

A Response to Luther

Book 2

Page and line numbers correspond to
The Complete Works of St. Thomas More
(Yale University Press), volume 5.
Side-glosses are given as footnotes.

A complete concordance to this work can be found at
<https://thomasmorestudies.org/concordance-home/#responsio-lutherum>.

N.B. This English translation of the Latin is reproduced, with permission, from volume 5 of *The Complete Works of St. Thomas More: Responsio ad Lutherum* (Yale University Press, 1969), edited by John H. Headley, translated by Sister Scholastica Mandeville. Copyright © 1969 by Yale University. All rights reserved.

**The Second Book of the Most Learned
William Ross
Against the Calumnies
of Luther**

He refutes the trifling arguments with which
Luther answers the king's passing remarks
on indulgences. Chapter 1.

325

Although the king, as his own book shows, had no other intention
in discussing indulgences and the papacy than to reprove the senseless
caprice of Luther, who, although he had talked nonsense on both
these points, chose to rage madly rather than return to his senses;¹ and
although the king had touched on these
points in passing, having in mind no inten-
tion but that of treating the sacraments,
nevertheless, those very comments which he made in passing so
prostrated Luther that he has not found anything more weighty to
answer than silly ridicule, which will recoil on his own ridiculous
head.

Let us come now to particular points of
our Henry, and let us see how success-
fully he fits his initial premises to his conclusions.²

And later:

First, the royal defender seized on indulgences, which I had declared
to be impostures of Roman wickedness.³
He defends these as follows: "If indul-
gences are impostures, then not only the
preceding pontiffs but even Leo X himself, whom Luther however
praises exceedingly, will be impostors." What royal and Thomistic
shrewdness!

And a little later:

And so the Thomistic king answers me nothing when I condemn
indulgences besides this statement: "Indulgences are not impostures
because Leo is a good man; therefore it must be so, it cannot be
otherwise."

At this point, reader, there is no need to answer, but to submit the
very words of the king; when you will read them and discover that
they have been perverted by this scoundrel, and that you will not find
the expression, "It must be so, it cannot be otherwise," anywhere in
the king's work, but that it has been fabricated by Luther as

¹ In these footnotes are given translations of the side-glosses that appeared in More's Latin text. The first is:
It is clear that the man has proceeded with unsteady footing

² Luther's words

³ Rather, there is great wickedness in you

frequently as it has been foolishly, so that he might have a statement about his own position which he might be thought to ridicule wittily, then indeed it must be so and it cannot be otherwise that if someone should say Luther is a biped you would be ready to answer that he is more foolish than a quadruped; it must be so, it cannot be otherwise. The prince, therefore, says the following. 5

“As every living being is recognized chiefly by its face,⁴ so also from this first proposition it becomes clear what a festering and rotten heart he has whose mouth, full of bitterness, overflows with such diseased matter. 10 For what he once argued about indulgences seems to many persons to detract not only from the power of the pontiff but also from the good hope and holy consolation of the faithful, and very forcefully to encourage men that, relying on the riches of their own penitence, they should contemn the treasury of the church 15 and the spontaneous goodness of God.⁵ And yet all that he then wrote was received more favorably on the grounds that he was merely debating, not declaring most of the points. He was continually seeking to be taught and promising to comply with the person who taught him something better. How sincerely this promise was written by the sanctimonious fellow who ascribes all his objections to the spirit which shuns falsehood, can easily be detected by the fact that as soon as he was wholesomely admonished by anyone he immediately returned a malediction for the benefaction, raging madly with revilings and reproaches. It is worthwhile to see to what degree of madness these 25 have finally carried him. He admitted earlier that indulgences had power at least insofar as they absolved both from guilt and from whatever penalties the church had established or one’s own priest had enjoined on each one. But now he has progressed so far, not in learning as he says but in ill will, that, contradicting himself, he condemns indulgences completely. And he says that they are nothing but mere impostures and have no power at all except to squander men’s money and their faith in God.⁶ On this 30 point everyone sees how he rants not only wickedly but also madly. For if, as Luther says, indulgences have no efficacy at all but are mere impostures, then it is necessary that we consider as impostors not only the present pontiff, Leo X, whose innocent and blameless 35

⁴ The king’s words

⁵ How wide a window Luther has opened to crimes

⁶ How this steward looks out for the money of men. Leo the pontiff

life and most holy conduct from the time of his youth have been quite well known throughout the whole world, as Luther himself admits in an epistle to the pontiff, but also all the Roman pontiffs through so many past ages who, as Luther himself recalls, used to grant indulgences:⁷ one, a year's remission, another three years'; some used to remit the penance of several lents, some a definite portion of the total penance, say a third or a half; others, finally, granted full remission both of the punishment and of the guilt. If what Luther says is true, then all these men were imposters.⁸ But how much more reason is there to believe that this single friarlet is a sick sheep than that so many pontiffs were once faithless shepherds."

And a little later:

"When he goes so far as to deny that indulgences have any power on earth, it would be useless for me to dispute with him on how much power they have in purgatory. Besides, what use will it be to discuss the means of being delivered from purgatory with one who almost wholly does away with purgatory? Since he cannot endure that the pontiff release anyone from that place, he takes on himself the great work of leaving no one there.⁹ What point is there in fighting with him who fights with himself? What shall I achieve by arguments if I try to persuade him to grant what he has before denied, since he himself now denies what he had before granted?"

"But however much the indulgences of the pontiff may be disputed, the words of Christ necessarily remain unshaken, by which He committed to Peter the keys of the church when He said: 'Whatever you shall bind on earth, shall be bound also in heaven; and whatever you shall loose on earth, shall be loosed also in heaven.' Likewise: 'Whose sins you shall forgive they shall be forgiven; and whose sins you shall retain they shall be retained.' If it is indisputable that by these words any priest has the power to absolve men from mortal sins and to take away an eternity of punishment, will it not seem absurd to everyone that the chief of all priests should have no right over temporal punishment?"

"But perhaps someone will say: 'Luther will not admit that any priest binds or looses anything¹⁰ or that the supreme

⁷ Therefore he is either there a base flatterer or here a liar

⁸ Or does this conclusion not hold, honored brother?

⁹ Perhaps he has that power from the same place he has his doctrine

¹⁰ To Luther, the pontiff is inferior to a common priest

pontiff has more power than any bishop, indeed than any priest at all.' But what do I care what the fellow admits or what he does not admit, since he admitted not long ago many of the truths of which he now admits nothing, and since he alone now rejects all the practices which the whole church has admitted for so many ages. For, to say nothing of the other things which this new Momus censures, surely if the pontiffs sinned who granted indulgences, then the whole congregation of the faith was not free from sin, since they accepted them for so long a time with such thorough agreement.¹¹ I have no doubt that we should accede to their judgment and to the custom observed by the saints rather than to Luther alone, who condemns the whole church so madly."

See, reader, how adroitly Luther has caught the king, since the king has proved both by the gospel and by reason that the successor of Peter can remit the punishment of purgatory; since the king moreover says that not only Leo X, whom Luther himself praises, but all the past pontiffs have been impostors if indulgences are nothing other than impostures, and that the whole Christian people for so many ages have been liable to blame, and that he himself is ready with better reason to believe that Luther alone is either stupid or impious than that all the pontiffs have been deceivers or that the whole people has been deceived for so many ages. Luther, on the other hand, says nothing to the gospel; he conceals the reasons by silence; he answers nothing at all about the other pontiffs of so many ages; he answers nothing about the people whom, deceased now for so many ages, together with the bishops and clergy, he tumbles down to hell in a common damnation.

What, then, does he answer? He answers nothing at all. The witty fellow only raises loud guffaws and with a Sardonian laugh laughs at the king as if the latter says nothing but:¹² "Indulgences are not impostures because Leo X is a good man." And yet this very statement, thus deliberately recited by him that he might be able to refute what he had perverted, he was not able to disprove although he disputed it with all his powers.

If Luther, he says, has so much authority¹³
that such a great king should believe him

¹¹ Now choose whichever you prefer, Luther

¹² Imitating, of course, the rhetoricians concerning those points he cannot solve

¹³ Luther's words

when he praises Leo X, why does not the king believe him also when he condemns indulgences?¹⁴

333

Phew! How artfully the reverend friar argues with us. If we should deny this assumption, he will no doubt prove his case from a similar one: “If the king believes me when I tell the truth, why does he not also believe when I openly lie?” For as for his statement that, when he says indulgences have no power at all but are mere impostures, he has fortified his opinion by scriptures and reasons, the reverend father is openly lying. For in those books in which he dealt in earnest with indulgences he said nothing further than that they have power only to take away punishments which either the law or man had inflicted. But the statement that they have no power at all and are mere impostures, this he first drew forth in the *Babylonian Captivity* without scriptures, without reasoning, from the bilge of his own breast through madness alone. No less clear is another statement which he makes as follows:

Using this kingly and Thomistic argument you can say that nothing evil is done in the Roman curia because Leo X is a good man, and thus you will justify all that abomination of the Roman perdition.¹⁵

See how neatly he relates such similar ideas.¹⁶ As if there happened in the Roman curia all the things which this good father lyingly claims; or as if the pontiff knew everything that everyone did, or that, if he did not know some of the things they did, he could therefore not know that the curia grants any indulgences; or as if a person who knowingly committed impostures were not an impostor, or as if a person who was an impostor were a good man; or as if the most prudent father did not contradict himself most foolishly when he says: “Leo X is an impostor, but nevertheless he is a good man.”

¹⁴ Because the prudent king does not believe a fickle buffoon

¹⁵ Luther’s words

¹⁶ Or are you so stupid that you do not better understand the argument of the king? See, Luther, how neatly you draw conclusions

In passing he deftly handles Luther's stupid prating
against Aristotle that no one is a good man
unless he can be a good
prince. Chapter 2.

335

What is duller than that subtlety with which he thinks he subtly
refutes the subtlety—as he calls it—of Aristotle.

5

If at this point, he says,¹⁷ I should treat
that subtlety that it is one thing to be a
good man and another to be a good prince (as their Aristotle teaches),
I shall have treated it in vain in the face of such stupid and dense lunk-
heads; how much less would they understand if I disputed on this
matter according to divine writings. For as a matter of fact one is not
a good man who cannot be a good prince.¹⁸
For the Spirit of Christ, in whom alone
we are good, renders a man perfect,
equipped for every good work, as Paul
teaches in his epistle to Timothy. The historical books of scripture also
prove this point. In the eyes of men this subtlety has value: that it is
one thing to be a good man, that is, in appearance, and another to be
a good prince, equally in appearance. But when Saul ceased to be a
good man, he at the same time ceased to be a good prince.

10

15

20

While you read these words, reader, do you not recall those words
of Horace: "Where are these addled words leading?" For if Leo X
was an impostor, he was neither a good pope nor a good man. Luther
used to affirm that Leo was a good man until Leo declared that he
would not favor a wicked man. Luther, therefore, prattles this
subtlety quite irrelevantly and for no other purpose than to declare
his own folly. For who besides Luther is so stupid and dense a lunk-
head as not to see that it is true, even if Aristotle denied it instead of
not mentioning it at all, that to be a good man is not the same thing
as to be a good prince, however much this statement may be denied
by that most foolish of bipeds, Luther? From those words of Paul,
"The Spirit of Christ renders a man perfect
and equipped for every good work," he
concludes¹⁹ that no one in this mortal state
is a good man who does not have the Spirit of Christ in such a way

25

30

35

¹⁷ Luther's words. Aristotle

¹⁸ Is this discussion of yours in accord with the divine writings?

¹⁹ He interprets the apostle absurdly

that he is equipped to govern a kingdom. And unless a man is as good as only God is good, he cannot otherwise be called a good man; nor is a person a good man who believes well and acts well according to his natural capacity, if he is somewhat too simple to be suited for governing people. The genius of this father, therefore, subtle and slighter than a slight straw, teaches us stupid and dense lunkheads that the words of Paul, “The Spirit of Christ renders a man perfect,” are understood to mean that no one is good unless he is likewise the best. And because the Spirit of Christ renders a man equipped for every good work, He therefore renders equipped for any activity whatever anyone on whom He chooses to pour Himself out in any manner, so that, unless a man has received all the gifts of all the graces, he has received no grace whatever; doubtless according to the words of the same Paul, “There are many varieties of gifts; and each one has his own gift from God, one indeed in one way and another in another.” But he eminently proves the same point to us from the scriptural histories. “For this subtlety has value in the eyes of men,” he says, “that it is one thing to be a good man, that is in appearance, another to be a good prince, that is in appearance. But when Saul ceased to be a good man, he ceased at the same time to be a good prince.”²⁰

What a brilliant argument! It happened thus in the case of Saul; therefore it must necessarily happen thus in the case of all men; as if anyone would infer: “This man is foolish; therefore every man is foolish.” What prevents a man who labors under some personal fault from being nonetheless able to be more useful for the public good than some person laboring under no fault but less skilled in those arts with which a prince ought to be equipped?²¹ God does not impart all things to all men. But if it were quite true that no one is a good prince unless he is a good man, nevertheless the proposition is not convertible: that no one is a good man unless he is a good prince; unless the reverend father should persuade us that this reasoning is good: “Every king is a man; therefore every man is a king.” And likewise this: “Every ass is an animal; therefore every animal is an ass.” And here you see, reader,²² how prettily that argument turns out for this reverend father which without necessity, without occasion, without any relevance he has brought forward for

²⁰ Splendid, excellent, superb!

²¹ Do you understand, Luther, or not even yet?

²² How poorly you have timed this argument, Luther

no other purpose at all than that he might boast of this fine discovery of his, and of his triumph over Aristotle: that to be a good man and a good king is the same thing.

339

He proceeds to disclose and wittily disprove
Luther's nonsense about Leo X. Chapter 3. 5

He returns once more to that point to which he is painfully urged by his own folly.

And so, he says,²³ the fact that I have
praised the person of Leo X and con-
demned indulgences does not work 10
against me at all. There is here a twofold judgment: that it is not law-
ful to judge a man, even if he is very wicked in the eyes of God, so long
as he lives exteriorly without offense, for this judgment belongs to Him
who is the searcher of the heart and desires; it is another thing to judge
about indulgences, which pertains to doctrine, in which although the 15
good as well as the wicked, whether they are truly or feignedly good,
indeed even the elect, can err, yet they are not stubbornly in error unless
they are clearly impious;²⁴ this judgment
belongs to each and every individual so
that we may distinguish the voice of the shepherd from that of 20
strangers. But as for Leo himself, I am uncertain even to this day what
he thought within himself and whether he is stubbornly in error. But
why do I cast these spiritual and precious
words before pigs?²⁵ What can a person
grasp of these things who does not grasp that by far the most foolish 25
syllogism is this: Leo is a good man; therefore indulgences are true?

What do you say, reader? Surely not that the reverend father has
extricated himself neatly through this fine distinction by which he
has of course proved that he praised Leo rightly even if he calls him
an impostor? For in order to excuse himself from inconsistency, he 30
thus excuses the pontiff; that although the pontiff not only granted
indulgences but even excommunicated the man who censured
indulgences, nevertheless there is some doubt as to what that pontiff
thought within himself about indulgences. If he thought the same
about them as Luther; that is, if he thought contrary to what he 35

²³ Luther's words. Do you hear this Sextus Naevius?

²⁴ You are of both kinds

²⁵ What spiritual words, please?

wrote, he was a good man. And this is the sagacious answer of the reverend father concerning indulgences:²⁶ “I am certain that they are mere impostures of the Roman pontiff, but because I should not judge about hidden matters, and it is hidden from me whether Leo X was stubbornly of the opposite opinion or whether he himself also believed that they are mere impostures and, while believing that they have no power at all, nonetheless granted them as though they would have much power and excommunicated me because I stubbornly thought the contrary and thus was a true impostor.²⁷ Therefore, without inconsistency I both censured indulgences as his impostures and yet praised as a good man the very author of the impostures, because a good man is the same thing as a good prince.” And this, reader, is an eminent example of the Lutheran genius;²⁸ that, having passed over all the king’s reasons, he plucked off one scrap for himself and distorted it for his own advantage so that he might more easily triumph. And yet, although he had distorted it completely, he is so stupid that he could not solve it.

He refutes Luther’s nonsensical answer about the papacy. Chapter 4.

Let us come now, he says,²⁹ to the other point about the papacy which I have destroyed by forceful scriptural texts. But its defender, muter than a fish in reply to the scriptures, presumes with royal assurance that at his mere nod Luther will abandon the scriptures and accede to his lies. But he proves the papacy in this manner:³⁰ “It must be so because I have heard that even India subjects itself to the Roman pontiff. Likewise Greece. Likewise Saint Jerome acknowledges the Roman church as his mother.” What will Luther dare to say here against such singular and such Thomistic arguments?

See Luther is everywhere like himself, reader; namely, a wicked scoundrel and a shameless liar. For although there are still books from which his deceitfulness is convicted, nevertheless, as though men were

²⁶ Luther’s answer concerning indulgences

²⁷ A subtle syllogism, indeed

²⁸ An example of Luther’s singular sagacity

²⁹ Luther’s words

³⁰ How completely unashamed of lying is the scoundrel

completely blind, the most deceitful buffoon dares to say things in which everyone knows he lies wickedly and foolishly. That I may make this clearer to you, I shall add the very words of the king insofar as they deal with this matter.

“Who would not here also marvel at his inconsistency, unless he knew his malice?³¹ 5
For earlier he had denied that the papacy is a matter of divine law but had conceded that it is a matter of human law. But now, contradicting himself, he affirms that it is of neither law, but that the pontiff has by sheer force assumed and usurped despotic power. He formerly thought, therefore, that the Roman pontiff was given power over the catholic church at least by human consent for the sake of the common good. And he was so convinced of this that he even denounced the schism of the Bohemians, declaring that whoever did not obey the pope sinned damnably. 10
Although he wrote this such a short time ago, he has now fallen into the same error which he then denounced. Indeed, the following instance shows a similar consistency: although he taught the people in a certain sermon that excommunication is a medicine and should be borne obediently and patiently, yet when he himself was shortly after excommunicated, and that for a very just reason, he bore the sentence with so little restraint that, raging with a kind of madness, he broke out into worse revilings, railings, 15
blasphemies than any ears could endure,³² so that he made it quite clear by his raving 25
that those who are driven from the bosom of their mother church are immediately seized by furies and tormented by demons. But I ask this: how does he who so recently saw those things now suddenly see that he then saw nothing? What new eyes has he taken on? Or does he perceive things with a keener vision now that anger and hatred have been added to his usual pride, and does he indeed have longer range vision using such excellent spectacles? 30
“I will not be so unjust to the pontiff as to debate anxiously and punctiliously about his right, as though the matter were considered doubtful; it is enough for the task at hand that his enemy is so carried away by raging madness that he detracts 35
from his own trustworthiness³³ and shows clearly that because of his malice he is neither consistent with himself nor

³¹ The king’s words. Consider how credible this is, reader

³² Can this be a good man who acts thus?

³³ That Luther by his vehemence detracts from his own trustworthiness

aware of what he is saying. For he cannot deny that every church of the faithful recognizes and venerates the holy see of Rome as mother and primate, at least wherever approach to her is not hindered either by distance of place or by the dangers of the way, although if those who come here even from India are telling the truth, the Indians also, separated by such expanses of land, sea and desert, yet submit themselves to the Roman pontiff.

5

“Therefore, if the pontiff has acquired such great and such widespread power neither by the order of God nor by the will of man but has claimed it for himself by force, I wish Luther would tell me when the pontiff usurped such great dominion.³⁴ The beginning of such boundless power cannot be obscure, especially if it has risen within the memory of men. But if he says that the matter perchance antedates one or two generations, then let him recall the matter to our memory from historical writings. Otherwise, if the matter is so ancient that even the origin of such an important matter has been obliterated, he knows that all laws provide that one whose right extends back so far beyond the entire memory of mankind that the nature of its beginning cannot be known is judged to have held it legally; everyone knows that it is forbidden by the agreement of all nations to change what has remained for such a long time unchanged.³⁵

10

15

20

“Certainly, if anyone reads the records of history he will find that long ago, just after peace was established in the world, almost all the churches of the Christian world obeyed the Roman church. In fact, although the imperial power passed to the Greeks, yet we will find that in what pertained to the primacy of the church, except for the time that Greece labored under schism, it submitted to the Roman church. Indeed, blessed Jerome clearly showed how much he thought men should defer to the Roman See by openly confessing, though he was not himself a Roman, that whoever else disapproved of his faith it was enough for him if the pope of Rome approved of it.³⁶

25

30

“When Luther so shamelessly declares, and that contrary to his own former opinion, that the pope possesses no right at all over the catholic church, not even by human law, but that the pope has by sheer force seized sheer despotic power, I am very much amazed that he would hope his readers are so gullible or so stupid as to believe

35

³⁴ Come on, Phormio

³⁵ Although it is well known, Luther scorns it

³⁶ Do you hear this, Luther?

that a priest, unarmed, alone, defended by no bodyguard—such as he must necessarily have been before gaining possession of the power which Luther says he usurped—could ever have even hoped that, supported by no right, relying on no claim, he would secure such great dominion over so many fellow bishops everywhere, among such diverse, such widely scattered nations; to say nothing of anyone’s believing that all nations, cities, kingdoms, provinces were so prodigal of their possessions, liberty, rights, that they would give to a foreign priest to whom they owed nothing such extensive power over themselves as he himself would hardly have dared to desire. But what difference does it make what Luther’s idea is in this matter, when through anger and envy he himself has no idea as to what his idea is?”

You see here, reader, that the king does not aim, as this fellow falsely claims, to prove the papacy, as though it were a doubtful matter. Rather he professedly refrains from that question, lest he seem to consider the power of the pontiff a matter of controversy. He only censures the senseless caprice of the scoundrel who himself a little later resisted what he had shortly before declared to be so legitimate that he admitted that whoever resisted it sinned damnably, and who by his own judgment fell into that same damnation,³⁷ declaring that the papacy has no rightful authority at all and that it is nothing else at all but sheer despotic power which the usurping pontiff has seized by force and injustice. How likely this assertion is the prince has discussed excellently. For he asked when, by what forces, the pontiff usurped power; how likely was it that so many nations could have been persuaded, though compelled by no obligation, to yield so much right over themselves to a foreign priest. For it is clear that all nations of the Christian people who are not prevented by distance of place nor hindered by force do acknowledge the Roman pope as the universal vicar of Christ. To all these things Luther answers nothing.³⁸ What could he answer in such an evident matter? But what the king added over and above about Greece and India, that indeed the shrewd fellow seizes on greedily to exercise against it his snarling eloquence.

I answer, he says,³⁹ if the papacy will stand firm because the king of England has heard that India and Greece have subjected themselves to it, by the

³⁷ And indeed deservedly

³⁸ For he could not

³⁹ Luther’s words

same reasoning it will not stand firm because Luther is certain that
neither India nor Greece has ever been
or wanted to be under the Roman
pontiff.⁴⁰

349

First of all, if anyone were to ask of this reverend friar how he is
certain that neither India nor Greece has ever been or wanted to be
under the Roman pontiff, he will answer us, I am quite sure, that
he is certain with the same certainty with
which he is certain, as he writes, that he has
his teachings from heaven.⁴¹ Therefore, if the reverend father is certain
that he speaks the truth because he is certain that he has his teachings
from heaven, I am certain that the reverend father lies falsely because
I am certain that he has his teachings from
Tartarus.⁴² And this is the form of a formal
conclusion according to the rule of Father Luther, friar outside the
rule of blessed Augustine. This rule of Augustine and that of Saint
Benedict, and likewise of Dominic and of Francis both Indians and
Greeks have accepted, approved of course by the authority of the
Roman see. Through this argument and many others from the annals
and synods and commentaries and epistles of the Greek fathers it
could be clearly established that the church of both nations acknowl-
edged the pre-eminence of the Roman see, had the king undertaken
to prove this, or had we intended anything other than to show how
stupidly Luther answers the king.

But if Luther denies the papacy because, as the king admits, the
Indians are too far away to be able to run to Rome for any little
business whatever, he will deny the dominion attributed to the human
race over other animals because in those wastelands there live many
which are inaccessible to men. But if the Greeks had continually
resisted the Roman church, nevertheless not even so would the
argument of the king have suffered at all,
since its strength rests in the agreement of
the catholic church which would clearly
have existed in the rest of the nations even if Greece had constantly
done what certain Bohemian backwoodsmen are now doing.⁴³ Unless
Luther denies that Charles is king of all Spain because several towns
have revolted. Then, from India and Greece he finally arrives at
Jerome.

⁴⁰ And here you lie

⁴¹ The same, to be sure

⁴² This is more likely

⁴³ But the Turk will not grant this, Luther will say

Next, he says,⁴⁴ the pompous lord king,
 according to his custom, lies quite boldly
 when he makes Jerome a defender of the
 papacy whereas that illustrious man called the Roman church only
 his own mother, not ours.

5

Please judge, reader, how honestly Father Tossplot handles this
 passage from Jerome; when that illustrious man says that it is
 enough for him if the Roman pope approved his faith, without doubt
 indicating clearly that no one must be doubted to have the right
 judgment about the faith who agrees with that see, what could he
 have said more grandly than this? This fact Father Tossplot Luther
 conceals precisely that he may try⁴⁵ to en-
 velop his reader also in darkness and by his
 words lead the minds of men elsewhere so that they will not remember
 anything. But most shameless is the fact that when he argues that the
 papacy has not received its power even by human agreement but that
 it is the sheer force of the pontiff usurping despotic power, he assails
 the prince with taunts, saying that in censuring his madness and
 insolence the king was muter than a fish in regard to the forceful
 scriptures, as he calls them, with which he himself has of course
 proved the matter. Who would not ridicule this shameless rascal,
 when everyone knows he is so far from having proved his case either
 by scriptures or by reasoning that he has never even tried to do so but
 has only boasted ragingly with railing; nor did he do so even before
 the time when, excommunicated from the
 assembly of the faithful, seized on by an
 assembly of demons, gnashing his teeth
 with rage and hatred, and no longer master of himself, he destroyed
 faith in himself?⁴⁶

10

15

20

25

⁴⁴ Luther's words. Where is your sagacity, honored brother?

⁴⁵ He tries, but in vain

⁴⁶ Then the devil seized him, cast out of the church

Concerning the communion of the laity under both kinds he presents those arguments which the king has written and compares them as to their nature with those which Luther writes. Chapter 5.

353

After expending half his little book on other trifles, this arch-trifler finally begins to trifle about the sacraments themselves, and after a bottomless pit of ranting and mad buffoonery he leads out a line of subtleties which, if one would believe him, are invincible. 5

Come, he says,⁴⁷ let us expose this criminal and royal wickedness in its foremost tyranny; that is, in the one part of the sacrament. That the other part has been impiously taken away from the Christian people I have proved by seven arguments which even then convinced me, but now also they triumph,⁴⁸ when the most boastful defender of the papists with royal courage passes them over without touching them. 10 15

Do you hear, reader, the pompous words of this Thraso and the solemn and splendid triumphs decreed by himself for himself as he boasts that the king, as though in awe of his seven arguments, has left them untouched? We will therefore immediately lead out for you, reader, these vigorous and at the same time, as you shall see, wretchedly weak arguments of Luther. But meanwhile, because he wishes it to appear that the king has not dared to touch them, we will first recall to your mind certain arguments from the king's book; once you have considered them carefully, it will become clear when you shall see those seven leaders of Luther's set out by me one by one, dead, that the invincible prince has long ago slaughtered all of them with one blow. The prince, then, writes of this matter as follows. 20 25

"But meanwhile,⁴⁹ I should like to examine how deceitfully, under pretext of favoring the laity, he tries to excite their hatred against the priests. For when he had determined to render the trustworthiness of the church suspect, so that her authority would not have any weight, and with the way thus opened, to destroy all the most important elements of the Christian religion, he took his start from a subject which he hoped the people would eagerly applaud. For he touched the old wound 30 35

⁴⁷ Luther's words

⁴⁸ So it seemed to you

⁴⁹ The king's words

with which Bohemia was long ago wounded: that the laity do not receive the eucharist under both forms. Although he had earlier treated this matter in such a way as to say only that the pope would do well to have a general council decree that the laity might communicate under both forms, later when someone or other refused him that, not being content to abide by what he had said, he proceeded to the worse point of accusing the entire clergy of impiety because they did not carry out his suggestion without waiting for a council. 5

“I do not argue about his first point. But even if I did not see the reasons why the church does not ordain that both forms should be administered to the laity, yet I could have no doubt that there are sound reasons which once caused this practice to be dropped and now also cause it not to be renewed. And I certainly do not agree that the entire clergy through so many ages has been so senseless as to incur eternal punishment because of a practice from which it would gain no temporal advantage. On the contrary, in fact, that there is no danger of this being the case is clearly shown by the fact that God has not only received into heaven both those who followed this practice and also those who wrote that it should be followed, but has also wished them to be venerated on earth and to be honored by the men by whom He Himself is honored. Among these men—to say nothing meanwhile of others—there was that most learned and also most holy man, Saint Thomas Aquinas, whom I mention the more readily because the impiety of Luther cannot bear the sanctity of this man, but at every opportunity he blasphemes with his polluted lips one whom all Christians venerate. There are very many men, however, who disagree with Luther on this point; even if these men are not accepted as saints, nevertheless, whether they are considered in their learning or in their piety, they are the kind of men with whom Luther cannot be compared. Among them there are the Master of the Sentences, and Nicholas of Lyra, and many others, any one of whom it is more fitting that all Christians believe than that they believe Luther. But please observe how Luther vacillates and contradicts himself: in one place he says that Christ at the supper said to every single one of the faithful, not by way of permission but by way of command, ‘All of you drink of this.’ But afterwards, fearing to offend the laity whom he flatters into hatred of the priests, he adds these words: ‘Not that they would sin against Christ who receive one form, 10 15 20 25 30 35

seeing that Christ did not command the use of any form but left the matter to the free choice of each individual, saying, “As often as you do these things you shall do them in remembrance of me”; but that they do sin who refuse to give both forms to those who wish to exercise this freedom of choice. The fault is not in the laity but in the priests.’ You see clearly that first he said it was commanded; here he says it was not commanded but left to the free choice of each individual. What need is there for us to contradict him, then, since he so often contradicts himself? 5

“And yet when he has said everything, he does not sufficiently defend the laity, should anyone press the matter, and he does not prove that there is any sin in the priests whom he so bitterly reproaches. For he says that the whole sin consists in the fact that the priests, against the wishes of the laity, took away from the laity the freedom of the second form. If anyone, then, should here inquire of the fellow how he knows that this custom has developed despite the resistance of the people, I do not think he can tell. Why, then, does he accuse the whole clergy of taking the laity’s own right away from them against their wishes, when he cannot prove by any evidence that this was done against their wishes? How much more reasonable it would have been, if no practice could lawfully be established except by the will of the laity, to declare that the agreement of the people was given for such an age-old custom. 10 15 20

“Indeed, when I see what things the clergy are unable to secure from the people, not even so much as to prevent them from burying their dead almost under the very altar, I do not easily believe that the people would have permitted themselves to be unwillingly and insultingly deprived of any part of their own right in such an important matter, but that this practice was established for some suitable reasons and according to the will of the laity. 25 30

“But I am surprised that Luther is so fiercely indignant that the one form was taken from the laity, since he is not at all disturbed that both forms are withheld from infants,⁵⁰ for that they at one time received communion he himself cannot deny. If this custom was rightfully dropped, although Christ says, ‘All of you drink of this,’ and if no one doubts that there were serious reasons for dropping it, even if no one now remembers them, why may we not also think that for good and just reasons, though now unknown, the custom was 35

⁵⁰ That infants once received communion

abolished by which the laity at one time, and that perchance not for long, used to receive the sacrament under both forms?

“Besides, if he restores that practice to the precise form of the gospel account and leaves nothing at all to the church, why does he not order that the eucharist always be received at supper, or rather, after supper?”

5

“Finally, it is no less detrimental, where this sacrament is concerned, to do something you should not have done than not to do something you should have done. Therefore, if the whole church acts wrongly in its custom of withholding the form of wine among the laity, by what reason does Luther dare to pour water into the wine? For I think he is not so bold as to consecrate without water; yet he neither has a precedent from the Lord’s supper for mingling water with the wine nor has he discovered this from what the apostle taught; rather he has learned it only from the custom of the church. If he thinks she must be obeyed in this matter, why does he so arrogantly oppose her in the other?”

10

15

“Consequently, no matter what Luther snarls on this point, I certainly think it is safer to believe that the laity are rightly communicated under only one form than that the entire clergy throughout so many ages has, as he argues, been damned for this reason alone. For he calls them all impious and such men as have fallen into the crime of treason against the gospel. But if either side, he says, must be called heretics and schismatics, it is not the Bohemians, not the Greeks, since they rely on the gospels, but you Romans are heretics and impious schismatics who presume on a fabrication alone, contrary to the evident scriptures of God.

20

25

“If Luther admits nothing else than evident scriptures of God, why does he not, as I said, order the eucharist to be received by men at supper? For scripture records that this was done by Christ. How much better for Luther to believe that the church’s practice of not giving the laity communion under both forms was not introduced by human invention but by the same divine authority which introduced the practice of receiving communion fasting. It pleased the Holy Spirit, as blessed Augustine says, that the body of the Lord which was received by the apostles at supper, after other food, should be received in the church by men fasting, before other food. Therefore, it seems probable that as the Holy Spirit who governs the church of Christ has caused the sacrament of the eucharist to be received by men

30

35

fasting instead of by men at supper, so He caused it to be received by the laity under one form instead of under both forms. Why could not He who was able to change the one practice also have been able to change the other?"

You see, my dear reader, how restrainedly the prince conducts himself in this passage against this scoundrel's lack of restraint. For he moderately reproaches both the fellow's malice and at one and the same time his deceitful inconsistency, always changing itself for the worse. He denounces the impiety of the fellow who condemns the whole church of so many ages and who says that a thing was done by the malice of priests which was done by the goodness of the Holy Spirit.⁵¹ For if Luther had stood firm in his statement that the church would do well, through a general council, to allow both kinds to the laity, the king says that he himself was not ready to argue about that point. However, I do not doubt that this practice which has already been followed throughout so many ages has been followed by the counsel of God, as the king has clearly shown; and unless it should please God that the practice be changed again, He would not otherwise allow the church to change it for the worse by human counsel, nor in the matter of the sacraments to be governed by a spirit other than His own Holy Spirit. But the king modestly says that he would not discuss this matter, except that Luther now stirs up discord and exhorts each one to dare on his own authority to contemn the agreement of the whole church of so many ages, and he sends to hell all Christians, deceased for so many centuries, as if the church were not governed by the Holy Spirit of God but by that spirit of the devil who through the most filthy mouth of Luther blasphemes the holy church and Christ the spouse of the church; this indeed the pious prince was not able to bear; and yet without railing and reviling he argues against a man who rails beyond measure and who very justly deserves every sort of railing and reviling; and he shows that there was no reason why the priests wished to take away the second form of the sacrament from the laity and to destroy their own souls for the sake of something from which they would gain nothing at all; nor would the laity ever have permitted the priests wickedly to snatch the second form, for when the priests at times sought fair and just measures, from which neither the clergy themselves would derive any gain nor the laity lose anything, the people nevertheless resisted them

⁵¹ A matter deserving a deadly cudgeling

as though for the title of their own right. The prince points out many practices surrounding the sacrament which the whole church of the faithful has already for many centuries changed from the example of Christ's instituting the sacrament, none of which had Luther censured before. He points out certain practices no longer current, a thing which yet necessarily either happens wrongly and culpably or happens, as is clearly true, by divine authority. The prince therefore shows that everything of that sort has been changed by the counsel of the Holy Spirit governing the church. Against this response of the king, so pious, so true and moderate, the wicked and impious scoundrel rages with mad railing and folly.

I, he says,⁵² have proved by seven arguments that the second part of the sacrament has been impiously taken away from the Christian people.

The king shows satisfactorily that it was not taken away by the priests. Therefore, if it was done by men, it was done by the laity themselves. And thus Luther, the wise man, diverts this impiety from the priests on whom he desires to thrust it to the very laity whom he is eagerly trying to flatter. And he diverts it irrefutably by his very own teaching. For if it is true that all the laity are priests, so that they have equal power over any sacrament whatever, after they have been simply elected to this office (and they will be able to be elected by other laymen, so Luther says, in the sacrament of orders), this utterly dull-witted patron so little defends the laity that he even involves them forcibly in damnation because, through want of care for their own salvation, they have neglected to elect for themselves priests who would administer to them both forms. Unless he should say that up till now the laity did not know this mystery. But now he has been sent down from heaven to reveal so sacred a teaching to men, so that God, who usually hides things from the wise and reveals them to little ones, now on the contrary is believed to have hidden it from little ones so that He might reveal it to a most conceited scoundrel.

Or will he say that the second form was taken away from the laity by the priests because this matter was provided for in councils? But if you should carefully examine those very councils, reader, you will easily see that this practice did not arise from those councils but that a decree was passed against those men who, as this fellow is now

⁵² Luther's words

doing, were daring to change what had already long before that time been observed by all the catholic people, undoubtedly by the counsel of the Holy Spirit pouring Himself out through the whole church. For how would the whole Christian people throughout such scattered nations have agreed to the same practice on that matter, since the words of the gospel seem rather to incline toward the other side, except by the action of Him who makes those who dwell in a house to be of one mind, who leads His church into all truth, who is ever with her even to the consummation of the world? As He is the most fitting author of the scriptures, so He is their truest interpreter. Therefore, since that which Luther complains has been taken away is not a matter of the substance, for the blood of Christ is also in the body of Christ, but is a matter of another form, and since it has been taken away not by the priests, not by men at all, but by the Spirit of God who rules and governs the church in matters of faith by His inspiration, a fact which the king has taught most clearly, as has been declared in the first book above, then so long as Luther says that this practice has been impiously taken away, he is not a railer against the king but a blasphemer against God, through whom was done what this fellow, thrice impious, declares was impiously done. Neither, then, does this gallant warrior now fight against the king with his seven arguments, but like that dragon with seven heads he rises up against God, and as Satan once dared to do in the desert he battles by means of the scriptures against the Lord of the scriptures.

He recites and refutes in particular the seven arguments of Luther. Chapter 6.

Well, then, let us now lead out those seven noble leaders of Luther's, seven Olympian victors I suppose, or rather, seven gladiators' rotting and abominably stinking carcasses.

My first argument, he says,⁵³ was the authority of the evangelists relating in a consistent and single report that Christ instituted both forms for those who would act in memory of him, and at the chalice He expressly added: "All of you drink of this." To this argument the king, defender of the church, says nothing.

⁵³ Luther's words. The first Achilles

See the ape in royal purple, Thersites in Achilles' armor. Your argument, Luther, is not the authority of the evangelists, for no evangelist is an author either of heresy or of schism; but the adulterated interpretation which you fabricate from the gospel and whatever you yourself pestilently patch on to the words of the evangelists—that is your argument. For from the fact that the evangelists report that Christ consecrated under both forms at the supper you conclude by an interpretation from your own head that both forms must be administered to the laity, although neither the example of Christ prove this nor does any word of Christ or of the evangelist urge it.⁵⁴ For although you choose not to understand this fact, nevertheless, there is no one who does not know that at the supper Christ instituted a form of sacrifice; this alone and only this He, as priest of the law of the gospel, offered in memory of His passion in place of all the sacrifices of the law of Moses. And the same sacrifice, as the king has truly written, which He consummated by offering it on the cross, He initiated by consecrating it at the supper. He likewise instituted the banquet at which the people might thereafter feast in His memory so that they would eat of the same sacrament and feed of the showbread, at least if they were clean. In so far as this institution pertains to the form of the sacrifice, Christ caused it to be forever preserved among priests, so that he might offer at the same time the form of both bread and wine in order that the reality, which was once foreshadowed in the offering of Melchisedech, who offered bread and wine to Abraham, may correspond to the figure. But the banquet of the people was at different times provided for in different ways, not by a priest, not by the people, but by the master of the feast Himself, Christ. For at one time He fed the people not only with His body and blood but also under the form of both bread and wine. At another time He took away the form of wine; nonetheless, He left for them in the flesh the reality itself, that is, His blood. Nor is the relation the same on both sides. For those two forms effect not only one sign, but two. But those two signs make not two integral sacrifices, but one.⁵⁵ There is, therefore, an integral sign under either form, but the integrity of the sacrifice requires both forms.

But how do you prove, he asks, that the second form was taken

⁵⁴ That Luther does not correctly understand the evangelist's words

⁵⁵ What must be noted concerning the sign and the sacrifice

away from the laity by Christ Himself, which I earlier argued was taken from the people by the malice of the priests? Rather, Luther, you should first have proved what you yourself have fabricated through malice: that the priests took away the form of wine through force and tyranny. This shameless and poisonous lie of yours the prince has revealed and refuted. But you conceal this according to your custom. Yet the king has proved that this change was effected by God alone, whose Spirit alone, he has proved, governs in the sacraments and in the articles of faith the catholic church, throughout the whole of which is observed that practice which you censure. And the prince has proved this not by reason alone, and by the opinions of all the holy fathers, but also by most evident scriptures. 5

Finally, which is to your utter disgrace, he has proved it by your words;⁵⁶ to all these proofs you have not answered a single word, but, entirely deaf to the answers given you, you think that you argue brilliantly if, like the cuckoo, you constantly re-echo what you have once begun to croak. 10

As to your wishing it to appear that your cause is wonderfully supported by the fact that Christ at the chalice expressly, as you say, added, "All of you drink of this," as if He wished no one at all to be excluded from drinking the blood under the form of wine, what text do you have from the gospel which enables you to apply those words to other persons than the apostles then present, especially since another evangelist records the same event and as it were interprets it in other words; that is, in these words, "Take this and divide it among you"? Of whom, I ask you, was He speaking when He said, "among you"? Among others than among the apostles present? Or does He not declare clearly enough all whom He commands to drink when He shows among whom He orders that that be divided which He ordered to be drunk? Or do you still demand, Luther, to be shown more clearly all of whom He was speaking when He said, "All of you drink of this"? Look, you can learn this at least from the fact that the evangelist adds, "And they all drank of it." Do you still doubt, my good fellow, to all of whom He spoke when you see that that which He commanded all to do was fulfilled by all? Rather, Luther, I would like to ask this of you: What do you mean by saying that Christ expressly added at the chalice, "All of you drink of this"? I do not think that you understand this to mean that Christ wished more persons to receive the form of wine than that of bread. However 15 20 25 30 35

⁵⁶ Nothing is disgraceful to a man inherently foul

expressly, therefore, He added “all” to the chalice, He nevertheless did not wish this to refer to more persons than that which He had before said of His body, “Take and eat”; so that both expressions have exactly the same force as if He had said of the former, “Drink of this” and not added, “all”; or had said of the latter, “Take and eat this, all of you.” But I think you are not ready to deny that Christ did not say the words, “Take and eat,” or, “All of you drink of this,” to any other persons than those to whom He said, “Do this in remembrance of me.” Therefore, if He did not say to the apostles, “Take and eat,” and likewise, “All of you drink of this,” but to all Christians present and future, without any exception whatever, it undoubtedly will follow that He said to everyone these words also, “Do this in remembrance of me.” Remember now, that you yourself thus interpret these words of Christ, “Do this”; that is, do this entire action that I am now doing; that is, consecrate my body and blood, and eat and drink it. You see therefore, my good fellow, to what point you have led the case, so that you necessarily must either restrict the words, “All of you drink,” to the apostles only who were present or extend the words, “Do this,” to absolutely everyone. From the first of these alternatives will follow the destruction of your most powerful argument;⁵⁷ from the second will follow that most absurd conclusion: that there will be no one at all, neither priest, nor layman, neither man, nor boy, neither male nor female, of whom it was not demanded that he not only receive the body and blood of Christ but also consecrate it. Although I see that you are so absurd that you do not consider this most absurd of all conclusions absurd, nevertheless, since I do not doubt that no one would be so insane that he would deign to subscribe to your madness in this matter, it will be enough for me to have drawn you on to the point where you either necessarily have to admit that what follows from your argument is completely absurd, or you have to deny that that conclusion is absurd which everyone clearly knows is raging mad.⁵⁸

And this, reader, is the first argument which, as his most powerful one, the honored doctor has stationed in the van; he says that the king has answered nothing to it, whereas the latter nevertheless has by one answer pierced both that argument and the remaining six to the core, when he proved that although at the supper this sacrament

⁵⁷ Haul away now, Luther, your lifeless Achilles

⁵⁸ Hold your tongue here, Luther

was first instituted and the sacrifice initiated, yet it was offered and
 consummated on the cross; and that the form of the sacrament was
 not prescribed for the faithful at that supper so definitely that the
 legitimate observance of this most holy sacrament as of all the others
 also need not be sought continually from the church, which even 5
 after that supper Christ has taught through the Holy Spirit; and
 through the same Spirit, when He wishes, He changes certain things
 in His church as it pleases Him; and as God alone makes the changes
 so God alone knows the reasons for changing. Only this does every-
 one know: whatever is changed throughout the whole church 10
 concerning the sacraments is changed with no one but God doing the
 changing, who, so that the whole church cannot err in matters of this
 sort, has promised that His Spirit will lead her into all truth and that
 He Himself will be with her even to the consummation of the world.

The second argument was this:⁵⁹ If Christ 15
 had given the sacrament at the supper to
 priests only, it is not lawful to give any part of it to the laity because
 it is not lawful to change the ordinance and example of Christ. At this
 argument the pompous defender, the king of England, is silent.

On the contrary, the king has not been silent here but he has shown 20
 you, Luther, many changes, but things changed by Him who has the
 power of changing all things; that is, by God Himself, without whose
 impulse, the king has proved, the church has changed nothing in the
 sacraments.

How brilliantly does this argument of yours proceed: “God gave 25
 the sacrament to priests only; therefore, it is not permitted to give it
 to the laity.” By the same reasoning you may say: “Christ gave it only
 to men; therefore, it is not permitted to give it to women.” But if you
 should say that in Christ there is no distinction between male and
 female, and if, contrary to Paul, you should permit women to preach, 30
 we will say to you that according to you neither does the laity differ
 from the priest, so that the comparison still works to your disadvan-
 tage, so that if what Christ is read to have given to men only can be
 given to women, then what Christ is read to have given to priests
 only can be given also to laymen. Besides, I ask you, Luther, whether 35
 anyone received the sacrament at the supper besides the apostles
 alone?⁶⁰ If you should say there were others,
 I ask by what scriptural text do you prove
 this? For you want nothing to be admitted

⁵⁹ Luther's second Achilles

⁶⁰ By means of his heavenly doctrine, of course

apart from clear scripture. But if you grant that the apostles alone received, a thing which you must necessarily grant, then I ask whether, when they were receiving the sacrament, you would say they were laymen or priests? For neither was one person one thing, another the other, nor was anyone both at the same time. Choose then whichever you please; if you wish them to have been laymen, then according to that brilliant form of arguing which you present it would be permissible to say, "He gave it only to laymen; therefore, it is not permitted to give it to priests, because it is not permitted to change the ordinance and example of Christ." But if you admit they were priests, then according to your argument you have taken both forms away from the laity to whom you are arguing that both forms are due; unless your inference is false: that it is not permitted to give to the laity what Christ at the supper gave only to priests. But this inference is utterly false and insane, unless the following is also valid: "Christ acted in this way at the supper; therefore, He determined that the same thing would be done in the same way forever in the church." And likewise the following: "Christ acted thus at the supper; therefore, the church is not permitted, even though Christ Himself commands it, to change anything." Christ gave the sacrament to men at supper; therefore, the church is not permitted, even though Christ commands it, to give it to men fasting. We read that at the supper Christ consecrated only wine in the chalice; therefore, Christ is not permitted to order that in His church the priest should mingle water with the wine. And this, reader, is according to the argument of the honored doctor which he wished to seem so powerful.

The third is:⁶¹ if one part of this sacrament can be taken away from the laity, then by the same authority part of baptism and penance will be able to be taken away, and whatever Christ has ever established can be taken away in part and bit by bit taken away wholly. If the whole cannot be taken away, neither can any part be taken away. To this argument the pompous defender of the sacraments is speechless.

The king has answered to this, Luther, that the one form of the sacrament has been taken away from the laity by the dispensation of God, and he has proved this to you clearly. Nor does he fear to declare that God, who took away one form from the laity, can, if He should wish, take away both forms; but the church, unless God so wills, cannot; yet neither can she give her consent to that thing in the

⁶¹ Luther's third Achilles

sacraments which may not be done if God does not want it done. For God directs hearts for His church in such matters, and through the Holy Spirit He leads her into all truth, so that He may render her a pillar and support of truth and faith. But as for you, on the contrary, the king shows that the devil breathes into your heart; through him you have dared to take grace away from the sacrament of baptism and to defile faith in it by lack of concern for evil works; to take away in fact two parts of penance and to infect the third with most foolish teachings, not only to mingle the sacrament of the eucharist with other substances but to strip it of the honor of all ceremonies and, what is most criminal of all, to steep it in a conscience contaminated by every kind of filth; finally, to reject the sacraments of matrimony and of confirmation and of orders and of extreme unction, relying neither on authority nor on reason. Are you not ashamed to assault the whole church with reproaches and slanders,⁶² as if she takes away from the laity one part of one sacrament when you, you wretched scoundrel, take away four whole sacraments and corrupt the remaining three with most loathsome heresies? And although the king, defender of the sacraments and deserving of true honor, has answered you all this, you, the raving assailant of the sacraments, grow deaf to all this.

The fourth, he says,⁶³ is that Christ says that His blood is shed for the remission of our sins; the sign of remission cannot be denied to them because Christ has given it to them. To this, he says, the masked English Thomist is mute.

To this, Luther, the prince was not mute; but you, you masked sot, are deaf, since you never hear anything you do not want to hear. Otherwise, recall, rascal, that the prince has proved that the form of wine was not taken away from the laity by men but by Christ Himself, and then set forth again this argument of yours: Christ shed blood for the laity unto the remission of sins; and you draw your conclusion as follows: "Therefore, Christ, although leaving the integral sign of remission in His body under the form of bread, was not able to take away from the laity the form of wine which is the sign of remission in His blood." For you necessarily make this inference if you wish to infer anything that is relevant.

⁶² Nothing is sacred to a scoundrel

⁶³ Luther's fourth Achilles

Otherwise, if you conclude as follows: “Therefore, men were not able to remove the form of wine which is the sign of remission,” what more stupid conclusion can be drawn against the prince who so clearly proved that it was not taken away by men but by God? Behold, honored doctor, how prettily this fourth argument of yours turns out.

5

The fifth is, he says,⁶⁴ if man was able to take away the wine he was able also to take away the bread and by this means wholly to make void the entire institution of Christ; if he cannot take away the whole, neither can he take away the part. And the invincible king, perhaps recalling the proverb, “Silence answers many things,” also answers me by keeping silent about everything.

10

You, tosspot invincible, cannot remember what the king has answered you nor what you yourself said in almost the next line. For what else is this stupid fifth argument of yours than a dried-up crumb plucked from the husk-like lump of your third argument. For what you here infer concerning the one sacrament, you were there inferring concerning all of them; nor do you meanwhile utter one word concerning what the prince has proved against you:⁶⁵ that this practice which you attack was not effected by men but by God. And yet, Luther, you should have answered that first of all. Meanwhile, you are acting stupidly if you conceal that argument and say to us, “Man cannot take away the form of wine”; if, on the contrary, you admit that argument, you act both stupidly and impiously if you say, “God cannot change what He could have not instituted.” See the kind of silence with which your fifth argument is answered.

15

20

25

What wonder if you set down part of the third argument in place of the fifth, you who omit the whole sixth argument, such a fine arithmetician that you can count thus: first, second, third, fourth, fifth, seventh! But lest you complain that anything has been stolen from you, that runaway slave has been discovered in the *Babylonian Captivity* and dragged out here, so that you can recognize this bloodless cadaver even from its brand:

30

I ask you, you say,⁶⁶ what need, what religious scruple, what utility is there in denying both forms to the laity; that is, the visible sign, since everyone grants them the substance of the sacrament without the sign; if they

35

⁶⁴ Luther’s fifth Achilles

⁶⁵ Why have you answered this by keeping silent, Luther?

⁶⁶ Luther’s sixth Achilles

grant the substance which is greater, why do they not grant the sign which is less?

381

I ask you, Luther, by your folly, do you not sense that the king has hurled back against you this very argument which you hurl against the clergy? For whereas, through malice, you shout nothing else than that the priests have impiously taken away the second form, the king, while declaring that this matter must not be imputed to the priests, shows not only that the laity would not have allowed so great an injustice but also, a thing which you yourself also very shrewdly admit, that there was no reason why the priests would have unjustly wished to do that. For what advantage would they themselves gain from it? Or, since they deny no one the total substance itself, since they deny to no one the sign of the whole substance in the body, what ill will would there have been to grant both signs also to anyone? Or, for what reason would they have wished, having granted that which is immeasurably greater, to steal away that which everyone knows is incomparably smaller?⁶⁷

O shrewd fellow, how cleverly you dispute against the king. He says that the priests did not do it; you, wishing to prove that they did, argue that there was no reason for them to do it. The king proves that God did it, and that He inspired not only the priests but also the faithful people as to what was His pleasure, since He does not allow His catholic church—with whom He has promised to remain even to the consummation of the world—to err on the sacraments. Or do you still ask, “Why did He do it?” And will you not cease attacking what God has done unless you are given the reason why He has done it? Or may we not answer: “Who has been His counsellor?” I know that many and weighty reasons can be alleged and that certain very wise men have alleged very many of them that could have influenced the people, but I will not deign to divine the reasons, since I am certain that neither would the people of God have acted without God nor would God among His people have acted without reason.⁶⁸

As for your snarling remark that this was permitted by God so that there might be an occasion of schism, obviously it was permitted by God just as it was permitted by God that the gospel be written from which heretics have stirred up many schisms. For good men have

⁶⁷ Say something here, honored brother

⁶⁸ Or is it not pious, Luther, to do this?

taken no occasion of schism from communion, but the church was of one heart and mind. And there was hardly any one of the people who either asked for the form of wine or was of so rebellious a spirit that, if offered, would have accepted it, until one or the other like you, a firebrand of hell, cast fire onto the grain field of the Lord in order to lay waste a corner of the Lord's field. 5

Moreover, as for what you say in these words: that we, having long ago lost the substance of the sacrament, now fight for the sign in opposition to the most important thing, the substance, you say that "we" correctly indeed and truly. For catholics, content with the substance itself, have not been anxious about the sign, but you schismatics and heretics, fighting against the truly most important reality, that is, the will of God, have for the sake of the sign alone destroyed the whole substance of the sacrament and all its fruit. 10 15

Finally, as for your statement that this removal of the second form began at that time when for the sake of worldly riches we began to rage against Christian charity, how feeble it is. For what connection does this case have with riches? Or are the priests bribed by riches not to administer both forms to the laity? How poor in solid arguments, how rich in stupid words you are, Luther. 20

The seventh is, he says,⁶⁹ Paul stopping the mouths of everyone when in Corinthians II he delivered the whole sacrament not to priests but to the church and to all the faithful. This argument, he says, has said to the defender of the sacraments: "Do not touch me." 25

Luther, are you not touched because you are so dense that you do not sense when you are touched? Certainly you are very dense if you do not sense how little the apostle proves your case. In the first place, even if that passage were not ambiguous, yet it would hardly be fair for you to demand that the apostle stop everyone's mouth, since no apostle's authority is so great in your mind as to stop your mouth, since you have dared not only to stick out your abusive tongue against the apostle James and to stir up controversy about his authority, but also to rant wildly even against Paul himself; when he offends you in the fifth chapter of his letter to the Ephesians because he dared to call matrimony a sacrament, you do not hesitate to call 30 35

⁶⁹ Luther's seventh Achilles

into doubt whether he has spoken that according to God or according to his own understanding.⁷⁰ But since it is certain enough that no one is so impious as you, proceed without fear to cite Paul to all other Christians. But take heed, nevertheless, to what extent he supports you. If anyone had either denied that the laity once received both forms or had reproved that practice among the Corinthians, you would rightly have quoted Paul, since such an important witness would prove that it was done, and such an important apostle would prove that it was done rightly. But now since everyone grants both that this practice was observed long ago according to the will of God and that it has now been changed by God's direction, you are now citing the apostle stupidly to prove what no one denies; that which opposes you, you do not touch on; unless perhaps you think you are making a clever inference if you draw the following conclusion: "Paul once gave the laity both forms when God so willed; therefore, the church ought forever to do this whether God wills it or does not will it." But did not Paul teach certain things to the Corinthians which he was not then permitted to disregard and which no one is now obliged to observe? Unless you who feign liberty would involve the whole world in many condemnations. Paul circumcised Timothy; I have no doubt that he did this rightly and fitly, and yet shortly after he warns others: "If you are circumcised Christ will be of no advantage to you." At one time only adults were admitted to baptism, and Christ was not baptized before He grew to manhood. We do not read that the apostles baptized infants. Why, therefore, do you not protest that it has been decreed that children should not be baptized, so that in this matter also you may contrive a false charge against the church?⁷¹ On the other hand, formerly, after infant baptism was begun, even infants used to receive communion. Now we see that practice abolished. Why do you not argue that both forms were wrongly taken away from children for so many ages, since you condemn the taking away of the one form from the laity? Then, this very matter of the form of wine: did not Christ Himself omit it at one time? Unless contrary to all the saints you deny that Cleophas and his companion received the body in the form of bread when they recognized Him in the breaking of the bread, or unless you who admit nothing apart

⁷⁰ For him, no one speaks according to God who does not support his impiety

⁷¹ Perhaps because it did not support you

from scripture would prove to us apart from scripture that the form of wine was offered at the same time, although the evangelist testifies that immediately after handing them the bread Christ disappeared. Do you not read in the Acts that Paul himself consecrated bread, handed it to the disciples, nor at the time was there any mention of wine? 5

But if you go on asking how I know that the things concerning the form of the sacraments which are changed in the church are changed by the will and design of God, I shall ask you in turn how you yourself know that it was permissible to omit the washing of feet? or that that practice was not thus instituted by God, whether as a sacrament of the faith or at least as a rite of the sacraments such as could never lawfully be abolished, since Christ seems to have presented an example of that action no less explicitly than He did that of the eucharist; in fact, even more explicitly than the latter, in that He did not say to them, “Do this,” but, “According to my example you should do this.” These words seem in no way to persuade but to impose a necessity, especially since Christ threatened Peter, who was refusing out of modesty such a lowly and almost disgraceful service toward himself on the part of the Lord, that he would have no part with Himself unless the mystery of that washing was carried through. Tell me then, Luther, how do you know that this washing was either not instituted as a sacrament or was only a temporary rite?⁷² By what scriptural text do you determine this? By any other than this in which Christ promised His church: “The Spirit, the Paraclete, whom the Father will send in my name, He will lead you into all truth,” and, “I shall be with you even to the consummation of the world,” and any other of the same kind? How do you know that those things were shortly after legitimately changed which the apostles once established by epistle? Unless you think that the Spirit of God was lacking also to the assembly which the apostles held in common at Jerusalem.⁷³ How do you know that the apostles changed without sin the form of baptism from that prescribed by Christ Himself, and that in a matter of the greatest importance—whatever you may prate? For it is not so important whether someone is baptized in water as it is important in whose name he is baptized. Moreover, a martyr can be baptized in his own blood. A person can 10 15 20 25 30 35

⁷² Why, great doctor, have you not taught this to us dolts?

⁷³ What else would a rival and enemy of the apostles think?

also be baptized in the spirit, but no one can be baptized in any other name than that which God prescribed. But if you should contend, Luther, that the name of Christ was sufficient, then, while I admit this is true, yet I truly see that it works wholly against you. For when Christ established the three names, of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, in which through washing the people would be regenerated unto faith, no human reason whatever could have been sufficient for the apostles to turn away from what was prescribed by Christ, nor could they contrary to such clear words of Christ believe that it is more important that the name of Christ alone be rendered glorious than that the whole Trinity be made known to the world and that the people grow accustomed at the very portals of Christianity to acknowledge and to worship the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, in whose names they had received baptism. 5 10

But if you should answer, as some do answer, that the name of Christ, since it signifies the anointed, implies both the Father as anointer and the unction, the Spirit, we will hurl back at you that the flesh which is concealed under the form of bread does not only imply but also truly contains the blood which is consecrated separately in the form of wine, but nevertheless, as you do not grant that this is sufficient reason for the church to abandon among the laity the form of wine, so we will not grant you that that other answer was sufficient reason for the apostles to have been able to omit in baptism the names of the Father and Holy Spirit; nor the following one, according to the same reasoning: that Christ was God and the same God with the Father and Holy Spirit. For, as you say that Christ established two forms in the eucharist, so we say, and we say it on the testimony of the gospel, that Christ established in baptism three names, nor did He establish this incidentally and haphazardly, but for a most important reason: so that immediately in baptism the trinity of persons might become known.⁷⁴ You see then, Luther, that no reason could have persuaded the apostles to strike out from the form of baptism the name of the Father or the Spirit; this form you see no less explicit in the gospel than both forms in the eucharist. Why do you bring up, then, something for which, while you reproach the church, you do not reproach the apostles? Or will you say that of course there is this difference between the latter case and the former one: that the action of the apostles is 15 20 25 30 35

⁷⁴ Go now and deny that it was lawful to change anything, Luther!

included in holy scripture, which you admit must stand firm, while the action of the church relies on no scripture but on a mere custom, which you think has grown rampant and should be speedily uprooted. But here see how you are saying nothing, for in the Acts of the Apostles you read nothing other than that the apostles baptized in the name of Christ alone, as here you see that the laity have received communion for so many ages under only one form; and in the gospel you see that the words of Christ by which He commanded them to add the name of the Father and of the Holy Spirit are much clearer than are all the words from which you argue that the church is commanded by God to give both forms to the people.

Again, therefore, I ask you: why is it that you do not attack the apostles with the same tricks with which you attack the church?⁷⁵ You who now abuse the church, how is it that you do not blaspheme the apostles? What other means do you have to defend them than that they baptized in the name of Christ alone by His own direction, from whose mouth they formerly had received a different form of baptizing? The king, then, gives you the same answer concerning the church; namely, that what she does in this matter she does governed by the Spirit of Christ. But where, you ask, does this king read that the church has changed this through the Spirit of God? Where do you read, Luther, that Christ commanded the apostles something after what He had earlier commanded? Or, on the matter of the sacraments, will He not allow the apostles to err whom He chose for the sake of the church, and allow the church herself to err for whose sake He chose the apostles? Or do the words of Christ pertain to the apostles alone: “The Holy Spirit when He shall have come will lead you into all truth,” so that you argue that the following words also pertain only to them: “I am with you even to the consummation of the world”?

⁷⁵ He does both, and that with the spirit of a gladiator

The epilogue to those arguments by which the king had refuted the arguments of Luther; and at the same time, how uncertain everything would be rendered if it should be permitted to each person to destroy the public faith on the authority of some word of scripture. Chapter 7. 5

Now then, reader, you see how feeble is the strength of all those seven arguments by which this Satan tries to conquer Christ, how foolishly he reproaches us when he says that men cannot do this thing,⁷⁶ since the prince has said most clearly, and in more than one passage proved most clearly, that men have not done this, but God. If Luther does not admit that God has done it, why has he not denied it? Why does he conceal by silence what has been said by the king so often, emphasized in so many passages of his book, proved so often and so evidently? But if he admits that God did do it—but he does admit it since he answers nothing to the contrary—then how stupid and impious are all the seven arguments, which have absolutely no other force than if he said: “God has instituted this; therefore, that man sins who has done otherwise by the order of God Himself.” Or, if he said: “The letter of scripture signifies this; therefore, those men are impious who obey the Holy Spirit against the appearance of the letter which that Holy Spirit understands better than the seven thousand evil spirits who supply Luther with his seven arguments.” 10 15 20

Therefore, dear reader, since the king has proved that this practice which Luther censures as the work of priests is the work of the Holy Spirit,⁷⁷ by whose hidden breath he has proved that the church is governed, to which proof Luther has not yet been able to find any answer, you see now how stupidly he rants against the king as if the latter has not answered his arguments, so strong and powerful indeed that they are all prostrated by one word of truth. And yet, although the king has destroyed all of them most clearly, namely by proving that what Luther censures as done by priests was not done by them but by the Holy Spirit, the dolt still comes back, so dense that he does not sense the blow by which he has been wounded even to the heart, and he hurls once more against the 25 30 35

⁷⁶ Luther's foolish reasoning

⁷⁷ That the church is governed secretly by the Spirit of Christ

king his seven arguments, seven times
 refuted, which seven weapons of his he
 aims so accurately that they now miss their
 target by seven thousand paces.⁷⁸ For, when the practice is proved to
 have been effected by God, the fellow argues against the priests. Or, 5
 when the authorship of the Holy Spirit is well-known, the fellow
 nevertheless resists the spirit for the sake of the shell of the letter.

I would very much like to know what he thinks about the salvation
 of the martyrs whom the church believes baptized in their own
 blood. They happened to die for the faith of Christ before they could 10
 receive the sacrament of baptism. I think
 he will not say that those most holy martyrs
 have all been damned.⁷⁹ Nevertheless, I do
 not see how he can affirm their salvation, if he accepts nothing but
 evident scriptures. If you should discover any of these scriptures 15
 which seem to promise the kingdom of God to those martyrs, he will
 still not easily find out any which makes the promise more clearly
 than the following text seems clearly to refuse it: “Unless a man is
 born again of water and the Holy Spirit he cannot enter into the
 kingdom of God.” But because Luther has so little care for the 20
 martyrs that he argues that their images and veneration should be
 wholly abolished, I desire at least to know of him—if he admits noth-
 ing at all besides evident scriptures—what sufficiently clear answer
 he would give if, when he promises such easy remission of all sins by
 faith alone, and that by means of any sort of sudden penitence lasting 25
 but a moment, someone were to bring up that text about the sin against
 the Holy Spirit which Christ clearly says is not to be forgiven either
 in this world or in the next? What will Luther do here? He will
 bring up, of course, that text of the prophet: “At whatever hour the
 sinner shall lament, etc.” What then will he say if the one who 30
 brought up the objection says that this sin is an exception and that
 there is at least some sin, the nature of which no one has yet
 satisfactorily explained, which cannot be blotted out by any repent-
 ance? What will be the end of the disputing? Or rather, if someone
 should bring up the words of the apostle,⁸⁰ 35
 “For if we sin willfully after receiving the
 knowledge of the truth, there remains no
 longer a sacrifice for sins, but a certain dreadful expectation of
 judgment and the fury of a fire which will consume the adversaries”?

⁷⁸ What an accurate marksman Luther is!

⁷⁹ Why not? He falsely accuses the apostles of Christ of lying and arrogance

⁸⁰ What has Luther to do with an apostle?

And likewise these words of the same apostle, “A man making void the law of Moses dies without any mercy on the word of two or three witnesses; how much worse punishments do you think he deserves who has trodden under foot the Son of God and has regarded as unclean the blood of the covenant through which He was sanctified and has insulted the Spirit of grace?” And likewise the following, “For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, who have both tasted the heavenly gift and become partakers of the Holy Spirit, who have moreover tasted the good word of God and the powers of the world to come, and then have fallen away, to be recalled again to repentance since they crucify again for themselves the Son of God and make Him a mockery”? If someone, I say, should bring out these scriptures and then those words of Christ; and if he should say that this text, “At whatever hour the sinner laments he will be saved,” must be understood to mean that at any time of his life whatever the unbelieving sinner can be received through penitence to the grace of baptism, but after baptism, if he sins again, there is no second opportunity for salvation, what will be the end here for Luther, who admits nothing besides evident scriptures? When will he make the scriptures so clearly harmonized that there will not remain more than seven arguments⁸¹ for Luther’s adversary which he will clearly never be able to destroy unless he has recourse to the faith of the church written by the fingers of God in the hearts of the faithful, no less true and no less certain than any book of scripture, through which faith we are certain about an article of faith even when we are often uncertain about the meaning of scripture; from a text of this scripture Arius attacked Christ with more than seven arguments; with more than seven arguments the impious Helvidius attacked Christ’s holy mother. The church conquered the faithlessness of both these men, being founded indisputably on the solid rock of faith by which the Holy Spirit taught her to harmonize the scriptures against Arius, against Helvidius, and to declare that the scriptures were brought into being by Himself, and to believe in the perpetual integrity of the virgin without any scriptural testimony.

Since, therefore, it is most certain both from the public faith of the catholic church and from the agreement of scripture that the church is ruled by the Spirit of Christ in matters of faith, we do not doubt that what the Spirit says to the church is true and correct even if there

⁸¹ But he will not hear any except his own

is an apparently contrary letter of scripture, knowing either that God has arranged for that text, or that it is surely not contradictory but seems so, just as we have no doubt that two texts of scripture which at times seem to conflict are consistent with each other, even though they seem to us to disagree. Therefore, either Luther should have destroyed the king's statement that the change which Luther attacks as made by priests was made by the Holy Spirit, and likewise the statement that the church is governed by the same Spirit in matters of faith, to which two statements he answers nothing at all; or else the church of Christ is safe not only against Luther's seven arguments but also against the seventy times seven times seven thousand cacodaemons who breathe into Luther, as into a most fitting demon-pipe,⁸² such stupid sophistries against the church and against Christ her spouse. 5

Therefore, whereas the prince has clearly solved all Luther's arguments, Luther on the other hand, in his usual manner plucking out certain points with which he may quarrel, conceals all the most forceful arguments. For he answers nothing at all to the king's demonstration that the practice he censures was not brought about by those whom he censures. He answers nothing to the king's demonstration that he does not excuse the laity whom he wishes excused. He answers nothing to the fact that both kinds are now taken away from infants, about which practice Luther makes no complaint.⁸³ He answers nothing to the king's statement that the action which the fellow is opposing was not done by men but by God, who rules the church in matters of faith; in which fact the sum of the whole matter consists. Since this is the way the matter stands on both sides, judge now, honest reader, between the two sides: how shameless a scoundrel is Luther who so pompously plays the buffoon and buffoonishly boasts that the king answers him nothing while he himself indeed answers everything; whereas the king with one word actually solves and destroys all the fellow's arguments, the latter, on the other hand, conceals and passes over almost all the arguments of the king. 10 15 20 25 30 35

⁸² Luther the pipe of cacodaemons

⁸³ Himself remembering the proverb: Silence answers many things

Those arguments which he has selected as the most powerful to wrestle with, this singular wrestler has so handled as to make it clear that those very arguments which he wishes us to think powerless are more powerful than his own powerless forces. 5

Let us see, he says,⁸⁴ how eloquent about his trifles is this defender, speechless about necessary matters; swell out your belly, reader, so that you can take in these grandiose Thomistic words;⁸⁵ when he is about to prove that it was permissible to take away one kind, how royally he advances, as though he were a king. The church, he says, receives in the morning the sacrament which Christ instituted in the evening; moreover, we mix water with the wine, of which practice scripture makes no mention. Therefore, if the church could do something different or institute something different on this point, she could also take away part of the sacrament. 10 15

See, reader, how rascally the rascal proceeds. For if the king, having spoken about either the institution or the custom of the church, had added absolutely nothing else in that passage, yet, since in so many passages of his book he has proved both by reason and by scriptures that in the sacraments the church is governed by the Holy Spirit, what man living would be so senseless as not to sense what the king meant? Or who would be so wickedly partial to Luther that in such a clear matter he would not condemn Luther's very stupid slander? But now, so that you may perceive the fellow's most deceitful chicanery, please listen, reader, to what the prince says in that very passage. 20 25

"If Luther admits nothing else than evident scriptures of God,⁸⁶ why does he not, as I have said, order the eucharist to be received by men at supper? For scripture records that it was done this way. How much better for Luther to believe that the church's practice of not giving the laity communion under both kinds was not introduced by human invention but by the same divine authority which introduced the practice of 30 35

⁸⁴ Luther's words

⁸⁵ Your mind is taken up with dishes, you pot-bellied rascal

⁸⁶ The king's words

receiving communion by men fasting. It pleased the Holy Spirit, as Augustine says,⁸⁷ that the body of the Lord which was received by the apostles at supper, after other food, should be received in the church by men fasting, before other food.” And the king directly concludes the case as follows: “Just as the Holy Spirit who governs the church of Christ has caused the sacrament of the eucharist to be received by men fasting instead of by men at supper, so He caused it to be received by the laity under one kind instead of under both kinds.” 5

What do you say here, reader? By whom does the king say this practice was changed? By men or by God? Does he not clearly say it was changed by God? What name then fits Friar Buffoon Luther, who everywhere falsely claims that the prince argues that this practice was changed by men? This is our rascal’s constant form, not of disputing, but of buffoonishly slandering. And now, as if everyone knew that the king said what everyone knows is Luther’s lie, the latter proceeds to play the buffoon briskly. 10 15

In this way there ought to be rolled and rushed along, he says,⁸⁸ the headlong and senseless lust for lying against the Lord of glory. 20

On the contrary, Luther, in this way there ought to be rolled and rushed headlong the furious friarling and his senseless lust for lying against the acknowledged truth, from a desire for spewing out a bit of boasting. It is ridiculous that you wish the king to seem to speak against the Lord of glory.⁸⁹ Is it anything at all against the Lord of glory that the king says God can order His sacraments as He chooses and that God must be obeyed whether He commands anything through scripture or without scripture? As for your accusing the king as though he says that man can change what God has established, here surely you are convicted of lying so shamelessly and wickedly that if you had any shame you would never dare to raise your eyes after this. 25 30

How I would wish, he says,⁹⁰ that asses and pigs could only speak so that they might judge between me and Henry. 35

This at least you do rightly, Luther, and conveniently for your own case: when you perceive your case condemned by God and men, you

⁸⁷ Saint Augustine

⁸⁸ Luther’s words

⁸⁹ Luther’s ridiculous fiction

⁹⁰ Luther’s words

summon it before pigs and asses,⁹¹ on the
 chance that you can find any brute beast
 so foul or foolish that it would wish either to grunt or bray for you.
 However, I have no doubt indeed that if either asses or pigs could
 speak they would readily judge you to be filthier than a pig and more
 foolish than an ass, since you so foully lie and hope to impose yourself
 on the world by means of such transparent and manifest lying.

5

But I will accept, you say,⁹² other asses and
 pigs. Judge therefore yourselves, you so-
 phists of Paris, Louvain, Cologne, Leipzig too, and wherever your
 ilk are found: by what dialectic does this most Henrician and
 Thomistic conclusion have validity? For you have even made a
 marginal note in this book: "Here Luther lies prostrate." And you
 have approved your Henry.

10

Ah! This is it! This is the source of those
 tears.⁹³ This, Luther, strikes your mind with
 consternation. This wounds, mangles,
 lacerates: that the book of the prince is everywhere approved by
 learned men, who justly approve it and justly make the marginal
 note: "Here Luther lies prostrate." You do indeed lie most shame-
 fully prostrate, if a person lies prostrate who has nothing left to hiss in
 his turn besides an evident, universally detected lie.

15

20

Tell me then: (you say)⁹⁴ What is the
 source of this topic? Whence the rule for
 this conclusion? Should it be something outside scripture, then it must
 be considered to be opposed to scripture.

25

You must seek the rule, Luther, by which you may defend this
 conclusion. For it is clearly yours. Who has made this conclusion for
 you? Who has drawn such a conclusion but you? For the prince has
 reasoned as follows: "Christ commands many things through the
 Holy Spirit, and teaches the church without scripture; therefore,
 Luther is a heretic and Antichrist, since he preaches that the church
 must not be believed in anything without scripture."

30

Whence, you say,⁹⁵ is the rule of this con-
 clusion: Wine is mixed with water with-
 out scriptural authority; therefore, the scripture decreeing the second
 part of the sacrament must be condemned, must be considered a
 heresy, and must be befouled by your other blasphemies?

35

⁹¹ Judges worthy of Luther

⁹² Luther's words

⁹³ And in very fact you were prostrate

⁹⁴ Luther's words

⁹⁵ Luther's words

And immediately you, you buffoon, grandly add:

407

Is not your face ashamed, Henry, now no longer a king, but a sacrilegious robber? Do you not sweat,⁹⁶
you poisonous sophists, you wretched
blockheads, turned toward a spurious interpretation?

5

Thus the rascal chooses and is permitted to make sport and to hurl the follies of his own head against others. For who has argued in this way with you? Who has condemned any scripture? Who has judged that it must be considered heretical? Who has befouled it with blasphemies? No one, certainly, but you, who reject even Paul's interpretation and condemn a canonical epistle and blaspheme the apostle James. For what the king says has this aim: that as God has taught without scripture that water must be mingled with wine, so also He has taught without scripture that the second kind must be taken away. No scripture, as has been proved before, has commanded that this kind be given to the laity. I should not hesitate to say even more: that if ever anything concerning the sacred rites or sacraments had been commanded most clearly in scripture so that we are commanded, I do not say to believe but to do something in this or that manner, nevertheless, if God afterwards dispenses otherwise concerning that commandment and orders the contrary without scripture—a thing which the king has proved was done in this case—a person will not be impious who obeys without scripture and submits to God as the church does; rather, that person is impious who—as Luther does and teaches—contemns God under pretext of the scripture. Nevertheless, if some scripture seemed contradictory, the church would not condemn it or consider it heretical or befoul it with blasphemies, but, safeguarding the honor of the scripture, she would recognize, being divinely taught, that the command referred to had been temporary.

10

15

20

25

Otherwise, let the most eloquent pig and most prudent ass tell us whether anyone condemns and befouls that gospel who does not preserve today that washing of the feet which Christ long ago carried out at the supper.⁹⁷ And yet Christ gave both the example of that washing, and, if you consider the passage, a command with a threat; and the apostles preserved and handed it on, and for some time the whole church preserved it, as may be learned from Cyprian the martyr. And yet now, without a new scripture, through the

30

35

⁹⁶ Rather, you are

⁹⁷ Here, Luther, a scruple is suggested to you

Spirit of Christ, the Christian people cease to be bound to that washing; unless you who have taken away five of the seven sacraments suddenly set up an eighth one. Still, no one condemns or befouls that gospel with blasphemies.

Or do you say that the apostle Paul has befouled God with blasphemies and condemned this scripture: “My covenant shall be in your flesh as a perpetual covenant. If any male have not the flesh of his foreskin circumcised, that person shall be cut off from his people, because he has broken my covenant”? For against that very manifest, very inflexible, very threatening scripture, he did not hesitate to say: “If you be circumcised, Christ will be of no advantage to you.”⁹⁸ But Christ, you say, ordered baptism and He Himself was baptized. I grant this, but He had also long ago ordered circumcision and He Himself was circumcised, and He said that He had come not to destroy the law, and scripture calls the law of circumcision an eternal covenant, nor did Christ teach the contrary to Paul through the scripture. For Paul himself circumcised Timothy. What else do you have to say than that Paul was taught apart from scripture by the Holy Spirit, so that contrary to the words of scripture clearly commanding circumcision forever, contrary to the example of Christ who was Himself circumcised, contrary to the very clear word of Christ who said that He had come not to destroy the law but to fulfill it, Paul did not hesitate nevertheless to do away with circumcision? You remember, therefore, that the king answered you in the same way that the catholic church, taught by the same Spirit by which Paul was taught, has not hesitated to take away the species of wine. Yet no clear and manifest scripture—the only kind you accept—has commanded that this species of wine be offered to the laity (although this was at one time done). But, you will say, God taught Paul even without scripture, yet He teaches the church nothing without scripture. Prove to us, therefore, by evident scriptures, Luther,⁹⁹ contrary to the words of the evangelist, “Not all things have been written,” that whatever God teaches the church He teaches by evident scriptures. Contrary also to the words of the apostle: “Now I praise you, brethren, because in all things you are mindful of me and hold fast my precepts as I gave them to you.” Moreover, the following: “For this reason I left thee in Crete, that thou shouldst set right anything

⁹⁸ Or is not this scripture sufficiently clear, Luther?

⁹⁹ Now the long-winded friarling falls mute

that is defective and shouldst appoint presbyters in every city, as I myself directed thee to do.” And on the other hand this: “Keep the teachings that you have learned whether by word or by letter.” And likewise the following: “The rest I shall set in order when I come.” Also the words of the prophet : “I will give my laws in their hearts and in their minds I will write them.” And whatever other passages there are of this nature. Or, at least prove by evident scriptures that Christ who sustained Paul with His Spirit does not sustain the catholic church, contrary to the evident scripture by which He Himself promised the opposite when He said: “I am with you even to the consummation of the world.”

Is not your face now ashamed, Luther?¹⁰⁰
Do you not sweat, poisonous sophist?
Surely, your face has become that of a harlot. Surely you have become a wretched blockhead and so turned toward a spurious interpretation that, growing numb by means of lies, deceits, heresies and blasphemies, you do not sense your own misery because of the mass of present troubles, the terror of threatening evils and the horror of eternal damnation.

Let the boastful defender of the sacraments tell us, he says,¹⁰¹ whence he proves that the mass must necessarily be celebrated in the morning.

See, reader, how he is ever like himself, how once more the rascal declares himself a liar, once again a trickster.¹⁰² Tell me, reverend ass, where the king has said that the celebration must necessarily take place in the morning. The king said the following:

“If Luther recalls this practice to the precise form of the gospel account,¹⁰³ why does he not order the eucharist always to be received at supper, or rather, after supper?”

See, Luther, the king does not restrict the practice to the morning, but, as I have often said already, he shows that the church is taught by the Holy Spirit not to consider herself bound to the evening. And with Augustine as witness, he proves that the Holy Spirit has taught, contrary to the example of Christ, that the eucharist, which Christ gave to men at supper, must be received by men fasting. Tell me now, Luther; tell me, where is that statement which you falsely claim the

¹⁰⁰ He plays on Luther’s words

¹⁰¹ Luther’s words

¹⁰² This he never fails to do

¹⁰³ The king’s words

king has made about the morning? Or is it the same thing to receive
 in the morning and to receive fasting? Prove to us by evident scrip-
 tures that it is the same thing to receive in the morning and to receive
 fasting. Or is it the same thing to receive fasting and to receive in the
 morning for the reason that you cannot receive fasting except very
 early in the morning since you are always drinking very early in the
 morning? Here your question has place:¹⁰⁴ 5
 Tell me, sophists of Wittenberg, whence is
 the topic, whence the rule for this conclusion: Father Tossopot is
 always drunk very early in the morning; therefore, no one can
 receive the sacrament soberly except in the morning? 10

I ask the same, he says,¹⁰⁵ about mixing
 water with wine. Who has made this an
 article of faith? Who dares say it is a sin to celebrate without water?
 Is it Henry when he believes it thus to be, and does not believe that
 Luther celebrates without water? 15

It is decent of you, Luther, to give the king the benefit of not having
 thought you so wicked as you yourself boast that you are. Does not
 your impiety surpass his opinion of you? You now indicate what you
 would dare in the sacred mysteries and shortly after declare it quite
 openly. 20

Who, you say,¹⁰⁶ has made this an article of
 faith? Who dares say it is a sin if one
 celebrates without water?

That mass should be celebrated by men fasting and that water
 should be poured into the wine have been taught His faithful people
 by the author of faith, who in matters both of the sacraments and of
 faith teaches His church all truth and inspires her as to His pleasure.
 Whether the person who does not obey His will sins or does not sin,
 your own condemnation will teach you, archdolt. There is no need
 for Henry to tell you this. The whole church of Christ for more than a
 thousand years past tells you this. Whatever her spouse has inspired
 in her for so long a time surely must be so, however much a new
 heretic may now deny and contemn it. 25
 30

Next, no less ridiculous than your other impious statements is that 35

¹⁰⁴ He plays on Luther's words

¹⁰⁵ Luther's words

¹⁰⁶ Luther's words

statement which, though it was born from your mad head, you pretend is said by the king, in these words:

415

Custom, he says,¹⁰⁷ has the force of law. I answer. It does have the force of law, but in civil cases.

5

Luther, how consistently you are Luther! Find for us in the whole book of the king where he says what you say he says: "Custom has the force of law." Are you not ashamed to fabricate this statement,¹⁰⁸ so that you can of course, neatly solve it by answering, "It does have, but in civil cases"? As if the king had alleged the agreement of men and not clearly written that Christ has inspired these things in His faithful.

10

In order, therefore, that you may see how prettily this very shameless cunning of yours works to your advantage, we will answer you that the custom of the Christian people in matters of the sacraments and of faith has the force of a more powerful law than has any custom of any people whatever in civil matters, since the latter relies only on human agreement, the former is procured and prospers by divine inspiration.

15

20

We, you say,¹⁰⁹ are called to the liberty which can endure neither law nor custom since we are acting in spiritual matters.

You announce the absolute truth, indeed, about yourself and your ilk whom the devil has called to his servile liberty. For just as to serve God is to reign according to the laws and customs of the Christian people, so, to tear away the laws and customs which Christ wished His people to observe and to shake off the sweet yoke which Christ wished His flock to bear,¹¹⁰ what else is this than to be a slave fleeing from God in order to live freely for the devil? Or rather, in order that you may serve the most miserable slavery with the appearance of liberty.

25

30

Therefore, he says,¹¹¹ Henry's lordship and regality has learned his dialectic badly and in this passage most faultily begs the initial premise, seizing on this as a certain, proven, divine, necessary article of faith, which is merely a free and human invention.

35

¹⁰⁷ Luther's words

¹⁰⁸ Beyond question, Luther, you are a splendid rhetorician

¹⁰⁹ Luther's words

¹¹⁰ Of what sort is Luther's liberty

¹¹¹ Luther's words

Luther's doctoral magistrality does not consider that in this passage he proclaims himself the kind of utterly vicious scoundrel who under the name of the king blasphemes, himself an Augustinian, Augustine, by whose words he had once sworn, from whom as well as from Christ he now flees as a fugitive forsworn. For the prince cited Augustine as clearly declaring that what this fellow proclaims is nothing but an optional human invention was the invention of the Holy Spirit. And certainly, of so many holy fathers of the church who have lived from the time of Christ's passion even to the present day, there has never been one who did not believe that the common customs of the universal church concerning the sacraments either were handed down by the order of God through the apostles or had developed in the church through the Holy Spirit. If anyone at times transgressed these customs through human frailty, he reckoned it among his sins.¹¹² But, on the other hand, of so many impious and insane scoundrels who have lived from the time of Christ's passion even to the present day, you almost singly have risen up to blather that the common customs of the universal church concerning the sacraments are so completely optional that what all men observe so holily, so uninterruptedly, and have observed during so many centuries is now optional for each person to ignore when he pleases, as often as he pleases. And you dare, scoundrel, under the name of papists to mock the whole church of so many ages.

Therefore, you say,¹¹³ we willingly grant to these holy papists those solemn articles of their faith by which they believe that the eucharist must be communicated only in the morning, that it must be celebrated only in a consecrated place or on a portable altar, as they call it; that water must be mixed with the wine, and other most weighty articles very worthy of these most saintly men.

There is no one, you most insolent buffoon, who does not sense that these blasphemous mockeries of yours directly touch all the most saintly leaders of the catholic church;¹¹⁴ namely, Cyprian, Jerome, Ambrose, Augustine, Basil, Gregory, Chrysostom, and the rest of that class whose most holy books everywhere proclaim that they observed earnestly and holily the practices which you

¹¹² But for Luther it is a sin to observe them

¹¹³ Luther's words

¹¹⁴ The importance and character of the men Luther mocks

deride, and that they believed a man execrable, not if he omitted those practices through carelessness, but if, as you do, he arrogantly and insultingly contemned them. But you, aware that you are execrable to all the saints, like a desperate scoundrel, senselessly and insanelly deride in turn all the saints.

5

But we, you say,¹¹⁵ declare such faithful men mere simpletons and dolts.

No doubt; as if you should say: “We heretics, we infidels, call such faithful men mere simpletons and dolts.” But when that day shall have come, Luther, in which the faithful shall stand in great constancy, then you heretics and infidels, seeing it, will be shaken with dreadful fear, and groaning in anguish of spirit you will say:¹¹⁶ “These are the faithful and holy men whom we faithless and impious men once held as a laughingstock and as a type for mockery. See how they are accounted among the sons of God. We then have strayed from the way of truth, and the light of justice did not shine for us, and the sun of understanding did not rise for us. We had our fill of the ways of mischief and of ruin; what did our pride avail us?”

10

15

20

We, you say,¹¹⁷ hold the communion of the sacrament freely, whether by day or by night, whether in the morning or in the evening; free are the times, hours, places, vestments, rites.

All things are free for you; nor does it make any difference to you where, when, how you offer the sacrifice, whether by night or by day, whether in the light or in darkness, drunk or sober, clothed or naked, clean or filthy, on the altar or on the toilet, you hang-dog knave.

25

Among us, you say,¹¹⁸ a man does not sin who eats or drinks moderately before communion, which Paul also confirms in I Corinthians 11, saying: “If anyone is hungry, let him eat at home, lest you come together unto judgment at the Lord’s supper.”

30

He who eats or drinks before communion does not sin among you heretics, men unquestionably without sin, among whom no sin is so serious that it can be a sin.¹¹⁹ All your sins are so swallowed up in faith, while at the same time, lack of faith wholly swallows up your souls.

35

¹¹⁵ Luther’s words

¹¹⁶ Then, Luther, this bandying about of words will be shaken out of you

¹¹⁷ Luther’s words

¹¹⁸ Luther’s words

¹¹⁹ Seeing that among them there is no sin but lack of faith

Now, as for what you bring up from Paul; suppose first of all that in that passage he clearly says what you say he says; what else have you yet proved from that passage than that the practice was then permitted? Do you conclude from it, after the king has proved to you that the Holy Spirit has willed the contrary for more than a thousand years already, that the same thing is permitted now because the apostle, by God's dispensation, permitted it then? As if the apostle did not at times permit certain things which shortly after even he himself prohibited; unless you now permit circumcision to all because Paul once circumcised Timothy.

But I ask you, Luther, who admit nothing besides evident scriptures, how will you make that passage of Paul support you so clearly? Paul says: "If anyone is hungry, let him eat at home." Will you therefore make it clear that he says this is permitted to them and that there is no sin if men who are hungry eat at home first, then when satisfied receive the eucharist? When the same apostle writes to the same Corinthians: "Appoint those who are rated as nothing in the church to judge,"¹²⁰ does he approve that men who are rated as nothing are appointed? Or does he rather say this to the shame of those men who did not find anyone sufficiently wise in the church to settle the lawsuits of Christians, but who permit them to go to law before unbelievers, although he wishes them rather to take up the case before some Christian judge than to profane the name of Christ before pagans? Nevertheless, he clearly declares that those men sin because they quarrel over money among themselves. "It is altogether sinful," he says, "that you have lawsuits one with another."¹²¹ And, Luther, if you carefully examine the passage which you bring up, you will see that he is perhaps rather declaiming wholly against you. For there the apostle clearly censures those who, bringing their suppers with them, hastened to eat them before they ate the Lord's supper. And so, he says: "It is not permitted to eat the Lord's supper because each one first greedily eats his own supper." From this it is inferred, not obscurely, that they came fasting to communion, but that each one began to carry his own food with him; and because certain ones were eating their supper beforehand, the apostle censures that practice, commanding that they should feed their body at home, feed their soul at church. But if they were so weak or at times so indisposed that it would be difficult for

¹²⁰ Listen now in turn, Luther

¹²¹ See your testimony against yourself, Luther

them to wait fasting so long a time until the assembly should come together, they should rather restrain themselves and eat at home, nor should they dare to approach communion filled and belching; from this they would bring condemnation on themselves. Reread the passage therefore, Luther, and you will see that it rather opposes you entirely than supports you, since he does not say, "If anyone is hungry let him eat at home and then come," but if anyone cannot bear fasting, he commands him to remain at home and there appease his hunger, and not to approach the temple of God to take care of his stomach's need.

Not that I¹²² condemn the usage of receiving communion in the morning and in consecrated places, but we reject the necessity of doing so. For we wish, if anyone cannot fast or cannot while fasting be relieved of catarrh or heaviness, that he should eat and drink before he partakes of the table of the Lord, and he should do this freely so that he may be completely at ease in body and mind. For what Henry calls the church we¹²³ say is the scarlet-clad harlot. Even if the church cannot do without rites and ceremonies, nevertheless she does not make laws and soul-snares of them; but those men do this who bandy about the name of church, those pigs and asses, Henricists, papists, sophists, Thomists, and deceivers of that ilk, and followers of Antichrist.

The honored Martin has openly declared more than a thousand times how solemnly, and how regally, or rather how rascally and how buffoonishly, he scorns all the customs of the church, all laws, all rites, and all ceremonies. For he has even burned the laws, lest anyone doubt how much store he sets by the rest of the things to which he attributes great significance that they be put on the same level as the laws which he has burned. But now suddenly he begins to be cautious and to temper his opinion. For before he often said that all these things are so free that it is permissible in the case of all of them, whenever one pleases, as often as one pleases, to keep them, to change them, to approve them, to condemn them, to attend to them, to ignore them. Now he does not condemn the usage, but he rejects the necessity of receiving communion in the morning and in consecrated places. And he who argued in the *Babylon*¹²⁴ that the mass would be much more Christian if the pomp of vestments, chants,

¹²² Luther's words

¹²³ You, that is, the heretics

¹²⁴ Is this the man who never says anything contradictory?

gestures and other rites and all ceremonies were abolished, now on the contrary admits here that the church cannot do without rites and ceremonies, but the true church, that is the Lutheran, considers rites and ceremonies free, whereas the papist church, that is the catholic, makes of them laws and soul-snares.

5

Let us see, therefore, Luther:¹²⁵ What are these snares which the catholic church sets and what is this liberty unto which your church sets us free? Let us examine this point in regard to this very custom by which we communicate fasting. The church accepts this rite and other rites of the same kind which have been drawn out into custom by the hidden dispensation of the Holy Spirit, as all the most holy fathers testify, not as being the substance of the sacraments but as those elements which are applied for the honor of the sacraments and which neither can be scorned without sin nor should be omitted without grave and serious cause. But if anyone falls ill or is at other times in danger, he communicates without fasting;¹²⁶ he communicates even if he has eaten three times so that he may not depart without viaticum. But when there is no necessity for communicating, the catholic church judges that you should rather abstain than that you should rashly presume to infringe the rite and divinely constituted custom. Tell me, then, Luther, what soul-snare is here, where you can fulfill what is commanded and where what you cannot fulfill is not required?

10

15

20

Yet this still does not seem sufficiently free for you and your church.¹²⁷ But if anyone, while fasting, cannot be relieved of catarrh or heaviness, you wish him to eat and drink before he approaches the table of the Lord and to do this freely. Why so? So that, you say, he may be as completely at ease as possible in body and mind. You certainly make that rite of the church extremely free if you are freely permitted to relax it so easily for any cause you please, because of a little catarrh or heaviness. If the body is so excessively full of such excrement, food will rather harm than profit it. Indeed, I am surprised that you should now want the one who communicates to have his mind at ease, since in the *Babylon* you wished that on approaching communion one should have his mind as confused as possible¹²⁸ by distracting

25

30

35

¹²⁵ Take notice, reader

¹²⁶ Is this not enough liberty, Luther?

¹²⁷ Doubtless for him to whom there is no liberty but license

¹²⁸ Here, of course, also, you do not contradict yourself at all, Luther

recollections and agitated either by the gnawing or by the titillation of sins. Besides, if a man is troubled by catarrh or heaviness, why may he not rather put off communicating than communicate contrary to such an accepted custom of the whole church?

This, of course, is your motive: that communion would then be received less often, and you would wish that most holy reception of communion to occur most frequently. You of course are concerned about this,¹²⁹ who in the *Babylon* think that the eucharist should be received only once in a lifetime and that not except on the point of death. But you make your church still more free, obviously so that one may hasten to eat beforehand, if he cannot fast. Long ago those who received communion used to fast even until supper; since some sick or delicate persons could not bear that, the church by the teaching of the Holy Spirit changed the time and chose rather to transfer it from evening to morning than to leave anyone the pretext of appearing forced to eat before communion. And now you still say: "If anyone cannot fast..." You could perhaps say this if one were not permitted to communicate before evening. Now I am surely sorry for you and your church if, guzzling your fill until midnight, you cannot afterwards fast until the very early morning. Now you see, reader, how finely the reverend father tempers his words, and how neatly he defines how far one must defer to the rites and customs of the church.

He refutes the solutions with which Luther tries to solve the king's objections about the water poured into the wine. Chapter 9.

But now, this practice that the water is lawfully mingled with the wine. This practice, as the prince has shown, could no more have come about than that the second kind be omitted, except by the Spirit of God, through whom he both says and proves that both practices have been accepted. It is worth while to see, since you have ridiculed it for so long, how confusedly you meanwhile handle the matter and how ridiculously you have finally solved it. You say that the reason for taking away the species of wine from the laity is different from that

¹²⁹ Consider how consistent these points are, reader

for pouring water into the wine. For the church is not permitted to decide the one practice since the species of wine is part of the sacrament; concerning the other she could lawfully have decided, since the matter is not essential to the sacrament. Whatever is not essential, this the fellow says is clearly free and men can decide concerning such matters as being rites and ceremonies which you say the church cannot do without. 5

Incidentally, reader, how amusing¹³⁰ is his admission that the church cannot do without rites and ceremonies and yet shortly after his wish that each one be free either to observe or to transgress those same statutes, so that of course the church may be free. “Into which liberty we are called,” he says, “from slavery so that we are bound neither by any law nor by any custom but each one is of course so free in spiritual matters that he ought to be permitted whatever he pleases.” Why not? So that while one celebrates Christmas, another may keep Easter, and while religious men fast during lent, Father Tossplot may celebrate the Bacchanalia with his pot-companions. And this is one solution with which he solves the king’s argument. 10 15 20

The comparison, he says,¹³¹ is not valid, because the church could not decide to take away the one kind since the form was instituted by Christ, but it could decide about pouring water into the wine since this does not concern the form of the sacrament but is something unessential, and whatever is unessential, not only the church but also anyone whatsoever can freely do or omit according to his pleasure.¹³² 25

And yet, shortly after, the same reverend father says that it is not unessential but wicked to pour water into the wine and that it is thus not permitted because it has, he says, an evil significance;¹³³ for it signifies, he says, that the purity of the scriptures is being mingled with human traditions. You see, then, how the wise fellow, never contradicting himself, solves the one argument of the king with two mutually contradictory solutions: the one that each person is permitted to pour in water because it is not prohibited but is only unessential and not more contrary to any part of the sacrament than to the creation of the world or to the nativity of Christ; the other that it is not permitted 30 35

¹³⁰ Amusing, that he wants us to think he says nothing inconsistent

¹³¹ Luther’s words

¹³² And you prefer to sin in the worse way

¹³³ Whence this rule, Luther?

because it has an evil significance. And certainly it cannot be permitted if it is so evil that it signifies that the purity of the scripture is mingled with human traditions.

Here I appeal to your faith, dear reader. Please consider whether that which this scoundrel calls at one moment unessential, at another moment a custom of uncertain origin, at still another even an evil rite, has any origin besides the sole will of the immortal God.¹³⁴ For if all mortals had met in assembly, do you think that anyone would have been so bold as to have dared to be the first to propose that water be poured into the wine, for which practice there is no precedent in Christ's action? But if someone had been so bold as to propose this, do you think anyone would have been so senseless that in such an important matter he would put up with the man who proposed such actions so that men would believe that they might lawfully do with water and wine what they had learned Christ had done with wine only? Or would they not have feared less to omit both kinds than to violate the second by adding a third through human rashness, even if it were something which everyone knew had the best significance?¹³⁵ How much less if, as this scoundrel says, the matter had the worst significance? For otherwise, he thinks there would be no danger if someone, in consecrating the sacrament, should do something which is unessential and not contrary to it. Ah, sinful buffoon, who, according to this reasoning, everyone sees would not be afraid to consecrate cheese mixed with bread, or to tear to pieces the most holy body of the Lord and to stuff it full of sausages.

Yet, devout reader, when you see that no one who was truly Christian would ever have dared to add anything to the venerable sacrament, you cannot doubt that the water is poured in only by the ordinance of the Holy Spirit, either so that it may represent the memory of that water which together with the blood flowed from Christ on the cross, or because Christ at the supper also mingled wine with water, even if this fact is not mentioned by the evangelists, who did not write all the things which Christ did. Certainly, for whatever reason the Holy Spirit instituted it, you can be most certain, reader, that it was not received from any other spirit than the Holy Spirit. Therefore you cannot doubt either that the spirit of the man¹³⁶ who says that this practice

¹³⁴ Luther could name no other

¹³⁵ It is not likely

¹³⁶ This fellow is Luther

instituted by the Holy Spirit signifies evil is powerfully possessed by a completely evil spirit. What wonder, then, if the stupid scoundrel slanders the prince, since he has already long ago scorned both the apostle James and the whole catholic church and now proceeds to such a degree of impiety that he openly blasphemes the Holy Spirit, since that which everyone sees the Holy Spirit has inspired in all the faithful,¹³⁷ this buffoon worse than any infidel dares to blaspheme with his cursed tongue which should be cut out by the roots.

He shows how embarrassed Luther is by that argument about the water poured into the chalice and at the same time he wittily retaliates against those two kinds of fools fashioned by Luther. Chapter 10.

But how wretchedly he is racked by that argument about the water poured into the wine, his confused vacillation shows. He whirls this way and that and is never consistent; he says it is lawful for men to decide that water be poured in because it is only a rite and a matter unessential to the sacrament; and very shortly after: it is not lawful for the water to be poured in because it has an evil significance. Again: the church cannot do without rites and ceremonies, from which it follows that rites and ceremonies must be preserved, and in consequence of this there must be preserved the mingling of the water, which he admits is a rite and only unessential, and as such, he says the church can decide it. But again, shortly after: no one is held to rites or ceremonies because we are free from all things with the gospel freedom; therefore, we are not bound to pour in the water. But shortly after again:¹³⁸ if anyone pours in the water; he signifies something evil, and according to this reasoning we are forbidden to pour it in. See how the honored Martin disentangles himself from this argument. We are obliged to pour in water. We are not obliged to pour in water. We are obliged not to pour in water. Come, come, rogue; keep on speaking so

¹³⁷ O sacrilegious good-for-nothing

¹³⁸ You seem to have learned your dialectics poorly, my honored Luther

confusedly, rascal. Thus the foolish heart is beclouded. Thus the impious are befogged. Thus the schismatics prate. Thus the heretics are whirled with giddiness.

And yet he aspires to appear not only a restless wrangler, but, should it please the gods, even a witty buffoon. And so he fashions two kinds of fools;¹³⁹ of which the one is so foolish that because of an unessential action without scriptural authority he thinks scripture is abolished; for example, from the fact that adultery is committed he thinks the scriptures forbidding adultery are abolished. But the other is so dull-witted that because of any one passage of scripture whatsoever he thinks that any other passage of scripture whatsoever, however irrelevant, is heretical; for example, from the passage where Jethro is read to have advised Moses to set up judges he believes that all the scriptures are false which speak of the nativity of Christ. Then he argues wittily in his usual manner, that is buffoonishly, that the prince is more foolish than either fool since, from the fact that men lawfully decided that water should be mingled with wine in the sacrament—which practice is, as he says, only an unessential rite and therefore could lawfully be instituted by men—he has concluded that it was also lawfully instituted by men that the species of wine be taken away from the laity. This matter Luther argues to be such that it could not have been instituted by men because the species of wine is not an unessential element but a part of the sacrament.

But since the foundation of such a facetious fiction is not any word of the prince but the dull-witted device of Luther himself,¹⁴⁰ by which everyone sees that he imputes to the king a statement which the king nowhere makes, who is so foolish that he will not laugh at this fool so foolishly fashioning fools? I am not surprised, indeed, that he so facilely fashions fools for us. For it is natural that a fool should beget fools, like beget like, as an ass begets an ass. Nor do I doubt but that this fool of ours,¹⁴¹ now that priestly chastity has begun to gall him, will beget many fools for us. But since he so glories in his begetting of his fools that he either believes no one sees his own folly, or at least pretends to believe it, let this remarkable fashioner of fools fashion for us at least one fool of the kind who, when

¹³⁹ Luther's foolish fashioning of fools

¹⁴⁰ The pretext for this fiction of Luther's

¹⁴¹ If he would beget only fools, it would be less evil

he has happened to discover a ring made of brass, being deceived by
 someone's joke, will persuade himself that
 it is the golden ring of Gyges,¹⁴² who once
 governed Sardis, by means of which,
 they say, he used to go anywhere he pleased, invisible. With this 5
 marvelous good luck, what tricks and jokes the conceited fool will
 play while with a thousand trifles he will try out his trick! How he
 will exult! How he will laugh! How he will leap for joy, while the
 spectators turn their gaze in another direction to encourage his
 folly! Then he will think that he is all the while considered some 10
 marvelous demigod by those who mock him as insane. An ape does
 not ape an ape more than a fool is played the fool by our foolish and
 foolishly fool-fashioning Luther, who, as though no one saw his folly,
 is so proudly puffed up, and, as if he had now persuaded everyone
 that the king attributes to men what everyone knows the latter has 15
 attributed to God alone, sports and frolics,
 the dolt, as though everyone's eyes were
 blinded by his new trick so that they do not
 perceive him frolicking; that is, dancing gracefully like a camel.¹⁴³ He
 himself meanwhile is so foolish that he does not notice the derisive 20
 grimaces, the roars of laughter, the jeers and sneering mockery of
 everyone on all sides ridiculing the ridiculous madness of a man
 stupidly applauding himself.

But lest the venerable father be irritated by the name of fool, come,
 let another be fashioned, not clearly a fool but nearly a fool; what is 25
 more, clearly a scoundrel and more than clearly a toadying buffoon,
 who was once a friar, later a pimp, then again a friar, afterwards an
 apostate, then again a pander, finally a
 clout-pate, who in some hinterland of
 Bohemia coming in on a feast of rustics 30
 begins to play the buffoon;¹⁴⁴ when he has won their laughter by the
 filthiest gestures and the most obscene words, afterwards the silly and
 wicked mimic, having imitated a rustic, a pander, a drunk, a raging
 whore, finally eager to delight the feasters, begins to imitate an
 idiot, and in order to present a prime example of folly he comes out 35
 naked into the company covered only with a net, as if someone has
 persuaded him that such a spell has been cast over him that he can be
 perceived by no one. Having thus entered, not a foolish and innocent
 idiot, but a wicked buffoon and shameless debauchee, he labors with

¹⁴² Something of this sort Luther thinks he has now found

¹⁴³ That is, like a fool dancing in a net

¹⁴⁴ Implicitly he touches on Luther's frequent metamorphoses

obscene gestures to arouse a laugh until so
 filthy a show is denounced¹⁴⁵ with curses even
 by the rustics of that hinterland, who publicly mate in their temples,
 while he alone who seeks the laugh is laughing—just as a dog when
 provoked usually laughs—and the rest, 5
 indignant, finally tear off the net and the
 buffoon is thrown out with a beating.¹⁴⁶

This buffoon, I know, would not displease Luther, for one is never
 displeased by one's own appearance, and nothing is so like Luther in
 appearance as a buffoon of this sort, so equally does each play the 10
 buffoon. For the nakedness of this fellow is no more conspicuous than
 that of Luther, whose obscenities the king's book uncovers and un-
 veils so thoroughly that his own book with which he pretends to be
 covered covers him no more than the net covers that other buffoon,
 nor is that fellow's nakedness more shameful nor more shameless than 15
 that of this scoundrel of ours, who, aware that his most disgraceful
 trickery is evident to everyone everywhere and that there is no mortal
 who does not sense that he clearly senses the same thing, nevertheless,
 a most foul buffoon, as though he has persuaded himself that he can be
 observed by no one, so simulates a simpleton, and under the mask of 20
 a simpleton, not at a rustic feast,¹⁴⁷ but in the
 theater of the whole world, not in a trifling
 matter but in a matter of religion and of
 faith, so shamelessly abuses the license of playing the wicked buffoon
 that he clearly proves himself deserving not only that all honorable 25
 men should see to it that he is chastised publicly as a public corrupter
 of honor but also that all buffoons should beat him with rods in the
 marketplace because by playing the buffoon so wickedly he renders
 the class of buffoons hateful for their joking.

¹⁴⁵ This fits you prettily, Luther

¹⁴⁶ So ought Luther to be treated

¹⁴⁷ This, so that his folly may appear more clearly

He shows Luther's mistrust in his cause and his concealment of those arguments he should have answered, together with his stupid and blasphemous slander against blessed Ambrose. Chapter 11.

441

On Transubstantiation

5

Fourthly, when I¹⁴⁸ had proved that it was not necessary to believe that the bread and wine are transubstantiated, the Thomist king rose up against me with two stratagems. Of which the first is the word of Ambrose, the other that Thomistic battering ram which is called: "It must be so." He brings in Ambrose's assertion that nothing remains but the body and the blood after consecration. What, then, should I answer such senseless and silly fools?¹⁴⁹ If I should here ask whether the word of Ambrose is a necessary article of faith, the king will say, "It must be so." If I ask, "Who gave Ambrose the right of establishing articles of faith?" he will say, "It must be so." And the dull-witted blockhead does not see that the word of Ambrose is the kind that devours itself, since it is impossible for nothing but the body and blood to remain after consecration, unless among the Thomists, very subtle men, form, color, cold and other accidents are said to be nothing. For, truly, as these things are not nothing, so we see that they remain, so that here we even palpably feel that Ambrose has openly erred.¹⁵⁰

10

15

20

25

Either no one has ever been conquered, honest reader, or in this case this fellow has certainly been most clearly conquered and has most shamefully fallen, this most impious of heretics, Luther; if he had as much sense of shame as he has nothing at all of mind, shame would have so completely overwhelmed him that he would rather have been ready to hurl himself into the fire than ever happen to mention this article a second time. But that he is ashamed of nothing, reader, recognize even from this: the king has reviewed all this fellow's arguments faithfully and so little does he abbreviate them that he even amplified some of them. But all of them he has solved so clearly¹⁵¹ that not even now has Luther been able to find

30

35

¹⁴⁸ Luther's words

¹⁴⁹ Just what a person as senseless as you would wish—mere insults

¹⁵⁰ And you, can you not see your own crime?

¹⁵¹ But Luther uses a different rhetoric, to lop off something

anything but foolish insults, as you shall see immediately, to bring up in his turn.

Next, he has proved the whole case from the very words of Christ, which, although they are so clear that they do not require explanation, he has yet explained so clearly that if they had been doubtful to anyone before, that person could not doubt them afterwards. Finally, lest he seem to say anything only from his own head,¹⁵² as Luther says everything from his, the king brings forward a large company of the ancient fathers, both very learned and very holy, completely unanimous on the matter; by their testimony he has proved not only that he does not twist a doubtful scripture according to his own whim as Luther usually twists a clear text into its opposite, but that not even in a most clear scripture does he readily trust himself unless he senses that the opinion of good and learned men is in agreement with him.¹⁵³

Indeed, he has at the same time proved this also; namely, that faith in transubstantiation, which Luther wickedly pretends has arisen within the past three hundred years, was the ancient faith of the church more than a thousand years ago. Since, therefore, the prince, as I have said, has clearly proved all these things, Luther, thus prostrate in the mud, goaded by the torture of shame, turned from wrath to raging madness, conceals almost all these things. And, passing over the bones and sinews, he tries to seize on some little piece of soft flesh in one spot or another to gnaw on.¹⁵⁴ And yet he does not find any morsel so tender but it breaks his rotting teeth. As, for instance, that very text from Ambrose, in which case you can behold a conscience marked by extremely desperate boldness, and by double-dealing Lutheran cunning.¹⁵⁵ For he says that the king brings forward only two arguments; namely, Ambrose's statement and the battering ram, as he calls it, of the Thomists: "It must be so."

Tell me, Luther, when the king has brought up so many ancient writers, why do you, who protest that it is a sacrilege for any of your arguments to be passed over and who shamelessly protest this in instances where nothing has been passed over at all, why, I ask, do you here fail to mention all the rest and speak of Ambrose alone? No

¹⁵² Rather than keep quiet about these men, Luther mocks them

¹⁵³ But Luther, on the other hand, sets himself above all others

¹⁵⁴ This he does in his usual manner

¹⁵⁵ Luther's usual cunning

one is so stupid that he does not understand that the agreement of so many men,¹⁵⁶ separated by time and place, who were both learned and holy, has more weight than the saying of a single Ambrose. Why do you, such a great warrior, so certain of victory, in what you pretend is an easy cause, why do you not dare to join combat hand to hand? Why do you seek such shameful subterfuges so that you conceal what is more forceful, what is less forceful call out as though it were the only one with which you should fight? Did you think anyone is so stupid as not to sense that when you handle the matter in this way you are refusing to fight,¹⁵⁷ and that by making a poor camouflage for your extreme desperation you are clearly betraying it?

But come, we will pass over the rest for your sake; let us see meanwhile how cleverly you have refuted this one argument which as though fitting and frail and most easy of conquest you have selected as equal to yourself.

If I should ask, you say,¹⁵⁸ whether the word of Ambrose is a necessary article of faith, the king will say, "It must be so." If I should ask who gave Ambrose the right to establish articles of faith, he will say: "It must be so, it cannot be otherwise."¹⁵⁹

The prince answers neither of these answers, Luther. But if you will ask whether the man who asks such questions talks arrant nonsense, or whether the man who talks such silly nonsense in such a serious matter is a wicked and senseless scoundrel, everyone will answer to both questions: "It must be so, it cannot be otherwise."¹⁶⁰

Now what have you ever read, reader, more buffoonish than that which follows, in which this raging little madman rants against blessed Ambrose, whom he would have us consider so foolish that his word devours itself because it is impossible that nothing remain but the body and the blood?¹⁶¹ Because, of course, the accidents remain, which are not nothing at all. And he concludes from this reasoning that Ambrose errs so plainly in that statement that we may even palpably feel it. Put out your hand once more, feeler extraordinary. Feel Ambrose more carefully; when he says the following,

¹⁵⁶ And so Luther conceals them by silence

¹⁵⁷ So he believed

¹⁵⁸ Luther's words

¹⁵⁹ Do you hear this trickster, reader?

¹⁶⁰ And not undeservedly

¹⁶¹ Clever reasoning, indeed, on Luther's part

“Although the appearance of bread and wine is seen on the altar, yet nothing else must be believed to be there but the flesh and blood of Christ.”¹⁶² Does he say that the accidents have altogether disappeared? If he should say that the accidents have disappeared, how does he say that the appearance of bread and wine remains? Or does he understand the appearance to be the substance? How could he have said more clearly that the accidents remain, the substance is changed, than when he said that those things still remained through which bread and wine seemed to remain, but that nothing at all remained which was either bread or wine?¹⁶³ Or does the species of bread remain only to the sense of sight and does not the same appear likewise to the rest of the senses? Therefore, when he says that bread and wine still appear, does he not clearly say that the accidents remain through which it comes about that bread and wine appear to be present? How, therefore, does our feeler here feel that blessed Ambrose errs? Are the fingers of anyone so numb that he does not feel that this feeler does not err as Isaac erred in his feeling, but that he raves with spiteful slandering, and that the word of Ambrose does not devour itself but that raging madness has devoured the brain of Luther?¹⁶⁴

But suppose, he says,¹⁶⁵ that Ambrose did not wish the bread and wine to remain; I would say: “I permit Ambrose to abound in his own interpretation.” Nor did the holy man wish to bind the conscience of anyone by this word as by an article of faith, since he cannot prove it from scriptures,¹⁶⁶ but as he himself held this opinion freely in this way, so he permitted others to think otherwise, with the exception of the Thomists, whom it is fair to ensnare and harass even by languid dreams as by articles of faith.

How keenly he has solved it, since not from the book of a single Ambrose but from the books of all the other holy men also does it become clear that the public faith of the catholic church (which the scripture testifies to be certain and true and unable to be deceived, even apart from scriptures) has been such for many centuries; since

¹⁶² Ambrose’s words

¹⁶³ Where, Luther, are those words which devour themselves?

¹⁶⁴ How accurate a feeler Luther is

¹⁶⁵ Luther’s words

¹⁶⁶ Why then are you more unfair than Ambrose since you are not at all more certain?

the clear words of Christ also prove the same faith, ought not these arguments to be enough for Luther, who pretends that this faith has arisen within the past three hundred years?¹⁶⁷ Or should not these arguments have force then against Luther because Luther permits Ambrose to abound in his own interpretation, and the same Ambrose revealed only his own interpretation and did not clearly command Luther to believe the same, because he never thought that a heretic would be born so wicked as to drag into doubt that which Christ handed on to the church as undoubted?

He compares and carefully examines the words of the king together with the words of Luther and from the gospels refutes Luther's answer.

Chapter 12.

Now the other argument of the king that it must be so, since, he says, the words of Christ are clear in saying:¹⁶⁸ "This is my body." He does not say, "My body is with this or in this." Here again I reproach not so much the lethargy of the king as his villainy. For the robber so mutilates the words of Christ, and regally leaps over my argument as if he had the right to snatch up the words of God and set them down according to his whim. He himself, according to the crude and asinine philosophy of the Thomists, fits the pronoun "this" to the predicate "my body." Then, as if by this means he had conquered, he soon shouts, "The words are clear: 'This is my body.'" But meanwhile the whole weight with which I was pressing that masked philosophy the subtle sophist passes over in silence.¹⁶⁹ Here I have been arguing throughout the whole disputation that the pronoun "this" cannot be fitted to "my body" in that passage. Nor did I need to do this with such fat pigs as were saying that nothing but the body was there if the pronoun "this" indicates nothing but the body. But although the most corrupt beggar of the initial premise—as is the custom of all sophists—ought first to

¹⁶⁷ Luther's fabrication about the faith

¹⁶⁸ Luther's words. Here are we amazed not so much at your folly as at your boldness

¹⁶⁹ On the contrary, rascal, you are mentally disturbed

show that the pronoun “this” belongs to the predicate and weaken my reasoning, he does none of these things and prattles absurdly that Christ did not say “in this,” or “with this,” but, “This is my body.”¹⁷⁰ Could not I also say by means of this most subtle subtlety of the Thomists: Christ did not say, “The bread is changed substantially into the body,” as you masters of fables pretend? But here the king will have to work, when from the context of the speech I show that the pronoun “this” is fitted to the word “bread”;¹⁷¹ and thus the words clearly signify: “This is my body”; that is, “This bread is body.” For thus the text has it: “He took bread, blessed, broke, and said, ‘This is, etc.’” You see here how all those words, “took,” “blessed,” “broke,” are spoken of the bread. And the pronoun “this” indicates the same thing, because that very thing which He took, blessed, broke, this, I say, is signified as taken, blessed, broken when the statement is made: “This is my body”; it indicates not the predicate but the subject.¹⁷² For he did not take His body and bless and break it, but bread; therefore, He does not indicate the body but the bread. These are clear words which the villainous king conceals, and urges that bare proposition, “This is my body,” and by his own rashness fits the pronoun “this” to “body.”

If there is any passage anywhere, reader, of which sort there are above a thousand which clearly prove that Luther is the most shameless of all mortals, surely this passage teaches it most clearly. He complains that the prince has desecrated the words of Christ, passed over his own arguments; whereas the king quotes the words of Christ exactly from all the evangelists; he recites Luther’s arguments better than Luther does. Moreover, he handles the case in such a way that in this book Luther plainly represents himself as considering his case completely conquered.¹⁷³ He thus leaves the arguments of the king completely untouched; he wrangles over only one or the other crumb of an argument; he presents nothing at all to support his own stumbling arguments. For this reason I will have nothing to do with Luther in this matter; I shall only subjoin certain words from the book of the prince; when the reader compares them with Luther’s answer, he will easily grasp how hopeless a cause Luther maintains,

¹⁷⁰ On the contrary, Luther, he does everything you deny that he does

¹⁷¹ With truly singular proofs

¹⁷² But it is already clear that you poorly grasp your grammar

¹⁷³ How the king passes over the arguments of Luther. Luther himself does that of which he accuses the king

which now, after such pompous boasting, he has finally left so defenseless. The king then says the following:

“He considers as the second captivity¹⁷⁴
 that anyone should be forbidden to believe
 that the true bread and true wine remain after consecration. In this 5
 matter, contrary to what the whole Christian world now believes and
 has believed for many centuries past,
 Luther tries to persuade us that the body
 and blood of Christ are in the eucharist in
 such a way that the substance of true 10
 bread and true wine still remains.¹⁷⁵ I suppose that later on, when he
 chooses, he will be ready to deny the substance of the body and the
 blood, as though he had changed his opinion for the better, just as he
 has done three times already; namely, on the questions of indulgences,
 the power of the pope, and the communion of the laity. At the same 15
 time he pretends that his motive for teaching these doctrines is
 indeed his pity for the captivity by which the people of Israel are
 enslaved to Babylon. Thus, he calls the
 whole church Babylon; he calls the faith of
 the church slavery; and this merciful 20
 fellow offers liberty to all who wish to be separated from the church¹⁷⁶
 and to be corrupted by the contagion of this rotting and lopped-off
 member. But it is worth our while to recognize the reasons for which
 he invites men to this more than slavish liberty. He judges that the
 great and foremost reason is that the divine words must not suffer 25
 any violence either at the hands of men or at the hands of an angel.

But insofar as can be done, he says,¹⁷⁷ they
 should be preserved in the most simple
 signification possible, and unless the context clearly requires it, they
 should not be accepted beyond their grammatical and proper sense, 30
 lest occasion be given to the adversaries for making sport of all
 scripture. But violence is done to the divine words, if we should say
 that what Christ Himself calls bread is
 understood as the accidents of bread and
 what He calls wine is only the appear- 35
 ance of wine.¹⁷⁸ In all ways, then, do the
 true bread and the true wine remain on the altar, lest violence be
 done to the words of Christ, if the appearance is taken for the sub-
 stance. For since the evangelists clearly write that Christ took bread

¹⁷⁴ The king's words

¹⁷⁵ He considers himself captive unless he is permitted to do whatever he pleases

¹⁷⁶ What sort of liberty Luther proposes

¹⁷⁷ Luther's words

¹⁷⁸ But greater violence is done if what He calls His body you through contempt call bread

and blessed it, and the book of Acts and Paul in turn call it bread, it ought to be understood as true bread and as true wine, just as there is understood a true chalice. For not even they say that the chalice is transubstantiated.

“This, then, is Luther’s great and, as 5
 he himself says, foremost reason.¹⁷⁹ I hope to
 cause everyone to grasp as soon as possible
 that it has no great importance. To begin with, however clearly
 the evangelists say what he quotes, it nevertheless proves nothing
 clearly for Luther; on the contrary, they nowhere say anything which 10
 would prove his point. But do they not write, he says, that He took
 bread and blessed it? Well, what follows? That He took bread and
 blessed it, we also confess. But that He gave bread to the disciples
 after He had made it His own body, this we flatly deny, nor do the
 evangelists say it. 15

“That this fact may become clearer, and that there may be less
 opportunity for evading the issue, let us hear the evangelists them-
 selves. Matthew’s account is as follows: ‘And while they were at supper,
 Jesus took bread, and blessed, and broke, and gave it to His disciples,
 and said, “Take and eat; this is my body.” And taking a cup, He 20
 gave thanks and gave it to them, saying, “All of you drink of this; for
 this is my blood of the new covenant, which is being shed for many
 unto the forgiveness of sins.”’ And the words of Mark are these: ‘And
 while they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessing it, He broke,
 and gave it to them, and said, “Take, this is my body.” And taking a 25
 cup and giving thanks, He gave it to them and they all drank of it; and
 He said to them, “This is my blood of the new covenant, which is
 being shed for many.”’ Finally, Luke tells it in this manner: ‘And
 having taken bread, He gave thanks and broke, and gave it to them,
 saying, “This is my body, which is being given for you; do this in 30
 remembrance of me.” In like manner He took also the cup after the
 supper, saying, “This cup is the new covenant in my blood, which
 shall be shed for you.”’

“From all the words of the evangelists, I see no place in which, after
 the consecration, the sacrament is called bread or wine, but only body 35
 and blood. They say that Christ took bread into His hands, a thing
 which all of us also admit; but when the apostles received it, it is not
 called bread but body. Yet Luther tries by his interpretation to twist
 the words of the evangelist to his own advantage. ‘Take. Eat. This

¹⁷⁹ The king’s words. Luther’s argument is weakened

(*hoc*)—that is, this (*hic*) bread (he says) which He had taken and broken—is my body.¹⁸⁰

“But this is the interpretation of Luther, not the words of Christ, nor the sense of His words. If He had handed to His disciples the bread which He took, just as He took it, and had not first turned it into His flesh, and had said while presenting it: ‘Take and eat,’ He would rightly be said to have presented to them what He had taken into His hands, for what He would be presenting to them would be nothing different. But since He changed the bread into flesh before He gave it to the apostles to eat, they now receive not the bread which He had taken up, but His body into which He had changed the bread. Just as if¹⁸¹ someone after taking up a seed were to give another person the flower sprung from that seed, he would not have given that which he had taken up, although the general order of nature would have made the one thing from the other, so, much less did Christ present to the apostles that which He had taken into His hands, since by such a great miracle He had turned the bread taken up into His very own flesh. Unless someone would argue that because Aaron took a rod into his hand and cast a rod from his hand,¹⁸² therefore the substance of the rod had remained together with the serpent or that of the serpent remained when the rod was taken up again. But if the rod could not remain with the serpent, how much less can bread remain with the flesh of Christ, such an incomparable substance?

“As for Luther’s prattling,¹⁸³ or rather babbling that it supports the simplicity of his faith when Christ says of the wine, not, ‘This (*hoc*) is my blood,’ but ‘This (*hic*) is my blood,’ I wonder what the man had in mind when he wrote this. For who does not see that it does not support him at all? Indeed, on the contrary, it would seem rather to have supported him if Christ had said, ‘This (*hoc*) is my blood.’ For Luther would have had at least some excuse for referring the demonstrative article to the wine.¹⁸⁴ But as it is, although wine is of the neuter gender, yet Christ did not say, ‘This (*hoc*),’ but ‘This (*hic*) is my blood’; and although bread is of the masculine gender, He said after all, ‘This (*hoc*) is my body,’ not ‘This

¹⁸⁰ The quibbling interpretation of Luther

¹⁸¹ A choice comparison

¹⁸² An effective comparison

¹⁸³ Luther’s trifling prattling is mocked

¹⁸⁴ Luther’s argument about the article is turned back on him

(*hic*); so that each article shows that Christ was setting before them neither bread nor wine but His very own body and blood.

“As for Luther’s wishing it to appear that the pronoun ‘this (*hoc*)’ refers to the body not according to the intention of Christ but by reason of the languages, that is Greek and Latin, and so sends us back to the Hebrew, is this not ridiculous? If the Hebrew language does not have the neuter gender, it cannot so clearly declare to which article Christ referred as can Latin or Greek. For in the Hebrew language, if the article had been masculine, as though He were saying, ‘This (*hic*) is my body,’ the matter would still be left ambiguous because that expression could have seemed forced by the exigency of a language that has no neuter. But since ‘bread’ and ‘body’ are of different genders among the Latins, the one who translated the article from the Greek would have joined it to ‘bread,’ had he not discerned from the text of the evangelist that reference was made to the body. Moreover, since Luther admits that there is the same distinction of gender among the Greeks, he could easily have known that the evangelists who wrote in Greek would have set down the article which referred to the bread except that, knowing the mind of the Lord, they wished to remind Christians by the article referring to the body that Christ did not give the disciples bread in communion, but His body.

“Therefore, whereas Luther interprets to his own advantage Christ’s words, ‘Take and eat, this is my body,’ that is, this bread which He had taken up; not I but Christ Himself teaches that His words are to be understood in a contrary sense; namely, that this which He was presenting to them was not, as it seemed to them, bread, but His very own body—if the evangelists accurately record the words of Christ. For otherwise He could have said, not ‘This (*hoc*)’—which would be explained, ‘that is “this (*hic*)”’—but rather, clearly, ‘This (*hic*) bread is my body’; by which manner of expression He would be teaching the disciples what Luther is now teaching the church; namely, that in the eucharist the body of Christ and the bread are equally present. But now He has spoken in such a way as to show clearly that only the body is present, not the bread.

“Now as for Luther’s so pompously¹⁸⁵ applying to his own advantage the fact that Christ speaks also about the chalice, which no one says was transubstantiated, I am amazed that the man is not ashamed of such

¹⁸⁵ Luther’s silliest argument

unrestrained folly. When Christ says, ‘This is the chalice of the new covenant in my blood,’ what is He doing for Luther? What else does He indicate but that what He was setting before the disciples in the chalice was His own blood? Will Luther show us from these words of Christ that the substance of wine remains because Christ speaks of the blood? Or that wine cannot be changed into blood because the chalice still remains? I wish Luther had chosen for himself a prelude from some other theme, on which he could have played with less danger. For when he so thoroughly excuses the Bohemians and Greeks from heresy as to proclaim all Romans heretics, Luther shows himself a much worse heretic, who not only rejects the faith which the whole church believes but also persuades men to believe worse things than either the Greeks or the Bohemians ever believed.”

What are you saying, Luther?¹⁸⁶ What questions do you believe your reader will be hurling at you the whole time he reads this? Do you not think he will wonder at and loathe your shamelessness? You said that the king regally leaped over your arguments, but the reader sees that here, like a buffoon, you lie grievously. You said that the king lops off words of Christ, but the reader judges you worthy to have your most deceitful tongue cut out and your blockhead lopped off. You said that the king presents nothing but, “It must be so,” but the reader sees that the king has so truly dissolved your arguments that you have nothing with which you can defend yourself.

Moreover, in order most basely to conceal your flight,¹⁸⁷ you select from so many arguments a part of one argument, and even that, insofar as you can, you distort; not even so do you escape it, but, nowhere safe, you run fearfully here and there as men in flight usually do. He should, you say, have shown that the pronoun “this” pertains to the body, as if everyone does not see that he has done this by the clearest arguments and also illustrated it with examples about the seed and the flower born from it, about the rod and the serpent made from it. With these he has clearly destroyed that defensive argument of yours from the context.¹⁸⁸ And yet, concealing those arguments, you return again with the same argument from the context: “He took bread, He blessed, He broke, and said, ‘This—that is, this bread—is

¹⁸⁶ Catalogue of Luther’s lies against the king

¹⁸⁷ Luther’s evasion

¹⁸⁸ The king’s proofs of that which Luther denies

my body.’” But meanwhile, concerning the answer of the king, not a word; concerning those examples, deep silence.

463

You see here, you say,¹⁸⁹ how all those words, “He took, blessed, and broke,” are said of the bread. And the pronoun “this (*hoc*)” designates the same thing, because that very thing which He took, blessed, and broke, this I say, is signified as taken, and blessed, and broken; when the words, “This is my body,” are said, it indicates not the predicate but the subject.¹⁹⁰ For He did not take, bless, and break His own body. Therefore He does not indicate the body but the bread. These are clear words, he says, which the villainous king conceals. 5 10

But what the king has answered to these words, and with what clear reasoning he has solved such a clearly silly sophism, this the villainous Luther conceals. And, as though he had closed the eyes of everyone so that no one could read it, he thus again most foolishly tosses out the same fallacy, again setting before our eyes and proclaiming subject and predicate and making us a long chain from ice:¹⁹¹ It was bread which He took, therefore it was bread which He blessed; it was bread which He blessed, therefore it was bread which He broke; it was bread which He broke, therefore it was bread which He gave to the disciples. Thus, Luther, you usually snore with a wakeful nose, so that you pretend you do not understand when the king broke this fragile chain of yours for you, denying that Christ gave what He had taken into His hands after He had changed what He took into something different, as that example of the flower born from the seed very beautifully proves. This example you have not dared to touch. But if this remarkable chain of yours would hold, then the rod of Aaron was neither turned from a rod into a serpent, nor from a serpent back into a rod, if we proceed to play the sophist as follows:¹⁹² Aaron cast down what he took into his hands; but he took up a rod; therefore he cast down a rod. Next, what he cast down lay before Pharaoh; but he cast down nothing but a rod; therefore nothing but a rod lay before Pharaoh. Or, if you wish it to have been at the same time both rod and serpent, one will at least be able to make the inference in the same manner: What lay on the ground Aaron took up and carried back 15 20 25 30 35

¹⁸⁹ Luther’s words

¹⁹⁰ O delightful interpreter

¹⁹¹ A recapitulation of the Lutheran argument

¹⁹² That the argument of Luther detracts from evident scriptures

with him; but a serpent lay on the ground; therefore he took up a serpent from the ground and carried a serpent back home. Indeed, by the same sophistry you will prove to us that Eve was always a rib, if any one allows this kind of sophism: What God took from the side of Adam He joined to Adam as wife; but He took a rib from his side; therefore He gave him a rib as wife. But if anyone should laugh at this sophism of yours, here, serious as usual, you will return raging mad with the same argument and you will try to gain your point by railing, exclaiming:¹⁹³ “You asses, did not God take a rib from Adam and fashion it into a woman and bring it to Adam and give it to him for a wife? Was it not then a rib which He took from Adam? And did He not fashion that which He took? And did He not present to Adam the same thing that He fashioned? And did He not join to him the same thing that He presented to him? Therefore, from first to last: He took a rib from Adam; therefore He joined a rib to Adam.” Now if anyone should dare to unfold the mystery of this sophism and say that God did not present a rib which He fashioned into a woman,¹⁹⁴ but a woman whom He fashioned from a rib, as the king answers that Christ gave to the disciples not the bread which He had taken but the body which He had made from the bread, the reverend father will ridicule this man ridiculously and will deny that his argument has been well solved, or that any answer at all has been given except, “It must be so.”¹⁹⁵ Nor, meanwhile, will he utter a word about these arguments with which he is so clearly refuted.

For I ask you, Luther, by your folly: Why have you not dared to take up again that brilliant argument of yours about the article? I believe indeed that all your joints, hand and foot, have caught the gout from the chill reception of that one article, which, when I compared your *Babylon* with the king’s answer, I found that you had so stupidly handled that not even a madman could have handled it more madly, that the king had handled it against you in such a way that he rendered mortal that one wound with which you yourself had wounded your cause, and with that one wound he annihilated your whole heresy, even had he added nothing further.¹⁹⁶ And so I am less surprised if pain has not allowed you to scratch open again

¹⁹³ Luther’s Cynic practice

¹⁹⁴ Your argument means this, Luther

¹⁹⁵ There is no need to touch that wound

¹⁹⁶ That fellow is almost learning to be eloquent

such a deadly wound inflicted on yourself by your folly; or, by the same token, that argument about the untransubstantiated cup which you clearly hit upon when you were too deep in your cups. Now, where you are ashamed of those arguments, it is enough to pass over them all in silence and to shout that nothing else has been presented against you but, “It must be so; the words are clear and evident.” 5

For this is, you say,¹⁹⁷ the distinctive mark of Thomistic wisdom, that, having been asked the reason for this article of faith—although he knows that no article is admitted by me unless it is supported by evident scriptures—he himself nevertheless presents nothing else but, “It must be so; the words are clear and evident.” But who is such a mad grammarian that from the expression,¹⁹⁸ “This is my body,” he would understand or infer that what is bread is transubstantiated into flesh, unless it be the dregs of Thomists who have untaught us even grammar? 15

I have no doubt, Luther,¹⁹⁹ however shameless you may be, that you are still sweating plenty here when in your own mind you perceive what your readers think of you as you so stupidly conceal all the things which everyone sees that you see. As for your asking, “Who is such a mad grammarian?” we leave this question for you to ask, Luther, who are constantly involved with mad grammarians who embellish your mad and ungrammared heresies with their own mad grammar. But those who understand those words as some understand them, you, twice mad, call madmen; I say they are all the most learned and most saintly of the ancients. Of these the king has brought up to you many who declare that the bread does not remain but is turned into flesh,²⁰⁰ men born so many centuries not only before the Thomists but also before Thomas, men whom you shamelessly pretend have not been mentioned by the king so that you may more boldly blaspheme them and, yourself a madman, call them madmen. 20

Indeed our distinguished King Henry,²⁰¹ with a Thomistic trick, has even dared to demand of me that I prove that transubstantiation does not take place; clearly a very silly Thomist, he needs to be taught even the elements 25

¹⁹⁷ Luther’s words

¹⁹⁸ But not even all of them

¹⁹⁹ Whoever has untaught you, you clearly seem to be ignorant of grammar

²⁰⁰ Thus the scoundrel considers nothing sacred

²⁰¹ Luther’s words

of disputation, for when he is supposed to prove the affirmative, he demands that his adversary prove the negative. Let us send these learned men to the heretics and to the Turk²⁰² to defend our faith in such a way that it is not necessary to supply a reason for the faith but only to say, "Prove the negative."

5

See again, reader, the Lutheric stratagem; that is, his utterly stupid shamelessness. The reverend father should have cited the words by which he says the prince demanded that he prove that transubstantiation does not take place. For, since Luther knows that he has been discovered by everyone to be an utter liar, he could have known that no one would be ready to believe anything from him except insofar as he proved what he said. Now, indeed, when the readers see that the king demands no such thing but that he has proven clearer than light what he should have proved, they will readily ridicule and reject this stupid trick of Luther's, together with other deceptions by the same father.

10

15

But I divine what he means. After he sees those arguments dissolved which he has advanced against the public faith and has nothing further at all by which he can now defend such stupid statements, desiring to be freed from the necessity of a debate, he so interprets things as though to demand from him that he give a reason why he defends an impious heresy against such steadfast, such unbroken faith of the whole church, confirmed by the clearest words of the gospel, as though, in fine, to demand this were to demand that he prove the negative. And this is the singular stratagem²⁰³ by which the reverend father hopes to swerve aside and flee so that he cannot be caught by the slow and lumbering Thomists.

20

25

30

²⁰² Have you been so taught, doctor, that you do not know who should prove what? Learn here, Luther, your function

²⁰³ Luther's stratagem

He shows how stupidly Luther tries to refute
the explanation with which the prince answers
those passages which Luther cites from the
apostle to prove that the eucharist is true
bread. Chapter 13.

5

But up to this point our kingly Thomist
has philosophized.²⁰⁴ Now it is worth seeing
how Thomistically he theologizes against my reasons. When against
that Thomistic article of faith I had cast that heavenly thunderbolt of
Paul's words in Cor. 12, where he so clearly calls this sacrament bread
that neither the ignorance of the king nor the wickedness of the
Thomist could find any escape through lying or raillery, since the
words of Paul stand clearer than light: "The bread which we break,
is it not the sharing of the body of the Lord?" He does not say, "the
body which we break," he does not say "the nothing left from conse-
cration which we break," or, "the accidents which we break," but,
"the bread which we break," surely already blessed and consecrated.
This blessed bread therefore is the sharing
of the body of the Lord, etc.²⁰⁵ Similarly,
I Cor. 2: "He who eats this bread, etc."
The good and agreeable Thomist, pre-
sented nothing either from scripture or
from reason but on his bare assertion, "It must be so," says that the
holy scripture usually refers in this way to that which has been or to
that which is similar, as in Ex. 7: "The rod of Aaron swallowed the
rods of the magicians"; that is, the serpent which up till then was the
rod of Aaron. Thus his argument runs.

10

15

20

25

See, reader, how our good and agreeable friarly Satanist says that
the king presents no text of scripture to prove that scripture at times
calls a thing, not that which it is, but that which it has been previ-
ously. And yet our same good and agreeable friarly Luther presents
and cites that scriptural text which the king has presented to prove the
point, and he presents it in the very same passage in which he denies
that the king has presented any text, and thus the reverend father,
never inconsistent, says at one and the same time, "The king presents
a scriptural text to prove this point," and,²⁰⁶
"He presents no scriptural text." Or is it

30

35

²⁰⁴ Luther's words

²⁰⁵ How Luther understands the sacred scriptures. Please notice, reader, what Luther reckons as a fault

²⁰⁶ Luther's art of disputing

not sacred scripture because it is in Exodus? Or does the king not present it to prove his point because the reverend father cannot disentangle himself while he turns and twists violently to prove that through that scriptural text the king does not satisfactorily prove his point? But in this passage, reader, lest we seem to be either withholding or forging anything, just as we have reported Luther's words, so also we subjoin the king's words.

5

“Up till now I have argued²⁰⁷ these points only to show from the words of Christ

Himself and of the evangelists that what he boasts that he shows cannot be shown; on the contrary, indeed, it is transparently clear that the bread is not in the eucharist.

10

“As for his saying that in the Acts of the Apostles the eucharist is called bread, I wish he had quoted the passage; I find none that is not ambiguous and that does not seem rather to speak of the common meal than of the sacrament. Yet I admit that the apostle more than once calls it bread, either following the scriptural manner of speaking which usually calls a thing not that which it is but that which it had been before, as when it says, ‘The rod of Aaron swallowed the rods of the magicians,’ which nevertheless were then not rods but serpents; or perchance content to call the eucharist that which it appeared to be, considering it sufficient to nourish with milk a people still young in the faith, and not at first to require anything else than that they believe that the body of Christ is somehow present in the sacrament, being ready afterwards to feed them gradually with more solid food when they had grown up in the Lord. The same thing could have occurred in the Acts of the Apostles, where blessed Peter also, addressing the people and initiating them into the faith of Christ, did not yet dare to say anything openly about Christ's divinity; thus, they did not rashly set forth mysteries hidden and difficult for the people. But Christ did not hesitate at the very moment of instituting the sacrament to teach His apostles whom He had so long formed by His teaching that the substance of bread and wine no longer remain but that while the appearance of both remain, yet both of them, the bread and the wine, have been changed into His own body and blood. This He taught so plainly that it is quite astonishing that anyone has afterwards arisen to call into question again such an evident matter.

15

20

25

30

35

“For how could He have more clearly said that nothing of the

²⁰⁷ The king's words

bread remains there than when He said,
 ‘This is my body?’ He did not say,²⁰⁸ ‘In this
 is my body,’ or ‘With this which you see is
 my body,’ as though it existed in or together with the bread, but He
 said, ‘This is my body,’ unquestionably declaring manifestly, in order
 to stop the mouth of every grumbler, that what He was presenting to
 them was entirely His body. Even if He had called by the name of
 bread what He thus presented to the apostles—which He did not do
 —nevertheless, since at the same time He reminded His hearers that
 the very thing which He was calling bread was nothing else than His
 own body into which the bread had been entirely converted by His
 own action of changing it, no one could have doubted what Christ
 wished us to understand by the designation, ‘bread,’ and for that
 reason the context itself—for Luther admits
 the argument from the context²⁰⁹—declares
 clearly that the word ‘bread,’ when the
 bread is changed into flesh, signifies without any violence done to the
 divine word the appearance, not the substance, of bread. Unless
 Luther sticks so closely to the literal
 meaning of the words as to believe that
 Christ was also in heaven as wheatbread or barleybread²¹⁰ because He
 says of Himself, ‘I am the bread which has come down from heaven’;
 or that He is a vine laden with real grapes because He said ‘I am the
 true vine and my father is the vinedresser’; or finally that the elect are
 to be rewarded in heaven with bodily pleasure because Christ said, ‘I
 arrange for you as my father has arranged for me a kingdom that you
 may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom.’ ”

Now judge, reader, how cogent an argument Luther takes from
 Paul, when the evangelists prove that bread is changed into flesh.
 What does Luther present to show that what is now not bread is not
 termed bread by Paul in the same way as in Exodus something was
 called a rod which nevertheless was not a rod but a serpent? But how
 sorely it galls the reverend father that he does not know how to untie
 this knot is well manifested by the reverend
 father’s wrath, with which, just as whores,²¹¹
 when something is brought up against
 them which they cannot refute by any reasoning, usually answer
 shamelessly, “You lie,” so the venerable father, driven into this tight

²⁰⁸ Opposition to Luther from the very words of Christ

²⁰⁹ Argument against Luther from the context

²¹⁰ A witty mocking of Luther

²¹¹ Luther’s whorish way of answering

spot from which he sees no way out, takes up his arms in his defense and strives to force a way out for himself by railing.

477

You lie, he says,²¹² against your own head,
you stupid and sacrilegious king, who
have dared with brazen face to assign a meaning to the infallible words
of God so that they say something different from what they signify. 5
What a wide window for blaspheming, pray tell, has this raging
madness of the king opened to all the heretics and enemies of the
faith, if it is once admitted that the authority of scripture relies on
slippery and deceptive words? What then will not all teachers of all 10
doctrines be able to approve, disapprove, uphold and defend? How
much more rightly did Saint Augustine
wish to accept in sacred writings not even
a jocose or obliging lie.²¹³

O sage and saintly father Luther, and sole miracle of the world, a 15
knave innocent of lying, who fears with unfeigned maidenly modesty
to assign a meaning to the infallible words of God so that they say
something different from what they signify, especially so clearly
contrary to the practice and example of Christ, every single one of
whose parables signifies nothing other than it says. And who does not 20
see how wide a window for blaspheming the king has opened to all
heretics and enemies of the faith once it is admitted that the authority
of scripture relies on slippery and deceptive words? What will not the
most mischievous master of every evil doctrine then be able to
approve, disapprove, uphold and defend? For example, if the 25
scripture would—as it often does—refer to
the corpse of a dead man as a “man,”²¹⁴ then
Luther, who denies purgatory, would form
his argument as follows: “Every soul dies with the body; therefore,
there is no purgatory,” and—he is such a sharp one—he would 30
prove his premise in this way: “He who is dead is still a man; but
man is nothing but a certain composite of soul and body; therefore, a
dead man is composed of a soul and a body, both of them dead.”
Now, if anyone should answer him that scripture, when it refers to a 35
corpse as a “man,” is speaking in a popular manner and does not refer
to that which now is but to that which before was, then immediately
the reverend father would be in a rage and with devout zeal would cry
out vehemently: “You lie stupidly and sacrilegiously, who with brazen
face have dared to attribute a meaning to the infallible words of God

²¹² Luther’s words

²¹³ Why then do you always lie seriously?

²¹⁴ Luther’s implicit, even if not explicit, line of reasoning

so that they say something different than they signify. The words say that a corpse is a man; therefore, they truly signify the same thing, and so the soul is also dead and so my heresy stands unconquered: that there is no purgatory”; and so through this window which the king opens, reverend friar Luther and similar heretics who are shrewd sophists would leap headlong to hell; and therefore Augustine did not wish to accept in the sacred writings either a jocose or an obliging lie. For of course that man lies who in his discourse uses the same figures which the people use.

5

But suppose²¹⁵ that the Thomistic king would not consider his creator worthy of such great honor as to render his own understanding captive to his creator’s words and admit that he does not know how a rod has swallowed a rod rather than rashly pervert the rods. Suppose it is true that the serpent which has been a rod is called a rod.²¹⁶ By what consequence will it follow that here also something is called bread which is not but has been bread? Or is this procedure which is found in one passage to be applied without scriptural authority to every passage of scripture? Of course, relying on this Thomistic wisdom, you will argue thus: “Scripture says in one place that a virgin is a mother;²¹⁷ therefore, many other virgins also must be mothers, although scripture says nothing of them”; just as he argues here that bread must not be bread because a rod is not a rod.

10

15

20

25

How fast this skin of the serpent into which the rod of Aaron was turned sticks to Luther’s rotten teeth is plainly shown even by the fact that, though seeking so solicitously with so many solutions, he cannot find any which is not completely absurd. First of all he wishes that what was turned into a serpent be still a rod; he is ready by the same reasoning to cause the serpent also to remain a serpent when it is turned into a rod again; then also, if the scripture there calls something a rod that is not but has been a rod, still the prince has presented that example to no avail, because we are not compelled to believe from one passage that the scripture speaks in the same manner in all passages.

30

35

What cannot the reverend friar easily solve if to solve is to pretend

²¹⁵ Luther’s words

²¹⁶ But you prefer to pervert everything rather than appear not to know

²¹⁷ No, but the scripture in one place says a virgin is a mother; therefore, a virgin is a mother

that he does not understand what he ought to solve? For he will have the king seem to speak in this manner: “Because scripture at times speaks thus, therefore scripture always speaks thus,” as though he were urging against Luther from one or the other passage of scripture which calls the body of Christ “bread” that it is of necessity truly bread because it was called bread in that passage. It was not enough for the king to prove from another passage that this does not necessarily follow because it is not continually characteristic of scripture to call a thing what it most truly is, but at times scripture calls a thing, according to human custom, that which the thing seems to be or that which it was shortly before, as scripture called the rod of Aaron a rod although it was at that time a serpent, not a rod; and scripture at times designates as “a man” that which is not a man but a corpse, at times perchance that which is a painting or a statue.

Although the king, then, proves only that the text of Paul calling the sacrament “bread” does not necessarily imply that it truly is bread, Luther handles the matter as though the king wished to prove from that passage that it is not bread,²¹⁸ whereas the king does not prove that fact from Paul but from the gospel, at the same time proving that the words of Paul do not prove the contrary, a result which abundantly satisfies the intention of the king. And although the reverend friar easily senses that this silly skulduggery of his is obvious to everyone, nevertheless, as though no one could understand such a shrewd stratagem, he congratulates himself on it exceedingly for almost two pages. And finally, as though with the sharpest sting, he pricks the king at the end.

The king, he says,²¹⁹ blathers: “The rod is called a rod, and yet it is not; therefore, Paul calls bread that which is not bread”; as though bread and a rod were the same thing.

And then, after such a great victory, the boastful friar gloats:

What abysses, he says,²²⁰ Satan would let overflow into the church after the sophists, admitted into the teachers’ chairs, began to use this form of teaching and disputing.

²¹⁸ That Luther, whether by malice or by ignorance, has misinterpreted the king’s words

²¹⁹ Luther’s words

²²⁰ Who disputes this way, except you?

I ask you, reader, what idiot would not ridicule an idiot letting himself get so ridiculously worked up with such violent ranting, because someone says that Paul called “bread” that which was previously bread, although it is now not bread but flesh, in the same manner of speech and with the same figure of speech as the scripture called a rod that which was not then a rod but a serpent. But this, as something supremely ridiculous, the ridiculous fellow ridicules. 5

Therefore if you should say, reader, that the corpse of an ass can be called an ass just as the corpse of a man can be called a man, with what loud laughter will Luther ridicule you and deny that a similar figure of speech can be admitted because the things themselves are of dissimilar form. Because, he says, man and ass are not the same thing, just as bread and a rod are not the same.²²¹ What if, when the reverend father argues with me, “Man and an ass are not the same thing,” we should solve the argument thus: “I grant this about some ass and some man, but I answer that the fellow who thinks himself sane when he argues in this way is altogether the same as an ass; and thus the cadaver of that ass can be called an ass, just as the cadaver of that man can be called a man, since that asinine man and cadaverous ass are altogether the same”? 10 15 20

But the king, he says,²²² shows still another skill of his in this matter, so that nothing but a Thomist can be believed. “If,” he says, “Luther seizes on the words of scripture so strictly, he will say also that Christ is wheat bread in heaven when He says, ‘I am the bread which has come down from heaven.’ Likewise a natural vine when He says, ‘I am the true vine.’” I have said before that nothing is born under the sun more dense and silly than the Thomistic monsters. For what boy would not ridicule this raving king?²²³ He has neither the sense nor the alertness to see what is the difference between his own dreams and these words of Christ. For the very context of the words, the absurdity of the matters, the conflicting understandings, finally his own interpretation force the conclusion that Christ is speaking of spiritual bread, as He says, “My words are spirit and life”; of these there is no mention in the text of Paul when he speaks of the bread of the sacrament.²²⁴ Indeed, everything urges that Paul be understood to be speaking of wheat bread. 25 30 35 40

²²¹ Will you argue thus from similarity, Luther?

²²² Luther’s words

²²³ You laugh because you can do nothing else

²²⁴ Add a cup of beer too, Father

See another skill of Luther's, reader, and of such a kind that nothing but a potist can be believed, nor is there anything born under the sun more dense and silly than the potistic monsters. For since he had earlier stammered drunkenly that the words of scripture must not be taken except in a literal and grammatical sense, the king made sport of his singular folly because the consequence of this rule would be that Christ is wheat bread in heaven, and a vine loaded with grapes, and the saints would one day eat and drink in the kingdom of God. Now the honored Luther, chagrined that his folly has been thus attacked, laughs very wrathfully, and the reverend father, in accord with his reverence, plays the buffoon very waggishly, expecting his buffoonery to be strong enough to support a solution which otherwise, by itself, would have as much force as a gnat. For, whereas he says that it is sufficiently clear from the context how Christ wished His calling Himself bread and a vine to be understood, the king has thus proved—a thing which Luther deplores and conceals²²⁵—that it is clear from the context how Paul understands the bread in the sacrament since he openly shows that the body of Christ has been made from that bread; unless the scripture does not sufficiently manifest how it understands the word “rod” in Exodus, when it earlier narrated that the rod was changed from a rod into a snake. For that snake, still a dead-drunk potist who dreams with his eyes open and, while he distinguishes and—so he thinks—keenly discriminates everything, does not know the difference between groin and head.

And I am amazed, he says,²²⁶ at this most wise Thomist, why he does not also transubstantiate the accidents.

And shortly after, the rascal again mocks Ambrose, then asks:

What need is there for destroying the substance and preserving the accidents?

There is no need for you to ask of the king why he does not transubstantiate the accidents.²²⁷ You should ask this of God, for He, not the king, transubstantiates the substance; and the king believes that God has changed the substance of bread, leaving the accidents, because the same God who has done it teaches His church

²²⁵ Luther's chagrin

²²⁶ Luther's words

²²⁷ Heretics usually ask such questions when they are stuck

that it is so done, He who teaches both interiorly and exteriorly, with the words of the gospel agreeing with His secret inspiration that His own body is made from the bread; that is, the substance of the bread is turned into the substance of the body. But if the words, which are most clear, had any ambiguity, even indeed if they seemed rather to incline somewhat to the opposite meaning, nevertheless, since Christ promised that He would teach His church through the Holy Spirit and that He would be with her even to the consummation of the world, and since the king has proved to you by the testimony of so many ancient and recent men that this faith in transubstantiation is not,²²⁸ as you pretend, new but the uninterrupted faith of the whole church from the time of Christ's passion, who does not see either that Christ has abandoned His church through so many centuries—that is, that Truth has made false promises or the Spirit of truth has taught false doctrine—or that you are a most arrogant rascal who, in the matter of how scripture should be understood, order the whole world to believe your folly rather than God who inspired the writers of scripture, and are not ready to believe Him that the substance has been changed unless He gives you a reason for not transubstantiating the accidents? That is, you will not trust God unless He deals with you in such a way that the matter becomes plain and faith is taken away. For Christ can seem to have left the accidents so that the mystery of His body might be more concealed, lest either the manifestation of reality would take away the merit of faith, or the people, fearing to eat, would not receive the fruit of the sacrament.

But this also is a very neat deception of Luther that when the prince says that the substance of bread is unworthy to be mixed with that substance which created all substances, then Luther struts about on his field of battle, talks nonsense, plays the buffoon, jeers, as though the king had presented that probability which he said in passing in place of a demonstrative proof. Then he bawls and shouts that the king is a three-fold heretic because he says that bread is unworthy to be mingled with that substance which established all substances.²²⁹ For here he wishes it to appear that the prince is so ignorant as to think that the body is not a creature but the creator. And although the reverend friar everywhere aspires to appear wonderfully wise, here he suddenly takes pains to appear so stupid

²²⁸ That Luther lies about faith in transubstantiation

²²⁹ For Luther will not stick even at mixing it with shit

that he has not understood the prince to speak as he does because of the divinity of Christ, which through concomitance, as they call it, is ever present in the body; nor has the simple fellow grasped that through the mutual sharing of properties men everywhere speak in this way about Christ, so that they say a man is creator and eternal and they say in turn that God was born and died.

5

I pass over²³⁰ here his most rhetorical contempt when I applied two very cogent analogies about fiery iron and about God incarnate, where it is not necessary either for the iron to yield to the fire or man to the divinity. For even if it is not necessary for me to defend my position, nevertheless I shall have given the defender enough trouble if I shall have shown that his fabrication can be considered otherwise. And so I can say that the body of Christ is in the sacrament without destroying the bread just as fire is in iron without destroying the substance of the iron, and as God is in man without destroying human nature; in each case the substances are so mingled that each one retains its own proper operation and nature and yet they constitute a single entity.

10

15

Here you pretend that the king has concealed those analogies of yours by silence, but whoever reads the book of the prince will see that you conceal the prince's answer;²³¹ although your analogies are so unlike the truth that they were not worth answering at all. For first of all, concerning the iron and the fire which you brought up, see how neatly you fit them together. Either fire is, as some have thought, a quality consisting of an extraordinary degree of heat in the iron, or it is an accumulation within the pores of the iron. If it is the first, it is not at all like the body of Christ, which is not a quality; if the second, not even so does your analogy fit at all. For, as the prince shrewdly noted, Christ did not say, "In this is my body," or "Together with this," as fire is in iron, but He said simply, "This is my body." Nor is that iron fire, but fired. But that which Christ presented was the body of Christ, if we believe Christ; if we believe you, it will not be the body of Christ but bread—if we may say so—Christ-bodied, just as your iron is not fire but iron fired.²³² O iron head, and forehead worthy to have a fired iron brand it with tall letters. But if you wish the body of Christ to be with the bread as a glorified body is or can be with a different body, or as the soul is with the body, nevertheless you

20

25

30

35

²³⁰ Luther's words

²³¹ Luther's analogies are not analogous

²³² Luther worthy of a brand

will stick in the same mud. For he will not speak correctly who says that the body is a soul rather than ensouled, nor he who says, “This body, namely a stone, is this glorified body, namely the body of Christ now entering through a marble wall though the doors are closed,” rather than, “In this stone or with this stone is this body of Christ.” But Christ, in order to show that this analogy of yours is not analogous, did not say, “in this,” or “with this,” but He said, “This is my body.”

5

Next, your other analogy regarding God incarnate is not only absurd but also

impious and sacrilegious,²³³ so that from it

10

follows what the very wise prince detected: that just as God assumed human nature, so God and man would assume bread and wine into the unity of a supposite, so that God, who never leaves what He has

once assumed, now would continuously assume into the unity of a supposite so many pieces of bread, so many cups which He would as

15

quickly abandon, for the analogy does not otherwise fit, that bread is with the body of Christ as God is present with man. Thus God allows heretics to be rolled along, and carried headlong by madness, so that they rush into folly and into deluded madness. And now, after you see

20

proven for you that Paul’s interpretation proves nothing for you and that he does not refer to bread in the way that you argue, since you see like figures of speech cited from sacred scripture; since you see that the gospel clearly proves the opposite of your argument; since no one

doubts that Paul’s interpretation harmonizes with the gospel; since you see that all the holy fathers, all the leaders of the faith, absolutely

25

all the faithful from the time of Christ’s passion through so many centuries bear unanimous witness against you; since you yourself are forced to admit that the faith of the whole church cannot be deceived; finally, since you clearly see yourself most shamefully conquered;

now, gnashing your teeth in fury and snarling and all the while laughing a Sardonian laugh, you trumpet yourself as victor and shout that you now consider this article excellently confirmed; and,

30

to show that in your usual manner you are rendered worse by the good work of others, you add in an excess of raging madness:

Earlier I set down²³⁴ that it made no difference whether you had this opinion on transubstantiation or that. But now I decree that it is impious and blasphemous if anyone says that the bread is transubstantiated.

35

²³³ Luther’s other analogy equally absurd

²³⁴ Luther’s words. Here he now charges himself with inconsistency

This is said, as you know, not only by Christian people everywhere today, but also by Eusebius, Gregory, Cyril, Jerome, Augustine, Ambrose, and almost anyone who has ever been noted in the church of Christ for his learning and sanctity. These men you, impious and blasphemous tosspot, dare to call impious and blasphemous. But you on earth thus impiously blaspheme the saints of God just as the damned in hell blaspheme God Himself. But so that all may see with what raging madness of your pride you have been thrust into this abyss of hopeless perdition, so that you have changed yourself from bad to worst, I will subjoin the words of the king; although you could have been raised up by them, your pride has thrust you to the depths.

“I wonder²³⁵ what profit Luther promises the people from this teaching. Is it, as he himself says, that no one should consider himself a heretic for thus agreeing with Luther? But Luther himself admits that there is no danger if someone judges in this matter what the whole church now judges. But the whole church, on the other hand, considers as a heretic him who agrees with Luther. Luther ought not, then, to encourage anyone whose good he has at heart to agree with himself whose judgment the whole church condemns, but he ought to persuade those he loves to join those whom he himself judges to be involved in no danger.

“This way of Luther, therefore, is a false way contrary to the public faith, not only of this age but even of all ages; nor does he free from captivity those who believe in him, but leading them out of the liberty of the faith, that is from a safe place, as Luther himself admits, he takes them captive, leading them into error, into a steep place, and into trackless, uncertain, doubtful ways, and thus ways full of danger; and he who loves danger will perish in it.”

Please tell me, reader, is not this the mark of extreme madness: that, although Luther himself admits that all of us who obey the catholic church pursue a safer way, as the king has shown from Luther’s own words, he nevertheless dares to represent as execrable and as destined to destruction anyone who will not join up with his triply execrable heresy. For while we would grant him that he does not have the worst opinion in regard to both public religion and the salvation of all Christians, nevertheless it could justly be called signal folly to seize on an uncertain hope in place of a certain reward, and to leap out of that way by which so many holy men have undoubtedly

²³⁵ The king’s words

arrived at the place where he himself has not dared with enough
 certainty to promise that he would lead us if we should wish to follow
 him. Now therefore, since it is clear to everyone, except to one who
 like him is blinded by cataracts, that he is heading for certain and
 manifest destruction and that he is dragging along those who follow 5
 him, so that he may gain a name for himself at the cost of the life of
 others, what man who loves his own soul would not reject and use
 every effort to destroy such a leader lest he could at some time be led
 astray by him unawares? But now hear again how pompously
 meanwhile he yet curses all those who do not wish for the sake of a 10
 little glory for him to hurl themselves knowingly into the abyss.

Being about to attack Luther's stupid sophism,
 arguing that the mass is not a good work, he
 first of all reveals and refutes the fellow's
 deceitful folly by which he absurdly says that 15
 the king reasons thus: the people give the priests
 money for the mass, therefore the mass is a
 sacrifice and a good work. Chapter 14.

The fifth point²³⁶ appears as the chief and
 final and fundamental fortification of 20
 Henrician defense: that the mass is a
 work and a sacrifice. Here at last Lord
 Henry is Lord Henry, and the Thomist is a Thomist. And first of all
 he probably heard from some semi-rhetorician that wherever he has
 sensed that the forces of the adversary are too invincible, the latter 25
 should be mocked and scorned with wrinkled nose, so that the dull-
 witted reader may believe that the adversary is conquered before he is
 attacked by such a great rhetorician. Thus also our lord king speaks
 beforehand with pompously swelling words so that he skillfully
 pretends he is weary of the confutation of such a foolish and unlearned 30
 Luther denying that the mass is a work and a sacrifice. Satan feels his
 wound and therefore, not knowing what to do because of the malady
 of his soul, tries with sheer spleen and
 intemperance to vex me with mockery
 and scorn.²³⁷ But He who grants us to know 35
 the thoughts of Satan will also grant us to mock his mockery and to

²³⁶ Luther's words. But here finally is not Luther Luther and the heretic a heretic?

²³⁷ How vexed the conceited scoundrel is at being scorned

scorn his scorn and confidently to expose to ridicule the brittle bombast of his folly.

497

Just as in a comedy the last act ought to be the best, so Luther has seen to it that at the end he is most foolish. For he has come now to the supreme heresy because of which he has thought out the rest. Because he sees this so overthrown from its foundation that he can by no trick restore it, with all hope of defense abandoned, he gives himself wholly to trifling. He is indignant that his very serious and grave opinion is thus mocked, an opinion which not even Heraclitus could have read without laughing, except that the madly raging rascal has dared to write arguments which are no less impious and wicked than they are foolish. Since the character of these arguments has now been disclosed by the most learned king, Satan truly feels his wound and through the mouth of Luther, his elect,²³⁸ he brays and bellows and at the same time, having entered a herd of pigs—the sensual semi-rhetoricians who between cups compose his books—he breathes his thoughts into them so that they mock not only an earthly king but also the heavenly one, and once the accursed men have descended into the depths they scorn everything holy. But He who dwells in the heavens will mock them and the Lord will deride them.

Lest²³⁹ such a distinguished defender have nothing to say, he presents one reason, clearly the most powerful, by which up till now everyone has been satisfied that the mass is a work and a sacrifice. The reasoning goes as follows: If the mass were not a good work, the laity would certainly not give the clergy any temporal favor for it. Be dumb with astonishment, reader;²⁴⁰ royal and Thomistic is this reason, and, as I said, clearly most powerful. For it has prevailed on very many up till now, and it will prevail today. Here Luther lies prostrate, and no one has subdued him so skillfully as the English king in this book by this very reason. For, though I do not wish it, I am nevertheless forced to confess that this is the way things are. Truly, I say, the mass is a sacrifice and a good work because, as the king says, the laity give the priests riches for it.

Do you wish to see, reader, an outstanding example of matchless craftiness? You will never see a more outstanding one than in this pompous boasting of Luther, if only you read it comparing it with the

²³⁸ This is the herd of Lutherans

²³⁹ Luther's words

²⁴⁰ On the contrary, a Lutheran and heretical fiction

words of the prince. For when Luther set
down as the great captivity that the mass is
believed to be a good work,²⁴¹ oblation, or
sacrifice, and had not produced any reason by which he said he was
moved to such an absurd heresy except the single one that now at last 5
he alone had discovered that the mass is a testament, on that point
the king convicted him of three things:²⁴² in
the first place, the boastful vanity by
which Luther vaunts as his own invention
that which the common sort of friarlings have preached everywhere; 10
secondly, rash folly because he handles more senselessly than all the
most senseless men a matter which so many senseless men handle;
finally, his hateful malice, because through hatred of priests, rather
than leave them temporal benefit, he strives to deprive the laity of all
the spiritual benefit of the mass. And so the king, while he treats these 15
points in this manner, touches in passing on the rabid malice of
Luther in the following words:

“The friarlings²⁴³ who foolishly preach that
testament, though better than Luther in
many points, nevertheless in this point 20
only are unequal to Luther, that they have
not discovered the marvelous and till now unheard of benefits of the
mass by which the clergy would lose all benefit in the present life and
the people that of the life to come.”

Then the king, in order to show that Luther, for no other reason 25
than the hatred with which he pursues the clergy, establishes this mad
doctrine that the mass profits the priests not the people, declares what
Luther has foreseen and seized on; namely, that the laity, persuaded
that the mass will profit them nothing, would not themselves give the
priests any profit in return. For they would, he says, grant no temporal 30
good to the priests for the sake of a mass from which they were per-
suaded that they would gain no spiritual
good.²⁴⁴ He teaches that Luther has con-
sidered this one point so that he might take
away from the clergy their means of bodily sustenance, even though 35
he would at the same time be taking away from the people the life of
their souls.

You see, reader, how much difference there is between the good-
ness of the prince and the malice of this buffoon. For although this

²⁴¹ One out of many of Luther's tricks

²⁴² Certain of the king's reproofs against Luther

²⁴³ The king's words. Unheard of fruits of the mass discovered by Luther

²⁴⁴ Luther's intention concerning the mass

fellow has been enrolled among the clergy, now, rending the church, he stirs up the order of the laity against the clergy and considers it improper for those men who serve the altar to live by means of the altar; a man of such stubborn malice that, although he understands that there is no reason why the altar should nourish anyone if the altar does not profit anyone, yet rather than let a priest of God live by means of the altar he tries to destroy the altar from its foundation. And if only he may take away from the priests their bodily sustenance, he labors to snatch from every single one of the laity every benefit for the soul. Since the king has most shrewdly grasped and openly exposed and most skillfully refuted such execrable malice in this fellow, Luther, blazing with wrath and now clearly raging mad as though no one would read the passage from the prince's book and detect Luther's stupid craftiness, pretends, the fashioner of slander, that the king reasons thus: "The laity bestow a living on the priests, therefore the mass is a sacrifice."²⁴⁵ And after he has fashioned this so prettily, then at last he reigns supreme in folly and fills whole pages with silly remarks which are concerned with nothing else but what he himself has ridiculously fashioned from his own ridiculous little brain, on which I cannot now call down any greater disgrace than that you, reader, should frequently and carefully reread his own very clever taunts, now revealed as slanders, with which he thinks he is making clever sport of the king. For no one's words can expose him to ridicule more clearly or with greater opprobrium than his own words by which he boasts that he exposes others to ridicule.²⁴⁶

He very skillfully refutes Luther's most vain boasting by which he brags ten times over that the king professedly leaves untouched his principal foundation. Chapter 15.

You have now heard, reader, his amazing craftiness, joined with no less folly. Now hear another pompous boast by Luther which is so

²⁴⁵ Luther's fabrication

²⁴⁶ That Luther is sufficiently convicted by his own statements

boastful that, whether its cunning or its folly is considered, it completely overshadows the former.

503

No less is the madness which follows,²⁴⁷
where when he had contemned me at
length—for this above all he has learned in rhetoric—he finally 5
declares publicly that he will leave untouched that which he should
above everything else have refuted, namely, my principal defense and
chief argument, when from the words of Christ I proved that the mass
is a testament and promise, therefore it cannot be called a work or a
sacrifice. This unfortunate defender, overcome by the strength of this 10
defense, wretchedly concealing his awareness of defeat, not only
passes over it but even declares publicly that he will pass it over and
leave it to others. O protector of the sac-
raments. O defender of the Roman
church, doubly Thomistic and by far the 15
most deserving of all the papist indul-
gences.²⁴⁸ It could have been forgiven if he had passed over this defense
of mine in silence, but to declare publicly that he will pass it by when
he hears that I rely on it solely and above all, and that from it all
his arguments are destroyed, this is so absurd and foolish as to be 20
unsurpassed.

You have heard, reader, this fellow's remarkable boasts; now hear
in turn the words of the king from which Luther wishes it to appear
that he has been given a pretext for boasting; when you have read
them I am sure that you will be amazed at the disgrace of the boastful 25
Thraso and at his shameful madness in exposing himself. These then
are the words of the prince.

“I will not argue with him²⁴⁹ about testa-
ment and promise and that entire defini-
tion and application of the word testament to the sacrament. I will 30
not be so troublesome to him as he will perhaps find others who may
undermine a good part of this foundation for him both by saying that
the new testament is the promise of the law of the gospel just as the
old was of the law of Moses and by denying that this testament is
very skillfully handled by Luther,²⁵⁰ since the 35
testator need not declare specifically what
he leaves to the heir whom he names as sole
heir, nor is the remission of sins which Luther says was declared as
the inheritance the same as the kingdom of heaven but rather the

²⁴⁷ Luther's words

²⁴⁸ O you wicked assailant of the sacraments and of the catholic church

²⁴⁹ The king's words

²⁵⁰ Luther falsifies the testament of Christ

way to heaven. Anyone who wishes to urge and insist on these and several other like points could probably shatter the structure of the Lutheran foundation by engines at any point. But I will leave this to those who wish it. I will not disturb for him this foundation, which he declares is unshakeable; I shall only show that the structure which he has built on it will easily tumble down of itself.”

5

Do you understand these words, Luther? Or, if you understand, will you be able to hold out boasting so stupidly to your own shame?²⁵¹ For the king here in no way grants your foundation but he shows that it is weak and a thing which can be easily destroyed should anyone take this on himself. But at the same time he promises that he will demolish those noble structures which you have built on it, since with these demolished your foundation would remain in vain. But at this point you exult like a conqueror because you have come on an antagonist so ignorant that he does not understand that he accomplishes nothing, no matter what he answers, so long as he has not destroyed that which his adversary takes as a foundation. And on this point you take such great pleasure that you repeat the same thing three and four times in one passage after another of your brilliant little book, as though by this means you would expose to ridicule the amazing stupidity and ignorance of the king who without destroying the foundation thinks that he has carried the encounter vigorously because he has stormed and overturned only the superstructures.

10

15

20

Come, let us for the time being, Luther, pretend that your foundation is most firm; namely that the mass is a testament and a promise of inheritance and the naming of an heir; do you remember why you laid this foundation? Was it that it might be the base of no building and thus not even be a foundation since nothing would be built on it?²⁵² Or did you rather lay it so that you might build upon it that impregnable tower by which you might destroy the whole and overthrow the altar of Christ; namely, that the mass is not a good work, is not a sacrifice, is not an oblation? Since, then, you built that foundation for the sake of these towers, truly the bulwarks of Babylon, by which you were preparing to scale heaven by force, does he seem to you to be an inexperienced warrior who has so completely overthrown those strongholds which were the sole source of danger that they can neither do any harm nor ever be rebuilt, even if he has left the

25

30

35

²⁵¹ That is, he who long ago laid aside all sense of shame

²⁵² Clearly for this reason

foundations solid and strong, but yet harmless? Or are you as dull-witted as you pretend to be, so that you think he accomplishes nothing who has thus dashed such buildings to the ground, leaving the foundation?²⁵³ Are you therefore so foolish as to say that a man who has burst through the walls and demolished them, put down the enemy and divided the spoils, is not a victor so long as he has not torn up the foundation of the wall and carried away the stones of the ruin?

5

O, if there were here any fashioner-of-fools like you, how many fools like you he might fashion. You have fashioned for us two fools under whose mask you mocked the folly which you found not in the king's book but in your own head. This other fashioner-of-fools would be permitted to fashion three most foolish fools, of which no one would be more foolish than Luther.²⁵⁴ For if someone should lay down a foundation of stone and then try to build on it a superstructure of dust, is Luther so foolish that he does not understand that this fellow is a fool? But the same fellow is no more foolish than our Luther, who thinks that the building cannot be demolished so long as the foundation lasts.

10

15

20

What if someone²⁵⁵ should be so dense that when he has laid a foundation very deep and, if he will, several feet wide upon most solid rock, he afterwards builds up the wall in a swampy place where not one of its stones for a good part of a mile touches that foundation which he has laid? Would not our Luther also laugh at this utter fool if he saw him boasting about the strength of his wall, which he says can neither fall down nor be torn down because of the strength of the foundation separated by such a distance from the wall? I think Luther would mock this man for a fool, and yet this fool is no more foolish than our Luther, who thinks it absurd that the king attacks his superstructures to tear them down while leaving the strong foundation, no stone of which touches any part of the superstructure.

25

30

But come, suppose still a third person²⁵⁶ more foolish than both the others, who lays on sand a foundation of dust and far from this he builds upon a lake a wall of ice; this fool, I am sure, Luther would mock; and yet Luther is more foolish than this fool. For his foundation is more likely to fall than any dust and his superstructure is more fragile than any ice, nor

35

²⁵³ Luther is clearly thus foolish

²⁵⁴ Three fools, yet Luther surpasses their folly

²⁵⁵ The second fool, or Luther

²⁵⁶ The third fool, or Luther

is there more connection between them than there is in the legends between the flames of Eteocles and Polyneices. For the king has proved most clearly that Luther's conclusion was neither valid nor consistent with his first premise, a fact which Luther has made more clear by answering.

5

But as for the foundation from which he boasts that he draws the conclusion, which he again and again accuses the king of leaving untouched professedly as something too strong to be destroyed, the king himself has shown how weak it is.²⁵⁷ For he has not only said that it can easily be demolished by others, but also with almost a single word in passing and while doing something else he himself demolished it when he said, "This new testament can be referred to the new testament just as the old testament to the law of Moses"; by these words what else has the prince signified than that very thing which the apostle says clearly to the Hebrews, in chapter eleven, when he says of Christ: "He is mediator of a new covenant, that whereas a death has taken place for redemption from the transgressions committed under the former covenant, they who have been called may receive the counter-promise of eternal inheritance. For where there is a testament, the death of the testator must intervene;²⁵⁸ for a testament is valid only when men are dead, otherwise it has as yet no force so long as the testator is alive. Hence not even the first has been inaugurated without blood; for when every commandment of the law had been read by Moses to all the people, he took the blood of the calves and of the goats, with water and scarlet wool and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book itself and all the people, saying:²⁵⁹ 'This is the blood of the covenant which God has commanded for you.'" And shortly after: "Thus also the Holy Spirit testifies unto us. For afterwards he said: 'This is the covenant that I will make with them after those days, says the Lord; I will put my laws upon their hearts and upon their minds I will write them, and their sins and iniquities I will remember no more.'" 35

10

15

20

25

30

See, reader, what a wonderful trickster Luther considers himself; he believes that he has bound up everyone's eyes so that no one can perceive how absurdly he twists this testament of Christ into the foundation of his heresy. For what the apostle clearly teaches to be

²⁵⁷ The Lutheran foundation undermined by the king

²⁵⁸ By whom a testament is granted

²⁵⁹ The manner of making a testament in the old law

the whole law of the gospel, this fellow restricts to the Lord's supper alone, as if the sacrament of the altar instituted at the supper is the only testament of Christ which Christ in dying, as he says, left to be distributed among His faithful people. As you know, reader, this is the way that testaments, not the wealth from the testament, are usually distributed. But Paul clearly teaches that as the law of Moses was the old testament, so the new testament is the law of the gospel;²⁶⁰ and as God ratified the former by the shedding of the blood of a calf and a goat, so He confirmed the latter by shedding of the blood of Christ. Christ clearly reminded the disciples of this fact when He said: "This is the blood of the new testament which shall be shed for many," as though He said: "This blood which you drink is the same blood which shall be shed on the cross a little later for the remission of sins, the blood, I say, of the new testament, by which my new testament, my law of the gospel, shall be confirmed, just as once the old testament, the law of Moses, was confirmed by the blood of goats and calves."

I ask you, what pretext does Luther seize on here for restricting the testament of Christ to this sacrament? For although the death of Christ accomplishes and perfects our redemption and this sacrament is His body and blood,²⁶¹ nevertheless the same death equally perfects the sacramental power of all the other sacraments, according to the measure of each one and in a manner known to God.

You see therefore, reader, how distortedly Luther has dragged scripture into this passage so that he might construct for himself a foundation upon which he might build up a citadel whence like the giants he might drive the gods from heaven. You see how the King of England, concealing the fact that he is touching that same foundation, has demolished it so completely that he has not left even one stone upon the other. And yet Luther, concealing in turn the destruction of his foundation, now makes marvelous sport of the king,²⁶² saying that the latter has not dared to touch on his strong foundation but has considered his own premise acknowledged.

I ask you, Luther, if someone should say: "I do not say that Luther is stupid, although, as you see, he so often contradicts himself so stupidly, not indeed off-handedly in speaking but at leisure in

²⁶⁰ Paul on the testament

²⁶¹ That Christ's death perfects all the sacraments

²⁶² How ridiculously Luther, himself deceitful, ridicules the king

writing, with great deliberation, so that a fool would be ashamed to dream the like; this only I say, that he is a heretic and more than sacrilegiously blasphemous.” Does the man who speaks in this manner leave your folly untouched and admit that you are a wise man? I certainly do not think so; no more, by Hercules, than if someone should say against a woman accused of poisoning who is notoriously lewd:²⁶³ “I do not say, men of the jury, that this woman is a whore, although whoever wishes to say that could easily prove it even from the fact that she has already borne four children outside marriage; this only I will say, which is enough for the present case, that she is a poisoner.” This man, I think, does not deny but confirms by denying that the woman is a whore. In the same way the prince says that he will not disturb your foundation, although he had earlier destroyed it completely with a single word. 5 10 15

But come, let us humor you, let us permit you to conceal your wound. Let us allow you to laugh and joke exteriorly while interiorly you groan and bewail your shame in your bosom. Let us pretend that the king has completely granted your foundation; namely, that the mass is a testament.²⁶⁴ Having granted you that premise, may he not deny the conclusion which you draw from it; namely, that therefore the mass cannot be a sacrifice? Is it thus that disputations are carried on at Wittenburg, so that if someone grants the antecedent he cannot therefore deny the consequent?²⁶⁵ If this form of disputing is prescribed so that it is the mark of a shameless person to deny the conclusion after you grant the first premise, then Luther clearly has conquered us and has easily found himself a way to prove that the mass is not a good work, is not a sacrifice. For he will be permitted to argue as follows: “Luther is a fashioner and fosterer of wicked works; therefore the mass is not a good work. Luther is an ass, and an ass cannot be offered for a sacrifice; therefore the mass is not an oblation nor a sacrifice.”²⁶⁶ O how many asses, how many pigs would ass and pig Luther invoke, how many fools would he, the most foolish of fools, fashion, if he had found in the prince’s book anything such as he now keeps saying again and again in his own book; as though to be a fool once is too seldom. But it is worth seeing how 20 25 30 35

²⁶³ From this example, stupid friarling, learn how to speak

²⁶⁴ See, Luther, how much we indulge you

²⁶⁵ This is the form of disputing among toppers

²⁶⁶ Here we grant the antecedent

prettily he joins with this folly a foxiness which, however, is as bare and conspicuous as are the ears on an ass.

515

The king, he says,²⁶⁷ declares publicly that he will leave untouched that which he should above all have refuted; namely, my principal defense and chief argument, where I proved from the words of Christ that the mass is a testament and a promise, therefore it cannot be called a work or a sacrifice.

5

Damn if I am not almost speechless with amazement, reader, as I consider how this scoundrel either is truly a stone or takes all men for stones; he says that his foundation was that the mass is a testament and therefore cannot be a work or a sacrifice, and he says that the king, overcome by the strength of this defense, professedly bypasses this foundation. Please, Luther, spew out that beer which has gone to your head. Call to mind, if you can, what was your foundation. If it was base of the king to pass it by, is it not more base of you to forget it?²⁶⁸ Was not this a part of your foundation: that the mass cannot be a good work or a sacrifice? If this was the foundation, what in the world was the conclusion? If the king has left these points untouched, how is it that you answer in turn those arguments by which the king has destroyed them? And you answer in such a way that when you have sweated plenty you accomplish nothing else than to make clear to everyone that you have found nothing with which to contradict him.

10

15

20

25

But why do I mouth words to a corpse? I return, reader, to you since he has proved no foundation from scripture but has only tried to prove that the mass is a testament, which very foundation has been refuted from scripture;²⁶⁹ from which foundation he has by his syllogism concluded those remarkable, completely irrelevant conclusions: that the mass cannot be a good work and a sacrifice. The king, nevertheless, has proven that these conclusions do not in any way follow from that foundation even if it were valid; and when he had destroyed that foundation in passing, while pretending to leave it alone, he handled the conclusions as though he were granting the foundation in order that he might show Luther so much the more foolish for having laid a foundation which neither upheld

30

35

²⁶⁷ Luther's words. Did he not do this when he rendered it useless to you?

²⁶⁸ Nothing is base to the unclean

²⁶⁹ That Luther has proved no foundation from scripture

nor touched any part of the superstructure. Luther, therefore, chagrined that his fatuity has been so exposed, tries to bring succor through cunning, but so transparently that it is nothing else but redoubled folly.²⁷⁰ He calls a part of the foundation what everyone sees to have been the conclusion. He says that the king left alone that point which even Luther's own answer shows was the only point the king explicitly discussed.²⁷¹ Thus he is prettily consistent, a man never inconsistent with himself, when he says that the king professedly passes over in silence the statement that the mass cannot be a work or a sacrifice, and yet Luther himself answers those arguments by which the king proves that even if the mass were above all a testament and a promise it would still be nonetheless a work and a sacrifice; unless perhaps he is aware that his answers are so inept that he does not consider his answer as an answer. And they are without a doubt, reader, as you will see immediately, most inept; that you may see this more clearly, I will not imitate Luther by corrupting his words in recounting them, as he usually does to the king's, but I shall set them down intact, just as they are. When you have read them, you will see that they are so corrupt that no one could have recounted them more corruptly. 5 10 15 20

Indeed, after Lord Henry, our Thomist,²⁷² had proved by this silver and golden reasoning that the mass is a work, he proceeds in his strength to weaken also Luther's reasonings, and first he Thomistifies in this manner: "He who cuts firewood does a work, therefore he who consecrates does a work. Therefore the mass also will be a work. But if it is a work it is not evil, therefore it is good." Thus that pompous defender of the sacraments. Here also Luther lies prostrate. 25 30

You have heard, reader; we have omitted none of his words; now you shall hear in turn the words of the king by which you will detect Luther's trustworthiness in recounting so sincerely the words of another in order thereby to win favor for his own words. And at the same time you will understand with what a lack of resources he is beset who is forced to turn aside to trifles and to omit the most 35

²⁷⁰ How Luther comes to the aid of his folly

²⁷¹ The shrew-mouse is betrayed by his squeak

²⁷² Luther's words. It is not difficult, Luther, to weaken your reasonings. How painfully it galls the bragging rascal to see himself overcome

important part of those arguments which he should have answered. And we have recounted his words before those of the king so that when we have allowed him to breathe out for some time with impunity those vain and stupid little boasts with which he trumpets himself as victor, he may fall more shamefully from the hoped-for glory of victory when he has seen himself clearly convicted of having deliberately distorted the king's words—so shameless is he—in order that he might the more easily appear to depart from the fight victorious. The words of the king are as follows. 5

“After long digressions (he says),²⁷³ he defines the mass; next he distinguishes the ceremonies of the mass from the mass itself; he examines the Lord's supper and weighs the words which Christ used when He instituted the sacrament of the mass. When he had discovered in them the word ‘testament,’—clearly a very abstruse point—then, as though the enemy were destroyed, he begins repeatedly to proclaim the victory, and he decks out his discovery—such is his boast—with words; and with great conceit, as though it were a mystery till now unheard of, he teaches what a testament is. He declares²⁷⁴ that it must be noted and held in mind that a testament is the promise of a man on the point of death by which he publicly declares his inheritance and appoints his heirs. This sacrament of the mass, he says, is therefore nothing else but the testament of Christ, and the testament is nothing else but the promise of an eternal inheritance to us Christians whom He has appointed as His heirs, adding His body and blood as the sign of the ratification of the promise. This then he repeats ten times, he rams it down our throats, he impresses it on us as the thing which he wishes to have considered the unshakeable foundation upon which he will build hay, wood and stone. For, having laid this foundation, that the mass is the testament of Christ, he boasts that he will destroy all the impiety which, so he says, impious men have introduced into this sacrament,²⁷⁵ and that he will clearly prove that the reception of communion must be approached with faith alone, that one must not be too much concerned about works of any kind whatsoever, that the more one's conscience is distracted and agitated by either the bite or the titillation of sins, the more holily 20 25 30 35

²⁷³ The king's words

²⁷⁴ Learn here from Luther, everyone, what a testament is

²⁷⁵ Grant this stronghold to such an illustrious leader. How many and what kind of things Luther is ready to prove from his foundation

does one approach, while the more calm, pure and cleansed from sin, the worse is it received.

“Furthermore he says that the mass is not a good work; that the mass is not a sacrifice; that the mass profits only the priests but not the people also; that it does not profit the deceased nor anyone living; that it is an impious error to sing the mass for sins, for anyone’s need, for the dead; that fraternities and annual commemorations of the deceased are a useless and impious practice; that all such support of the priests, monks, canons, friars, in fine all so-called religious, must be abolished. These many and measureless benefits, then, he boasts of having discovered from the sole fact of having found out that this most holy sacrament is the testament of Christ. Then he goes on to inveigh against the ‘sententiaries,’ as he calls doctors; he cries out against all who preach before the people because, while the former write so much and the latter speak and preach so much about the sacrament of the eucharist, yet neither touch at all on the testament but impiously conceal from the people that incomparable good, which it would yet have profited them to have known long ago, namely that the laity, whether living or dead, will never derive any good from the mass.²⁷⁶ He proclaims that because of their ignorance of this matter, all priests and monks today, together with the bishops and all their superiors, are idolators and living in a state of extreme peril.”

You see, reader, how the prince recounts with good faith all Luther’s defenses and does not even omit his teachings lest he should complain that he was deprived of any of his defense. But meanwhile this point must be carefully weighed: in what danger are all those who do not believe Luther’s teachings?²⁷⁷ Certainly they come into the danger—which I pray God may happen to me—of being shut out from hell, lest they burn there forever with Wyclif, Hus, Helvidius, Arius, Montanus, and Luther—more pestilent than all the others—and, on the other hand, of being forever blessed in heaven with Christ’s saints, Ambrose, Augustine, Jerome, Chrysostom, Cyprian, Basil and others like them, most blessed men, who believed and taught about the mass the things which Luther execrates; they execrated the things which Luther teaches must be believed, but does not believe. But shortly after the king proceeds thus.

²⁷⁶ This function has doubtless been reserved by the fates for you, Luther

²⁷⁷ The danger of those who are not Luther’s listeners

“But it is worth seeing²⁷⁸ from what tree
 Luther gathers such wholesome fruits.
 After he has often rammed home that the sacrament of the eucharist
 is the sign of the testament, but that a testament is nothing else than
 a promise of inheritance, he thinks that it immediately follows there- 5
 from that the mass can be neither a good
 work nor a sacrifice.²⁷⁹ Whoever grants him
 this will immediately have to admit that
 whole catalogue of plagues with which he
 disfigures the whole face of the church. But whoever denies him this 10
 will have accomplished nothing despite such great effort. For one is
 almost ashamed to review the arguments with which he shows him-
 self teaching those things; in a matter of such great dignity they are
 so utterly trifling and frivolous. For he syllogizes thus—I will quote
 his own words—‘You have heard that the mass is nothing else than 15
 the divine promise or testament of Christ, enhanced by the sacrament
 of His body and blood. If this is true, you understand that it cannot in
 any way be a work nor be dealt with by anyone in any other spirit
 than faith alone. Faith, however, is not a work but the teacher and
 way of works.’ It is amazing how, despite 20
 the throes of such great travail, he brings
 forth nothing but mere wind,²⁸⁰ which,
 although he would have it appear powerful
 enough to overturn mountains, seems to me indeed too feeble to stir a
 reed. For if you remove the windings of words with which he clothes 25
 the absurd matter like an ape in royal purple, if you take away those
 cries with which, as though the matter were already clearly proved,
 he so often raves wildly against the whole church, and with the battle
 not yet joined behaves insolently like a fierce victor, you will see that
 nothing else remains but a bare and wretched sophism. For what else 30
 does he say in such a bombastic show of words than: The mass is a
 promise, therefore it cannot be a work? Who would not feel sorry for
 a man if he is so stupid that he does not sense his own folly, or who
 would not be indignant if, conscious of it, he still would judge all
 Christians so stupid that they cannot detect such manifest madness? 35
 “I will not argue with him about testament and promise and that
 entire definition and application of the word testament to the
 sacrament. I will not be so troublesome to him as he will perhaps find
 others who may undermine a good part of this foundation for him

²⁷⁸ The king’s words

²⁷⁹ From what premise Luther infers that the mass is not a good work

²⁸⁰ Doubtless according to the proverb: The mountains are in labor, a ridiculous mouse is born

both by saying that the new testament is the promise of the law of the gospel just as the old was of the law of Moses and by denying that this testament is very skillfully handled by Luther, since the testator need not declare specifically what he leaves to the heir whom he names as sole heir, nor is the remission of sins which Luther says was declared as the inheritance the same as the kingdom of heaven but rather the way to heaven.

5

“Let us therefore come now to these remarkable reasons by which Luther proves that the mass is neither a good work nor a sacrifice, and although it would be preferable to treat first of sacrifice, yet, because he first raised the question of work, we will follow him. When therefore he syllogizes thus, ‘The mass is a promise, therefore it is not a good work because no promise is a work,’²⁸¹

10

we will answer that the mass which the priest celebrates is no more truly a promise

15

than was Christ’s consecration, and at the same time we will ask of him whether Christ then performed a work. If he should deny this, we will indeed be surprised, if a man performs a work when he makes an image of wood, that Christ did not perform any work at all when He made His flesh from bread. But if He performed any work, no one, I think, will doubt that it was a good one. For if the woman who poured ointment on His head performed a good work, who can doubt whether Christ performed a good work when He presented His own body as food to men and offered it as a sacrifice to God? But if it cannot be denied, except by him who in a matter so very serious has the greatest urge to talk nonsense, that Christ performed a good work, neither can this also be denied, that in the mass the priest performs a good work, since he does nothing else in the mass than what Christ did at the supper and on the cross. For Christ’s words, ‘Do this in remembrance of me,’ declare this fact.²⁸² Given these words,

20

25

30

what else did He wish that they should represent and do in the mass than what He

Himself did at the supper and on the cross? For He instituted and began at the supper the sacrament which He perfected on the cross.”

35

Now, reader, please reread Luther’s nonsensical statements. See with how much fidelity he recounts the arguments of the king, with what fine reasonings he opposes him. What nonsense this fellow chatters to us. The king says that Christ performed a work when He

²⁸¹ How Luther proves that the mass is not a good work

²⁸² The mass is shown to be a work according to the words of Christ Himself

made His body from bread and offered it on the cross to the Father, and that there was no hindrance to its being a work, however much it was a testament. And thus he also shows briefly in one word how silly a sophism is that irrefutable premise of Luther: “This sacrament is a testament, therefore it cannot be a work.” Next the king shows and proves from the gospel that the priest does the same thing in the mass as Christ did at the supper and on the cross on which He completed what He had begun at the supper, especially since the mass is a memorial rather of His death than of the supper, according to the words of Paul which the king also recalls:²⁸³

“As often as you do these things, you proclaim the death of the Lord.” Therefore, since Luther cannot deny that what was done by Christ was truly a work, even though it had been above all a testament—and what is done by the priest is nothing else than what was done by Christ—is not the most prudent man forced to admit that the wisdom of his sophism is utterly silly with which he thus prates as if it were an inviolable argument: The mass is a testament and a promise, therefore it cannot be a work?

But here, sensing himself to be clearly overcome, with absolutely amazing genius he finds a way out, lest he be forced to admit that he sees that which everyone sees. Because the king says that he who consecrates does something, the keen-eyed fellow understands the king to say there that the mass is a good work by reason of the doer, not by reason of the work done, as if one who said that someone does something would not say that something was done by that same person, or as if in fact that which someone does and that which comes about by his doing were not the same thing, even if it were considered in one respect insofar as it is such and such a work and in another respect insofar as it is done by such and such a person. How cautious one needs to be to deal with such a sharp-witted fellow. For if someone should say that these stairs lead upward, Luther will immediately swear that the man has denied that the same stairs lead downward, because up and down are opposites.²⁸⁴ Thus the sharp-witted dialecticians dispute. We simple and uneducated men think that the way from Athens to Thebes and from Thebes to Athens is the same, and we think that the same mass is as much the work done as it is the work of the doer. But we think that its goodness and fruit which come

²⁸³ Paul’s interpretation of the mass

²⁸⁴ How subtly indeed Luther argues

to the people from that work come by reason of the work done, not by reason of the one doing the work; that is, because it is such and such a work, not because such and such a man has done the work.

But this other subtle point the reverend father has also discovered; that if the mass were somehow a work of the priest consecrating, then, since every mass is a good work, a wicked priest cannot consecrate; that is, because a wicked man cannot perform a good work. And this argument seems to him so keen that he even glories in it excessively and boasts thus: "This argument will greatly trouble the defender of the sacraments."²⁸⁵ But I rather suspect, indeed I know for certain, that such an arguer is greatly troubled by a demon who so deprives him of his wits that he does not understand that no matter how wicked a man is he can perform a work that is good either by nature or by custom or that is useful and beneficial to another, even if it is injurious to himself. Unless perchance almsgiving is not a good work or cannot be performed by a wicked man. Or unless someone believes with Luther that baptism is not a good work or that a wicked priest does not confer baptism on another person. Let that subtlety of Luther be.²⁸⁶ We poor rustic men believe that the wickedness of the minister does not shut out the goodness of God, but that, as God works together with the work of the thief sowing stolen seed to produce fruit, so in the sacraments, whatever kind of priest it may be, God works together with his work a good work and one perfected by a definite grace;²⁸⁷ the work by means of the goodness implanted in it is saving for those for whom it is performed, even if it harms those by whom it is performed. For he who performed it performed a good work badly and by rashly handling the sacrament he benefits another, harms himself.

When I had read the book of the king and at the same time the response of Luther and had examined them as carefully as I could, I very much wondered what Luther meant by such an absurd sophism; finally I began to examine carefully the same argument from his *Babylon*, from which fount of confusion this stream of the infernal river has overflowed. And sure enough, just as in the present work he talks nonsense about the mass, so he there talks most nonsensical nonsense about the notion of work; clearly so that he might enmesh

²⁸⁵ Luther's foolish boasting about nothing

²⁸⁶ Luther's subtlety

²⁸⁷ That a work good in itself is not vitiated by a wicked doer

the question in a twofold subtlety and involve himself in a twofold folly. For this is what he there sets down.

531

Let no one dare be so senseless²⁸⁸ as to say
that a man does a good work when he
comes poor and needy to receive a benefit
from the hand of a rich man. But the mass, as I have said, is the benefit
of the divine promise delivered through the hand of the priests to all
men. 5

See the reasoning, reader: The mass cannot be a good work; that
is, because in the mass we receive a benefit from God, we do not
confer one on Him. 10

I ask you, reader, do you think that this fellow either remembers
his own words, or listens to his own words all the while he is speaking?
For if the work of a man cannot be good in which he receives a
benefit from God but does not offer one, what need was there for him
to pour out so many useless words to prove that in any good work
whatsoever there is sin? How much easier it was to say: no work is
good. For now he openly says this when he says that no work is good
in which someone receives a benefit from God. For not even martyr-
dom, according to this reasoning, will have been a good work, since
the martyr does not bestow anything on God but receives from Him. 20
For what benefit does a martyr present to God by dying? Does he not
rather also come poor and needy to receive from the hand of a rich
God a benefit, when he exchanges with Him a trifling copper coin for
a valuable gold one; or rather he pays back his copper in order to
carry away a gold. For he returns to Him the wretched and brief life
which he received from Him as a loan in order to receive a blessed
life and one that is never to end. Therefore, according to you, Luther,
the martyr does not perform a good work
when he lays down his life on behalf of the
faith.²⁸⁹ But God, as the king objected to you, 30
declared that Magdalen was doing a good work; I do not think He
considered her work a benefit, but He conferred a great benefit on the
woman whom He deigned to admit to a service of that kind. We
miserable men, when we have done everything, are still worthless 35

²⁸⁸ Luther's words from the *Babylonian Captivity*

²⁸⁹ That in Luther's opinion not even martyrdom is a good work

servants, for we have done what we were obliged to do; we give nothing to God but in every good work we receive from the goodness of God. Although everyone admits this, Luther alone declares that it is no good work, because he who does it receives a benefit from God, does not offer one. And the man who declares this says that just men sin in every good work. And thus the wise fellow, never inconsistent with himself, defends these two conclusions equally: every good work of man has sin; and, there is no good work of man because it can have sin.

5

Here I ask you, reader, to reread those solemn words of Luther in which he says that the king thinks those things about the mass which clearly he himself could never have thought either through fever or through frenzy. How much glory he has gained for himself by these bombastic words, since now everyone clearly senses that the prince has spoken most wisely about the mass and about good work, whereas at the same time concerning both these points Luther in his fevers and frenzies has thought out for us such ideas that neither could fever itself have thought out such feverish thoughts, nor could frenzy itself have thought out such frenzied thoughts.

10

15

He refutes those most foolish subtleties with
which Luther tries to prove that the mass is not
a sacrifice. Chapter 16.

20

With this remarkable triumph, therefore, the patron of evil works triumphs against good works; now let us see how vigorously the frenzied friarling and sacrilegious little sacrificer conducts himself against the sacrosanct sacrifice. So that this may become clearer to you, reader, we shall set the words of the prince before those in which the rascal prattles. They are then as follows.

25

“But Luther understands well²⁹⁰ enough that whatever he had built up is easily destroyed if the mass can be a sacrifice or an oblation which may be offered to God. He therefore promises to remove this obstacle; so that he may appear to do this more honestly and effectively, he himself

30

²⁹⁰ The king's words

proposes to himself in advance certain obstacles which he perceives to stand in his way.²⁹¹ Now, he says, yet another stumbling block must be removed, which is much greater and very deceptive; that is, that the mass is everywhere believed to be a sacrifice which is offered to God. Even the words of the canon seem to give expression to this opinion when they say: ‘These gifts, these offerings, these holy sacrifices.’ And below: ‘This oblation.’ Likewise, it is most clearly implored that the sacrifice may be received as the sacrifice of Abel, etc. For this reason Christ is called the victim of the altar. To these texts are added the words of the holy fathers, very many examples, and the extensive custom constantly observed throughout the world. 5

“You have heard, reader, what objections he perceives are raised against him.²⁹² Now hear in turn with what Herculean powers he undertakes to dispel them. To all these objections, he says, one should steadfastly oppose the word and example of Christ. But what are those words of Christ, unknown by so many holy fathers in times past and to the whole church of Christ for so many ages, which Luther like a new Esdras has found for us?²⁹³ He himself declares this when he says:²⁹⁴ ‘Unless we maintain that the mass is a promise or a testament, as the words clearly state, we lose the whole gospel and all solace.’ Now we have heard the words; it remains to see an example. He therefore subjoins an example.²⁹⁵ ‘At the last supper,’ he says, ‘when Christ instituted this sacrament and established a testament, He did not offer it to God the Father or accomplish it as a good work for others, but sitting at the table He presented the same testament and offered a sign to each of them.’ These then are the words of Christ; this is the example; from these now at last Luther alone clearly sees that the mass is not a sacrifice nor an oblation. It is strange then that of so many holy fathers, of so many eyes that have read the same gospel in the church for so many ages, there was never any so clear-sighted as to perceive such an evident matter; in fact, that everyone is even now so blind that although Luther himself shows it to them they cannot even yet perceive what Luther boasts²⁹⁶ that he 10 15 20 25 30 35

²⁹¹ How the mass is not a sacrifice. Luther’s words

²⁹² Luther is scoffed at

²⁹³ Luther a new Esdras

²⁹⁴ Luther’s words

²⁹⁵ The argument of Luther from the example, as he himself thinks, of Christ

²⁹⁶ An answer is given to Luther’s argument about sacrifice

sees. Is not Luther rather seeing things, and thinking that he sees what he does not see and trying to point out something which is nowhere? Tell me, what sort of proof is this, when he tries to teach that the mass is not a sacrifice on the grounds that it is a promise, as if a promise and a sacrifice were as mutually contradictory as cold and heat? This reasoning of Luther falls so flat that it seems unworthy of an answer. For the very many sacrifices of the Mosaic law, although they were all figures of future events, were still promises.²⁹⁷ For they promised those things for the sake of which they were done, not only those future events of which they were the figures, but also deliverances, atonements, cleansings, purifications of the people then present for whom they were yearly offered by a solemn custom. Since this fact is so clear that no one at all can be ignorant of it, this dissimulation of Luther's is clearly ridiculous, since he now argues that a thing cannot be done which not only he himself but the people also know has often been done."

You have heard the words of the king, reader. Now hear in turn the words of the rascal, so that you can judge how cleverly the friarling plays the buffoon.

Next, for the sake of defending the sacrifice of the mass,²⁹⁸ he Thomisticates thus: "Granted that the mass is a promise," he says, "it does not follow from this that it is not at the same time a sacrifice, since in the old law there were sacrifices which were at the same time promises." I answer: the king should have brought up at least one example of this Thomistic assertion. But now according to his custom he thinks it enough if he writes only that in the old law sacrifices were promises, then directly, "It should be so." But as I see it, such a dull-witted defender should have been presented with some glossary from which he might learn first of all what is the meaning of sacrifice as well as promise, since a promise is a word, a sacrifice is a thing, so that even very young children understand that it is impossible for a promise to be a sacrifice or a word to be a thing. It is too bad that I, who am forced to waste my time with such monsters of folly, am not worthy to have men of outstanding genius or learning contend with me.²⁹⁹ And so it is a palpable error to say that in the old law sacrifices were promises. Unless the king defender, with Thomistic slipperiness, wished to speak figuratively, that the sacrifices promised,

²⁹⁷ The promises of the sacrifices of the old testament

²⁹⁸ Luther's words

²⁹⁹ You say this truly, Luther; you are not worthy

that is, signified, future events in Christ.³⁰⁰

But this is not to defend the sacraments

but to play and trifle with words, since in this sense a promise is a sign
or a thing, not a word. But in the mass especially we call a promise
those very words of Christ without which the bread and wine would
be neither a sign nor a sacrament nor the mass. For as for the fact that
through sacrifices offered in faith promises are fulfilled, that is
another matter. For we are not disputing here either about the fruit or
the signification of the sacrifices but about their very substance, in
order to know what is and what is not a sacrifice.

5

10

Now consider carefully, reader, how

prettily the rascal destroys the prince's

reasonings.³⁰¹ For when the king, among the

fellow's other follies, refuted also this wretched sophism according to

which he makes the inference: the mass is a promise, therefore it

cannot be a sacrifice, arguing that the sacrifices of the old law were

also promises just as Luther prattles that the mass is a promise; Luther

now returns and says that the sacrifices of the old law were not

promises except in a sophistical sense, but that the mass is nothing

else at all except a true and unmixed promise. What would you do

with this blockhead, reader, who disputes as though all his listeners

were utter blockheads? That serious and stern man is accustomed to

mock the subtleties of the scholastics, although he himself is very

often forced to take refuge in the most foolish sophisms. For who does

not know that in the sacrifices of the Mosaic law the promises of God

were manifest? This is the sense of that text of Leviticus, chapter six:

“For his sin he shall offer a ram without blemish out of the flock, and

shall give it to the priest, according to the estimation and measure of

the offense; and he shall pray for him before the Lord and he shall

have forgiveness for everything in the doing of which he hath

sinned.” You see here, reader, that the promise is so manifest that it

could nowhere be more manifest. But perhaps Luther will say that in

such matters the promises of granting forgiveness exist through the

sacrifices but that the sacrifices themselves are not promises, whereas

the mass does not have a promise added, but that the substance of

the mass itself is nothing else but an unmixed promise because the

mass is a testament which is nothing else, so Luther says, than a

promise of inheritance.

Come, then, let us approach closer so that you may see, reader, how

15

20

25

30

35

³⁰⁰ You indeed trifle with words

³⁰¹ Luther's quibbling about mass and sacrifice

in the wretched consciousness of his disgrace the rascal blathers such things. Let us consider that sacrifice which the apostle Paul³⁰² joined to this very sacrifice as a kind of antecedent figure. He says: “When every commandment of the law had been read by Moses to all the people, he took the blood of the calves and of the goats with the water and the scarlet wool and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book itself and all the people, saying: ‘This is the blood of the covenant which God has commanded for us.’”

5

What do you say now, honored doctor; where is your glossary which you buffoonishly say should be presented to the prince?

10

Examine the glossary entry for the old

sacrifice. Examine the glossary entry for

the new sacrifice.³⁰³ Do you not read in either glossary entry the same

15

term? Is not the blood of Christ called in the one the blood of the

covenant just as the blood of a calf is called the blood of the covenant

in the other? Do you not then readily see, if you have any brain at all,

that it follows either that a testament is not a promise, and then your

whole foundation will have been destroyed which you have poorly

20

established on the notion of testament by arguing that mass and

testament are altogether the same in every respect; or, if the testa-

ment is a promise, then what you deny is true, namely that that

sacrifice was a promise? And thus, honored doctor, I have taught you

as clearly as pedagogues are accustomed to teach boys that the sacri-

25

fices of the old law were promises, not only in the same way in which

you say that the mass is a promise in the new law, but even by means

of the same word, however keenly you argue that the sacrifice is a

thing and the promise is a word; and so you see now how splendidly

your glossary has profited you. And yet I do not say these things with

30

the intention of arguing that in that passage of Exodus, or of agreeing

with you that here in the gospel, the testament is a mere promise, for

I clearly see the truth of what the king shows you in passing with three

words: it is a mere trick that you present on the notion of testament,

which in fact signifies in the one passage the old law and in the other

the new, according to that prophecy which the apostle recalls:

35

“Behold the day is coming, says the Lord, when I will make a new

covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Juda, not

according to the covenant that I made with their fathers on the day

when I took them by the hand to lead them forth out of the land of

³⁰² Paul the apostle

³⁰³ Take up your glossary, Luther

Egypt, for they did not abide by my covenant and I did not regard them, says the Lord. For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, says the Lord:³⁰⁴ I will put my laws into their mind and upon their hearts I will write them, 5
and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. And they shall not teach, each his neighbor and each his brother, saying: 'Know the Lord'; for all shall know me, from least to greatest among them. Because I will be merciful to their iniquities and their sins I will remember no more. Now in saying 'a new covenant,' He has made obsolete the former one. And that which is obsolete and has grown old is near its end." 10

What does the apostle here say the old testament is? What does he here call the new one? Is it not the old law and the new law? And he declares this so clearly in many ways that you have no room for shifting or for defending your most deceitful trick which, relying neither on reason nor on scripture, you stupidly set up by your sheer willfulness and, as it were, imperiously order the world to believe. 15

Therefore, as I said, I have not presented these arguments with the intention of arguing that in Exodus the word testament signifies a promise, but even from other sacrifices it is shown that the notion of promise is neither opposed to nor contrary to that of sacrifice, as you have blathered; and from that fact I have proved what is sufficiently opposed to you, that if a testament were a mere promise as you contend, then at least some sacrifice in the Mosaic law was a promise, a thing that you, a most absurd man, claim is absurd and impossible. 20 25

Lord Henry also wonders³⁰⁵ what sort of preachers I have listened to because I wrote that nothing was ever said in sermons about these promises, whereas he had heard even to the point of weariness about the testament, about promises, about witnesses, etc. I answer: And I wonder that the head of the king is so ignorant and his madness so great who has heard such distinguished sermons and has learned so little and not understood that the word of God cannot be our work or sacrifice but that he blathers the opposite endlessly. 30 35

Lord Henry wonders,³⁰⁶ I think, that the head of Luther is so stupidly pompous that from the dregs of commonplace and stale sermons he has drawn that very insane doctrine which, as something

³⁰⁴ Peruse this glossary carefully, Luther

³⁰⁵ Luther's words

³⁰⁶ And with every right he wonders

new and before unheard of, he sets before the whole world, whereas only this much is new about it, that it is handled more foolishly by him than anyone has handled it before. Nor is he ashamed, though conquered now so many times and shamefully refuted to his own supreme disgrace, to talk stupid nonsense by spewing out again that sophism.

5

For if any spark of human reason thrived in him,³⁰⁷ he could surely not deny that the sign of God is a work of God towards us, that thus sacrifice and the promises of God are the word of God, not our work.

10

On the contrary, if any spark of human reason thrived in Luther, he could never contradict himself so insanely in so few lines. Does he not clearly say to us here that sacrifice as well as promises are the word of God, and he confirms this so strongly that he considers that man not to have even a spark of human reason who has dared to deny it? Not a single spark of human reason, therefore, does Luther have. For on the same page he completely denied that very statement. For he denied that a sacrifice can be a promise on the grounds that every promise is a word and every sacrifice a thing and for this reason it cannot be a word because no thing is a word. But, to prevent his being able to pretend that I distort his words through trickery to my own advantage, since I see that he has forgotten his words, though so recently quoted, I will not begrudge recalling them a second time.

15

20

As I see it,³⁰⁸ such a dull-witted defender should have been presented with some glossary from which he might learn first of all what is the meaning of sacrifice as well as of promise, since a promise is a word, a sacrifice is a thing, so that even very young children understand that it is impossible for a promise to be a sacrifice or a word to be a thing. It is too bad that I who am forced to waste my time with such monsters of folly am not worthy to have men of outstanding genius or learning contend with me.

25

30

Behold a man, reader, worthy of disputing with Minerva; it is deplorable that he is thus forced to waste his time with fools since he himself is so wise that in one line he cries that they are stupid who think a sacrifice is a word or can be a word since it is a thing, and afterwards, in almost the next line, he cries on the contrary that those

35

³⁰⁷ Luther's words. See how these words agree with his previous words

³⁰⁸ Luther's words

men are fools and have no spark of human reason who would deny that the sacrifice is a word. Would not this assailant of the sacraments have need not of a glossary but of a branding iron so that his very stupid forehead might be branded with the mark of folly as an everlasting reminder of the fact?

5

Then this king of lies,³⁰⁹ who writes in this passage that he has heard even to the point of weariness about testaments and promises of this sort, afterwards chatters in regard to the sacrament of orders that in the whole supper of Christ there is no promise, not only most basely contradicting himself but with shameless lying raging madly against the supper of the Lord. Thus rage and madness dash the papists headlong, so that they see nothing at all which they may say, or against which they may take a stand.

10

It vexes Luther that his brethren have seized the glory of such a noteworthy discovery; he cannot yet digest the fact that the king has heard the same things before from other friarlings of the same flour; that, I say, Luther cannot endure.³¹⁰ For he who will wish to be inferior in genius will be rare; but he cries that the king is a liar. Certainly, if the prince would hear me, rather than have Luther as an enemy he will render to Luther the entire praise for such a foolish discovery. But he adds, so wrathful that he does not hear himself talking, that the king who falsely says that he has heard so much about testaments and promises afterwards chatters that in the whole supper of Christ there is no promise and thus both contradicts himself and rages insanely against the supper of the Lord.

15

20

25

First of all, reader, consider carefully the marvelous shrewdness of the reverend father, who, from the fact that the king says he has more than a thousand times heard that several unlettered friarlings have stupidly preached those things which Luther now boasts that he himself first wisely discovered, infers that the king contradicts himself if he says that both talk nonsense and that those former are foolish and this latter more foolish; it is this that the reverend father toper calls inconsistency.³¹¹ Then, saving the reverence of the reverend father, the reverend father shamelessly lies when he says that the king says there is no promise in the supper of the Lord. For he

30

35

³⁰⁹ Luther's words

³¹⁰ Luther envies other triflers his own trifles

³¹¹ What Luther means by self-contradiction

does not say that; indeed, he admits there is a promise, but not a promise of the sort which helps the cause of Luther. For there was no promise made to anyone there because of the reception of the sacrament which Christ instituted at the supper, but through the shedding of the blood which Christ shed on the cross. That you may see this more clearly, reader, hear again the words of the prince. 5

“But let us touch Luther a little more closely still.³¹² He grants that the eucharist is a sacrament; if he did not grant this he would be raving mad. But where has he found in scripture the grace promised in that sacrament? For he accepts nothing but the scriptures and only those which are evident. Let the passage about the supper of the Lord be read; he will not find among any of the evangelists the promise of grace in the receiving of the sacrament. The words of Christ read: ‘This is my blood of the new testament which shall be shed for many unto the remission of sins.’ By these words He signified that He would redeem the human race through His suffering on the cross. But when He said earlier, ‘Do this in remembrance of me,’ He there promises no grace, no remission of sins to the one who does this, that is, to the priest consecrating or to the one receiving the eucharist. But neither does the apostle in the epistle to the Corinthians when he threatens judgment to those who eat unworthily make any mention of grace for those who eat worthily. But if anything from the sixth chapter of John promises grace to the one who receives the sacrament of the flesh and blood of the Lord, not even that can help Luther any, seeing that he denies that that whole chapter has anything to do with the eucharist. You see therefore how,³¹³ regarding this promise of grace which, as the foundation of the whole sacrament, he has solemnly promised in his whole work, he cannot defend it in that sacrament which almost alone he leaves, unless he considers it necessary to have recourse to the faith of the church beyond the words of scripture.” 10 15 20 25 30

Now you see, reader, this reverend father’s shameless slander and no less folly. For he imputes to the king what the latter nowhere says, but to that which he does say Luther says nothing in return, although it is nevertheless of such a kind that it demolishes Luther’s whole foundation, that foundation, I say, which he considers as most firm; namely, that nothing has to be believed of necessity unless it is proved by evident scriptures. The prince has interpreted a passage and made 35

³¹² The king’s words

³¹³ Luther cannot defend his own opinion

clear what he has said, namely that Luther cannot prove by evident scripture from that passage that that sacrament has the promise of grace since the gospel does not there say, “This is my blood of the new testament which shall be drunk unto the remission of sins,” but, “which shall be shed for many unto the remission of sins.” But what will Luther answer to such clear arguments as these? Certainly, nothing else but, “You lie.”³¹⁴ This is usual with him since he himself lies. Therefore there is no need of any other answer than that Echo answer him the same thing in as many words.

He dares³¹⁵ also to declare that it is manifest that the priests do not only that which Christ did at the supper but also that which He did on the cross. I answer: Since Lord Henry only says this and does not prove it, I say on the contrary that it is manifest that the priests in the mass leave out that which Christ did at the supper and do that which the Jews did to Christ on the cross. And I do not only say this, but I also prove it.³¹⁶ For he who perverts and annuls the word of God, he truly crucifies the Son of God, a thing which everyone does who makes a work from a promise, since this is truly to change the truth of God into a lie.

He says that the king says and does not prove this, but at the same time he conceals all those arguments by which the king has proved it. He passes over in silence the statement of the apostle that a testament involves the death of the testator. He is silent also about the words of the same apostle: “As often as you eat the body of the Lord and drink His blood, you proclaim the death of the Lord,” which was accomplished on the cross, not at the supper. Therefore the death through which Christ offered Himself belongs to that sacrament. He is likewise silent about what the king has shown, that the church, taught by the Holy Spirit, pours water into the wine because water with blood flowed from Christ’s side as He was dying on the cross.³¹⁷ Concealing all these things, he thinks that he has singularly blinded everyone by that witty blasphemy by which he says that all priests again crucify Christ who say that the mass is a good work or a sacrifice. But since it is well enough known that the whole church of Christ now does that; since it is well known that the whole church for

³¹⁴ Luther’s answer

³¹⁵ Luther’s words

³¹⁶ Now, my honored sir, I say you lie

³¹⁷ Why water is mingled with wine in the mass

so many ages has done the same thing; since Blessed Clement and the
 apostle James referred to those very masses which they are said to
 have celebrated as an oblation and a sacrifice; and since no one has
 ever read any canon so ancient that in it that venerable sacrament
 has not been called a sacrifice; what Christian anywhere is so luke- 5
 warm that he can endure that, against so many thousands of saints
 who followed that canon according to which the sacrament of the
 body and blood of the Lord is offered as a sacrifice,³¹⁸ this buffoon plays
 the buffoon with such insolent buffoonery
 as to say that those men together with the 10
 Jews again crucify Christ, of whom very
 many did not hesitate to pour out their blood for Christ, for whose
 sake Luther, if he were not such a scoundrel that he begrudges pour-
 ing out one cup of beer, could never resolve to rage with such stupid
 buffoonery against the saints and in blasphemies against the saints to 15
 blaspheme God.

After these arguments he urges me with
 that canon of the mass in which the mass
 is called a sacrifice,³¹⁹ by the authority of which he wishes me to be
 bound because I have used its words. For those, “As often as you do,
 etc.” are not, he says, found in the gospel, but these words, “Do this,” 20
 and different ones indeed in Paul. Here you see how the unfortunate
 Satan snatches, how he seizes, how he earnestly seeks a means of
 escape, but in vain; he will not escape. I have rejected the canon and
 I reject it because in utterly clear opposition to the gospel it calls 25
 sacrifices those things which are signs of God added to promises,
 offered to us to be received, not to be offered by us. As for the king’s
 saying that these words, “As often as you do,” are not in the gospel,
 what child does not see that such a great defender fails in grammar?
 As if indeed it was necessary for the evangelists to agree in every 30
 syllable and to establish that form of the sacrament which the papists
 have established for us so immutable and necessary that they make
 guilty of mortal sin and deliver to hell one who has omitted that least
 little word: like Rhadamanthus and
 Aeacus those men, murderers of most free 35
 consciences, thus rave.³²⁰ Therefore, by the
 testimony of grammarians and of everyone’s common sense, I say
 that what the evangelists say about the supper is the same, however
 much it may vary in a few words, and that “Do this” is the same as
 “As often as you do this”; and I believe that the Holy Spirit with 40

³¹⁸ The blasphemous buffoonery of Luther

³¹⁹ Luther’s words

³²⁰ These render you raving or rather raging mad

singular wisdom took care that the evangelists would write the same matter a little differently and commit that unforgivable sin against the papist form of the sacrament, so that He might render us safe from future superstition and the tyranny of impious men. For he who would use the form of Luke, Mark, Matthew, Paul, would consecrate no less truly than he who uses the form of this impious and false canon.

5

Truly the canon of the mass urges you, which you have approved in one passage and used in your own support; but this has no weight against you who think nothing is more foolish than that someone should demand of you that you should stand by your words, you whose constant custom it is whenever you please to declare unsaid whatever you have said.³²¹ But I wonder what occasion you have had here of chattering about the agreement of the evangelists, as if the king had denied that they say the same thing in different words, or as if any of the evangelists has those words which you have selected for confirming your own position from the canon so often condemned by you. Have you, by such trifling, hoped to trick your readers, so that they could not understand how prettily you answer? For you think you make witty sport against the king; you say that any boy sees that he is lacking in grammar; then you, such a great grammarian, with all grammarians and the common sense of everyone called on for a witness, say that “Do this” is the same as “Do this as often as you do it.” If only you had argued that in that passage Christ meant such and such, and that elsewhere He spoke certain things in such and such a manner of speaking, to which it was not His intention to bind anyone, the matter could somehow have been tolerated. But now, since you say that according to grammar and the common sense of men “Do this” is the same as “Do this as often as you do it,” I think that no boy is so ignorant of grammar as not to laugh at your grammar, and to judge that you have nothing at all of the sense common or proper to man, but rather a sense more brutish than is in any brute, you through whom we are taught according to grammar and common sense thus constantly to understand the scriptural text, “Do this as often as you do it.”³²² Give alms, as often as you give them. Fast, as often as you fast. And according to the same method he will doubtless deduce: Thou shalt not steal, as often as you do not; love God, as often as you love Him; and, thou shalt not commit adultery, as often

10

15

20

25

30

35

³²¹ Luther’s constant custom

³²² Luther’s canon for interpreting scriptures

as you do not commit adultery; and others by a similar reasoning; and this is the rule of the reverend father for understanding scriptures according to both grammar and common sense, according to which rule he can escape anyone's being able to prove by evident scriptures that either any virtue has been commanded or any vice forbidden; and then he will more easily maintain that good works profit nothing nor do evil works cause any harm, but faith alone suffices for salvation, not according to the promise of Christ, but according to the promise of Luther.

5

He refutes that most absurd sophism by which Luther quibbles thus: The priest receives the eucharist in the mass, therefore he cannot offer it. Chapter 17.

10

Where indeed I had written that sacrifice and mass are contrary since a sacrifice is offered but the mass is received,³²³ here the daring Lord Henry dares to summon Luther to the Bible, saying: "Where is there anywhere in the old law any sacrifice which is not at the same time offered and received?" He proclaims that clearly here Luther's foremost argument is destroyed, and the boastful defender triumphs securely. I answer: My foremost argument is not this, but that which above Lord Henry, in his Thomistic goodness, has granted me; namely, that the mass is a testament and a promise; this, I say, is my chief argument.³²⁴ Nevertheless, if I may make a suggestion to the conqueror, if Lord Henry had only once opened the Bible and looked into it, indeed if he had remembered the fiftieth psalm which he once recited as a boy (if he is a Christian), he would not have boasted of such a Thomistic triumph, since there he would have read of the holocaust, than which there is no more solemn or greater sacrifice in the law. This certainly was offered wholly to God alone; nothing was received from it.

15

20

25

30

Here at least Luther, sensing that this line of attack is weak, gives the signal for retreat as covertly as possible and says that his strongest foundation was not this but rather the statement that the mass is a testament, which he says the king in Thomistic politeness has granted

35

³²³ Luther's words

³²⁴ Even this the king did not grant you, if you understand well enough

him, but which everyone sees was refuted before it was granted; afterwards it was so granted that the more he granted it to Luther the more foolish he proved Luther, who stupidly took as his foundation that which could be granted him without any disadvantage; having been granted, it profited him absolutely nothing. And yet he is still so stupid that he does not sense this, but so relies on the very powerful strength of that argument that he now considers as almost abandoned this statement that the same thing cannot be offered as is received,³²⁵ yet I do not see why the one is stronger than the other. For these two arguments: “The mass is a promise, therefore it cannot be a work,” and “The sacrament is received, therefore it is not offered,” are altogether similar sophisms, like the bad eggs of the same bad raven.

But while fleeing, he still skirmishes so as not to admit that he is fleeing. For when he had thus quibbled in the *Babylon*: “The sacrament of the altar is received by the priest, therefore it is not offered to God, for the same thing cannot be both received and offered,” the prince, amazed at the sophistry, asks whether or not all the sacrifices in the Mosaic law were both offered and yet received and eaten. Here Luther thinks that he gives a wonderful response when he brings forward one sacrifice which was wholly burned, as if it were enough for himself to find some one such sacrifice and not more than enough for the king against the sophism of Luther that there was even some one sacrifice which was both offered and eaten. But Luther of course has nettled the king exceedingly because the king spoke of all whereas this fellow teaches that one must be excepted. As though the king had asked thus:³²⁶ “Who is so impious that he denies that the most holy sacrament offered by the priests profits the people? Who is such an absurd heretic as to think that only faith suffices and that good works are not required? Who is so dull-witted as to judge that the Christian people are bound by no laws?” and a thousand questions of this nature; Luther would at once leap up and in his usual manner thus jeer at the prince: “How forgetful is this king who declares that there is no one so impious and dull-witted as to say such things. Therefore, if I may make a suggestion to this defender, if Lord Henry had only once opened and examined my books, he would not so boldly declare that there is no one so impious, no one so heretical,

³²⁵ That Luther himself now almost distrusts his own words

³²⁶ How neatly of course Luther stings the king

no one so dull-witted, since there he would easily have seen such an impious and dull-witted heretic, me.”

I do not know what the king may find here in his defense; I certainly find nothing but am forced to admit that in this matter indeed he is clearly overcome. For I did not take it on myself to defend anything written by the king with too little caution or to belittle with misrepresentation anything true that Luther may happen to say. On the contrary, I rather desire that each should correct whatever error he has made.³²⁷ 5
Therefore, just as I have urged Luther to 10
revoke and retract so many, such foolish heresies impiously aroused, so I have clearly advised the king to temper his pen in the future and to write more carefully and as often as he says that there was of old no sacrifice offered without its being also eaten, he should except the holocaust; if he should deny that anyone can create anything out of nothing, he should always except God; if he should deny that there is any virgin who has given birth, he should nevertheless except Mary; if he should deny that anyone is so impious or dull-witted as to defend this or that heretical point of monstrous absurdity, let him remember in such matters always to except Luther. 15
20

On the contrary,³²⁸ if my king had a little human sense I would turn the triumphant question on him and say: Where is there in the law any sacrifice which is received and not altogether wholly offered? Or will he mention to me here the sacrifice of the shoulders, the little breasts, and the other things which were granted for the use of the priests? Or will the equivocating king mock again call it an offering that something was brought from the fields by people and priests and placed before the Lord? Doubtless to offer and to present is the same thing with Lord Henry.³²⁹ But 25
what is it to me what the vendor of women’s wares pretends? For me it is enough that in the law whatever was offered to God was wholly burned. But what was not burned, but given partly to the priest, partly to the people, was not offered but separated from the offerings and eaten. But what have these sacred things to do with the profane? Therefore in the cup of the harlot of Babylon there is no sacrifice which is only offered, for that is the Bible of our Lord Henry; our Bible is filled with such sacrifices. 30
35

Here he thinks he is sharp and he thinks that he has found a

³²⁷ The candid intention of the author

³²⁸ Luther’s words

³²⁹ Here you seem to have a very good hold on your Bible

marvelous escape when he distinguishes between presenting and offering and argues that that only is a sacrifice which is burned for the Lord; but the other parts, with which are fed either the priest or those for whom the offering is made, he says are no sacrifice; here he reigns, here mocks, here he laughs loudly at the papists and keeps them like profane men at a distance from these very sacred things by means of the distinctions with which he distinguishes subtly between presenting and offering. 5

But meanwhile I wonder that this reverend friar, who wonders that there is anyone who summons him to the Bible, does not remember the second chapter of Leviticus, where we read as follows:³³⁰ “When anyone shall offer an oblation of sacrifice to the Lord, his offering shall be of fine flour, and he shall pour oil upon it, and put frankincense, and shall bring it to the sons of Aaron, the priest; and one of them shall take a handful of the flour and oil, and all the frankincense, and shall put it as a memorial upon the altar for a most sweet savor to the Lord. And the remnant of the sacrifice shall be Aaron’s, and his sons’, holy of holies of the offerings of the Lord.³³¹ But when thou offerest a sacrifice baked in the oven of flour, to wit, loaves without leaven, tempered with oil, and unleavened wafers, anointed with oil, if thy oblation be from the frying of flour tempered with oil, and without leaven, thou shalt divide it into little pieces and shalt pour oil upon it. And if the sacrifice be from the gridiron, in like manner the flour shall be tempered with oil. And when thou offerest it to the Lord thou shalt deliver it to the hands of the priest. And when he hath offered it, he shall take a memorial out of the sacrifice and burn it upon the altar for a sweet savor to the Lord. And whatsoever is left shall be Aaron’s and his sons’, holy of holies of the offerings of the Lord.³³² Every oblation that is offered to the Lord shall be made without leaven, neither shall any leaven or honey be burnt in the sacrifice to the Lord. You shall offer only the first fruits of them and gifts; but they shall not be put upon the altar, for a savor of sweetness. Whatsoever sacrifice thou offerest, thou shalt season it with salt, neither shalt thou take away the salt of the covenant of thy God from thy sacrifice. In all thy oblations thou shalt offer salt.” 10 15 20 25 30 35

Does not the scripture here manifestly say, reverend father, that

³³⁰ From Leviticus

³³¹ Is this wholly offered, father?

³³² Here it is clear that the whole sacrifice was not usually burned

that which falls to the share of the priests was the first share of the oblation of the sacrifice? Next it calls the same portion the remnant of the sacrifice; what else is this than that part of the sacrifice which is left over? It also calls this the holy of holies of the oblations of the Lord. Or does it call it the holy of holies of the offerings of the Lord because, according to the remarkable reasoning of your paternity, it was never offered to the Lord? Or does your paternity thus understand the holy of holies from the offerings of the Lord, that is, as so separated from the offerings of the Lord that there never was a part of that offering which was wholly an offering of the Lord? Your paternity often boasts of his grammar; but if this is your grammar,³³³ then if you wish to say that you are not an ass you necessarily have to concede that you are from the asses; this means, according to your grammar, separated from the asses, but according to the grammar of everyone else it means you are one of the asses; and this is the more common and truer sense. This same fact is also shown by what is read at the end of that same chapter: “But if thou offer a gift of the firstfruits of thy corn to the Lord, of the ears yet green, thou shalt dry it at the fire and break it small like meal, and so shalt thou offer thy firstfruits to the Lord, pouring oil upon it and putting on frankincense, because it is the oblation of the Lord, whereof the priest shall burn for a memorial of the gift part of the corn, broken small, and of the oil, and all the frankincense.” In these words you see, father, how manifestly the scripture says that the whole thing is an offering of the Lord although the priest will burn only a part of it. What then?³³⁴ But the remaining part of the flour Aaron with his sons shall eat without leaven. It shall not be leavened because a part of it is offered as a burnt-offering of the Lord. But why could it not be leavened after that part was separated and burnt, except because that also which is left and not burnt as a burnt-offering is nevertheless offered to the Lord. For it was also commanded earlier that every offering which is offered to the Lord should be made without leaven. Therefore it is manifest that this part also which is not burned but is eaten by the priests is an offering which is offered to the Lord. For that reason they are ordered to eat that part also without leaven, which otherwise they could leaven if it were not a sacrifice but, as you say, separated.

³³³ Luther’s grammar

³³⁴ Surprising that you do not remember these things, my honored Luther

Do you still want a most clear passage, Luther? “This is,” it says,
 “the law of the victim for sin; in the place where the holocaust is
 offered, it shall be immolated before the Lord. It is the holy of holies.
 The priest that offereth it shall eat it.”

And again:³³⁵ “As the sacrifice for sin is 5
 offered, so is also that for a trespass; the
 same shall be the law of both these sacri-
 fices; it shall belong to the priest that
 offereth it.” And again: “And every sacrifice of flour that is baked in
 the oven, and whatsoever is dressed on the gridiron, or in the frying 10
 pan, shall be the priest’s that offereth it.” Here you see, even if only
 part is burned, nevertheless the scripture thus testifies that the whole
 is offered and what must be eaten by the priest should be eaten by that
 one by whom the offering is made. And Holy Scripture is so full of
 testimonies of this fact that I am almost ashamed to present these as 15
 though the matter required proof; and yet I am astonished if others
 would be lacking. What will your fraternity say to that sacrifice of
 which Exodus, chapter twelve, writes, in which a male lamb without
 blemish was wholly immolated and wholly eaten; and the honored 20
 doctor Luther teaches us that it was not the custom for any sacrifice
 to be eaten among the Jews because to offer and to present are not the
 same thing. And this is that sacrosanct wisdom which we cannot grasp,
 we who are dull and profane papists, which they teach their initiates,
 these shrewd and sacrosanct potists.

He convicts the ridiculous arrogance of 25
 Luther, who thinks it ridiculous that the
 authority of all the holy fathers is opposed
 to himself. Chapter 18.

Finally he brings in the sayings of the 30
 fathers for the sake of establishing the
 sacrifice of the mass,³³⁶ and he laughs at my folly since I alone wish to
 know more than everyone, which is most foolish, etc. Here I say that
 my opinion is confirmed by this name, for this is what I have said, that

³³⁵ Here, Luther, you may see that your conclusion does not hold: It is received, therefore it is not offered

³³⁶ Luther’s words

the Thomistic asses have nothing to bring forward but a multitude of men and ancient usage; that then when someone presents the scriptures they say: “You are the most foolish of all men; are you alone wise?”³³⁷ Then, “It must be so.” To me, however, the most foolish of all men, it is enough that the most wise Henry can bring forward no scripture against me nor weaken the force of any brought forward against himself. Next, he is forced to grant that his fathers have quite often erred, that his ancient usage does not make an article of faith; against them one is permitted to trust only in that church of the multitude with its indulgences of which he himself is the defender.

5

10

Behold again how pompously he now talks of the scriptures brought forward by himself, as though he had brought forward anything to the point, or as if the king, with regard to that one text which Luther has seized by the neck and dragged with him by force, had not with a single word withdrawn it from a sacrilegious and tortured meaning and restored it to its proper meaning; as if the king had not demolished that fellow’s ridiculous sophisms with evident scriptures; so now the shameless fellow dares to say that scriptures have not been brought forward against him,³³⁸ that those which he himself has brought forward have not been resolved. But of course it is absurd that when the point in question is what is the meaning of any proposed scripture, someone should dare to prefer the sayings of all the holy fathers agreeing on the same point to the word of a single friarling and heretic inconsistent with himself. For I see that it is this by which Luther is so inflamed, and I am surely not surprised, because the king says that it is strange that of so many holy fathers, of so many eyes as have read the same gospel in the church through so many ages, not one was ever so clear-sighted that he was able to grasp a matter as clear as Luther would have this one appear. No one, therefore, who has any sense would believe in Luther unless he first shows either that he has read another gospel than those holy fathers read, or that he has read the same one more carefully or understood it better, or finally that he has a greater concern for the faith than any mortal has ever had up till now. These words of the king are of course absurd to Luther. I am not surprised if he should long to be deaf to them. For surely, however much he has laid aside

15

20

25

30

35

³³⁷ Indeed, and the most arrogant of all men and the most greedy for glory

³³⁸ The bold and manifest lie of Luther

all sense of shame, yet it cannot but happen that this biting truth should also painfully prick the ears, however asinine, of the lying fellow. For what do you have to say here, Luther? Scripture is brought forward by each of you; each of you acknowledges it as sacred; but you do not agree on its meaning; what then shall be done? Who will judge which of you presents the truer meaning of that scripture?³³⁹ Which now seeks more fairly? You seek to have yourself believed; the king seeks to have the ancient fathers believed. What reason do you present for rejecting these judges? If the suit is difficult of judgment, there is need of such judges; but if it is easy, it is no easier for others than it was for them. Why do you cast them out from this judgment who above all ought to be accepted? For of these men who live today, some are good, others evil. The evil men favor you because of your vices. The good for the same reason are hostile to you. Thus differing emotion eliminates both from this trial. The ancient fathers could not have hated you since they died so many ages before anyone could suspect that some cacodaemon would one day cack such dung as you out on the earth. Or is this not evidence of your consciousness of being condemned most completely by your own judgment, that you reject such judges?

But you earlier objected the same thing to the papists, as you call them, that they demand that only they themselves be believed whereas you demand that the most clear scriptures of God be believed. First of all I ask you, most wise man, for what men alone do the papists demand belief? It is only for the Italians, Spaniards, Germans, English, and finally for all men alone, not only who live today but also whatever good men have lived since the death of Christ. They are so ridiculous that they demand that all men alone be believed.³⁴⁰ But you demand that the most evident scriptures of God be believed; but how do you call evident, I pray, what for so many ages no one of such enlightened men could discern? Moreover, since it is now a question on behalf of which side those scriptures are evident, on behalf of yours or on behalf of the opposite, since you present no one on behalf of your side as either the patron or witness of your opinion, whereas the church brings forward against you the public agreement of all Christians and proves by the sayings of the ancient fathers that all the faithful have also judged the same thing throughout

³³⁹ He will answer: himself, as one taught from heaven

³⁴⁰ See, reader, what Luther calls an unfair demand

so many ages, who judges it ridiculous, except you who are the most ridiculous of all men, if all men prefer to trust all themselves alone rather than only you, a single infidel?³⁴¹ And although these things are so clear that even a blind man clearly discerns them, and that Luther can neither endure nor conceal his own overthrow, by which he is most disgracefully thrown down, nevertheless, as drunkards usually do, while waking he dreams mad dreams and solemnly decrees a triumph for himself.

5

Here, he says,³⁴² I sit. Here I stand. Here I remain. Here I boast. Here I triumph. Here I leap with insults on the papists, the Thomists, the Henricists, the sophists, and all the gates of hell. And I do not care if a thousand Augustines, a thousand Cyprians, stand against me.

10

15

Now, Luther, you think you have acted vigorously, as if indeed it were a great matter to rage in this raging mad manner, and, as happens most wretchedly to abandoned heretics after they have fallen into the depths of despair, now to contemn absolutely everything human and divine. Would that the dungeon would not press its mouth upon you, wretched little fellow. Then you would see yourself wretched and would bewail your unhappy fortune and would cry out with changed words: Alas, here have I fallen wretchedly, here I am thrust down, here I lie, here I am jeered at, here I am tormented, here I am cut down in the depths of the whirlpool, here all hell has closed its gates upon me, from here on that terrible day the demons will lead me forth to judgment; alas, wretch that I am, how miserable a spectacle. There then those men will insult me whom I now insult, the papists, Thomists, Henricists, Augustines, Cyprians, and all the saints. Then, contemned by Christ whom I formerly had contemned in His church and saints, the cacodaemons will lead me back again and hell will shut up its gates again. Lying there a pauper together with the condemned Dives, tortured with flame, I will implore a thousand times with many vain groans that one Augustine, or one Cyprian, of whom I, a thousand times mad, formerly contemned a thousand, with even one little finger dipped in water might cool my cursing tongue as it pays with burning the punishment of blasphemy; and as these things will be true, Luther, unless you return to your

20

25

30

35

³⁴¹ Do you not think this is ridiculous, Luther?

³⁴² Luther's words. It is not necessary to insult them for the gate lie wide open for you

senses, so I pray God that with your mind restored you may regain your senses and make them false.

575

It is very mean in such a great king³⁴³ to write such an important book and not to wish to touch this my head point, namely that the mass is a testament. Nor has it been discovered who has ever dared to touch it. However many draw near to this point, they flee back by seven paths who with great force and with a triumphal shout rushed in by one path. It is strange how they would wish to do harm here, how serious this spectre is in their eyes. But no one has conducted himself more shrewdly here than King Henry,³⁴⁴ who, ready to destroy Luther, declares that he will not touch this argument. But I neither have nor give thanks for such a great kindness; rather, let his wrath and raging fury enjoy bad health if he can do harm and does not do it.

Behold now for the tenth time, reader, this ridiculous boast, that neither the king nor anyone has dared to touch that insane head point of Luther, but that such a terrifying and raging spectre has so frightened everyone that whoever have approached by one path, retreated by seven. O terrifying fury! He imagines, I think, that he is now Cerberus in hell and that, throwing himself about in his chains, he affrights the shades there with his snarling and barking. But the king, who Luther says has shrewdly declared that he will not touch that insane head point, has nevertheless so crushed that head with one blow that he has cut it completely to pieces.³⁴⁵ Then he has so shattered the rest of the body that no paralysis could destroy a body more.

But I condemn his madness with which he inveighs against me,³⁴⁶ because I have taught that faith without works is the best preparation for the sacrament and that Christians ought not to be bound by laws to receive it. For they are the words of a man who thinks that men become good before God through laws, knowing less of what faith and works are and what laws operate in the consciences of wicked men than this irrational block of wood. For it is not like papists to know these things, but, as Peter and Jude say, only to blaspheme what they do not know. For consciences are advised not by laws but by grace alone; by laws, especially by human ones, they are most miserably destroyed.

³⁴³ Luther's words

³⁴⁴ What a spectre Luther is

³⁴⁵ The Cerberean head of Luther crushed by the king

³⁴⁶ Luther's words. What then he means by those who have done well, etc.

Here in the midst of his madness Luther enjoys at least a lucid interval, when he leaps over this rugged passage by contempt. For it is easier for him to condemn the reasons of the prince than to defend his own ravings, that indeed all Christians are released from all laws, nor can anyone be bound by any laws, and because consciences are advised by grace, therefore the laws should be abrogated, lest anyone heedless of grace should at least be restrained from crime and like a wandering sheep be thrust back onto the path by the shepherd's staff. The prince has certainly never understood these amazing paradoxes;³⁴⁷ but neither has Paul the apostle of the papistic church, who says that the law is good and the bond of justice. But neither, I think, could the king have ever understood the statement that it is best to approach the sacrament as empty as possible of good works. For as the church sets confession before communion so that everyone may come to receive it free from vices, so Luther, contemning confession, retaining vices, warns that no one should come more sluggishly weighed down by virtues; and he preaches that faith alone without good works suffices. But it is not like the papists to know these sacrosanct mysteries; indeed, it is not like men, nor angels, nor even Christ Himself, unless perchance He has now finally learned from Luther. For at one time He certainly did not know them, since through the mouth of the apostle James He said: "Faith without works is dead," and by His own mouth He declared:³⁴⁸ "Those who have done good shall go into life everlasting, but those who have done evil, into everlasting fire." Therefore, honest reader, he who now at last teaches such amazing doctrines, he is certainly not a stupid and irrational block of wood, but a man of unusual understanding and clearly a very rational head worthy of understanding irrational blocks of wood.

³⁴⁷ Luther will easily conquer this man by contemning him

³⁴⁸ Does he not here, Luther, demand good works?

He refutes the stupid misrepresentation
with which Luther distorts a certain
argument of the king so that he may seem
to conquer it. Chapter 19.

579

But at the end of this passage it is worth
seeing how anxiously he strives³⁴⁹ to estab- 5
lish necessary traditions of men against my judgment by which I
established that outside of the scriptures nothing should be established,
or if it is established it should be considered free and not necessary,
since we are lords even of the sabbath through Christ the liberator. 10
And so the king argues first of all thus: If nothing must be retained
except what has been delivered by the scriptures, since it is not written
that the sacrament was received by Christ, it will follow that neither
can the priests receive. Relying on this Thomistic hypothesis, he thus
raises this syllogism against me: Priests necessarily receive the sacra- 15
ment and the gospel does not have this; therefore other practices also
must necessarily be observed without the gospel. This is Thomistically
concluded through the rule of conse-
quences familiar to them, which is called
begging the question.³⁵⁰ For the king should 20
first have proved that it is necessary under pain of mortal sin that
the sacrament be received by priests. For I say that priests are free
to receive and not to receive. But it is necessary through the tra-
ditions of men and the usage of many. Therefore the Thomistic
king very well proves traditions through traditions, that which is 25
denied through what is denied, for on
such proofs, not on others, is the defense
of the sacraments and the whole Henrical
church supposed to rely.³⁵¹

Indeed, reader, in all this passage Luther would be a not un- 30
pleasant rascal, if the reasoning of the king had been as convenient to
refutation as Luther fashions it to his convenience. For what he now
answers is not unwitty but altogether beside the point. For, as Horace
says, it was not now the place for these things; as you will easily see,
reader, when you have heard the words of the king, for they are as 35
follows:

“Now let us come to the example of
Christ³⁵² by which Luther thinks that we are

³⁴⁹ Luther's words

³⁵⁰ I wonder why St. Thomas is so hateful to you

³⁵¹ Now this buffoon plays the buffoon

³⁵² The king's words

violently overthrown, because at the supper Christ did not use the sacrament as a sacrifice, nor did He offer it to the Father. From which he tries to prove that the mass, which ought to correspond with the example of Christ by which it was instituted, can be neither sacrifice nor oblation. If Luther recalls us so strictly to the example of the Lord's supper that he does not permit priests to do anything which Christ is not read to have done there, then they will never receive the sacrament which they consecrate. For we do not read in the gospel that Christ received His own body.³⁵³ The fact that several doctors teach that He did receive it and that the church proclaims the same teaching can give no support to Luther, since he does not place any faith in all the doctors or in the faith of the whole church, and he thinks that nothing at all should be believed except what is confirmed by scriptures and those clear ones, for this is what he writes on the sacrament of orders; I am sure that he will not find in this sort of scriptures that Christ received His own body at the supper. It will follow from this, as I said, that priests should not receive what they themselves consecrate, if Luther binds us so strictly to the example of the Lord's supper. But if he grants that it should be received by priests on the grounds that the apostles received and argues that they are commanded to do what the apostles then did, not what Christ did, then according to this reasoning priests will never consecrate. For Christ, not the apostles, consecrated."

You see here, reader, that Luther was arguing from the example of Christ that the priest cannot offer the body of Christ because Christ, to whose example the mass ought to correspond, did not offer His body at the supper. The king, as you have heard, answered that if Luther permits the priest to do nothing in the mass which Christ is not proved according to the gospel to have done at the supper, the priest will not be permitted to receive the body of Christ which he himself has consecrated, because Christ who consecrated is not read to have received at the supper. But if Luther said that the priests receive because they are ordered to do that which the apostles then did, not that which Christ did, then by this reasoning the priests would not consecrate.³⁵⁴ For Christ, not the apostles, consecrated. Where then is this syllogism which Luther says that the king sets up against him? There is absolutely none such in the king's work,

³⁵³ The absurdity of Luther is here shown

³⁵⁴ The king's dilemma against the argument of Luther

nor was there place for such a syllogism in the king's work, since there was being discussed not this which Luther pretended, whether the priest necessarily received, but that it was not right for him to receive the body of Christ consecrated by himself, if Luther's reasoning was valid, which forbade the priests to offer because Christ did not offer; which reasoning of Luther also forbids the priest to receive because Christ did not receive. Where then does Luther now find that argument which he writes that the king makes? Is it not clear that he himself has fashioned it himself, doubtless so that he might have something against which he could make mocking sport? Go now and deny that Luther is a witty and merry buffoon. Now that also which follows is the second part of the same witty raillery.

Secondly he says this:³⁵⁵ Christ, not the apostles, consecrated the sacrament; therefore it is not permitted to the apostles or the priests to consecrate because it is not permitted to establish or do anything other than the scripture contains. But if that wretched Luther should wish to escape here and to say, "Christ commanded the apostles to consecrate when He says, 'Do this,' " my Lord Henry ungraciously seizes on this, saying that this was said about receiving, not about consecrating. Christ our Savior, what unheard of blindness and madness is in these men.

Christ our Savior, what a great trifler and pettifogger is father toper.³⁵⁶ For neither can he thus escape through the fact that Christ ordered the apostles to consecrate. For by ordering this, He ordered them to do only what He Himself had done. But this was to consecrate only what they would give to others. For Luther, who receives nothing but evident scriptures, cannot prove that Christ received His own body; therefore Luther still does not prove anything, except that according to his reasoning the priest will consecrate only; he will not receive what he consecrates. But the apostles, you will say, ate before they were ordered to do so. True, but not what they themselves consecrated; therefore you cannot escape this labyrinth by any means; indeed, if you restrict the priests to the example of the Lord's supper, the priest will not receive the sacrament which he himself consecrates. For no one did this at the supper, but as no one is³⁵⁷ baptized by his own hand, no one is absolved by his own hand, so no priest will receive the sacrament

³⁵⁵ Luther's words

³⁵⁶ Mimicry of Luther's words

³⁵⁷ Inference from example

which he himself has consecrated. And thus the argument of the king still proceeds, penetrating the cloud which the rascal tries to pour out.

585

Now as for his statement that the king seizes on the word, “Do this,” saying that it was said about receiving, not about consecrating, truly father toper seizes on this by lying. For the king never said this; since this is so, that witty buffoonery of the reverend father clearly flags, with which he thus foolishly interrogates the king: Lord Henry, from what grammar did your lordship learn?³⁵⁸ What vocabulary or glossary said to you that “Do this” is the same as “Receive”? And then he himself answers for the king; “He will answer,” he says, “it should be so,” because names are arbitrary.

Indeed my honored Luther, since you discuss nothing seriously but only mock so foolishly and together with misrepresentation of others you deride your own discovery, your name “Luder” will be fashioned from Luther, because it should be so;³⁵⁹ and that not according to Aristotle by whom names are imposed arbitrarily, but according to Plato’s *Cratylus* on the right meaning of names; or, one who I see is more familiar to you, according to Albert on the modes of signification, who also wrote for you that little treatise *On the Secrets of Women*. For just as with him a stone is as it were something wounding the foot, so you will be Luder as though a mocking-master. But in this passage I am amazed at the wonderful wealth of your folly, that it almost never makes an appearance except doubled. For another it would have been enough in this way to have sought a stupid laugh from that statement of the king which the king never said. But for you it was not enough, unless you would laugh at that statement regarding which even if someone said it, not he who said it but he who laughed at it would be ridiculous. For I ask you, my honored sir, from what grammar did your lordship learn? What glossary told you that he does not speak accurately who, on being asked what he has done, should answer, “I ate or drank”? On the contrary, so that you may clearly see that you have gained this laugh stupidly, see the apostle clearly referring this word, “Do this,” to the reception of the sacrament. For thus he recounts: “Take and eat, this is my body which shall be delivered for you; do this in

³⁵⁸ Honored Doctor Martin’s tasteless wit

³⁵⁹ Indeed they say that in this way a name was bestowed perhaps by the fates on some of the fathers, like Hippolytus and such

remembrance of me.’ Likewise the cup after He supped, saying, ‘This cup is the new testament in my blood; do this, as often as you shall drink it, in remembrance of me.’³⁶⁰ For as often, etc.’”

5

What is clearer than that these words, “Do this,” are referred by the apostle to the reception; about which nevertheless the king, so far as I see, has said not even a word, but the honored Luder makes sport of the apostle. He is angry at him, I believe, because he is afraid that the apostle seems to seize on and take away the other part of his remarkable division which follows; for thus Father Luder proceeds to mock.

10

But now, dismissing these pigs, let us say:³⁶¹ Christ instituted the practice of receiving when He said, “Take and eat,” as the words themselves most clearly testify, not indeed to these Henries and blockheads, but to any boys and simpletons whatever. But He instituted the office of consecration when He says, “Do this,” for to do is wholly to imitate this which He Himself then did.

15

20

Here the reverend father, dismissing the papist pigs, turns to Lutherist asses, that is, his elect disciples, saying: “But now, dismissing the pigs, let us say,” as though he should say, “My pearls are not to be thrown before pigs, but you whom I have chosen, whom I have washed with mud, whom I have cleansed with dung, whom I have puffed up with heresies, whom I have sanctified with schism, to you I say it is given to know my mysteries.” And then he begins to expound the scripture to them, and, avoiding the Thomistic and scholastic manner, he follows the simplicity of the gospel and divides the words of Christ into two parts, teaching that Christ teaches two things, the practice of receiving and the office of consecrating; the first by the words, “Take and eat,” the second by the words, “Do this, etc.” Concerning these things, according to the teaching of the reverend father, it must be noted that Christ instituted for everyone the use of this sacrament in remembrance of Himself, so that anyone at all might determine for himself whether he wished to use or ignore it, and therefore Christ said, “Do this in remembrance of me”; that is, choose either to do or not to do; in confirmation of which Christ,

25

30

35

³⁶⁰ The apostle’s words for the opinion of the king

³⁶¹ Luther’s words. Why then, simpleton, do you not understand more clearly?

when He had said, “Do this,” immediately added, “in memory of me,” as though He said: “I grant you the free choice whether you wish to be mindful or unmindful of me, just as I grant myself the free choice whether I wish to be mindful or unmindful of you.”³⁶² And this teaching the reverend father everywhere teaches, in the *Babylon*, in the *Assertions*, in this book against the king, again and again insisting on it and throwing it up against the king, even apart from his intention, for he says nothing of the sort. 5

Therefore, after he has thus clearly taught his disciples, he promptly roams about in his own arena. For his mind wanders abroad as long as a discussion demands the use of reason; but when it comes to a matter of railing, then, and then only, does it feel perfectly at home again. 10

What shall I say, he says,³⁶³ to these sacrilegious monstrosities, who indicate by such arguments how they have thus written from the most unrestrained envy so that nothing more silly and foolish can be fashioned? For if this argument of the dull-witted king is valid, then we will be permitted to imitate Christ in nothing. For suppose that Christ had not instituted the consecration of the sacrament, a thing which is impossible, nevertheless He showed the example of consecrating and wished it to be written down; unless our king argues that we ought neither to pray nor do good nor suffer because nothing has been written about our prayers, works, and sufferings. The boundless stupidity of the most stupid king quite overcomes me with weariness. 15 20 25

You have railed vehemently indeed, but all against your own head. For that which you rail at, you yourself, not the king, have said. I ask you, where has the king said that we are so strictly bound to the example of Christ at the supper? On the contrary, his whole reasoning wars against your folly, by which you wished to bind everyone so strictly to the example of Christ that because Christ did not there offer His body to the Father neither can the priest therefore now offer it. On the other hand, the king has proved and shown from this foolish trick of yours what great nonsense would follow. For in that manner it follows that the priest should neither consecrate nor should he eat what he himself has consecrated. Besides he has taught, even by your admission, that it is permitted to mingle water with the wine, a thing which does not square with the example of the Lord’s supper. 30 35

³⁶² The Lutheran interpretation of the institution by Christ

³⁶³ Luther’s words

And now you hurl jeers at him as though he too strictly binds us to the example of the Lord's supper, whereas you yourself alone do that.³⁶⁴ And all the while we are all portents and pigs to you.

591

He proves to Luther that it cannot be certain how the body of Christ must be consecrated except through the faith of the church. Chapter 20. 5

But because to you, Luther, we papists are pigs, what if some one of these pigs should step in among your herd of asses and as you were braying your mysteries to your herd should grunt at you in this manner: Hail, herd of asses, and hail to you also, Luther, master and leader of the asinine herd, ass supreme. I have for a long time now heard you braying many things most ignorantly about the mass. 10

But here I ask you, master ass, since you alone understand the mass, since you have seen those things which, if your boasts are true, no one has seen before you, you who have discovered that the mass is not a sacrifice and who have condemned the canon which calls it a sacrifice, you who together with the false and erroneous canon as you call it have convicted all Christian priests of falsehood and error who, almost from the time of Christ's passion, have celebrated the mass, you who do not at all believe the Holy Spirit of God who rules the church of Christ, you who cause there to be no church at all if that one is not the church whose canon calls the mass an oblation and a sacrifice, you who wish all things to be free which cannot be proved by evident scripture, which very scripture, whenever you please, you either pretend is doubtful or twist it to an evident absurdity;³⁶⁵ nor, concerning its evidence, would you wish to stand by the judgment of anyone, not even of the whole world, but by your own alone, so that for scripture to be evident is nothing else but to be called evident by you; I ask you, great authority on the mass, what you can prove to us about the mass should someone meanwhile pass over the authority of the church and attack you with your own tricks? Tell me how you 15 20 25 30

³⁶⁴ Luther mocks in another what he allows in himself

³⁶⁵ For he knows that no one would vote for him

can know either what the mass is or how it should be celebrated, or by what words the consecration is accomplished. You teach that the mass is the words of Christ with a visible sign, and you add: those words of Christ are these, "But while they were at table, etc." First of all, how clever it is that you call the words of Christ those which are of the evangelist; if the king had said anything like that, how many and what kind of fools would you have wittily fashioned here where such a true opportunity would be given, you who have stupidly fashioned so many kinds of fools there where there was no folly but your own? But, leaving aside this folly of yours, I inquire by what scripture do you prove that those words of the gospel are about the substance of the mass? But here, I remember, you will answer that they are not. For it does not make any difference by which evangelist's words it is accomplished. I will not argue with you about this matter, but yet at the same time do you recall it, so that you do not later pretend that it was granted to you, as you do with the king; for I wish this point to be retained integrally for me who do not hesitate to prove that the consecration must take place according to the canon rather than according to all the books of the evangelists.

But meanwhile I ask this: by what scripture do you prove that it is of the substance of the mass that any gospel be read? For if it is not, your definition would be false by which you define the mass as a promise and as the words of the gospel with a sensible sign added.³⁶⁶ But if you argue that it is of the substance of the mass that some gospel be read at the mass, since you say that nothing is valid except evident scripture, prove to us through evident scripture that it is of the substance of the mass that some gospel be read at the mass. Doctor Martin teaches us the doctrine of Christ about the mass and he divides the matter clearly, saying that Christ instituted the practice of receiving by the words, "Take and eat," and the office of consecrating when He says, "Do this." Therefore, if it belongs to the office of the one consecrating to read the gospel at mass, it is contained in those words by which Christ handed over that office. But Doctor Martin expounds those words to us most clearly. To do, he says, is to imitate wholly this which He did. Therefore someone should preside who should take the bread, bless and break and give it to the disciples. But meanwhile I see no scripture here which either evidently or obscurely commands that the gospel be

³⁶⁶ That the mass is defined perversely by the honored Martin

read, in which you, Luther, wish the promise to be contained, which together with the adjoined sacrament constitutes the mass. For when He says, "Do this that I am doing," He did not command that any gospel be recited, for He Himself was not reciting any.

You see here, Luther, outstanding authority on the mass who cast out the old mass, that you can nowhere find anything with which to defend that new mass of yours. Or will you say that by necessary reasoning the gospel must be recited because the consecration would not be brought about by the priest except through some words of that gospel? I admit that this is true, because the church teaches me so, because Christ teaches the church so. But you, who despise the church, who blaspheme Christ who teaches the church, who protest that you hold nothing as certain besides evident scriptures, you will never make it evident from scripture, especially if anyone answers you in your own manner, that the consecration would take place through any words of the gospel.³⁶⁷ For, to omit for the time being that I could refer the words, "Do this," to the reception, and that on the authority of the apostle, yet, setting this aside, as you, more expert than the apostle, have divided the matter with a Tenedian two-edged axe, let those words refer to the office of consecrating, what do you yet have there which proves that consecration is accomplished by the power of any words whatever of the gospel? Is it these words, namely, "This is my body"? How do you prove this? You do not read there a precept that those words should be said as they are recited in the gospel in the manner of one relating an account. If you wish to do there what He does, then, just as Christ commands when He says, "Do this," the priest in the mass should, not in the manner of one relating an account but as one admonishing and declaring, say, "This is the body of Christ," just as He Himself did not relate but admonished and declared when He said, "This is my body."

What will you say here, if you condemn the church? When will you make this scripture evident for the mass so as to prove that it is necessary for that gospel to be read in the mass? And I could defend these things against you even if you had proved that in those words, "This is my body," Christ accomplished the consecration. But now, not even in this can you prove anything. For if you say that immediately after those words His body was present, I may say that it was

³⁶⁷ Now you may see, Luther, that your mass cannot be consecrated

present before He broke the bread, as the apostle says: “The bread which we break is the sharing of the body.” For when the evangelists thus recount: “He took the bread, blessed and broke and gave it to the disciples saying, “This is my body,”” by what scripture or reasoning could you refute me if I argued that in that blessing He accomplished the change, and that then He broke and handed over His body which was present and said this, which was a fact, “This is my body,” namely, what was His body before He began to utter those words? I could easily defend these arguments against you. I could easily defend the statement that without any word of the gospel at all the consecration could take place, merely by the presentation and blessing of the bread. 5 10

In fact, take away, as you try to do, the authority of the Holy Spirit governing the church, and I shall accomplish what I said before: that you will sweat aplenty before you can show, since you leave only two sacraments, baptism and the eucharist, why either of these is a sacrament according to your definition rather than that washing by which Christ washed the feet of the apostles.³⁶⁸ For even there also there was a sensible sign of washing, just as in baptism, and a promise so necessary that when Peter refused he was threatened: “Unless I wash you you shall have no part with me.” Then, just as at the supper He said, “Do this,” so here also He said precisely, after having presented His own example, “You also ought to wash one another’s feet.” What could you say here³⁶⁹ if anyone should argue against you who lay down only two sacraments that according to scripture you should take up a third, to which your definition fits, namely, a promise of grace with a sensible sign; by what scripture could you avoid this? You could neither beat off this argument nor establish the mass itself. For after I am permitted, contrary to your glossaries, on the authority of Paul, to refer this text, “Do this,” to the reception, then when I please you would be dispossessed of the other part of your division by which you teach that in that word the office of consecration is delivered and that it is absurd for anyone to refer it to the reception. And then I shall thrust you back, so that you will seek for anything whatever in defense of the authority of consecrating. But if I should grant that those words are referred to the office of consecrating, you will not any the more have 15 20 25 30 35

³⁶⁸ How would you avoid this, definer extraordinary?

³⁶⁹ That which you are accustomed to say elsewhere: a lie

succeeded in being able to prove by evident scripture by what means
 or words the mass must be accomplished. And I am not saying these
 things just as if the matter were true, but because you can never dis-
 prove that it is true if someone should dispute with you in your own
 manner. But we who know that it is certain 5
 that Christ delivered His sacraments to
 the church through the apostles, we are
 certain about the number, about the form,
 about the rite; nor would we be uncertain even if no gospel had ever
 been written.³⁷⁰ For Paul delivered it to the Corinthians just as he had 10
 received it from the Lord. And he had delivered it through a dis-
 course before the writing of the epistle, not relying on any books of the
 evangelists.

Nor does anyone doubt that the mass was also celebrated a
 thousand times before Matthew wrote. This was preserved according 15
 to the primitive tradition by uninterrupted custom. This the Spirit
 of Christ preserves in the church. In that very church, I say, which
 teaches which is the true gospel. From this church you must learn
 about the mass, if you wish to speak correctly about the mass.
 Otherwise you will be borne about in doubt and uncertainty by 20
 every wind of doctrine, and you will reduce everything to doubt; this
 is clearly your only purpose, and you strive for nothing else at all than
 that everyone should finally consider the mass and the sacrament and
 all holy things dismissed as uncertain.

He shows excellently how Luther, ensnared by 25
 his own confession, now tries in vain to escape,
 variously twisting the word of Augustine and
 quibbling foolishly between the right of judging
 doctrines and the right of establishing laws.

Chapter 21. 30

Therefore let us turn his³⁷¹ pen to the ulti-
 mate source of perfidy, which is the word
 of Augustine: “I would not believe the gospel if the authority of the

³⁷⁰ That faith in Christ would stand firm even if no written gospel existed

³⁷¹ Luther’s words

church did not persuade me"; this word the sacrilegious men twist and pervert to the extent that they attribute to the church, that is, to the harlot of Rome, who except for her title has nothing either ecclesiastical or Christian, the right of establishing laws. To this Lord Henry adds that by the authority of the same kind of word he also presses me by my own words, when I said that in the church there is the right of judging any doctrine whatever. I see that this most ignorant head of the king needs nothing but a dictionary or glossary so that he might begin to learn words with the boys,³⁷² unless from sheer Thomistic wickedness he does this so that he may force all words to signify all things, so that here also the right of judging is the same as the right of establishing or founding laws.

Briefly, if Augustine had declared even in well-polished words that anyone in the church has the right of establishing laws, who is Augustine? Who will force us to believe him? By what authority is his word an article of faith? I admit his word has been accepted, but it is not sufficiently safe or firm. The right of establishing law must be proved by divine edict, not by human. But now they do not simply corrupt the word of Augustine. For he speaks of the church spread throughout the world, whose right it is to judge concerning doctrines. This they attribute to the pope whom they themselves confess to be very often a member of the devil and to be in error. And they not only give him the right and the power of judging but also even of founding law. Accordingly, it is necessary that we declare here to these ignorant sophists what is the difference between the right of judging or investigating and the right of establishing or commanding. To investigate and judge about doctrine belongs to each and every Christian, and it belongs in such a way that he is anathema who has established this right by invincible and varying opinions. Matthew: "Beware of false prophets who come to you in sheep's clothing." This word he certainly says to the people against these doctors and commands them to avoid their false teachings.³⁷³ But how can they avoid them unless they investigate them? How investigate unless they have the right of judging? But now he has established not only the right but the command to judge so that this authority alone can be enough against the opinions of all popes, all fathers, all councils, all schools. These opinions have attributed the right of judging to bishops and ministers alone, and have impiously and sacrilegiously snatched it away from the people, that is, from the

³⁷² And I see that you need nothing but a sound mind

³⁷³ Against such doctors as Luther is. According to the doctrine of the catholic church each one judges those who teach heretical doctrines

Queen Church. For Christ stands firm,
 saying, "Beware of false prophets."³⁷⁴ To
 this almost all the syllables of all the
 prophets subscribe; for what do the
 prophets do but warn the people not to believe in false prophets? But 5
 what is this warning but to declare and affirm that the right of
 judging and investigating is in the power of the people, and to warn
 them of their own work and to arouse them against all the teachings
 of all their own priests and doctors? Therefore we here conclude that
 as often as Moses, Joshua, David, and all the prophets in the old law 10
 summon the people away from false prophets and warn them, so often
 do they proclaim, command, confirm, and stir up the right of
 investigating and judging all the teachings of all men. But they do this
 in innumerable passages. Does our Henry, or any unclean Thomist
 here, have anything to snarl at these arguments? 15

Have we not stopped the mouth of those
 who speak wicked things?³⁷⁵ Let us return
 to the new law where Christ, in John 10,
 says, "My sheep hear my voice." In truth they do not hear the
 voice of strangers but they flee from them. Does He not here make the 20
 sheep judges and confer the right of investigating on His hearers?
 And Paul, when in I Corinthians 4, he says: "Let one speak, let the
 others judge. But if something is revealed to someone sitting by, let
 the former be silent." Does he not here mean that judgment is in the
 possession of the hearer? Thus whatever Christ in Matt. 24 and else- 25
 where commands concerning false doctors, whatever Peter and Paul
 command about false apostles and teachers and John about testing
 spirits, leads to this conclusion that the authority for judging, proving,
 condemning belongs to the people, and that most justly.

In this most excellent passage, the honored doctor does two things. 30
 First, he answers to that which was nowhere said. Second, he answers
 what is most foolish. Concerning the first, it should be noted that the
 honored Luder, as is usual with him, tries to make sport of the reader
 so that he believes that the whole Christian church before it was
 taught by the honored doctor did not rightly understand that saying 35
 of Saint Augustine: "I would not believe the gospel if the authority
 of the church did not persuade me." For, according to him, the
 church did not understand in this way, that, unless he were taught by
 the catholic church, Augustine would not have known which was the
 true gospel but could have considered some pseudo-gospel as the true 40

³⁷⁴ O pestilential interpretation, that any one person should judge against all men taken together

³⁷⁵ Not in the least, for your mouth is still wide open

one and rejected the true as false; but up till now the church has understood that saying of Augustine in this way, that blessed Augustine even though it were well known which was the true gospel,³⁷⁶ even if God had testified it to him mouth to mouth, nevertheless would not want to believe the gospel unless he was commanded by the pope.

5

And this is one error which the honored doctor Luder has caught in the church. The other error³⁷⁷ is that according to this saying of Augustine the Roman pontiffs have arrogated to themselves the authority of founding law, since that saying of Augustine pertains only to the power of investigating and judging teachings, and these must be judged by the people; nor did blessed Augustine mean anything else. But the church has understood it thus for so many years now, namely as though Augustine had meant the power of founding laws, and according to that misunderstood saying the church has taken to itself the power of founding laws. And in this matter, reader, you will see easily that doctor Luder says the truth. For you will never see any council in which any laws were founded which did not lay the foundation of its power on that saying of Augustine, and especially will you see this in those councils in which laws were founded before the birth of Augustine,³⁷⁸ and especially in the council of the apostles in which the canons of the apostles were founded, and in the council which the apostles celebrated at Jerusalem, where they established for the time certain legal observances.

10

15

20

25

The third error³⁷⁹ is that the King of England misunderstood that text of Augustine and the gloss of doctor Martin, who confessed that the church has from God the power to distinguish the word of God from the words of men, according to which gloss of Luther the king objects to Luther that the church does not have this from God except for the reason that God does not wish to allow His church to err dangerously in necessary matters. According to which the king concluded that Luther must admit that the church also has from God the power of distinguishing the true meaning of scripture from the false, because otherwise she would distinguish the true scriptures to no purpose if she could not distinguish the true

30

35

³⁷⁶ How Luther understands the words of Augustine

³⁷⁷ The second error of the church censured by Luther

³⁷⁸ Luther is mocked

³⁷⁹ The third error censured by Luther

meaning from the false. And besides, Luther must grant according to his own statement that the church has from God the power of distinguishing the traditions of God from the traditions of men and false teachings from true ones, because in these matters she would be deceived with no less danger than in receiving human scripture in place of divine. And according to this it follows that the church cannot err in the sacraments and in necessary articles of faith, but can condemn Luther's false teachings and false interpretations of scripture. This argument of the king seemed to Father Luder so nonsensical that he did not wish to recall it because he did not have the strength to refute it, but, silently admitting everything, dismissing the king, he returns to the pope and distinguishes the power of investigating from the power of founding; only he rhetoricates in his own manner, that is, in the manner of harlots, panders, porters, charioteers, buffoons, and he again cites the glossaries, for they take the place for him of any kindly *deus ex machina* whenever he cannot extricate himself otherwise and bring his tragedy to a close. Again therefore, as though from a glossary, the honored doctor teaches what is the difference between the right of judging and the right of founding;³⁸⁰ nevertheless, at the same time he admits that the church, as she has from God the right of distinguishing the scriptures, so also has the right of judging teachings. Let us see therefore what gain the honored Luder makes from this distinction. Let us put off for a little while that part in which he asks whether any pontiff, any synod, any prince, any people has any right of founding laws. Let us accept for the time being what Luder grants. Let the church have the right of distinguishing scriptures and teachings. In this at least abide, Luther. Now, reverend doctor, I argue thus with you, with your permission. The church has the right of judging doctrines, according to you; but the church has condemned your doctrines; therefore, according to you your doctrines are truly condemned because you admit that in scriptures and in doctrines the church has from God the power not to err. Here I do not doubt but that, as is usual with you, you will be in a rage and rail, but I ask you, honored doctor, answer the argument. Or will you summon us to a glossary and say that the church which condemned you is the papistic church and that this church which has the right of judging doctrines is the catholic church spread throughout the whole world? To this answer, the right of the

³⁸⁰ What to Doctor Luther is the difference between the right of judging and the right of founding

pontiff being meanwhile passed over in silence, I thus renew the argument that in no action of a multitude is unanimous consent required, but this church which you call papistic, which everywhere condemns your doctrines, is by far the greatest part of the Christian world; therefore, still according to you, your teachings are evil because they have been condemned by the catholic church which in such matters cannot judge wrongly. Besides, to judge which are false doctrines belongs to that same church to which it belongs to judge which are the true scriptures. But the same church which teaches and judges which are the true scriptures, that same church, I say, teaches and judges that your doctrines are false.³⁸¹ Therefore, in every way your doctrines are condemned. 5 10

What do you say in return, honored doctor? What escape does your glossary provide you? A marvelous one, indeed. For he has found that the right of judging doctrines does not belong to the pontiff, not to the priests, not to synod and councils; but according to this authority of Christ, "Beware of false prophets," he proves that authority is granted to the people against all the holy pontiffs, all the councils, and all the holy fathers, as if the holy fathers taught one faith, the faithful people believed another. The honored doctor teaches us therefore that "beware of false prophets" is the same as "beware of holy fathers," and he has learned from glossaries that false prophet means the same as holy father.³⁸² Therefore, after several passages cited from sacred scripture in this way, he has clearly proved, by the proper judges, that the judgment of doctrines should have belonged not to the clergy but to the people. Finally the boastful conqueror taunts thus: Has our Henry or any unclean Thomist anything to snarl here at these arguments? Have we not stopped the mouth of those who speak wicked things? Certainly not, my honored sir, not until you have stopped the mouth of all those who speak wicked things; because you have not yet stopped your own mouth, which speaks the most wicked things. 15 20 25 30

But come, honored doctor, I do not wish to argue with you; I only inquire: What have you accomplished when you have appealed from the clergy to the people? Certainly you have escaped from the smoke into the flame. For as there is no cleric in any church spread through the whole world who does not condemn your doctrines on orders and 35

³⁸¹ Luther is condemned by those who he admits possess the authority of judging

³⁸² Therefore he carefully avoids being a holy father

the mass, so nowhere is there any people, neither Christian nor Turk
 —whom you esteem far more—who does not condemn your doctrines
 on the right of establishing laws. Therefore, since all people every-
 where, to whom, according to you, belongs the right of judging
 doctrines, judge this doctrine of yours that no one has the right of
 founding a law to be not only impious but also stupid, you still do not
 escape without your doctrine's being rightly condemned as both truly
 impious and truly stupid. Then I thus form the syllogism against you,
 honored doctor. Those who you say have the right of judging
 doctrines all judge unanimously that that
 doctrine of yours by which you teach that
 no one has the right of founding law is an
 impious and foolish doctrine;³⁸³ therefore, according to the confession
 of the one part, that the church has the power of judging doctrines,
 there is proved also that other part which you have denied, that the
 same church has the right of founding laws, because she who has the
 power of judging doctrines judges as false and stupid the doctrine
 which you teach, that she does not have the right of founding laws.
 For if anyone has any right, certainly the church has a right over the
 church, just as each one has power over himself. But your wisdom
 denies not only that the Roman church has the right of founding laws
 but also that church which you grant has the right of judging doctrine,
 that is, the church as you say spread throughout the whole world.
 And so you see, most wise father, that you distinguish so expertly that
 the one part of your distinction utterly destroys the other part.

He shows that Luther's opinion, by which
 each one is taught to believe for himself
 against the authority of everyone else, is the
 most absurd of all. Chapter 22.

For each one believes³⁸⁴ rightly or falsely at
 his own risk, and therefore each one must
 look out for himself that he believes rightly, so that even common
 sense and the necessity of salvation urge necessarily that the judgment
 of doctrine is in the power of the hearer. Otherwise it is said to no

³⁸³ That even by his own confession Luther judges impiously

³⁸⁴ Luther's words

point: "Test all things; hold fast that which is good." And again: "The spiritual man judges all things, and he himself is judged by no man." But any Christian whatever is spiritual from the Spirit of Christ.³⁸⁵ "All things are yours," he says, "whether Apollo or Paul or Cephas"; that is, you have the right of judging about the words and deeds of everyone.

5

Now you hear, reader, admirable wisdom. Perhaps you were inclined to doubt before whether the reverend father was semi-foolish; now you will no longer doubt that he is more than sesquifurious. First of all he took away from the pontiff the authority of judging doctrines; he could have seemed to transfer it to the council. He transferred it from the councils, you might have thought, to the multitude of the whole clergy. He transferred it altogether from the clergy; he seemed to transfer it to the people. Now he transfers it from the people and delivers it to anyone whatever. Do you think this man is sane? And yet now I perceive he is certainly most wise. The matter is of a deeper design than I thought.³⁸⁶ For Catiline, if he could have used such an appeal, would have been saved; if, when condemned by the senators, he appealed to the people, when condemned by the people he appealed to anyone whatever, and the just condemnation of everyone would not have had force so long as anyone at all like him would be found among the people who would free him from condemnation. But by this appeal Luder protects himself.

10

15

20

25

Once he allowed that what he wrote about indulgences should be judged by the pope; and immediately, fearing for himself, just as an impious fellow flees though no one is pursuing him, he began to appeal half of the concession by taking away from the pope the power of divine law. Shortly after, he appealed the whole concession, having testified that the power of that pontiff was supported by no law at all; but yet he appealed to a council, having admitted that there at least was the right of judging; and yet, cautious, he added, not simply the next council but the next one which must be gathered together in the Holy Spirit. And he did this with the intention, as the prince well grasped,³⁸⁷ that in whatever council he were to be condemned he would deny that the Spirit was there; a man, as the king wittily writes, exceedingly spiritual since he admits that the Holy

30

35

³⁸⁵ But any Christian whatever judges you a heretic

³⁸⁶ Luther's shrewd design

³⁸⁷ Luther's shrewdness caught by the king

Spirit is nowhere but in his own bosom. But still he was admitting that there is at least some council which might judge doctrines through the Holy Spirit. But now again he condemns all councils, even the Nicene. This council the man, never inconsistent with himself, at the same time condemns and admits to be the best. Therefore he appeals from the council to the people. There, he argues in many words, resides the power of judging doctrines which he has so often transferred from one place to another. But since he senses that the people also, indeed above all, condemn his doctrines, and not the people of any one nation, but all the people of all the nations spread through the whole world, he finally reduces the matter to the point where he leaves the power of judging to anyone whatever.³⁸⁸ For he hopes that nothing can be said so absurd that he will not find at least one person somewhere agreeing. Him therefore, if he can by chance discover anyone so dull-witted, lest he should waver because of the agreement of the whole world, he arms with impudence and fortifies with raging madness. He takes away every scruple, he orders each person to trust in himself. For otherwise, he says, it would be said to no point: "Test all things, hold fast to what is good." And therefore of course let each one believe himself against all men together concerning what is good, what evil, in doctrines. Why not? "For the spiritual man," he says, "judges all things and is judged by no man. But any Christian whatever," he says, "is a spiritual man from the Spirit of Christ. 'For all things are yours,' he says, 'whether Apollo, or Paul, or Cephas'; that is, you have the right of judging about the words and deeds of everyone."

I thought indeed that I handled well the folly of Luder when I had shown that this fellow brought up most stupidly those words of the apostle, "All things are yours," since according to his argument it would follow that we are judges not only of the pope but even of Peter and Paul. But now I see that nothing can be fashioned so absurd that you cannot cause him not to consider it as absurd, but he will bring forward even more absurd arguments and say they are sheer wisdom. For before he had made the whole people judges of Peter and Paul, but now he constitutes as judge of Peter and Paul each single person from among the people. Thus then doctor Luder now argues, "All things are yours, whether Paul or Cephas," and this about individuals, that is, you have the right of judging about the

³⁸⁸ By this means let Luther at last have the right of judging

words of everyone. And this is said, not to all men as a whole, but to individuals, just as also that text: “The spiritual man judges all things and he is judged by no man.” But any Christian whatever is a spiritual man, therefore any Christian whatever has the right of judging; that is, of thinking what he pleases about the doctrine of Peter and of Paul and of Mark and of Matthew and of John and of Luke and of the apostles and of all Christians. For this reasoning does not operate more, nor does Luther raise it as an objection more, against the doctors, schools, and councils than against Peter and Paul, whose names he cites in this passage, so that he subjects their doctrine also to the judgment of each person, as though Paul were of the same mind when he wrote, “All things are yours, whether Apollo, or Paul, or Cephas.” And this reasoning of Luther, than which nothing is more absurd, nevertheless seems so valid to Luther that from it doctor Luder has taken to himself the authority of judging that the epistle of James the apostle has nothing worthy of the apostolic spirit.

But to what end does doctor Luder present this reasoning? Namely, that because each one, so he says, believes truly or falsely at his own risk, and for this reason each must look out for himself that he believes rightly, therefore no one should bother about the pontiff, or the councils, or the church, or the holy fathers, or the people, or Peter, or Paul, but anyone whatever should judge boldly about all men taken together, and because he believes at his own risk, therefore he may believe himself without risk against the whole world, according to that advice of the wise man: “Son, do not rely upon your own prudence, and do not wish to appear wise in your own eyes.”³⁸⁹

You see here, reader, the manifest ravings of this most absurd man. You see his very words, recounted to you in good faith, with nothing either shortened by us in the relating or twisted in interpretation. I know well enough that if we had comprised his words in a summary, a suspicion would have entered the minds of some, as though what he had written correctly had been corrupted in the telling, and as though the fight had been carried on with his own weapons against him who relates nothing honestly. But since I knew that no one would believe that anyone had thought out such absurd arguments, lest I should leave the folly of the man doubtful to anyone, I have determined to recite his very words and with his own hand to brand him with the mark of raging madness. Therefore, so that you

³⁸⁹ How differently he conducts himself here than Luther does

may have still less doubt that he thinks nothing wiser but that he truly wishes each person to stand by his own judgment, hear what he says shortly after.

619

But here they will say,³⁹⁰ if it is the right
of individuals to judge and prove, what 5
will be the limit if the judges have disagreed and each one has judged
according to his own head? Therefore it is necessary that there be one
by whose judgment the others stand content, so that the unity of the
church may be safe. I answer: this quibble becomes no one better than
the Thomists. For I also ask, what is the 10
limit today when all stand by the
judgment of one pope?³⁹¹ Where is unity
safe here? Is this what it means for unity to be safe, to be united under
the external name of the pope? Where does unity of hearts abide?
Who is certain in his conscience that the pope judges rightly? But 15
unless there is certainty, there is no unity. Therefore under the pope
there is a certain pomp of external unity but interiorly nothing but the
most confused Babylon, so that neither is there stone upon a stone, nor
does heart agree with heart. So that you see how happily human
rashness amends spiritual matters with its own decrees. By another 20
way, then, must the unity of the church be sought.

You see how anxiously Luder discusses this matter, so that no one
may fear to trust himself. For he also considers as a quibble the argu-
ment that everything would thus be uncertain, and that there would
be as many varieties in faith as there would be heads among the 25
people. And with a like quibble, as it were, he jeers if anyone prefers
in matters of faith to yield to the pontiff rather than to be driven to
and fro and be carried about by every wind of doctrine, or to rely
entirely on himself alone. And he speaks as
though the pontiff teaches a different faith 30
than that which is common to the Christian
people;³⁹² indeed, he denies that there is any faith on which Christians
who obey the pontiff agree. But he thus lies that one has one belief,
another a different one, so that heart does not agree with heart; and
this wickedness of deceit his heart has gathered to itself so that, while 35
he persuades everyone that nothing is anywhere certain but that each
one believes at his own risk, he can win each one over through his
own fear of danger, so that, despising the authority of the whole
church, despising the holy fathers and the doctors and all the ancient

³⁹⁰ Luther's words

³⁹¹ That there is none, we place to your credit

³⁹² Forcing on the pontiff, of course, that which he himself does

interpreters, each one will interpret sacred scripture according to his own understanding and form for himself whatever faith he chooses. For since Luther has made each person the judge of Peter and also of Paul. each person may mount the tribunal in his own heart and judge both men: Here Paul speaks well, here badly. Here Peter teaches rightly, here he teaches wrongly.³⁹³ Here they advise the church rightly, wherever they persuade one to believe; here Thomistically, wherever they command to do good. But James, although he is an apostle, has nothing at all of the apostolic spirit, since he is not ashamed to write: "Faith without works is dead." There is only one of whom no one is judge; who, whatever he says, it is certain; that is doctor Luder, who is certain that he has his doctrines from heaven, whose coming the prophet foretold, saying: "A third Cato has fallen from heaven." And likewise another: "Now a new offspring is sent down from high heaven." And the same prophet prophesied to what place he must be sent down, when he said: "Smooth is the descent to Avernus." For that text speaks of doctor Luder to the letter.

By another way, then, must the unity of the church be sought.³⁹⁴ This is the way which Christ lays down in John 6: "They shall all be taught of God. Everyone who has heard from my Father comes to me." That interior Spirit alone, I say, makes those who dwell in a house to be of one mind. He teaches men to understand the same thing, to judge the same, to investigate the same, to prove the same, to teach the same, to confess the same, to follow the same thing.³⁹⁵ Where He is not present, it is impossible that there be unity. And if there is any, it is external and fictitious. Therefore also it is no concern of God's that impious men should be one or not one who are empty of the unity of the Spirit. For His sons there suffices for external unity one baptism, and one bread, as common characters and signs through which they profess and exercise the unity of their faith and spirit. The papistic church places its unity in the unity of its external idol, the pope, but is scattered by the errors of internal confusion unto all the whims of Satan.

Now there comes into my mind, reader, that gospel text in which the demons, reluctant and tortured, confessed Christ from the mouth

³⁹³ The method of passing judgment on the ancients, according to Luther's judgment

³⁹⁴ Luther's words

³⁹⁵ And here He teaches everyone that you impiously err

of the madman: “Jesus Christ, son of David, why have you come to torment us before the time?” For here, clearly, truth has wrenched from the reluctant demon which possesses Luther that response by which it overthrows the whole of Luther’s sect from its foundation. For this is the very thing, Luther, which we have so often dinned into your ears and you did not wish to hear, that the Holy Spirit of God interiorly inspires His church with truth,³⁹⁶ that that interior Spirit renders all taught of God, that He alone makes those who dwell in a house to be of one mind, that He teaches so that they understand the same thing, judge the same, investigate the same, prove the same, confess the same, follow the same, teach the same, that that interior Spirit is the only one who makes men who dwell in a house to be of one mind, so that those who are outside the house are not of one mind but are divided by heresies and sects.³⁹⁷ This catholic church, which you call papistic, which you falsely say is so at variance that heart does not agree with heart, so agrees through this interior Spirit of God in articles of faith that it unanimously condemns the teachings of your faithlessness. The whole church, spread throughout the whole world, holds matrimony as a sacrament; it holds orders as a sacrament; it holds penance as a sacrament; and what need is there to recall individual details? These things the church both thinks unanimously now and has thought through so many ages. But if you and your herd believe something different, the church is nonetheless of one mind in its house. For it cleansed and purified itself when it cut you off, a festering boil, and cast you from its body.

Now you admit that where the Spirit of God is, there is agreement, that He teaches interiorly what is true. Bring forward, then, the church which agrees with you; tell me in what lands the church truly consists of wicked men; where are the people anywhere either so impious or dull-witted that, in opposition to the Spirit of God, who has taught all Christians through so many ages to believe the same thing against you, they now at length believe you, a raving madman,³⁹⁸ that orders is not a sacrament, the people who, scorning the threats of the apostle, receive the eucharist with a conscience agitated as much as possible by the tickling of sins, who believe that faith alone suffices, that there is no need of good works, that the apostle who denies this understands

³⁹⁶ That Luther now concedes that which is most opposed to him

³⁹⁷ These are the Lutherans

³⁹⁸ Catalogue of Luther’s heresies

nothing of the apostolic spirit, that no Christian can be bound by laws, and a thousand most absurd impieties of this same sort. Can you name any church which you have persuaded of such foolish things; which thinks that it has the right to resist magistrates, and believes that it is useful to live without laws? I know well enough that you cannot name any people. Therefore, since you admit that it is the Spirit of God who makes people who dwell in a house to be of one mind and in agreement on necessary matters, you must admit willy-nilly that that church is the catholic church and the house of God in which through so many ages all men have judged unanimously against your irrational opinion, and that the Spirit of God is wholly absent from you who, thrust from the house, disagree with the whole church, in which the whole people throughout the world by the working of God has for so many ages agreed against you. With you none agrees. Why do I say people? Indeed, I wonder if any one man agrees with you. For this I know for certain, that you do not agree with yourself.³⁹⁹

For first of all you confessed that the church has this power from God, that she cannot be deceived in distinguishing the words of God from the words of men. Then, forced by the reasonings of the king, you admitted that the church has the same right in judging doctrines. What then does it mean, what you afterwards say, that each one believes at his own risk? As if God, all good, would render anyone confused and not open a way out. I ask you, if what you said before is true, with what risk to himself does he believe who believes the whole church when it agrees on any article of faith, since you admit that the church has from God the power not to be deceived in judging doctrines? In fact, also according to you, she could not even agree on an article of faith except by the interior teaching of that Spirit who makes those who dwell in a house to be of one mind.

Behold, Luther, as you madly rave with these roundabout arguments the truth is finally wrested from you against your will, by which truth you admit unwittingly that those traditions on which the whole church has agreed for so many ages, which in so many books up till now you have railed at as the traditions of men, now, I say, you suddenly admit unwittingly that they are the traditions of God, without whose secret inspiration the people of God, so widely scattered, could not harmoniously agree, since it is He alone who, as

³⁹⁹ This is not infrequent with Luther, that he disagrees with himself

you admit, makes those who dwell in a house to be of one mind. And how this admission thence escaped you, I do not know. For immediately thereafter, as if you had never heard anything at all of these things which you yourself just now said, you immediately say such things that they contradict what you have just said no differently than darkness contradicts light. 5

Now see of what spirit were those sacrilegious and abominable councils,⁴⁰⁰ which against such great thunderbolts of the entire scripture and the most clear judgments have dared to arrogate to themselves,⁴⁰¹ the pontiffs, the right of judging and of investigating, in addition to commanding and founding. Without a doubt these were the thoughts of Satan, by which he has flooded the world with the operations of error and set up the abomination in the holy place with the most secure tyranny after the authority of judging was snatched from the people, by which false doctors were forced to tremble, and the way was laid open through the stupid and superstitious obedience and patience of the people for rushing in with universal errors and abominations. 10
15
20

Does it not seem to you, reader, that through this impious mouth infernal furies breathe? For I ask you, Luther, through those demons of hell who torment you, when some cacodaemon sends plagues like you into the flock of the Lord, do you think that while the matter is being examined the whole Christian people from the whole world should be called together at one time, as to an assembly of consuls to the Campus Martius, and their votes sought man by man?⁴⁰² What sort of arrogation is it if the pastors before all others treat of the danger of the flock? To whom should the people rather wish that business delegated than to the bishops, to whom it especially belongs to be anxious about the safety of the people? If, as you often declare, God is present in their midst wherever two or three are gathered together in His name, will you deny that He is there where so many are gathered in His name for most important reasons? Recall again those things which you said a little while ago: that it is God who works agreement in His church. From every part of the church scattered widely throughout the world men gathered together for a council, and, as shortly after even you do 25
30
35

⁴⁰⁰ Luther's words

⁴⁰¹ But it seems to me no one arrogates more than you

⁴⁰² Nay rather, from every forest, wood should be gathered to burn Luther to ashes

not deny, very many of the best and most holy men agreed among themselves, each one returned home; the people spread throughout almost the whole world agreed on the same things. But through whom do the Christian people agree? Have you not admitted that this happens through that God teaching interiorly who makes those who dwell in a house to be of one mind? Therefore what you earlier admitted to be of God you now rave to have been the thoughts of Satan, by which the way was laid open through the stupid and superstitious obedience of the people for rushing in with universal abominations. 5 10

You see now, reader, Luther's consistency; you see the evil things which he has discovered to arise from the council of the best fathers gathered in the name of God. But how we should resist these evils he has taught before this when he said that each one believes truly or falsely at his own risk. Therefore if it is decreed that each one should believe whatever he wishes, now is found the true way by which no error can creep in. 15

And, that I⁴⁰³ may here recall my Henry and the sophists, who depend with their faith on length of time and a multitude of men, first of all, he cannot deny that the tyranny of this usurped right has lasted more than a thousand years. For in the council of Nicea itself, the best of all, they began already then to establish laws and to claim this right for themselves. And from that time even to this it has grown strong so that nothing is more accepted nor can anything be proved more firmly by multitude of men and length of time than this right, so much so that no one today does not think it sound, right, and divine. But here you see that there is sacrilege and impiety against the most evident and invincible scriptures of God. Therefore, if such a great error and such a sacrilege has reigned against the truth of God because of such a great length of time, such a great multitude of men either agreeing, or led astray, or approving, I wish here that once for all the chief arguments of all the sophists and papists concerning length of time and multitude were crushed even to dust and their mouth stopped so that they might see why God does not want us to believe any creature, however long-lasting and numerous and great, but only His own infallible word. 20 25 30 35

Who does not sense that the man who wrote this is a madman, unless he is a madman who reads it? For he even admits that the

⁴⁰³ Luther's words

Nicene council was the best; and yet he says that it was the beginning of all evils, and that those most good and holy men then began a sacrilege and impiety against the most evident and invincible scriptures of God, which they could not have done unless they were either most foolish or most wicked. For if the scriptures were most evident, they were most blind if they did not see them; if they saw them, they were impious who contemned them. And the sacrilegious and impious man reproaches with so great a sacrilege and impiety so great a number of such men whom he himself also admits were the best, that once for all he shows that he pays the penalty of impiety to such holy fathers and that he is entangled in manifest madness who is driven to rant such stupidly conflicting things with his sacrilegious mouth, as no one could who is not tormented by furies. Thus I shall omit that which he also falsely says there when he asserts that in the Nicene council laws first began to be founded, since it is sufficiently well known that the apostles both commonly in council and separately established individual laws, as the king also has objected, to which Luther answers nothing at all.

And so we hold⁴⁰⁴ without any question that the right of investigating about doctrine and of judging or of approving is in our power, not in the power of councils, pontiffs, fathers, doctors. But it does not follow from this that the right of founding laws is likewise in our power. For this belongs to God alone.⁴⁰⁵ It is our right to investigate His law and word, to approve, judge, and distinguish it from all other laws, but not at all to found or command. For neither does it follow from the word of Christ, "Beware of false prophets," that therefore it is your right to prophesy; on the contrary, as Peter says: "Not by the will of man was prophecy brought at any time, and no interpretation of scripture is made privately, but holy men of God spoke by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit." Thus, it does not follow: My sheep hear my voice; therefore, the sheep sound or cause my voice;⁴⁰⁶ rather, the contrary follows: I sound my own voice, but the sheep recognize it when sounded, they approve and follow it.

Here I see that the great right is not in the power of councils, pontiffs, fathers, doctors, but in your power; which you, please? I

⁴⁰⁴ Luther's words

⁴⁰⁵ See if he does not say everything to his own advantage

⁴⁰⁶ See what excellent arguments he presents for his cause

was thinking that Martin Luder is a reverend father, is a doctor; now you deny both. You say indeed that that right of investigating is not in the power of the fathers, nor the doctors, but in your power. Which you, then? Not you fathers, but you friars; not you doctors, but you untaught. You say well, indeed, my honored sir. Then I see that, according to you, fathers and doctors had doctrine in their possession; but you, who are an untaught friar, have in your possession not doctrine but the right of judging doctrine without doctrine. For you do not investigate doctrine but you have the right of investigating it.

But no one, so you say, has the right of founding laws. For this belongs to God alone, and so not only kings and peoples founding laws but also apostles who have done the same thing in the same spirit have, like Lucifer, usurped for themselves the power of God. But yet in the *Babylon* the reverend friar was milder. For there he says that no one can lay one syllable upon any Christian without his own consent, but that with his assent one can do so. And thus according to that rule of the reverend friar a law can at least be established which has force for so long a time until someone else comes into the region who never agreed to the law; a thing which will happen almost everywhere within two days. But now none at all can be established; so that Luder clearly shows that in such a serious matter he makes foolish sport. Therefore, after Luder has conducted himself in this matter with such wonderful wisdom, he immediately concludes pompously.

Wherefore we see here that all pontiffs,⁴⁰⁷ all councils, all schools which express in the church something other than the word of God alone, are wolves, ministers of Satan, and false prophets.⁴⁰⁸ At the same time we understand the extraordinary stupidity of our Henry and of all Thomists who set their shameless mouth against heaven and dare to say in this sacrilegious book that even if the sacrament of orders had not been instituted in the scriptures, nevertheless the right of instituting it is in the power of the church. And how foolishly he adapted the word of Augustine, which he speaks about the gospel recognized and proved by the church in the whole world, to the right of establishing traditions by the free choice of impious men. This is the manner of understanding the statements of the fathers and of scripture. These are the men who write defenses of the sacraments. The multitude of these men and length of time is

⁴⁰⁷ Luther's words

⁴⁰⁸ Therefore you are a wolf, and a minister of Satan, and a false prophet

the power of making articles of faith, men so stupid and dim-witted that they make no distinction between investigating and commanding.

635

We have already declared ten times that the word of God is as much that which God speaks to His church without writing as that which is comprised in writing. But since it is clear that Luder speaks only of the written word of God, it is clear that this minister of Satan plainly lies who declares that all are ministers of Satan who say anything else in the church than the word of God written in sacred scripture. For by this reasoning this minister of Satan declares the apostle a minister of Satan, who said: “Keep the teachings that you have learned whether by word or by letter,” who both taught and instituted many things not according to the written word of God, but according to the unwritten tradition of God.⁴⁰⁹ For even that very teaching about the sacrament of the eucharist Paul delivered to the Corinthians not according to the written word of God but according to the unwritten tradition of God. Indeed, Luther also declares the evangelist according to this reasoning to be a minister of Satan, who not only taught the unwritten word of God but also himself wrote that all the words of God were neither written nor could be written. Therefore, when the evangelist writes that neither have all things been written nor can they be written, you must now seek, Luther, a scriptural text which proves that whatever of the words, deeds, institutions of Christ the writers could not include has been condemned to everlasting darkness like some deformed Erichthonius and monstrous birth, and that he is a minister of Satan who expresses anything at all of those things in the church, which indeed were not written but which nevertheless Jesus did, which nevertheless He taught, together with the Spirit sent by the Father. Now, Luther, you who admit nothing but the scriptures, bring forward the scriptures by which you prove that anyone is forbidden to write such things.⁴¹⁰ But, you say, if anyone writes such things which he asserts and affirms as the words of God, that man is a minister of Satan.

Meanwhile we have wrested from this minister of Satan that he is not wholly a minister of Satan who, apart from the written word of God alone, that is, apart from the word of scripture alone, expresses another word in the church.

⁴⁰⁹ How many times do you want this said to you, Luther?

⁴¹⁰ He will bring forward his own doctrine

But, he will say, although he is not a minister of Satan who speaks another word of God besides that which is written in sacred scripture, nevertheless he is a minister of Satan who has not only spoken or written but also defended this word.

But here also this minister of Satan lies. For if it is lawful to write the word of Christ which was spoken, certainly it is lawful to declare that it is true. This minister of Satan will finally be thrust down gradually to this point, that, departing from what he had said formerly, he now declares that only that man is a minister of Satan who forces others to believe any word of God which is not contained in the canonical scripture.⁴¹¹ Let this minister of Satan then answer us: If anything at all of those things which indeed have not been written, but which Jesus did, taught, and delivered; what if, I say, someone reported something of these things to Luther and ordered him to believe what was reported, but, as concerns him who reports, Luther is certain that he who does the reporting cannot make any error or be deceived in discerning that matter? Would that man sin who ordered him to believe, or would Luther if he should refuse to believe? I have no doubt but that he would admit here that he is bound to believe a revelation so certain. But Luder himself admits that the church cannot be deceived in judging the word of God;⁴¹² therefore, when the church relates anything at all of those things which Jesus did, which He taught, which He delivered, Luder is bound to believe. Satan himself in hell is not bound more strongly by his chain than the minister of that same Satan, Luder, is straitened by this chain. For if he should say that when he admitted that the church has the power from God of distinguishing the words of God from the words of men, he meant this to be said only of the written word, not also of that word which was indeed either done or said by God but yet not written in the canonical scripture, already beforehand he has been thrust down from that defense, when, on being forced by the reasonings of the king, he admits that the church also has the power of judging not only scripture but also any doctrines whatever.⁴¹³ He particularly, a man so versed in glossaries, does not judge that the scriptures are the same as doctrines. But if he had not admitted that, still, however shameless he has been, he will

⁴¹¹ How this Proteus turns himself in every direction

⁴¹² How often Luther himself is overcome by his own confession

⁴¹³ How Luther, forced by the king, changed his opinion

necessarily admit it, unless he proves to us that God, who was able to teach the church who wrote the truth, could not teach her who spoke the truth;⁴¹⁴ or finally that God took care that the church should not be deceived by deceitful writings but wanted her to be deceived by deceitful tongues. 5

Now then you see, reader, that this minister of Satan, who writes that all are ministers of Satan who speak anything else in the church than the word of God alone, alone by the example of his master Satan, alone, I say, tortures, perverts and blasphemes the word of God. 10

He refutes Luther's most evident deceitfulness by which he falsely maintains that the king says the church has the right of instituting the sacrament of orders. Chapter 23.

At the same time we understand⁴¹⁵ the extraordinary stupidity of our Henry and of all Thomists who set their shameless mouth against heaven and dare to say in this sacrilegious book that even if the sacrament of orders had not been instituted in the scriptures, nevertheless the right of instituting it is in the power of the church. And how foolishly he adapted the word of Augustine, which he speaks about the gospel recognized and proved by the church in the whole world, to the right of establishing traditions by the free choice of impious men. This is the manner of understanding the statements of the fathers and scriptures. These are the men who write defenses of the sacraments. The multitude of these men and length of time is the power of making articles of faith, men so stupid and dim-witted that they make no distinction between investigating and commanding.⁴¹⁶ 15
20
25
30

I think enough has been said about how accurately Luther writes of the word of Augustine. Now we must speak about the fact that the king has written that the right of instituting a sacrament is in the power of the church. I have read and reread, reader, the whole book of the king to see how, in what words he said this, that the church 35

⁴¹⁴ Solve this dilemma, Luther

⁴¹⁵ Luther's words. How much more shameless are you who revile with abusive language what God has instituted?

⁴¹⁶ You make such a distinction so that you may command all things, investigate nothing

could institute the sacrament of orders even if it had not been instituted by God; I certainly do not find it said openly by way of emphatic assertion, but only in repeating what he had proved,⁴¹⁷ he does say in passing something, yet not precisely the same thing as Luther imputes to him, but something from which I think he has seized on a pretext with which, as is usual, he makes an inference. For these are the words of the king. 5

“Now since we have proved⁴¹⁸ from Luther’s own foundation that the sacraments which the church believes could not have been established otherwise than by God, even if nothing at all were read about them in scripture, let us nevertheless see whether scripture makes no mention at all of this sacrament.” 10

Behold, honest reader, with what words the king says of the sacrament of orders that the church could have instituted the sacrament of orders, even if it had not been instituted by God. Thus the wisdom of Luder understands the words of the king; thus the honesty of Luder quotes. Thus the virginal modesty of the reverend father stands in awe of the judgment of the world. This is the man by whose word the world is supposed to stand firm against the holy fathers and the word of God; and because he himself says that he is certain that he has his doctrines from heaven, therefore of course all are certain that the most lying friar cannot lie. 15 20

He wittily twits Luther’s boastful triumph
on the mass. Chapter 24. 25

Let us return to the point at issue.⁴¹⁹ And so we have wrenched away the mass by force and we triumphantly proclaim against the defender of the sacraments that it is not a work nor a sacrifice but a word and a sign of divine grace which He employs toward us to arouse and strengthen faith in Him. And we see how Satan has been made a fool of, so that the longer and the more he rages and writes against us so much more bunglingly and foolishly does he rave.⁴²⁰ For this book of the king, as it is almost the best Latin of 30 35

⁴¹⁷ Because he has nothing solid, Luther pursues all the most trivial points

⁴¹⁸ The king’s words

⁴¹⁹ Luther’s words

⁴²⁰ How great is Luther’s shrewdness, who now grasps that Satan is his master of folly

all those which have been written against me, so it is certainly the most foolish and stupid of all, so that I almost attributed it to our Leipzig writers, who are thus accustomed to quibble when they quibble at their best.

What a wonderful innovator is the honored Martin; after he has made us a new religion and a new faith, now by a new custom he proclaims his triumph before the victory. It used to be the custom that one who had conquered often obtained his triumph with difficulty.⁴²¹ But this man has already triumphed ten times because he has been conquered three times ten times. But this is less to be wondered at since the ancients obtained their triumph from others. But Luder himself decrees his triumph for himself. But why should he not easily triumph over such a foolish book as was that book of the prince, which, as it was almost the best Latin of all those which have been written against Luder, so it was of all of them, if we believe Luther, the most foolish? Why not? And therefore, as he himself admits, it was especially pleasing to those who especially desire of course that whatever is written against him be especially stupid; and therefore also the honored Luder is in such a violent rage, because he can easily refute that book by jeering and joking, seeing that its folly has caught on to Luther's wisdom and showed his impieties and publicly exposed to ridicule⁴²² the designs of his stupid sagacity by which he thought he had shrewdly entered the path by which he might destroy all the sacraments of Christ, all faith and religion.

Having indeed triumphed over the mass, I think we triumph over the pope entirely.⁴²³ For on the mass as on a rock does the whole papacy rely with its monasteries, episcopacies, colleges, altars, ministries, and doctrines and indeed with its whole belly. All these necessarily fall into ruin with the ruin of their sacrilegious and abominable mass. Thus through me has Christ begun to reveal the abominations standing in the holy place and to destroy him whose coming occurred through the operation of Satan in prodigies and deceitful signs.⁴²⁴ O that wretched defender of the papistic church. O wretched church, which vainly lavished its indulgences for the sake of such an important book; unless

⁴²¹ A new reason for triumphing seized on by Luther

⁴²² Hence of course the tears, hence that raging madness of the friarling

⁴²³ Luther's words

⁴²⁴ You are he, Luther, in every way

a fitting reward was paid to the defender as to the book. For such as are indulgences, such is the church, such the defender, such also the book.

645

As though he said, “Now that I have mounted into heaven, borne aloft on the wings of a goose, I can now stroll wherever I please on the rays of the sun, and from a height look down on all popes as though they were ants, and on all bishops, colleges, monasteries, priests, knights, dukes, princes;⁴²⁵ I have subjected all things beneath my feet after I placed my throne toward the north, and have become like to the most high.” Thus Satan has set up the abomination in the holy place when he raises up the abominable friarling in the church of God, when he puffs up the sacrilegious and loathsome scoundrel with raging furies, who as a cowardly enemy of the sacraments fights with empty bombast against Him whose coming was in humility, who will afterwards come with power, when with the breath of His mouth He will scatter into dust this son of pride and faithlessness who now stupidly boasts in malice and thinks himself powerful in wickedness when together with him the fool says in his heart, there is no God.⁴²⁶

O wretched adversary of the sacraments, whom at that time the grace of the sacraments will leave desolate. O wretched mocker of the sacramental characters whom at that time the baptismal character and the character of orders, branded like marks of disgrace, will degrade as a deserter and deliver to punishment. O wretched mocker of the catholic church, which at that time will in its turn laugh at you, wretch, in your ruin. Then, mocker of forgiveness, alas with what sighs you will long for forgiveness when, with forgiveness refused, you will receive the deserved reward of iniquity in the everlasting fires which have been prepared for the devil and his angels like you.

⁴²⁵ Luther’s proud boasting

⁴²⁶ Only this Luther does not say

Luther's trifling remarks against the sacrament
of orders are refuted. Chapter 25.

Let this suffice for me in answer to the
defense of the first sacrament.⁴²⁷ In defend-
ing it Lord Henry the defender especially labored as one who was not 5
unaware that in this is placed the ultimate safety of the papistic
dominion. I am forced to put off the others, overwhelmed by many
other concerns, but especially by the
translating of the Bible,⁴²⁸ clearly a neces-
sary work, lest I myself prosper the efforts 10
of Satan too much.

The honored Luder may well have labored enough up till now for
his attack on the first sacrament. Now, wearied in the way of iniquity,
he is forced to put off other things, being wholly overwhelmed in trans-
lating the Bible, clearly a necessary work so that he may prosper the 15
efforts of Satan exceedingly, while he so
translates sacred scripture as to mistrans-
late its meaning and tricks the uneducated
common folk,⁴²⁹ who from a translation by a heretic ponder heresies, to
prove which that leaden rule has been deliberately bent. 20

Satan thinks through these senseless
books to hinder me,⁴³⁰ but he will accom-
plish nothing; nor will it have been any great effort to refute the dull-
witted Thomists on the remaining six sacraments.

Satan has figured out a case for his soldier, which he brings forward 25
as an excuse for flight. For he summons him to himself, planning to
send him to fight elsewhere where he may carry out vigorously a
work more necessary for him, if he can accomplish anything in mis-
translating the Bible. For what he tried on
the sacraments among men of sense, he 30
sees to have been attempted in vain.⁴³¹
Raising the siege for the time being, he threatens that he will return
to it after he has mistranslated the Bible, and that it will be no great
effort for such a mighty conqueror to take the remaining six sacra-
ments by storm, who in that one which he first assaulted labored in 35

⁴²⁷ Luther's words

⁴²⁸ You certainly prosper them as much as you can

⁴²⁹ How Luther translates the Bible

⁴³⁰ Luther's words

⁴³¹ That Luther leaves no crime untried

vain and, beaten back with disgrace, most shamefully conquered, routed and put to flight, left the battle.

649

They present nothing worthy of an answer⁴³² throughout the whole six sacraments besides that one text which he cites on the sacrament of orders, namely, where Paul orders Titus to ordain presbyters throughout the churches. For by this passage he would have the sacrament of orders instituted. 5

Now doctor Luder has no leisure for mockery, for he runs swiftly, having lost his supplies, and fearing his pursuers, alarmed, like a dog he drinks from the Nile and flees. He passes by all the rest as though in contempt;⁴³³ when you have read them from the book of the king itself you will easily see why he passes over them. Meanwhile he seizes on that text of the apostle to Titus. For he says that the king understands that the sacrament of orders was instituted in that text. 10 15

Here, reader, I invoke your honesty against the most stupid dishonesty of this scoundrel. How often the king says so clearly and insists, indeed, how often he proves so clearly that no sacrament either has been instituted or can be instituted except by God; how evidently he has repeated this very thing again and again explicitly in discussing the sacrament of orders. And now this most stupid scoundrel says that the king says that the sacrament of orders was instituted by the apostle.⁴³⁴ But on the sacrament of extreme unction, when this blasphemous buffoon said against the apostle James that he would not believe the apostle on the sacrament of extreme unction since he did not have the right to institute a sacrament, that is, to promise grace with a visible sign, the king answers in this way, that the apostle delivered to the people what he himself had received from Christ, just as the apostle Paul delivered to the Corinthians what he had received from Christ. He says that neither of them instituted a sacrament.⁴³⁵ But if the king had said what this fellow falsely claims was said by him, namely, that the sacrament of orders was instituted by Paul, why did the fellow not bark again here the same thing against Paul as he there barked madly against James, that he 20 25 30 35

⁴³² Luther's words

⁴³³ This was easier than to refute them

⁴³⁴ Does not Luther reflect on what he speaks?

⁴³⁵ You see here, reader, how Luther says nothing rationally

would not believe Paul on the sacrament of orders even if he was an apostle? For no apostle has the power to establish a sacrament, that is, to promise grace with a visible sign. Why does the scoundrel dissimulate this here if the king wrote that, when there he could not restrain himself from blasphemy where he wrote against others, of whom I do not know whether anyone wrote that? How could the king think that the sacrament of orders was instituted by the apostle when so often he says clearly that the apostles were instituted priests by Christ? And yet father Luder says that he says this, he who so often lies that he never lies.⁴³⁶ Now you see, reader, Luder's shrewd stratagem as he flees, by which he spreads out smoke to conceal his flight.

But the Thomistic spectre does not see either what I am saying or what he himself should answer.⁴³⁷ I denied that orders is a sacrament, that is, a promise and sign of grace added, such as are baptism and the bread; I did not deny, on the contrary, I stated emphatically that it is a calling and instituting of a minister and preacher, whether this is done by the authority of one apostle or by that of the pope alone, or by that of the people choosing and agreeing together makes no difference. Although it would be done more correctly by the choice and agreement of the people, as the apostles, Acts 4, instituted seven deacons. For although Paul orders Titus to ordain presbyters, it does not nevertheless follow that Titus alone did this on his own authority, but by the example of the apostles he instituted them through the formal approbation of the people; otherwise, the words of Paul will conflict with the example of the apostles. Indeed, children see that what he drags in about the imposition of hands for the sacrament of orders does not belong to the sacrament of orders, but in his own papistic way he treats as according to the scriptures whatever has seemed best.⁴³⁸ The imposition of the hands was at that time the visible conferring of the Holy Spirit.

Truly you do not see, spectre Luder, either what you yourself are saying or what the prince answers. For the king did not prove to you that the sacrament of orders is only a calling and an instituting of a minister and preacher, but that it is as truly a sacrament as baptism is or the eucharist, and that according to your own definition; that is, that it truly confers grace with a sensible sign.⁴³⁹ But neither did you, Luder, say

⁴³⁶ Luther's vacillation

⁴³⁷ Luther's words

⁴³⁸ On the contrary, this is your custom, to twist the scripture as you please

⁴³⁹ Who is clearer, Luther?

simply that a promise of grace with a sensible sign added is a sacra-
 ment, as you now wish to appear to have said. On the contrary, you
 clearly denied that any promise of grace made by Christ with a visible
 sign added is a sacrament unless the same promise with its sign is read
 included in evident scripture. In this matter the king resisted you. In 5
 this matter he proved by evident scripture that you lied. For he
 proved that all were instituted by Christ
 through word and deed altogether apart
 from scripture, and that not all the things
 which Christ did are included in scriptures;⁴⁴⁰ indeed the king proved 10
 this by most evident scriptures. But that the church cannot in such
 matters err or be deceived so far as pertains to the sacraments, this he
 proved not only by evident scriptures but also by evident reasonings
 and, the foundation having been laid from your own confession, he
 dragged you along forcibly to the point where it was necessary for you 15
 to admit also the other things that you had so stubbornly denied. And
 yet he proved to you abundantly concerning the sacrament of orders
 that that grace with a visible sign is evident also from the scriptures
 themselves, from which he presented to you various passages, also
 from the same apostle, clearer than is that passage to Titus; of the 20
 same sort are several to Timothy. And thus in this matter there is
 again evident your trickery—I know not whether it is more shameless
 or more foolish—and your most stupid
 escape by which you pretend that the
 imposition of the hands was at that time 25
 the visible conferring of the Holy Spirit,⁴⁴¹ not the bestowing of a grace;
 as if they did not impose the hand on many laymen when they
 ordained them as clerics, to whom the Holy Spirit had already before
 been given in a sensible sign; or as if the Holy Spirit, approaching in
 a sensible sign, bestows on Christians no grace together with Himself. 30
 But this also is an equally stupid escape when you so avoid the
 words of the apostle, by which it is clear that orders were conferred by
 bishops, that you admit this indeed, but say that it is not proved from
 the fact that the bishop ordained that he ordained alone without the
 approbation of the people, lest the words of Paul conflict with the 35
 example of the apostles in instituting
 deacons;⁴⁴² clearly because, when they were
 about to elect such men to the clergy to
 whom the dispensation of temporal goods

⁴⁴⁰ Here learn, Luther, why the king does not agree with you

⁴⁴¹ Luther's fabrication on the imposition of hands

⁴⁴² Luther's interpretation on the example of the apostles is destroyed

was to be entrusted, they did not wish to employ without the people
 their own right to set up in their own place deacons to distribute
 provisions to each one, because they saw that those men would be
 more free from suspicion among the people whom the people them-
 selves had put in charge as distributors; therefore, of course, Paul
 would conflict with this example if he wished Titus, in putting a pres-
 byter in charge as minister of spiritual goods, to confer the sacrament
 of orders without the formal approbation of the people in that place
 where the merits of each one were known to the very bishop who was
 to consecrate. For at times when the matter was less well known the
 bishops permitted the people to name the one whom they judged
 best;⁴⁴³ which practice was more a kind of
 commendation of virtue and a testimony
 of an approved life than the right of
 election. But here you say that it makes no difference to you whether
 the priest is ordained by the sole authority of a single apostle or
 pontiff or by that of the people choosing and agreeing together.
 Behold how shamefully you beat a retreat. Did you not write clearly
 in the *Babylon* that the bishop could in no way make priests on his
 authority alone without the people, and that there was no need of
 ordinations and consecrations, so much so that the king raised these
 words of yours as an objection to you?

If priests were forced to admit that as
 many of us as are baptized are all equally
 priests,⁴⁴⁴ as in fact we are, and that the
 ministry alone is given to them, yet by our consent, and that no right of
 command over us is granted them except insofar as we allowed it of
 our own free choice. . . .

By these words you clearly say that the pontiff alone cannot make
 a priest except by your consent. For you completely remove yourself
 also from the sacerdotal order and number yourself among the laity,
 and this you do clearly seven times in a few words, so that you make
 it perfectly clear that in your own mind
 you are no longer a priest.⁴⁴⁵ No doubt
 because the bishop ordained you without
 the consent of the laity and employed consecration which you
 execrate as superstitious. For even so you write shortly after.

⁴⁴³ You see, Luther, how your trick has profited nothing

⁴⁴⁴ Luther's words from the *Babylon*

⁴⁴⁵ Nor is he, except of Satan, whose worship he celebrates

It cannot be denied⁴⁴⁶ that the churches were once governed by elders chosen for this function because of their age and long experience in affairs, without these ordinations and consecrations.

Behold how clearly you wrote formerly that the bishop cannot make a priest without the people and that there is no need of ordinations or consecrations. But now, clearly vanquished, you admit that both are false. But yet you add that it makes no difference to you, as if you should say: I am such a shameless scoundrel that it makes no difference to me how clearly I am convicted of madness. For even this also which you wrote in the *Babylon* and now repeat, that orders is only the office of preaching,⁴⁴⁷ the king has taken away from you both by reason and by clearly evident scriptures, from which it seemed good to recall one or another passage so that the reader may see how prettily Luder mocks in a matter so holy and serious. For thus the prince writes.

“Luther denies that orders is a sacrament, and he says that it is only a rite for electing a preacher.⁴⁴⁸ He says that those who do not preach are by no means priests, nor are they priests in any other way than as a painted man is a man; contrary to the apostle Paul who, writing to Timothy, says: ‘Let the presbyters who rule well be held worthy of double honor, especially those who labor in the word and in teaching.’ The apostle here manifestly teaches that, although those men are especially worthy of a double honor who, since they are presbyters, labor in the word and in teaching, yet those also who do not perform this function are not only presbyters but can also rule well and deserve a double honor. Otherwise he would not have said, ‘especially those who labor in the word and teaching,’ but only, ‘those who labor in the word and teaching.’

“Moreover, so that Luder cannot say, as he does, that the office of the priest toward the people is nothing but to preach—for to chant masses, he says, is nothing else than to give oneself communion⁴⁴⁹—that it may appear how false this is, I say, let us again hear the apostle. ‘Every high priest,’ he says, ‘taken from among men is appointed for men in the things pertaining to God that he may offer gifts and sacrifices for sins.’ Does not the apostle clearly declare that

⁴⁴⁶ Luther’s words

⁴⁴⁷ How often, Luther, do you want this solved for you?

⁴⁴⁸ The king’s words

⁴⁴⁹ Lutheran definition of the mass

it is also the office of the high priest to offer sacrifice to God for men? Since he writes this to those who, though Hebrews, are nonetheless Christians, whom he does not wish to live in the Jewish manner, it is granted that he is speaking of the high priest of both laws, and therefore that he twice urges Luther with his testimony. For he also teaches that the mass is a sacrifice and that it is offered for the people, since the church offers none other,⁴⁵⁰ and he shows that the duty of offering it is the chief part of the high priest's function. And certainly, if what Luther says were not false, you easily see that it follows that, since no one but a priest can consecrate the body of the Lord, if of the many thousands of priests who do not know how to preach not one is truly a priest but is only equivocally so called, as a painted man is called a man, then the whole Christian world has as clergy and people hardly anything other than idolaters worshipping bread for Christ and bending their knees before Baal."⁴⁵¹

Why did Luder omit these words? By them the king so clearly proves that to offer sacrifice in the mass for the people belongs especially to the office of priest, whereas this fellow argues that no sacrifice takes place in the mass and that the priesthood is nothing, nor is the high priesthood, except only a rite for electing a preacher; and the shameless fellow is not ashamed to blather this although he clearly sees that only priests have consecrated continuously from the beginning, although occasionally some preached who were not priests, a fact which is evident in the Acts of the Apostles; that blessed Stephen acted not as a priest but as a deacon, so that it is manifest that the office especially proper to a priest resides in this, that he consecrate for the people.⁴⁵² But I will add another passage from the king's book.

"If each layman has equal power with the priest in any sacrament whatever,⁴⁵³ and if the order of the priesthood is nothing, why does the apostle write thus to Timothy:⁴⁵⁴ 'Do not neglect the grace that is in you which was granted to you through prophecy with the laying on of hands of the presbyterate'? And elsewhere to the same person: 'I admonish you to stir up

⁴⁵⁰ That the mass is both a sacrifice and an oblation

⁴⁵¹ According to Luther's opinion almost all Christians are idolaters

⁴⁵² The function proper to a priest

⁴⁵³ The king's words

⁴⁵⁴ Paul on the priesthood

the grace of God which is in you by the laying on of my hands?’
 Again, ‘Do not lay hands hastily upon anyone, and do not be a
 partner in other men’s sins.’ Finally the
 apostle writes in this way to Titus:⁴⁵⁵ ‘For this
 reason I left you in Crete that you should
 set right anything that is defective and should appoint presbyters in
 every city, as I myself directed you to do.’ You now have before your
 eyes, reader, once and for all a few passages of the apostle, and not a lot
 of verbiage; by comparing them with each other, you can easily grasp
 that all the arguments with which Luther so intemperately rants
 against orders are false and fictitious. For those who he says become
 priests by the consent of the people, Paul shows are made so by the
 bishop, whom he says he left at Crete for the purpose of appointing
 presbyters in every town, and yet not hastily but as he himself, when
 present, had directed. You see that a
 priest is made by the imposition of hands.⁴⁵⁶
 And lest it can be doubted that grace is
 conferred at the same time, you see that it is conferred by the imposi-
 tion of hands. ‘Stir up the grace,’ he says, ‘which is given to you
 by the laying on of my hands.’ And this also: ‘Do not neglect the
 grace that is in you which was granted you through prophecy with
 the laying on of the hands of the presbyterate. Give yourself wholly to
 these things.’ I wonder therefore that Luther is not ashamed when he
 denies the sacrament of orders while aware of the fact that everyone
 reads the words of Paul which teach that a priest is not made except
 by a priest, nor does he become one without consecration, in which
 both the corporal sign is applied and so much spiritual grace is
 poured into him that he who is consecrated receives not only the
 Holy Spirit himself but also the power of
 conferring Him on others. How indeed can
 it be a new thing of which the apostle
 writes?⁴⁵⁷ How can that be unknown to the
 church which is read and has always been read in all the churches of
 Christ? It is clear that of these things, so numerous, which Luther has
 blathered against orders with such confidence as being most evident,
 not even one syllable was true, but all was fabricated and false
 through his malice.”

Even from these details, reader, you see how skillfully Luder
 handles the sacrament of orders, who passes over in silence whatever

⁴⁵⁵ The apostle Paul on the priesthood

⁴⁵⁶ How men became priests long ago

⁴⁵⁷ That the priesthood is not a new thing nor unknown to the church

he has not the power to solve. But then of course he will handle it more exactly after he has returned from the mistranslation of the Bible. I most certainly hope that he will treat the same thing a second time. For he has so handled it up till now that he offers me the undoubted hope that the oftener he has handled the matter, so much the more madly will he handle it.⁴⁵⁸

5

He refutes the arguments which Luther again touches on timidly and stupidly concerning matrimony. Chapter 26.

10

And what should I say?⁴⁵⁹ He did not even wish to understand the name “sacrament,” as he clearly shows when he handles in relation to matrimony the passage of Paul in Ephesians 5, which Paul set down in relation to Christ and the church, saying: “This is a great mystery, I mean in reference to Christ and to the church.”

15

On the contrary, Luder preferred to jeer at rather than to understand what the king wrote on that passage,⁴⁶⁰ unless, as I think is more true, he preferred in his usual manner to conceal it stupidly, as though by his passing over the matter in silence, no one could read the passage from the king’s book. When you have read this passage, reader, there at least you will perceive that that matter has been so handled by the king that it is no wonder that Luder has discovered nothing to answer here, and that he therefore has passed it over as if nothing had been said.

20

25

For scripture does not allow matrimony to be called a sacrament,⁴⁶¹ since by the practice of the whole scripture a sacrament signifies a thing secret and hidden which can be attained by faith alone. But matrimony is so far from being a thing hidden or perceived by faith that if it is not contracted openly before our eyes, it cannot be matrimony, since it is the external bond of man and wife confirmed both by public profession and association. But no wonder that the Thomist asses so rant, among whom God has wished nothing to be either sane or right.

30

35

⁴⁵⁸ That Luther changes for the worse whatever he handles

⁴⁵⁹ Luther’s words

⁴⁶⁰ Luder acts the mocker

⁴⁶¹ Luther’s words

What shall I say here, reader? I fully admit that here above all I am a raving madman, if Luder is not here a raving madman. The word sacrament, he says, signifies a thing secret and hidden,⁴⁶² but matrimony is not a thing hidden, therefore matrimony is not a sacrament. 5

Honored doctor, by your faith, or rather by your faithlessness, according to what rule does this conclusion hold, since in the premises the copula is changed from “to signify” to “to be,” unless your glossarians tell you that these two expressions, “I am” and “I signify” signify the same thing? Otherwise, if that argument is valid, the following is also likewise valid: Every man sits, but Luder is not running, therefore Luder is not a man. Honored doctor, where is your mind wandering when you are so silly? Or does God strike heretics with insanity? A sacrament signifies a thing secret and hidden; granted. Matrimony is not a thing secret or hidden; what then follows? You do not say that a sacrament is a thing hidden but that it signifies a thing hidden. Say then in the same way that matrimony does not signify a thing secret or hidden and conclude from that that it is not a sacrament;⁴⁶³ but then you lie in the minor premise. For as baptism of the body signifies washing of the soul, so matrimony signifies the union between Christ and the church, which is a thing, I think, hidden and secret, although the sacrament, that is its sign, is sensible; just as the washing of the soul is a thing hidden and secret although its sacrament, that is the sacred sign, is a sensible sign.⁴⁶⁴ Tell me I pray, honored doctor, do you not admit that at least in this passage you plainly write so stupidly that no ass could have brayed more stupidly? 30

Although I have yielded⁴⁶⁵ this to popular usage, that they may call sacraments what are rather visible signs, I only denied that they are called sacraments in the scriptures.

Good God, what dullness is in this dolt, who in this one brief sentence twice acts the madman.⁴⁶⁶ First of all he says that these things which are called sacraments are rather visible signs. But since he had already said, in the line 35

⁴⁶² What Luther thinks a sacrament is

⁴⁶³ Luther’s reasoning on matrimony is refuted

⁴⁶⁴ That matrimony is a sacrament even by Luther’s definition

⁴⁶⁵ Luther’s words

⁴⁶⁶ Luther’s stupid forgetfulness

just before that, that the word sacrament signifies a thing hidden and
 concealed, I ask, of what sacrament did he say that? Did he say it of
 baptism and the eucharist? I think so. For he admits those alone as
 sacraments. But of the thing signified he does not speak, namely the
 washing of the soul. For that does not signify the thing hidden but is
 5
 itself the thing hidden. Therefore the sacrament of which he speaks,
 which signifies the thing hidden, is in baptism the washing of the body,
 in the eucharist the species of bread and wine. I ask you now, Luder,
 whether or not these also are visible signs? They are as much so, by
 God, as matrimony. What therefore do you mean, you utter madman,
 10
 when you snore as in a dream that those things which you say are not
 sacraments are rather visible signs, whereas they are no more visible
 signs than those very things which you grant are sacraments? I have
 no doubt that when Luder has read these things, the man will be
 chagrined that he has written half sleeping such raving dreams; he will
 15
 sweat plenty and will turn every stone to see if in any way he can find
 anything to mitigate at least such great madness. I am eager indeed to
 see with what cloth of purple he will cover such a great sore. Or,
 shameless as he is, does he pretend that he is only defining the word
 sacrament when he says that sacrament by the practice of scripture
 20
 signifies a thing hidden, and that he spoke as though he were
 saying that the word man always signifies a certain rational being?
 And thus the word sacrament by the practice of scripture always
 signifies a thing hidden, but matrimony is not a thing hidden; there-
 fore, matrimony is not that which by the practice of scripture is called
 25
 a sacrament. If Luder should pretend this,⁴⁶⁷
 he will be defending himself in the same
 way as though someone should ward off a blow so shrewdly that he
 beats it off from his arm with his head. For what will he fashion more
 dull-witted than this trick? For as it is true that there is no sacrament
 30
 which does not by some sensible sign indicate a secret thing, so it is
 true that none of those signs always signifies a secret thing, but the
 words for them generally signify only those very things which are at
 times the signs of sacred things. For even washing as a sacrament
 signifies a thing hidden, namely the washing of the soul; yet, generally
 35
 it does not signify that, nor does its word generally indicate a sacra-
 ment. For what is a washing or a baptism generally other than a
 certain bathing of the body? Therefore if he should think that by
 this trick he will escape, he will plainly slip into a latrine. For if the

⁴⁶⁷ How Luther defends himself

honored doctor thus quibbles with us that the word sacrament by the practice of all the scriptures signifies a thing secret and hidden, but matrimony is not a thing secret or hidden, therefore matrimony cannot be a sacrament, I will oppose to the honored doctor an argument very similar to this, as follows:⁴⁶⁸

The word sacrament by the practice of all the scriptures signifies a thing secret and hidden, but washing or baptism is not a thing hidden and the species of bread and wine are not a thing hidden—rather, since the honored doctor jeers at the notion of species, neither bread nor wine are things hidden—therefore neither baptism, nor the species of bread and wine, nor bread and wine, can be sacraments. Let the honored doctor find me a solution to this argument of mine, and at the same time he will find a solution for his own. Let the honored doctor defend himself, who till now has confessed at least by word that those two are sacraments. Certainly, unless he wishes to take those two away, which he clearly will try some day—indeed, as a matter of fact he has already done it long ago—he will be forced to admit that this reasoning of his has nothing of reasoning in it. Indeed, he will be forced to admit, according to his own premise, that matrimony must be called a true sacrament rather than baptism itself.⁴⁶⁹ For neither does washing signify a thing hidden, except insofar as it is a sacrament, nor has it always been a sacrament, nor is it now always a sacrament. But matrimony from the beginning was a sacred sign of a most sacred reality.

Not any less insane is your statement that you have denied nothing else but that matrimony and the other sacraments which you condemn are called sacraments in scriptures.

Is it thus, Luder, that you finally make sport?⁴⁷⁰ Do you deny nothing further? A little while ago you denied that they are sacraments; now you deny nothing except that they are called sacraments in the scriptures. This quarrel is settled then, and you have yielded the whole case, unless someone should argue that all those sacraments are called by the name sacrament in sacred scripture. But I ask you, who ever started this quarrel with you? Who ever argued thus? Once you denied that the ancient fathers of the church called orders a sacrament. The king proved by the testimony of most ancient men that you lied. Now you

⁴⁶⁸ Luther's argument on sacraments is refuted

⁴⁶⁹ According to Luther's premise matrimony is more truly a sacrament than baptism

⁴⁷⁰ How prettily Luther corrects himself

propose as a great issue that scripture at least does not call them sacraments. Oh, what a powerful weapon you have hurled! Set forth, I pray, the sacred scripture which calls baptism by the name sacrament. Set forth one which calls the eucharist by this name. You will find, I think, no sacrament named by the term sacrament in scripture except this one which you now stupidly attack, matrimony. Have you ever heard anyone, reader, in a matter so sacred and serious, so insolently and stupidly talking nonsense? 5

He treats cleverly and delightfully those points which Luther buffoonishly brought together as the sum of the matter at the end of his work. Last chapter. 10

The sum of the matter is this:⁴⁷¹ The whole of Henry's book relies upon the words of men and the usage of the ages, not on the words of God or the usage of the Spirit, as he himself is forced to admit. On the other hand, the sum of my arguments is this, that the words of men and the usage of the ages, although they can be maintained and preserved wherever they do not contradict the sacred scriptures, still do not constitute articles of faith or make for a necessary observance. And so, if King Henry, by the conjoined forces and efforts of all Thomists, papists, demons and men, can show the necessary observance of human words, then Luther is conquered by his own judgment and confession.⁴⁷² For then I will finally hold as articles of faith whatever even the Thomists will command. If he cannot do this, Luther is the victor. For what else do they want? Not even if they have written a million books against me, will they be able to ask anything else from me. 15 20 25

The sum of the matter is this:⁴⁷³ The whole book of Luther is nothing else but a sheer conglomeration of buffoonish words, with distortion of the words of God, contempt of all the saints, and blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, as he himself is forced to admit. On the other hand, the sum of the prince's arguments is the defense of the sacraments,⁴⁷⁴ which he has proved more 30 35

⁴⁷¹ Luther's words

⁴⁷² So you are indeed, if you would be willing to acknowledge it

⁴⁷³ The sum of the Lutheran book

⁴⁷⁴ The sum of the king's book

clearly than light to be, not the traditions of men, but the traditions of God, and he has proved this by reason, by the scriptures, and by the confession of Luther himself. And so, if Luther with all his pot-fellows combined, with all his buffoons and rascals combined, with all his spectres and cacodaemons (the inspirers of his blasphemies) combined, if he can, I say, show that the buffoonery of impious scoundrels has more validity than the traditions of God, then Luther is the victor. If he cannot, then Luther is conquered by the confession of Luther himself. For what else does he want? If those who write against him should write even a million books they will be demanding nothing else from him than that he listen to what is said to him and remember what he himself has said.⁴⁷⁵ Up till now no one has been able to gain either of these aims from him.

For neither do I ask what Ambrose,⁴⁷⁶ Augustine, the councils and the usage of the ages say. As I say, I do not dispute about what has or has not been said by anyone, what has or has not been written, but I question whether this saying and writing must necessarily be obeyed, whether it is an article of faith, whether it binds the conscience.

I think there is no one who has opposed to you either Ambrose or Augustine or any of the saints whatever, or the councils, or the synods because he is unaware of how arrogantly and stupidly you scorn everyone but yourself; rather they do this because they are eager to defend the people with a saving antidote to your raging poison. For when they see that in opposition to your opinion, not just any one ancient writer, but all of them uphold the sacraments of the church, they cannot doubt that that was the common faith of the catholic church, wherever in the world there was a church truly catholic. By your confession the king proved that this church cannot be deceived and err concerning the sacraments. Besides, since you admit that Christ is present wherever two or three persons are gathered together in His name,⁴⁷⁷ the people easily see that you are not in your right mind when you argue that Christ was not present there where there were gathered together in the name of Christ two hundred or three hundred persons, and these some of the most learned and holy men from all over the world. So the people understand well enough that the catholic church, even if it does not make

⁴⁷⁵ How wicked Luther has always been

⁴⁷⁶ Luther's words

⁴⁷⁷ How distortedly Luther joins everything

articles of faith, still does prove and teach true articles of faith, just as it proves and teaches which is the gospel, even if it does not make the gospel. Therefore, no one is saying that the words of the whole church are equal to the words of God,⁴⁷⁸ but that the church teaches that the sacraments have been handed on to her through the word of God; in discerning which, Luder, you also have admitted that she cannot err. And thus, you are always straitened by your own confession, especially since it has been proved to you that not only today is the church of this mind—the church which you call papistic, which nevertheless is in fact the catholic church—but that it has always thought thus, whichever church anywhere in the world has been truly catholic. This fact is clear both from the decrees of the councils and from the agreement of most holy fathers from very diverse places and times still consistently holding the same judgment, so that, when you, a single individual, disagree with all these men together, you do nothing else but betray your impious and shameless folly.

Nor did I need King Henry as a master to teach me these things,⁴⁷⁹ since I know them well enough even to have attacked them, so that I must wonder at the folly of Satan, which attacks me with the arguments which I myself attack and which constantly begs the question.

On the contrary, you do need King Henry as master to unteach you the arguments that your own king, Satan, has taught you, he who is truly king over all the sons of pride, who has so infatuated you that without realizing it you are constantly contradicting yourself; nor are you at all consistent, but you judge one thing standing, another sitting. As for your statement that those who oppose to you the holy fathers and the councils constantly beg the question, you are constantly deaf because you do not choose to listen. For if any church was ever truly Christian, it was certainly that one whose faith the writings of the holy fathers testify to have been the faith which you are now attacking. Therefore, since you yourself admit that the church cannot be deceived in distinguishing the word of God, but yet you say that this same church is false which has for so long judged that the sacraments were handed on by the word of God from the beginning, it is clear even to boys both that you lie most falsely and that you are contradicting yourself most shamefully.

⁴⁷⁸ The sacraments handed down to the church by the word of God

⁴⁷⁹ Luther's words. You speak truly for he attacks you with the scriptures which you assail

Besides, when the question arises as to the meaning of a scriptural text,⁴⁸⁰ when the king agrees with you on the identity of the scriptural text but disagrees with you in that he says you misinterpret the text and that it does not signify what you contend, it seems to you a ridiculous begging of the question if,⁴⁸¹ in support of his own opinion, he cites all the most ancient and most sacred supporters from among the ancient fathers, who could neither have sought his favor nor hated you, since they died so many centuries before Orcus vomited you as a most horrible plague onto the earth. How ridiculously you ridicule one who begs the question in this way! It is indeed no less ridiculous than the following: Someone wishing to demonstrate a geometrical conclusion first asks you to concede that the half is less than its whole; then, since you are either so stupid as not to grasp this principle, or so shameless that you would knowingly deny it, leaving you to your folly, he proceeds anyway to employ this postulate and from it he deduces his conclusion.⁴⁸² Now if you should return again and trifle with a thousand absurdities, saying that he has demonstrated nothing but is most perversely begging the question and deducing the matter from that premise which you initially denied, and there with a Sardonian smile you should distend your dog jowl and boast that he proves what is denied through what is denied, what would you be doing different from what you are now doing, when with your stupid raillery you propose what must be laughed at as a stupid argument? 5

I ask about liberty and slavery; I fight for liberty; the king fights for slavery.⁴⁸³ I have indicated the reason for liberty; the king omits the reasons for slavery and only blathers about what slavery is. He makes us guilty and does not assign any fault. And so away with this absurd and wretched defender of the Babylonian captivity and of his own papistic church. 10 15 20 25 30 35

As always, Luder hears badly whatever is not advantageous to him. For how often the prince has taught him that liberty and all safety stem from the side of the church, but that on the other hand

⁴⁸⁰ On what the king agrees with Luther, on what not

⁴⁸¹ How the king begs the question

⁴⁸² Luther's manner in disputing

⁴⁸³ Luther's words. On the contrary he is for the word of God, you for the license of crimes

captivity and the greatest danger come from Luther's own side, and he has proved this, laying the foundation of his argument on the admission of Luder himself. But if anyone should once more shout that into his ears, the drunken Luther would no more hear it than did the drunken Fusius once when he slept through the role of Ilione, although twelve hundred Catienuces shouted: "Mother, I am calling you." But let the fellow sleep, or as he is used to doing, let him snore while awake. Nevertheless, for your sake, reader, I will again review the passage from the prince's book; when you hear it, you will not be able to doubt on which side stands the danger of captivity. 5 10

"But Luther himself admits⁴⁸⁴ that there is no danger in anyone's agreeing with the opinion of the whole church in this matter. On the other hand, though, the whole church judges that he who agrees with Luther is a heretic. Therefore Luther ought not to encourage anyone whose welfare he has at heart to agree with himself, whose opinion the whole church condemns. Rather he ought to persuade those whom he loves to join those whom he himself also judges to be involved in no danger.⁴⁸⁵ Therefore, this way of Luther is false, opposed to the common faith not only of this time but even of all ages. Nor does he free from captivity those who believe in him, but leading them from the liberty of the faith, that is, from a holy place (as Luther himself admits), he imprisons them in error, leading them into a steep place and along trackless, uncertain and doubtful ways, and to that extent ways full of danger. And he who loves danger perishes in it." 15 20 25

To conclude,⁴⁸⁶ if my harshness toward the king has offended anyone, let him have this as his answer. In this book I was dealing with senseless monsters who despised all of my excellent and restrained writings, as well as my abject submission, and who grew more hardened as a result of my moderation.⁴⁸⁷ Moreover, I have refrained from the bitter invective and the lies with which the book of the king is replete. Nor is it such a great matter if I scorn and bite a king of earth when he has not been afraid to blaspheme the king of heaven by his words and to profane Him with the most noxious lies.⁴⁸⁸ 30 35

⁴⁸⁴ The king's words

⁴⁸⁵ If you are wise, Luther, persuade those whom you hold dear of this

⁴⁸⁶ Luther's words

⁴⁸⁷ But besides you no one sees this moderation of yours

⁴⁸⁸ This you do, Luther

From so many lies, from so many blasphemies, Luder ought to have presented at least one as an example, especially to prevent anyone's truly charging him with what he falsely charged the prince. He lies when he says that the king indicated no contradictory passage in Luther's writings, whereas the king has indicated more than ten such. But let Luther produce those examples when he has the leisure for it. But meanwhile the prince has seen to it that no one at all can be unaware of Luther's most lying blasphemies against God, unless it be someone who has not read him, or who is altogether the kind of person that does not see water in a flood. As the king has shown, Luther openly blasphemes all the saints who shed light on the scriptures with their writings.⁴⁸⁹ He blasphemes the apostle James. He blasphemes the apostle Paul. He blasphemes the church of Christ. He blasphemes the sacraments of Christ, which he contemns as the inventions of men. He blasphemes Christ Himself, whose first sacrament and the doorway to the rest he makes almost nothing other than a secure license for every evil deed. He blasphemes the Holy Spirit; whatever of the Holy Spirit's doctrine has been taught without scripture he deprives of faith as far as he can as though it were wholly false. Finally he blasphemes the whole Trinity, to whose unbending will he attributes the inevitable necessity of all evil deeds.⁴⁹⁰

Now for the ridiculous excuse which he makes for himself—namely, lest he seem to be biting the king too mercilessly—I really have no doubt but that the king will easily overlook all his bites, as one who sees the truth of Seneca's remark: The barking dog rarely bites. In his barking Luther is truly equal to Cerberus, but in his bite hardly to a gnat.⁴⁹¹ But why not let him bark fiercely, this truly good and most moderate man, when, as he says, he is dealing with senseless monsters who do not understand that all his writings are, by his own praise alone, excellent and most restrained; that is to say, more inflated with heresies and blasphemies than anyone ever inflated a bag with wind. These monsters have been hardened even by the fellow's most humble submission,⁴⁹² with which he submitted as a friarlet to the vicar of Christ just as the Jews submitted themselves to Christ when, slapping Him in the face, they bent

⁴⁸⁹ Such was ever Luther's mildness

⁴⁹⁰ This is Luther's piety toward God

⁴⁹¹ Luther more a barker than a biter

⁴⁹² The nature of Luther's submission

their knees to Him, shouting in mockery: “Hail, king of the Jews.”
 But he testifies that he has absolutely refrained from lies and invective,
 the very person in whose pen there is nothing but calumnies, lies and
 deceptions; in whose spirit there is nothing but venom, bombast and
 ill will; who conceives nothing in his mind 5
 but folly, madness, and insanity;⁴⁹³ who has
 nothing in his mouth but privies, filth and
 dung, with which he plays the buffoon more foully and impurely than
 any buffoon, of whom none has ever been found besides this one such
 a stupid butt of men’s scorn that he would cast into his mouth the 10
 dung which other men would spit out into a basin. Therefore, since
 he is this sort of person, I am not at all surprised if he is now con-
 sidered unworthy for anyone to dispute with him. Surely, since he has
 devoted himself totally to hell, and has persisted in schism, and has
 determined never to retract his heresies,⁴⁹⁴ he 15
 still ought to resolve on showing some
 regard at least for public dignity, by which
 he might claim for himself the authority of
 a teacher of dogma rather than that of a worthless heretical buffoon.
 If he will ever be willing to do this, if he will carry on his disputation 20
 in a serious manner, if he will retract his lies and deceptions, if he will
 leave off the folly and rage and the till now too familiar mad ravings,
 if he will swallow down his filth and lick up the dung with which he
 has so foully defiled his tongue and his pen, there will not be lacking 25
 those who, as is fitting, will discuss serious matters in a serious way.
 But if he proceeds to play the buffoon in the manner in which he has
 begun, and to rave madly, if he proceeds to rage with calumny, to
 mouth trifling nonsense, to act like a raging madman, to make sport
 with buffoonery, and to carry nothing in his mouth but bilge-water,
 sewers, privies, filth and dung, then let others do what they will; we 30
 will take timely counsel, whether we wish to deal with the fellow thus
 ranting according to his virtues and to paint with his colors, or to
 leave this mad friarlet and privy-minded rascal with his ragings and
 ravings, with his filth and dung, shitting and beshitted.

⁴⁹³ Luther painted according to his virtues

⁴⁹⁴ This also would not be useless for his praise, of which he is desirous

The peroration of the work, in which many
points are handled piously, cleverly and
learnedly, as well as pleasantly.

685

I have no fear, good reader, but that your sense of fairness will make
allowance for me that in this book you so often read such things as I 5
think your sense of modesty shuns. Indeed, nothing more irksome
could have happened to me than to be forced to such a point of
necessity that I should inflict on decent ears anything that would
offend by indecent words. But there was
no way of avoiding it unless I had deter- 10
mined, as I had tried to do with all my
strength, not to touch the buffoonish book of Luther at all.⁴⁹⁵ Otherwise,
if a response absolutely had to be made to a man on the lookout for
spreading calumnies, nothing that he had written should have been
omitted, nor was it allowable that words be changed when there was 15
no substance to them, nor was it effective to recount decently what
had been written indecently. Finally, how can it be that I who under-
take to refute his buffoonish tricks should answer purely and cleanly
the most impure words of an impure rascal? For he handles the
matter in such a way that he clearly declares that he contemplates 20
within himself a certain most absurd kind of immortality and has al-
ready begun to enjoy it and wholly to be in, to be engaged in, to live
in, this kind of sense and tickling of paltry glory which he presumes
will come after yet some myriads of ages,⁴⁹⁶ so
that men will recall and say that once long 25
ago there was in a former age a certain rascal by the name of Luther
who, when he had got the better of cacodaemons in impiety, in order
to adorn his sect with fitting emblems, surpassed magpies in chat-
ter, pimps in wickedness, prostitutes in obscenity, all buffoons in
buffoonery. This he zealously strove for, took pains about, accom- 30
plished so that as the sects of philosophers have names after the
philosophers themselves, and Gnatho contemplated that parasites
likewise should be called Gnathonites, so the most absurd race of
heretics, the dregs of impiety, of crimes, and filth, should be called
Lutherans. For I ask you, reader, what race 35
of heretics was ever so absurd as to be
compared to this one?⁴⁹⁷ It renews every one

⁴⁹⁵ With a Cretan one must act the Cretan, as the proverb says

⁴⁹⁶ Luther's future fame

⁴⁹⁷ That Luther equals all the ancient heretics

of those heresies which the Christian world once condemned, overwhelmed, quenched, each one in its own time; the ashes of all of these this firebrand of hell once more enkindles. Since by this very deed he makes a pretext of piety, to pass over the books of most learned men who have ripped this mask and disguise from his wicked face, if you consider the matter itself, reader, you will easily recognize the tree from its fruit. For if you turn over in your memory the ancient leaders of the church from the very beginnings of Christianity, you will see, reader, how whatever was honored most holily by them is thus held in the utmost contempt by these Lutherans. What was once celebrated with so much veneration as the most holy sacrifice of the mass? What has been so defiled by these pigs and trodden underfoot and all but abolished?⁴⁹⁸

This one thing, indeed, they still preserve sacred in every temple, but this very thing they pollute and profane by their impieties, since they both contend that it is not a sacrifice and preach that it does not profit the people anything; are they not constructing for themselves a way by which they will very soon cast out even that one sacred thing which they have left? Now how much they value prayers you see,⁴⁹⁹ since they not only throw out the canonical hours but also those universal prayers which even from the beginning the church has continually chanted for the support of the deceased. On this point who will not detest such great cruelty? For if, as they falsely argue, it were especially doubtful whether the prayers of the living were profitable to the dead, nevertheless what ill will would it have been to exercise devout affections and to make a trial of prayers by which, though you might be doubtful perhaps whether you were of service, yet you would be certain that you could do no harm? What was once held to be more religious than fasting? What was more exactly observed than Lent? Yet now these men, finally perfected by the spirit, lest they seem to distinguish day from day, dedicate every day to bacchanalian orgies.⁵⁰⁰

Who does not know how continence was once prized? How strictly conjugal fidelity was commanded, how esteemed by the ancients the chastity of widows, how zealously, how rightly virginity was praised? And all these things by the authority of Christ Himself. Now this Antichrist has taken away almost completely all sense of modesty. Priests, monks, virgins dedicated to God, now by the favor of the

⁴⁹⁸ Luther's abuse of the mass

⁴⁹⁹ Luther's opinion on prayers

⁵⁰⁰ These men prefer to sin in a worse manner

devil, in the church of the wicked, under the title of lawful spouses,
 with great pomp of demons celebrate nefarious nuptials, and the
 contract and fidelity which even when ratified by man none except
 the wicked violate, they do not fear to violate, though it is ratified by
 God; they are secure of course with Luther condoning their nuptials,
 who begins to promise also numerous wives at once, which alone he
 calls the true second marriage. Very soon no doubt he will confirm
 this promise when he will have sufficiently fortified himself with troops
 of men against squadrons of women. But meanwhile, so that he may
 oblige those also, to how many persons, how easily he opens exits in
 the *Babylon*, by which it is permitted to leave one's spouse if any have
 not been able to pay their conjugal debt, unless the husband himself
 is so fair that he brings in a substitute from elsewhere who will in his
 place faithfully pay the debt to the wife. And these things, which are
 not only impious but also so silly that they can seem to be distorted
 by me for the sake of a joke, you will see, reader, in the *Babylon* so
 seriously confirmed by him that you cannot wonder enough that he
 ever finds anyone who is not thoroughly ashamed to be called the
 disciple of so utterly absurd and insane a master.

But a great stimulus to evil is the hope of liberty and license; while
 it is extended in the one hand, fear is stretched out in the other. For
 neither is anything more violent than the Lutherans. What wonder is
 it if Luther's sect advances itself by these same arts, by which it has
 grown strong and continues to grow strong
 from day to day, not unlike that sect of the
 Turks—that is,⁵⁰¹ if the impiety of these men
 does not surpass even the Turks them-
 selves? For this is plainly evident, that
 never have the images of the saints been mistreated with such insult as
 they are mistreated from day to day by the most criminal fingers of
 these scoundrels, who do not fear not only to tear them away from
 their most holy shrines, to cast them aside when torn away, to trample
 them down when cast aside, but also to abuse them trampled down
 and trodden underfoot by every kind of mockery and insult.

And these things Luther gleefully beholds perpetrated against the
 images of the saints, all of whose honors and veneration he judges
 should be abolished as most harmful scandals, while in the meantime
 he rejoices that his own truly venerable image is carried about and
 worshipped.⁵⁰² But because he sees, conscious
 of his guilt, that his impiety is hateful to all

⁵⁰¹ The Lutherans are like the faction of the Turks. The insults of the Lutherans against the saints themselves

⁵⁰² Luther's piety

the saints, he hates in turn the veneration and honors of all of them. Even the Turks venerate the virgin mother of God, whose name the Lutherans hardly endure. For how can they endure the honors of Mary when these most criminal buffoons bespatter the most holy image of Christ crucified with the most foul excrement of their bodies destined to be burned? These are the spiritual fruits of that sect. To this point at last has grown Luther's piety. A single impiety protects all the crimes of this heresy: according to it, they want themselves to seem to be, and they argue that they are, necessarily such as they are—on the grounds that the certain and destined will of God drives men into every kind of crime. Do you doubt, do you doubt, illustrious Germany, that those who sow such spiritual goods as these are, will one day reap carnal goods? Indeed now, as I hear, the thistles are reproducing their bad fruit, and God is beginning to show how He approves this sect, when He does not allow the priests who take wives to be joined to any other than public strumpets.⁵⁰³ And in the case of those whom He once forbade to be joined in legitimate wedlock, except to most pure virgins, He does not now allow their incestuous and criminal nuptials to take place except with the most foul prostitutes. What about the fact that everywhere such spouses, exposed at first with wretched infamy, then ruined by illness, poverty and destitution, shortly afterwards slipping into robbery, He finally punishes with public penalty? And would that the vengeance be confined within these dregs, but unless it is speedily resisted, it will spread somewhat farther. For just as very many of the princes look not without pleasure on a degenerating clergy, undoubtedly because they pant for the possessions of those who defect and hope to seize them on the grounds of abandonment, and just as those princes rejoice that obedience is withdrawn from the Roman pontiff with the hope that they will be able to dispose and divide and squander it all for themselves at home, so too there is no reason for them to doubt but that the people look to the time when they may shake off in turn the yoke of the princes and strip them of their possessions; once they have accomplished this, drunk with the blood of princes and revelling in the gore of nobles, enduring not even common rule, with the laws trampled underfoot according to Luther's doctrine, rulerless and lawless, without restraint, wanton beyond reason, they will finally turn their hands against themselves and like those earthborn brethren, will

⁵⁰³ The purity and sanctity of the Lutherans

mutually run each other through. I pray Christ I may become a false prophet; I shall if men will come to their senses and resist the rising evils. Otherwise, I fear that I will become what I do not wish, a true prophet. But let Germany see to these things.

I return to Luther's book; since it is such as you see, that is, 5
 a mere conglomeration of buffoonish words, you will, reader, consider my book worthy of pardon wherever you see what that fellow's filth has infected to be not sufficiently clean. But if at times I seem too long-winded, let your fairness consider that since his words had to be recorded, and those added which the prince wrote, as well 10
 as something added of my own so that the misrepresentation of Luther might become evident, it could not but happen that the work should grow somewhat, not to mention meanwhile the fact that by the custom of all the courts the respondent obtains a longer time to speak. But if you think that you find less of serious matter and matter 15
 worthy of approval than is proportionate to the size of the book, not even that can you rightly impute to me, to whom it was not permitted to stray beyond the limits of that man's book, nor to present anything else from it than what was there. And yet I hope that some things have been thrown in by me which so undermine Luther's foundations 20
 that together with them the man's impious doctrines stupidly built upon them will necessarily fall into ruin; this I certainly do not doubt, that nothing from the book of the king was carped at by Luther in which I did not clearly refute Luther's shameless deceitfulness. Finally, as I confess my book not to be the kind that demands 25
 publication as something that must be read, so I trust it is not the kind which a person ought rightly to condemn who deigns to read Luther's trifles. For if anyone has spurned his chatter, there is no need, nor do I desire, that he waste his time on this book. Indeed, my most earnest prayer is that I may sometime see the day in which all 30
 mortals will cast aside both these trifles of mine and all the insane heresies of that fellow, so that, with the pursuit of the worst things consigned to oblivion, with the incitements to railing buried, and the memory of contentions wiped out, the serene light of faith may shine into souls, sincere piety and truly Christian harmony may return; 35
 and I pray that He who came into the world to bring peace from heaven, may one day bring back and restore that harmony to the world. The end.

POEM ON LUTHER
BY JOHN VITALIS OF LONDON

695

This book sent by the remote Britons, Luther, has come, a second
shaft for your destruction. Henry, king most great and hero most
brave, remarkably favored in body and mind, and himself a most
fierce defender of the true faith, shattered your powers before, 5
Luther. Routed and ruined you still fight back, but in vain, and then
insanely seek to be called victor, no differently than a wrestler overcome
by his opponent who hangs from the neck of his conqueror and argues
that he is not beaten by him at all, although he sinks down now 10
supine on the ground. This trick Ross has destroyed for you, and he
acts so that no one can now be deceived by such a stupid stratagem.
Here he exposes your whole plan point by point, or rather the de-
sign of a brain so insane that all may see how stupidly wicked you are
and hurl at your stupid head these words: Lo, Luther is borne aloft 15
here by his triumphal car. Hurrah! Shower him with festal shit, honor
worthy of the man who is shamefully overcome and trumpets himself
as victor with his own mouth.

AN ADMONITORY POEM TO LUTHER
BY NICOLAS PACHETUS

697

Take the means that will make you now appear safe to me, Luther;
take the means that alone can let you live—if you can, shut the bounds
of your fatherland from all sides, so that this book may not penetrate
to the priests of your mystic rites. For this book so exposes your false
doctrines and so reveals your deceits, Luther, that if it is once
received among the whole people, and these things come to the notice
of your followers, not a place will be left to your prayers thereafter to
keep you from being rent to pieces by your own people.

5

10

AN EPITAPH
BY LAWRENCE NEWLIUS
ON LUTHER ALREADY DEAD
TO EVERYTHING GOOD

699

Him who once stood against heaven and the father of heaven, who
hurled curses even at the holy fathers, who scorned the laws of men
and all laws and wished to live by no counsel, but thought himself
free to do as much as he pleased, and held nothing sacred, nothing
pious, him this small urn conceals, turned to ashes, Luther. He dwells
in Tartarean shade for his sins.

5
10

So that you may not be surprised, most excellent reader, that so many sheets have been inscribed with the mark of a single letter in the same passage, this happened for this reason, that, after the work had already been printed, another copy arrived, emended again by the author himself: in this he himself had added many things, had changed many things. And for that reason it happened that many sheets were cut in pieces in order to conform to the author's changes. Moreover, where he had added something, we were forced to mark all the things which he had added with the letters from that passage into which they had been inserted (as we did in H and A) since we did not find any more convenient method. Besides, since the tops of the leaves have not been marked with numbers, so that you the reader, if you need to look for something, can more easily discover it—this indeed is the next best thing—use in place of the marks of the numbers those letters by which the bottoms of the leaves have been designated. But I should like you also to know this, that, where within the H signature there are many leaves without marks, all the pages, the bottoms of which do not have a signature, are classified under the mark immediately preceding. And for that reason, in connection with these emendations, you will read at times the seventh page and the eighth. Therefore, in this way correct the errata which happened during the printing in accordance with the order of these letters.

And, indeed, these are all things by which we thought that the meaning could be obscured. Those less important matters, however, namely corrupted orthography and things of this sort, which can easily be both noticed and corrected by you, fair reader, we have left for you; even of these very things, we have corrected the major part. Let this, then, be the end of the most learned and most witty work of the most learned William Ross. If, indeed, you, the reader, agree with me, may I perish if you shall not wish to have read this work, because of both its charm and its shrewdness of treatment; by these you will be able to be no less instructed than delighted.

INDEX OF THOSE THINGS
WHICH ARE CONTAINED IN THIS WORK.

703

He refutes the shameless boasting and falsehood of Luther against the emperor and the German princes. P. 40.	
Why it is stupid to dispute face to face with Luther at Wittenberg, the same and following.	5
Why it is profitable to dispute with pen rather than with tongue. P. 44.	
He exposes the stupid subtlety of Luther in ambitiously catching at vainglory. P. 46.	10
He answers Luther's pretense of not believing that the king's book was written by the king himself. P. 54.	
He shows from what distinguished authors the book of Luther is put together, the same and following.	
He convicts Luther of shameless dishonesty and mad self-contradiction. P. 62, and thence throughout chapter 6.	15
How badly Luther refutes the reproach of capricious inconstancy and the charge of stupid abuse. P. 76, and throughout the seventh chapter.	
He refutes Luther's general response, in which the latter argues that nothing should be believed with certainty which cannot be proved by clear scripture. P. 84, and thence throughout the eighth chapter.	20
The same thing later. P. 126, and from there to the end of the tenth chapter.	
The same thing again. Pp. 590–98.	
The same thing again. Pp. 238–44.	25
Again. Pp. 248–52.	
The same thing again. Pp. 392–98.	
The same thing again. Pp. 400–402.	
The same thing again. Pp. 634–40.	
Some things in the church have been correctly instituted, some correctly changed, some even correctly abolished, so completely aside from scripture that scripture seems apparently to be rather opposed. Pp. 382–90.	30
He refutes the assertion that although something may be true apart from scripture yet it cannot be certain, and therefore there will be the danger that false teachings will pass as truths into articles of faith and that traditions of men will be received in place of traditions of God.	35

P. 108, and thence throughout the ninth chapter, and again, Pp. 632–38.	705
He shows that Luther stupidly boggles, when he tries to make the identity of the church a matter of dispute. P. 116 and thence throughout the tenth chapter.	5
How ineptly and stupidly Luther cites and applies the scriptures. P. 214 and thence throughout chapter 12. The same thing again. P. 234 and throughout the fourteenth chapter, in which you will see, and laugh at, him acting like a madman more than fourteen times.	
He wittily refutes Luther’s silly premise attacking the long duration of the catholic faith by comparison with the long enduring superstition of the Jews, Turks, and heathen. P. 220 and thence throughout chapter 13.	10
Luther denies not only that the ancient fathers, but also that Elijah, Jeremiah, John the Baptist, and all other prophets, must be believed. P. 236 and following.	15
Luther disparages confidence in the apostle Paul, and despises the apostle James. Pp. 284–92.	
What sort of things they are which Luther thinks must be taken out of circulation as the most harmful scandals. P. 254.	20
How stupidly Luther wavers on the matter of works and faith, shamelessly pretending that the king falsely attributes to him the statement that faith alone suffices, without good works. P. 258 and thence throughout chapters 16 and 17.	
He refutes the wicked folly of Luther, who is of the opinion that all laws should be repealed. P. 270 and thence throughout chapter 18.	25
He shows that Luther does only one thing: destroy the very scriptures for which he pretends to fight. P. 282 and thence throughout the nineteenth chapter.	
How much danger there will be, if the ancient interpreters are scorned, in each one believing for himself about the meaning of scripture. Pp. 292–98.	30
He proves that Luther begs the initial premise everywhere. P. 298 and thence up to the end of the first book; this whole subject is treated delightfully.	35
About indulgences. Pp. 324–32.	
How stupidly Luther censures Aristotle for subtlety and argues that a good man and a good prince are not two different things. P. 334 throughout the second chapter.	

About the papacy. P. 340 and thence throughout the fourth chapter. Concerning the communion of the laity under both kinds. Pp. 352–438.	
How beautifully Luther tempers his opinion, obviously because there must be freedom to communicate any time and any place, and to celebrate without having fasted. Pp. 420–26.	5
How confusedly Luther treats this, that the water is mingled with the wine in the mass. Pp. 426–38.	
Luther urges that no one mix in water, because he says that this has an evil significance, the same place.	10
The rascal treats Blessed Ambrose scurrilously. P. 440 and thence throughout the eleventh chapter.	
He treats whether bread remains with the body of Christ. Pp. 448–94.	
The subject of dispute between the prince and Luther, whether scripture sometimes calls something not that which it is, but that which it seems to be, or that which it once was, is treated. Pp. 470–84, where you will see not merely one stupid deception of Luther.	15
He answers Luther's query, why God in the eucharist does not transubstantiate the accidents. P. 484.	20
He answers that deception of Luther, by which he casts heresy against the king, when he pretends that the king says that the body of Christ is not a creature but the creator. P. 486.	
He refutes the analogies of Luther, by which he tries to prove that the bread remains along with the body of Christ just as fire remains with iron, or divinity with humanity. P. 488.	25
How impiously Luther, fleeing the good work of others, becomes worse, and how impiously he blasphemes all the holy fathers and calls them impious and blasphemous. Pp. 490–94, from which it plainly appears that either all the ancients were unlearned or this one is most unlearned; all the ancients were stupid or this one is most stupid; all the ancients were criminal, or this one is most criminal.	30
From the confession of Luther himself that the doctrine of Luther confers no good. P. 492.	35
He answers that most stupid boast which Luther makes more than ten times, that the king professedly leaves untouched his principal foundation, namely that the mass is a testament. Pp. 500–14. There	

you the reader will see Luther's foundation absolutely and utterly overthrown and toppled.

On the same thing again. P. 540.

He considers whether the mass is a good work. Pp. 516–28.

He exposes the ineptitude of Luther, talking nonsense in the matter of the work of the doer and the work done. P. 526. 5

He answers Luther's argument, that if the mass were a good work then a wicked priest could not consecrate the mass. Pp. 528–32.

He disproves that stupid doctrine of Luther, that the mass cannot be a sacrifice. Pp. 532–98. 10

He refutes that abhorrent sophism of Luther: the mass is a promise, therefore it cannot be a sacrifice. Pp. 536–46.

He refutes the shameless slander of Luther, his lie that the king says that there is no promise in the whole supper of Christ. Pp. 546–50.

The rascal blasphemes scurrilously all the holy fathers. P. 550. 15

It is worthwhile to see with how much arrogance and how stupidly he interprets these words of the evangelist, Do this in remembrance of me. Pp. 552–56.

Most stupidly Luther contradicts himself. P. 544.

He refutes that stupid sophism of Luther by which he quibbles thus: the priest receives the eucharist in the mass, therefore he cannot offer it. Pp. 556–66. 20

He convicts and confutes the ridiculous arrogance with which Luther thinks it ridiculous that the authority of all the holy fathers is opposed to himself. Pp. 566–76. The same thing again. Pp. 674–76. 25

He refutes Luther's deception and argumentation, which are so stupid that you can wonder whither his mind had roamed. Pp. 578–90.

He proves to Luther that it cannot be certain from the scriptures in what way the mass must be celebrated or how the body of Christ must be consecrated at all, except through the public faith and the custom of the Christian church. Pp. 590–98. 30

He shows excellently how Luther, ensnared by his own confession, tries in vain to escape, variously twisting that word of Augustine, I

would not believe the gospel if the authority of the church did not persuade me. Pp. 598–638. And there you will see how foolishly he quibbles between the right of establishing laws and the right of judging doctrines.	
He shows that Luther's doctrine is most stupid, by which each one is taught to believe for himself against the authority of everyone else. Pp. 610–20.	5
The demon which possesses Luther confesses reluctantly that the truth itself is against him. Pp. 620–26.	
He refutes the scurrilous blasphemy of Luther against synods and general councils. Pp. 626–34.	10
Luther does not argue, but he lies. P. 638.	
He refutes those things which Luther babbles against the sacrament of orders. Pp. 646–62.	
He refutes those things which Luther prattles about the sacrament of matrimony. Pp. 662–70. There you will see Luther grow faint, stagger, totter, fall prostrate.	15
He treats cleverly and delightfully those points which Luther scurrilously brought together as the sum of the matter at the end of his work. Pp. 670–82.	20
He answers Luther's nonsense against Ambrose Catharinus on the question of the church. Pp. 116–210.	
Luther utterly destroys the whole church on earth. P. 156.	
The same thing. P. 172.	
The most stupid self-contradiction of Luther. P. 178.	25
Other things no less stupid. P. 180.	
How absurdly Luther believes for himself about the meaning of scripture rather than the holy fathers of the church. P. 182.	
He shows excellently by passages that the signs through which Luther writes that the church is rendered well known for certain cannot furnish this; and in this way Luther loses his whole case, since he confesses that the church should be known for certain. P. 186.	30