Supper, but the most principal and essential part. But he had confessed before, that by the words, Do this in remembrance of me, the scope and end of the whole Supper is proposed: is this not an open contradiction! The thing itself teaches, that this is ordered to be done, which they were ordered before, and which the Apostles did, who certainly were not ordered, to eat bread only, to drink wine only, nor did they only do that, but they celebrated the whole sacrament, as Christ instituted and ordered it. Now therefore the end is expressed, that they ought to do this very thing in remembrance of Christ. Therefore by these words, Do this in remembrance of me, it is not declared, what is to be done with the blessed bread and cup, which was previously indicated by clear words, but it is only inculcated anew, what was previously enjoined, so that we should frequently repeat the sacrament, and at the same time the use or end is indicated, why and to what end, this, which Christ has commanded, is to be observed so diligently. Which things we then urged in Stereoma p. 102. But Bergius could respond nothing. For the thing is evident, and too manifest. Furthermore, I had also shown pp. 108. that the nature of the sacrament does not consist in remembrance. Whatever is directed to dvá mnēsin, is not ergō anamnēsis. But this to do (touto poieite, that is, to eat, to drink sacramentally the body and blood of Christ is directed to dvamnēsin, Christ teaching. Therefore to eat and drink sacramentally the body and blood of Christ is not anamnēsis itself, or spiritual perception. Likewise: In what is the scope of the sacrament, in that the esse of the sacramental eating cannot consist. But anamnēsis is the scope of the sacrament, Bergius confessing. Therefore. in anamnēsi anamnēsei the esse of the sacramental eating cannot consist. Besides if in anamnēsei consists the true sacramental eating of the body of Christ it follows, that Matthew and Mark deliver nothing about the sacramental eating of the body of Christ! if indeed they make no mention of an-mnēseōs . If this; the aforesaid Evangelists have not described the whole substance of the Supper. Absurd. These things ibidem. To which is added the argument of Blessed Luther, Confess. de Coen: T. III. Jen. Germ. f. 473. that namely those words: This is my body, This is my blood are altogether idle, and superfluous, according to the Calvinists. If indeed it is enough for them, if they so read, Take, Eat, Take, drink, Do this in remembrance of me: for in those words the Zwinglians have their whole and entire supper, nor do they need the above said words, which are altogether useless, and superfluous according to their gloss: since they want both the matter and form and end to be included in those words Take, Eat, Drink, do this in remembrance of me spoken about the bread and wine. What therefore did it pertain to bring in those superfluous things, This is my

body, This is my blood, if they express nothing else, than that the bread and wine are a memorial of the body and blood of Christ? But what does Bergius say! He is silent to those things, and does not respond a word. He also responds so much to those things, by which we overthrew his subtleties about the miracle of eating p. 103 seq. He also responds so much to those things, by which we refuted the Sacramentarian analogy, and gloss of the essential words sophistically elicited from the words expressing the end p. 109. seqq. He also responds so much to those things, by which we discussed the argument of Bergius, that what Christ instituted for his remembrance, he instituted this properly for the spiritual eating of his body p. 111. seqq. Therefore the sacramentarian spirit fails in all these things.

§. LXXXVIII. I had shown, that to say simply about bread and wine, that they were instituted properly for spiritual perception, or as Bergius speaks, that the sacramental eating of bread is anamnēsis itself, is a manifest absurdity: if indeed bread and wine are perceived not spiritually and metaphysically, but corporeally, and properly in the Supper. How does Bergius escape this absurdity! He became mute: and when he was not able to snatch himself from the absurdity, he only fabricated another argument for me, as if I had thus concluded: Bread is not eaten spiritually. Therefore the body of Christ is eaten orally. Which conclusion never came into my mind. My argument was this: Whatever cannot be eaten spiritually, but is eaten properly and orally, that was not instituted properly by Christ for spiritual perception, and its eating is not anamnēsis itself, or spiritual perception. But bread cannot be eaten spiritually, but is eaten properly and orally (even in the Holy Supper) Therefore bread was not instituted properly by Christ for spiritual perception, and its eating is not anamnēsis itself. Which conclusion was to be opposed by Bergius. Therefore I did not want to prove our opinion about the oral eating of the body of Christ, but I convicted the Bergian opinion of absurdity, to which he was able to respond nothing here.

§. LXXXIX. After many things interposed, however, Bergius may seem to collect his spirit, lest he respond nothing at all to that absurdity about the spiritual eating of bread. He says that the bread is exhibited certainly not only to the eyes, to the mouth of the body, as sheep eat fodder, but is to be looked upon by true faith of the promise, and thus also is to be accepted in some way spiritually by the mind and faithful heart. Thus therefore Bergius, lest I say of him, that he does not want to look upon the bread with the mouth of the body (I believed that he sees it with the eyes, not with the mouth) and looks upon it with the bodily eyes, and eats it with the mouth of the body, as a sheep fodder, for the sake of the sacramentarian analogy whose foundation is the nourishment or aliment of bread. Therefore for the sake of it it is necessary that he eat it in the Holy Supper. And besides he also eats the bread Spiritually, nay the eating of bread in this sacrament is to Bergius anamnesis itself, as is clear from his words: Which he now so moderates, that he wants at least IN SOME WAY by the mouth of the soul, or by faith to eat bread, or to accept spiritually, namely insofar as the bread, by force of sacramentarian analogy, REPRESENTS to the Calvinist soul the BODY of Christ, the breaking of bread the breaking of the body on the cross, the eating of bread the eating of the body of Christ, the nourishment of bread the spiritual nourishment which the body of Christ supplies. But where did Christ command this, where did he order the bread to be eaten spiritually in some way! Give the words of the command, or confess that you do this without the command of Christ. By the word of the

prior command Eat it certainly is not commanded, because you want that to speak only, when it regards bread, about oral, natural eating. Will you therefore have recourse to the latter command; Do this in remembrance of me! But that DO THIS commands nothing new, but only inculcates the former anew. But those words IN REMEMBRANCE OF ME, or to recall the passion of Christ by memory, to be the same as to eat bread in some way spiritually, whence and from what sacred lexicon will you prove, I ask, Bergius, and will not this gloss thus come forth: Do this, that is, eat bread naturally by the bodily mouth for my remembrance, so that you may eat bread in some way spiritually? thus the natural eating of bread will be the means of the spiritual eating of bread. But it is irksome to examine those *logēmata* more inwardly.

§. LXXXIX. I had shown to Bergius the enormous vice in the argument opposed to us: Bread is instituted, for the spiritual perception of the body of Christ. Therefore only spiritually should the Body of Christ be perceived; with a similar instance given: The sacramental eating is instituted for the spiritual perception. Therefore in the Supper there is only a spiritual perception. Therefore bread is not perceived in the Supper: which it is absurd and alogon for only to be perceived spiritually. I had also added a direct response in these words altogether: Therefore let him have for himself that way of concluding, by which he argues from the simple affirmative to the exclusive, or let him acknowledge, that he concludes nothing less, than what he intends. It was to be proved, that the body of Christ is perceived in the Supper by faith alone. But it is only proved that the sacramental eating ought to be directed to the spiritual perception, from which, if that is further inferred, as it ought altogether to be inferred, that base *asyllēpsia* is committed. But here he wants to seem, to respond something, although he responds nothing at all; He says, that the exclusive is contained in his argument, in this way: The eating of bread properly, proximately, immediately is instituted for the remembrance of the body delivered for us, as its spiritual eating. Therefore not for any oral as intermediate of the body itself: or, for which eating of the body the bread in this sacred use is instituted properly and proximately, that alone is the true eating of the body of Christ in the Holy Supper. But to remembrance, or its spiritual eating this use of the Symbols is instituted properly and proximately, nor is any other end as intermediate, or properly indicated by Christ or the Apostles. But these are new arguments, in contriving which Bergius has still wearied himself, He converts into diverse forms in this *Epimetrum*, (but not that, which I was examining from the German treatise) by which themselves nevertheless he profits nothing. For it is a mere begging of the principle, that the eating of bread was instituted for the remembrance of the body of Christ delivered for us: if indeed it has now been shown, which Bergius himself also confessed, that not the eating and drinking of bread, or wine, but the whole sacred Supper was instituted for this end: Nor does this agree enough with the Calvinian opinion, that bread was instituted properly proximately, and immediately for spiritual eating: because they want the broken bread to be instituted proximately and immediately for the analogical representation of the body of Christ broken on the cross, and this then by analogical representation for the spiritual eating of the body of Christ. Nor does the conclusion of the former argument strike us: for we do not say that the eating of bread was instituted for the oral eating of the body of Christ, but that this eating of Eucharistic bread is one and the same as the eating of the body of Christ, because one sacramental thing is constituted from Eucharistic bread, and the body of Christ. But in the other argument the major proposition wavers. For why can there not be a true eating of the body of Christ in the Holy Supper, even if

bread in this sacred use was not instituted properly and proximately for it, if only it was instituted? But above all the minor is false, in which the same vice lies hidden. The use of the Symbols of bread and wine is so proximate, that they are the very metadotika means or instruments exhibitiv and communicative of the body and blood of Christ, Christ being witness, who when he exhibits bread and wine, testifies that he truly exhibits his body and blood through these symbols and the Apostle, who pronounces with a clear voice that the bread is the communication of the body of Christ, and the blessed cup is the communication of the blood of Christ. That the bread is a memorial of the body of Christ, that the wine was instituted in memory of the blood of Christ, whether it is understood to have been done proximately or remotely, whether mediately or immediately, neither Christ, nor the Apostles commemorate or testify by any little word.

§. XC. I had warned, that Bergius impudently denies those things, which were clearly commanded by Christ, while he denies that the oral perception of the body of Christ is the means of anamnesis: and I had evidently shown this in this way: Bergius concedes, that the anamnesis of Christ is the proper and proximate end; of which thing I ask, whether of the spiritual perception of the body of Christ! But he cannot say this, since he says that this is anamnesis itself. Or of the eating of bare bread! But Bergius protests against this, denying, that he leaves bare bread. Therefore we will hardly get a response from him. Wherefore let us hear Christ, who says do this, as often as you will drink for anamnesis. I conclude: Whatever we are ordered by the word do, this is the means of anamnesis, or its end is anamnesis. But by the word Do we are ordered to eat and drink sacramentally (what? except that, which is exhibited by Christ, namely the body and blood of Christ! By what organ! except the proper one of eating which is known to be of the body, and the propriety of the words proves:) Therefore the oral eating and drinking is the means of anamnēseōs . Wherefore from the words of Christ written with rays of the Sun it is clear, that here the act of faith is not noted by the word poiete , but the means is designated, making for the confirmation of faith, which is eating, and sacramental drinking, but that faith is included in the word anamnēseōs , which defines the end and scope of the sacrament. Namely the use of the Holy Supper recalls to us who are too forgetful the passion of the Lord into memory, and all the benefits acquired by the death of Christ, not through shadows, figures and significations of external Symbols, which are fitting for the old Testament, cease in the New, but through the true and real exhibition of that very body; which was delivered for us unto death, and of the blood, which was shed for us for the remission of sins, so that we may recall with a mindful mind the benefits performed by Christ, devoutly give thanks and faithfully apply them to ourselves, and seal our faith by this most certain pledge. What does Bergius say to those things? When he cannot respond, he inverts and perverts my arguments: he asks, what kind of consequences are these finally: Spiritual eating is anamnesis itself, Therefore the oral eating of the body itself is a means to that anam nēsin. Not bare bread, but also the body of Christ is exhibited in the Holy Supper. Therefore it is exhibited to be eaten by mouth for its remembrance, Spiritual bread is not eaten. Therefore the body of Christ is eaten orally for this end. Bergius, where, ever, did you read these consequences in the Stereoma! Designate the section, page, thesis, or confess, that you only cavil, not respond. Show, where through mere antithesis I suppose: Therefore the oral eating of the body of Christ was instituted for his remembrance, because it is eaten by mouth: therefore it is eaten by mouth, because it is

truly exhibited with bread, truly communicated, eaten. Where from that presupposed mode of oral eating do I argue to its anamnestic end altogether nugatorily! These are mere calumnies, and plainly deceptive cavillations. But you Bergius plainly nugatorily, and through mere begging of the principle always repeat your coccysm: that the end of the external eating of bread is anamnesis, which you neither prove by any argument, nor will ever be able to prove, nay you cannot even reconcile it with your own opinion, you who confessed before that anamnesis is not of the external eating of bread, but the scope of the whole sacramental action; and besides you said, that anamnesis is the sacramental eating itself of bread. That is also the right Sacramental eating of Bread/ and the Spiritual eating of the Body of Christ German tr. p. 83. Reconcile: Whatever is the sacramental eating itself of Eucharistic bread, that surely is not the end of the sacramental eating of bread. But anamnesis, through you, is the sacramental eating itself of Eucharistic bread. Therefore anamnesis is not the end of the sacramental eating of bread, which nevertheless you have here so lengthily contended, and through mere antithesis so often and so often inculcated.

§. XCI. Furthermore, when I have already responded to that Bergian paralogism, that here only the external visible rite was instituted for this end of the remembrance of Christ, p. 104. what does Bergius rejoin, than his coccysm, that that external visible sacramental rite of eating and drinking bread and wine was instituted for spiritual eating, or faithful remembrance: that the bread itself is a memorial of the body delivered for us and a means of salutary koinōnia , as if bread was instituted in remembrance of Christ and as a means of salvation which is fitting not to bread, but to the sacrament or Holy Supper Whether this is to respond, or to dissolve those things, which were opposed, or rather the desiderata, I leave to be judged by Bergius himself.

§. XCII. I had warned, that bread is employed here, not for supplying natural nourishment, which analogically represents the spiritual, but for the sacramental office: That the disciples were already satiated before. and the Apostle warns, if anyone is hungry, let him eat at home 1 Cor. xi. 34. but in the Supper according to the Nicene Canon, not much bread is taken, but a little, not to satiety, but to sanctification, that Eucharistic bread is not considered here in the School of Physics, according to the reason of nature and natural eating, nor in the School of Rhetoric, according to the metaphor and figurative adumbration of spiritual nutrition, but in the School of Theology, according to the sacred institution of Christ, as it is the communication of the body of Christ, and thus it is said absurdly by the analogists: therefore we receive bread in the Supper, so that we may appease bodily hunger, and thus at the same time expect spiritual refreshment. What does Bergius say! He is silent again, and only complains, that it is most calumniously fabricated against him, that he said that bread is eaten spiritually only on account of the analogy of natural to spiritual nourishment , which is common to all bread: if indeed that is to be attributed to Eucharistic bread, on account of the promise, by which it is a memorial and seal of the covenant, sanctioned by the body and blood of Christ, sealing the heavenly thing promised, and exhibiting it to the souls of the faithful. But it is manifest that analogy alone is so constituted a cause, although it is imagined to be founded in the words of Christ. But where was a promise made about bread, that as a memorial and seal of the covenant it seals the heavenly thing promised, and exhibits the same to the souls of the faithful.

Give the tablets; or the formula of this promise. That bread is a memorial of the body of Christ, if those words, This is my body, signify this, as the Calvinists contend, this is certainly no promise. For what, I ask you, does he promise, who says, that one thing signifies another, or the sign adumbrates the thing signified? But where is bread called the seal of the covenant? where is it said to seal the heavenly thing of the sacrament! Where is it said to exhibit the same, that is, to REPRESENT, to FIGURE, (for the analogy demands that) to the souls of the faithful. These are mere delusions of the Calvinian brain.

§. XCIII. I had warned, that the eating of the body of Christ in the Sacrament happens, not in remembrance of his own but of the Lord's passion, endured not in body alone, but at the same time also in soul. What does Bergius say! when he ought to respond, he only laughs, if indeed here there is no other remembrance of the passion of Christ, than of his body delivered for us. Therefore he acknowledges no passion of the soul of Christ, which altogether sustained the most grave penalties for our sake, which to deny would be the highest ingratitude, nay the destruction of our soul, which cannot be freed from penalties, except by the vicarious satisfaction of Christ. But by another argument also I had shown, that these are diverse: To be a reminder of the passion and death of the Lord, and to be a memorial of the body of Christ. The sacramental eating was instituted for the recollection and annunciation of the death of the Lord, but not for the remembrance of the body of Christ. The passion of the Lord has now passed: But the body is still substantially present and a memorial of it. Here again he rejoins nothing except sarcasm, that the remembrance of the passion cannot excite the body, which is imagined impassible in the wafer of bread. But that the body of Christ is present together with the Eucharistic bread is not our fiction, but the testamentary sanction of Christ: but the remembrance of the passion is not recalled by the body of Christ, but by the sacrament itself: Do this in remembrance of me. One thing is the sacramental act itself expressed by the word Poiete, namely the eating of that, which Christ sanctioned, who indeed does not offer bare bread to be eaten, but with bread his own body to be eaten, although it is not seen, nor in the state of glory is it now liable to passions. Which act ought to be done in remembrance of the Lord's death Another thing is the object of this act, which with bread is the body of Christ: certainly not diverse, than what was delivered unto death, and thus not some impassible body, as he cavils against our faith. But who ever said that an impassible body, excites the remembrance of the body delivered for us, or of the passion of Christ! When at last will Bergius, now close to the goal, make an end of calumnies and cavillations! When will Bergius cease to be Bergius.

## SECTION VIII. The Eighth Response from the Collation of the other Promise: This cup is the N. T. in my blood.

§. XCV. We have said more than once, that the proximate responses do nothing for the paralogue proposed in the beginning. So much however also the present one does for it. But we will follow, as we have begun Bergius. It is asked, whether the words in Paul and Luke: This is the cup of the N. T. in my blood, can in no way be explained, unless a trope is admitted?

Although indeed it may help the tropists nothing, if we grant a trope in them, provided that those words, Eat, This is my body: Drink, This is my blood of the N. T. are free from trope: yet out of abundance following in the footsteps of certain Theologians, I taught that not even in those words is a trope to be necessarily conceded, about which one can read at length in Stereoma p. 171. Bergius only puts forth cavils, according to his custom, in which arena let it be absent, that I contend to conquer, I willingly leave the little laurel in the mustard to Bergius seeking it. Who when he cannot respond here, then relegates me to the Dialecticians, then to the Rhetoricians, namely because in the Dialectic of Bergius it is equally treated of tropes, as in Rhetorics. But he wonders if the blood of Christ is not properly the covenant, or New Testament, how either the cup, or what is contained in the cup, is exhibited, is drawn, can properly be called the N. T.! But he will cease to wonder, if he will have considered that in the cup is contained blessed wine, which is the communication of the blood of Christ, nor only blood, but with and under the blessed wine is drawn, which sacramental drinking with sacramental eating is the covenant, which is thus sanctioned on our part, and sealed, just as by the shedding of blood on the altar of the cross, the covenant was sanctioned with respect to God.

§. XCVI. But Bergius thinks it sufficient for himself, that I assert, that the cup not by reason of its substance, but in its use, or proper sacramental office, when in the Holy Supper it is drunk from this cup, is the New Testament, or covenant with God; as, which is thus sanctioned and confirmed on our part; and thus is the new covenant APPLIED TO US, or the application of the New covenant made to us: which having been done the cup is properly said to be with the blood, or on account of the blood the New Testament by predication of the sacramental fruit concerning the sacrament, just as Baptism is properly the stipulation of a good conscience 1 Pet. III. 21. Circumcision is called the covenant, Gen. XVII. 18. He wants to congratulate himself in vain, if these things properly said without figure are proved; for thus equally the sacramental sense itself of Bergius will be proper. For the reason of the Bergian sacramental sense is far different, as which cannot have place without trope, and indeed such, by which from the substance of the Holy Supper the kernel itself, the body and blood of the Lord, is taken away, and in its place only a figure of the body and blood of the Lord is left. But here when the fruit of the sacrament is predicated, nothing is derogated from the substance of the sacrament: and therefore, supposing, that some trope is to be admitted; yet by it nothing falls away from the sacrament, nay rather the dignity of the sacrament is celebrated by that very thing, that the sacramental action is not only a testimony of confederation, but the confederation itself with God. Although, as I showed in Stereom., without trope the sacramental action can be called our confederation in the Holy Supper, as also Baptism the stipulation of a good conscience with God. Nor has Bergius shown, that anything obstructs nor do I see, why I should here depart from the opinion of other Theologians, not admitting a trope.

§. XCVII. But to the argument of Bergius, which he alone urges here if that, which is exhibited sacramentally by force of this promise in the cup with wine, is drunk not by the mouth of the body, but only spiritually, certainly neither is that, which is exhibited sacramentally in and with bread, eaten by the mouth of the body, but only spiritually eaten: But the former is true; which when we deny, Bergius proves in two ways. The first proof sounds thus. The New Testament in the blood of Christ is not properly drunk by the mouth of the body, but is accepted by faith alone:



But this cup, or that, which is exhibited by this cup in and with wine is the New Testament in the blood of Christ. Therefore this cup, or that, which is exhibited by this cup in and with wine is not drunk by the mouth of the body. Resp. This argument, to which Bergius attributes much, is merely sophistic. First, the major proposition, if it speaks not of the goods of the N. T. but of the sanction itself of the new Testament, surely the New Testament as it is sanctioned by the communication of the blood of Christ, is not only to be accepted by faith, but there is also need of the participation instituted by Christ, which is the sacramental drinking itself. Then indeed the minor proposition is false. For neither is the cup called the New Testament in the blood of Christ, but the cup in the blood of Christ, or insofar as it supplies the blood of Christ, the New Testament is indicated, as I taught in Stereoma p. 176. nor also is that, which is exhibited in the cup with wine the New Testament in the blood of Christ: but it is the blood itself. For what else is exhibited with wine in the cup, than the blood of Christ, when the cup is the communication of the blood of Christ? The cup is indeed said in its sacramental office, insofar as it is drunk by us, through and on account of the blood of Christ, which it exhibits to us, to be the New Testament. But that, which is exhibited in the cup with wine, to be called the New Testament, whence will it be proved! Similarly, when Bergius endeavors to conclude a little more closely, in this way; This which Christ gave in the cup, is drunk by mouth; This, which he gave in the cup is the New Testament. Therefore He ordered the New Testament to be drunk by mouth. If I wanted to respond *kata anthrōpon*, I would say, that the genus of predicating is changed, that there are more terms in the Syllogism, than was proper, as Bergius responded above: but the falsity of the Minor is in the open. For not this which he gave in the Cup, did Christ say to be the New Testament, whether only wine is understood to have been given, or his blood with wine, but he said that the cup constituted in its proper office is the New Testament, or the sanction of the new covenant made with us, because on our part confederation happens by this very Sacramental drinking, which is nothing other, than the application of the divine covenant sanctioned by the shedding of blood MADE TO US.

§. XCVIII. Therefore there is no need, that we deliberate with ghosts and specters, what is to be responded to the argument of Bergius, whose minor is most false, and has already been convicted of falsity in the Stereoma, to which here again Bergius was able to rejoin nothing, perhaps because he was destitute of the nocturnal monitor comrade of Zwingli, We never had such comrades or monitors, which the Sacramentarians hold in esteem with their Patriarchs, as long as they still defend their suggestions, and leave a place for them. Nor is it necessary, that I have recourse to that, so that I may say that the phrase of Paul does not in all things equipollent with the proposition of Matthew: which was said and shown about another argument Summar. Confut. disp. 1. §. 35. but by no means, when the present argument is expedited. But it pleased Bergius to repeat that, but a little changed, since he was warned Summar. Confut. l.c. about the vicious form, which is his other proof. Whoever are made partakers of the blood of the New Testament in reality, they by that very thing are also made partakers of the New Testament sanctioned by blood in word and sacraments applied. But no unbelievers by oral drinking are made partakers of the New Testament in blood. Therefore, He could have had the Response from Summ. Confutat., that the Major is denied by us. But he says this is a begging of the principle. Most ineptly. If in this way you can prove the major proposition, when the same is denied to you, where namely you will only have rejoined, that it is a begging of the principle,

what will you not prove? I would say, that there is nothing inside the olive, nothing outside in the nut is hard, which you could not overcome. But the boys of the Dialecticians will chastise you Bergius, that a begging of the principle is not committed, except when the same thing is proved through the same, or the doubtful through the equally doubtful. But when I desire from you the proof of some proposition, I do not prove the same through the same, but I want the doubtful to be proved, which when you do not perform, but only rejoin the same proposition as certain, what is more certain, than that you yourself commit only a begging of the principle!

§. XCIX. But I had taught moreover from your confession, that unbelievers although not partakers of the N.T. in reality, yet are to be said partakers of the blood of the N. T. Bergius confesses, that the Body/ and the Blood of Christ belong to the Substance of the Supper p. 77. Therefore by what forehead will he deny, that unbelievers perceive the body and blood of Christ, when they perceive the sacrament? Do not those who perceive the sacrament itself perceive the substance of the sacrament! But it is a mere begging of the principle, when Bergius brings forth the major proposition, which contains the *krinomenon*, without proof, and where proof was desired, adduces nothing else, except the same proposition, which he was bound to prove, except that besides the Sophist makes sport for us with the little word really, who are really partakers of the blood of the N.T.; because he is accustomed to distinguish between the sacrament, and the thing itself, and thus between the sacrament or sign of blood, and the blood of Christ itself as the thing signified: whence indeed he grants that the unworthy participate in the blood of Christ sacramentally or signally: But he denies that they participate in the same in reality, which to him is the very *krinomenon*, only figured in other words. But he professes with Irenaeus that the sacrament consists of an earthly and heavenly thing as far as substance: We agree about the substance/ that there is a twofold Food in this Supper/ *res terrena & coelestis*, as Irenaeus calls it/ the Earthly and Heavenly: When therefore they participate in the substance of the Holy Supper, who enjoy the Holy Supper, nor is the Supper of the unworthy, as far as substance, other than that of the faithful, unless perhaps the Calvinist distributes another to his absolutely elect, than to the rest, or since they themselves cannot discern them, the God of the Calvinists distributes only to his absolutely elect a Supper of such a kind; which exhibits the whole substance the earthly and heavenly thing, but to the rest only the earthly thing: whence that dissension of God, and of the ministers, about which Beza against Castellio to the 10th argument. p. 398. that the ministers contend that the whole Supper is dispensed to all, even to those, whom they do not know do not pertain to the flock of the Lord. Bergius indeed says, that to all communicants, and to each one is offered both the earthly and heavenly thing, which is offered to all and each one of the Communicants/ but the pretense is not recent in the School of Calvin, which Piscator calls, the will of the sign, which is commonly said to others, that grace is offered to many in the promise, to whom meanwhile he has decided by no means to give the same, as the institution of Calvin has it I. III. c. xxiv. sect. XII. and how can saving grace, or salvific food be said to be seriously offered to those, whom by absolute decree, by election to grace he passed over, as Bergius teaches about the reprobate, that they indeed were not reprobated by absolute decree, yet were passed over, in the election of grace, as far as saving grace. But if with the earthly thing he equally offers the heavenly to all and each communicant, with bread the body of Christ, with wine the blood of Christ i.e. the whole substance of the Holy Supper, which Christ also testified in express words, Eat, This is my body, Drink, this is my

blood, surely not only the faithful, but also the unbelieving communicants receive with bread the body of the Lord, with wine the blood of the Lord. Which if Christ dispenses there to all communicants, to be eaten and drunk, it is certain that by force of those words, Eat, This is my body, Drink, This is my blood, all participate. Just as faith does not make the whole sacrament, but the institution of Christ, so unbelief cannot take away the integrity of the Sacrament. Will the unbelief of men make void the faith or truth of God! Rom. III. 3. the unbelieving unworthily approaching are guilty not only of the sign of the body of Christ, but they become guilty of the very body of Christ itself, and indeed by eating unworthily, not by rejecting, as the Apostle teaches expressly, constituting the guilt in the unworthy eating itself, but not in the rejection of the object set forth in the Holy Supper, to which Bergius therefore openly contradicts, when he places the guilt not in the eating itself, but in the rejection of the body of Christ.

§. C. But Bergius urges: thus plainly diverse promises are fabricated for the Evangelists and the Apostle: That only the faithful are made partakers of the N. T. in blood, from the promise in Luke and Paul; that all, even unbelievers are made partakers of the blood of the Testament itself from the promise in Matthew and Mark. Than which he declaims that nothing more contumelious can be said, he also proclaims us falsifiers of the divine Testament, Resp. is it therefore a contumely in the Testament of the Son of God, and a falsification of the same, when two diverse promises about the same Sacrament or Testament are said to be consigned by the holy notaries, one concerning the substance, the other the fruit of the sacrament: when indeed Matthew and Mark expressly denominated the blood of Christ the heavenly matter, according to our opinion, while they said, Drink This is my blood: but Luke and Paul at the same time with the heavenly matter more expressly defined the end, This cup is the New Testament in My Blood, which is shed for you: because the blood in and with the cup, which itself on account of the blood, which it exhibits, is said to be shed for us, is the heavenly matter; but that the New covenant is thus sanctioned with us in the blood of Christ exhibited to us with the cup, pertains to the fruit and efficacy of the sacrament: which was not omitted even by Matthew or Mark, but by that very thing signified, when they thus report the words of Christ, Drink, This is my blood of the NEW TESTAMENT. Bergius, your faith, is there here even a shadow of falsification, or contumely! Is it not rather a contumely to the Testator, a falsification is brought in for his Testament, when one promise is imagined from two diverse ones, substance is confused with fruit, so that in place of the truth of the blood of Christ its bare sign may be brought in?

§. CI. Although in this also a contumely is brought in for Luke and Paul, that only the faithful from the promise in Luke and Paul are said to be made partakers of the New Testament or covenant in blood. For from that promise and by force of the same all, not only the faithful, ought to be made partakers, so that they may be made, the blood of Christ is offered to them in the promise, Bergius confessing, nay by force of the promise in Luke and Paul that drinking of the Eucharistic cup is the sanction itself of the New Testament through the blood of Christ, which it offers to be drunk with wine, and sealing, which Christ intends for all, to whom he offers his blood to be drunk with blessed wine, although in act only those are made partakers of the same, who approach with true faith. Therefore not from the promise are only the faithful made partakers, but that they are made partakers, is to be attributed to the promise of Christ,

apprehended by faith, which others are not made, its fault is not situated in the promise of Christ, but in their unbelief.

§. CII. Therefore the argument of Bergius drawn from the undoubted equipollence of the promise is not most firm, but most infirm, when he thus concludes: Whoever according to the promise of Christ in Matthew and Mark are made partakers in reality of the blood of the N.T., they equally are made partakers of the New Testament in blood, according to the same promise in Luke and Paul. But no unbelievers, but only the faithful drinking from this cup are made partakers of the New Testament. Therefore, Namely Bergius deceives and is deceived by the equipollence of promise, since he wants it to be not only one promise, which in truth is not one, but twofold; then concerning the substance of the sacrament, then the efficacy: For the participation of the covenant of grace, and of its benefits to pertain to the end and efficacy of the sacrament, the body and blood of Christ to the substance of the Holy Supper can be denied by no appearance of truth. Therefore indeed Matthew and Mark include both, but the efficacy is more clearly set forth by the sacramental proposition, as it is repeated in Luke and Paul. Which two things are most wickedly confused by Bergius. Namely, those things which equipollent in a certain way, he holds for simply equipollent, because from propositions either actually, or virtually two he makes simply one: Just as if I concluded thus: Whoever are made partakers of the sacrament of baptism of regeneration, they are also made partakers of regeneration. But hypocrites are not made partakers of regeneration. Therefore neither are they made partakers of the Baptism of the sacrament of regeneration. Whoever are made partakers of the word, which is spirit and life, they are also made partakers of the Spirit and life. But the impious, and impenitent are not partakers of the Spirit and life. Therefore neither of the word, which is Spirit and life. Then indeed that participation is either regarded with respect to the divine intention, and also the efficacy of the sacraments, and in the divided act, as they say: or with respect to the actual enjoyment, and in the composed act. In the former respect indeed, whoever are of the blood of the New Testament, they are also made partakers of the New Testament itself, as much as is in God, or as far as pertains to the divine intention, and the efficacy itself of the sacrament in itself, which is of such power, that it can render all partakers of the benefits of the covenant of grace, not restricted to a few from the decree of God, but destined for all. But that they do not actually enjoy those benefits, that is not to be attributed to the defect, or absence of the heavenly thing of the blood of Christ, but of the applicatory means of the benefits, which are offered with the blood of the New Testament, that is, of true faith.

§. CIII. Bergius adds another argument: If by the blood of Christ not only the substance of the blood liquor, as it is in the body of Christ, but as the blood of the sacrifice for sins together with life and soul poured out as the one and only ransom of souls, and by that very thing the blood of the Testament is denoted, certainly there is no participation, or communion of the blood of Christ, without the pouring out of the sacrifice itself, nor without the Testament and covenant sanctioned by that pouring out, nor finally without the communion of the life and Spirit of Christ himself. But the former is true. Therefore also the latter. He proves the consequence both from the Physical union of soul and blood in the living body, and because through the pouring out of blood on the cross the life itself and soul of Christ was poured out together, but was resumed by resurrection, so that by the power and merit of the pouring out we may become partakers of the

resuscitated life and Spirit. But the assumption partly, because it is plainly contradictory, that the blood of Christ should be taken separately according to the substance alone, partly because never and nowhere does the blood of Christ denote the substance of the blood liquor alone. Resp. by denying both propositions. As for the Major, even if the blood of Christ were denoted as the blood of the sacrifice poured out together with life and soul, yet the sacramental participation or communion of blood could happen without the spiritual communion of the sacrifice, Testament and life and Spirit of Christ: because the sacramental participation depends solely on the institution of Christ. Therefore not the physical union of soul and blood in the living body, but the testamentary disposition of Christ is to be regarded here, nor are things to be defined from Physics, but from the tables of institution, which certainly was not made according to Physics. Therefore there is no consequence, that those things which are physically united, are also exhibited united in the Sacrament: For thus with the Eucharistic bread not only the body of Christ, but because the body is not physically without blood, also the blood of Christ would be exhibited sacramentally, which is opposed to the institution of Christ. Therefore it proceeds illogically from the physical union to the sacramental, which transcends all Physics. Nor does the pouring out of the life of Christ made with blood on the cross pertain to the matter: because the reason of the blood of Christ is one, as it is regarded as a sacrifice, another, as it is exhibited in the Sacrament, which the Calvinists always confuse. As a sacrifice the blood was offered to God to expiate sins. But in the sacrament it is not offered to God, but is supplied to us by God, not to acquire, but to apply the remission of sins. Therefore not whatever pertains to the reason of the sacrifice, is also supplied in the sacrament or because through the pouring out of blood the soul of Christ was also poured out, with the Eucharistic cup the soul is also supplied. To the sacrifice of Christ pertains especially the death of Christ, as one who delivered himself for us as a sacrifice Eph. V. 2: pertains not only the blood poured out for us, but also the body of Christ delivered for us not only the passions of the Body, but also the passions endured in the soul: not only the external passions, but also the internal, and thus the very passions and infernal torments; not only the human nature, but also the person of the Son of God, and his divine nature: because the sacrifice of a mere man could not expiate sin: therefore God poured out his own blood for us, the Son of God was made our propitiation. But will you say, that all these things are exhibited in the sacrament with the Eucharistic wine, which is the communication of the blood of Christ, for this reason, because the blood is regarded as a sacrifice, and indeed by sacramental exhibition, and thus to be united with the blessed wine! Will you say that not only the blood of Christ, but also the body of Christ, not only the blood and body, but also the soul are united: not only the human, but also the divine nature, the passion and death of the Son of God himself, the infernal torments, which he sustained, are united with the Eucharistic wine. Which if it is not Papistic concomitance, certainly it is Zwinglian; far worse than Papistic: since the Papistic still leaves the substantial presence of the body of Christ, but this so joins the blood to the body, that it takes away both from the Holy Supper: it may want those things to be represented to our faith objectively both separately and conjointly, but it denies that they are really present in the Holy Eucharist, nor does it confine them except to a certain place in heaven; which objective presence also has a place, if the blood of Christ is by no means denied, or called into doubt, as Edmund Your Albertinus believes that the blood of Christ is exhibited to him in the Holy Supper, even if he does not believe, that Christ now has blood. The Calvinists believe in such a true and real presence! In which way Bergius will not deny, that the faithful of

the Old Testament had the blood of Christ truly and really, before the blood of the Son of God yet existed, who nevertheless with great imagination declaims, that he believes in the true and real presence of the blood of Christ in the Holy Supper, he also protests about injury, if he is pronounced to deny the same.

§. CIV. But so that we may respond to the arguments of the assumption, how, I ask you, is it proved, that absurdly and plainly illogically, the participation or communication of the blood of Christ is established according to the substance alone of the blood body taken separately by a certain and oral drinking of it from the cup! Which indeed the very words of Christ, as they sound, import: Drink, this is my blood: For he does not say, this is the pouring out of my blood, as Bergius following the Socinians, interprets, not, this is my blood, with my soul and spirit, but simply, this is my blood. He brings forth two arguments. First, that it is plainly contradictory, that blood, since it exists nowhere separately outside or on this side of the body, neither physically, nor hyperphysically, should be exhibited to be drunk separately in the cup. But this is begging the question. For that the blood of Christ is present in and under the Eucharistic wine, but not the body of Christ, as, which is supplied in and with the Eucharistic bread, indeed not physically and naturally, but hyperphysically, and by force of the sacramental ordination of Christ, we holy believe Christ asserting, although our infirmity cannot explain the mode or perceive, which indeed we leave to the wisdom and power of Christ the divine Testator. But this is, what the Calvinists deny, and in which the state of the controversy consists. Therefore that is brought forth for an argument of proof: What is this, except a mere begging of the principle? Then indeed, even if elsewhere outside the sacrament blood does not exist separately, does it therefore not able to be supplied separately in the sacrament! Will you Bergius set a limit to the divine power and wisdom! But if you believed that divine majesty and omnipotence was communicated to the flesh of Christ, together with the divine wisdom of the Son of God, it would be a religious scruple for you, I believe, to deny that the flesh of Christ can present itself, where and how it wishes firmly and immovably by force of its infinite power; the first pseudos therefore of that denial is the evacuation of the mystery of the personal union derived from the School of Nestorius into the School of Calvin.

§. CV. But here I would like Bergius to explain to me, when he wants to seem to believe in the real presence of the blood of Christ in the Holy Supper, if with the blood of Christ his pouring out is to be participated in as exhibited, how the pouring out of the blood of Christ and the sacrifice or oblation is really present in the Holy Supper: or do the Calvinists really pour out the blood of Christ in the Holy Supper, and thus anew: for otherwise there will be no real pouring out, which passed long ago. And is the sacrifice and oblation made in the Holy Supper truly and really, and indeed lest they completely accede to the Papists, not an unbloody sacrifice, but a bloody one. Certainly, where the blood of Christ really is, insofar as it is poured out for us, there a sacrifice happens. But in the Supper, according to you, the blood of Christ really is, insofar as it is poured out for us. Therefore in the Supper a sacrifice happens. Which argument opposed to you in the Summary confutation, because you were not able to dissolve, you skipped over with dry foot. Explain also to me, please, how with the blessed wine you receive not only the blood, but also the life and soul poured out in death, resumed in resurrection? If you say that it is presented objectively and representatively, and received by the faithful soul, therefore the POURING OUT

of the blood of Christ will be represented by the INFUSION of wine into the Cup, not only the POURING OUT of the blood of Christ, which has hitherto been your representative analogy, through which you wanted to present the blood of Christ present to you, namely through the INFUSION of wine the POURING OUT of blood, as through the BREAKING of bread the BREAKING of the body of Christ (although that infusion, rather than pouring out of blood is adumbrated) but also the POURING OUT of the life and soul of Christ, indeed also the RESUMPTION of life and soul made in the resurrection. What kind of analogy of wine with blood is here, what kind of similitude, and in what it is fixed, so that all those things are represented by the same, Bergius will be able to meditate with himself, so that he may also explain to us this new mystery of the Calvinian religion. But if the blood of Christ is really presented, how at the same time and once the blood poured out and the blood existing in the living body (they do not believe it resumed, nay some say rather impiously, that it rotted on the altar of the cross, as is clear from Job Cramer in Enchir. ubiqut. part: 1. f. 158. Cureus in Exegesis, Perkins in Cathol. Reform. contr 10. Erasmus in Gründlichem Bericht on the words of Christ p. 29. Sadeele in indic. error. Valent. indeed also from Calvin in c. XXVI. Matth. and also Edmund Yours previously adduced) how at the same time and once life and soul poured out, and life and soul resumed will be really present! This likewise we leave to be explained to the acumen of Bergius. Furthermore, how can the blood of Christ poured out for us be really presented as present in the Holy Eucharist, when that Blood is no longer in the nature of things, according to the Calvinists? For that blood, says Edmund l. c. on the sacr. Eucharist. ch. XXIX. p. 207. which was poured out in the passion and fell to the earth, remained in it and mixed or resolved with other things, is not the same in number with that, which is IMAGINED to be in the Eucharist, but only in species. Finally, let him also consider, from which words of institution he may want to sculpt those things: certainly in those, Drink, this is my blood of the New Testament nothing about life, nothing about the soul of Christ, nothing about his resurrection to be had, he who will deign to look at the words of Christ even with only the left eye, with Victorinus Strigelius, will see. But let him deliberate with himself, or with the senate of wiser Calvinists, whether he has other things about the sacramental presence of the blood of Christ, and where at last those things are had.

§. CVI. It could also be advised, in what way he establishes life and the soul of Christ, the true and only ransom of souls, by no means leaving this eulogy to the blood of Christ, as the words present themselves: since everywhere scripture presents the blood as ransom and price of redemption to us. Or if this is left to the blood of Christ, whether perhaps he has only that blood, with which the life and soul of Christ was poured out, for ransom? in which way the blood poured out in circumcision, in agony at the Mount of Olives, in scourging, in the imposition of the crown of thorns, in the transfixion of hands and feet will not be held for ransom and redemptory blood: But here we permit Bergius to be the interpreter of his own words.

§. CVII. The other argument, that the blood neither Here, nor anywhere else in the scriptures denotes only the substance per se of the blood liquor, as it is in the body of Christ, but as the blood of the sacrifice for sins poured out together with life and soul, partly begs the principle: because that very thing is to be proved, that HERE it does not note the substance of the blood liquor per se: which indeed Christ indicates to be noted, when exhibiting bread blessed

separately, he testifies that with it his body, but separately with blessed wine his blood to be exhibited: partly it is refuted by clear instances. For is not the substance of the blood liquor noted, when Christ is said to be made partaker of flesh and blood, just as the children Heb. II. 14. where certainly by blood is not understood the sacrifice for sins, unless Bergius wants to attribute that also to children, see also Matth. XXVII, 4. 24. 25. If you say, that nowhere and never in word and sacraments, as to the substance of the liquor alone, but as blood poured out it is proposed, again you will beg the principle: because about this, whether here only in the sacrament, as to the substance of the liquor it is proposed, is the question: certainly the words of Christ do not say that the blood is exhibited here, INsofar as it was poured out: they only say that that blood, which was poured out for us, is exhibited and they openly distinguish it from the body of Christ exhibited under a distinct symbol in the first part of the Supper, which it is right, and pious to adhere to. If therefore the blood of Christ were proposed in such a way never elsewhere in word and sacraments, it is to be thought, that here a peculiar sacrament distinct from the rest is instituted, and it is to be estimated from the very tables of institution, but not from other sacraments, since each one has its own peculiar seat. Which when it happens, it is plainly illogical if Bergius still says that it happens for this reason, because such a communication of the blood of Christ appears absurd and contradictory to reason, let him see, lest he prefer his reason to Christ, and place the ass upon Christ, as Luther speaks, not Christ upon the ass.

§. CVIII. Moreover, we have elsewhere diluted the contradiction, which Bergius here imagines, how the body of Christ is exhibited separately from blood in the Holy Supper. We establish no Physical separation, but we believe that the blood of Christ is physically united to his body, so that no separation can now be made: meanwhile to derogate faith from the words of Christ exhibiting his body separately with bread, his blood with wine, is a religious scruple for us. But we advise Bergius, let him learn to distinguish between the physical union of the body and blood of Christ: and the mystical, and sacramental union of the body of Christ with the blessed bread, which depends not on the natural union, but on the institution of Christ. But what will Bergius say here about his Edmund, who book on the Eucharist. c. XX. f. 24. has these things: Secondly this is clear from this, that here it is a question of the bloodless body. For in the words of the Cup it is expressly said, This is, my blood, which is poured out for many, (that is, will be poured out) for the remission of sins From which it is evidently gathered, that in the former proposition a body emptied and destitute of its blood is designated. But a body bloodless through death, is nothing other than a corpse. Whence also the Lord himself speaking about the very body was saying: Wherever the body will be, there the eagles will be gathered together: properly designating a corpse by body. These things Edmund, who not only says that the body and blood are supplied by separate sacramental exhibition, but a body emptied and destitute of its blood, a bloodless body, a mere corpse, properly so called. Will you accuse him with better right of the separation of blood from body! But whether he is going to excuse or approve the impiety of this his ally and defender, or accuse it, certainly such a thing cannot be imputed to us, who imagine no real, much less local separation of blood, much less do we bring in a bloodless body, or corpse, we only believe a sacramental exhibition.



## SECTION IX. The ninth Response from the breaking of bread.

§. CIX. Bergius now also fetches the breaking of bread to destroy his own paralogism. As it does not follow: This which Christ broke and gave, is the body of Christ. Therefore also the body of Christ is broken in the Supper, so neither that. Therefore it is eaten by mouth. Because in both places, the same reason of consequence, from the corporeal and natural breaking and eating of the earthly thing as a sign, to the corporeal breaking and eating of the heavenly thing signified. But the reason is also most disparate here, because this which Christ gave to be eaten with the Eucharistic bread, he gave to be eaten by mouth, by force of the word of command Eat: which he testified to be his own body. But where did Christ testify that with the Eucharistic bread he broke his body! The Calvinists perhaps dream this in their analogical Supper, but Christ taught it by no jot: He did not say, I say, Break, This which is broken, is my body. But eat, this (which is eaten) is my body. Therefore that solution is merely sophistic, but not our argumentation.

§. CX. And indeed Bergius himself acknowledges here, that the reason of breaking and eating is disparate. But, he says, lest Calovius here object that breaking is only a preparatory action, antecedent, but the sacramental union consists only in the giving itself and simultaneous taking. For this WE ALSO WILLINGLY CONCEDE. Which confession of Bergius is to be well observed, and opposed to others who deny that the breaking of bread is only a preparatory, and antecedent action, and make it either an essential, or integral part of the Holy Supper. Whence he is also compelled to acknowledge now, that the reason of the consequence is disparate, and thus that syncrisis is Sophistic. But he excepts: that breaking was conjoined with the distribution itself at the same moment, nay and was posterior to the promise pronounced at least as to some disciples: and thus not only after the antecedent breaking, but during the breaking itself the body of Christ was. I respond: Although breaking was conjoined with the distribution itself, which indeed who will admit to have been done AT THE SAME MOMENT: If indeed a tract of time, however long it was, intervened: yet not in the breaking, but in the distribution, in the giving and taking the body of Christ was sacramentally present. Because the sacramental union does not have place outside of use, but in use: whether therefore the breaking preceded the pronounciation of the promise, or was conjoined with the same, or even followed it, this does nothing for the sacramental union, which is not bound to that pronounciation, or depends on the moment of pronounciation, but as it has the words of promise, joined to the words of command, it regards the use of the sacrament, consisting in giving and taking: outside of which no union, or sacramental communion is to be asserted. Nor however are we persuaded, that Christ in the Calvinian manner broke off or broke a morsel of bread for each one, and when he was breaking bread with the first disciple in the order of the disciples, said, This is my body, which is delivered for you, so that thus breaking was posterior to the promise pronounced, at least as to some. From what tradition Bergius has this who asserts it so confidently, let him himself consider. To us it is certain to do nothing for the matter, while it is agreed, which here he confesses to admit, that the sacramental union consists only in the giving itself and simultaneous taking. But the Apostle when he says, that the bread, which we break, is the communion of the body of Christ, speaks about that very distribution, as, which is accustomed to come under the name of

breaking. Is. LIX. 7. nor if by breaking the separation into particles is understood does he teach that in the breaking itself there is communion, as Bergius thinks: he only testifies that the bread, which we break, is the communion of the body of Christ, because with bread the body of Christ is communicated. Not in breaking, but in distribution and perception of bread is the communion of the body of Christ, to which breaking is only a certain preparation, Bergius confessing.

§. CXI. He gives another instance of syncrisis: This which is given, which is eaten by mouth, is also broken by teeth, Therefore the body of Christ is properly broken by teeth: But it does nothing to the matter. For we thus conclude: that which is supplied with the Eucharistic bread, is to be eaten by mouth: But the body of Christ is that, which is supplied with the Eucharistic bread. Therefore the body of Christ is to be eaten by mouth. Therefore the instance, if it ought to square, will be this: that which is given with the Eucharistic bread, is also broken by teeth: which proposition Bergius will therefore be bound to prove. For we deny the same, if indeed it is not at once required for eating, that the food be broken by the teeth of those eating, otherwise infants and any toothless ones will never eat. In sum, about breaking and contrition, which happens to teeth supernaturally, insensibly, impassibly, and thus properly is no more absurd, than when the body of Christ is said to be thus eaten by mouth, we remit to the author Bergius: that the body of Christ is ground by teeth, is nowhere taught in Holy Scripture, nay it is denied against the Capernaïtes John VI. But that the body of Christ is to be eaten by mouth is manifest from the words of institution, if they are taken in a simple and native sense, although the mode of that eating happens supernaturally, not naturally, insensibly, as far as we are concerned, impassibly as far as the object of eating is concerned, as also impartibly which: we are not surprised that it seems absurd to foolish reason, nor do we care, because the foolishness of God is wiser than men. the Judge being the Apostle 1 Cor. 1. 25.

§. CXII. But Bergius in vain and rashly exagitates the bread, which our Churches use, by invective, of course according to his fraternal affection towards the same. As if we had devised the same such, which does not need to be broken by tooth, but liquefies of its own accord, lest the body of Christ be broken by tooth. Bergius knows this as well as his fingers, that our Churches never had that mind, that when bread is broken and ground by teeth, the body of Christ is also broken by teeth, nor for that reason, but for more convenient use the small round cakes, or bread is used, which our Churches did not introduce, or devise, but ancient Churches already used, Epiphanius being witness in Ancorato. But what Blessed Luther asserted with Chrysostom, Augustine and others, Confess: Major., that whatever is said of bread, the same on account of the sacramental union, is rightly said of the body, as, that it is broken, ground by tongue, teeth, is to be taken from his mind and that of the Ancients. Namely the substance itself of the body of Christ is not broken, or ground by teeth, but such things are predicated of the body of Christ, as it is united to the Eucharistic bread, because they are proper to the bread, with which the body of Christ is united, as it is said of the cup, that it was poured out for us on account of the blood, which is exhibited in and with the cup, of which that is proper. Blessed Luther did not approve transubstantiation, when he defended the confession prescribed by Pope Nicholas to Berengarius Confess. de Can. T. III. Jen. f. 487. but the substantial presence of the body of Christ in the Holy Supper, For it is the Meaning/ that/ whoever eats this Bread/ and bites/ he eats and bites that/ which is the right true Body of Christ/ and not simply bare

Bread/ as Wycliffe teaches. He did not establish that the substance itself of the body of Christ is ground, nor yet only sacramentally in the Zwinglian sense, which Bergius here insinuates, that is only Signly of the body of Christ, or of bread alone, but of bread kat' auto and per se, of the body of Christ kat' allo, and on account of the union with bread: Whoever touches this Bread/ he touches the Body of Christ/ and whoever eats this Bread/ he eats the body of Christ/ whoever crushes this Bread with Teeth or Tongue/ he crushes with Teeth or Tongue the Body of Christ/ and yet it always remains true/ that no one sees the Body of Christ/ touches/ eats or bites/ as one visibly sees or bites other Flesh/ for what is done to Bread/ is so attributed to the Body of Christ/ on account of the Sacramental Unity.

§. CXIII. But he has, what Bergius may here require; Namely he wants, that Lutherans confess at least this, that the body of Christ is eaten by mouth in no other sense, than in which it can be said to be seen by eyes, touched by hands, broken by teeth, so that we will acknowledge that they are said just as improperly, as when nothing of these happens in the body itself, but properly only in the signs alone, Resp. Luther does not admit that these are said improperly of the body of Christ, but as it is said properly of God, that he suffered, died, by force of the personal union, although it is proper to the human nature, not to the divine to suffer, to die, so it is said properly of the body of Christ, that it is seen by eyes, broken by teeth, when the bread, to which it is united, is seen, or ground by teeth, by force of the sacramental union. His opinion is clear from the collation of the personal union with the sacramental, and also of the union of the dove and the Holy Spirit, of the Angels with the assumed form, on account of which the things that are of the humanity, are said of the Son of GOD, and it is said only of John, that he saw the Holy Spirit, when he saw the dove, of Abraham and Lot, that they saw angels, heard them, when they appeared, and spoke in bodily form, about which Blessed Luther acts there at length.

§. CXIV. Nor is the mind of Chrysostom, or Augustine other, from whose opinion if this controversy is to be settled, it will be all over for Zwinglian tropes, and the Lutheran truth about the substantial presence and oral eating of the body of Christ will certainly prevail. For they pronounce deictic that the body of Christ is not improperly, and only in sign received or eaten, but that it is present by its substance, and is truly received and eaten by the mouth of the body. From innumerable places of Chrysostom it will suffice to have noted here some, which more nearly pertain to this matter. So that not only, says Chrysostom homil. XLV. in Joh. through love, but in reality we may be converted into that flesh, this is effected through the food, which he has bestowed upon us. For when he wanted to indicate his love towards us, he implicated himself with us through his body, and immixed his body into us, so that we might be one thing, just as the body is united to the head. For this is most of all of lovers. Who here will deny that the real presence of the body of Christ is indicated, when not only through love, but IN REALITY we are converted into that flesh, the body of Christ is mixed with us, and we are made one thing with him, as lovers would desire to be filled even with the flesh of those, whom they love: just as he adds about the Servants of Job. ch. XXXI. from love saying. Who would grant to us, that we might be filled with his flesh! But the things which follow are still clearer. What Christ did, so that he might bind us with greater charity, and so that he might show his desire towards us, permitting himself not only to be seen, but to be touched, and to be eaten, and his teeth to be fixed in his flesh, and to fill all with his desire. Parents often gave their children to others to be

nourished. But I nourish from my flesh, I exhibit myself here etc. To which things written by the rays of the Sun when Edmund Albertinus despaired of a response in the former he devised hyperbolic expressions; in the latter he thought that the knot, which he could not loosen, had to be cut, pronouncing those things to be empty of good sense, about the Eucharist p. 545.

§. CXV. Nor are the things less clear, which are read in Homily XXIV of Chrysostom. on the first Epistle to the Corinthians. That in the Cup is, what flowed from the side, that we are sprinkled as the altars of the Lord with his blood. Likewise: What he did not suffer on the cross, he suffers that in the oblation and sustains to be BROKEN for you, so that he may satiate all, And further: If no one would rashly touch the garment of a man, in what way will we receive the body of the Lord of all pure and immaculate, which is partaker of that divine nature, on account of which we both are and live, on account of which the gates of hell were broken, and the heavens were opened, with such ignominy? Let us not, I beseech, let us not kill ourselves imprudently, but with all honor and purity let us approach God and when you SEE IT (the body) SET FORTH, say with yourself: on account of this body I am no longer earth and ashes: no longer captive, but free. On account of this I hope to receive heaven and the goods in it, on account of this immortal life, the seat of angels, the companionship of Christ. He carried up his body there, (to the supernal throne) which he also exhibited to us, so that we might hold and eat it, which is the greatest sign of love. For those whom we love, we sometimes even attack with a bite. Wherefore Job, so that he might show the love of the servants towards himself, was saying, that they very often from too much love towards him said, who would grant from his flesh, that we may be satiated? Thus also Christ gave his flesh to us, so that we may be satiated by it, by which he enticed us most into his love. Therefore let us approach him with fervor, and with the most vehement love, lest we undergo a graver punishment. For by how much a greater benefit we receive, by so much more we will be punished, when we will appear unworthy of it. This body in the manger the Magi revered and impious men, and barbarians having completed a long journey, adored with the most fear and trembling. Therefore let us imitate at least the Barbarians we, who are citizens of the heavens. For they indeed when they saw it only in the manger and cottage, and none of those things, which you now see, approached with the highest reverence and dread. But you see it not in the manger, but on the altar: etc. While we are in this life, this mystery makes it, that the earth may be heaven to us. Ascend therefore to the gates of heaven, and diligently attend, nay not of heaven, but of the heaven of heavens and then you will behold what we say. For I will show to you on earth what is worthy of the highest honor. For just as in palaces not the walls, not only the golden, but the royal body sitting on the throne is the most excellent of all: so also in the heavens the royal body, which is now proposed to you to be seen on earth, I show to you not angels, not Archangels, not the heavens, not the heavens of heavens, but the Lord himself of all these. Do you observe, in what way, what is the greatest of all, and principal, on earth you behold not only, but touch, and not only touch, but eat, and having received it you return home. Cleanse therefore your soul from all filth. Which things are clearer, than that they can be obscured by the explanations of Albertinus, as if Chrysostom speaks of the mystical body of Christ, i.e. of the Eucharistic bread. For do those attributes and predicates in any way fit bread! That dignity above angels and Archangels and the heavens of heavens! Did the Magi in the manger revere the mystical body!

§. CXVI. We add to these from homil. to Neophyt. T. V. p. 726. When the enemy will see you departing after the banquet of the Lord, after the heavenly feasts as fire flaming from the mouth of the lion he flees and deserts swifter than any wind, nor does he attempt to approach, and when that cruel one will have perceived from afar your tongue stained with blood, believe me, he will not stand, and when he will have perceived your mouth to be ruddy, he will with fear twist his step backwards. Now therefore if the enemy will see not blood imposed on the doorposts of the type of truth, but the blood of the truth of Christ shining from the mouth of the faithful dedicated to the doorposts of the temple, much more he withdraws himself. And a little after, in the same Homily. He himself is to us the substance of food, and nourishment. For just as a woman by the nature of affection compelling hastens to nourish her offspring by the fecundity of her milk; so also Christ, those whom he himself regenerates, he always nourishes by his own blood. These things are too evident, nor can they be dulled by any gloss. To this pertains the exclamation of Chrysostom book III. on the Priesthood T. V. p. 507. While you behold the Lord immolated, the Priest leaning over the sacrifice, pouring out prayers, and then indeed the crowd poured around to be dipped and reddened by that precious blood, do you think that you still converse among mortals, and consist on earth? and are you not rather straightway transferred to the heavens, and casting off every thought of the flesh, with bare soul, with pure mind do you look around, what things are in heaven? O miracle, O benignity of God: who sitting above with the Father in that very point of time is handled by the hands of all, and himself delivers himself to those willing to receive and embrace him.

§. CXVII. If you desire more, hear homil. XXVII. on 1 to the Corinthians: from which we only write down these things, which pertain to the eating of the unworthy here: You ask, why he who eats and drinks unworthily is said to become guilty of the body and blood of the Lord? Because, he says, he poured out blood, and now made it murder (body), not sacrifice: therefore, just as then when they transfixed, they transfixed not so that they might drink, but so that they might pour out, he who communicates unworthily, and obtains no fruit therefrom, does the same: You see with how much terror he speaks, and with how much vehemence he touches them, and shows, that if they were thus going to partake, they would partake of things unworthily set forth. In what way therefore do they unworthily despise the poor and besides contempt affect them with ignominy! For if not giving to the poor casts a man out from the kingdom of the heavens, even if he be a virgin, or rather not giving with a large hand (for indeed those virgins had oil, but not more abundantly) understand how great an evil it is, to work such great absurdities, What, he says, absurdities? What do you say, What absurdities? You were partaker of such a table, and when you ought to be most meek of all, and equal to the angels, you were made most cruel of all, you tasted the blood of the Lord, and not even here do you acknowledge your brother, and of what pardon are you worthy, And you do this, when you have dined at the table of Christ, on that day, on which you were deemed worthy to touch his flesh with your tongue! Therefore lest these things happen, consider also the right hand, tongue, lips, in what way they were made the vestibule of Christ, so that he may enter. What kind of things are also read in Homil. XXXI. on Matthew Remember you not the sacrifice: which has adorned your LIPS, and the blood, which has made your TONGUE purple. And on Ps. XLI. This is the member (he speaks about the TONGUE) through which we have received the tremendous sacrifice; the faithful know, what is said. These things Chrysostom.

§. CXVIII. Too frigid, nay violent is the gloss of Edmund, that the LIPS are said to be the vestibules of the MYSTICAL BODY of Christ, that is, of bread; that by the sacrifice and blood of Christ bread and wine are designated: which things are contrary to the words of Chrysostom from diameter, and cut the nerve of the arguments, which he uses. But let Chrysostom vindicate the sense of his own mind: who homil. XXX. on poster. to the Corinthians teaches that we kiss the vestibule of the entrance of the body of the Lord, when we kiss the mouth of a brother. Therefore we kiss the vestibules of the temple and the entrance, by mutually kissing. Do you not see, that even the vestibules of this temple are kissed, some indeed bending, but others touching with the hand, and moving the hand to the mouth; through these gates also and doors and entrances Christ is, and enters to us, when we communicate. You know, who are partakers of the mysteries, what is said: for indeed our mouth has obtained no common honor, receiving the body of the Lord; on account of this we especially kiss here. Let those hear, who speak foul things, who bring forth reproaches, and let them shudder, that they pollute such a mouth. These things Chrysostom. What will you say to those things with your Edmund Bergius! Is bread Christ entering to us! And how is our mouth the vestibule of the temple of the entrance of the Lord, if only bread enters? Hear further the golden mouth from homil. III. to the Ephesians And how will you appear before the tribunal of Christ, who dare to touch his body with unclean hands and lips! And you would not want to kiss a king with your fetid mouth, but do you kiss the king of heaven with a stinking soul? The matter is a contumely. But what is that Bergius, which is held by the hands for a time, and afterwards is wholly resolved into the soul! Is it bread, as your Edmund wants, which he ineptly calls the mystical body, or is it Christ himself, or the body of the Lord? You will hardly say that bread is resolved into the soul, although your Edmund says it, it remains therefore that it is Christ the King of heaven, as Chrysostom says, and his body.

§. CXIX. Let us add a similar and altogether notable place from homil. LXXXIII. on Matthew O how many say, I would want to see his form and appearance, I would want to see his very garments, I would want to see his shoes. You see him therefore, you touch him, you eat him. You desire to see his garments, But He has delivered himself to you, not only so that you may see, but also so that you may touch, and have in you. And with a few things inserted: It is not enough therefore for him to become man, meanwhile to be beaten with whips, but he reduces us with himself into one, (so to speak) mass, and that not by FAITH only, but IN REALITY he makes us his body. By what thing therefore ought he not to be cleaner, who is going to partake of this sacrifice, what rays of the sun ought that hand not to exceed, which handles this crown, the mouth, which is filled with spiritual fire, the tongue, which is stained with this admirable blood? Let it come into your mind, with what honor you are honored; what table you enjoy? For we are nourished by that thing, which the Angels seeing tremble, nor without fear on account of the brightness, which thence gleams forth, are they able to look upon, and we are reduced into one mass with him the body of Christ one, and flesh one. Who will speak the powers of the Lord, will make heard all his praises? what Shepherd has ever nourished his sheep with his own members? Many mothers after birth have given their infants to other nurses, which he himself refused to do, but he nourishes us with his OWN BODY, and conjoins and glues us to himself. Do you not see, with how great alacrity of soul infants seize the breasts, with how much pressure they fix their lips to the nipples. Let us also with no less desire approach to this table

and to the spiritual nipple of this cup etc. Nothing indeed clearer than these things could have been said for our opinion. To which Edmund by no means casts darkness, that the mind of Chrysostom CAN BE, that Christ mixes himself with us, not through the proper substance of his body and blood, but through his mystical body and blood, as Edmund calls, the Eucharistic bread and Wine. For is the form and appearance of Christ had in it! Is it deserved to be compared with this, that he wanted to become man, and to be cut and scourged, that he instituted bread and wine in sign of his passion? Does he so mix himself with us through bread and wine with his body and blood absent, that he makes us his body not by faith only, but IN REALITY, or as when mothers nourish their infants with their milk, he nourishes us by his own proper blood, and through all things glues himself to us! Does not Chrysostom speak openly of the proper blood of Christ? how therefore is the speech of Chrysostom drawn to mystical blood as it pleases your Edmund to call it! Although neither can those things be predicated of wine, which are proper to the proper blood of Christ, unless the blood of Christ were united with wine! For if the absent were only figured, how can the Tongue be said to be purpled by this tremendous blood!

§. CXX. Therefore Bergius undeservedly appealed to Chrysostom, who is here wholly ours. But does perhaps St. Augustine only improperly and signly establish that the body of Christ is received and eaten! The opinion of St. Augustine is manifest book XII. against Faust. Manich. c. XX, that the Church is consociated by the sacrament of hope as long as it is drunk there, what flowed from the side of Christ. But Edmund is absurd, explaining this not of the Dominical blood, but of wine: which figuratively speaking flowed from the side of Christ, For what is clearer, than that this is proper of the blood of the Lord, not however of that imaginary one, since the real blood itself flowed from the side, not the imaginary, and improper, But you will ask with Edmund: whence is it gathered, that Augustine speaks of blood to be taken not by faith alone, but by mouth! Resp. there is no need of gathering: Augustine teaches it openly with many words in the same book C. X, The blood of Christ has a great voice on earth, when it having been accepted by all nations Amen is responded. This is the clear voice of blood, which the BLOOD itself expresses FROM THE MOUTH of the faithful redeemed by the same blood. He says, that the blood of Christ is accepted on earth, and having been received from the mouth of the faithful expresses to them a voice, as if the blood itself were speaking and crying out; Therefore on earth not only the symbol of blood ought to be present, but the blood itself: because not wine, but blood cries out, and so that blood may cry out from the mouth of the faithful when it is received, it must be received by mouth. Which in Ch. XI. following Augustine so expresses; whence with Christ having suffered on the cross the veil of the temple was torn, so that through the passion of Christ the secrets of the sacraments may be revealed to the faithful for DRINKING his blood, passing through with MOUTH open in confession. How here will the Calvinists attach their sacramentally or signly, when just as there he spoke of blood crying out, not of bread, so here about to reveal the secrets of the sacraments, he pronounces that the blood of the Lord is drunk by mouth, not the sacrament or sign of blood the Eucharistic wine, in the drinking of which there is nothing secret proper to the New Testament, to be revealed through the passion of Christ, since in the Old Testament there were clearer signs, than wine is imagined to be of the blood of the Lord. And what is this circumgyration, when Edmund will have admitted that the discourse is properly of blood, but not to be drunk by mouth, but by faith: but

now he admits, that the faithful are indeed said to take the blood of the Lord by mouth; but not the proper one; but the mystical one; or only the sign of blood! But Augustine vindicates himself, speaking of the drinking of blood, not under the sacrament, as the Calvinists explain, that is, the sign, but as the truth itself, as one who here expounds the secrets of the sacraments, or signs. Therefore also Ep. CXIX. which is to Januar. c 6. it pleased, he says, the Holy Spirit, that in honor of such a Sacrament the body of the Lord should enter INTO THE MOUTH of Christians first, before other foods. If the body of the Lord enters into the mouth of Christians, it ought to be perceived by mouth: if before other foods, the body of the Lord is no less, than the rest of eatables, food to be perceived by mouth. How would the Holy Spirit hold as a Sacrament worthy of such great honor the bare Symbol of bread, nay how would he call bread the body of the Lord, unless it were in reality the means of participation of the body of the Lord?

§. CXXI. But lest we doubt, that Augustine believed in the oral perception of the proper body of the Lord, the eating of the unworthy more fully confirms us about his mind. For he teaches that the impious themselves eat and drink the body and blood of the Lord, and that to judgment for themselves, who certainly do not perceive those things by faith, but by mouth. see tract. LXII. on John and on Ps. XXI, and XLVIII. also Epist. LXIV LXXIII. CXX. CLII. Also book II. against Liter. Petil. c. LV. Also book I. against Crescon: c. XXVII. and also against Donatist. After collat. c. XX. against Fulgent. &c. Finally, Serm. on time. C. LXXVIII. CXXIII. CCXLIV. Which he understands with the Apostle about that body and blood of Christ, of which thing the unworthy are guilty: who certainly are not guilty of bread and wine, or of symbols, but of the very body, the very blood of the Lord. About that body and blood, which are the price of our redemption. The Lord himself, he says, Epist. IXII. tolerates Judas, the Devil, the thief, and his betrayer, permits him to receive among the innocent disciples, what the faithful know to be OUR PRICE. But I do not believe, that Bergius will call bread and wine our price. About that body of the Lord, which others receive to salvation, he asserts that the unworthy receive it to judgment. Thus book V, against Donatist. on Baptism. c. VIII. Just as Judas, to whom the Lord handed the morsel, not by receiving evil; but by receiving evilly gave place in himself to the Devil, so anyone unworthily taking the sacrament of the Lord does not effect, that because he himself is evil, it be evil, or because he does not receive to salvation, he received nothing. For it was nevertheless the body of the Lord and the blood of the Lord to them, to whom the Apostle was teaching, he who eats unworthily, eats and drinks judgment to himself. Therefore Judas did not receive another body, but that very body of the Lord, which the others well received. he had received evilly, He did not receive nothing, besides bread and wine; but he received the very body and blood of the Lord, according to Augustine. For he speaks of that body of the Lord, which besides bread the unworthy receive, and thus teaches that they receive the whole Sacrament: just as similarly I. 1. against Cresco. Donatist. c. XXV. he asserts that they receive the body and blood of the Lord our unique sacrifice, for our salvation. But, to persuade the Calvinist that bread and wine are from the mind of Augustine our unique sacrifice! And serm. XI. on the word of the Lord many, he says, eat that flesh and drink that blood with a false HEART, or when they become Apostates, they do not remain in Christ. Therefore he speaks of that flesh and of that blood, the eating and drinking of which makes, only if it be conjoined with faith, that we remain in Christ, and Christ in us: but not only of the sign of flesh and blood, bread and wine; and thus they testify that the impious receive the flesh itself and the blood itself of the Lord. Can we also (his words have)



receive those here, about whom the Apostle says, that they eat and drink judgment to themselves, when they eat the flesh itself. and drink the blood itself!

§. CXXII. Finally, so that we may pass over many other things, III. against adversar. leg. and Prophet. c. IX. he teaches that the flesh and blood of Christ are eaten and drunk, not only by faith, but also by mouth, which certainly cannot be taken of the sign. For is the body of Christ received only signly by faith! Just as, he says, We, with FAITHFUL HEART and MOUTH RECEIVE the Mediator of God and men the man Christ Jesus giving to us his flesh to eat, and blood to drink, although it may seem more horrible, to eat human flesh, than to destroy it, and to drink human blood, than to pour it out. A cross fixed here for the Calvinists: Edmund turns the passage in all directions, but profits nothing. First he says that Augustine speaks conjointly about both the eating of the Flesh of Christ, which happens then Sacramentally, and then truly, because the heart is required for eating the flesh of Christ in truth itself, but the mouth for perceiving the sacrament (sign) of it: but because it is a question of the same flesh, which Augustine teaches is received by the faithful both with heart and mouth, not however of mystical flesh which Edmund is accustomed to call, (more truly imaginary) mere bread, soon another resolution pleases him, and he asserts the text of Augustine to be corrupted without any cause of suspicion, at least because it is less congruent to the sacramentarian error, so that it is not read, with faithful heart and mouth, but with faithful heart and EAR we look up to the mediator giving his flesh to be eaten, and giving is not understood here, but a command, giving, that is, COMMANDING. But since it is read thus in no Codex, Edmund exclaims by vowing, and would that it were permitted to see more and older handwritten codices, for it was most easy to change ear into mouth, either from industry or from ignorance! Such is the force of a preconceived opinion! But since that suspicion is vain, and the wish for a diverse reading vain and void, Edmund dismisses that opinion also, and takes refuge in the figure, Hendiadys and transposes the words in Augustine, so that it is received with faithful heart and mouth, for with heart and faithful mouth, and faithful mouth is put for heart, and thus heart and faithful mouth are synonymous, not disparate, or the mouth of faith is understood of the soul. But openly heart and mouth are distinguished here, and faithful heart is said, but not faithful mouth, and thus it is asserted, that not only with faithful heart, but also with the mouth itself the flesh is eaten, and blood is drunk: nay lest anyone still contend that the discourse is about oral eating and drinking, the words adjoined are entirely opposed, although to eat human flesh may seem more horrible, than to destroy it, and to drink human blood, than to pour it out: which most openly speak of the oral eating of flesh and drinking of blood. Whence above Edmund conceded to Lambert, that the eating of the body and drinking of blood properly and orally done is understood here, but he denied that thus the proper body and blood are designated, taking it of the Symbolic; but how will he say that it is more horrible, to eat and drink bread and wine as signs of the absent body and blood by mouth, than to destroy human flesh, and to pour out blood. And therefore this chrēsmōidion is also vain. Finally in the last place he has devised a new response, which he says is most solid and perhaps to be preferred to the others, but which is truly most inept: that Augustine does not speak of the mediator as through the Eucharist offering his body to be eaten and blood to be drunk but of him as teaching, handing over, communicating, and commanding his flesh to be eaten, blood to be drunk, and not of faithful heart and mouth, as the organ of eating, but as the instruments of approbation and confession: Thus to give for him is to

command or to teach, among other things by the authority of St. Terence in *Heauton*. now for what reason I had learned these parts, in a few words I will give; To receive with heart and mouth is to hear, approve and confess, and Augustine is compelled willy-nilly to speak not of the Eucharist, but of receiving the Mediator with faithful heart and mouth, that is, so that we may venerate and embrace him as truthful, both by faith of heart and by mouth of profession, notwithstanding that he expressly says that Christ GIVING his flesh to be eaten by us, and blood to be drunk is received with faithful heart and mouth, and protests, that the flesh to be eaten and blood to be drunk is to be received by MOUTH, even if it may seem horrible.

§. CXXIII. It is clear from these specimens of Edmund, with what faith that author deals with the ancient Doctors, whom he compels against their most open opinion of their own mind to act for the cause of the sacramentarians, and to unlearn our faith, to which they assent, exercising no trickery in the writings of the Fathers, so that he may transform them into Calvinists. And to this author or most successful defender of the Calvinian opinion Bergius remitted me.

§. CXXIV. But now it is entirely indubitable, not only from the mind of Blessed Luther, but also of Chrysostom and Augustine, that the body of Christ is said to be seen by eyes, touched by hands, ground by teeth not on account of a bare relation, that those things happen to the sign of the absent body of Christ, but on account of the sacramental union, that the Eucharistic bread and body of Christ constitute one sacramental thing, just as what is fitting for bread, is considered to happen to the body of Christ not through figure, and improperly, but through some new oral, or mutual communion, just as vice versa, what is proper to the blood of Christ, to be poured out for us, is attributed to the Cup or Eucharistic wine on account of the same union and sacramental communication, as Bergius confesses this: How also in Luke the *to enchynomenon* can be referred to the *potērion*? Which is to be well noted. For Beza preferred rather to fabricate a Solecism for Luke; but Albertinus l. 1. on the Eucharist: c. X. to have recourse, either to some exemplar, in which those words *to hyper hymōn enchynomenon* were omitted, or to Basil, who read *tō enchynomenō*, in moral. regul: XXI. c. 3. as also Jerome Canon: on Luke (who indeed did not read otherwise, than is now read: This is the cup of the N.T. in my blood, Which cup namely, so that it may accord with the Greek, will be poured out for us) and thus to contrive a corruption of the text here, or with Picherel to antiptosis, (of which however he confesses there to be no necessity) finally to take refuge in the commutation of the prepositive article for the subjunctive which to admit this, which Bergius admits here.

§. CXXV. But Bergius objects, even if it is said of the signs, what is fitting for the thing signified, and vice versa, not on account of relation alone, but on account of sacramental union and communication, yet that this is said improperly his opinion still obtains. For thus also we, he says, just as it is said of sacramental signs, what properly is fitting for the thing signified (in what way also in Luke the *to enchynomenon* can be referred to the *potērion*) thus we confess that what is properly of the sign, can be said improperly of the thing signified, and indeed not only by a merely schetic union on account of signification alone, which he himself always fabricates against us disput. III. §. 5 but also *koinōnikēn*, on account of a certain real, yet not corporeal, or oral, but according to the nature of the thing promised, and exhibited, a Spiritual exhibition through these Sacramental signs. Resp. whether we fabricate a merely schetic union on

account of signification alone for the Calvinists, can be established from the things said above. If the Calvinists believe in a true and real communication and exhibition of the body and blood of the present Christ through sacramental signs, what need is there, that they here have recourse to impropriety? could it not properly be said, with the dove having been shown, This is the Holy Spirit. with the bodily form having been seen, in which the Angels were appearing, These are Angels: What also that it is altogether necessary, when some things are united to constitute one certain thing, and so, that one is really exhibited and received with the other, that in those things at least, which pertain to the end of the union, they have communion, and what is said of either of them, if the end of the union requires it, is also uttered of the other, not improperly, but properly. Therefore thus since the body of Christ is united to the Eucharistic bread on account of sacramental eating, it is necessary that the body of Christ be eaten properly with the Eucharistic bread; but bread is not eaten properly, the body of Christ improperly. For to that no real union would be needed at all, a bare schesis would entirely suffice, in which also the Calvinists constitute their union. Therefore whatever may be the case concerning other predicates, which do not pertain to the end of the sacramental union, as that bread is broken by teeth, that it is seen by eyes, whether those things are said properly or improperly of the body of Christ, provided that they are said through and on account of the real union of the body of Christ with the blessed bread: Certainly it is a manifest thing that propriety is to be preserved in eating: because for the sake of eating the body of Christ is united to the Eucharistic bread, and by one word Eat the whole symplegmenon the blessed bread with the body of Christ is included, which united and conjointly they are commanded to be received, and eaten by that one word, which cannot sustain a twofold signification proper, and improper at the same time.

## SECTION X. Examining the tenth Response about the Fallacy from something said in a certain respect.

§. CXXVI. Bergius imagines that perhaps also other Sophisms can be noted in that most celebrated Paralogism, which however was not made famous by us, much less most celebrated, but Bergius the author of the Same sells it for such, which even if they may seem puerile so much more however are to be attended not only by the successors of Luther, but also of Philip, who cannot not know, Strange, that he leaves Philip to us, whom they otherwise make entirely theirs here, whom we ourselves also do not deny to have defected to the Calvinian party after the death of Blessed Luther. But perhaps he indicates that we have succeeded Philip in Dialectics. It does not irk or shame us and our Academy to have cultivated Dialectic, or rather the whole of Logic hitherto: Which if Mr. Bergius had taken better care of, he would not commit such puerile vices, impinging on the principles of Logic. Which indeed he was not able to demonstrate about us: but we have shown very many about his Disputations and writings: just as also in Zwingli and Oecolampadius the Patriarchs of the Calvinists our Blessed Luther once noted sophisms of this kind in Confess. on the Supper of the Lord. I have not known/ that Oecolampadius was in total such a bad poor Logician or Dialectician/ that he also takes quod for qualiter/ and syllogizes from accident to substance. In Zwingli it is no Wonder/ he is a self-grown Doctor, they are accustomed to turn out thus. Truly whoever wants to dispute/ and

cannot yet his puerilia in Logic/ what good should he accomplish? Oecolampadius annoys me with this so much/ that I can henceforth conceive of no special understanding in him. For even if he does not need to know the useless Quibbles and Sophistry of the Sophists/ he should nevertheless well know the puerilia, that is/ common Dialectic, as the rules of consequence, Formulas of Syllogisms, species of argumentation &c. It would be then/ that I had struck him with the truth (as I think) so that he cannot well see/ what he is saying. Which things most fittingly fit Bergius, whoever will have compared this defense of ours with the anti-Bergian vindications, no one will doubt.

§. CXXVII: The Sophism, which he here fabricates against us, does not even bear the appearance of truth, that namely we conclude from something said in a certain respect to something said simply. By what Scheme therefore is it imputed to us! Bergius brings forth two things for that matter: One is, about bread, that it is the body of Christ, is not predicated simply as to its substance, but only in sacramental use: the other, that not even in this use is the body simply considered, but AS a body delivered for us, Therefore it is wrongly concluded that there is oral eating, because it is fitting to the substance of bread, therefore also to the substance of the body. But none of us attribute oral eating to the body of Christ for this reason; because it is attributed to bread, and because bread is the body of Christ, but because Christ ordered, and instituted this, which he exhibits to be eaten by mouth, about which he testifies, that it is not only bread, but that it truly is his own body. And hence it is, that bread is called the body of Christ in sacramental use, namely by force of the sacramental union, but the body of Christ, not as delivered for us, but what was delivered for us: because it is not exhibited here As dead, just as neither As living again, but As destined and ordained to the sacrament of the Eucharist to vivify us. Therefore Bergius here again stumbles with his Zwingli on the principles of Logic: the Boys in School know/ that quod refers to substance, and this Spirit says: quod refers to quality, says Blessed Luther. And since Bergius builds not only his response here, but also the primary argument of Calvinism in this cause upon that confusion, by which he makes a quality out of substance, which he transmutes into as far as, what prohibits me from here repeating the iudgment of Blessed Luther, from Confess. on the Supper. Is it not to be pitied now/ that from such a null false Ground one should deny/ the clear Truth of Christ/ this is my Body/ and thus shame the Supper? If a Boy in School made such a Syllogism/ they would give him a Shilling. If a Master did it among the Sophists/ he would have to be called an Ass and here in the Spirit it should be called God's Scripture and Truth/ which they boast so highly against our Understanding. Thus one could also drive such Spirits and say/ Christ to the right of God is the Son/ born of Mary is/ but he is born mortal of Mary/ so he must also sit mortal to the right of God. Sir Hans Rider does not ride in Armor/ therefore it is not a Rider/ Rachel has no Veil on/ therefore Rachel is no Woman. According to the new rule, Accident is substance, nor can it be absent from its subject. He wanted to remit us to the boys of the Dialecticians, we with Luther would thus more rightly remit him to the preceptors.

## SECTION XI. Presenting the eleventh response about pure particulars.

§. CXXVIII. But because Bergius is so ingenious and successful in observing sophisms, let us hear him further: The boys of the Dialecticians will also note, he says, that it is concluded from pure particulars. For not every this, which Christ gave to the disciples in the Holy Supper, he ordered to eat or drink by mouth, but only this which broken by hand, poured into the cup, he gave into their hands. But where is this written, Bergius, that he gave only this. Did he not also order to eat and drink by mouth that, which he testified to exhibit with bread and wine? We argue thus: Which things as the object are joined to the act of eating and drinking by precept, the same Christ commanded to eat and drink: But the body of Christ as the object is adjoined to the act of eating the blood of Christ as the object to the act of drinking by the word of the command of Christ by precept. The matter is clear from the most express words of Christ: Eat, This is my body. Drink, This is my blood. Therefore Christ commands to eat his body, to drink his blood, and not only bread broken by hand, wine poured into the cup.

§. CXXIX. But the proof of Bergius is destitute of all nerve, That what Christ gave by the word of promise and efficacy of the Spirit and today also gives he by no means ordered to be accepted by mouth, but by faith as food, and drink by faithful memory of his death. Which proposition laboring under begging of the principle Bergius assumes gratis: because he opposes subordinates, acceptance; which happens by mouth; and which happens by faith. A certain Schwenckfeldian would argue in like manner: What he gives by the word of promise, and efficacy of the Spirit, he ordered to accept not by ear, but by faith. Thus there will be no need of external hearing of the word: nor will the Holy Spirit be efficacious through hearing. Wherefore just as against Schwenckfeld we teach that both by external ears the things which are exhibited by the word of promise, and by faith are to be received, so against the Calvinists, we assert that both by mouth are to be perceived, what things Christ exhibits, with blessed bread and wine, and by faith, because Christ commanded not only faithful memory of his death, but also ordered to eat his body with bread, and with wine to drink his blood.

§. CXXX. The reason subjoined is likewise feeble, that namely every Evangelical promise requires faith, and heavenly goods offered by word and sacraments, are received not by hand, but by faith alone: because the question is not about manual acceptance, but about oral eating and drinking, and rashly, as we have now advised, faith is opposed, either to the ear by which the word, or to the mouth, by which the sacrament of the Eucharist, or of the body by which the sacrament of Baptism is received. What consequence, I ask you! Every promise requires faith. Therefore the promised goods are received by faith alone: Therefore the heavenly goods offered by the word are not received by means of hearing, not by means of oral eating, or drinking, not by means of the oblation of baptism. Bergius will call it the corpse of a consequence, if someone infers in this way. But the consequence, which he himself uses, is no better; the Evangelical promise requires faith, but it also requires or prerequires hearing; when it is announced, it also requires eating and drinking, when the Holy Eucharist is used, it also requires washing when Holy Baptism is received. The word of command and promise is not to

be torn asunder in the sacraments; because the promise is made to those observing the command.

## SECTION XII. Considering the twelfth and last Response about the redundant Conclusion.

§. CXXXI. In the last place Bergius responds to the conclusion. That it is plainly something else and so much more, by how much more absurd it is in the conclusion, than in the premises. That these speak about a truly human body crucified for us: The conclusion about an impartible body, which he never had, which could not even be crucified. The premises about sensible natural eating. The conclusion about supernatural, neither sensible, nor insensible. But this response is partly mere battology, inculcating the same thing which was said in the first and second response, partly inept peritology, because thus the conclusion would not abound, but the argument would labor under a plurality of terms, or ambiguity: partly it is a most iniquitous calumny: for we believe that no other than that very body of Christ, which was crucified for us, is exhibited and eaten in the Supper we are ignorant of a diverse body of Christ: partly finally it is a Sophistic opposition of subordinates: because it opposes a body endowed with parts to being present in an impartible mode; and also the eating of an externally sensible and natural thing, to the supernatural eating of a heavenly thing, which pertains neither to the discernible or sensible things, nor to the intelligible or intelligible things, but to the credible or things to be believed. For that a body having parts outside parts, is present somewhere in a mode not partible, but impartible, with its substance preserved does not imply: as certainly when the body of Christ penetrated through the closed womb, or doors not opened, it is necessary that it was present in an impartible mode without quantitative commensuration to space. But the eating of an external and earthly sensible thing does not exclude the supernatural eating of a heavenly thing, even if the same is not perceived by sight, and other external senses.

§. CXXXII. Therefore with the Bergian responses having been thus discussed it is manifest, that Bergius only either betrayed Logical ignorance, or Sophistic trickery, and besides pompous vain speaking demonstrated nothing except an unstable mind: since in those things, which concern the substance of the matter, he gave conquered hands, and willing unwilling descended into our opinion, so that nothing is left, except that he openly profess HIMSELF CONVICTED: which he would certainly do, unless the pertinacity of error overwhelmed the force of conscience.

## SECTION XIII. and LAST. Coronis about the Sacramentarian heresy.

§. CXXXIII. It remains, that we examine that Sophism of all the most stupid and most pernicious, which as it appears, in the manner of a Coronis, Bergius rubs against us, making us argue thus.

The body of Christ is properly eaten in bread by mouth: therefore whoever deny it are sacramentarian heretics, are fanatic Schwermers, outside of Christian fraternity, to be cast out by the thunderbolt of anathema from the Church. But it may hardly seem worth the effort. For the Sophist has himself devised this illation doing nothing for the previous paralogism, which he has hitherto examined according to length, width, height and depth, but he has nowhere read it in any Lutheran Doctor. Produce Bergius anyone, who has argued thus from our Theologians, or when you cannot do that, confess that you are either playing in a serious matter, or calumniating. Our people indeed know, with you being silent, that not any Theological truth having been denied induces heresy: and therefore no one was ever of a mind so frenzied, that he concluded from the truth of a Theological dogma either to the necessity of believing, or to the crime of heresy, if it is not believed. Many things are true in Theology, the denial of which no one would say at once to infer heresy. Does Bergius perhaps want to demonstrate heresy about us by such an argument, which we defend, here the egregious little brother pronounces with a sonorous voice (the body of Christ is not properly eaten in bread by mouth. Therefore whoever assert it, are heretics,) let him see about it himself.

§. CXXXIV. But when we accuse the Sacramentarians of heresy, we convict them by other arguments, which having been routed in the Calixtine Syncretism and elsewhere adduced it is not necessary to repeat here. But if Bergius wants not only to deplore with worthy tears the sacramentarian Schism, and the evils, which were thereby brought upon the Churches of the Protestants, but also seriously to consult for the salvation of his soul, now very close to the goal, let him give glory to Christ the testator, and acknowledge him truthful in the dispositive words of institution, the proper meaning of which he is now entirely convicted in conscience to have attacked in vain: but then let him do this with the greatest zeal he can, in the fear of the Lord, that the schism may grow together, not through empty buskins of words, but through a solid consensus of minds, according to the tenor of the most sacred testament of Christ. It is altogether time, that he cease from strife, cease from calumnies, cease from blasphemies, and seriously repent, and beg pardon from the most benign God, of contentions, illusions, insults, and blasphemies, to which he has made himself liable through so many years, and now especially very close to the goal, for the sake of an unhappy colophon. Let him not palliate such things any longer, by the scheme of a harsher word, which perhaps slipped out, by which way indeed for the most atrocious and most deliberate injuries poured out without any shame before the face of the Church (I use the words of Bergius, imputing these things to me, but beyond the matter, and most unjustly) pardon is not obtained, but a graver punishment is attracted! *mē planas the, theos u mūktērizetai.* Let him not mock men, and God, by offering fraternity to them, and even seeking it from God by prayers, whom he accuses of heresy, and contends at length, and obstinately to undermine the glory of God, and also the principal articles of faith, and to cherish the seed itself and innermost root of the Missatic sacrifice also, and of all its Papistic abominations and idolomanias.

May GOD open to him, and to all who have been seduced by him, or by others, the eyes of the mind, that they may acknowledge error, and leave a place for the truth both in this, and in the rest of the articles of faith, and sanctify us all in his truth. May the Prince of peace direct our feet in the way of peace, and bruise Satan under our feet quickly.

Amen!