

The Eucharist & Baptism

[...]

2.23 The second captivity of this sacrament is less grievous so far as the conscience is concerned, yet the very gravest danger threatens the man who would attack it, to say nothing of condemning it. Here I shall be called a Wycliffite and a heretic a thousand times over. But what of that? Since the Roman bishop has ceased to be a bishop and become a tyrant, I fear none of his decrees, for I know that it is not in his power, nor even in that of a general council, to make new articles of faith. Years ago, when I was delving into scholastic theology, the Cardinal of Cambrai gave me food for thought, in his comments on the fourth Book of the Sentences, where he argues with great acumen that to hold that real bread and real wine, and not their accidents only, are present on the altar, is much more probable and requires fewer unnecessary miracles – if only the Church had not decreed otherwise. When I learned later what church it was that had decreed this – namely, the Church of Thomas, i.e., of Aristotle – I waxed bolder, and after floating in a sea of doubt, at last found rest for my conscience in the above view – namely, that it is real bread and real wine, in which Christ's real flesh and blood are present, not otherwise and not less really than they assume to be the case under their accidents. I reached this conclusion because I saw that the opinions of the Thomists, though approved by pope and council, remain but opinions and do not become articles of faith, even though an angel from heaven were to decree otherwise. For what is asserted without Scripture or an approved revelation, may be held as an opinion, but need not be believed. But this opinion of Thomas hangs so completely in the air, devoid of Scripture and reason, that he seems here to have forgotten both his philosophy and his logic. For Aristotle writes about subject and accidents so very differently from St. Thomas, that I think this great man is to be pitied, not only for drawing his opinions in matters of faith from Aristotle, but for attempting to base them on him without understanding his meaning – an unfortunate superstructure upon an unfortunate foundation.

Altera captivitas eiusdem sacramenti mitior est, quod ad conscientiam spectat, sed quam multo omnium periculosissimum sit tangere, nedum damnare. Hic Viglephista et sexcentis nominibus haereticus ero. Quid tum? postquam Romanus Episcopus Episcopus esse desiit et tyrannus

factus est, non formido eius universa decreta, cuius scio non esse potestatem articulos novos fidei condendi, nec Concilii quidem generalis.

Dedit mihi quondam, cum Theologiam scholasticam haurirem, occasionem cogitandi D. Cardinalis Cameracensis libro sententiarum quarto, acutissime disputans, multo probabilius esse et minus superfluum miraculorum poni, si in altari verus panis verumque vinum, non autem sola accidentia esse astruerentur, nisi Ecclesia determinasset contrarium. Postea videns, quae esset Ecclesia, quae hoc determinasset, nempe Thomistica, hoc est Aristotelica, audacior factus sum, et qui inter saxum et sacrum haerebam, tandem stabilivi conscientiam meam sententia priore, Esse videlicet verum panem verumque vinum, in quibus Christi vera caro verusque sanguis non aliter nec minus sit quam illi sub accidentibus suis ponunt. quod feci, quia vidi Thomistarum opiniones, sive probentur a Papa sive a Concilio, manere opiniones nec fieri articulos fidei, etiam si angelus de coelo aliud statueret. Nam quod sine scripturis asseritur aut revelatione probata, opinari licet, credi non est necesse. Haec autem opinio Thomae adeo sine scripturis et ratione fluctuat, ut nec philosophiam nec dialecticam suam novisse mihi videatur. Longe enim aliter Aristoteles de accidentibus et subiecto quam sanctus Thomas loquitur, ut mihi dolendum videatur pro tanto viro, qui opiniones in rebus fidei non modo ex Aristotele tradere, sed et super eum, quem non intellexit, conatus est stabilire infoelicissimi fundamenti infoelicissima structura.

2.24 I therefore permit every man to hold either of these views, as he chooses. My one concern at present is to remove all scruples of conscience, so that no one may fear to become guilty of heresy if he should believe in the presence of real bread and real wine on the altar, and that every one may feel at liberty to ponder, hold and believe either one view or the other, without endangering his salvation. However, I shall now more fully set forth my own view. In the first place, I do not intend to listen or attach the least importance to those who will cry out that this teaching of mine is Wycliffite, Hussite, heretical, and contrary to the decision of the Church, for they are the very persons whom I have convicted of manifold heresies in the matter of indulgences, the freedom of the will and the grace of God, good works and sin, etc. If Wycliffe was once a heretic, they are heretics ten times over, and it is a pleasure to be suspected and accused by such heretics and perverse sophists, whom to please is the height of

godlessness. Besides, the only way in which they can prove their opinions and disprove those of others, is by saying, "That is Wycliffite, Hussite, heretical!" They have this feeble retort always on their tongue, and they have nothing else. If you demand a Scripture passage, they say, "This is our opinion, and the decision of the Church – that is, of ourselves!" Thus these men, "reprobate concerning the faith" and untrustworthy, have the audacity to set their own fancies before us in the name of the Church as articles of faith.

Permitto itaque qui volet utranque opinionem tenere: hoc solum nunc ago, ut scrupulos conscientiarum de medio tollam, ne quis se reum haereseos metuat, si in altari verum panem verumque vinum esse crediderit, sed liberum esse sibi sciat, citra periculum salutis, alterutrum imaginari, opinari et credere, cum sit hic nulla necessitas fidei. Ego tamen meam nunc prosequor sententiam. Primum, nolo eos audire nec tantilli facere, qui clamaturi sunt, hoc esse Viglephisticum, Hussiticum, haereticum et contra Ecclesiae determinationem, cum hoc non faciant nisi ii, quos multis modis haereticos esse convici in re indulgentiarum, libero arbitrio et gratia dei, operibus bonis et peccatis &c. ut, si Viglephus semel fuit haereticus, ipsi decies haeretici sint et pulchrum sit ab haereticis et perversis sophistis culpari et criminari,

quibus placuisse summa impietas est. Praeterea, quod suas sententias non alia re probare nec contrarias alia ratione improbare possunt quam dicendo 'hoc est Viglephisticum, Hussiticum, haereticum'. Hoc enim elumbe in summa semper natat saliva atque aliud nihil, ubi, si petas scripturam, dicunt 'Nos sic sentimus, et Ecclesia (id est, nos ipsi) sic determinavit': adeo homines reprobi circa fidem et incredibiles nobis sua phantasmata autoritate ecclesiae pro articulis fidei audent proponere.

2.25 But there are good grounds for my view, and this above all – no violence is to be done to the words of God, whether by man or angel. But they are to be retained in their simplest meaning wherever possible, and to be understood in their grammatical and literal sense unless the context plainly forbids, lest we give our adversaries occasion to make a mockery of all the Scriptures. Thus Origen was repudiated, in ancient times, because he despised the grammatical sense and turned the trees, and all things else written concerning Paradise, into allegories. For it might be concluded from this that God did not create trees. Even so here, when the Evangelists plainly write that Christ took bread and broke it, and the book of Acts and Paul, in their turn, call it bread, we have to

think of real bread and real wine, just as we do of a real cup. For even they do not maintain that the cup is transubstantiated. But since it is not necessary to assume a transubstantiation wrought by Divine power, it is to be regarded as a figment of the human mind, for it rests neither on Scripture nor on reason, as we shall see.

Est autem meae sententiae ratio magna, imprimis illa, quod verbis divinis non est ulla facienda vis, neque per hominem neque per angelum, sed quantum fieri potest in simplicissima significatione servanda sunt, et nisi manifesta circumstantia cogat, extra grammaticam et propriam accipienda non sunt, ne detur adversariis occasio universam scripturam eludendi. Quo consilio recte Origenes olim repudiatus est, quod ligna et omnia quae de paradiso scribuntur, grammatica locutione contempta, in allegorias verterit, [Matth. , ., Marc. , ., Luc. , ., Apgsch. , ., . Cor. , .] cum hinc possit duci, ligna non esse creata a deo. Ita et hic, cum Euangelistae clare scribant, Christum accepisse panem ac benedixisse, et actuum liber et Paulus Apostolus panem deinceps appellent, verum oportet intelligi panem verumque vinum, sicut verum calicem (non enim calicem transsubstantiari etiam ipsi dicunt), transsubstantiationem vero potestate divina factam, cum non sit necesse poni, pro figmento humanae opinionis haberi, quia nulla scriptura, nulla ratione nititur, ut videbimus.

2.26 Therefore it is an absurd and unheard-of juggling with words, to understand "bread" to mean "the form, or accidents of bread," and "wine" to mean "the form, or accidents of wine." Why do they not also understand all other things to mean their forms, or accidents? Even if this might be done with all other things, it would yet not be right thus to emasculate the words of God and arbitrarily to empty them of their meaning.

Absurda est ergo et nova verborum impositio, panem pro specie vel accidentibus panis, vinum pro specie vel accidentibus vini accipi. Cur non et omnia alia pro speciebus et accidentibus accipiunt? Quod si caetera omnia constarent, non tamen liceret, verba dei sic elevari et cum tanta iniuria suis significationibus exinaniri.

2.27 Moreover, the Church had the true faith for more than twelve hundred years, during which time the holy Fathers never once mentioned this transubstantiation – certainly, a monstrous word for a monstrous idea – until the pseudo-philosophy of Aristotle became rampant in the Church these last three

hundred years. During these centuries many other things have been wrongly defined, for example, that the Divine essence neither is begotten nor begets, that the soul is the substantial form of the human body, and the like assertions, which are made without reason or sense, as the Cardinal of Cambray himself admits.

Sed et Ecclesia ultra mille ducentos annos recte credidit nec usquam nec unquam de ista transsubstantiatione (portentoso, scilicet vocabulo et somnio) meminerunt sancti patres, donec cepit Aristotelis simulata philosophia in Ecclesia grassari in istis trecentis novissimis annis, in quibus et alia multa perperam sunt determinata, quale est, Essentiam divinam nec generari nec generare, Animam esse formam substantialem corporis humani, et iis similia, quae nullis prorsus asseruntur rationibus aut causis, ut ipsemet confitetur Cardinalis Cameracensis.

2.28 Perhaps they will say that the danger of idolatry demands that bread and wine be not really present. How ridiculous! The laymen have never become familiar with their subtle philosophy of substance and accidents, and could not grasp it if it were taught them. Besides, there is the same danger in the case of the accidents which remain and which they see, as in the case of the substance which they do not see. For if they do not adore the accidents, but Christ hidden under them, why should they adore the bread, which they do not see?

Dicent fortassis, periculum Idolatriae cogere, ut non sit panis et vinum vere. Ridiculum hoc valde, cum subtilem philosophiam de substantia et accidentibus laici nunquam cognoverint nec, si docerentur, capere possint, et idem sit periculum salvis accidentibus quae vident, quod in substantia quam non vident. Si enim accidentia non adorant sed latentem ibi Christum, cur adorarent panem, quem non vident?

2.29 But why could not Christ include His body in the substance of the bread just as well as in the accidents? The two substances of fire and iron are so mingled in the heated iron that every part is both iron and fire. Why could not much rather Christ's body be thus contained in every part of the substance of the bread?

Cur autem non possit Christus corpus suum intra substantiam panis continere sicut in accidentibus? Ecce ignis et ferrum duae substantiae sic miscentur in ferro ignito, ut quaelibet pars sit ferrum et ignis: cur non

multo magis corpus gloriosum Christi sic in omni parte substantiae panis esse possit?

2.30 What will they say? We believe that in His birth Christ came forth out of the unopened womb of His mother. Let them say here too that the flesh of the Virgin was meanwhile annihilated, or as they would more aptly say, transubstantiated, so that Christ, after being enfolded in its accidents, finally came forth through the accidents! The same thing will have to be said of the shut door and of the closed opening of the tomb, through which He went in and out without disturbing them. Hence has risen that Babylonian philosophy of constant quantity distinct from the substance, until it has come to such a pass that they themselves no longer know what are accidents and what is substance. For who has ever proved beyond the shadow of a doubt that heat, colour, cold, light, weight or shape are mere accidents? Finally, they have been driven to the fancy that a new substance is created by God for their accidents on the altar – all on account of Aristotle, who says, "It is the essence of an accident to be in something," and endless other monstrosities, all of which they would be rid if they simply permitted real bread to be present. And I rejoice greatly that the simple faith of this sacrament is still to be found at least among the common people. They do not understand, so they do not dispute, whether accidents are present or substance, but believe with a simple faith that Christ's body and blood are truly contained in whatever is there, and leave to those who have nothing else to do the business of disputing about that which contains them.

Quid facient? Christus ex utero matris natus creditur illeso. Dicant et hic, carnem illam virginis interim fuisse annihilatam seu, ut aptius dici volunt, transsubstantiatam, ut Christus, in accidentibus eius involutus, tandem per accidentia prodiret. Idem dicendum erit de ianua clausa et ostio monumenti clauso, per quae illesa intravit et exivit. Sed hinc nata est Babylonia illa philosophiae istius de quantitate continua distincta a substantia, donec eo ventum sit, ut ignorent et ipsi, quae sint accidentia, et quae substantia. Nam quis certo monstravit unquam, calorem, colorem, frigus, lucem, pondus, figuras esse accidentia? Denique, accidentibus illis in altari coacti sunt fingere novum esse ac creari a deo, propter Aristotelem, qui dicit 'Accidentis esse est inesse', et infinita monstra, quibus omnibus essent liberi, si simpliciter panem ibi esse verum sinerent. Et plane gaudeo, saltem apud vulgum relictam esse simplicem fidem sacramenti huius. Nam ut non capiunt ita nec disputant, an

accidentia ibi sint sine substantia, sed simplici fide Christi corpus et sanguinem veraciter ibi contineri credunt, dato ociosis illis negotio de eo quod continet disputandi.

2.31 But perhaps they will say: From Aristotle we learn that in an affirmative proposition subject and predicate must be identical, or, to set down the beast's own words, in the sixth book of his *Metaphysics*: "An affirmative proposition demands the agreement of subject and predicate," which they interpret as above. Hence, when it is said, "This is my body," the subject cannot be identical with the bread, but must be identical with the body of Christ.

At dicent forte, Ex Aristotele doceri subiectum et praedicatum propositionis affirmativae debere pro eodem supponere, seu (ut bestiae ipsius verba ponam ex vi. metaphysicorum) 'Ad affirmativam requiritur extremorum compositio', quam illi exponunt pro eodem suppositionem: quare, dum dico 'hoc est corpus meum', subiectum non posse pro pane supponere sed pro corpore Christi.

2.32 What shall we say when Aristotle and the doctrines of men are made to be the arbiters of these lofty and divine matters? Why do we not put aside such curiosity, and cling simply to the word of Christ, willing to remain in ignorance of what here takes place, and content with this, that the real body of Christ is present by virtue of the words? Or is it necessary to comprehend the manner of the divine working in every detail?

Quid hic dicemus, quando Aristotelem et humanas doctrinas facimus tam sublimium et divinarum rerum censors? Cur non explosa ista curiositate in verbis Christi simpliciter haeremus, parati ignorare, quicquid ibi fiat, contentique, verum corpus Christi virtute verborum illic adesse? An est necesse, modos operationis divinae omnino comprehendere?

2.33 But what do they say to Aristotle's assigning a subject to whatever is predicated of the attributes, although he holds that the substance is the chief subject? Hence for him, "this white," "this large," etc., are subjects of which something is predicated. If that is correct, I ask: If a transubstantiation must be assumed in order that Christ's body is not predicated of the bread, why not also a transaccidentation in order that it be not predicated of the accidents? For the same danger remains if one understands the subject to be "this white" or "this round" is my body, and for the same reason that a transubstantiation is assumed,

a transaccidentation must also be assumed, because of this identity of subject and predicate.

Verum quid ad Aristotelem dicunt, qui subiectum omnibus praedicamentis accidentium tribuit, licet substantiam velit esse primum subiectum? Unde apud eum 'hoc album', 'hoc magnum', 'hoc aliquid' sunt subiecta, de quibus aliquid praedicatur. Quae si vera sunt, Quaero: si ideo est transsubstantiatio ponenda, ne corpus Christi de pane verificetur, cur non etiam ponitur transaccidentatio, ne corpus Christi de accidente affirmetur? Nam idem periculum manet, si per subiectum intelligat quis 'hoc album vel hoc rotundum est corpus meum', et qua ratione transsubstantiatio ponitur, ponenda est et transaccidentatio propter suppositionem istam extremorum pro eodem.

2.34 If, however, merely by an act of the intellect, you can do away with the accident, so that it will be regarded as the subject when you say, 'this is my body', why not with equal ease transcend the substance of the bread, if you do not want to regard either as the subject, so that 'this is my body' is no less in the substance than in the accident? After all, this is a divine work performed by God's almighty power, which can operate just as much and just as well in the accident as it can in the substance.

Si autem, intellectu excedens, eximis accidens, ut non velis subjectum pro eo supponere, cum dicis, "Hoc est corpus meum," Cur non eadem facilitate transcendis substantiam panis, ut et illam velis non accipi per subiectum, ut non minus in substantia quam accidente sit, "hoc corpus meum?" Praesertim, cum divinum illud sit opus, virtutis omnipotentis, quae tantum et taliter in substantia, quantum et qualiter in accidente potest operari.

2.35 Let us not, however, dabble too much in philosophy. Does not Christ appear to have admirably anticipated such curiosity by saying of the wine, not, "Hoc est sanguis meus," but " Hic est sanguis meus"? And yet more clearly, by bringing in the word "cup," when He said, "This cup is the new testament in my blood." Does it not seem as though He desired to keep us in a simple faith, so that we might but believe His blood to be in the cup? For my part, if I cannot fathom how the bread is the body of Christ, I will take my reason captive to the obedience of Christ, and clinging simply to His word, firmly believe not only that the body of Christ is in the bread, but that the bread is the body of Christ.

For this is proved by the words, " He took bread, and giving thanks, He broke it and said, Take, eat; this [i.e., this bread which He took and broke] is my body." And Paul says: " The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" He says not, in the bread, but the bread itself, is the communion of the body of Christ. What does it matter if philosophy cannot fathom this? The Holy Spirit is greater than Aristotle. Does philosophy fathom their transubstantiation, of which they themselves admit that here all philosophy breaks down? But the agreement of the pronoun "this" with "body," in Greek and Latin, is owing to the fact that in these languages the two words are of the same gender. But in the Hebrew language, which has no neuter gender, "this" agrees with "bread," so that it would be proper to say, "Hic est corpus meum." This is proved also by the use of language and by common sense. The subject, certainly, points to the bread, not to the body, when He says, "Hoc est corpus meum," "Das ist mein Leib," – i.e., This bread is my body.

Sed ne nimium philosophemur, Nonne Christus videtur huic curiositati [Matth. , .] pulchre occurrisse, cum non de vino dixerit 'hoc est sanguis meus' sed 'hic [. Cor. , .] est sanguis meus'? Et multo clarius, cum calicis miscet nomen, dicens 'Hic calix novi testamenti in meo sanguine', Nonne videtur nos voluisse in simplici fide continere, tantum ut crederemus sanguinem suum esse in calice? Ego sane, si non possum consequi, quo modo panis sit corpus Christi, captivabo tamen intellectum meum in obsequium Christi, et verbis eius simpliciter inhaerens credo firmiter, non modo corpus Christi esse in pane sed panem [. Cor. , f.] esse corpus Christi. Sic enim me servabunt verba, ubi dicit: Accepit panem gratias agens, fregit et dixit 'Accipite, manducate, hoc (id est hic panis, quem [. Cor. , .] acceperat et fregerat) est corpus meum'. Et Paulus: Nonne panis quem frangimus participatio corporis Christi est? Non dicit 'in pane est' sed 'ipse panis est participatio corporis Christi'. Quid, si Philosophia haec non capit? Maior est spiritussanctus quam Aristoteles. Nunquid capit transsubstantiationem illorum, cum et ipsi fateantur, hic universam philosophiam ruere? Quod autem in graeco et latino pronomen 'hoc' ad corpus refertur, facit similitudo generis, sed in hebraeo, ubi neutrum genus non est, refertur ad panem, ut sic liceat dicere 'Hic est corpus meum', quod et ipse usus loquendi et sensus communis probat, subiectum scilicet esse monstrativum [Matth. , .] panis et non corporis, dum dicit 'Hoc est corpus meum, das ist meyn leyp', id est, 'iste panis est corpus meum'.

2.36 Therefore it is with the sacrament even as it is with Christ. In order that divinity may dwell in Him, it is not necessary that the human nature be transubstantiated and divinity be contained under its accidents. But both natures are there in their entirety, and it is truly said, "This man is God," and "This God is man." Even though philosophy cannot grasp this, faith grasps it, and the authority of God's Word is greater than the grasp of our intellect. Even so, in order that the real body and the real blood of Christ may be present in the sacrament, it is not necessary that the bread and wine be transubstantiated and Christ be contained under their accidents. But both remain there together, and it is truly said, "This bread is my body, this wine is my blood," and vice versa. Thus I will for now understand it, for the honour of the holy words of God, which I will not allow any petty human argument to override or give to them meanings foreign to them. At the same time, I permit other men to follow the other opinion, which is laid down in the decree *Firmiter*. Only let them not press us to accept their opinions as articles of faith, as I said above.

Sicut ergo in Christo res se habet, ita et in sacramento. Non enim ad corporalem inhabitationem divinitatis necesse est transsubstantiari humanam naturam, ut divinitas sub accidentibus humanae naturae teneatur. Sed integra utraque natura vere dicitur 'Hic homo est deus, hic deus est homo'. Quod et si philosophia non capit, fides tamen capit. Et maior est verbi dei autoritas quam nostri ingenii capacitas. Ita in sacramento ut verum corpus verusque sanguis sit, non est necesse, panem et vinum transsubstantiari, ut Christus sub accidentibus teneatur, sed utroque simul manente vere dicitur 'hic panis est corpus meum, hoc vinum est sanguis meus', et e contra. Sic interim sapiam pro honore sanctorum verborum dei, quibus per humanas ratiunculas non patiar vim fieri et ea in alienas significationes torqueri: permitto tamen aliis opinionem alteram sequi, quae in decretali 'firmiter' statuitur, modo non urgeant suas opiniones (ut dixi) pro articulis fidei a nobis acceptari.

2.37 The third captivity of this sacrament is that most wicked abuse of all, in consequence of which there is today no more generally accepted and firmly believed opinion in the Church than this – that the mass is a good work and a sacrifice. This abuse has brought an endless host of others in its wake, so that the faith of this sacrament has become utterly extinct and the holy sacrament has truly been turned into a fair, tavern, and place of merchandise. Hence participations, brotherhoods, intercessions, merits, anniversaries, memorial

days, and the like wares are bought and sold, traded and bartered in the Church, and from this priests and monks derive their whole living.

Tertia captivitas eiusdem sacramenti Est longe impiissimus ille abusus, quo factum est, ut fere nihil sit hodie in Ecclesia receptius ac magis persuasum, quam Missam esse opus bonum et sacrificium. Qui abusus deinde inundavit infinitos alios abusus, donec fide sacramenti penitus extincta meras nundinas, cauponationes et quaestuarios quosdam contractus e divino sacramento fecerint. Hinc participationes, fraternitates, suffragia, merita, anniversaria, memoriae et id genus negotiorum in Ecclesia venduntur, emuntur, paciscuntur, componuntur, pendetque in his universa alimonia sacerdotum et monachorum.

2.38 I am attacking a difficult matter, and one perhaps impossible to abate, since it has become so firmly entrenched through century-long custom and the common consent of men that it would be necessary to abolish most of the books now in vogue, to alter almost the whole external form of the churches, and to introduce, or rather re-introduce, a totally different kind of ceremony. But my Christ lives, and we must be careful to give more heed to the Word of God than to all the thoughts of men and of angels. I will perform the duties of my office, and uncover the facts in the case. I will give the truth as I have received it, freely and without malice. For the rest let every man look to his own salvation. I will faithfully do my part that none may cast on me the blame for his lack of faith and knowledge of the truth, when we appear before the judgment seat of Christ.

Rem arduam et quam forte sit impossibile convelli aggredior, ut quae tanto saeculorum usu firmata omniumque consensu probata sic insederit, ut necesse sit maiorem partem librorum, qui hodie regnant et pene universam Ecclesiarum faciem tolli et mutari, penitusque aliud genus cerimoniarum induci seu potius reduci. Sed Christus meus vivit et maiori cura verbum dei oportet observare quam omnium hominum et angelorum intelligentias. Ego mea vice fungar, rem ipsam in lucem producturus, gratisque sicut accepi veritatem sineque invidia communicaturus. caeterum quisque suae salutis rationem habeat: incredulitatis suae et ignoratae veritatis culpam in me ne ullus torquere possit coram iudice Christo, fideliter operam dabo.

2.39 IN THE FIRST PLACE, in order to grasp safely and fortunately a true and unbiased knowledge of this sacrament, we must above all else be careful to put aside whatever has been added by the zeal and devotion of men to the original, simple institution of this sacrament – such things as vestments, ornaments, chants, prayers, organs, candles, and the whole pageantry of outward things. We must turn our eyes and hearts simply to the institution of Christ and to this alone, and put nothing before us but the very word of Christ by which He instituted this sacrament, made it perfect, and committed it to us. For in that word, and in that word alone, reside the power, the nature, and the whole substance of the mass. All else is the work of man, added to the word of Christ. And the mass can be held and remain a mass just as well without it. Now the words of Christ, in which He instituted this sacrament, are these:

Principio, ut ad veram liberamque huius sacramenti scientiam tuto et foeliciter perveniamus, curandum est ante omnia, ut omnibus iis sepositis, quae ad institutionem huius sacramenti primitivam et simplicem humanis studiis et fervoribus sunt addita, qualia sunt vestes, ornamenta, cantus, preces, organa, lucernae et universa illa visibilium rerum pompa, ad ipsam solam et puram Christi institutionem oculos et animum vertamus, nec nobis aliud proponamus quam ipsum verbum Christi, quo instituit et perfecit ac nobis commendavit sacramentum. Nam in eo verbo et prorsus nullo alio sita est vis, natura et tota substantia Missae. Caetera omnia sunt humana studia, verbo Christi accessoria, sine quibus missa optime potest haberi et subsistere. Verba autem Christi, quibus sacramentum hoc instituit, sunt haec:

2.40 "And while they were at supper, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and broke it: and gave to His disciples, and said: Take it and eat. This is my body, which shall be given for you. And taking the chalice, He gave thanks, and gave to them, saying: All of you, drink of this. This is the chalice, the new testament in my blood, which shall be shed for you and for many the remission of sins. This do to commemorate me."

[Matth. , ff.] Caenantibus autem eis, accepit Ihesus panem et benedixit ac fregit, deditque discipulis suis et ait ‘Accipite et manducate, [. Cor. , .] hoc est corpus meum quod pro vobis tradetur’. Et accipiens calicem, gratias egit et dedit illis dicens ‘Bibite ex hoc omnes, [Luc. , .] Hic est calix novum testamentum in meo sanguine qui pro vobis [. Cor. , .] et pro

multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum. Hoc facite in meam commemorationem’.

2.41 These words the Apostle also delivers and more fully expounds in 1 Corinthians 11. On them we must lean and build as on a firm foundation, if we would not be carried about with every wind of doctrine, even as we have until now been carried about by the wicked doctrines of men, who turn aside the truth. For in these words nothing is omitted that concerns the completeness, the use and the blessing of this sacrament and nothing is included that is superfluous and not necessary for us to know. Whoever sets them aside and meditates or teaches concerning the mass, will teach monstrous and wicked doctrines, as they have done who made of the sacrament an opus operatum and a sacrifice.

[. Cor. , ff.] Quae verba et Apostolus i. Corint. xi. tradit et latius explicat, quibus nos oportet niti et super ea aedificari, ceu supra firmam petram, si non volumus omni vento doctrinae circumferri, sicut hactenus circumlati sumus, per impias doctrinas hominum aversantium veritatem. Nihil enim in his omissum, quod ad integritatem, usum et fructum huius sacramenti pertinet, nihilque positum, quod superfluum et non necessarium sit nobis nosse. Qui enim omissis his verbis de Missa vel meditatur vel docet, monstra impietatis docebit, ut factum est per eos, qui opus operatum et sacrificium ex eo fecerunt.

2.42 Therefore let this stand at the outset as our infallibly certain proposition – the mass, or Sacrament of the Altar, is Christ's testament which He left behind Him at His death, to be distributed among His believers. For that is the meaning of His word – "This is the chalice, the new testament in my blood." Let this truth stand, I say, as the immovable foundation on which we shall base all that we have to say, for we are going to overthrow, as you will see, all the godless opinions of men imported into this most precious sacrament. Christ, who is the Truth, said truly that this is the new testament in His blood, which is shed for us. Not without reason do I dwell on this sentence. The matter is not at all trivial, and must be most deeply impressed upon us.

Stet ergo primum et infallibiliter, Missam seu sacramentum altaris esse testamentum Christi, quod moriens post se reliquit distribuendum suis fidelibus. [Luc. , .] Sic enim habent eius verba ‘Hic calix novum testamentum in meo sanguine’. Stet, inquam, ista veritas ut fundamentum

immobile, super quod omnia struemus, quae dicenda sunt. hoc enim videbis, ut subvertemus omnes hominum impietates in hoc dulcissimum sacramentum invectas. Verax ergo [Luc. , .] Christus vere dicit, Hoc esse novum testamentum in sanguine suo pro nobis fuso. Non frustra haec inculco: res est non parva et imis sensibus reponenda.

2.43 Let us inquire, therefore, what a testament is, and we shall learn at the same time what the mass is, what its use is, what its blessing is, and what its abuse is.

Quaeramus ergo quid sit testamentum, et simul habebimus quid sit missa, quis usus, quis fructus, quis abusus eius.

2.44 A testament, as every one knows, is a promise made by one about to die, in which he designates his bequest and appoints his heirs. Therefore a testament involves, first, the death of the testator, and secondly, the promise of the bequest and the naming of the heir. Thus St. Paul discusses at length the nature of a testament in Romans 4, Galatians 3 and 4, and Hebrews 9. The same thing is also clearly seen in these words of Christ. Christ testifies concerning His death when He says: "This is my body, which shall be given; this is my blood, which shall be shed." He designates the bequest when He says: "For remission of sins." And He appoints the heirs when He says: "For you, and for many" – i.e., for such as accept and believe the promise of the testator. For here it is faith that makes men heirs, as we shall see.

Testamentum absque dubio Est promissio morituri, qua nuncupat haereditatem suam et instituit haeredes. Involvit itaque testamentum primo mortem testatoris, deinde haereditatis promissionem et haeredis nuncupationem. [Röm. ., Gal. . ., Hebr. .] Sic enim Paulus Ro. iiii. et Gal. iii. et iiii. et Heb. ix. diffuse testamentum tractat. Quod et in verbis istis Christi clare videmus. Mortem suam Christus [Luc. , f.] testatur, dum dicit 'Hoc est corpus meum, quod tradetur, Hic sanguis meus, qui effundetur'. Haereditatem nuncupat et designat, cum dicit 'In remissionem peccatorum'. Haeredes autem instituit, cum dicit 'pro vobis et pro multis', id est, qui acceptant et credunt promissioni testatoris: fides enim hic haeredes facit, ut videbimus.

2.45 You see, therefore, that what we call the mass is the promise of remission of sins made to us by God – the kind of promise that has been confirmed by the

death of the Son of God. For the one difference between a promise and a testament is that a testament is a promise which implies the death of him who makes it. A testator is a man who is about to die making a promise. While he that makes a promise is, if I may so put it, a testator who is not about to die. This testament of Christ was foreshadowed in all the promises of God from the beginning of the world. Yes, whatever value those ancient promises possessed was altogether derived from this new promise that was to come in Christ. This is why the words "covenant" and "testament of the Lord" occur so frequently in the Scriptures, which words signified that God would one day die. For where there is a testament, the death of the testator must follow (Hebrews 9). Now God made a testament. Therefore it was necessary that He should die. But God could not die unless He became man. Thus both the incarnation and the death of Christ are briefly understood in this one word "testament."

Vides ergo, quod Missa quam vocamus sit promissio remissionis peccatorum, a deo nobis facta, et talis promissio, quae per mortem filii dei firmata sit. Nam promissio et testamentum non differunt alio quam quod testamentum simul involvit mortem promissoris. Et testator idem est quod moriturus promissor, promissor autem victurus (ut sic dicam) testator. Hoc testamentum Christi praefiguratum est in omnibus promissionibus dei ab initio mundi, immo omnes promissiones antiquae in ista nova futura in Christo promissione valuerunt, quicquid valuerunt, in eaque pependerit. Inde usitatissima sunt illa in scripturis verba 'pactum, foedus, testamentum domini'. Quibus significabatur deus olim moriturus. Nam ubi testamentum est, mors [Hebr. , .] testatoris intercedat necesse est, Heb. ix. Deus autem testatus est, ideo necesse fuit eum mori: mori autem non potuit, nisi esset homo: ita in eodem testamenti vocabulo compendiosissime et incarnatio et mors Christi comprehensa est.

2.46 From the above it will at once be seen what is the right and what is the wrong use of the mass, what is the worthy and what is the unworthy preparation for it. If the mass is a promise, as has been said, it is to be approached, not with any work, strength or merit, but with faith alone. For where there is the word of God Who makes the promise, there must be the faith of man who takes it. It is plain, therefore, that the first step in our salvation is faith, which clings to the word of the promise made by God, Who without any effort on our part, in free and unmerited mercy makes a beginning and offers us the word of His promise. For He sent His Word, and by it healed them. He did not accept our work and

thus heal us. God's Word is the beginning of all. Faith follows it, and love follows faith. Then love works every good work, for it does cause harm, no, it is the fulfilling of the law. In no other way can man come to God and deal with Him than through faith. That is, not man, by any work of his, but God, by His promise, is the author of salvation, so that all things depend on the word of His power, and are upheld and preserved by it, with which word He conceived us, that we should be a kind of firstfruits of His creatures.

Ex quibus iam sua sponte patet, quis sit usus et abusus Missae, quae digna vel indigna praeparatio. Si enim promissio est, ut dictum est, nullis operibus, nullis viribus, nullis meritis ad eam acceditur, sed sola fide. Ubi enim est verbum promittentis dei, ibi necessaria est fides acceptantis hominis, ut clarum sit initium salutis nostrae esse fidem, quae pendeat in verbo promittentis dei, qui citra omne nostrum studium gratuita et immerita misericordia [Ps. , .] nos praevenit et offert promissionis suae verbum. 'Misit enim verbum suum et sic sanavit eos'. Non autem accepit opus nostrum et sic salvavit nos. Verbum dei omnium primum est, quod sequitur fides, fidem charitas, Charitas deinde facit omne bonum opus, quia non operatur malum, immo est plenitudo legis. Nec alia via potest homo cum deo aut convenire aut agere quam per fidem, id est, ut non homo suis operibus ullis, sed deus sua promissione sit autor salutis, ut omnia pendeant, portentur serventurque in verbo virtutis suae, quo genuit nos, ut essemus initium aliquod creaturae eius.

2.47 Thus, in order to raise up Adam after the fall, God gave him this promise, addressing the serpent: "I will put hostility between you and the woman, and you seed and her seed. She shall crush your head, and you will lie in wait for her heel." In this word of promise Adam, with his descendants, was carried as it were in God's arms, and by faith in it he was preserved, patiently waiting for the woman who should crush the serpent's head, as God had promised. And in that faith and expectation he died, not knowing when or in what form she would come, yet never doubting that she would come. For such a promise, being the truth of God, preserves, even in hell, those who believe it and wait for it. After this came another promise, made to Noah – to last until the time of Abraham – when a rainbow was set as a sign in the clouds, by faith in which Noah and his descendants found a gracious God. After that He promised Abraham that all nations should be blessed in his seed. This is Abraham's arms, in which his posterity was carried. Then to Moses and the children of Israel, and especially

to David, He gave the plain promise of Christ, thereby at last making clear what was meant by the ancient promise to them.

Sic Adae post lapsum erigendo dedit hanc promissionem, dicens ad [. Mos. , .] serpentem 'Inimicitias ponam inter te et mulierem, inter semen tuum et semen illius, Ipsa conteret caput tuum, et tu insidiaberis calcaneo illius'. In hoc promissionis verbo Adam cum suis tanquam in gremio dei portatus est et fide illius servatus, expectans longanimiter mulierem, quae conteret caput serpentis, sicut deus promisit. Et in hac fide et expectatione etiam mortuus est, ignarus, quando et qualis esset futura, futuram tamen non diffidens. Nam talis promissio, cum sit veritas dei, etiam in inferno servat credentes [. Mos. , ff.] et expectantes eam. Post hanc secuta est promissio alia, facta Noe, usque ad Abraham, dato pro signo foederis arcu nubium, cuius fide ipse et posterii [. Mos. , .] eius propitium deum invenerunt. Post hunc Abrahae promisit benedictionem omnium gentium in semine eius. Et hic est sinus Abrahae, in quem recepti [. Mos. , ., . Sam. , .] sunt posterii eius. Deinde Mosi et filiis Israel, praecipue David, apertissimam de Christo promissionem dedit, quo revelavit tandem, quae fuerit priscis facta promissio.

2.48 So it came finally to the most complete promise of the new testament, in which with plain words life and salvation are freely promised, and granted to such as believe the promise. He distinguished this testament by a particular mark from the old, calling it the "new testament." For the old testament, which He gave by Moses, was a promise not of remission of sins or of eternal things, but of temporal things – namely, the land of Canaan – by which no man was renewed in his spirit, to lay hold of the heavenly inheritance. Therefore it was also necessary that irrational beasts should be slain, as types of Christ, that by their blood the testament might be confirmed. So the testament was like the blood, and the promise like the sacrifice. But here He says: "The new testament in my blood" – not in another's, but in His own. By this blood grace is promised, through the Spirit, for the remission of sins, that we may obtain the inheritance.

Sic ventum est ad promissionem omnium perfectissimam novi testamenti, in qua apertis verbis vita et salus gratuito promittuntur et credentibus promissioni donantur. Et insigni nota discernit hoc testamentum a [Luc. , .] veteri, dum dicit 'Novum testamentum'. Vetus enim testamentum, per Mosen datum, erat promissio non remissionis peccatorum seu aeternarum rerum, sed temporalium, nempe terrae

Canaan, per quam nemo renovabatur spiritu ad haereditatem coelestem capessendam. unde et irrationalem pecudem in figura Christi oportebat occidi, in cuius sanguine idem testamentum confirmabatur, ut qualis sanguis tale testamentum, qualis hostia talis promissio. At hic [Luc. , .] dicit 'Testamentum novum in meo', non alieno sed proprio, 'sanguine', quo gratia per spiritum in remissionem peccatorum ad haereditatem capiendam promittitur.

2.49 The mass, according to its substance, is, therefore, nothing else than the words of Christ mentioned above – "Take and eat." It is as if He said: "Behold, condemned, sinful man, in the pure and unmerited love with which I love you, and by the will of the Father of all mercies, I promise you in these words, even though you do not desire or deserve them, the forgiveness of all your sins and life everlasting. And, so that you may be most certainly assured of this my irrevocable promise, I give my body and shed my blood, thus by my very death confirming this promise, and leaving my body and blood to you as a sign and memorial of this same promise. As often, therefore, as you partake of them, remember me, and praise, magnify, and give thanks for my love and bounty for you."

Est itaque Missa secundum substantiam suam proprie nihil aliud quam [. Cor. , .] verba Christi praedicta 'Accipite et manducate &c.' ac si dicat 'Ecce o homo peccator et damnatus, ex mera gratuitaque charitate, qua diligo te, sic volente misericordiarum patre, his verbis promitto tibi, ante omne meritum et votum tuum, remissionem omnium peccatorum tuorum et vitam aeternam, et ut certissimus de hac mea promissione irrevocabili sis, corpus meum tradam et sanguinem fundam, morte ipsa hanc promissionem confirmaturus et utrunque tibi in signum et memoriale eiusdem promissionis relicturus. Quod cum frequentaveris, mei memor sis, hanc meam in te charitatem et largitatem praedices et laudes, et gratias agas.

2.50 From this you will see that nothing else is needed to have a worthy mass than a faith that confidently relies on this promise, believes these words of Christ are true, and does not doubt that these infinite blessings have been bestowed upon it. Following closely behind this faith there follows, by itself, a most sweet stirring of the heart, by which the spirit of man is enlarged and grows fat – that is love, given by the Holy Spirit through faith in Christ – so that he is drawn to Christ, that gracious and good Testator, and made quite another

and a new man. Who would not shed tears of gladness, no, nearly faint for the joy he has for Christ, if he believed with unshaken faith that this inestimable promise of Christ belonged to him! How could one help loving so great a Benefactor, who offers, promises and grants, all unasked, such great riches, and this eternal inheritance, to someone unworthy and deserving of something far different?

Ex quibus vides ad Missam digne habendam aliud non requiri quam fidem, quae huic promissioni fideliter nitatur, Christum in his suis verbis veracem credat et sibi haec immensa bona esse donata non dubitet. Ad hanc fidem mox sequetur sua sponte dulcissimus affectus cordis, quo dilatatur et impinguatur spiritus hominis (haec est charitas, per spiritum sanctum in fide Christi donata), ut in Christum, tam largum et benignum testatorem, rapiatur fiatque penitus alius et novus homo. Quis enim non dulciter lachrymetur, immo prae gaudio in Christum pene exanimetur, si credat fide indubitata, hanc Christi promissionem inaestimabilem ad se pertinere? Quomodo non diliget tantum benefactorem, qui indigno et longe alia merito tantas divitias et haereditatem hanc aeternam praeveniens offert, promittit et donat?

2.51 Therefore, it is our one misfortune, that we have many masses in the world, and yet none or but the fewest of us recognize, consider and receive these promises and riches that are offered, although truly we should do nothing else in the mass with greater zeal (yes, it demands all our zeal) than set before our eyes, meditate, and ponder these words, these promises of Christ, which truly are the mass itself, in order to exercise, nourish, increase, and strengthen our faith by such daily remembrance. For this is what He commands, saying, "This do in remembrance of me." This should be done by the preachers of the Gospel, in order that this promise might be faithfully impressed upon the people and commended to them, to the awakening of faith in the same.

Quocirca una et sola miseria nostra, quod multas Missas in orbe habemus et nulli vel pauci has promissiones et divitias propositas agnoscimus, consyderamus et apprehendimus, cum revera in missa aliud agi non oporteat maiori, immo unico studio, quam ut haec verba, has promissiones Christi, quae vere sunt ipsa Missa, ante oculos versaremus, meditaremur et ruminaremus, quo fidem in ea exerceremus, nutrireus, augeremus et roboraremus [. Cor. , f.] hac quotidiana commemoratione. hoc est enim quod praecipit, dicens 'Hoc facite in meam

commemorationem': hoc ipsum agere deberet Euangelista, ut promissionem istam populo fideliter inculcaret et commendaret ad provocandam fidem eorum in eandem.

2.52 But how many are there now who know that the mass is the promise of Christ? I will say nothing of those godless preachers of fables, who teach human traditions instead of this promise. And even if they teach these words of Christ, they do not teach them as a promise or testament, and, therefore, not to the awakening of faith.

At nunc quota pars novit missam esse promissionem Christi? ut taceam impios fabulatores, qui humanas traditiones vice tantae promissionis docent. Quod si etiam haec verba Christi docent, non tamen nomine promissionis aut testamenti, ac per hoc non ad obtinendam fidem docent.

2.53 O the pity of it! Under this captivity, they take every precaution that no layman should hear these words of Christ, as if they were too sacred to be delivered to the common people. So mad are we priests that we arrogantly claim that the so-called words of consecration may be said by ourselves alone, as secret words, yet so that they do not profit even us, for we too fail to regard them as promises or as a testament, for the strengthening of faith. Instead of believing them, we reverence them with I know not what superstitious and godless fancies. This misery of ours, what is it but a device of Satan to remove every trace of the mass out of the Church? although he is meanwhile at work filling every nook and corner on earth with masses, that is, abuses and mockeries of God's testament, and burdening the world more and more heavily with grievous sins of idolatry, to its deeper condemnation. For what worse idolatry can there be than to abuse God's promises with perverse opinions and to neglect or extinguish faith in them?

Quin, quod deploramus, in hac captivitate omni studio cavetur hodie, ne verba illa Christi ullus laicus audiat, quasi sacratiora quam ut vulgo tradi debeant. Sic enim insanimus et verba consecrationis (ut vocant) nobis sacerdotibus solis arrogamus occulte dicenda, sic tamen, ut ne nobis quidem prosint, cum nec ipsi ea ut promissiones seu testamentum habeamus ad fidem nutriendam. sed nescio, qua superstitione et impia opinione ea reveremur potius quam eis credimus. Qua miseria nostra quid aliud Satan in nobis operatur, quam ut nihil de missa in Ecclesia reliquum faciat, curet tamen interim omnes angulos orbis missis plenos esse, hoc

est, abusionibus et irrisionibus testamenti dei, gravissimisque idolatriae peccatis mundum assidue magis ac magis onerari ad damnationem maiorem augendam? Quod enim idolatriae peccatum gravius esse potest quam promissionibus dei perversa opinione abuti et fidem in easdem vel negligere vel extinguere?

2.54 For God does not deal, nor has He ever dealt, with man otherwise than through a word of promise, as I have said. Again, we cannot deal with God otherwise than through faith in the word of His promise. He does not desire works, nor has He need of them. We deal with men and with ourselves on the basis of works. But He has need of this – that we deem Him true to His promises, wait patiently for Him, and thus worship Him with faith, hope and love. Thus He obtains His glory among us, since it is not of ourselves who run, but of God who shows mercy, promises and gives, that we have and hold every blessing. That is the true worship and service of God which we must perform in the mass. But if the words of promise are not proclaimed, what exercise of faith can there be? And without faith, who can have hope or love? Without faith, hope and love, what service can there be? There is no doubt, therefore, that in our day all priests and monks, together with all their bishops and superiors, are idolaters and in a most perilous state, by reason of this ignorance, abuse and mockery of the mass, or sacrament, or testament of God.

Neque enim deus, ut dixi, aliter cum hominibus unquam egit aut agit quam verbo promissionis. Rursus, nec nos cum deo unquam agere aliter possumus quam fide in verbum promissionis eius. Opera ille nihil curat nec eis indiget, quibus potius erga homines et cum hominibus et nobisipsis agimus. Indiget autem, ut verax in suis promissis a nobis habeatur talisque longanimiter sustineatur, ac sic fide, spe et charitate colatur. Quo fit, ut gloriam suam in nobis obtineat, dum non nobis currentibus sed ipso miserente, promittente, donante omnia bona accipimus et habemus. Ecce hic est verus cultus dei et latria, quam in missa debemus persolvere. Sed quum promissionis verba non traduntur, quae fidei exercitatio haberi potest? At sine fide quis sperat? quis amat? sine fide, spe et charitate quae latria? Non est itaque dubium, universos hodie sacerdotes et monachos cum Episcopis et omnibus suis maioribus esse idolatras, in statu periculosissimo agentes ob hanc missae seu sacramenti seu promissionis dei ignorantiam, abusionem, irrisionem.

2.55 For any one can easily see that these two – the promise and faith – must go together. For without the promise there is nothing to believe, while without faith the promise remains without effect, for it is established and fulfilled through faith. From this every one will readily gather that the mass, which is nothing else than the promise, is approached and observed only in this faith, without which whatever prayers, preparations, works, signs of the cross, or genuflections are brought to it, are incitements to impiety rather than exercises of piety. For they who come thus prepared are likely to imagine themselves on that account justly entitled to approach the altar, when in reality they are less prepared than at any other time and in any other work, by reason of the unbelief which they bring with them. How many priests will you find every day offering the sacrifice of the mass, who accuse themselves of a horrible crime if they – wretched men! – commit a trifling blunder – such as putting on the wrong robe or forgetting to wash their hands or stumbling over their prayers – but that they neither regard nor believe the mass itself, namely, the divine promise. This causes them not the slightest qualms of conscience. O worthless religion of this our age, the most godless and thankless of all ages!

Quilibet enim facile intelligit, quod haec duo sunt simul necessaria, promissio et fides: sine promissione enim credi nihil potest, sine fide autem promissio inutilis est, cum per fidem stabiliatur et impleatur. Ex quibus itidem facile quivis colligit, Missam, cum sit aliud nihil quam promissio, hac fide sola adiri et frequentari, sine qua quicquid preclarum, praeparatoriorum, operum, signorum, gestuum, affertur, irritabula sunt impietatis magis quam officia pietatis, cum fere fiat, ut his paratis existiment sese legitime altaria accedere, et revera non fuerint ullo tempore vel opere magis inepti propter infidelitatem quam secum afferunt. Quantos passim videas et quotidie sacrificulos, qui, si vel inepte vestiti vel illotis manibus vel inter precandum titubantes quid leviuscule erraverint, ingenti sese miseri crimine reos faciunt, at, quod missam ipsam, id est, divinam promissionem, neque observant neque credunt, prorsus ne tantillum quidem habent conscientiae. O indigna religio nostro saeculo omnium impiissimo et ingrattissimo!

2.56 Hence the only worthy preparation and proper use of the mass is faith in the mass, that is to say, in the divine promise. Whoever, therefore, is minded to approach the altar and to receive the sacrament, let him beware of appearing empty before the Lord God. But he will appear empty unless he has faith in the

mass, or this new testament. What godless work that he could commit would be a more grievous crime against the truth of God, than this unbelief of his, by which, as much as in him lies, he convicts God of being a liar and a maker of empty promises? The safest course, therefore, will be to go to mass in the same spirit in which you would go to hear any other promise of God, that is, not to be ready to perform and bring many works, but to believe and receive all that is there promised, or proclaimed by the priest as having been promised to you. If you do not go in this spirit, beware of going at all. You will surely go to your condemnation.

Praeparatio itaque digna et usus legitime non est nisi fides, qua creditur Missae, id est, divinae promissioni. Quocirca accessurus ad altare sive sacramentum accepturus caveat, ne vacuus appareat in conspectu domini dei. Vacuus autem erit, si fidem non habuerit in Missam seu testamentum hoc novum. Qua impietate quid posset gravius committere in divinam veritatem quam hac incredulitate sua? quantum est in se, mendacem arguit et vane promittentem. Tutissimum itaque fuerit, ad Missam non alio animo accedere, quam si ad audiendam quamlibet aliam promissionem dei velis accedere, hoc est, ut paratus sis non multa operari et afferre, sed omnia credere et accipere, quae tibi illic promittuntur seu promissa pronunciantur per ministerium sacerdotis. Hoc animo si non veneris, cave accesseris, in iudicium sine dubio accedes.

2.57 I was right, then, in saying that the whole power of the mass consists in the words of Christ, in which He testifies that the remission of sins is bestowed on all those who believe that His body is given and His blood shed for them. For this reason nothing is more important for those who go to hear mass than diligently and in full faith to ponder these words. Unless they do this, all else that they do is in vain. But while the mass is the word of Christ, it is also true that God usually adds to nearly every one of His promises a certain sign as a mark or memorial of His promise, so that we may thereby the more faithfully hold to His promise and be the more forcibly admonished by it. Thus, to his promise to Noah that He would not again destroy the world by a flood, He added His rainbow in the clouds, to show that He would be mindful of His covenant. And after promising Abraham the inheritance in his seed, He gave him the sign of circumcision as the seal of his righteousness by faith. Thus, to Gideon He granted the sign of the dry and the wet fleece, to confirm His promise of victory over the Midianites. And to Ahaz He offered a sign through

Isaiah concerning his victory over the kings of Syria and Samaria, to strengthen his faith in the promise. And many such signs of the promises of God do we find in the Scriptures.

Recte itaque dixi, totam virtutem Missae consistere in verbis Christi, quibus testatur remissionem peccatorum donari omnibus, qui credunt corpus eius tradi et sanguinem eius fundi pro se. Atque ob hanc rem nulla re magis opus esse audituris Missam quam ut ipsa verba sedulo et plena fide meditentur. quod nisi fecerint, frustra omnia alia fecerint. Hoc sane verum est, in omni promissione sua deus fere solitus est adiacere signum aliquod, ceu monumentum, ceu memoriale promissionis suae, quo fidelius servaretur et efficacius moneret. Sic in promissione Noe data de non perdenda terra alio diluvio dedit arcum suum in nubibus, quo dixit, sese recordaturum [. Mos. , . , ff., Richt. , ff.] foederis sui. Et Abrahae post promissionem haereditatis in semine suo dedit circumcisionem in signaculum iustitiae fidei. Sic Gedeoni dedit vellus aridum et roridum ad firmandam promissionem suam super vincendis Madianitis. [Jes. , ff.] Sic Ahas per Esaiam obtulit signum pro vincendo rege Syriae et Samariae, quo promissioni suae fidem in eo firmaret. Talia multa legimus signa promissionum dei in scripturis.

2.58 Thus also to the mass, that crown of all His promises, He adds His body and blood in the bread and wine, as a memorial sign of this great promise, as He says, " This do in remembrance of me." Even so in baptism He adds to the words of the promise, the sign of immersion in water. We learn from this that in every promise of God two things are presented to us – the word and the sign – so that we are to understand the word to be the testament, but the sign to be the sacrament. Thus, in the mass, the word of Christ is the testament, and the bread and wine are the sacrament. And as there is greater power in the word than in the sign, so there is greater power in the testament than in the sacrament. For a man can have and use the word, or testament, apart from the sign, or sacrament. "Believe," says Augustine, "and you have eaten." But what does one believe save the word of promise? Therefore I can hold mass every day, yes, every hour, for I can set the words of Christ before me, and with them refresh and strengthen my faith, as often as I choose. That is a truly spiritual eating and drinking.

Sic et in Missa, hac omnium principe promissione, adiecit signum memoriale tantae promissionis, suum ipsius corpus et suum ipsius

sanguinem [. Cor. , f.] in pane et vino, sicut dicit 'Hoc facite in meam commemorationem'. Sic in Baptismo verbis promissionis adiicit signum mersionis in aquam. Ex quibus intelligimus, in qualibet promissione dei duo proponi, verbum et signum, ut verbum intelligamus esse testamentum, signum vero esse sacramentum, ut in Missa verbum Christi est testamentum, panis et vinum sunt sacramentum. Atque ut maior vis sita est in verbo quam signo, ita maior in testamento quam sacramento, Quia potest homo verbum seu testamentum habere et eo uti absque signo seu sacramento. Crede, inquit Augustinus, et manducasti. Sed cui creditur, nisi verbo promittentis? Ita possum quotidie, immo omni hora Missam habere, dum quoties voluero possum verba Christi mihi proponere, et fidem meam in illis alere et roborare. hoc est revera, spiritualiter manducare et bibere.

2.59 Here you may see what great things our theologians of the Sentences have produced. That which is the principal and chief thing, namely, the testament and word of promise, is not treated by one of them. Thus they have obliterated faith and the whole power of the mass. But the second part of the mass – the sign, or sacrament – this alone do they discuss, yet in such a manner that here too they teach not faith but their preparations and opera operata, participations and fruits, as though these were the mass, until they have fallen to babbling of transubstantiation and endless other metaphysical quibbles, and have destroyed the proper understanding and use of both sacrament and testament, altogether abolished faith, and caused Christ's people to forget their God, as the prophet says, days without number. Let the others count the manifold fruits of hearing mass. Focus your attention on this: say and believe with the prophet, that God prepares a table before you in the presence of your enemies, at which your soul may eat and grow fat. But your faith is fed only with the word of divine promise, for "not by bread alone does man live, but by every word that proceeds from the mouth of God." Hence, in the mass you must above all things pay closest heed to the word of promise, as to your rich banquet, green pasture, and sacred refreshment. You must esteem this word higher than all else, trust in it above all things, and cling firmly to it even through the midst of death and all sins. By thus doing you will attain not merely to those tiny drops and crumbs of "fruits of the mass," which some have superstitiously imagined, but to the very fountainhead of life, which is faith in the word, from which every blessing flows. As it is said in John 4: "He who believes in me, out of his heart will flow rivers of living water" and again: "He who will drink of the water that I will

give him, it shall become in him a fountain of living water, springing up to life everlasting."

Hic vides, quid et quantum Theologi sententiarum in hac re praestiterint. Primum, id quod summum et capitale est, nempe testamentum et verbum promissionis, nullus eorum tractat, atque ita fidem et totam missae virtutem nobis oblitterarunt. Deinde, alteram eius partem, scilicet signum seu sacramentum, solum versant, sed ita, ut nec in hac fidem doceant sed suas praeparationes et opera operata, participationes et fructus missae, donec in profundum venerint, et de transsubstantiatione aliisque infinitis metaphysicis nugis nugarentur, et scientiam verumque usum tam testamenti quam [Jer. , .] sacramenti cum universa fide abolerent, facerentque, ut populus Christi (ut propheta dicit) oblivisceretur dei sui diebus innumeris. Tu vero sine alios percensere varios fructus auditae missae et animum tuum huc intende, ut [Ps. , .] cum Propheta dicas et credas, hic tibi a deo paratam esse mensam coram te adversus omnes qui tribulant te, in qua pascatur et pinguescat fides tua. [Matth. , .] Non autem pascitur fides tua nisi promissionis divinae verbo. Homo enim non in solo pane vivit, sed in omni verbo quod procedit de ore dei. Quare in missa ante omnia verbi promissionis te observatorem esse curiosissimum oportet tanquam opulentissimi convivii, omnimodae pascae et sanctae refectionis tuae, ut hoc prae omnibus maximi facias, plurimum in id confidas et firmissime in eo haereas, etiam per mortem et omnia peccata. Quod si feceris, non solum stillas istas et minutias fructuum missae, quas quidam etiam superstitiose finxerunt, sed ipsum fontem principalem vitae obtinebis, [Joh. , .] fidem scilicet verbi, ex qua omne bonum fluit, sicut Iohan. iii. dicit: Qui [Joh. , .] in me credit, de ventre eius fluent aquae vivae. Item: Qui biberit ex aqua, quam ego dabo, fiet in eo fons aquae vivae, salientis in vitam aeternam.

2.60 Now there are two roadblocks that commonly prevent us from gathering the fruits of the mass. First, the fact that we are sinners and unworthy of such great things because of our exceeding vileness. Secondly, the fact that, even if we were worthy, these things are so high that our faint-hearted nature dare not aspire to them or ever hope to attain to them. For to have God for our Father, to be His sons and heirs of all His goods – these are the great blessings that come to us through the forgiveness of sins and life everlasting. If you see these things clearly, aren't you more likely to stand in awe before them than to desire to

possess them? Against this twofold faintness of ours we must lay hold on the word of Christ and fix our gaze on it much more firmly than on those thoughts of our weakness. For "great are the works of the Lord; all who enjoy them study them," " who is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think." If they did not surpass our worthiness, our grasp and all our thoughts, they would not be divine. Thus Christ also encourages us when He says: "Fear not, little flock, for your Father is pleased to give you a kingdom." For it is just this overflowing goodness of the incomprehensible God, lavished upon us through Christ, that moves us to love Him again with our whole heart above all things, to be drawn to Him with all confidence, to despise all things else, and be ready to suffer all things for Him. For this reason, this sacrament is correctly called "a fount of love."

Iam duo sunt, quae solent nos tentare, ne fructus missae percipiamus. Alterum est, nos esse peccatores et indignos prae nimia vilitate rebus tantis. Alterum, etiam si digni essemus, magnitudo tamen rerum tanta est, ut natura pusillanimis non audeat ea petere aut sperare. Nam remissionem peccatorum et aeternam vitam quis non stupescat potius quam optet, si digne pensetur magnitudo bonorum, quae per ea veniunt? habere scilicet deum patrem, esse filium, haeredem omnium bonorum dei. Adversus hanc geminam pusillanimitatem oportet ut verbum Christi apprehendas ipsumque multo fortius intuearis quam has cogitationes infirmitatis tuae. Magna enim sunt opera domini, exquisita in omnes voluntates eius, qui potens est dare supra quam petimus aut intelligimus. Nisi enim superarent nostram dignitatem, nostram capacitatem, nostrum denique omnem sensum, divina non essent. Sic et [Luc. , .] Christus nos animat dicens: Nolite timere, pusillus grex, placuit enim patri vestro dare vobis regnum. Haec ipsa enim exuberantia incomprehensibilis dei in nos per Christum effusa facit, ut eum rursus super omnia ardentissime diligamus, summa fiducia in eum feramur, omnia contemnamus, prompti simus omnia pro eo pati, unde et recte fons dilectionis hoc sacramentum est appellatum.

2.61 Let us take an illustration of this from human experience. If a thousand gold coins were bequeathed by a rich lord to a beggar or an unworthy and wicked servant, it is certain that he would boldly claim and take them regardless of his unworthiness and the greatness of the bequest. And if any one should seek to oppose him by pointing out his unworthiness and the large amount of the legacy, what do you suppose he would say? Certainly, he would say: "What

is that to you? What I accept, I accept not on my merits or by any right that I may personally have to it. I know that I am unworthy and receive more than I have deserved, no, I have deserved the very opposite. But I claim it because it is so written in the will, and on the account of another's goodness. If it was not an unworthy thing for him to bequeath so great a sum to an unworthy person, why should I refuse to accept this other man's gracious gift?" With such thoughts we need to fortify the consciences of men against all qualms and scruples, that they may lay hold of the promise of Christ with unwavering faith, and take the greatest care to approach the sacrament, not trusting in their confession, prayer and preparation, but rather despairing of these and with a proud confidence in Christ Who gives the promise. For, as we have said again and again, the word of promise must here reign supreme in a pure and unalloyed faith, and such faith is the one and all-sufficient preparation.

In qua re exemplum tibi sume ex hominibus. Si enim cuiquam mendico aut etiam indigno et malo servo legaret ditissimus dominus mille aureos, certe cum fiducia eos postularet et acciperet, nec indignitatis suae nec magnitudinis testamenti habita ratione. Quod si quis ei resistens obiiceret indignitatem suam et magnitudinem testamenti, quid, putas, dicturus est? scilicet 'Quid ad te? non ego merito meo nec iure ullo proprio accipio quod accipio. Scio me indignum et maiora accipere quam merear, immo contraria merui, sed iure testamenti et alienae bonitatis peto quod peto: si illi non fuit indignum tanta tam indigno legare, cur ego propter indignitatem meam contemnam acceptare? quin hac ipsa causa magis amplector gratuitam et alienam gratiam, qua ego sum indignior'. Eadem cogitatione armari oportet et cuiusque conscientiam adversus omnes scrupulos et morsus suos ad hanc Christi promissionem indubitata fide obtinendam summopere cavendo, ne fiducia confessionis, orationis, praeparationis quisquam accedat, sed his omnibus desperatis in superba fiducia promittentis Christi. Quia, ut dictum est satis, verbum promissionis hic solum regnare debet in fide pura, quae est unica et sola sufficiens praeparatio.

2.62 Hence we see how angry God is with us, in that he has permitted godless teachers to conceal the words of this testament from us, and thereby, as much as in them lay, to extinguish faith. And the inevitable result of this extinguishing of faith is even now plainly to be seen – namely, the most godless superstition of works. For when faith dies and the word of faith is silent, works and the

traditions of works immediately crowd into their place. By them we have been carried away out of our own land, as in a Babylonian captivity, and despoiled of all our precious possessions. This has been the fate of the mass. It has been converted by the teaching of godless men into a good work, which they themselves call an *opus operatum* and by which they presumptuously imagine themselves all-powerful with God. Thereupon they proceeded to the very height of madness, and having invented the lie that the mass works *ex opere operato*, they asserted further that it is none the less profitable to others, even if it be harmful to the wicked priest celebrating it. On such a foundation of sand they base their applications, participations, sodalities, anniversaries and numberless other money-making schemes.

Videmus ex his, quam grandi ira dei factum sit, ut verba testamenti huius nos caelarint impii doctores atque per hoc ipsum fidem extinxerunt quantum in eis fuit. Iam pronum est videre, quid ad fidem extinctam sequi fuit necesse, nempe superstitiones operum impiissimas. Ubi enim fides occidit et verbum fidei obmutescit, ibi mox surgunt opera in locum eius et traditiones operum. Quibus ceu captivitate Babylonica translati sumus de terra nostra, captis omnibus desyderabilibus nostris. Ita de missa contigit, quae impiorum hominum doctrina mutata est in opus bonum, quod ipsi vocant *opus operatum*, quo apud deum sese omnia praesumunt posse. Inde processum est ad extremum insaniae, ut, quia Missam ex vi operis operati valere mentiti sunt, adiecerunt, eam non minus utilem esse caeteris, etiam si ipsi impio sacrificio noxia sit, atque in hanc harenam fundaverunt suas applicationes, participationes et fraternitates, anniversaria et id genus infinita lucri et quaestus negotia.

2.63 These lures are so powerful, widespread and firmly entrenched that you will scarcely be able to prevail against them unless you keep before you with unremitting care the real meaning of the mass, and bear well in mind what has been said above. We have seen that the mass is nothing else than the divine promise or testament of Christ, sealed with the sacrament of His body and blood. If that is true, you will understand that it cannot possibly be a work, and that there is nothing to do in it, nor can it be dealt within any other way than by faith alone. And faith is not a work, but the mistress and the life of all works. Where in all the world is there a man so foolish as to regard a promise made to him, or a testament given to him, as a good work which by his acceptance of it he renders to the testator? What heir will imagine he is doing his departed father

a kindness by accepting the terms of the will and the inheritance bequeathed to him? What godless audacity is it, therefore, when we who are to receive the testament of God come as those who would perform a good work for Him! This ignorance of the testament, this captivity of the sacrament – are they not too sad for tears? When we ought to be grateful for benefits received, we come in our pride to give that which we ought to take, mocking with unheard-of perversity the mercy of the Giver by giving as a work the thing we receive as a gift. So the testator, instead of being the dispenser of His own goods, becomes the recipient of ours. What sacrilege!

Contra has larvas, quia validae sunt et multae penitusque insederunt, nisi constantissima cura observaveris, quid sit Missa, et praecedentium fortiter memineris, vix subsistes. Audisti enim, Missam aliud non esse quam promissionem divinam seu testamentum Christi, sacramento corporis et sanguinis sui commendatum. quod si verum est, intelligis, non posse ipsum esse opus ullo modo nec quicquam in ipso fieri nec alio studio a quoquam tractari quam sola fide: fides autem non est opus, sed magistra et vita operum. Quis enim est usquam tam insanus, ut promissionem acceptam aut testamentum donatum vocet opus bonum, quod suo testatori faciat accipiens? Quis est haeres, qui patri suo testatori existimet benefacere, dum instrumenta testamenti cum haereditate testata accipit? Quae est ergo impia temeritas nostra, ut divinum testamentum accepturi veniamus ut bonum opus ei facturi? Est ne ista ignorantia testamenti et captivitas tanti sacramenti omnibus lachrymis superior? ubi de acceptis grati esse debemus, venimus superbi daturi accipienda, irridentes inaudita perversitate donatoris misericordiam, dum hoc donamus ut opus, quod accipimus ut donum, ut testator iam non suorum largitor bonorum sed nostrorum sit acceptor. Ve impietati isti!

2.64 Who has ever been so mad as to regard baptism as a good work, or to believe that by being baptised he was performing a work which he might offer to God for himself and communicate to others? If, therefore, there is no good work that can be communicated to others in this one sacrament or testament, neither will there be any in the mass, since it too is nothing else than a testament and sacrament. Hence it is a manifest and wicked error to offer or apply masses for sins, for satisfactions, for the dead, or for any necessity whatsoever of one's own or of others. You will readily see the obvious truth of this if you but hold firmly that the mass is a divine promise, which can profit no one, be applied to

no one, intercede for no one, and be communicated to no one, save him alone who believes with a faith of his own. Who can receive or apply, in behalf of another, the promise of God, which demands the personal faith of every individual? Can I give to another what God has promised, even if he does not believe? Can I believe for another, or cause another to believe? But this is what I must do if I am able to apply and communicate the mass to others. For there are but two things in the mass – the promise of God, and the faith of man which takes that which the promise offers. But if it is true that I can do this, then I can also hear and believe the Gospel for others, I can be baptised for another, I can be absolved from sins for another, I can also partake of the Sacrament of the Altar for another, and – to run the gamut of their sacraments also – I can marry a wife for another, be ordained for another, receive confirmation and extreme unction for another!

Quis vero unquam fuit tam demens, ut baptismum duceret esse bonum opus, aut baptisandus crederet sese opus facere, quod pro se et aliis deo offerret et communicaret? Si ergo in uno aliquo sacramento et testamento nullum est opus bonum communicabile aliis, nec in Missa erit, cum et ipsa non sit nisi testamentum et sacramentum. Unde manifestus et impius error est, Missam pro peccatis, pro satisfactionibus, pro defunctis aut quibuscunque necessitatibus suis aut aliorum offerre seu applicare. Quod facillime intelligis esse evidentissime verum, si firmiter teneas, Missam esse promissionem divinam, quae nulli prodesse, nulli applicari, nulli suffragari, nulli communicari potest, nisi ipsi credenti soli propria fide. Quis enim promissionem dei, quae uniuscuiusque singulatim exigit fidem, potest pro alio acceptare aut applicare? Nunquid possum alteri promissionem dei dare, etiam non credenti? aut possum pro alio credere? aut possum facere, ut alius credat? At haec fieri oportet, si Missam possum aliis applicare et communicare, cum in Missa non sint nisi ista duo, promissio divina et fides humana, quae accipiat quod illa promittit. Quod si verum est, potero etiam pro aliis audire Euangelium et credere, potero pro alio baptisari, potero pro alio absolvi a peccatis, potero et pro alio communicare de altaris sacramento, potero, ut et illorum sacramenta percenseam, pro alio ducere uxorem, pro alio fieri sacerdos, pro alio confirmari, pro alio inungi.

2.65 So, then, why didn't Abraham believe for all the Jews? Why was faith in the promise made to Abraham demanded of every individual Jew? Therefore,

let this irrefutable truth stand fast. Where there is a divine promise every one must stand upon his own feet, every one's personal faith is demanded, every one will give an account for himself and will bear his own burden, as it is said in the last chapter of Mark: "He that believes and is baptised, shall be saved. But he that does not believe, shall be damned." Even so everyone may derive a blessing from the mass for himself alone and only by his own faith, and no one can commune for any other. Just as the priest cannot administer the sacrament to any one in another's place, but administers the same sacrament to each individual by himself. For in consecrating and administering, the priests are our ministers, through whom we do not offer a good work or commune (in the active), but receive the promises and the sign and are communed (in the passive). That has remained to this day the custom among the laity, for they are not said to do good, but to receive it. But the priests have departed into godless ways. Out of the sacrament and testament of God, the source of blessings to be received, they have made a good work which they may communicate and offer to others.

Denique, cur Abraham non pro omnibus Iudaeis creditur? cur exigitur a Iudaeis singulis fides in eandem promissionem Abrahae creditam? Stet ergo insuperabilis veritas: ubi promissio divina est, ibi unusquisque pro se stat, sua fides exigitur, quisque pro se rationem reddet et suum onus portabit, [Marc. , .] sicut dicit Marci ult. Qui crediderit et baptisatus fuerit, salvus erit: qui autem non crediderit, condemnabitur. Ita et Missam unusquisque tantum sibi potest utilem facere fide propria et pro nullis prorsus communicare, Sicut sacerdos nulli pro alio potest sacramentum ministrare, sed cuilibet seorsum idem sacramentum ministrat. Sunt enim sacerdotes consecrando et ministrando ministri nostri, per quos non offerimus bonum opus aut communicamus active, sed per eos promissiones et signum accipimus et communicamur passive, id quod in laicis hactenus permansit. Nam hi non dicuntur bonum facere sed accipere. Sacerdotes vero abierunt in impietates suas, facto sibi bono opere, quod communicent et offerant ex sacramento et testamento dei, quo bonum acceptum oportuit.

2.66 But you will say: "How is this? Will you not overturn the practice and teaching of all the churches and monasteries, by virtue of which they have flourished these many centuries? For the mass is the foundation of their anniversaries, intercessions, applications, communications, etc. – that is to say,

of their fat income." I answer: This is the very thing that has constrained me to write of the captivity of the Church, for in this manner the adorable testament of God has been subjected to the bondage of a godless traffic, through the opinions and traditions of wicked men, who, passing over the Word of God, have put forth the thoughts of their own hearts and misled the whole world. What do I care for the number and influence of those who are in this error? The truth is mightier than they all. If you are able to refute Christ, according to Whom the mass is a testament and sacrament, then I will admit that they are right. Or if you can bring yourself to say that you are doing a good work, when you receive the benefit of the testament, or when you use this sacrament of promise in order to receive it, then I will gladly condemn my teachings. But since you can do neither, why do you hesitate to turn your back on the multitude who go after evil, and to give God the glory and confess His truth? Which is, indeed, that all priests today are perversely mistaken, who regard the mass as a work whereby they may relieve their own necessities and those of others, dead or alive. I am uttering unheard-of and startling things. But if you will consider the meaning of the mass, you will realize that I have spoken the truth. The fault lies with our false sense of security, in which we have become blind to the wrath of God that is raging against us.

Sed dices 'Quid? Nunquid subvertes omnium Ecclesiarum et Monasteriorum usum et sensum, quibus per tot saecula invaluerunt, fundatis super Missam anniversariis, suffragiis, applicationibus, communicationibus &c. hoc est, pinguiissimis redditibus?' Respondeo: Hoc est, quod de captivitate Ecclesiae scribere me compulit. Sic enim venerabile testamentum dei in impiissimi quaestus servitutum coactum est per impiorum hominum opiniones et traditiones, qui omisso verbo dei sui cordis nobis cogitationes proposuerunt et orbem seduxerunt. Quid mihi de multitudine et magnitudine errantium? Fortior omnium est veritas. Si potes Christum negare qui docet, Missam esse testamentum et sacramentum, volo illos iustificare. Deinde, si potes dicere, eum facere opus bonum, qui recipit beneficium testamenti, aut utitur in hoc ipsum sacramento promissionis, volo mea libens damnare. Cum autem neutrum possis, quid dubitas contempta turba ad malum eunte, dare gloriam deo et veritatem eius confiteri, esse scilicet hodie sacerdotes omnes in sententia perversa, quicumque Missam pro opere ducunt, quo succurrant suis aut aliorum sive mortuorum sive vivorum necessitatibus? Inaudita et stupenda dico, Sed Missam si intuearis quid sit, vera me esse locutum

cognosces. Hoc fecit illa nimia securitas, qua iram dei in nos grassantem non intelleximus.

2.67 I am ready, however, to admit that the prayers which we pour out before God when we are gathered together to partake of the mass, are good works or benefits, which we impart, apply and communicate to one another, and which we offer for one another. As James teaches us to pray for one another that we may be saved, and as Paul, in 1 Timothy 2, commands that supplications, prayers and intercessions be made for all men, for kings, and for all that are in high station. These are not the mass, but works of the mass – if the prayers of heart and lips may be called works – for they flow from the faith that is kindled or increased in the sacrament. For the mass, being the promise of God, is not fulfilled by praying, but only by believing. But when we believe, we shall also pray and perform every good work. But what priest offers the sacrifice of the mass in this sense and believes that he is offering up nothing but the prayers? They all imagine themselves to be offering up Christ Himself, as all-sufficient sacrifice, to God the Father, and to be performing a good work for all whom they have the intention to benefit. For they put their trust in the work which the mass accomplishes, and they do not ascribe this work to prayer. Thus, gradually, the error has grown, until they have come to ascribe to the sacrament what belongs to the prayers, and to offer to God what should be received as a benefit.

Hoc autem facile admitto, Orationes, quas ad missam percipiendam congregati coram deo effundimus, esse bona opera seu beneficia, quae nobis mutuo impartimus, applicamus et communicamus et pro invicem offerimus, [Jac. , ., . Tim. , f.] Sicut Iacobus nos docet orare pro invicem, ut salvemur, et Paulus i. Timot. ii. praecipit fieri obsecrationes, orationes, postulationes pro omnibus hominibus, pro regibus et omnibus qui in sublimitate sunt constituti. Haec enim non sunt missa sed opera missae, si tamen opera vocari debent orationes cordis et oris, quia fiunt ex fide in sacramento percepta vel aucta. Non enim Missa vel promissio dei impletur orando, sed solum credendo. Credentes autem oramus et quodlibet opus bonum facimus. Sed quis sacerdotum hoc nomine sacrificat, ut solas orationes arbitretur sese offerre? Omnes imaginantur, sese offerre ipsum Christum deo patri tanquam hostiam sufficientissimam et bonum opus facere omnibus quibus proponunt prodesse, quia confidunt in opere operati, quod orationi non tribuunt. Sic paulatim errore

crescente, id quod orationum est tribuerunt sacramento, Et quod recipere beneficium debent, id obtulerunt deo.

2.68 It is necessary, therefore, to make a sharp distinction between the testament or sacrament itself and the prayers which are there offered. And it is no less necessary to bear in mind that the prayers avail nothing, either for him who offers them or for those for whom they are offered, unless the sacrament be first received in faith, so that it is faith that offers the prayers, for it alone is heard, as James teaches in his first chapter. So great is the difference between prayer and the mass. The prayer may be extended to as many persons as one desires. But the mass is received by none but the person who believes for himself, and only in proportion to his faith. It cannot be given either to God or to men, but God alone gives it, by the ministration of the priest, to such men as receive it by faith alone, without any works or merits. For no one would dare to make the mad assertion that a ragged beggar does a good work when he comes to receive a gift from a rich man. But the mass is, as has been said, the gift and promise of God, offered to all men by the hand of the priest.

Quare acute discernendum est inter testamentum sacramentumque ipsum et inter orationes quas simul oramus, Nec id solum, sed scire quoque oportet, orationes prorsus nihil valere nec oranti ipsi nec iis pro quibus orantur, nisi primum testamentum fide perceptum sit, ut fides oret quae sola exauditur, [Jac. , .] sicut Iacobus i. c. docet. adeo longe aliud est oratio quam Missa: orationem possum extendere in quotquot voluero, Missam nemo accipit nisi qui per seipsum credit et tantum quantum credit, nec potest dari sive deo sive hominibus, Sed solus deus per ministerium sacerdotis dat eam hominibus, qui accipiunt eam fide sola sine ullis operibus aut meritis. Neque enim ullus audeat tantum insanire, ut dicat bonum opus facere eum, qui pauper et indigens venit, accepturus de manu divitis beneficium. At missa (ut dixi) beneficium est promissionis divinae, per manum sacerdotum omnibus hominibus exhibitum.

2.69 It is certain, therefore, that the mass is not a work which may be communicated to others, but it is the object, as it is called, of faith, for the strengthening and nourishing of the personal faith of each individual. But there is yet another stumbling-block that must be removed, and this is much greater and the most dangerous of all. It is the common belief that the mass is a sacrifice, which is offered to God. Even the words of the canon tend in this

direction, when they speak of "these gifts," "these offerings," "this holy sacrifice," and farther on, of "this offering." Prayer also is made, in so many words, "that the sacrifice may be accepted even as the sacrifice of Abel," etc., and hence Christ is termed the "Sacrifice of the altar." In addition to this there are the sayings of the holy Fathers, the great number of examples, and the constant usage and custom of all the world.

Est ergo certum, Missam non esse opus aliis communicabile, sed obiectum (ut dicitur) fidei propriae cuiusque alendae et roborandae. Iam et alterum scandalum amovendum est, quod multo grandius est et speciosissimum, id est, quod Missa creditur passim esse sacrificium, quod offertur deo. In quam opinionem et verba Canonis sonare videntur, ubi dicitur 'haec dona, haec munera, haec sancta sacrificia', et infra 'hanc oblationem'. Item, clarissime postulatur, ut acceptum sit sacrificium, sicut sacrificium Abel &c. Inde Christus hostia altaris dicitur. Accedunt his dicta sanctorum patrum, tot exempla tantusque usus per orbem constanter observatus.

2.70 We must resolutely oppose all of this, firmly entrenched as it is, with the words and example of Christ. For unless we hold fast to the truth, that the mass is the promise or testament of Christ, as the words clearly say, we shall lose the whole Gospel and all our comfort. Let us permit nothing to prevail against these words, even though an angel from heaven should teach otherwise. For there is nothing said in them of a work or a sacrifice. Moreover, we have also the example of Christ on our side. For at the Last Supper, when He instituted this sacrament and established this testament, Christ did not offer Himself to God the Father, nor did He perform a good work on behalf of others, but He set this testament before each of them that sat at table with Him and offered him the sign. Now, the more closely our mass resembles that first mass of all, which Christ performed at the Last Supper, the more Christian will it be. But Christ's mass was most simple, without the pageantry of vestments, genuflections, chants and other ceremonies. Indeed, if it were necessary to offer the mass as a sacrifice, then Christ's institution of it was not complete.

His omnibus, quia pertinacissime insederunt, oportet constantissime opponere verba et exemplum Christi. Nisi enim Missam obtinuerimus esse promissionem Christi seu testamentum, ut verba clare sonant, totum Euangelium et universum solatium amittimus. Nihil contra haec verba permittamus praevalere, etiam si angelus de coelo aliud docuerit. Nihil

enim de opere vel sacrificio in illis continetur. Deinde et exemplum Christi pro nobis stat. Non enim Christus in caena novissima, cum institueret hoc sacramentum et conderet testamentum, ipsum obtulit deo patri aut ut opus bonum pro aliis perfecit, sed in mensa sedens singulis idem testamentum proposuit et signum exhibuit. Iam Missa quanto vicinior et similior primae omnium Missae, quam Christus in caena fecit, tanto Christianior. At Missa Christi fuit simplicissima sine ulla vestium, gestuum, cantuum aliarumque cerimoniarum pompa, ubi si necesse fuisset eam offerri ut sacrificium, non plene eam instituisset.

2.71 Not that any one should condemn the Church universal for embellishing and amplifying the mass with many additional rites and ceremonies. But this is what we contend for: no one should be deceived by the glamour of the ceremonies and entangled in the multitude of pompous forms, and thus lose the simplicity of the mass itself, and indeed practice a sort of transubstantiation – losing sight of the simple substance of the mass and clinging to the manifold accidents of outward pomp. For whatever has been added to the word and example of Christ, is an accident of the mass, and ought to be regarded just as we regard the so-called monstrances and corporal cloths in which the host itself is contained. Therefore, as distributing a testament, or accepting a promise, differs diametrically from offering a sacrifice, so it is a contradiction in terms to call the mass a sacrifice. The former is something that we receive, while the latter is something that we offer. The same thing cannot be received and offered at the same time, nor can it be both given and taken by the same person. Just as little as our prayer can be the same as that which our prayer obtains, or the act of praying the same as the act of receiving the answer to our prayer.

Non quod calumniari debeat ullus universam Ecclesiam, quae multis aliis ritibus et cerimoniis Missam ornavit et ampliavit, sed hoc volumus, ne quis cerimoniarum specie falsus ac multitudine pompae impeditus simplicitatem Missae amittat et revera transsubstantiationem quandam colat, si amissa substantia simplici Missae in accidentibus multiplicibus pompae haereat. Nam quicquid ultra verbum et exemplum Christi accessit, accidens Missae est, quorum quodlibet non alio loco ducere debemus, quam quo loco nunc ducimus Monstrantias quas vocant et pallia altaris, quibus ipsa hostia continetur. Quare, sicut repugnat, testamentum distribui seu promissionem accipere et sacrificare sacrificium, Ita repugnat Missam esse sacrificium, cum illam recipiamus,

hoc vero demus. idem autem simul recipi et offerri non potest, nec ab eodem simul dari et acceptari, non magis certe quam oratio et impetrata res queunt idem esse, nec idem sit orare et orata accipere.

2.72 What shall we say, then, about the canon of the mass and the sayings of the Fathers? First of all, if there were nothing at all to be said against them, it would yet be the safer course to reject them all rather than admit that the mass is a work or a sacrifice, lest we deny the word of Christ and overthrow faith together with the mass. Nevertheless, not to reject altogether the canons and the Fathers, we shall say the following: The Apostle instructs us in 1 Corinthians 11 that it was customary for Christ's believers, when they came together to mass, to bring with them meat and drink, which they called "collections" and distributed among all who were in need, after the example of the apostles in Acts 4. From this store was taken the portion of bread and wine that was consecrated for use in the sacrament. And since all this store of meat and drink was sanctified by the word and by prayer, being "lifted up" according to the Hebrew rite of which we read in Moses, the words and the rite of this lifting up, or offering, have come down to us, although the custom of collecting that which was offered, or lifted up, has fallen long since into disuse. Thus, in Isaiah 37, Hezekiah commanded Isaiah to lift up his prayer in the sight of God for the remnant. The Psalmist sings: "Lift up your hands to the holy places" and "To you will I lift up my hands." And in 1 Timothy 2 we read: "Lifting up pure hands in every place." For this reason the words "sacrifice" and "offering" must be taken to refer, not to the sacrament and testament, but to these collections, from this also the word "collect" has come down to us, as meaning the prayers said in the mass.

Quid ergo dicemus ad Canonem et auctoritates patrum? Primum respondeo: Si nihil habetur quod dicatur, tutius est omnia negare quam Missam concedere opus aut sacrificium esse, ne verbum Christi negemus, fidem simul cum Missa pessundantes. Tamen, quo servemus et eos, Dicemus ex Apostolo [. Cor. , f.] i. Corint. xi. nos doceri, solitos fuisse fideles Christi ad Missam congregatos secum afferre cibum et potum, quas collectas vocabant, quae distribuerentur [Apgsch. , f.] in omnes egentes, exemplo Apostolorum act. iiiii. e quibus sumebatur id quod consecrabatur panis et vini pro sacramento. Et quia haec omnia sanctificabantur per verbum et orationem ritu hebraico, quo levabantur sursum, ut [. Mos. , .] in Mose legimus, relictas sunt verba et ritus levandi seu offerendi, abolito iam dudum usu conferendi et colligendi ea quae

offerrentur seu levarentur. [Jes. , .] Sic Ezechias Esa. xxxvii. iubet Esaiam levare orationem in conspectu dei [Ps. , . , . Tim. , .] pro reliquiis. Et psal. Extollite manus vestras in sancta. Item: Ad te levabo manus meas. i. Timot. ii. Levantes puras manus in omni loco. Quare vocabula sacrificii seu oblationis referri debent non ad sacramentum et testamentum, sed ad collectas ipsas. Unde et reliquum est vocabulum collectae pro precibus in Missa dictis.

2.73 The same thing is indicated when the priest elevates the bread and the chalice immediately after the consecration, whereby he shows that he is not offering anything to God, for he does not say a single word here about a victim or an offering. But this elevation is either a survival of that Hebrew rite of lifting up what was received with thanksgiving and returned to God, or else it is an admonition to us, to provoke us to faith in this testament which the priest has set forth and exhibited in the words of Christ, so that now he shows us also the sign of the testament. Thus the offering of the bread properly accompanies the demonstrative this in the words, "This is my body," by which sign the priest addresses us gathered about him. In like manner the offering of the chalice accompanies the demonstrative this in the words, "This chalice is the new testament, etc." For it is faith that the priest ought to awaken in us by this act of elevation. I wish that, as he elevates the sign, or sacrament, openly before our eyes, he might also sound in our ears the words of the testament with a loud, clear voice, and in the language of the people, whatever it may be, in order that faith may be the more effectively awakened. For why may mass be said in Greek and Latin and Hebrew, and not also in German or in any other language?

Idem facit, quod sacerdos mox consecrato pane et calice elevat eundem, quo non sese offerre aliquid deo ostendit, cum nullo verbo tum meminerit hostiae seu oblationis. Sed est et idipsum vel reliquum ritus hebraici, quo levabantur, quae cum gratiarum actionibus accepta deo referebantur, vel admonitio nostri, quo provocemur ad fidem testamenti huius, quod tum verbis Christi protulit et exhibuit, ut simul et signum eiusdem ostendat et oblatio panis proprie respondeat huic demonstrativo 'Hoc est corpus meum', nosque circumstantes ceu alloquatur hoc ipso signo, sic oblatio calicis proprie respondeat huic demonstrativo 'Hic calix novi testamenti &c.' Fidem enim in nobis sacerdos excitare debet ipso elevandi ritu. Atque utinam, ut in oculis nostris manifeste elevat signum seu sacramentum, ita simul auribus nostris aperta altaque voce pronunciaret et

verbum seu testamentum, idque in qualibet populorum lingua, quo fides excitaretur efficacius. Cur enim liceat Graece et latine et hebraice Missam perficere, et non etiam Alemanice aut alia quacunque lingua?

2.74 Let the priests, therefore, who in these corrupt and perilous times offer the sacrifice of the mass, take heed, first, that the words of the greater and the lesser canon together with the collects, which smack too strongly of sacrifice, be not referred by them to the sacrament, but to the bread and wine which they consecrate, or to the prayers which they say. For the bread and wine are offered at the first, in order that they may be blessed and thus sanctified by the Word and by prayer. But after they have been blessed and consecrated, they are no longer offered, but received as a gift from God. And let the priest bear in mind that the Gospel is to be set above all canons and collects devised by men. The Gospel does not sanction the calling of the mass a sacrifice, as has been shown.

Quocirca observent sese sacerdotes hoc perdito periculosissimoque saeculo, qui sacrificant: Primum, ut verba Canonis maioris et minoris cum collectis, quae aperte nimis sacrificium sonant, dirigant non ad sacramentum, sed vel ad ipsum panem et vinum consecrandum vel ad orationes suas. Panis enim et vinum antea offeruntur ad benedicendum, ut per verbum et orationem sanctificentur. Postquam autem benedictus et consecratus est, iam non offertur sed accipitur dono a deo. Et in hoc negotio cogitet, Euangelium esse praefendum omnibus Canonibus et collectis per homines compositis: Euangelium autem non sinit Missam esse sacrificium, ut audisti.

2.75 Further, when a priest celebrates a public mass, he should determine to do nothing else through the mass than to commune himself and others. Yet he may at the same time offer prayers for himself and for others, but he must beware lest he presume to offer the mass. But let him determine to commune himself, if he holds a private mass. The private mass does not differ in the least from the ordinary communion which any layman receives at the hand of the priest, and has no greater effect, apart from the special prayers and the fact that the priest consecrates the elements for himself and administers them to himself. So far as the blessing of the mass and sacrament is concerned, we are all of us on an equal footing, whether we be priests or laymen.

Deinde publice Missam perficiens praestituat sibi non aliud facere quam se et alios communicare per Missam, simul tamen orationes suas pro se et

aliis offerre, cavens, ne Missam offerre praesumat. Qui vero privatim missas parat, praestituat sibi, ut seipsum communicet. Prorsus nihil differt nec plus facit missa privata quam simplex cuiusque laici de manu sacerdotis sumpta communio, exceptis orationibus, et quod sibiipsi consecrat et ministrat. Re ipsa missae et sacramenti omnes sumus aequales, sacerdotes et laici.

2.76 If a priest be requested by others to celebrate so-called "votive" masses, let him beware of accepting a reward for the mass, or of presuming to offer a votive sacrifice. He should be careful to refer all to the prayers which he offers for the dead or the living, saying within himself, "I will go and partake of the sacrament for myself alone, and while partaking I will say a prayer for this one and that." Thus he will take his reward – to buy him food and clothing – not for the mass, but for the prayers. And let him not be disturbed because all the world holds and practices the contrary. You have the most sure Gospel, and relying on this you may well despise the opinions of men. But if you despise me and insist upon offering the mass and not the prayers alone, know that I have faithfully warned you and will be without blame on the day of judgment. You will have to bear your sin alone. I have said what I was bound to say as brother to brother for his soul's salvation. Yours will be the gain if you observe it, yours the loss if you neglect it. And if some should even condemn what I have said, I reply in the words of Paul: " But evil men and seducers shall grow worse and worse: erring and driving into error."

Quod si postulatur ab aliis, votivas quas vocant celebrare, caveat, ne mercedem accipiat pro missa aut praesumat ullam votivam sacrificare, sed studeat hoc totum ad orationes referre, quas sive pro defunctis sive viventibus offerat, sic cogitans 'Ecce ibo et mihi soli sacramentum suscipiam, sed inter suscipiendum pro illo et illo orabo', sic, ut orationis, non Missae, mercedem pro victu et amictu recipiat. Nec moveat, quod totus orbis contrarium et sensum et usum habeat. Euangelium certissimum habes, quo fretus facile contemnes hominum sensus et opiniones. Quod si, me contemnens, pergas Missam offerre, non solas orationes, scito me fuisse monitorem tibi fidelem et in die iudicii excusatum, tuum portabis ipse peccatum. Dixi, quae tibi dicere tenebar frater fratri in salutem: tibi proderunt servata, tibi nocebunt neglecta. Quod si aliqui etiam damnarint haec, illud Pauli respondeo: [. Tim. , .]

Mali vero homines et seductores proficient in peius, errantes et in errorem mittentes.

2.77 From the above every one will readily understand what there is in that often quoted saying of Gregory's: "A mass celebrated by a wicked priest is not to be considered of less effect than one celebrated by any godly priest. St. Peter's mass would not have been better than Judas the traitor's, if they had offered the sacrifice of the mass." This saying has served many as a cloak to cover their godless doings, and because of it they have invented the distinction between opus operati and opus operantis, so as to be free to lead wicked lives themselves and yet to benefit other men. Gregory speaks truth, but they misunderstand and pervert his words. For it is true beyond a question, that the testament or sacrament is given and received through the ministration of wicked priests no less completely than through the ministration of the most saintly. For who has any doubt that the Gospel is preached by the ungodly? Now the mass is part of the Gospel, no, its sum and substance. For what is the whole Gospel but the good tidings of the forgiveness of sins? But whatever can be said of the forgiveness of sins and the mercy of God, is all briefly comprehended in the word of this testament. So popular sermons ought to be nothing else than expositions of the mass, that is, a setting forth of the divine promise of this testament. Doing this teaches faith and truly edifies the Church. But in our day the expounders of the mass play with the allegories of human rites and make it a joke to people.

Ex isto nunc facile illud quivis intelligit, quod usitatissimum ex Gregorio dicitur, Missam mali sacerdotis non minoris ducendam quam boni cuiuscunque, Nec sancti Petri meliorem fuisse quam Iudae traditoris, si sacrificassent. Hoc enim operculo suas impietates quidam velant, et hinc distinctionem operis operati et operis operantis invenerunt, quo secure ipsi male vivere et aliis tamen benefacere praesumerent. Verum Gregorius recte dicit, at illi perverse eum intelligunt. Verissimum est enim, per impios sacerdotes non minus de testamento et sacramento dari et accipi quam per quosque sanctissimos. Quis enim dubitat, Euangelium praedicari per impios? At missa est pars Euangelii, immo summa et compendium Euangelii. Quid est enim universum Euangelium quam bonum nuntium remissionis peccatorum? At quicquid de remissione peccatorum et misericordia dei latissime et copiosissime dici potest, breviter est in verbo testamenti comprehensum. Unde et conciones

populares aliud esse non deberent quam expositiones Missae, id est declarationes promissionis divinae huius testamenti: hoc enim esset fidem docere et vere Ecclesiam aedificare. At qui nunc missam exponunt, in allegoriis humanarum cerimoniarum ludunt et illudunt.

2.78 Therefore, just as a wicked priest may baptise, that is, apply the word of promise and the sign of the water to a candidate for baptism, so he may also set forth the promise of this sacrament and administer it to those who partake, and even himself partake, like Judas the traitor, at the Lord's Supper. It still remains always the same sacrament and testament, which works in the believer its own work, in the unbeliever a "strange work." But when it comes to offering a sacrifice the case is quite different. For not the mass but the prayers are offered to God, and therefore it is as plain as day that the offerings of a wicked priest avail nothing, but, as Gregory says again, when an unworthy intercessor is chosen, the heart of the judge is moved to greater displeasure. We must, therefore, not confound these two – the mass and the prayers, the sacrament and the work, the testament and the sacrifice. For the one comes from God to us, through the ministration of the priest, and demands our faith, the other proceeds from our faith to God, through the priest, and demands His answer. The former descends, the latter ascends. Therefore the former does not necessarily require a worthy and godly minister, but the latter does indeed require such a priest, because " God does not hear sinners." He knows how to send down blessings through evildoers, but He does not accept the work of any evildoer, as He showed in the case of Cain, and as it is said in Proverbs 15, "The victims of the wicked are abominable to the Lord" and in Romans 14, "All that is not of faith is sin."

Igitur sicut impius potest baptizare, id est verbum promissionis et signum aquae super baptisandum ferre, ita potest et promissionem huius sacramenti proferre et ministrare vescentibus et simul ipse vesci, sicut Iudas traditor in coena domini, manet tamen semper idem sacramentum et testamentum, quod in credente operatur suum opus, in incredulo operatur alienum opus. Verum in offerendo longe aliud agitur. Cum enim non Missa sed orationes offerantur deo, clarum est, oblationes impii sacerdotis nihil valere, sed, ut idem Gregorius ait, cum is qui indignus est ad deprecandum mittitur, animus iudicis ad deterius provocatur. Non ergo sunt confundenda illa duo, Missa et oratio, sacramentum et opus, testamentum et sacrificium, quia alterum venit a deo ad nos per

ministerium sacerdotis et exigit fidem, alterum procedit a fide nostra ad deum per sacerdotem et exigit exauditionem. Illud descendit, hoc ascendit: ideo illud non requirit necessario dignum et pium ministrum, hoc vero requirit, quia deus peccatores non exaudit, qui novit per malos benefacere, sed nullius mali acceptat opus, sicut monstravit in Cayn [Spr. , ., Röm. , .] et Prover. xv. dicitur: Victimae impiorum abominabiles domino. Roma. xiiii. Omne, quod non est ex fide, peccatum est.

2.79 But in order to make an end of this first part, we must take up one remaining point against which an opponent might arise. From all that has been said we conclude that the mass was provided only for such as have a sad, afflicted, disturbed, perplexed and erring conscience, and that they alone commune worthily. For, since the word of divine promise in this sacrament sets forth the remission of sins, that man may fearlessly draw near, whoever he be, whose sins distress him, either with remorse for past or with temptation to future wrongdoing. For this testament of Christ is the one remedy against sins, past, present and future, if you but cling to it with unwavering faith and believe that what the words of the testament declare is freely granted to you. But if you do not believe this, you will never, nowhere, and by no works or efforts of your own, find peace of conscience. For faith alone sets the conscience at peace, and unbelief alone keeps the conscience troubled.

Ut autem finem huius primae partis faciamus, reliqua producturi, ubi impugnator insurrexerit, Concludimus ex omnibus his, quibus nam Missa sit parata, et qui digne communicent, nempe soli ii, qui tristes, afflictas, perturbatas, confusas et erroneas habent conscientias. Nam verbum divinae promissionis huius sacramenti, cum exhibeat peccatorum remissionem, secure accedit quicumque peccatorum suorum vexatur sive morsu sive titillatione. Est enim testamentum hoc Christi medicina unica praeteritorum, praesentium et futurorum peccatorum, modo indubitata fide ei adhaeseris et credideris tibi gratuito dari id quod verba testamenti sonant. Quod si non credideris, nusquam, nunquam, nullis operibus, nullis studiis conscientiam poteris pacare. Fides enim sola est pax conscientiae, infidelitas autem sola turbatio conscientiae.

THE SACRAMENT OF BAPTISM

3.1 Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, Who according to the riches of His mercy has preserved in His Church this sacrament at least,

untouched and untainted by the ordinances of men, and has made it free to all nations and every estate of mankind, nor suffered it to be oppressed by the filthy and godless monsters of greed and superstition. For He desired that by it little children, incapable of greed and superstition, might be initiated and sanctified in the simple faith of His Word. Even today baptism's chief blessing is for them. But if this sacrament were to be given to adults and older people, I think it could not possibly have retained its power and its glory against the tyranny of greed and superstition which has everywhere laid waste to divine things. Doubtless the wisdom of the flesh would here too have devised its preparations and worthinesses, its reservations, restrictions, and I know not what other snares for taking money, until water fetched as high a price as parchment does now.

Benedictus deus et pater domini nostri Iesu Christi, qui secundum divitias misericordiae suae saltem hoc unicum sacramentum servavit in Ecclesia sua illibatum et incontaminatum a constitutionibus hominum, liberumque fecit omnibus gentibus omniumque hominum ordinibus, nec passus est et ipsum teterrimis quaestus et impiissimis superstitionum portentis opprimi, eo scilicet consilio usus, quod parvulos, qui avaritiae et superstitionis capaces non sunt, eo voluit initiari et simplicissima fide verbi sui sanctificari, quibus et potissimum hodie prodest baptismus. Nam si adultis et maioribus donandum esset hoc sacramentum, non videtur potuisse et eius perseverari virtus et gloria prae tyrannide Avaritiae et superstitionis, quae omnia divina nobis supplantavit. Invenisset sine dubio et hic prudentia carnis suas praeparationes et dignitates, deinde reservationes, restrictiones et si qua sunt similia rhetia pecuniarum, quibus aqua non vilior quam nunc membranae venderetur.

3.2 But Satan, though he could not quench the power of baptism in little children, nevertheless succeeded in quenching it in all adults, so that scarcely anyone calls to mind their baptism and still fewer glory in it. So many other ways have they discovered of ridding themselves of their sins and of reaching heaven. The source of these false opinions is that dangerous saying of St. Jerome's – either unhappily phrased or wrongly interpreted – which he terms penance "the second plank" after the shipwreck, as if baptism were not penance. Accordingly, when men fall into sin, they despair of "the first plank," which is the ship, as though it had gone under, and fasten all their faith on the second plank, that is, penance. This has produced those endless burdens of vows, religious works, satisfactions, pilgrimages, indulgences, and sects, from this has

arisen that flood of books, questions, opinions and human traditions, which the world cannot contain. So that this tyranny plays worse havoc with the Church of God than any tyrant ever did with the Jewish people or with any other nation under heaven.

Verum ubi virtutem Baptismi in parvulis non potuit Satan extinguere, praevaluit tamen, ut in omnibus adultis extingueret, ut iam fere nemo sit, qui sese baptisatum recordetur, nedum gloriatur, tot repertis aliis viis remittendorum peccatorum et in coelum veniendi. prebuit his opinionibus occasionem verbum illud periculosum divi Hieronymi, sive male positum sive male intellectum, quo poenitentiam appellat secundam post naufragium tabulam, quasi baptismus non sit poenitentia. Hinc enim, ubi in peccatum lapsi fuerint, de prima tabula seu nave desperantes velut amissa, secundae tantum incipiunt niti et fidere tabulae, id est, poenitentiae. Hinc nata sunt votorum, religionum, operum, satisfactionum, peregrinationum, indulgentiarum, sectarum infinita illa onera et de iis maria illa librorum, quaestionum, opinionum, traditionum humanarum, quas totus mundus iam non capit, ut incomparabiliter peius habet Ecclesiam dei ea tyrannis, quam unquam habuit synagogam aut ullam nationem sub coelo.

3.3 It was the duty of the pontiffs to abate this evil, and with all diligence to lead Christians to the true understanding of baptism, so that they might know what manner of men they are and how Christians ought to live. But instead of this, their work is now to lead the people as far astray as possible from their baptism, to immerse all men in the flood of their oppression, and to cause the people of Christ, as the prophet says, to forget Him days without number. (Jeremiah 2:32) How unfortunate are all who bear the name of pope today! Not only do they not know or do what popes should do, but they are ignorant of what they ought to know and do. They fulfill the saying in Isaiah 56: "His watchmen are all blind, they are all ignorant. The shepherds themselves knew no understanding. All have declined into their own way, every one after his own gain."

At pontificum erat haec omnia tollere et Christianos omni cura ad synceritatem baptismi revocare, quo intelligerent, quid essent, et quid facere Christianos oporteat. Verum unum est hodie eorum offitium, populos quam longissime abducere a baptismo, et diluvio tyrannidis suae omnes immergere, [Jer. , .] et facere, ut populus Christi (sicut Propheta

ait) obliviscatur eius imperpetuum. O infoelices omnes, qui hodie pontificum nomine censentur, qui non modo nihil sciunt nec faciunt, quod Pontifices decet, sed ignorant quoque, [Jes. , .] quid scire et facere eos oporteat, et implent illud Esaie lvi. Speculatores eius caeci omnes, nescierunt universi, ipsi pastores ignoraverunt intelligentiam, omnes declinaverunt in viam suam, unusquisque ad avaritiam suam &c.

3.4 Now, the first thing in baptism to be considered is the divine promise, which says: " He that believes and is baptised shall be saved." This promise must be set far above all the glitter of works, vows, religious orders, and whatever man has added to it. For on it all our salvation depends. We must consider this promise, exercise our faith in it and never doubt that we are saved when we are baptised. For unless this faith be present or be conferred in baptism, we gain nothing from baptism. No, it becomes a hindrance to us, not only in the moment of its reception, but all the days of our life. For such lack of faith calls God's promise a lie, and this is the blackest of all sins. When we try to exercise this faith, we shall at once perceive how difficult it is to believe this promise of God. For our human weakness, conscious of its sins, finds nothing more difficult to believe than that it is saved or will be saved. Yet unless it does believe this, it cannot be saved, because it does not believe the truth of God that promises salvation.

[Marc. , .] Primum itaque in Baptismo observanda est divina promissio, quae dicit: Qui crediderit et baptisatus fuerit, salvus erit. Quae promissio praeferenda est incomparabiliter universis pompis operum, votorum, religionum et quicquid humanitus est introductum. Nam in hac pendet universa salus nostra: sic autem est observanda, ut fidem exerceamus in ea, prorsus non dubitantes, nos esse salvos, postquam sumus baptisati. Nam nisi haec assit aut pareatur fides, nihil prodest baptismus, immo obest non solum tum cum suscipitur sed toto post tempore vitae. incredulitas enim eiusmodi mendacem arguit promissionem divinam, quod est summum omnium peccatorum. Hoc exercitium fidei si apprehenderimus, statim intelligemus, quam arduum sit credere promissioni huic divinae. Humana enim imbecillitas, peccatorum suorum sibi conscia, difficillime omnium credit se esse salvam aut salvandam, et tamen nisi id credat, salvari non poterit, quia non credit veritati divinae promittenti salutem.

3.5 This message should have been persistently impressed upon the people and this promise diligently repeated to them. Their baptism should have been called

again and again to their mind, and faith constantly awakened and nourished. Just as the truth of this divine promise, once pronounced over us, continues to death, so our faith in the same ought never to cease, but to be nourished and strengthened until death, by the continual remembrance of this promise made to us in baptism. Therefore, when we rise from sins, or repent, we are only returning to the power and the faith of baptism from this we fell, and find our way back to the promise then made to us, from which we departed when we sinned. For the truth of the promise once made remains steadfast, ever ready to receive us back with open arms when we return. This, if I am not mistaken, is the real meaning of the obscure saying, that baptism is the beginning and foundation of all the sacraments, without which none of the others may be received.

Haec erat praedicatio sedulo inculcanda populo, assidue recantanda ista promissio, semper repetendus baptismus, iugiter excitanda fovendaque fides. Sicut enim semel super nos lata divina hac promissione usque ad mortem veritas eius perseverat, ita fides in eandem nunquam debet intermittere, sed usque ad mortem alii et roborari, perpetua memoria promissionis eiusdem in baptismo nobis factae. Quare dum a peccatis resurgimus sive poenitemus, non facimus aliud quam quod ad baptismi virtutem et fidem, unde cecideramus, revertimur et ad promissionem tunc factam redimus, quam per peccatum deserueramus. Semper enim manet veritas promissionis semel factae, nos extenta manu susceptura reversos. Atque id, ni fallor, volunt qui obscure dicunt, Baptismum esse primum et fundamentum omnium sacramentorum, sine quo nullum queat aliorum obtineri.

3.6 Therefore a penitent will gain much by laying hold of the memory of his baptism above all else, confidently calling to mind the promise of God, which he has forsaken. He should plead it with His Lord, rejoicing that he is baptised and therefore is yet within the fortress of salvation. He should detest his wicked ingratitude in falling away from its faith and truth. His soul will find wondrous comfort, and will be encouraged to hope for mercy, when he considers that the divine promise which God made to him and which cannot possibly lie, still stands unbroken and unchanged, yes, unchangeable by any sins, as Paul says in 2 Timothy 2. "If we do not believe, He continues to be faithful, He cannot deny Himself." Yes, this truth of God will sustain him, so that if all else should sink in ruins, this truth, if he believes it, will not fail him. For in it he has a shield

against all assaults of the enemy, an answer to the sins that disturb his conscience, an antidote for the dread of death and judgment, and a comfort in every temptation – namely, this one truth – he can say, " God is faithful that promised, Whose sign I have received in my baptism. If God be for me, who is against me?"

Proinde non parum profuerit, si poenitens primo omnium baptismi sui memoriam apprehendat et promissionis divinae, quam deseruit, cum fiducia recordatus eandem confiteatur domino, gaudens se tantum adhuc in praesidio habere salutis, quod baptisatus sit detestansque suam impiam ingratitude, quod a fide et veritate eiusdem defecerit. Mire enim cor eius confortabitur et ad spem misericordiae animabitur, si consideret, divinam promissionem sibi factam, quam impossibile est mentiri, adhuc integram et non mutatam, [. Tim. , .] nec mutabilem ullis peccatis esse, sicut Paulus dicit ii. Timot. ii. si non credimus, ille fidelis permanet, seipsum negare non potest. Haec, inquam, veritas dei eum servabit, ita ut, si caetera omnia ruant, haec tamen eum credita non derelinquet. Habet enim per hanc, quod insultanti adversario opponat, habet, quod turbantibus peccatis conscientiam obiiciat, habet, quod horrore mortis et iudicii respondeat, habet denique, quod universis tentationibus solatium sit, nempe hanc unam veritatem, dicens 'Deus est verax in promissionibus suis, cuius signum in baptismo suscepi. Si deus pro me, quis contra me?'

3.7 The children of Israel, whenever they repented of their sins, turned their thoughts first of all to the exodus from Egypt, and, remembering this, returned to God Who had brought them out. This memory and this refuge were many times impressed upon them by Moses, and afterward repeated by David. How much rather ought we to call to mind our exodus from Egypt, and, remembering, turn back again to Him Who led us forth through the washing of regeneration, which we are bidden remember for this very purpose. And this we can do most fittingly in the sacrament of bread and wine. Indeed, in ancient times these three sacraments –penance, baptism and the bread – were all celebrated at the same service, and one supplemented and assisted the other. We read also of a certain holy virgin who in every time of temptation made baptism her sole defense, saying simply, "I am a Christian." Immediately the adversary fled from her, for he knew the power of her baptism and of her faith which clung to the truth of God's promise.

Si enim filii Israel ad poenitentiam reversuri primo omnium exitum de Aegypto memorabant, et hac memoria ad deum, qui eduxerat eos, revertebantur, quae memoria et hoc ipsum praesidium eis toties a Mose inculcatur et a David repetitur, quanto magis nos nostrum de Aegypto nostra exitum debemus memorare et eius memoria redire ad eum, qui nos eduxit per lavacrum regenerationis novae, cuius memoria in hoc ipsum nobis commendata est! Id quod omnium comodissime fieri in sacramento panis et vini potest. Sic enim olim tria ista sacramenta, poenitentia, baptismus, panis, simul eodem officio frequentabantur et alterum alterum iuvabat. Ita legitur de quadam sancta virgine, quae, quoties tentabatur, non nisi Baptismo suo repugnabat, dicens brevissime 'Christiana sum'. Intellexit enim hostis statim virtutem baptismi et fidei, quae in veritate dei promittentis pendebat, et fugit ab ea.

3.8 See, how rich therefore is a Christian, the one who is baptised! Even if he wants to, he cannot lose his salvation, however much he sin, unless he will not believe. For no sin can condemn him save unbelief alone. All other sins – so long as the faith in God's promise made in baptism returns or remains – all other sins, I say, are immediately blotted out through that same faith, or rather through the truth of God, because He cannot deny Himself. If only you confess Him and cling believing to Him that promises. But as for contrition, confession of sins, and satisfaction – along with all those carefully thought out exercises of men – if you turn your attention to them and neglect this truth of God, they will suddenly fail you and leave you more wretched than before. For whatever is done without faith in the truth of God, is vanity of vanities and vexation of spirit.

Ita vides, quam dives sit homo Christianus sive baptisatus, qui etiam volens non potest perdere salutem suam quantiscunque peccatis, nisi nolit credere. Nulla enim peccata eum possunt damnare, nisi sola incredulitas: caetera omnia, si redeat vel stet fides in promissionem divinam baptisato factam, in momento absorbentur per eandem fidem, immo veritatem dei, quia seipsum negare non potest, si tu eum confessus fueris et promittenti fideliter adhaeris. Contritio autem et peccatorum confessio, deinde et satisfactio et omnia illa hominum excogitata studia subito te deserent et infoeliciorem reddent, si oblitus veritatis huius divinae in ipsis tete distenderis. Vanitas enim vanitatum et afflictio spiritus est, quicquid extra fidem veritatis dei laboratur.

3.9 Again, how perilous, no, how false it is to suppose that penance is the second plank after the shipwreck! How harmful an error it is to believe that the power of baptism is broken, and the ship has foundered, because we have sinned! No! That one, solid and unsinkable ship remains, and is never broken up into floating timbers. It carries all those who are brought to the harbor of salvation. It is the truth of God giving us its promise in the sacraments. Many, indeed, rashly leap overboard and perish in the waves. These are they who depart from faith in the promise and plunge into sin. But the ship herself remains intact and holds her steady course. If one be able somehow to return to the ship, it is not on any plank but in the good ship herself that he is carried to life. Such a one is he who through faith returns to the sure promise of God that lasts forever. Therefore Peter, in 1 Peter 1, rebukes those who sin, because they have forgotten that they were purged from their old sins, in which words he doubtless chides their ingratitude for the baptism they had received and their wicked unbelief.

Simul vides, quam periculosum, immo falsum sit opinari, poenitentiam esse secundam tabulam post naufragium, et quam perniciosus sit error putare, per peccatum excidisse vim baptismi et navem hanc esse illisam. Manet illa una, solida et invicta navis, nec unquam dissolvitur in ulla tabulas, in qua omnes vehuntur, qui ad portum salutis vehuntur, quae est veritas dei in sacramentis promittens. Hoc sane fit, ut multi e nave temere in mare prosiliant et pereant: hi sunt, qui deserta promissionis fide in peccatum sese praecipitant. Verum navis ipsa permanet et transit integra cursu suo, quod, si qua gratia ad navem reverti potest, nulla tabula sed solida ipsa nave feretur ad vitam: hic est, qui ad promissionem dei stabilem et manentem [. Petr. , .] per fidem revertitur. Unde Petrus ii. Pet. i. arguit eos qui peccant, quod oblivionem accipiant purgationis veterum delictorum suorum, sine dubio ingritudinem accepti baptismi et impietatem infidelitatis eorum taxans.

3.10 What is the good, then, of writing much on baptism and yet not teaching this faith in the promise? All the sacraments were instituted for the purpose of nourishing faith, but these godless men so completely pass over this faith that they even assert a man dare not be certain of the forgiveness of sins, that is, of the grace of the sacraments. With such wicked teachings they delude the world, and not only take captive but altogether destroy the sacrament of baptism, in which the chief glory of our conscience consists. Meanwhile they madly rage

against the miserable souls of men with their contritions, anxious confessions, circumstances, satisfactions, works and endless other absurdities. Read, therefore, with great caution the Master of the Sentences in his fourth book, or, better yet, despise him together with all his commentators, who at their best write only of the material and form of the sacraments, that is, they discuss the dead and death-dealing letter of the sacraments, but pass over in utter silence the spirit, life and use, that is, the truth of the divine promise and our faith.

Quid ergo prodest de baptismo tam multa scribere et hanc fidem promissionis non docere? omnia sacramenta ad fidem alendam sunt instituta, et hanc ipsam adeo non tangunt, ut etiam asserant impii homines, non debere hominem esse certum de remissione peccatorum seu gratia sacramentorum, qua impietate orbem totum dementant et sacramentum baptismi, in quo stat prima gloria conscientiae nostrae, funditus extinguunt nedum captivant, interim insanientes in miseris animas suis contritionibus, anxiiis confessionibus, circumstantiis, satisfactionibus, operibus et id genus infinitis nugis. Esto ergo prudens lector, immo contemptor Magistri sententiarum libro quarto cum omnibus suis scribentibus, qui tantum de materia et forma sacramentorum scribunt, dum optime scribunt, id est, mortuam et occidentem literam sacramentorum tractant, caeterum spiritum, vitam et usum, id est, promissionis divinae veritatem et nostram fidem prorsus intactas relinquunt.

3.11 So be careful, that the external pomp of works and the deceits of human traditions mislead you, so that you may not wrong the divine truth and your faith. If you would be saved, you must begin with the faith of the sacraments, without any works whatever. But on faith the works will follow. Only do not think lightly of faith, which is a work, and of all works the most excellent and the most difficult to do. Through it alone you will be saved, even if you should be compelled to do without any other works. For it is a work of God, not of man, as Paul teaches. The other works He works through us and with our help, but this one He works in us and without our help.

Vide itaque, ne te fallant operum pompae et humanarum traditionum fallatae, ut veritati divinae et fidei tuae non facias iniuriam. A fide sacramentorum tibi incipiendum est sine ullis operibus, si salvus fieri voles, fidem autem ipsa sequentur opera, tantum ne vilem habeas fidem, quae opus est omnium operum excellentissimum et arduissimum, quo

solo, etiam si caeteris omnibus carere cogereris, servaberis. Est enim opus dei, non hominis, sicut [Eph. , .] Paulus docet. Caetera nobiscum et per nos operatur, hoc unicum in nobis et sine nobis operatur.

3.12 From this we can clearly see the difference, in baptism, between man the minister and God the Doer. For man baptises and does not baptise. He baptises, for he performs the work, immersing the person to be baptised. He does not baptise, for in that act he officiates not by his own authority, but as God's representative. Hence, we ought to receive baptism at the hands of a man just as if Christ Himself, no, God Himself, were baptising us with His own hands. For it is not man's baptism, but Christ's and God's baptism, which we receive by the hand of a man, just as every other created thing that we make use of by the hand of another, is God's alone. Therefore beware of dividing baptism in such a way as to ascribe the outward part to man and the inward part to God. Ascribe both to God alone, and look upon the person administering it as the instrument in God's hands, by which the Lord sitting in heaven thrusts you under the water with His own hands, and speaking by the mouth of His minister promises you, on earth with a human voice, the forgiveness of your sins.

Ex his perspicue discernere possumus, quid inter ministrum hominem et autorem deum intersit in baptisando. Homo enim baptisat et non baptisat: Baptisat, quia perficit opus, dum mergit baptisandum, Non baptisat, quia non fungitur in eo opere sua autoritate sed vice dei. Unde oportet nos baptismum de manu hominis non aliter suscipere, quam si ipse Christus, immo ipse deus nos suis propriis manibus baptisaret. Non enim hominis est sed Christi et dei baptismus, quem recipimus per manum hominis, Sicut quelibet alia creatura, qua utimur per manum alterius, non est nisi dei. Cave ergo sic discernas baptismum, ut externum homini, internum deo tribuas: utrumque soli deo tribue, nec conferentis personam aliam quam instrumentum vicarium dei accipe, per quod dominus in coelo sedens te in aquam suis manibus propriis mergit et remissionem peccatorum promittit in terris voce hominis tibi loquens per os ministri sui.

3.13 This the words themselves indicate, when the priest says: " I baptise you in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen," and not: "I baptise you in my own name." It is as though he said: " What I do, I do not by my own authority, but in the name and as God's representative, so that you should regard it just as if our Lord Himself had done it in a visible manner. The

Doer and the minister are different persons, but the work of both is the same work, or, rather, it is the work of the Doer alone, through my ministry." For I hold that "in the name of" refers to the person of the Doer, so that the name of the Lord is not only to be uttered and invoked while the work is being done, but the work itself is to be done not as one's own work, but in the name and as another's representative. In this sense, in Matthew 24, Christ says, "Many shall come in my name," and in Romans 1 it is said, "By whom we have received grace and apostleship for obedience to the faith, in all nations, for His name."

Hoc et ipsa verba tibi dicunt, cum dicit 'Ego baptiso te in nomine patris et filii et spiritus sancti, Amen', non dicit 'Ego baptiso te in nomine meo', quasi dicat 'id, quod facio, non mea autoritate sed vice et nomine dei facio, ut non aliter habeas quam si ipse dominus visibiliter fecisset. autor et minister diversi sunt, sed opus idem utriusque, immo solius autoris per ministerium meum'. Sic enim ego arbitror, 'In nomine' referre personam autoris, ut non tantum sit nomen domini praetendere et invocare in opere sed ipsum opus tanquam alienum alterius nomine et vice implere. Quo [Matth. , ., Röm. , .] tropo Matt. xxiiii. Christus dicit 'Multi venient in nomine meo', Et Ro. i. 'per quem accepimus gratiam et Apostolatum ad obediendum fidei in omnibus gentibus pro nomine eius'.

3.14 This view I freely endorse. It is very comforting and greatly aids faith to know that one has been baptised not by man, but by the Triune God Himself through a man acting among us in His name. This will dispose of that fruitless quarrel about the "form" of baptism, as these words are called. The Greeks say: "May the servant of Christ be baptised," while the Latins say: "I baptise." Others again, pedantic triflers, condemn the use of the words, "I baptise you in the name of Jesus Christ" – although it is certain that the Apostles used this formula in baptising, as we read in the Acts of the Apostles – they would allow no other form to be valid than this: "I baptise you in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." But their contention is in vain, for they bring no proof, but merely assert their own dreams. Baptism truly saves in whatever way it is administered, as long as it is not administered in the name of man but in the name of God. No, I have no doubt that if one received baptism in the name of the Lord, even though the wicked minister should not give it in the name of the Lord, he would yet be truly baptised in the name of the Lord. For the effect of baptism depends not so much on the faith or practice of him that confers it as on the faith or practice of the one who receives it – of which we

have an illustration in the case of the play-actor who was baptised as a joke. Such anxious disputings and questionings are aroused in us by those who ascribe nothing to faith and everything to works and forms, while we owe everything to faith alone and nothing to forms, and faith makes us free in spirit from all those scruples and fancies.

Hanc sententiam ego libentissime sequor, quod sit plenissimum solacii et efficax fidei adiutorium, nosse se esse baptisatum non ab homine sed ab ipsa trinitate per hominem, qui nomine eius rem gerat apud nos. Quo cessat illa ociosa contentio, qua de forma baptismi, quam appellant ipsa verba, litigant, Graecis dicentibus 'Baptisetur servus Christi', Latinis 'Ego baptiso'. Item, alii rigidissime nugantes damnant sic dici 'Ego baptiso te [Apgsch. , .] in nomine Iesu Christi', quo ritu certum est Apostolos baptisasse, ut in actis apostolicis legimus, voluntque nullam aliam deinceps valere quam istam 'Ego baptiso te in nomine patris et filii et spiritus sancti, Amen'. Sed frustra contendunt: nihil enim probant, sua somnia duntaxat asserunt. Quocunque modo tradatur baptismus, modo non in nomine hominis sed in nomine domini tradatur, vere salvum facit: immo non dubitem, si quis in nomine domini suscipiat, etiam si impius minister non det in nomine domini, vere baptisatum esse in nomine domini. Non enim in conferentis tantum quantum in suscipientis fide vel usu sita est virtus baptismi, Sicut legitur exemplum de quodam Mimo per iocum baptisato. Istas et similes disputationum et quaestionum angustias fecerunt nobis ii, qui fidei nihil, operibus autem ritibusque omnia tribuerunt, cum soli fidei omnia et nihil ritibus debeamus, quae nos facit liberos spiritu ab omnibus istis scrupulis et opinionibus.

3.15 The second part of baptism is the sign, or sacrament, which is that immersion into water from this also it derives its name. For the Greek baptize means "I immerse," and baptisma means "immersion." For, as has been said, signs are added to the divine promises to represent that which the words signify, or, as they now say, that which the sacrament "effectively signifies." We shall see how much of truth there is in this.

Alterum, quod ad baptismum pertinet, est signum seu sacramentum, quod est ipsa mersio in aquam, unde et nomen habet. Nam 'baptiso' graece, 'mergo' latine, et 'baptisma' 'mersio' est. Dictum est enim, iuxta promissiones divinas dari et signa, quae id figurent, quod verba

significant, seu, ut recentiores dicunt, sacramentum efficaciter significat: quod quale sit videbimus.

3.16 The great majority have supposed that there is some hidden spiritual power in the word or in the water, which works the grace of God in the soul of the recipient. Others deny this and hold that there is no power in the sacraments, but that grace is given by God alone, Who according to His covenant aids the sacraments He has instituted. Yet all are agreed that the sacraments are effective signs of grace, and they reach this conclusion by this one argument: If the sacraments of the New Law merely "signified," it would not be apparent in what respect they surpassed the sacraments of the Old Law. Hence they have been driven to attribute such great power to the sacraments of the New Law that in their opinion they benefit even such men as are in mortal sins, and that they do not require faith or grace. It is sufficient not to oppose a "bar," that is, an actual intention to sin again.

Arbitrati sunt quam plurimi, esse aliquam virtutem occultam spiritualem in verbo et aqua, quae operetur in anima recipientis gratiam dei. His alii contradicentes statuunt, nihil esse virtutis in sacramentis, sed gratiam a solo deo dari, qui assistit ex pacto sacramentis a se institutis. Omnes tamen in hoc concedunt, sacramenta esse efficaciter signa gratiae, ad quod hoc unico moventur argumento, non videri alioqui qua ratione novae legis sacramenta praestarent vetustis, si solum significarent. Et hinc impulsus sunt tantum tribuere sacramentis novae legis, ut prodesse ea statuerent etiam iis, qui in peccatis mortalibus sunt, nec requiri fidem aut gratiam, sed sufficere non posuisse obicem, hoc est, actuale propositum denuo peccandi.

3.17 But these views must be carefully avoided and shunned, because they are godless and faithless, being contrary to faith and to the nature of the sacraments. For it is an error to hold that the sacraments of the New Law differ from those of the Old Law in the effectiveness of their "signifying." The "signifying" of both is equally effective. The same God Who now saves me by baptism saved Abel by his sacrifice, Noah by the rainbow, Abraham by circumcision, and all the others by their respective signs. So far as the "signifying" is concerned, there is no difference between a sacrament of the Old Law and one of the New – provided that by the Old Law you mean that which God did among the patriarchs and other fathers in the days of the law. But those signs which were given to the patriarchs and fathers must be sharply distinguished from the legal

types which Moses instituted in his law, such as the priestly rites concerning robes, vessels, meats, dwellings, and the like. Between these and the sacraments of the New Law there is a vast difference, but no less between them and those signs that God from time to time gave to the fathers living under the law, such as the sign of Gideon's fleece, Manoah's sacrifice, or the sign which Isaiah offered to Ahaz, in Isaiah 7. for to these signs God attached a certain promise which required faith in Him.

Haec autem, quia sunt impia et infidelia, contra fidem et naturam sacramentorum pugnantia, diligenter sunt cavenda et fugienda. Error enim est, sacramenta novae legis differri a sacramentis veteris legis penes efficaciam significationis: utraque aequaliter significabant. Idem enim deus, qui nos nunc per baptismum et panem salvat, salvavit Abel per sacrificium, Noe per arcum, Abraham per circumcisionem et alios omnes per sua signa. Nihil itaque differt sacramentum veteris et novae legis quo ad significationem, modo veterem legem appelles quicquid in patriarchis et aliis patribus tempore legis operatus est deus. Nam ea signa, quae in patriarchis et patribus facta sunt, longe sunt discernenda a figuris legalibus, quas Moses in lege sua instituit, quales sunt ritus sacerdotales in vestibus, vasis, cibus, domibus et similibus: ab his enim non modo longissime differunt novae legis sacramenta, sed et ipsa signa, quae pro tempore deus patribus dedit in lege viventibus, [Richt. , ff. , f., Jes. , ff.] quale fuit Gedeonis in vellere, Manue in sacrificio, quale et Isaias obtulit Ahas, Isa. vii. in iis enim simul promittebatur aliquid, quo fides in deum exigebatur.

3.18 This, then, is the difference between the legal types and the new and old signs is that the types do not have attached to them any word of promise requiring faith. Hence they are not signs of justification, for they are not sacraments of the faith that alone justifies, but only sacraments of works. Their whole power and nature consisted in works, not in faith, and he that observed them fulfilled them, even if he did it without faith. But our signs, or sacraments, as well as those of the fathers, have attached to them a word of promise, which requires faith, and they cannot be fulfilled by any other work. Hence they are signs or sacraments of justification, for they are the sacraments of justifying faith and not of works. Their whole efficacy, therefore, consists in faith itself, not in the doing of a work. For whoever believes them fulfils them, even if he should not do a single work. From this has arisen the saying, "Not the sacrament

but the faith of the sacrament justifies." Thus circumcision did not justify Abraham and his seed, and yet the Apostle calls it the seal of the righteousness of faith, because faith in the promise, to which circumcision was added, justified him and fulfilled that which circumcision signified. For faith was the spiritual circumcision of the foreskin of the heart, which was symbolised by the literal circumcision of the flesh. And in the same manner it was obviously not Abel's sacrifice that justified him, but it was his faith, by which he offered himself wholly to God and which was symbolised by the outward sacrifice.

In hoc ergo differunt legales figurae a signis novis et vetustis, quod legales figurae non habent annexum verbum promissionis, quod fidem exigat, unde non sunt signa iustificationis, quia non sunt sacramenta fidei, quae sola iustificat, sed sunt sacramenta operis tantum. Tota enim eorum vis et natura erat opus, non fides. Qui enim ea faciebat, implebat ea, etiam sine fide operans. At nostra et patrum signa seu sacramenta habent annexum verbum promissionis, quod fidem exigit et nullo opere alio impleri potest: ideo sunt signa seu sacramenta iustificationis, quia sunt sacramenta iustificantis fidei et non operis, unde et tota eorum efficacia est ipsa fides, non operatio. Qui enim eis credit, is implet ea, etiam si nihil operetur. Inde proverbium illud 'Non sacramentum sed fides sacramenti iustificat'. Sic circumcisio non iustificavit Abraham et semen eius, et tamen Apostolus eam appellat signaculum iustitiae fidei, Quia fides in promissionem, cui iuncta fuit circumcisio, [Röm. , .] iustificabat et implebat id quod circumcisio significabat. Fides enim fuit circumcisio prepuccii cordis in spiritu, quam figurabat circumcisio carnis in litera. Sic sacrificium Abel plane non eum iustificabat, sed fides, qua se deo totum obtulit, quam sacrificium externum figurabat.

3.19 Even so it is not baptism that justifies or benefits anyone, but it is faith in the word of promise, to which baptism is added. This faith justifies, and fulfils that which baptism signifies. For faith is the submersion of the old man and the emerging of the new. Therefore it cannot be that the new sacraments differ from the old, for both have the divine promise and the same spirit of faith. But they do differ vastly from the ancient types on account of the word of promise, which is the one decisive point of difference. Even so, today, the outward show of vestments, holy places, meats and of all the endless ceremonies has doubtless a fine symbolical meaning, which is to be spiritually fulfilled. Yet because there is no word of divine promise attached to these things, they can never be

compared with the signs of baptism and of the bread, nor do they in any way justify or benefit one, since they are fulfilled in the very observance, apart from faith. For while they are taking place or are being performed, they are being fulfilled. The Apostle says of them, in Colossians 2, "Which are all to perish with the using, after the commandments and doctrines of men." The sacraments, on the contrary, are not fulfilled when they are observed, but when they are believed.

Ita baptismus neminem iustificat nec ulli prodest, sed fides in verbum promissionis, cui additur baptismus: haec enim iustificat et implet id quod baptismus significat. Fides enim est submersio veteris hominis et emersio novi hominis. Quare fieri non potest, ut sacramenta nova differant ab antiquis sacramentis. Habent enim aequae promissiones divinas et eundem spiritum fidei, licet a figuris antiquis incomparabiliter differant propter verbum promissionis, quod est medium unicum et efficacissimum differentiae. Sicut et nunc pompa vestium, locorum, ciborum et infinitarum ceremoniarum sine dubio figurat egregia in spiritu implenda, et tamen, quia nullum adest eis verbum divinae promissionis, nulla ratione cum signis baptismi et panis conferri possunt, nec iustificant aut prosunt ullo modo, cum impletio eorum sit ipse usus seu opus eorum sine fide: dum enim fiunt seu aguntur, implentur, [Col. , .] sicut et Apostolus Colos. ii. de eis dicit 'quae omnia ipso pereunt usu, iuxta praecepta et doctrinas hominum &c.' At sacramenta non implentur, dum fiunt, sed dum creduntur.

3.20 It cannot be true, therefore, that there is in the sacraments a power efficacious for justification, or that they are effective signs of grace. All such assertions tend to destroy faith, and arise from ignorance of the divine promise. Unless you should call them effective in the sense that they certainly and efficaciously impart grace, where faith is unmistakably present. But it is not in this sense that efficacy is now ascribed to them. Witness the fact that they are said to benefit all men, even the godless and unbelieving, provided they do not put an "obstacle" in the path of grace – as if such unbelief were not in itself the most obstinate and hostile of all obstacles to grace. That is how firmly they are bent on turning the sacrament into a command, and faith into a work. For if the sacrament confers grace on me because I receive it, then indeed I obtain grace by virtue of my work and not of faith. I lay hold not on the promise in the sacrament, but on the sign instituted and commanded by God. Do you not see,

then, how completely the sacraments have been misunderstood by our theologians of the Sentences? They do not account for either faith or the promise, in their discussions on the sacraments. They only cling to the sign and the use of the sign, and draw us away from faith to the work, from the word to the sign. Thus they have not only carried the sacraments captive (as I have said), but have completely destroyed them, as far as they were able.

Ita nec verum esse potest, sacramentis inesse vim efficacem iustificationis seu esse ea signa efficacitiae gratiae. Haec enim omnia dicuntur in iacturam fidei ex ignorantia promissionis divinae, nisi hoc modo efficacitiae dixeris, quod, si assit fides indubitata, certissime et efficacissime gratiam conferant. At non hoc modo efficacitiam illis tribui, probat, quod ea prodesse dicunt omnibus etiam impiis et incredulis, modo non ponant obicem, quasi ipsa incredulitas non sit omnium obstinatissimus et hostilissimus obex gratiae: adeo ex sacramento praeceptum, ex fide opus facere moliti sunt. Nam si dat gratiam mihi sacramentum, quia suscipio, iam vere ex opere meo, non ex fide gratiam obtineo, nec promissionem in sacramento apprehendo, sed solum signum institutum et praeceptum a deo. ita clare vides, quam nihil sacramenta intellecta sunt sententionariis Theologis, quod nec fidei nec promissionis ullam in sacramentis rationem habuerint, tantum in signo et usu signi herentes et ex fide in opus, ex verbo in signum nos rapientes, qua re (ut dixi) sacramenta non modo captivaverunt, sed penitus quod in eis fuit aboleverunt.

3.21 Therefore, let us open our eyes and learn to give more heed to the word than to the sign, and to faith than to the work, or the use of the sign, remembering that wherever there is a divine promise there faith is required, and that these two are so necessary to each other that neither can be efficacious apart from the other. For it is not possible to believe unless there be a promise, and the promise is not established unless it be believed. But where these two meet, they give a real and most certain efficacy to the sacraments. Hence, to seek the efficacy of the sacrament apart from the promise and apart from faith, is to labor in vain and to find damnation. Thus Christ says: "He that believe and is baptised, shall be saved. He that does not believe shall be damned." He shows us in this word that faith is so necessary a part of the sacrament that it can save even without the sacrament. For which reason He did not see fit to say: "He that does not believe, and is not baptised..."

Nos ergo aperientes oculos discamus magis verbum quam signum, magis fidem quam opus seu usum signi observare, scientes, ubicunque est promissio divina, ibi requiri fidem, esseque utrunque tam necessarium, ut neutrum sine utro efficax esse possit. Neque enim credi potest, nisi assit promissio, nec promissio stabilitur, nisi credatur. ambae vero si mutuae sint, faciunt veram et certissimam efficaciam sacramentis. Quare efficaciam sacramenti citra promissionem et fidem querere est frustra niti et damnationem [Marc. , .] invenire. Sic Christus 'qui crediderit et baptisatus fuerit, salvus erit, qui non crediderit, condemnabitur'. Quo monstrat, fidem in sacramento adeo necessariam, ut etiam sine sacramento servare possit, ideo noluit adiicere 'Qui non crediderit et non baptisatus fuerit'.

3.22 Baptism, then, signifies two things –death and resurrection – that is, full and complete justification. When the minister immerses the child in the water, baptism signifies death. When he draws the child forth again, baptism signifies life. Thus Paul expounds on this in Romans 6, "We are buried together with Christ by baptism into death. As Christ is risen from the dead by the glory of the Father, so we also may walk in newness of life." This death and resurrection we call the new creation, regeneration, and the spiritual birth. And this must not be understood only in a figurative sense, of the death of sin and the life of grace, as many understand it, but of actual death and resurrection. The significance of baptism is not an imaginary significance, and sin does not completely die, nor does grace completely rise, until the body of sin that we carry about in this life is destroyed. This the Apostle teaches in the same chapter. For as long as we are in the flesh, the desires of the flesh stir and are stirred. When we begin to believe, we also begin to die to this world and to live to God in the life to come. Faith is truly a death and a resurrection, that is, it is that spiritual baptism in which we are submerged and from which we rise.

Significat itaque baptismus duo, mortem et resurrectionem, hoc est, plenariam consumatamque iustificationem. Quod enim minister puerum immergit in aquam, mortem significat, quod autem rursus educit, vitam significat. [Röm. , .] Ita Paulus Ro. vi. exponit: Consepulti enim sumus Christo per baptismum in mortem, ut, quemadmodum Christus resurrexit ex mortuis per gloriam patris, ita et nos in novitate vitae ambulemus. Hanc mortem et resurrectionem appellamus novam creaturam, regenerationem et spiritualem nativitatem, quam non oportet allegorice

tantum intelligi de morte peccati et vita gratiae, sicut multi solent, sed de vera morte et resurrectione. Non enim baptismus significatio ficta est, Neque peccatum moritur, neque gratia surgit plene, donec [Röm. , .] corpus peccati, quod gerimus in hac vita, destruat, ut ibidem Apostolus dicit. Nam donec in carne sumus, desideria carnis movent et moventur. Quare dum incipimus credere, simul incipimus mori huic mundo et vivere deo in futura vita, ut fides vere sit mors et resurrectio, hoc est spiritualis ille baptismus, quo immergimur et emergimus.

3.23 Hence it is indeed correct to say that baptism washes sins away, but that expression is too weak and mild to bring out the full significance of baptism, which is rather a symbol of death and resurrection. For this reason I would have the candidates for baptism completely immersed in the water, as the word says and as the sacrament signifies. Not that I deem this necessary, but it would be well to give to so perfect and complete a thing a perfect and complete sign. Thus it was also doubtless instituted by Christ. The sinner does not so much need to be washed as he needs to die, in order to be wholly renewed and made another creature, and to be conformed to the death and resurrection of Christ, with Whom, through baptism, he dies and rises again. Although you may properly say that Christ was washed clean of mortality when He died and rose again, yet that is a weaker way of putting it than if you said He was completely changed and renewed. In the same way it is far more forceful to say that baptism signifies that we die completely and rising to eternal life, than to say that it signifies merely our being washed clean from sins.

Quod ergo baptismis tribuitur ablutio a peccatis, vere quidem tribuitur, sed lentior et mollior est significatio quam ut baptismum exprimat, qui potius mortis et resurrectionis symbolum est. Hac ratione motus vellem baptisandos penitus in aquam immergi, sicut sonat vocabulum et signat mysterium, non quod necessarium arbitrer, sed quod pulchrum foret, rei tam perfectae et plenae signum quoque plenum et perfectum dari, sicut et institutum est sine dubio a Christo. Peccator enim non tam ablui quam mori debet, ut totus renovetur in aliam creaturam, et ut morti ac resurrectioni Christi respondeat, cui per baptismum commoritur et resurgit. Licet enim possis Christum dicere ablutum a mortalitate, dum mortuus est et resurrexit, segnius tamen dixeris quam si in totum mutatum et renovatum dixeris: ita ardentius est, per baptismum nos significari

omnibus modis mori et resurgere in aeternam vitam, quam ablui a peccatis.

3.24 Here, again, you see that the sacrament of baptism, even in respect to its sign, does not last only for a moment, but continues on forever. Although its administration is soon over, yet the thing it signifies continues until we die, no, until we rise at the last day. For as long as we live we are continually doing that which our baptism signifies, that is, we die and rise again. We die, that is, not only spiritually and in our affections, by renouncing the sins and vanities of this world, but in reality we die. We begin to leave this bodily life and to lay hold on the life to come. So there is, as they say, a real and even a bodily leaving of this world to go to the Father.

Hic iterum vides, Baptismi sacramentum etiam quo ad signum non esse momentaneum aliquod negotium sed perpetuum. Licet enim usus eius subito transeat, tamen res ipsa significata durat usque ad mortem, immo resurrectionem in novissimo die. Quam diu enim vivimus, semper id agimus, quod baptismus significat, id est, morimur et resurgimus, Morimur, inquam, non tantum affectu et spiritualiter, quo peccatis et vanitatibus mundi renunciamus, sed revera vitam hanc corporalem incipimus relinquere et futuram vitam apprehendere, ut sit realis, quod dicunt, et corporalis quoque transitus ex hoc mundo ad patrem.

3.25 We must, therefore, beware of those who have reduced the power of baptism, making it something thin and small. While they do say that baptism indeed pours the grace of God into us, but afterwards sin pours it out again. So, they say, one must reach heaven by another way. As if baptism had then become entirely useless! Do not hold such a viewpoint, but know that baptism signifies that you die and live again. Therefore, whether it is by penance or by any other way, you can only return to the power of your baptism, and once again do what you were baptised to do and what your baptism signified. Never does baptism lose its power, unless you despair and refuse to return to its salvation. You may, indeed, for a time wander away from the sign, but that does not mean that the sign is powerless. You have, thus, been baptised once in the sacrament, but you must be constantly baptised again through faith, you must constantly die, you must constantly live again. Baptism absorbs your whole body, and gives it back again. Even so that which baptism signifies should absorb your whole life in body and soul, and give it back again at the last day, clothed in robes of glory and immortality. We are, therefore, never without the

sign of baptism nor yet without the thing it signifies. No, we must be baptised ever more and more completely, until we perfectly fulfill the sign, at the last day.

Quare nobis cavendum est ab iis, qui baptismi vim eo redegerunt tenuitatis et parvitatibus, ut gratiam in eo dicant quidem infundi sed postea per peccatum effundi, tum alia via, ac iam quasi baptismi penitus irriti facti, ad coelum eundem. Non sic tu arbitrare sed intelliges, eam esse baptismi significationem, qua moriaris et vivas, ideo non posse te sive per poenitentiam sive per quancunque aliam viam redire, nisi ad vim baptismi ac denuo illud facere, quod baptisatus es ut faceres, quodque baptismus tuus significabat. Nunquam fit baptismus irritus, donec desperans redire ad salutem nolueris: aberrare quidem poteris ad tempus a signo, sed non ideo irritum est signum. Ita semel es baptisatus sacramentaliter, sed semper baptisandus fide, semper moriendum semperque vivendum. Baptismus totum corpus absorbit et rursus edidit: ita res baptismi totam vitam tuam cum corpore et anima absorbere debet et reddere in novissimo die indutam stola claritatis et immortalitatis, itaque nunquam sine baptismi tam signo quam re ipsa sumus, immo semper sumus baptisandi magis ac magis, donec signum perfecte impleamus in novissimo die.

3.26 Therefore, whatever we do in this life that promotes the mortifying of the flesh and the giving life to the spirit, belongs to baptism. The sooner we depart this life the sooner we fulfill our baptism. The greater our sufferings the more closely do we conform to our baptism. Hence those were the Church's happiest days, when the martyrs were being killed everyday and accounted as sheep for the slaughter. For then the power of baptism reigned supreme in the Church, which power we have today lost sight of in the midst of the multitude of works and doctrines of men. For all our life should be baptism, and the fulfilling of the sign, or sacrament, of baptism. We have been set free from all else and wholly given over to baptism alone, that is, to death and resurrection.

Intelligis ergo, quicquid in hac vita gerimus, quod ad mortificationem carnis et vivificationem spiritus valet, ad baptismum pertinere, et quo brevius a vita absolvimur, eo citius baptismum nostrum impleamus, et quo atrociora patimur, eo foelicius baptismi respondeamus, ideoque Ecclesiam tunc fuisse foelicissimam, quando martyres mortificabantur omni die et aestimabantur sicut oves occisionis: tunc enim regnabat in Ecclesia virtus baptismi pleno imperio, quam hodie ignoramus etiam prae

multitudine operum et doctrinarum humanarum. Quicquid enim vivimus, Baptismus esse debet et signum seu sacramentum baptismi implere, cum a caeteris omnibus liberati uni tantum baptismo simus addicti, id est, morti et resurrectioni.

3.27 This glorious liberty of ours, and this understanding of baptism have been carried captive in our day. And whom have we to thank for this but the Roman pontiff with his despotism? More than all others, it was his first duty, as chief shepherd, to preach and defend this liberty and this knowledge, as Paul says in 1 Corinthians 4 "Let a man so account of us as of the ministers of Christ, and the dispensers of the mysteries, or sacraments, of God." Instead of this, he seeks only to oppress us with his decrees and his laws, and to enslave and ensnare us in the tyranny of his power. By what right, in God's name, does the pope impose his laws upon us – to say nothing of his wicked and damnable neglect to teach these mysteries? Who gave him power to despoil us of this liberty, granted us in baptism? One thing only (as I have said) has been enjoined upon us all the days of our life – be baptised – That is, to be put to death and to live again, through faith in Christ. This faith alone should have been taught, especially by the chief shepherd. But now there is not a word said about faith, and the Church is laid waste with endless laws concerning works and ceremonies So the power and right understanding of baptism are put aside, and faith in Christ is prevented.

Hanc gloriam libertatis nostrae et hanc scientiam baptismi esse hodie captivam, cui possumus referre acceptum quam uni tyrannidi Romani pontificis? qui, ut pastorem primum decet, unus omnium maxime debuit esse praedicator et assertor huius libertatis et scientiae, sicut Paulus [1. Cor. , .] i. Corint. iiiii. dicit: Sic nos existimet homo, sicut ministros Christi et dispensatores mysteriorum seu sacramentorum dei. ipse solum id agit, ut suis decretis et iuribus opprimat et in potestatis suae tyrannidem captivos illaqueet. Obsecro, quo iure (ut non dicam, quam impie et damnabiliter haec mysteria omittat docere) Papa super nos constituit leges? Quis dedit ei potestatem captivandae huius nostrae libertatis per baptismum nobis donatae? Unum, ut dixi, nobis in tota vita agendum est propositum, ut baptisemur, id est, mortificemur et vivamus per fidem Christi, quam et unice doctam oportuit, maxime a summo pastore. At nunc, tacita fide, infinitis legibus operum et ceremoniarum extincta est Ecclesia, ablata virtus et scientia baptismi, impedita fides Christi.

3.28 Therefore I say: neither the pope nor a bishop nor any other man has the right to impose a single syllable of law upon a Christian man without his consent. If he does, it is done in the spirit of tyranny. Therefore the prayers, fasts, donations, and whatever else the pope decrees and demands in all of his decretals, as numerous as they are evil, he demands and decrees without any right whatever. He sins against the liberty of the Church whenever he attempts any such thing. In fact, today's churchmen are indeed such vigorous defenders of the liberty of the Church, that is, of wood and stone, of land and rents – for "churchly" is nowadays the same as "spiritual" – yet with such fictions they not only take captive but utterly destroy the true liberty of the Church, and deal with us far worse than the Turk, in opposition to the word of the Apostle, "Do not be enslaved by men." Yes, to be subjected to their statutes and tyrannical laws is to be enslaved by men.

Dico itaque: neque Papa neque Episcopus neque ullus hominum habet ius unius syllabae constituendae super Christianum hominem, nisi id fiat eiusdem consensu. Quicquid aliter fit, tyrannico spiritu fit: ideo orationes, ieiunia, donationes et quaecunque tandem Papa in universis suis decretis tam multis quam iniquis statuit et exigit, Prorsus nullo iure exigit et statuit, peccatque in libertatem Ecclesiae toties quoties aliquid horum attentaverit. Hinc factum est, ut Ecclesiastici hodierni strenui quidem sint tutores libertatis Ecclesiasticae, id est, lapidum, lignorum, agrorum et censuum (sic enim hodie Ecclesiastica sunt idem quod spiritualia), sed eisdem fictis verbis veram Ecclesiae libertatem non modo captivent sed pessudent penitus, etiam plus [. Cor. , .] quam Turca, contra Apostolum qui dicit: Nolite fieri servi hominum. Hoc enim vere est hominum servos fieri, statutis et tyrannicis eorum legibus subiici.

3.29 This impious and sinful tyranny is fostered by the pope's disciples, who here drag in and pervert that saying of Christ, "He that hears you hears me." With puffed cheeks they blow up this saying to a great size in support of their traditions. Though Christ said this to the apostles when they went forth to preach the Gospel, and though it applies solely to the Gospel, they pass over the Gospel and apply it only to their fables. He says in John 10 "My sheep hear my voice, but the voice of a stranger they do not hear." To this end He left us the Gospel, that His voice might be uttered by the pontiffs. But they utter their own voice, and themselves desire to be heard. Moreover, the Apostle says that he was not sent to baptise but to preach the Gospel. Therefore, no one is bound to

the traditions of the pope, nor does he need to give ear to him unless he teaches the Gospel and Christ, and the pope should teach nothing but faith without any restrictions. But since Christ says, "He that hears you hears me," and does not say to Peter only, "He that hears you," why doesn't the pope also hear others? Finally, where there is true faith, there must also be the word of faith. Why then does not an unbelieving pope now and then hear a believing servant of his, who has the word of faith? It is blindness, sheer blindness, that holds the popes in their power.

Adiuvant hanc impiam et perditam tyrannidem discipuli Papae, huc [Luc. , .] torquentes et depravantes illud Christi: Qui vos audit, me audit. Magnis enim buccis hoc inflant verbum pro suis traditionibus, cum Christus hoc dixerit Apostolis euntibus praedicare Euangelium et ad Euangelium tantum referri debeat: ipsi omissio Euangelio suis tantum fabulis id aptant. Dicit [Joh. , .] enim Iohan. x. Oves meae vocem meam audiunt, alienorum autem vocem non audiunt. ideo et relictum est Euangelium, ut vocem Christi sonarent [. Cor. , .] Pontifices: at ipsi suas voces sonant, audiri denique volunt. Apostolus quoque dicit, sese missum esse non baptizare sed Euangelizare: itaque nemo est obnoxius pontificis traditionibus, nec oportet eum audiri, nisi dum Euangelium et Christum docet, nec aliud ipse docere debet quam fidem liberrimam. [Luc. , .] Cum autem Christus dicat 'Qui vos audit, me audit', Cur non Papa quoque audit alios? non enim soli Petro dicit 'qui te audit'. Denique, ubi est vera fides, ibi et verbum fidei esse necessarium est. Cur ergo Papa infidelis non audit quandoque servum suum fidelem habentem verbum fidei? Caecitas, Caecitas in Pontificibus regnat.

3.30 But others, more shameless still, arrogantly ascribe to the pope the power to make laws, on the basis of Matthew 16, "Whatever you shall bind," etc., though Christ treats in this passage of binding and loosing sins, not of taking the whole Church captive and oppressing it with laws. So this tyranny treats everything with its own lying words and violently wrests and perverts the words of God. I admit indeed that Christians ought to bear this accursed tyranny just as they would bear any other violence of this world, according to Christ's word: "If someone strikes you on your right cheek, turn to him also the other cheek." But this is my complaint – that the godless pontiffs boastfully claim the right to do this, that they pretend to be seeking the Church's welfare with this Babylon of theirs, and that they foist this fiction upon all mankind. For if they did these

things, and we suffered their violence, well knowing, both of us, that it was godlessness and tyranny, then we might number it among the things that contribute to the mortifying of this life and the fulfilling of our baptism, and might with a good conscience rejoice in the inflicted injury. But now they seek to deprive us of this consciousness of our liberty, and would have us believe that what they do is well done, and must not be censured or complained of as wrongdoing. Since they wolves, they want to look like shepherds. Since they are antichrists, they want to be honored as Christ.

[Matth. , .] Alii vero multo impudentiores ex illo Matt. xvi. Papae arrogant potestatem legum condendarum 'Quodcunque ligaveris &c.' cum ibi Christus de peccatis ligandis et remittendis agat, non de Ecclesia tota captivanda et legibus opprimenda. ita omnia agit ista tyrannis fictis suis verbis, tortis per vim ac depravatis verbis dei. Hoc sane confiteor, Esse tyrannidem istam maledictam ferendam Christianis, sicut quamlibet aliam violentiam huius mundi, iuxta [Matth. , .] illud Christi 'Qui te percusserit in maxillam dexteram, prebe ei et alteram': sed hoc quaeror, quod impii pontifices se id iure posse et facere iactant et rei Christianae sese consulere hac Babylone sua praesumunt, hanc ipsam opinionem omnibus persuadentes. Si enim conscientia impietatis et tyrannidis ea facerent aut nos pateremur vim eorum, inter ea securi numeraremus, quae ad mortificandam vitam hanc et implendum baptismum valent, integra nobis relicta conscientia gloriandi de iniuria illata. At nunc volunt sic conscientiam libertatis nostrae illaqueari, ut credamus, bene a se geri quae gerunt nec licere ea reprehendi aut inique gesta quaerulari, et cum sint lupi, videri volunt pastores, cum sint Antichristi, volunt honorari pro Christo.

3.31 I only lift my voice to defend this freedom of conscience. I confidently cry out: No one – not men – not angels – may justly impose laws upon Christians without their consent, for we are free from all things. If any laws are laid on us, we must bear them in such a way as to preserve the consciousness of our liberty. We must know and strongly affirm that the making of such laws is unjust, that we will bear and rejoice in this injustice. We will be careful neither to justify the tyrant nor complain against his tyranny. "For who is he," says Peter, "that will harm you, if you are followers of that which is good?" " All things work together for good to the elect." Nevertheless, since few know this glory of baptism and the blessedness of Christian liberty, and cannot know them because

of the tyranny of the pope, I for one will walk away from it all and redeem my conscience by bringing this charge against the pope and all his papists: Unless they will abolish their laws and traditions, and restore to Christ's churches their liberty and have it taught among them, they are guilty of all the souls that perish under this miserable captivity, and the papacy is truly the kingdom of Babylon, yes, the kingdom of the real Antichrist! For who is "the man of sin" and "the son of perdition" but he that with his doctrines and his laws increases sins and the perdition of souls in the Church, while he sits in the Church as if he were God? All this the papal tyranny has fulfilled, and more than fulfilled, these many centuries. It has extinguished faith, obscured the sacraments and oppressed the Gospel. But its own laws, which are not only impious and sacrilegious, but even barbarous and foolish, it has enjoined and multiplied world without end.

Pro hac duntaxat clamo libertate et conscientia, clamoque fidenter, Christianis nihil ullo iure posse imponi legum, sive ab hominibus sive ab angelis, nisi quantum volunt: liberi enim sumus ab omnibus. Quod si quae imponuntur, sic ferenda sunt, ut libertatis conscientia salva sit, quae sciat et certo affirmet, iniuriam sibi fieri, quam cum gloria ferat, ita cavens, ne [. Petr. , .] iustificet tyrannum, ut ne murmuret contra tyrannidem. Quis enim est, ait [Röm. , .] Petrus, qui vobis noceat, si bonum emulati fueritis? omnia cooperantur electis in bonum. Attamen quia hanc baptismi gloriam et libertatis Christianae foelicitatem pauci noverunt, nec prae tyrannide Papae nosse possunt, ipse me hic expedio et conscientiam meam redimo, compellans Papam et omnes papistas, Quod nisi sua iura et traditiones sustulerint, et ecclesiis Christi libertatem suam restituerint eamque doceri fecerint, reos esse eos omnium animarum, quae hac misera captivitate pereunt, esseque papatum aliud revera nihil quam regnum Babylonis et veri Antichristi. Quis enim est homo peccati et filius perditionis quam is, qui suis doctrinis ac statutis peccata et perditionem animarum auget in Ecclesia, sedens tamen in Ecclesia sicut deus? At hoc totum abunde implevit tyrannis papalis iam a multis saeculis, quae fidem extinxit, sacramenta obscuravit, Euangelium oppressit, suas autem non modo impias et sacrilegas, verum etiam barbaras et indoctissimas leges imperavit et sine fine multiplicavit.

3.32 Behold, then, our miserable captivity. How empty is the city that was full of people! The mistress of the Gentiles has become like a widow. The princess

of provinces has been made a client nation! There is none to comfort her. All her friends despise her. There are so many orders, so many rites, so many sects, so many vows, exertions and works, in which Christians are engaged, that they lose sight of their baptism. This swarm of locusts, cankerworms and caterpillars – not one of them is able to remember that he is baptised or what blessings his baptism brought him. Are engaged in no efforts and no works, but are free in every way, secure and saved only through the glory of their baptism. For we are indeed little children, continually baptised anew in Christ.

Vide ergo miseriam captivitatis nostrae, quomodo sedeat sola civitas plena populo et facta sit vidua domina gentium, princeps provintiarum sub tributo. Non est qui consoletur eam: etiam amici eius spreverunt eam &c. Tot ordines, tot ritus, tot sectae, tot professiones, tot studia, tot opera sunt, quibus hodie Christiani occupantur, ut obliviscantur baptismi sui et nemo prae harum locustarum, erucarum, bruchorum multitudine meminisse possit, sese esse baptisatum aut quid in baptismo consecutus sit. Decebat enim nos esse sicut parvuli baptisati, qui nullis studiis nullisque operibus occupati in omnia sunt liberi, solius gloria baptismi sui securi et salvi. Sumus enim et ipsi parvuli, in Christo assidue baptisati.

3.33 Perhaps someone will oppose what I have said by pointing to the baptism of infants. Infants do not understand God's promise and cannot have baptismal faith. So either faith is not necessary or else infant baptism is useless. Here I say what everyone says: the faith of others, namely, the faith of those who bring them to baptism aids infants. For the Word of God is powerful, when it is uttered. It can change even a godless heart, which is no less unresponsive and helpless than any infant. Even so the infant is changed, cleansed and renewed by faith poured into it, through the prayer of the Church that presents it for baptism and believes. All things are possible for this prayer. Nor should I doubt that even a godless adult might be changed, in any of the sacraments, if the same Church prayed and presented him. We read in the Gospel of the paralytic, who was healed through the faith of others. I should be ready to admit that in this sense the sacraments of the New Law confer grace effectively, not only to those who do not resist, but even to those who do resist it very obstinately. Is there any obstacle that the faith of the Church and the prayer of faith cannot remove? We believe that Stephen by this powerful means converted Paul the Apostle, don't we? But then the sacraments accomplish what they do not by

their own power, but by the power of faith, without which they accomplish nothing at all, as has been said.

Opponetur forsitan iis quae dicta sunt baptismus parvulorum, qui promissionem dei non capiant, nec fidem baptismi habere possunt, ideoque aut non requiri fidem aut parvulos frustra baptisari. Hic dico, quod omnes dicunt, fide aliena parvulis succurri, illorum, qui offerunt eos. Sicut enim verbum dei potens est, dum sonat, etiam impii cor immutare, quod non minus est surdum et incapax quam ullus parvulus, ita per orationem Ecclesiae offerentis et credentis, cui omnia possible sunt, et parvulus fide infusa mutatur, mundatur et renovatur. Nec dubitarem, etiam adultum impium, eadem Ecclesia orante et offerente, posse in quovis sacramento mutari, [Matth. , ff.] sicut de paralytico Euangelico legimus, aliena fide sanato. Atque hac ratione libens admitterem, sacramenta novae legis esse efficaciter ad dandam gratiam non modo non ponentibus sed etiam obstinatissime ponentibus obicem. Quid enim fides Ecclesiae et oratio fidei non tolleret, cum Paulum Apostolum Stephanus hac vi convertisse credatur? At tunc sacramenta non sua sed fidei virtute faciunt quod faciunt, sine qua nihil prorsus faciunt, ut dixi.

3.34 The question remains, whether it is proper to baptise an infant not yet born, with only a hand or a foot outside the womb. Here I will decide nothing hastily, and confess my ignorance. I am not sure whether the reason given by some is sufficient – that the soul resides in its entirety in every part of the body. After all, it is not the soul but the body that is externally baptised with water. Nor do I share the view of others that he who is not yet born cannot be born again, even though it has considerable force. I leave these matters to the teaching of the Spirit. For the moment I permit every one to be convinced by his own opinion.

Queritur etiam adhuc, an parvulus nondum natus possit porrecta ex utero manu vel pede baptisari. Hic nihil temere iudico meamque ignorantiam confiteor, Nec scio, an id satis sit, quod pro fundamento habent, Esse videlicet animam in qualibet parte corporis totam. Non enim anima, sed corpus baptisatur aqua externe. Sed nec hoc iudico, quod dicunt, renasci eum non posse, qui natus nondum sit, et si vehementer urgeat. Ideo magisterio spiritus haec relinquo, interim sinens quenque suo sensu abundare.

3.35 One thing I will add – and I wish I could persuade everyone to do it! – namely, to completely abolish or avoid all the making of vows, whether they are vows to enter religious orders, to make pilgrimages or to do any works whatsoever. Then we could remain in the freedom of our baptism, which is the most religious, rich in works, state of all. It is impossible to say how greatly that widespread delusion of vows weakens baptism and obscures the knowledge of Christian liberty. This is to say nothing now of the unspeakable and infinite peril to souls which that mania for making vows and that ill-advised rashness daily increase. Godless pontiffs and unhappy pastors! You slumber on without heeding, and indulge your evil lusts, without pity for this "affliction of Joseph," so dreadful and fraught with peril!

Unum hic addo, quod utinam cunctis queam persuadere, id est, ut vota prorsus omnia tollerentur aut vitarentur, sive sint religionum sive peregrinationum sive quoruncunque operum, maneremusque in libertate religiosissima et operosissima baptismi. Dicitur non potest, quantum detrahat baptismi et obscuret scientiam libertatis Christianae opinio illa votorum plus nimio celebris, ut interim taceam infanda etiam eaque infinita pericula animarum, quae vovendi ista libido inconsultaque temeritas quotidie auget. O impiissimi pontifices et infoelicissimi pastores, qui secure stertitis et in [Amos , .] vestris cupiditatibus lascivitis et nihil compatimini super ista contritione Ioseph pessima et periculosissima.

3.36 Vows should be abolished by a general edict, especially life-long vows, and all men diligently recalled to the vows of baptism. If this is not possible, everyone should be warned not to take a vow rashly. No one should be encouraged to do so. Permission to make vows should be given only with difficulty and reluctance. For we have vowed enough in baptism – more than we can ever fulfill. If we devote ourselves to the keeping of this one vow, we shall have all we can do. But now we travel over earth and sea to make many converts. We fill the world with priests, monks and nuns, and imprison them all in life-long vows. You will find those who argue and decree that a work done in fulfilment of a vow ranks higher than one done without a vow. They claim such works are rewarded with I know not what great rewards in heaven. Blind and godless Pharisees, who measure righteousness and holiness by the greatness, number or other quality of the works! But God measures them by faith alone,

and with Him there is no difference between works except in the faith which performs them.

Oportuit hic generali edicto vel tollere vota, illa praesertim perpetua, et ad baptismi vota cunctos revocare vel diligenter monere, ne quis temere voveret, nullum invitare, immo difficiles tardosque esse ad vota permittenda. Abunde enim vovimus in baptismo et plus quam possimus implere, sat negotii habituri, si huic uni intenderimus. At nunc mare et aridam circumimus, ut multos proselytas faciamus, mundum sacerdotibus, monachis, monialibus implemus et hos omnes perpetuis votis incarceramus. Hic invenias, qui disputent et statuunt, opus intra votum esse prestancius opere extra et citra votum et nescio quantis premiis in coelo aliis praeferendum, Pharisei caeci et impii, qui ex operum magnitudine et multitudine aliave qualitate metiuntur iustitiam et sanctitatem, quae ex sola fide apud deum mensuratur, apud quem nulla est differentia operum, nisi quanta est fidei differentia.

3.37 These wicked men inflate with bombast their own opinions and human works. They do this to lure the unthinking populace, who are almost always led by the glitter of works to make shipwreck of their faith, to forget their baptism and to harm their Christian liberty. For a vow is a kind of law or requirement. Therefore, when vows are multiplied, laws and works are necessarily multiplied. When this is done, faith is extinguished and the liberty of baptism taken captive. Others, not content with these wicked allurements, go on to say that entrance into a religious order is like a new baptism which may be repeated later and as often as the commitment to live the religious life is renewed. Thus these "votaries" have taken for themselves alone all righteousness, salvation and glory, and left to those who are merely baptised nothing to compare with them. No, the Pope of Rome, that fountain and source of all superstitions, confirms, approves and adorns this mode of life with high-sounding bulls and dispensations, while no one deems baptism worthy of even a thought. And with such glittering pomp (as we have said) they drive the easily led people of Christ into certain disaster, so that lose their gratitude for baptism and presume to achieve greater things by their works than others achieve by their faith.

Faciunt hac bucca sua homines impii, suis inventionibus opinionem et opera hominum inflant ad alliciendum stolidum vulgus, quod specie operum fere ducitur in magnam iacturam fidei, oblivionem baptismi, iniuriam libertatis Christianae. cum enim votum sit lex quaedam et

exactio, necessario multiplicatis votis leges et opera multiplicantur, quibus multiplicatis fides extinguatur et baptismi libertas captivatur. Hiis blanditiis impiis non contenti, addunt alii, Ingressum religionis esse velut novum baptismum, quod deinceps licet toties renovari, quoties ab integro propositum religionis renovatur: ita votarii isti sibi solis iustitiam, salutem, gloriam tribuerunt, baptisatis prorsus nihil reliquerunt, quo possint eis conferri. Iam Romanus pontifex, superstitionum omnium fons et autor, magnificis bullis et indultis has vivendi rationes confirmat, approbat, ornat, Baptismum vero nemo vel memoria dignatur. Atque iis pompis speciosis, ut dixi, sequacem populum Christi in quascunque volent symplegadas pellunt, ut ingrati suo baptismo praesumant meliora suis operibus prestare quam alii sua fide.

3.38 Therefore, God again shows Himself perverse to the perverse. He repays the makers of vows for their ingratitude and pride, causes them to break their vows or to keep them only with prodigious labor. He compels them to remain sunk in these vows, never coming to the knowledge of the grace of faith and baptism. He makes them continue in their hypocrisy to the end – since God does not approve their spirit – and that at last makes them a laughing-stock to the whole world, always persuing righteousness, yet never achieving righteousness. God ordains all this so that they fulfill the word of Isaiah: " The land is full of idols."

Quare et deus rursus cum perversis perversus, ulturus ingratitude et superbiam votariorum facit, ut vota sua non servent aut cum ingenti labore servent, maneatque in eis immersi, nunquam fidei et baptismi gratiam cognoscentes et cum non sit creditus cum deo spiritus eorum, perseverent in hypocrisi sua inperpetuum, et tandem ludibrio sint toti mundo semper iustitiam sectando, et ad Iustitiam nunquam perveniendo, ut impleant illud [Jes. , .] Isaie ii. Et terra repleta est Idolis.

3.39 I am indeed far from forbidding or discouraging any one who may desire to take a vow privately and of his own free choice; for I would not altogether despise and condemn vows. But I would most strongly advise against setting up and sanctioning the making of vows as a public mode of life. It is enough that every one should have the private right to take a vow at his peril; but to commend the vowing of vows as a public mode of life – this I hold to be most harmful to the Church and to simple souls. And I hold this, first, because it runs directly counter to the Christian life; for a vow is a certain ceremonial law and a

human tradition or presumption, and from these the Christian has been set free through baptism. For a Christian is subject to no laws but the law of God. Again, there is no instance in Scripture of such a vow, especially of life-long chastity, obedience and poverty. But whatever is without warrant of Scripture is hazardous and should by no means be commended to any one, much less established as a common and public mode of life, although whoever will must be permitted to make the venture at his own peril. For certain works are wrought by the Spirit in a few men, but they must not be made an example or a mode of life for all.

Ego sane non prohibuerim nec repugnauerim, si quis privatim arbitrio suo quippiam velit vovere, ne vota penitus contemnam aut damnem, sed publicum vitae genus hinc statui et confirmari omnino dissuaserim. Sufficit cuique vovendi privata licentia periculo suo, publicam vero commendari rationem vivendi in votis vovendis arbitror perniciosum esse Ecclesiae et animabus simplicibus. Primum, quod non parum Christianae vitae repugnet in hoc, quod votum est lex quaedam ceremonialis et humana traditio seu presumptio, a qua Ecclesia per baptismum liberata est. Christianus enim nulli legi addictus est nisi divinae. Deinde, quod non habeat exemplum in scripturis, praecipue castitatis, obedientiae, paupertatis perpetuae votum. Quod autem e scripturis exemplum non habet, periculosum est, nulli prorsus suadendum, multo minus pro vulgari et publico vivendi genere statuendum, et si cuilibet audere suo periculo, quod voluerit, sit permittendum. Opera enim quaedam spiritus in paucis operatur, quae in exemplum aut vivendi modum nequaquam sunt vocanda.

3.40 Moreover, I greatly fear that these modes of life of the religious orders belong to those things which the Apostle foretold: " They shall teach a lie in hypocrisy, forbidding to marry, to abstain from meats, which God has created to be received with thanksgiving." Let no one retort by pointing to Sts. Bernard, Francis, Dominic and others, who founded or fostered monastic orders. Terrible and marvelous is God in His counsels toward the sons of men. He could keep Daniel, Ananias, Azarias and Misael holy at the court of the king of Babylon, that is, in the midst of godlessness; why could He not sanctify those men also in their perilous mode of living or guide them by the special operation of His Spirit, yet without desiring it to be an example to others? Besides, it is certain that none of them was saved through his vows and his "religious" life; they were

saved through faith alone, by which all men are saved, and with which that splendid slavery of vows is more than anything else in conflict.

Sed et vehementer metuo, ne votivae istae vivendi rationes religiosorum [. Tim. , f.] sint de numero eorum, de quibus Apostolus praedixit: Erunt docentes in hypocrisi mendacium, prohibentes nubere et abstinere a cibis, quos deus creavit ad percipiendum cum gratiarum actione. Nec mihi quisquam obiecerit sanctum Bernardum, Franciscum, Dominicum et similes religionum vel autores vel auctores. Terribilis et mirabilis est deus in consiliis suis super filios hominum, potuit Danielem, Ananiam, Azariam, Misael in Babylonici regni (id est, in media impietate) administratione servare sanctos, cur non potuisset et hos in periculoso vitae genere sanctificare aut singulari opere spiritus gubernare, quod tamen exemplum aliis fieri nollet? Et certum est, nullum illorum per vota sua et religionem fuisse salvatum, sed per fidem solam, in qua omnes salvantur, contra quam maxime omnium pugnant speciosae illae servitutes votorum.

3.41 But every one may hold to his own view of this. I will return to my argument. Speaking now in behalf of the Church's liberty and the glory of baptism, I feel myself in duty bound publicly to set forth the counsel I have learned under the Spirit's guidance. I therefore counsel the magnates of the churches, first of all, to abolish all those vows, or at least not to approve and extol them. If they will not do this, then I counsel all men who would be assured of their salvation, to abstain from all vows, above all from the great and life-long vows; I give this counsel especially to all growing boys and youths. This I do, first, because this manner of life has no witness or warrant in the Scriptures, as I have said, but is puffed up solely by the bulls (and they truly are "bulls") of human popes. And, secondly, because it greatly tends to hypocrisy, by reason of its outward show and its unusual character, which engender conceit and a contempt of the common Christian life. And if there were no other reason for abolishing these vows, this one were reason enough, namely, that through them faith and baptism are slighted and works are exalted, which cannot be done without harmful results. For in the religious orders there is scarce one in many thousands, who is not more concerned about works than about faith, and on the basis of this madness they have even made distinctions among themselves, such as "the more strict" and "the more lax," as they call them.

Sed abundet hic sensu quisque suo, Ego quod cepi proseguar, cum pro libertate Ecclesiae et gloria baptismi nunc loquar, in medium consulere debeo, quod spiritu magistro intellexero. Quare consulo Primum magnatibus Ecclesiarum, ut omnia ista vota seu vitas votariorum tollant vel non probent et extollant, Aut si hoc non fecerint, suadeo omnibus qui volunt securius salvi fieri, ut sibi ab omnibus votis, praesertim magnis et perpetuis, temperent, maxime adolescentes et iuvenes. Hoc consulo primum ideo, quod hoc vitae genus, ut dixi, nullum habet in scripturis testimonium et exemplum, sed solis hominum pontificum bullis et vere bullis est inflatum, deinde, quod proclive sit in hypocrisim propter suam speciem et singularitatem, unde nascitur superbia et contemptus communis Christianae vitae. Atque si nulla alia esset causa eadem vota tollendi, haec una satis haberet ponderis, Quod per ipsa fidei et baptismo detrahitur, et opera magnificentur, quae sine pernicie magnificari non possunt. Nam inter multa milia vix est unus, qui non magis opera in religionibus suspiciat quam fidem: qua insania et sese mutuo praeferunt tanquam strictiores et laxiores, ut vocant.

3.42 Therefore I advise no one to enter any religious order or the priesthood – no, I dissuade everyone – unless he be forearmed with this knowledge and understand that the works of monks and priests, be they never so holy and arduous, differ no whit in the sight of God from the works of the rustic toiling in the field or the woman going about her household tasks, but that all works are measured before Him by faith alone; as Jeremiah says: " O Lord, thine eyes are upon faith"; and Ecclesiasticus: " In every work of thine regard your soul in faith: for this is the keeping of the commandments." no, he should know that the menial housework of a maidservant or manservant is oftentimes more acceptable to God than all the fastings and other works of a monk or a priest, because the latter lacks faith. Since, therefore, vows seem to tend nowadays only to the glorification of works and to pride, it is to be feared that there is nowhere less of faith and of the Church than among the priests, monks and bishops, and that these men are in truth heathen or hypocrites, who imagine themselves to be the Church or the heart of the Church, and "spiritual," and the Church's leaders, when they are everything else but that. And it is to be feared that this is indeed " the people of the captivity," among whom all things freely given us in baptism are held captive, while "the people of the earth" are left behind in poverty and in small numbers, and, as is the lot of married folk, appear vile in their eyes.

Quare ego nulli suadeo, immo omnibus dissuadeo ingressum cuiuscunque religionis aut sacerdocii, nisi sit ea scientia praemunitus, ut intelligat, opera quantumlibet sacra et ardua religiosorum et sacerdotum in oculis dei prorsus nihil distare ab operibus rustici in agro laborantis aut mulieris in [Jer. , .] domo sua curantis, sed sola fide omnia apud eum mensurari, sicut Hierem. v. [Sir. , .] dicit 'Domine, oculi tui respiciunt fidem', Ecclesi. xxxii. 'In omni opere tuo crede ex fide animae tuae, haec enim est conservatio mandatorum dei', immo frequentius contingere, ut gratius sit ancillae aut servi domesticum et vile opus quam omnia ieiunia et opera religiosi et sacerdotis ob fidei defectum. Cum ergo probabile sit, vota hodie non nisi ad operum valere iactantiam et praesumptionem, metuendum est, nusquam minus de fide et Ecclesia esse quam in sacerdotibus, monachis et Episcopis et eos ipsos esse revera gentiles seu hypocritas, qui se Ecclesiam aut cor Ecclesiae, item spirituales et rectores Ecclesiae arbitrantur, cum sint nihil minus, et hunc esse vere populum transmigrationis, in quibus captiva sunt omnia, quae nobis in baptismo libera donata sunt, relicto populo terrae paupere et modico, qui, velut coniugatis contingit, viles in oculis illorum apparent.

3.43 From what has been said we learn that the Roman pontiff is guilty of two glaring errors.

Ex his duos insignes errores Romani pontificis cognoscimus:

3.44 In the first place, he grants dispensations from vows, and does it as though he alone of all Christians possessed this authority; such is the temerity and audacity of wicked men. If it be possible to grant a dispensation from a vow, then any brother may grant one to his neighbour or even to himself. But if one's neighbour cannot grant a dispensation, neither can the pope by any right. For from this has he his authority? From the power of the keys? But the keys belong to all, and avail only for sins (Matthew 18:15). Now they themselves claim that vows are "of divine right." Why then does the pope deceive and destroy the poor souls of men by granting dispensations in matters of divine right, in which no dispensations can be granted? He babbles indeed, in the section "Of vows and their redemption," of having the power to change vows, just as in the law the firstborn of an ass was changed for a sheep (Exodus 13:13) – if the firstborn of an ass, and the vow he commands to be everywhere and always offered, were one and the same thing, or as if when God decrees in His law that a sheep shall be changed for an ass, the pope, a mere man, may immediately claim the same

power, not in his own law but in God's! It was not a pope, but an ass changed for a pope, that made this decretal; so egregiously senseless and godless is it.

Prior, quod dispensat in votis facitque id quasi solus prae omnibus Christianis habeat auctoritatem: tanta est hominum impiorum temeritas et audacia. Si enim votum dispensari potest, quilibet frater cum proximo et ipse secum dispensare potest: sin dispensare proximus non potest, nullo iure Papa potest. Unde enim habet hanc auctoritatem? Ex clavibus? At heae omnibus communes [Matth. , ff.] sunt et super peccata duntaxat valent Matt. xviii. Cum autem et ipsi fateantur, vota esse iuris divini, quid miseras fallit et perdit animas dispensans in iure divino, quod est indispensabile? Blatterat quidem tit. de vot. et voti [. Mos. , .] redem., se posse mutare vota, sicut olim in lege primogenitum asini mutabatur ove, quasi idem sit primogenitum asini et votum, quod tam constanter ubique exigit reddi, aut si dominus in lege sua ovem pro asino statuatur mutari, mox etiam homo Papa in lege non sua sed eiusdem dei eandem habeat potestatem. Non Papa hanc decretalem fecit, sed asinus pro Papa mutatus: sic insigniter et delyrus et impius est.

3.45 The other error is this. The pope decrees, on the other hand, that marriage is dissolved if one party enter a monastery even without the consent of the other, provided the marriage be not yet consummated. Grammercy, what devil puts such monstrous things into the pope's mind! God commands men to keep faith and not break their word to one another, and again, to do good with that which is their own; for He hates "robbery in a holocaust," as he says by the mouth of Isaiah. (Isaiah 61:8) But one spouse is bound by the marriage contract to keep faith with the other, and he is not his own. He cannot break his faith by any right, and whatever he does with himself is robbery if it be without the other's consent. Why does not one who is burdened with debts follow this same rule and obtain admission to an order, so as to be released from his debts and be free to break his word? O more than blind! Which is greater; the faith commanded by God or a vow devised and chosen by man? you art a shepherd of souls, O pope? And ye that teach such things are doctors of sacred theology? Why then do ye teach them? Because, forsooth, ye have decked out your vow as a better work than marriage, and do not exalt faith, which alone exalts all things, but ye exalt works, which are nothing in the sight of God, or which are all alike so far as any merit is concerned.

Posterior, quod rursus decernit, matrimonium dirimi, si alter, altero etiam invito, monasterium ingrediatur, nondum consumato matrimonio.

Obsecro, Quis satan haec inspirat Papae portenta? deus praecipit homini servari fidem et veritatem invicem custodire, deinde de suo quenque facere [Jes. , .] bonum. odit enim rapinam in holocaustum, ut per Isaiam dicit. At coniunx alter alteri per pactum fidem debet, nec suus est, quam nullo iure potest dissolvere, et quicquid de se facit, de rapina facit, altero invito. Aut quare non etiam hac regula, qui aere alieno premitur, religionem intrat et suscipitur, ut a debitis liberetur, ut fidem liceat negare? Caeci, caeci. Quid est maius, fides a deo praecepta, an votum per hominem excogitatum et electum? Tu es pastor animarum, Papa? et vos estis doctores sacrae Theologiae, qui haec docetis? Qua enim causa sic docetis? Nempe, quod votum meliore opere quam coniugium ornastis, sed non fidem, quae sola magnificat omnia, sed opera magnificatis, quae nihil sunt coram deo aut omnia aequalia quantum ad meritum attinet.

3.46 I have no doubt, therefore, that neither men nor angels can grant a dispensation from vows, if they be proper vows. But I am not fully clear in my own mind whether all the things that men nowadays vow come under the head of vows. For instance, it is simply foolish and stupid for parents to dedicate their children, before birth or in early infancy, to "the religious life," or to perpetual chastity; no, it is certain that this can by no means be termed a vow. It seems a mockery of God to vow things which it is not at all in one's power to keep. As to the triple vow of the monastic orders, the longer I consider it, the less I comprehend it, and I marvel from this the custom of exacting this vow has arisen. Still less do I understand at what age vows may be taken in order to be legal and valid. I am pleased to find them unanimously agreed that vows taken before the age of puberty are not valid. Nevertheless, they deceive many young children who are ignorant both of their age and of what they are vowing; they do not observe the age of puberty in receiving such children, who after making their profession are held captive and devoured by a troubled conscience, as though they had afterward given their consent. As if a vow which was invalid could afterward become valid with the lapse of time.

Ego itaque non dubito, in votis, si recta sunt, neque homines neque angelos posse dispensare. Sed hic non sum plane mihi ipsi persuasus, an ea sub voto cadant omnia, quae hodie voventur. Quale est illud mire ridiculum et stultum, quod parentes vovent prolem vel nondum natam vel

infantem ad religionem seu perpetuam castitatem, immo hoc sub nullo voto cadere certum est, et videtur esse quaedam irrisio dei, dum ea vovent, quae nullo modo in sua sunt potestate. Ad religiosos venio, quorum tria vota, quo magis consydero, eo minus intelligo, mirorque, unde inoleverit ista votorum exactio: iam hoc multo minus intelligo, quo aetatis anno voveri possint, ut legitima sint et valeant. In hoc placet convenisse omnes, ante annos pubertatis nihil valere vota eorum, licet magnam partem puerorum hic fallant, ignaram tam suae aetatis quam rei, quam vovent: non enim observant in suscipiendis annos pubertatis, tum professos dira conscientia, quasi consensu postea secuto, captivos tenent et devorant, quasi votum, quod irritum fuit, tandem ratum fiat succedentibus annis.

3.47 It seems absurd to me that the terms of a legal vow should be prescribed to others by those who cannot prescribe them for themselves. Nor do I see why a vow taken at eighteen years of age should be valid, and not one taken at ten or twelve years. It will not do to say that at eighteen a man feels his carnal desires. How is it when he scarcely feels them at twenty or thirty, or when he feels them more keenly at thirty than at twenty? Why do they not also set a certain age-limit for the vows of poverty and obedience? But at what age will you say a man should feel his greed and pride? Even the most spiritual hardly become aware of these emotions. Therefore, no vow will ever become binding and valid until we have become spiritual, and no longer have any need of vows. You see, these are uncertain and perilous matters, and it would therefore be a wholesome counsel to leave such lofty modes of living, unhampered by vows, to the Spirit alone, as they were of old, and by no means to change them into a rule binding for life.

At mihi stultum videtur, ab aliis praestitui terminum legitimi voti alterius, qui sibi ipsis non possunt praestituere. Nec video, cur valeat votum decimo octavo anno factum, et non decimo aut duodecimo. Nec satisfacit, quod decimo octavo sentit homo carnem suam. Quid, si vix vicesimo aut tricesimo sentiat, aut fortius tricesimo quam vicesimo sentiat? Aut cur non diffinitur aequè terminus paupertati et obedientiae? Sed quod tempus dabis, quo se avarum et superbum sentiat, cum etiam spiritualissimi hos affectus vix deprehendant? Ergo nunquam erit ullum votum certum et legitimum, nisi donec spirituales facti fuerimus et votis iam non eguerimus. Vides itaque res istas incertas et periculosissimas

esse, unde salutare consilium foret, has sublimes vivendi rationes votis
liberas soli spiritui relinquere, sicut olim fuerunt, et nequaquam in genus
quoddam perpetuae vitae mutandas esse.

3.48 But let this suffice for the present concerning baptism and its liberty; in
due time I may discuss the vows at greater length. Of a truth they stand sorely in
need of it.

Verum haec interim de Baptismo et libertate eius satis. Suo forte venient
tempore vota latius tractanda, ut sunt revera tractatu vehementer
necessaria.

English: Volume 36 of *Luther's Works*, Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1959.

Latin: Volume 6 of *D. Martin Luthers Werke: kritische Gesamtausgabe*, Weimar.