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SEVENTH SECTION.

OBSTACLES TO THE PROGRESS OF THE REFORMATION, ARISING FROM DIFFERENCES OF OPINION UPON THE SACRAMENTS OF BAPTISM AND THE LORD’S SUPPER.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

“For there shall arise false Christs, and false prophets, and shall show great signs and wonders; insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect. Behold, I have told yon before. Wherefore, if they shall say unto yon, Behold, he is in the desert; go not forth: behold, he is in the secret cham­bers; believe it not.”—Matt. xxiv. 24-26.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Introduction.—Zwingli’s Standing-Point.

We have seen how Zwingli, equipped in the armour of God, victoriously wielded the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God, against the Papacy, storming with this potent weapon many of the strongholds of this anti-Christian power. In vain the burning missiles of lying calumny and intrigue were dis­charged against the champion of God. Unhurt, he stood girded with truth, defended by the armour of righteousness on the right hand and on the left, the shield of faith before him, and the helmet of salvation on his head, ever ready to proclaim the gospel. But just as the papal enemy, smote by the two-edged sword of the Spirit, began to give way, another arose in a different quarter, which pretended to fight under the same banner with the friends of truth, which employed the same watch-word, but which raised the shout of battle in their rear and flank, thus not only procuring, by their furious and ill-timed fanaticism, a breathing space for the Papists to rally their broken forces, but throwing such confusion into the ranks of the Evangelicals, that many, in the tumult thus occasioned, mistook the friend for the foe, and directed the whole weight of battle against the friend, instead of assailing the enemy. But while the bravest com­batant may be deceived by a stratagem, which produces such a dislocation of forces, it is just in such a moment of peril that the prudent general manifests his superiority, by pene­trating with an eagle glance the designs of the enemy, and taking measures accordingly with a wise deliberation to frus­trate them; with a suddenly made evolution, he falls upon the enemy behind him, while he holds in check the beaten foe in front. Such a generalship did Zwingli show in this crisis; but it was a spiritual generalship, proving all in the light of God’s Word, and of a faith which, resting upon God and over­coming the world, knew correctly to balance, with a sharp dis­crimination, the opposing claims of truth and falsehood, as they hung in the balance of controversy and of fight. Painfully as he was affected by the disunion in the ranks of truth, he allowed himself neither to be led astray by illusion, however tricked out it might be in the garb of piety, nor to be hurried away to any excess or violence by the angry attacks of his erring brethren. “We glorify God in the highest,” he wrote to his friends in Berne, “as well for every accession as for every defec­tion; not only when He strengthens our hopes but when He tries our patience. It is then we truly experience what fighting is, when the enemy not only attacks us in the front, but on the flank and rear; nay, when the very members of our household join him.” The position which Zwingli took up, and the opinions he maintained in these conflicts, have been from first to last grievously misrepresented, and, indeed, grossly misapprehended. How? Because the standing-point he assumed, and from which he acted, has not itself been apprehended and steadily kept in view. In order to answer the misrepresentations, and to prevent all miscon­ceptions of Zwingli’s opinions, with regard to the nature and significance of the sacraments, we intend, shortly, to illuminate from the right quarter the *standing-point he took up in these disputes.*

The authority of the Word of God being recognised by all who took part in these controversies, for each party sought to make good its views by quotations from Scripture,[[1]](#footnote-1) the question in the end came to be, Who has adopted the right method of discovering the true sense of Scripture? Let us learn from Zwingli’s own words his opinions upon this point: “The Word of God,” he says, “is full of significance, and rich in reference and allusion, and although it has but one, and this the simplest and the truest sense, yet it happens that, owing to the obtuseness and limited range of the human faculties, the genuine and proper sense of the Holy Ghost, who it is that speaks in Scripture, is comprehended but rarely and with difficulty, except by those whom the Spirit has conducted into His innermost sanctuary. It is thus that so many various explanations and senses are produced by the inter­preters of Scripture, each striving to explain it to the profit of the Church, according to the gift given him of God. Nor are they to be so severely reprehended for their mistakes, when, as often occurs, they miss the mark in their commentaries, in so far as they keep solely in view that which is, in all the books of Scripture the grand and main object, *the glory of God and the salvation of man.* For Holy Scripture is an unmeasurable, and, in its whole extent, unnavigable sea, the depth of which has been sounded by none; it is a field, the cultivation of which will afford exercise to the intellectual labours of man during centuries. The Word of God is infallible perfect truth,—there is nothing therein unconsidered, disconnected, or self-contradictory; where, however, we do not understand the sense and the connection, there the fault lies not in the Word of God, but in the darkness and bluntness of our understanding. When these statements occur, which, at the first blush appear to stand in contradiction to other statements, the different passages ought to be held opposite each other; nor ought we to hold obstinately to a single one without any regard to the others, but view the whole in the light of all. What I mean will appear clearly by the following example: Arius[[2]](#footnote-2) defended his heresy with the passage, John xiv. 28, ‘My Father is greater than I.’ Now Arius, along with this statement, ought to have weighed the following, John iii. 16, ‘For God so loved the world, that He gave *His only begotten Son:’* and farther, chap. x. 30, ‘I and my Father are one;’ again, chap. xvi. 15, ‘All things that the Father hath are mine;’ and chap. xiii. 3, ‘Jesus, knowing that the Father had given all things into His hands.’ Had Arius compared these and countless other passages of a similar hearing from the gospel of John, with the statement, ‘My Father is greater than I,’ he would have found that this passage bore reference alone to the human nature of Christ, that in this he was *less* than his Father, not in His divine nature.” “Almost every error comes from the *literalists,* who wrest the letter in a manner contrary to the true sense. The letter is for the sake of the sense, and is designed to serve it, not the sense the letter; and the letter must be explained according to the spirit and the true sense, else the former were nothing but a deception and a delusion. For there is not a word, the very plainest and simplest word that can be spoken on earth, which if one is bent upon chicanery and deception, may not be wrested from its true sense and falsified. Therefore it is not only with Holy Scripture, but with every law, with every precept, order or edict that is issued, with every speech, or use of language what­ever, a standing rule, that the purport and sense show the con­tents and significance of the words, and not that the dark, and as yet, comparatively speaking, unintelligible *word* be allowed to overmaster, to confuse, and mystify the sense. This may be shown by innumerable examples from Holy Scripture, as well as from profane books; I shall illustrate it by a single one. Christ com­mands: ‘If thy foot offend thee, cut it off.’ If we were to estimate the sense of these words according to *the literal standard,* it would be requisite to take from man not only one foot but every foot he had, even although he had as many as the centi­pedes or the sea-urchins. But if we keep to the true sense and purpose of Christ, according to which He means to say, that we are to cut off from the body, which is the Church, the infectious part that, like a cancer, would eat into the whole if not removed, it is evident that not the foot upon which a man goes and stands is to be cut away, but the corrupt brother in the faith, even although he might in other respects be as serviceable as one foot is to the other. The clear sense must determine the less clear sense, not the words the sense. The words of Christ are spirit, not letter; therefore one ought not in a stubborn and violent spirit to hang on the letter alone, but to take the letter according to the spirit. But still the letter must not be despised. If you say the letter kills, of what use is it then? I reply: this is a mode of speech; for properly speaking, it is not the letter which kills, but he kills himself, is himself the cause of his death, who rests upon the letter alone, and pierces not to the sense and the spirit. The ropes draw not without the horse, nor the horse without the ropes, but both when they are united. The ropes, however, keep the horse in the straight line. If there were no letter in Scripture, each would speak according to his own spirit. The written Word is therefore the rule, and the rope by which all is to be directed. The spirit of truth, *i.e.* the spirit of the believer, illuminated by the Spirit of God, comprehends the letter, and rules it. The Spirit wrests not the letter or the sense, but it clears it up, and makes it plain. It is not only carnal, it is something worse, so foolishly to hold to the unintelligible letter that one will not listen to the clearer word. We will that one reject not the letter, but esteem it very highly, but only for the right understanding of the sense, else the letter is worse than useless, for it becomes positively hurtful.”

While Zwingli, according to these principles of interpretation, which will hold true for ever, investigated the Scriptures, and explained their meaning, he preserved himself from the errors in which others were involved, so that the Word of God was, in truth, to him “a lamp to his feet and a light to his path.” An­other guiding star which lighted him and preserved him from error was *faith,* which, in its whole depth and clearness, and a confidence founded upon God, he seized and retained firmly in his grasp. Let us hear how he expresses himself upon the mean­ing of faith. “Faith,” says the apostle, “is the substance of things hoped for (the essential confidence in the things); the evi­dence of things not seen.” The meaning of the apostle thus is, faith is something substantial, fundamental in the soul, not a light haphazard dreaming or thinking, which shapes itself now so and now so, that is, something uncertain; but a firm and sub­stantial confidence of the soul, with which it entirely depends on that hoped for, to wit, the thing which can alone be the object of hope with infallible certainty. The expression, “the things hoped for,” is a periphrasis for God, upon whom alone we can with truth set our hope. But the words of the apostle mean farther, that faith is *that substantial and solid thing in our soul,* vouchsafed to us by Him who is the object and the confidence of our hope. The words, “and the evidence of things not seen,” elucidate the first part of the statement; for the invisible is again a circumlocution for the one God, as the visible denotes the creature. See Rom. i. 20; 2 Cor. iv. 17, 18. Thus faith rests alone upon Him who cannot be perceived and recognised by the senses, but of whom the mind, the intellect, the soul, with reflec­tion and confidence, is conscious. Therefore faith can neither have reference to, nor find support on, any creature, but has alone to do with the one invisible God. Thus it is contrary to the nature of faith to turn itself upon anything visible, *i.e.,* upon any crea­ture as creature. When we are pointed to Christ, this is done for the reason that he is God and man; but to his humanity none is to be directed, as he himself says, John xii. 44: “He that believeth on me, believeth not on me, *(i.e.,* he is not to have faith or confidence in me in so far as I am man), but on Him that sent me.” Faith is consequently the essential and living power of the soul animated by the Spirit of God, which rests firmly and immovably upon God, who is invisible. Man is thus inwardly conscious of faith in the soul, which then springs up when he begins to despair of himself and to perceive that he must set his confidence upon God alone; then, however, arrives at perfection (is perfected), when he renounces himself entirely, and gives him­self wholly up to the Divine mercy; but so that inasmuch as Christ has given himself for him he reposes full confidence in it. But how is the believer to know his faith? ’Tis then thou art free from sin when thy soul firmly trusts in *the death of Christ,* and rests upon it. But this faith comes not from man, it comes alone from God, as Paul likewise derives it from the Holy Ghost, 1 Cor. xii. 9, &c. Flesh and blood, *i.e.,* man, comprehends not that God has become man, and that through His death the whole world has received new life and blessing. Man reasons much rather in this way; thou hast sinned, consequently thou must suffer the penalty, or give satisfaction. So run human contracts. He who believes, however, that, by the death of Christ, the sins of the whole world have been atoned for, has learned it from another teacher, namely, from God. Faith, then, comes not from flesh and blood, but from God. Flesh and blood, *i.e.,* man, cannot comprehend this, partly because what is good in him is so small, partly because his sins are of such magnitude and of such number that it is impossible for him to come to God. When, however, he begins to recognise and believe that he can obtain justification and salvation not through his own strength, and through his own righteousness, but alone through the free mercy of God, such knowledge and belief comes to him from God, it descends to him from heaven. Such a man is born again; he is born from above, and begins a heavenly life; his former life displeases him, he abhors sin, and acknowledges himself to be a sinner before the Majesty of heaven; he cleanses himself daily from his transgres­sions, he feels grief for past sins, and guards against new ones. If he falls, he quickly rises and flies to God, arms himself to battle against the enemy, and stands steadfast at his post. Neither does the proclamation of the Word work such a faith as this; for we see that many hear the gracious message of the gospel and yet believe it not. Nay, the greater part of those who heard Christ himself remained without faith, and many of those who can talk of Christ from Holy Scripture trust not upon Him, as may be seen in those who seek their salvation in the creature, or in external things. Thus faith proceeds not from human reason or intelligence, but alone from the illuminating and drawing Spirit of God. This our dear Lord Jesus himself teaches, John vi. 44: “No man can come unto me except the Father which hath sent me draw him.” He then proves from the prophets that it was recognised by them of old that the knowledge of the Redeemer must be learned from God; and then he adds, “Every man therefore that hath heard and hath learned of the Father cometh unto me,” ver. 45 ; from which words we plainly perceive to what school we must go to be instructed in the knowledge of the Son; to the Father. Thus faith can come from no quarter but from God. One man can show to another by the outward Word with what love God, as Father, embraces us, and what He has given us in His Son. This consolation the evangelical preacher can represent and proclaim to the dejected and doubt­ing conscience, but that it with full confidence accept it, approve it, and firmly believe it, this he cannot effect. He who believes a preached gospel, and trusts in Christ, from him despair van­ishes, and the conscience, staid upon certain and undoubting faith, becomes healed and pacified. For what shall He refuse us, who has given His only-begotten Son for us? But that a man believes this, holds fast to it, and becomes transformed to a new man in Christ, this is the work of the Holy Spirit. Nevertheless, this effect is sometimes ascribed to the evangelical teacher, and it is considered to be the effect of his mediation, as when Paul says, “He hath begotten the Corinthians through the gospel.” In the same manner, when Scripture ascribes salvation to faith, that is attributed to the nearer and more known cause which is alone the work of God. It is God alone who justifies and saves, and that out of pure mercy and grace. As Paul also says, Horn. viii. 30: “Whom He did predestinate, them He also called; and whom He called, them He also justified.” To speak correctly, then, it is election and not faith -which saves. But because faith is the surest sign of our election, that is here ascribed to faith which properly belongs to election. In like manner, Paul, when he writes to the Romans, chap. x. 17, “Faith cometh by hearing,” attributes to the nearer and to us better known cause that which is alone the work of the Spirit and not of the outward preaching. And this is a truth, not only proved to us by such testimonies of Scripture as, “No man cometh unto me except the Father draw him,” and “to another, faith (is given) by the same Spirit,” 1 Cor. xii. 9, and many others, but by daily experience; for we see that many who hear the preaching of the gospel believe it not. Paul, however, means to say something more than that it is necessary that the Word be preached, through which means God plants faith, from whom all growth proceeds, by his own hand. For even apostolic labour, though derived from the power of God, is but a means; the inward drawing of the soul is the immediate act of God’s Spirit. Faith likewise comes not from outward things, but alone from a drawing God. Nor can outward things even con­firm it. Christ indeed says : “If I had not done among them the works which none other man did, they had not had sin,” &c. &c. These words seem to import that miracles wrought faith; but this is not their sense. For who saw greater miracles than Pharaoh and the Pharisees? And who believed less than they? There­fore signs and wonders do not make a believer; they lead only in so far to faith as God in the soul of man is operative and draws.

From this stand-point Zwingli investigated the significance of the “sacraments,” and their reference to the work of salvation. By *sacrament,* the Romans understood *an oath,* and principally the oath which soldiers swore when they joined the army,—the oath to follow the standards. Latin ecclesiastical language employed “sacrament” to designate a sign or symbol of a holy thing. Both these significations Zwingli combined, so that, according to him, “the sacraments were solemn symbolical assurances and promises, or *signs of obligation.* This they are in a double sense. Firstly, because God’s gifts of mercy and grace which He has vouchsafed to us in Christ are presentiated and assured to us by them. Hence the name of Sacrament properly belongs to those holy transactions alone which God has instituted, commanded, and ordained in His Word, which itself is as firm and sure as the oath of God can be. Secondly, “Sacrament” signifies, in respect to us, a symbolical obligation upon oath, seeing that he who receives the sacrament binds himself thereby to do that which is demanded by it. He who has been marked by the holy rite of baptism will hear what God says to him, will learn His command­ments, and live according to them. Wherefore Paul derives from baptism the strongest encouragements to crucify the flesh. Bap­tism is thus that symbolical sign by which we are summoned, and by which we bind ourselves to lead a new life, engaging to show gratitude to the grace of God, which has been done to us in Christ, who has washed us by His blood, that we may not be again stained with sin. Baptism does not regenerate or make us new men, but it reminds us that we be such, or at least that we seek to be such. In the Holy Supper of the Eucharist, we comme­morate the propitiation made, when Christ, the God-man, was offered up in sacrifice in His human nature, and we thank God for this great benefit, obliging ourselves to lead a Christian life with love to the brethren. While in this holy transaction we praise the gracious gifts of the divine goodness and mercy, these are not com­municated to us except symbolically, the symbols and the preached Word simply *announcing* them to us. It is the Holy Spirit alone which draws the mind to its own source of light and joy, by which the souls that have pined in despair on account of their sins are again quickened and renewed in youth. If the *mere transaction* could do anything of this sort, then were Judas come to himself again, and had not left the society of the other disciples to go away and betray his Master. Nay, the executioners themselves who nailed Christ to the cross, or blasphemed Him at the cross, had changed their disposition, and had not given free course to their wickedness, if the outward things had brought faith or the pardon of sins. For they saw that thing by which the sins of the world are expiated, not symbolically expressed, but transacted before their eyes. However nothing of the kind followed. For only those repented whom the Spirit inwardly illuminated to recognise Christ as their Saviour, and whom the Father drew, that they might come to Him, and joyfully receive Him. Outward things, therefore, can only *announce* and *signify.* Yet Christ condescends to call the bread His body, which, to speak with Augustine, is but the sign of His body; and men enlightened by the Spirit of God follow their Master, attributing to the holy Eucharist all that for which we give thanks in this solemn act of praise. They call it the *body of the Lord,* because we therein commemorate that Christ became man, and died for us. They call it *pardon of sins,* because we therein give thanks that Christ purged away our sins by His death. They call it a *nourishment of souls,* because in it He is exalted who alone is the undoubted pledge of our hope. Not as though the natural bread were the natural body of Christ, or as if the same, eaten and digested, took away sin, or as if the natural bread and the natural body of Christ could nourish the soul, but because the divine goodness has acted towards us in so gracious and familiar a way as to present certain images and forms of inward spiritual things to our outward senses, which signs it dignifies with the same names as the things themselves which they signify, because they are the symbolical signs and intimations of the more sub­stantial realities. Hence the holy fathers taught that the sacra­ments consisted of two things—of the visible and invisible, or of the sensible and the spiritual. Not as though the bread in the Supper were at once the sign and the thing, that is, the real bread and the real body of Christ, but in the sense that the bread is the sign, while the thing signified is, that Christ has given himself for us, and been actually sacrificed, which is confessed and believed by the partakers of the Supper. Of this reality the bread is the symbol present to the senses, the reality itself, how­ever, is present to the believing soul. Not as if the bread were natural and visible bread, and at the same time the natural and invisible body of Christ, but the bread is natural and visible bread; the thing, however, which nourishes the soul, namely, that God has given His Son for us, is the invisible. Of this invisible the bread is the visible sign. Nor is it meant to be asserted that the bread is natural bread perceptible to the senses, and at the same time a spiritual power, but simply that the bread, as it falls upon the senses, points to the spiritual renewal of the soul which is effected through faith in Christ sacrificed for us. The divinely illuminated men, then, who, after the example of Christ their teacher, have employed very strong language on this subject, have not done wrong in so doing, inasmuch as they per­ceived that with no colours could they sufficiently magnify the greatness of the benefits conveyed. But it is highly objectionable in us to be so foolish and perverse as to attribute to a thing sym­bolical that which belongs to God, and at once to transform the Creator into the creature, and the creature into the Creator. Christ has not instituted the sacraments that we may seek or place our righteousness in them, but that we may be reminded and stirred up by them to arrive at true righteousness of heart and faith; for the external signs do not make us righteous, but they point us to justification by faith, and they awaken us to holiness of life.”

Having thus surveyed the standing-point which Zwingli took up upon this ground, we shall pass over to the contests which he was compelled to wage from the position which he assumed, and first of all, with the Anabaptists of Zurich.

2. The Anabaptists of Zurich.—Their Overtures to Zwingli, and Factious Spirit.

We have already, on various occasions, alluded to those men of impetuous character who plunged into the conflict of the Reformation without the necessary consecration of heart and soul, and whom Zwingli was oftentimes compelled to exhort to moderation and temperance of spirit, lest the pure and healing stream of the evangelical movement might be disturbed by their passions, or made to overflow its banks. These men became, after they had failed to shape the Reformation according to their views, the founders and heads of the sect of the Anabaptists.[[3]](#footnote-3) Zwingli himself speaks of them in the following terms : “They who have begun with us the strife about baptism have often before this time entreated us to found a new church or commu­nity, free from sin. These were fanatical men of turbulent dis­positions, who had already formed the resolution to change the freedom of the gospel into the license of the flesh. They came to us ministers of the Word in Zurich, at first, indeed, in a friendly, but yet in so importunate a spirit, that one could bode mischief from their very mien and bearing. They thought it would be impossible for us to prevent that, even among those who boast themselves as belonging to the gospel, many should not be found who would stand in the way of it. It could never be expected that all should live as Christians. ‘Now,’ said they, ‘according to the Acts of the Apostles, the faithful separated themselves from the others, and formed a new church. The same thing must be done now.’ They begged us to publish a declaration, that those who were disposed to follow Christ should place themselves to us, in which case they promised us that our host would far exceed that of the unbelievers. The community of the saints would then choose their council or senate from among themselves, as it was very apparent how many disbelieving and impious persons were to be found in the Council and in the present mixed Church. We returned them the following answer: ‘It is undoubtedly true that there ever will be people who, though confessing Christ, lead ungodly lives, and make a mock of virtue, nay, of godliness itself. If such, however, perseveringly give themselves out as Christians, and their practice is such as to permit of their being suffered by the Church, they yet belong to our party, according to the principle which Christ himself laid down at the planting of the gospel, a time which has so much resemblance to our own, ‘He who is not against us is with us.’ He has also commanded that we should let the tares grow with the wheat till the harvest. Thereby we have the confident hope that of those who are disinclined to godliness several will daily change and amend their lives. But even although this result should not take place, it is still possible for even the most pious to live among the godless. The example of the apostles is not applicable here, since they from whom they separated did not confess Christ. Nor would the greater part of these join in a separation from us, even were they more intimately bound to Christ than we ourselves. In the continual administration of the Word, we shall proclaim to all that which it is necessary for them to know, if they will not trifle with their own salvation, and we doubt not the number of believers will continue to increase steadily by the continual exhibition of the Word, and not by the tearing asunder of the body into many parts.’”

To the leaders of this extravagant party belonged Conrad Grebel, a descendant of one of the most honourable families of Zurich, who had formerly enjoyed the friendship of his brother-in-law Vadian, and through him of Zwingli also. He had studied at Vienna and Paris, and had made acquirements in learning by no means common, especially in the Greek language; but he had, by a life of dissipation and debauchery,[[4]](#footnote-4) squandered away his patrimonial means, and so ruined his health, and so sullied his mind, that as Hottinger says, “he resembled a mirror, that, stained by an impure breath, takes up and reflects even the most beautiful image in deformed and distorted shapes.” To him was united Felix Manz, the natural son of a prebend and a Zurich maiden. He also had received a learned education, and had made considerable proficiency in Hebrew. Both had at first expected of Zwingli that, as “Hector of the Schools,” he would have caused some of the prebends to be suppressed, and appointed and paid them out of the funds as teachers, Grebel of the Greek, and Manz of the Hebrew languages. As, however, this could not be done without an infringement of the rights guaranteed and obligations already entered into, and Zwingli, besides, reposed no great confidence in them, they sought to satisfy their ambition, and accomplish their interested objects in another way. To the above two, there united themselves some men from the people, and some country priests, who, without the unction of the Spirit, and more from hatred to the papacy than love to the Lord, sided with the Reformers, and who, in the sequel, gave themselves up to their impure zeal and fanaticism, instead of subjecting them­selves to the discipline of the Word of God, and the guidance of His Spirit. These were joined by William Roeubli[[5]](#footnote-5) parson at Wytikon, John Broedlein at Zollikon, Simon Stumpf at Hoengg, and a run-away monk Blauroek, called George of the house of Jacob, of Chur. At first they had no fixed party-standard to call together the new community, and bring their fanaticism into action. The waves of the peasant insurrection, which raged at this time in Germany, threw the notorious Thomas Muenzer,[[6]](#footnote-6) on the Swiss frontier. In Waldshut, this fanatic made the acquaint­ance of the parson of the place, Balthazar Hubmeier, whom he entirely gained over to his objects. On Muenzer’s approaching Switzerland, and holding intercourse with the Zurichers of like opinions, they soon discovered a badge of distinction for the new community: it was *rebaptism.* They began to depreciate infant baptism, and to represent it as highly objectionable.[[7]](#footnote-7) “It surprised us much,” says Zwingli, “that they were so zealous against it, but at length we observed that it was for the reason that, on infant baptism being rejected, they might have a pretext for organising their church under the banner of rebaptism.” Zwingli held a disputation with them upon this controversial point, and endeavoured to instruct them. With this view, he arranged a meeting with them once a week, when he hoped that arguments and counter-arguments might open their minds to better opinions, (Zwingli himself candidly confesses, that he held for a time the opinion, that it would be better not to baptise the young till they had reached a convenient age.) But instruction was not the object of these fanatics; the abolition of infant baptism, and the introduction of anabaptism, were only to serve as pretexts for bringing a spirit of insurrection to bear on all order in Church and State. With the change in baptism the Holy Supper was to be degraded to an evening revel, which they held under the name of “setting up the table of the Lord”[[8]](#footnote-8) in particu­lar houses at nocturnal meetings. At the same time, they rejected all regularly ordained preachers, maintaining that no paid clergy­man can preach the truth. In the state, they recognised no authority. “No Christian,” they said, “can assume a civil office, or carry the sword, or be judge; none is obligated to pay rents, tithes, or dues; all chattels are common to all.” Community in wives was also not only taught by them, but practised, as appears from the words of Zwingli: “Into whatever house they enter, they lay snares for the fidelity of wives, and innocence of daughters, and cause them to fall; for in their spotless church fornication, adultery, perjury, theft, deceit, and whatever more wicked can be conceived, happens far more frequently than among those whom they decry with the opprobrious epithets of the ‘flesh’ and ‘devil.’ I speak the truth, and could, if necessary, prove what I say. But in whatever crime or vice they are taken, their defence is ever the same: I have not sinned, I am no more in the flesh but in the Spirit; I am dead to the flesh and the flesh is dead to me.”

Zwingli recognised, at an early period, the great danger threatened by these dangerous and delusive doctrines; and with a wise circumspection, he adopted measures fitted to avert it. We have seen above how, in order to preserve the change in public worship and its ordinances from the evil influence of such people, he gave over the decision in regard to any alteration to be made to the Council, with consent of the congregation. The legal civil authority, in its relation to the Christian moral, he considered in his sermon, “On Divine and Human Justice.” “The Scriptural Character of the Christian Minister,” in a treatise. But with a true appreciation at once of their fanaticism, and of the principles of Christian charity, he dis­suaded against any violent interference with them, although they nevertheless proceeded to the wildest excesses. In Zol­liken, Broedlein and Roeubli excited the people, on the Pente­cost of 1524, to break in pieces the images, the altars, and even the baptismal font. This occurrence was the more vexatious to Zwingli and his friends, as it took place when they were seriously deliberating about removing the images in a legal way, and changing the mass into the celebration of the Supper. The Council interfered against this act of violence, imprisoning Roeubli, and banishing Broedlein from the town and territory of Zurich. Broedlein’s friends gave him a feast at parting, at which Manz, Blaurock, and one after the other, a number of uninvited guests appeared, many of whom, heated by wine and exciting speeches, desired to receive the “baptism of the regenerate.” Manz and Blaurock consented. The rebaptised, baptised again others, and so the fanaticism spread. Upon the following Sun­day, as another preacher entered the pulpit at Zolliken, Blaurock stood up in the centre of the church, and commanded him to keep silence: “I am,” said he, “the door, by me if any man enter in he shall find pasture; whoever goes in otherwise is a thief and a robber; as it is written: ‘I am the good shepherd; the good shepherd giveth His life for the sheep,’ so I give my body and my life for my sheep, my body to the dungeon, and my life to the sword, or the fire, or the rack, wherever, like the blood of Christ on the cross, it may be drained from the flesh. I am the beginner of baptism and the bread of the Lord, along with my elect brethren in Christ, Conrad Grebel and Felix Manz. Therefore the pope with his followers is a thief and a murderer. Zwingli and Leo Jud, too, with their followers, are thieves and murderers until they recognise this.” So ran the confused creed of this fanatic. It was with difficulty that the under-governor maintained the peace, so as to enable the new parson to deliver his sermon. Meantime, the spirit of fanaticism blazed up still higher. Bands of these people carrying lighted torches pro­menaded the streets of Zurich, shouting dark prophetic sayings, and held from time to time nocturnal assemblies, “to set up the table of the Lord.” Whole crowds of deceivers and deceived clothed themselves in sackcloth, bestrewed themselves with ashes, and girding themselves with ropes, cried on the public streets: “Woe, woe to thee, Zurich; in forty days thou shalt be destroyed.” The Council ordered the ringleaders of the sect to appear at the Town-Hall, that they might there defend their doctrine against Zwingli in open disputation, or be instructed by him in a better, and turned from their error. They made excuses; “they had already spoken enough with Zwingli upon their doctrine, and might not answer him any more, especially as in consequence of his long speeches, they could never come to it.” They were obliged at length to yield obedience. Accordingly, on the I7th January 1525, the Disputation with the Anabaptists took place, in which Zwingli gained a complete victory over them, all their arguments being thoroughly answered. The Council then pub­lished the following ordinance: “An error having arisen in respect of baptism, to the effect that infants should not be bap­tised until they arrive at years of discretion, and knowledge of the faith; and some having, in consequence thereof, left their children unbaptised, we have ordered a disputation upon this matter on the grounds of Holy Scripture; and have ordained that without regard to this error, children must be baptised as soon as born; and those who have left their children unbaptised, must have this rite performed within the next eight days. Whoever will not conform to this decree, shall, with wife and child, with purse and property, quit the town of our lords, their jurisdiction and territory, or take what farther may befall him.”[[9]](#footnote-9) The expatriation which, in conformity with this decree, was pronounced on some of the party, was not in accordance with Zwingli’s sentiments, for he would rather have had the fanatical spirit die out under his powerful influence at Zurich, than, by the dispersion of its authors, have caused it to be more widely disseminated. Those left behind in Zurich still continuing their irregular pro­ceedings, a number of them were enclosed in the Augustine cloister, that they might be brought from their errors by Zwingli and his colleagues, who frequently visited them for this purpose. But this measure was equally unavailing. The outlawed carried their doctrines farther and farther, and the imprisoned persisted obstinately in their delusion. Nay, they even gave out that Zwingli, in his conversations with them, had been refuted and put to silence. Grebel, indeed, had the audacity to write to Vadian: “Zwingli has conferred with the greatest simpleton amongst us, and yet he, with the help of God and His truth, has put him to shame, with all his wisdom.” In these circumstances, some of the Anabaptists themselves desired a new public dis­putation with Zwingli, and in their petition to the government to this effect they gave the assurance, that “whatever is then discovered to be in accordance to the Word of God, we shall stake our persons and lives, our honour and property upon. As, however, we have not received from God the gift so to speak with Zwingli that he may thoroughly understand us, or we fully express ourselves, we beg you will permit certain who have been banished for this matter to appear with a safe-conduct at said Conference, and thereafter to return to their present place of residence free of danger.”

3. Public Disputation with the Anabaptists, 6th November 1525.

*Zwingli s Opinions on Baptism, Rebaptism, and Infant Baptism.*

Zwingli supporting the petition of the Anabaptists, a Dispu­tation was fixed for the 6th November 1525, and a free safe-conduct secured to all who were willing to attend the same, and defend their views and opinions. As rulers of the Conference, there were appointed: Dr. Vadian of St. Gall, Dr. Sebastian Hofmeister of Schaffhausen, Comthur Schmidt of Kuessnacht, and Abbot Joner of Kappel. Zwingli, along with Leo Jud and Kasper Grossmann, undertook to speak against the Anabaptists, who assembled in the town in great numbers from all the com­munes of the canton, under their chief men, Grebel, Manz, and Blaurock. The town-hall was already filled with the multitude of auditors and participators in the proceedings, when a fresh crowd thronged in with the exclamation, “O, Zion! O, Zion! rejoice Jerusalem!” which made it necessary to adjourn the meeting to the Great Minster Church.

Here Zwingli developed, with lucidness and dignity, his views of baptism, and the propriety of infant baptism, and rebutted with force the objections of his opponents. “In respect of bap­tism,”[[10]](#footnote-10) he said, “nearly all the teachers in the Church have erred since the days of the apostles, by attributing to the water a significance which it has not, and which the holy apostles have not taught; and thus they have misapprehended the words of Christ, John iii. 5, when he speaks of water and the Spirit. Baptism has four different senses in Holy Scripture. Firstly, it signifies *the dipping in water,* whereby alone we are designated or consecrated to a Christian life.[[11]](#footnote-11) Secondly, it is taken to repre­sent *the inward illumination and attraction* when man acknow­ledges and depends on God, and this is *the baptism of the Spirit*.[[12]](#footnote-12) Thirdly, it signifies *the outward doctrine of salvation,* and *the outward washing with water.*[[13]](#footnote-13) Fourthly, and finally, it stands for *the outward washing and the inward faith at once,*[[14]](#footnote-14) that is, *the designation and obligation to lead a Christian life,* and for the *assurance of salvation in its whole extent.* Now as some pay no regard to these distinctions made by Scripture, they run in strange errors, and judge of things which they do not understand, We shall establish each of the above significations by passages from Holy Scripture. In John iii. 23 it is said: ‘And John was baptising in Ænon, near to Salim, because there was much water there: and they came and were baptised.’ Here it is clear that water-baptism alone is spoken of, it being said there was much water there, which could alone serve a water-baptism. Of the baptism of the spirit, Christ speaks in the Acts of the Apostles, chap. i. 5: ‘For John truly baptised with water; but ye shall be baptised with the Holy Ghost not many days hence.’ Here Christ clearly marks the distinction between the two bap­tisms. John baptised only with water, and the outward doctrine. Nay, the apostles, and John, and all that ever were, have no other baptism to administer but that of water and of doctrine; for the baptism of the Spirit no man can give, but God alone. Therefore Christ says, immediately thereon, ‘but ye shall be baptised with the Holy Ghost.’ This signifies the inward teach­ing, drawing towards and fastening on God. Christ, however, speaks not of such in the sense as if He rejected the baptism of John; for the external baptism of John, of Christ, and His disciples is one and the same baptism, and what Christ says of the baptism of John holds good of all human baptism, refer, Paul, James baptised only with water, or with outward doctrine, for with the Spirit they could not baptise, God alone baptising with the Spirit, how, whom, and when He will. In regard to the third sense, the doctrine of the apostles and their baptism shows that ‘baptism’ is taken for the outward doctrine and baptism by water at once, as John himself says, John i. 16, ‘I baptise with water.’ Now, John did not baptise only with water, for he united instruction with it. As, however, his doctrine, as well as that of the apostles was but external, and of no avail to influence the heart, it was, in as far as they were concerned, as much an outward thing as the dipping in water, or the sprinkling with it. Therefore he himself says, ‘I baptise with water,’ although he taught not less than baptised, as he speaks after­wards, ‘I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness.’ But we find ‘baptism’ taken for doctrine in John iii. 22: ‘After these things came Jesus and his disciples into the land of Judea: and there he tarried with them, and baptised.” How? Did Christ baptise? Yet it is immediately afterwards added, John iv. 2: “Though Jesus himself baptised *not,* but his disciples.” It is undeniable that *baptism* here, in the first instance, means *teach­ing.* For Jesus *taught,* which was specially His office, while His disciples administered the baptism by water. How Christ, however, drew the heart thereby, He himself alone knows. The baptism of John is likewise taken for doctrine in Matt. xxi. 25, and Acts xix. 1. We said, fourthly, that baptism signifies the Christian’s order of salvation, that is, the inward faith which saves, as it is said in 1 Peter iii. 21: ‘Baptism doth only now save us.’ Now baptism does not save us, neither that of doctrine nor of water, but *faith*. But that one might receive water-baptism, unaccompanied by faith, appears from John vi. 66. No one of those disciples were unbaptised. For we hear, John iv. 1, ‘He made and baptised disciples;’ but He reproaches them, vi. 56, ‘Ye also have seen me, and believe not,’ and in the same chapter, ver. 24, ‘But there are some of you that believe not,’ Yet He baptised them. Nor was Judas believing, as it is written, ver. 70, ‘Have not I chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil?’ It is evident from what has been said that Judas was baptised, for Christ made many more disciples than John, and baptised also through his disciples. They cannot, however, have been unbaptised, seeing they baptised others. Thus water-baptism has been administered to those who did not believe, and many have received it who believed not. We find here and there examples of the baptism by the Spirit’s being bestowed before the baptism by water. Nicodemus, Joseph of Arimathea, Gamaliel, were believers, but secretly; hence they were without doubt *not* baptised, else they had not been able to conceal it, for baptism is granted and received for the sake of the other fellow-believers, and not for his sake who receives it, as though it effected some­thing by him. In the Acts of the Apostles, chap. x. 44, Cornelius and all who heard Peter received the Holy Ghost *before* they were baptised. Thus water-baptism and Spirit-baptism are not neces­sarily united. Nay, throughout Holy Scripture we find more frequently that the Spirit was granted after baptism than before or during it. But we shall quote a plainer example, which irrefragably demonstrates that there, where water-baptism has not reached, faith has been existent, and salvation obtained. The thief on the cross believed, and was the same day with Christ in para­dise, and yet he had not been baptised with any outward baptism. From thence we learn that *baptism* is an outward ceremonial sign, to which salvation is not bound, as we have shown in the example of the thief and others; also that they are not necessarily con­current with one another, nor must of necessity be united. We shall here more closely consider the baptism of the Holy Ghost. It was an outward and an inward baptism at the same time. The latter is taught by John, in Matt. iii. 11, and Luke iii. 16: ‘I indeed baptise you with water unto repentance: but He that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear: He shall baptise you with the Holy Ghost and with fire.’ Here, in the first place, we learn, that although John says, ‘I baptise you with water,’ he will by no means be understood to say that his office consisted alone in baptising with water. For could he have effected by water alone the knowledge of sin and repentance? One must be a very long time bathed in water ere he come to the knowledge of himself and repentance, or seek Christ as His Redeemer and Comforter. Therefore John will say nothing else here but, ‘I am a weak vessel, which can only bring the doctrine outwardly to you, and give you the outward baptism of water, and am not so strong as to soften the heart; but He that cometh after me is much stronger than I: He is able to pierce into the heart, He will baptise you inwardly with His Spirit, inflame you with His love, or endow you with tongues,’ &c. &c. The baptism of the Spirit is nothing else than that of which Christ speaks, John vi. 44: ‘No man can come to me except the Father draw him.’ And what the drawing signifies, He imme­diately shows in the words, ‘Every man that hath heard and learnt of the Father cometh unto me.’ Thus the inward baptism of the Spirit is nothing else than the teaching which God causes our *hearts* to experience, and the drawing whereby they are com­forted and assured in Christ. This baptism none can administer but God, nor can any be saved without it; but a man can be saved without doctrinal baptism, and without water baptism. Proof: the thief on the cross was neither outwardly taught nor baptised, and yet was saved. It thus follows, that faith is the alone necessary condition which saves us who hear the Word preached; and this no man plants within us but God alone. The. other baptism of the Spirit is an outward sign, namely, *the miracle of tongues.* This sign is not given for the sake of those who speak with foreign tongues or languages, for they have been already inwardly assured of salvation; but for the sake of the unbelievers. What unbelievers? Those to whom the gift of tongues was communicated? No, for they were believing. But they were granted to the believing, as a sign and a wonder to the unbelieving. This outward baptism of tongues the Lord himself hath promised, Acts i. 5: ‘Ye shall be baptised with the Holy Ghost not many days hence.’ Now they had already become believers, but the fire of love was increased, and the tongues granted, when the words of Christ were fulfilled at Pentecost. This sign is not necessary to salvation, for it was vouchsafed to few, and but rarely, (Acts ii. 3; x. 46; xvi. 31); it was a miracle, and was done, like other miracles, *when God willed* Thus, by the mouth of the Son of God himself, the miracle of tongues is called a baptism. As now this sign sometimes took place before sometimes after, water-baptism, in all fairness of reasoning, doctrinal baptism may be likewise communicated before or after water-baptism.”

Here the Anabaptists objected: Christ says, Matt, xxviii. 19, 20, “Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,” &c. It is plain from this passage that mankind are to be taught before they be baptised.

*Zwingli:* Through these words ye very far deceive yourselves and others, looking wholly to the succession of the words, and obstinately crying: Christ says, “Teach and baptise them.” In the first place, look at the words which immediately follow, “Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have com­manded you;” for from thence we learn that baptism is a com­mencing sign, and that then only *after* it has been communicated is the teaching of all the things which Christ commanded to take place. As, however, you lay so great weight on the literal succes­sion of the words, “Teach and baptise them,” I, for my part, am willing, for your sakes, to stand to it. “Teach all nations and baptise them,” say ye, and I say, “Baptise them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.” Now, I say, which of us, you or I, gives the plainer word in respect of *teaching.* You have, indeed, “Teach all nations, and baptise them” on the other hand, ye have not *what* should be taught. We express it plainly, “Teach them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you;” and this stands *after* bap­tise. Moreover, the passage in the Greek runs very differently from the way in which you interpret it; for what we translate by “teach” is, in the original, “Make to disciples” or, “Bring to me as to a master.” Accordingly, the passage in the Greek text runs exactly so, “*Go ye, make all nations my dis­ciples, baptising them in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things what­soever I have commanded you.”* See now if the literal succession of the words does not much rather speak for us, although I do not so obstinately cleave to the letter, for the letter of the gospel may not less kill than the letter of the law. I know, however, in the faith which I have to God, and, according to my understand­ing, small though it be, of the Word of God, that this is the right true natural sense; for Christ previously said, at the calling of His disciples, “He would make them fishers of men.” What does that, however, signify, but the bringing men to Christ? But I shall not contend farther in respect to the position and sense of the words. I would only show you that is in vain that with these you undertake to do away infant-baptism. For, even although the words were interpreted in your favour, they have no bearing at all on the baptism of children, so that they may not be baptised before the doctrinal baptism. The Jews and heathens were to be made disciples of Christ by doctrinal and water-bap­tism, but the children of believers belong already to the Church of Christ, as also the children of the Israelites belonged to the people of God.

*Anabaptists:* If these words have no reference to children, then they ought not to be baptised, because Christ has here instituted baptism.

*Zwingli:* Here you err again, because you do not know the Scripture, nor rightly understand it, (Matt. xxii. 29.) Baptism was not here first instituted; for Christ baptised a long time pre­vious to this through His disciples, and He himself was baptised before this; consequently, it must have been instituted at some earlier period. Wherefore, observe, baptism was instituted by God through John, who, for this reason, is called “The Baptist.” “Be­hold,” says God, through Malachi, chap. iii. 1, “I will send my messenger, and he will prepare the way before me.” This messen­ger, or angel, is no one else but St, John the Baptist. (Mark i. 4.) John, however, when he came, baptised, as appears plainly from all the gospels. But if he came to make plain and prepare the way of the Lord, and baptised, then it is evident he has begun the baptism of the Lord.

*Anabaptists:* The baptism of John and the baptism of Christ were not one and the same, but they are different baptisms; for the baptism of John was but a prefiguration or foreshadowing of the baptism of Christ.

*Zwingli:* I know that you have not only the papists but all the divines, too, for your assertion. But with the strong, invin­cible Word of God which is on my side, I trust to show that ye are all in the wrong. That the baptism of John and the outward baptism of Christ were the same the already quoted passage from the prophet Malachi shows. For if John had another baptism than that of Christ he had not begun to prepare the way of the Lord, but he had made a *way of his own,* which, however, was contrary to the way of the prophets. These have alone led to God and His work; of themselves have they begun nothing new or different. When, however, ye maintain that the baptism of John is but a type of that of Christ, ye do violence and injustice both to Christ and John. To Christ, because you regard not what He says, Luke xvi. 16: “The law and the prophets were *until* John; since that time the kingdom of God is preached,” &c. Now, if the law and the prophets continued till John, and since, that the kingdom of God is preached, then John with his baptism could have been no type or shadow; for it is clear from the statement of Christ that *John preached the kingdom of God,* i.e., *the gospel;* consequently, he began the baptism of Christ as he began the doctrine of his kingdom. For how can it be said that his doctrine was the light and his baptism only a shadow of a future baptism? To John you do violence and wrong in making him a shadow, and counting him to the Old Testament, he being, according to the order of God, a preacher of the gospel, preaching and revealing it so plainly as no prophet ever did, and he being the first who pointed to the Lord Jesus Christ when the time of His revelation came, as it is said in John i. 29-31: “The next day John seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith, Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world. This is he of whom I said, After me cometh a man which is preferred before me: for he was before me. And I knew him not: but that he should be made manifest to Israel, therefore am I come baptising with water.” From these verses we learn plainly that John came to reveal Christ to the people of Israel; therefore he was no shadow-maker, but a revealer of the Redeemer of the whole world.

*Anabaptist:* John himself calls his baptism only a water- baptism; but the baptism of Christ is not a water-baptism alone, consequently the baptism of John and of Christ cannot be the same.

*Zwingli:* Had you opened your ears wide enough you had long heard the answer to this objection. Did John only baptise with water? No. Then know and understand that when here he speaks of baptising with water he does not mean the dipping in or besprinkling with water alone, but he means also his doctrine; for, by a water-baptism, he could not teach them to recognise Christ. Therefore he specially understands here, when he speaks of baptising with water, the doctrine; this he so administered, that he taught them to recognise Christ, and to place their hopes upon Him.

*Anabaptist:* It is impossible that the baptism of John and the baptism of Christ are one and the same; for John could not bap­tise with the Holy Ghost, as He himself says, Matt. iii. 11, But Christ baptised with the Holy Ghost.

*Zwingli:* Be grateful that, like the fox, you yourselves bring the skin. Tell me, when the disciples baptised, or when one now baptises, with what does one baptise? With the Holy Ghost, or with water? You must acknowledge that the disciples and all men administer nothing but the outward baptism of doctrine and of water, and that they are not able to baptise inwardly with the Holy Spirit. Tell me now if the baptism of the disciples were the baptism of Christ, for ye will have it that your baptism is that of Christ? But if John administered the baptism of water and of doctrine just as the disciples did, how much more is the baptism of John nothing but the baptism of Christ, he having been, according to the order of God, a founder of the doctrine and of the baptism? The baptism, however, which Christ received from John himself proves, in the clearest manner possible, that John’s and His own baptism were the same. Christ has been baptised as a pattern and example for us, you must admit. Now, if Christ was baptised with the baptism of John as an example for us, we likewise must be baptised with John’s baptism. The baptism, however, was not John’s but Christ’s, although the ignorant then, as in our own day, called it the baptism of John, although it was just as little his as the baptism performed by Paul, or Cleophas, or Apollos, were theirs, and which Paul repudiated as his, and would by no means suffer to be called his, 1 Cor. i. 12. If, then, Christ, together with the apostles, were baptised unto John’s baptism, there cannot, in truth, be more than *one* baptism, and if we be baptised according to the example of Christ, then we must of necessity be baptised by John’s baptism. There is but *one baptism,* which John began, and which continues to the present day. And if the baptism with which John baptised should not last to all eternity, then neither Christ nor the apostles were baptised with the right baptism. Away, then, with such futile objections. Paul exhorts the Ephesians, chap. iv. 5, 6, with great propriety, to unity, for they are, “One Lord, one faith, one bap­tism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all.” Annihilate this passage of Paul’s, if you can, ye baptism-splitters. If John has taught *one* Spirit, gathered into *one* body, taught only *one* hope in Christ Jesus, only *one* faith, only *one* God and Father, as Christ and the apostles, why allow not his baptism to be *one baptism* with the one baptism of Christ. God give you understanding !

*Anabaptist:* The doctrine of John and that of Christ and the apostles were different, for John preached the law and repentance, Christ and the apostles, on the other hand, preached the gospel. The doctrine thus being different, the baptism of John was different from the baptism of Christ.

*Zwingli:* In substance John preached the gospel, as Christ himself and the apostles; although I know well that Christ’s preaching was more powerful, more beautiful and stronger than that of any other man, Matt. vii. 29. Mark describes the commencement of Christ’s preaching in the following words, Mark i. 14, 15: “Now after that John was put in prison, Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God, and saying, The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye, and believe the gospel.” But John also made the same announcement, as Matthew relates in the following words, chap. iii. 1, 2: “In those days came John the Baptist, preaching in the wilderness of Judea, and saying, Repent ye: for the king­dom of heaven is at hand.” Here it must be well observed that the gospel has two parts: the one consisting of repentance and amendment of life; the other of confidence to God through the Lord Jesus Christ. So Christ himself taught; Luke xxiv. 47: “And that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem.” The gospel indeed is sometimes designated by the word “repentance” alone, as in Acts xi. 18: “Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life.” Christ, however, can alone raise the Spirit to life, for although we feel repentance, yet we have not peace of soul; but when we believe on Christ, then it is we first experience joy and life. Sometimes Scripture terms the pardon of sin the gospel, as in Acts x. 43: “To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins.” Here the gospel is called the remission of sins. We have thus found that John preached the gospel, that is, the one part of it, faithfully, therefore ye ought not to exclude him from the list of Evangelists or preachers of the gospel, since, where it is said repentance is preached, the whole gospel is meant, as has been proved above. So Mark says, chap. vi. 12: “And they went out and preached that men should repent.” But even although we leave this distinction out of sight, yet we can prove that John preached the gospel as clearly as any apostle. In John i. 29, he says, “Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.” Here is the whole sum of the gospel, in so far as it means the grace of God by which Christ the Lamb of God taketh away the sins of the world. Shortly after, he says, “And I saw and bare record that this is the Son of God.” This is, however, the very confession of faith on which Christ builds his Church, Matt. xvi. 16-18. Christ teaches ofttimes through parables that He is the true Son of God, and that he who believes on Him has eternal life, as in John iv., vi., vii., &c. Because it is expressed in parables, is it less the message of the grace of God? I think not. If I show, then, that John preached the very same doctrine, it is, I hope, proved that John, not less than the other messengers, preached the gospel. Go and read what he says to his disciples and the Jews, who came to Him about purification, concerning Christ, John iii. 27-36, especially the two last verses: “The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hand. He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him.” What apostle has called Christ Jesus more plainly the Son of God into whose hands the Father hath committed all things? Who has, in a clearer and shorter form, expressed the whole sum of the gospel than the God-commissioned baptiser has done in this address? What is this: “Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned?” Mark xvi. 15, 16. Is it not even the same? Paul says, Acts xix. 4: “John verily baptised with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people, that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus.” Is it not the gospel when sinners are taught to repent and amend their ways? As he, however, who feels repentance would, without hope, have fallen into despair; God sent His Son to be our com­fort, and the sure pledge of our redemption. To Him John pointed very distinctly. He testified that this is the Son of God, John i. 34. He said: “He that believeth on the Son hath ever­lasting life,” John iii. 36. Is not this the fundamental and clear gospel? Accordingly, the doctrine of John, of Christ, and the apostles, is *one and the same* doctrine, and proclaims the salvation of all men through Christ Jesus. Him John preached as *the coming,* he pointed to him also as *the present* Saviour, as did also the apostles. Turn to Matt. x. 7; Mark vi. 12; Luke x. 9. They also preached the kingdom of God, the salvation through Christ, although He was not yet crucified; and Christ proclaims himself as the Saviour, although He had not yet suffered death. This, I say, that ye dividers of baptism may not assert John preached only *the coming* Christ, the apostles and we preach the slain Redeemer. For he preached even as Christ himself and His disciples preached. Thus the doctrine of John is the same as the doctrine of Christ, as his baptism is one and the same with the baptism of Christ.

*Anabaptist:* If the baptism and doctrine of John were the same with the baptism and doctrine of Christ, how comes it that the apostle Paul *rebaptised* those twelve disciples of John, who had only received John’s baptism, Acts xix. 1, &c.? Does not this passage clearly prove our assertion that those are to be bap­tised again who received baptism before they were properly instructed? Does it not clearly show that John’s baptism is less than Christ’s baptism?

*Zwingli:* That the doctrine and baptism of John are the same with the doctrine and baptism of Christ, we have already sufficiently established and proved, and this passage from the Acts makes nothing against our proof if we will only rightly understand it. The matter here referred to is as follows: Apollos was a very learned Jew, as we learn from Acts xviii. 24, but instructed only in the elements of the Lord’s doctrine, ver. 25. The little which he knew of the doctrine of Christ he had learned from John or his disciples, not from Christ or his disciples. Hence it is said he only knew the baptism, or much rather the doctrine of John, (for baptism here stands for doctrine.) He knew, however, the doctrine of John as imperfectly as he knew the doctrine of Christ, for had he understood the full sense of the doctrine of John, he would have known essentially the gospel. Now so much as this Apollos knew he taught faithfully and zealously, Acts xviii. 25; Aquila and Priscilla having, however, come to him, they taught him the way of the Lord more fully. Mark this, that that which he previously called the “baptism,” he now calls the “doctrine,” ver. 27. By this Apollos the twelve men in question, chap. xix. 1, &c., were instructed. Now as he himself knew not the way of the Lord fully, the twelve without doubt knew it still less; for it cannot easily be supposed that they surpassed their Master, who was so well versed in the Scrip­tures. On Paul’s coming to Ephesus, where Apollos, who had from thence sailed for Achaia, had taught before him, Paul began, according to his custom, to preach the gospel. There met him the twelve, who gave themselves out as disciples of Christ. After Paul had convinced himself of their deficient knowledge, he inquired of them whether they had received the Holy Ghost, *i.e.,* whether they stood right with God, and whether their hearts were comforted. (He made no inquiry about the tongues, such not being necessary to perfectness in the gospel.) They then manifested their ignorance, and confessed they had not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost. Paul then asked them unto what then they had been baptised, *i.e.,* what had been taught them, unto what they had been directed in the doctrine communicated to them. They refer to nothing either in the doctrine of John, or in the doctrine of Christ, but simply name the teacher whose doctrine they yet did not fully understand. Just as in the present day some land-lopers say they are Lutheran or Evangelical, although they have nothing evangelical either in doctrine or life about them; they but fatten upon the godly without working. Not that I mean to compare these twelve honest men, in regard to the deception practised, to such knaves, except in so far as disinclination is concerned, to admit their ignorance manifested in their giving themselves out as Christians and disciples. Paul, on discovering this desire to cloak their ignorance, told them that which they themselves did not know, namely, that John baptised with the baptism of repentance. Mark here if *baptism* and *baptising* can be anything else but *doctrinating* and *indoctrinating.* Accordingly, the sense of the passage quoted by you is the following: John taught the doc­trine of repentance, and through it also the assurance of grace (thus the two parts of the gospel), and exhorted the people to believe on Him who should come after him, that is, on Christ. It cannot, however, be proved that the twelve men had any­where received water-baptism, for we cannot find that Apollos gave them the baptism of water, we only know that he zealously taught, as far as he was able, the *baptism* of John, (here the word is plainly used in the sense of doctrine,) Acts xviii. 25. John taught, and at the same time baptised with water. Christ taught, His disciples baptising with water. And if this Apollos had been baptised with water, Luke would not have omitted mentioning it. It is, however, highly probable that these twelve received from Apollos instruction in the elements of Christian doctrine. For Luke means to show, when he tells us that Apollos had been in Ephesus, and but imperfectly taught that Paul first planted the doctrine of Christ in Ephesus. By Aquila and Priscilla still less were they baptised; for they were so well and clearly instructed in the gospel that they taught Apollos more fundamentally. Or, if we should maintain that the twelve had been baptised by Aquila and Priscilla, then the disciples of Christ baptised previously to instruction, in which case we had in respect of baptism completely got the better of you. It is therefore clear and manifest that these men had not been baptised by Apollos, and also that *baptism* here signifies *doctrine.* If it is evident, then, that Apollos did not baptise with water, and that Paul does not speak here of baptism by water, why do ye then, O! ye ignorant unintelligent teachers of the people, and rioters, rebaptise under the colour of this passage in the Acts (chap. xix. 1 and following), rebaptism being, in verity, contrary to Christ. Christ says, John xiii. 15: “I have given you an example that ye should do as I have done to you.” And as He has been an example to us in everything, that we should shape our actions according to his pattern, neither dare we administer baptism otherwise than he has had it administered on himself. Christ, however, was baptised with the baptism of John, as also the apostles, and neither He nor the apostles were again baptised. Nor may we let ourselves be again baptised.

*Anabaptists:* We baptise ourselves now, because we do not know whether we have been baptised or not.

*Zwingli:* What are your names?

The Anabaptists give their names.

*Zwingli:* Know you not that Christians receive their names at baptism? Have you then no god-fathers? And have they not told you that you were baptised?

*Anabaptists:* Yes; but we do not know whether we have been baptised or not; for granting that, as infants, we have been baptised, this took place at such an age that we could not know it, and therefore we must receive baptism now that we may be assured of it.

*Zwingli:* Do ye know, then, that ye have been born of your own mothers?

*Anabaptists:* Yes.

*Zwingli:* You could know this of your own knowledge just as little as that you were baptised.

*Anabaptists:* But although we have been baptised, it is the Pope’s baptism we have received, which has been defaced and falsified by superstitious additions, so that we have not been rightly baptised. Therefore we must, first of all, receive the right baptism.

*Zwingli:* The true formula of baptism is: *“I baptise thee in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.”* Therein all teachers of the church agree, and herein we are at one with the papists. You also admit this to be the right form of baptism. Now tell me, if baptism, performed with these words, could be falsified by anything antecedent, nay, by perverse, superstitious prayers, and foolish mummery. If you reply, Yes, then, in your opinion, the devil is stronger than God, if God’s work can be annihilated by the devil’s power. If you say, No, then the baptism of Christ has not been falsified, and we have gained the day already; for you and we have been, at a former time, rightly baptised. Why, then, do ye harass and disquiet pious Christians with such groundless and frivolous assertions? We have been all baptised, and, in truth, rightly baptised; for every woman can baptise herself. What is of highest importance is, that we become *new men,* that we pass under the cross of Christ, that we die, and be dead daily at once; for the flesh con­tinues to send forth its suckers, which must be without inter­mission pruned and cut off. This all takes place through the strength of God, which He, through His grace, causes to dwell and work in us, but not through rebaptism or anabaptism, which has not the slightest foundation in the doctrine of Christ, but is quite contradicted by it. Baptism is an image of the death of Christ, Rom. vi. 4. Now Christ has died once, and cannot die any more. As now, they sin grievously against God who pre­tend they offer Christ daily; because once offered on the cross, He took away thereby the sins of the whole world to all eternity; they also sin grievously who crucify Him again with their second baptism, and despise the significance of his resurrection. He has risen only once, we also should be but once raised from bap­tism, and from thence our lives long live no more to sin.

*Anabaptists:* Children are nowhere in Scripture commanded to be baptised, nor is it anywhere said that Christ or the apostles baptised children. Infant baptism, then, not being founded or commanded in the Word of God, but an invention of the Pope, or the devil, it ought to be done away with as an abuse, as other papistical abuses have been done away with.

*Zwingli:* But it is nowhere commanded in Scripture that the inhabitants of Calcutta should be baptised, nor do we find that Christ or the apostles baptised any one in Calcutta, and yet we baptise now in Calcutta, and do rightly therein; for they also, as all people, are to be made disciples of Christ, we baptising them, and teaching them to observe all things whatsoever Christ has commanded. Farther, it is nowhere said in Scripture that women were present at the supper of Christ; nor have we an express command of Christ to admit them to the Eucharist, and yet we allow women to partake of the Lord’s Supper, and are right in so doing; for it would be quite contrary to the will of God to exclude them. Therefore let no man thus judge: Christ has not baptised children, therefore we ought not to baptise them. In respect of outward things, many things are not expressly mentioned in the Word of God which yet with God we do.

*Anabaptists:* You have ever defended yourself against the Papists with the asseveration, what is not founded in God’s Word holds not, and now you say: “There are many things not in the Word of God, which yet with God may be done.” Where is now that word of power with which you vanquished the Suf­fragan Bishop Faber and all the monks? “In vain they do wor­ship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.” (Matt. xv. 9; Isaiah xxix. 13.)

*Zwingli:* What I have ever said, that I shall say till death, nor will you ever discover that I have said aught but one and the same thing. Therefore weigh better the sense of my words. They have no reference to what you lay to my charge, for I speak of outward elementary things, for which we have no express command, but which we yet observe with God. Thus, in respect to the Supper or Eucharist, here we have a distinct institution, and a clear intimation that it is a *commemoration*, and nothing more can be made of it, although the whole host of Papists were to lose their senses upon it. Its *commemorative­ness,* however, is not such an elementary, *i.e.,* such an outward thing that it were uncertain, and that it might be given out to be a *sacrifice;* for it has its distinct definition, and the ground-idea of the whole Epistle to the Hebrews concerns it. The ele­ment, however, or outward thing, that women likewise should celebrate the commemoration, is nowhere to be found in any pas­sage of Scripture. Yet we do rightly when we admit them to the Supper. In the name of God hold the same language in regard to infant baptism. If God has commanded to baptise, don’t say, “But not the children.” Why do ye make a difference in mankind? Are children men too, or are they not? If they are mankind, then you must grant they are to be baptised, seeing we can make no difference in mankind between old and young, man and woman.

*Anabaptist:* The man that is to be baptised must first be instructed, and have faith; an infant cannot have it, and conse­quently may not be baptised.

*Zwingli:* Prove me this by a clear passage of Scripture.

*Anabaptist:* In Matt, xxviii. 19 it is written: “Teach all nations, baptising them,” &c. Here Christ himself commands us first to teach, and then baptise.

*Zwingli:* I have already proved that the Greek text does not admit of such a sense being put upon this passage, and that it has not the meaning which ye would extract from it; for it is to this effect: Make all nations my disciples, baptising them, and teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have com­manded you. Since ye will again wrest the sense of the pas­sage, it is clear that you are only waging an empty war of words, which Paul forbids. (1 Tim. vi. 5.) To the partaking of the Supper or commemoration of Christ’s death, unconditional faith is to be demanded, in accordance with 1 Cor. xi. 28: “But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup.” On the other hand, it is nowhere said that one is to examine himself before baptism. Without doubt the divine providence of God has not demanded examination before baptism, inasmuch as it knew that believing Christians would furnish their children with the sign of children of God, as this was done under the Old Testament by circumcision.

*Anabaptist:* What God wills that we should do, He has expressly commanded in His Word. He has, however, nowhere commanded infant baptism, and Christ and His apostles have never practised it; it is therefore an invention of men, or of Satan, and thereby we abide. If you will establish the legiti­macy of infant baptism, do it by the Word of God; for we desire God’s Word, and not man’s word.

*Zwingli:* If in regard to outward things of eternal observance, about which there is no clear and distinct announcement in the New Testament, a dispute arises, we are in this case to turn from the doctrine of Christ to Moses and the prophets, that he may not blame us like the Sadducees: “Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures,” Matt, xxii. 29, and that we may learn from the Word of God what ought to be done. Thus, for example, *marriage* is an outward rite of eternal observance; yet the New Testament contains no prescription as to how it is to be performed, although we find such in Numbers xviii. It is a like case with infant baptism. We admit that in the New Testament there is no express command that children are to be baptised, much less, however, is there any prohibition of it. When God made the covenant with Abraham, He gave him circumcision as a covenant-sign for the sake of his posterity, as it is said in Genesis xvii. 7, &c.: “And I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee,” &c., &c. Circumcision was performed on the eighth day after birth. Circumcision, however, was an obligatory sign, and Abraham and his whole posterity were to circumcise their children, for the reason that they might have the God of Israel pointed out to them as Him in whom Abraham believed, as God afterwards commanded by Moses, Deut. xxxi. 11, 12, thou shalt read this law before all Israel in their hearing: “Gather the people together, men, and women, and children, and thy stranger that is within thy gates, that they may hear, and that they may learn, and fear the Lord your God, and observe to do all the words of this law.” Thus the covenant commenced with the outward sign which God really commanded, because He knew well what would follow if it were neglected. What God, however, has spoken and commanded, has always a good object, although we may not know the exact reason for which He commanded it. In the present case, let us observe well from the diligence with which God inculcated the command, how he provided that the children, even from the cradle, should be led to himself, upon whom Abraham trusted, and to whom the child was obligated by the external sign that it might not, through the carelessness or unbelief of its parents, or by the instrumentality of heathenish people, be led away to idolatry ere it came to be properly instructed. Now, in the New Testament economy, baptism has entered into the place of circumcision, with the difference that circumcision obligates to God under the covenant of the law; baptism, indeed, likewise to God, but through Christ to God under the covenant of grace. Here I refer to what Paul says of circumcision and of baptism, Colos. ii. 10-12, where he calls circumcision “a burial in baptism.” The sense of these words is: Ye were, then, when ye put off your sins, circumcised with the circumcision which is without hands; for ye were not less than they visibly circumcised, but with the circumcision of Christ, which, through the washing with water, signifies the same as circumcision. Therefore, ye are buried with Christ in baptism that ye may die unto sin. Now “the dying unto sin,” and “the circumcision from sin,” is one and the self-same thing, which, in the one case, is signified by outward circumcision; and in the other, by baptism, and therefore he calls baptism our circum­cision. Hence it is evident that baptism in the New Testament has come into the place of circumcision in the Old. Again, as to what regards the origin of infant baptism, there is in my mind no doubt that it was begun, as Augustine[[15]](#footnote-15) says, at the time of Christ and the apostles, although no mention is made of it in express words. For in regard also to the commemorative Supper of Christ, there is nothing said by any evangelist or apostle as to how it was ordered according to the institution of Christ, except by Paul, and by him only in 1 Cor. x. 16, and following; and xi. 20, and following. For although in Acts ii. 42, we find that bread was broken, we do not find in what manner or order it was done. If the Corinthians had not abused the Supper, we should have had no place in Scripture from whence we could learn how it had been kept. Now I say the same with respect to infant baptism. Although it is not described or stated in express words, yet it is from various intimations in the Word of God to be con­cluded that they also, with the general multitude who were baptised, received baptism; surely the women and children were fed with the rest, yet they are not counted, Matt. xiv. 21. We shall now quote some proofs for our view. In Matt. xix. 13-15, Luke xviii. 15-17, there is the narrative which Mark x. 13-16 gives in the following words: “And they brought young children to him, that he should touch them: and his disciples rebuked those that brought them. But when Jesus saw it, he was much displeased, and said unto them, Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not; for of such is the kingdom of God. Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein. And he took them up in his arms, put his hands upon them, and blessed them.”

In the first place, they are blamed who forbad little children to be brought to Christ; are those not to be blamed who forbid them to be baptised? For if theirs is the kingdom of God, why should the sign of the people of God be denied them? As Peter said, (Acts x. 47,) when he saw that Cornelius with his whole family had received the Holy Ghost: “Can any man forbid water that these should not be baptised, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?” so must I likewise say in regard to in­fants: Who will forbid them water when we see that they are God’s as well as we who believe?

*Anabaptist:* Is it, however, said that Christ baptised the children, when it is related that He took them up in His arms and blessed them?

*Zwingli:* Who says it? I quoted the passage for two reasons; one you have heard; Are they God’s? who will forbid them water, the sign of God’s people? The other is, that I may show by these words what care and zeal the parents manifested in thus bring­ing their children to Christ; and seeing this, we can, with no semblance of truth suppose, that they had not their children baptised, although this be not stated in express words. The Jews looked more to outward things than any other people, for which they were reproached by Christ, John iv. 48; Luke xi. 29; and by Paul, 1 Cor. i. 22. Thus it may, with all safety, be assumed that they let themselves as well as their children be designated by baptism. When, therefore, of a whole company or of a whole household it is related that they had been baptised, it may be assumed with all probability that there were children also among them, and that these also were baptised.

*Anabaptist:* In Acts ii. 87, 38, it is written: “Now when they heard this, they were pricked in their heart, and said unto Peter and to the rest of the apostles, Men and brethren, what shall we do? Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptised every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.” Can these have been children whom Peter’s sermon so pricked in heart? Have infants asked, “What shall we do?” Has Peter recommended children to repent?

*Zwingli:* And if ye went to unbelievers at this day—but that you do not do, although you all say that you are sent by God to preach, but you go only to those regions where the gospel has been already planted, and there you destroy by your anabaptism what was formerly built up in peace—if, however, you went, you would without doubt baptise only those who understood your preaching and received it. When these believers, however, had been well and rightly instructed in the nature of the ordinance, they would, without doubt, attach their children to Christ by the sign even from the cradle.

The commencement of baptism in the times of the apostles is described, as in all histories, without any particular mention of children, although they may have been present, as we have seen in the narrative of the miraculous feeding they really were. Nor is it inconsistent with the sense in Acts ii. 41 that children were baptised, for all that is said, “they were pricked in their heart,” “what shall we do,” and “repent,” is quite applicable to a company in which there was a mixture of women and children, although the men only who understood the word, and whom it in the first instance concerned, spoke, the women and children not speaking. For the children, although they did not believe, belonged not less to the number of believers than the fathers themselves; since among the Jews, the family was counted to the father by every census which God commanded. Nor in con­sequence of the circumcision in which they formerly walked could they have any other view than that they should now *bap­tise* their children as they formerly *circumcised* them. Paul gives us a farther proof in favour of this view, in 1 Cor. x. 1, where he says, “All our fathers were under the cloud,” plainly understand­ing by “fathers,” all the people with the women and children. They also all “passed through the sea,” “were all baptised to Moses in the cloud and in the sea,” although the women and children are not particularly mentioned. The sense of this pas­sage is, however, the following: Paul would exhort the Christians at Corinth not to place their dependence on outward things, and not to suppose that by these, and without a change of their sinful lives, they could be saved. Accordingly he says: “Ye might think, because ye have been baptised, and have partaken of the sym­bolical food of the Eucharist, that you were saved. It is not so. For our fathers had the sign even as well as we; and as we are placed under the sacraments of baptism and the Lord’s Supper, so they also were under the cloud, and passed through the sea, they were nourished from heaven above, as our souls also receive comfort through Christ, in consequence of which consolation ye celebrate the holy feast of commemoration; yet, notwithstand­ing all this, they were punished by God for their sins. And although these miracles were but obligating signs of a prefigurative character, it will fare with us as with them if we seek our salvation through any external signs; for just the more did they trust on themselves from thinking of all the wonders which God had wrought in their behalf.” I have cited this passage here, however, for the reason that the image of the cloud and of the sea signifies baptism, as Peter himself tells us. Now, this sub­jection to these signs took place before the children of Israel were brought under Moses, that is, were brought under the law, from which it may be readily seen that Paul looked upon bap­tism as a common obligative sign for the whole people of God, for believers and their children. For as, in the one case, young and old together passed through the sea, and were under the cloud; so also in baptism, which was symbolised by the cloud and sea, *young and old without difference* are obligated and bound. We see thus from the custom of the children of Israel, and from the testimony of Paul, that infant-baptism must have been usual at the times of the apostles, which also the histories themselves prove, relating how the apostles baptised whole house­holds. In 1 Cor. i. 16, Paul says: “And I baptised also the household of Stephanas,” and Acts xvi. 15, say: “and when she, (Lydia,) was baptised, and her household,” in which cases, it may, with safety, be assumed, that there were children in the house­hold. It is in the same l6th chapter that mention is made of the jailor. He said, “Sirs, what must I do to be saved? And they said, Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shall be saved, and thy house. And he took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes; and was baptised, he and all his, straightway. And when he had brought them into his house, he set meat before them, and rejoiced, believing in God, with all his house.” (Ver. 30-34.) Here there were, doubtless, children under the “all his,” who would especially rejoice that their father had become a believer, and that he rejoiced in his faith. Thus the young especially rejoiced at the entrance of Christ into Jerusalem, of whom He said, as the rulers, priests, and Scribes, called on Him to command them silence, “out of the mouths of babes and sucklings thou hast perfected praise.” (Ps. viii. 2.) It is thus with good ground to be supposed that all believers directed their next care to their children, and bound them over to that same God, to the knowledge of whom they themselves had come. Therefore we do well and act rightly in binding our children to God and the Redeemer from their earliest years, according to the example of the old covenant and of the apostles, and in bringing them to him according to his invitation, the more especially as much that is good flows from infant-baptism. By this we may readily recognise the Divine wisdom in the vouchsafement of this outward sign. In the first place, it is beneficial for us to be early instructed in Christian doctrine and discipline. For this end the pastor ought, at certain seasons, to collect the youth, and faith­fully instruct them in the elements of the doctrine of salvation. If this be not done, each may propagate his own errors among his children. This is of especial importance at the present time, when you, Anabaptists, manifest such reserve to all who con­tradict you that you forbid your children to go to the legally appointed evangelists or bishops to hear sermon. What will become of us if more sects arise? The other good effect of infant-baptism is, that the youth are necessitated from their first years to live as Christians, while their parents are placed under an obli­gation to instruct them in Christianity. Let it be supposed that children were not baptised before the sixteenth or eighteenth year, or even later, the consequence would be, that on your say­ing to your neighbour, “Why do you bring up your children in a manner so contrary to Christianity?” He would reply, “I don’t know whether they will be Christians or not and the child itself could say, which in the petulancy of the young spirit would certainly occur often: “What have I to do with your warning? I can become a Christian or not.” The third good effect of infant-baptism is, that it corrects remissness in religious education. Each would excuse his negligence in instructing his children from their earliest years, with the apology, “it is still soon enough.” Nor would all men learn with the same ardour to know God, and to call upon Him as we even now find. For this reason we take god-fathers or sponsors, that, on the decease of father and mother, they may instruct the children in the doctrines of salvation.

These and other arguments Zwingli brought forward during the three days’ Disputation on infant-baptism. In the estima­tion of all competent to judge they had the more weight, because the Anabaptists were unable to advance a single argument which would stand the test, in proof of their assertions. Instead of justifying, by Scripture, the innovation they moved for, they were obliged to confine themselves to certain subtle objections, which Zwingli always rebutted with a calm deliberation.

For example, an Anabaptist said: I would make it manifest, from the Word of God, that infant-baptism is an invention of Satan, but no man can understand me, except one who is without sin.

*Zwingli:* Do you understand it yourself?

*Anabaptist:* Yes, thank God.

*Zwingli:* Then you are without sin?

*Anabaptist:* Would to God that all men acknowledged their sins as I do. With this exclamation he withdrew, and had no desire to take any farther part in the Disputation?

Another said: Infant-baptism is an invention of the Pope; Nicolas II. has first introduced it.

*Zwingli:* Whence do you know this?

*Anabaptist:* I have read it in the Pope’s book myself.[[16]](#footnote-16)

*Zwingli:* Do you understand Latin, then?

*Anabaptist:* No.

*Zwingli:* How can you say you have read it in the Pope’s book, when you are ignorant of Latin, and this book has not been translated into German? You, Anabaptists, maintain you do not lie, is this not lying? Moreover, Pope Nicolas II. lived about the year 1055, while we know, from the writings of Augustine, who lived about the year 400, after Christ, that, at his time, infant- baptism was generally customary, and that, in his opinion, it had been administered by the apostles. How, then, could Pope Nicolas II. first have introduced it?

Another came forward, and placing himself before Zwingli, and employing all the gestures of an exorcist, said, Zwingli, Zwingli, I conjure thee, by the living God, speak the truth.

With perfect composure Zwingli answered, I shall, and you shall hear it. You are a stupid, riotous boor, as silly a one as our lords have in the whole land. Amid universal laughter, the fanatic, who had boasted he would overcome Zwingli with a single word, slunk back into the crowd speechless.

Neither the subtleties of the learned Anabaptists, nor the quaint sallies of the narrow-minded fanatics among them could throw the Reformer for a moment off his guard; and, while he replied to the one with well-grounded solid learning, he worsted the other with his shrewd and pointed remarks, often with sar­castic wit. Zwingli had gained a complete victory, so that the Council, after the Disputation was over, published the following declarations: “The Anabaptists and their followers having, for three successive days, disputed in our Town-hall, and in the Great Minster, in our presence, and in the presence of the whole community, and each and every Baptist, without any hinderment, having spoken his quarrel, dispute, and opinion, it hath, from first to last, shown itself by the true divine Scriptures, maintained by the strongest arguments, that Magister Huldreich Zwingli, with his followers, has completely overcome the Anabaptists, demonstrated the invalidity of Anabaptism, and, on the other hand, established the validity of infant-baptism. It hath also been rendered very evident by this Disputation that the ring­leaders and sectarists of Anabaptism have set up their doctrines out of an insolent, intemperate, and arrogant mind, and in no good spirit, thinking to draw to them a particular sect and faction, contrary to the command of God, to the despite of us, the temporal magistracy, to the implanting of all disobedience, and to the destruction of Christian charity between man and man; for they esteem themselves to be better than other men, and without sin, as their words and manners, works and gestures, clearly show; considering which, we hereby command and enjoin all persons, man or woman, young man or maiden, to abstain from such Anabaptism, and we authorise infants only to be baptised. Given on St. Andrew’s Day, 1525.”

Manz, Grebel, Blaurock, and the other chief men of the sect, were called before the Council, and seriously exhorted to acknow­ledge their errors. But in vain; they obstinately persisted in maintaining them, nay, they found means to issue an address from prison, in which the Council now enclosed them, stimulat­ing their followers to a new resistance to the above decree of the Council.

4. The Riotous proceedings of the Anabaptists in the Can­ton of Zurich.—Their Course and End.

These repeated instigations to opposition against the civil authority were so much the more deserving of punishment, because, in the country district of Zurich, as well as in other parts of Switzerland, the flames of civil insurrection, which had already raged destructively in the so-called “peasant-war” in Germany, and had only been quenched in streams of blood, threatened to fasten on the doctrines of the Anabaptists. The districts on the Rhine were the first to feel the influence of this insurrectionary spirit. Payment of legal dues and villanage were refused to the governor of Eglisau, and, upon his showing a dis­position to maintain the existing fish-rights, a mob collected, and set his authority at defiance. “Freely has God Almighty given,” they cried, after the example of their German co-religionists, “the beasts of the wood, the birds in the air, and the fish in the run­ning stream. The use of them belongs to the countryman, who must also bear the loss and damage they occasion.” A deputy of the government, who meant to exhort them to order, was received with a shower of stones. The spirit of insubordination spread farther and farther. On the 23d April 1525, a swarm of riotous peasants broke violently into the cloister of Rueti, the abbot of which had previously escaped with the moneys, valuables, and documents, and gave themselves up to outrageous licence, and the wildest excesses. In contempt of the orders of the governor of Grueningen to go to their homes they pulled the alarm-bells, and thereby increased the number of their comrades. The whole host now rolled itself against the house Bubikon of the order of St. John, where riot and revelry began anew, and it was only with considerable difficulty that some deputies of the government who hastened thither succeeded in inducing the uproarious mul­titude to go home, there put in writing their complaints and wishes, and hand them in to the government.

From no less than five different communes petitions of griev­ances were delivered to the government, in which were demanded the dissolution of the subject-relation, (the petitioners regarding God alone as their Lord, on the other hand, their superiors in Zurich as only lords-protectors,) confiscation and application of the property of the cloisters for the benefit of the district in which they may lie, the right of every community to call and appoint their pastors, and, finally, abrogation and diminution of several imposts. One of these petitions concluded with the prayer: “May our lords of Zurich look well to the above matters, and consider our and the poors’ need according to the Word of God. And if this should accord more, may our officers not be restricted from giving it.” The Council investigated the reported griev­ances, and issued to the districts a very lengthened, instructive, and tranquillising answer. “We record,” it is said, among other things, “our satisfaction that your petitions are not brought before us in an intemperate spirit, (as is the fashion of the times,) and have, therefore, sat in Council upon your articles, examining all deeds, documents, contracts, letters, and seals, which we have against you and you against us, worthy people of the country-district, and we have weighed these, and *compared them with Holy Scrip­ture,* the Word of God, as also have had special regard to the ebullitions which have everywhere manifested themselves of late. In regard, then, to your first article: “That you will only have God, our heavenly Father, for your Lord, us, however, for your tem­poral superiors; we opine that it requires no answer, it being self-evident; for, as God is the Lord and Saviour of us all, so are your lords of Zurich, in worldly affairs, in all townships, lordships, and governorships, your lawful and natural lords and superiors, having brought you under them with no force or violence of war, but by free purchase. Therefore let the matter so rest, for, if you obey God, and render to Him what is due, ye will in all things lawfully obey your lords and superiors, as God com­mands to obey Him and the magistracy.” In this dignified Christian spirit the separate articles were considered; unjust burdens and grievances were removed; while the legality and necessity of various dues and services were clearly established. The answer concludes with the exhortation and the wish: “Now, dear friends, we have good hope that, after you have received our answer, you will be satisfied, and content yourselves, as you can­not but see that we have honourably and faithfully met your requests, and done more than enough; for it were neither becom­ing for us nor for you, that any one should refuse the magistrate, or any other, the obedience that is due to him in law and right. Consider likewise what hostility we and the whole province at present suffer from without, in that we cleave to the Word of God, and will have nothing to do with foreign princes. Live ye then, peaceably and obediently, in the discipline and in the fear of God, and do not, by riot and disobedience of your superiors, prepare for yourselves loss, and damage, and shame? But if any one among you instigate to rebellion and disobedience, set him right, and warn him to depart from such courses, that we both, in the town and in the country, may live together, according to the will of God, unitedly, and in obedience, both towards him and our lawful superiors, and may maintain that which God the Almighty hath granted to our fathers, and us, their children, to our great glory, so that every one may see that we have good, faithful rulers, and we, on the other hand, good, faithful, and obedient subjects, and also, that we may, reciprocally with one another, pursue that which is conducive to piety, peace, and content­ment. We, on our parts, engage to do and suffer all for you, as it behoves pious and honourable lords and superiors to do and suffer for their subjects. May the Almighty help us both, in our respective duties, with His divine grace.”

These exhortations, which were read aloud, and explained and commented on orally by deputies of the government, in all the dis­tricts, met, at first, with no very favourable reception. Several com­munes announced that they would only give their answer after con­sultation with the others, in consequence of which, on Pentecost Monday, 5th June 1525, a meeting of the populace was held on a field near Toess, where about four thousand men were present. Nor here at first would they allow a deputation of the Council, headed by the burgomaster, to speak. “It is for us to order,” cried the insurgents; “and we’ll accustom the towners to walk a-foot, while we shall ride deputies.” Gradually, however, the voice of duty and of fair play prevailed with the multitude, and a gover­nor, Lavater, and others succeeded in obtaining a hearing. The rabble dispersed without having come to any resolution. Many of those who had taken part in the meeting were, on the home-going, invited by the citizens of Winterthur, and hospitably treated in their houses, when the events of the day were farther discussed. Many were thus brought to a better mind. Some errors prevailing on tithes, a public disputation was ordered to be holden on this subject, in which Zwingli again took a chief part. While the Anabaptists and the rioters denounced their exaction as contrary to law and justice, the town-clerk, am Gruet, whom we have already mentioned, as a zealous partisan of the Papacy, defended their legality, on the ground of the Levitical law. Zwingli was thus placed between two fires. Against the town-clerk, he maintained that the Levitical tithe-law, with the whole Levitical priesthood, and all dependent upon it, was abolished by the New Testament. Against the Anabaptists, he made it clear that the existing tithes had grown to be a legal debt, through sale and purchase, which debt must be discharged, according to human and divine law. (Rom. xiii.) Above all, the tithes devoted to the support of public worship were absolutely necessary, inasmuch as, if not exacted, the expenses of worship must be defrayed by other im­positions.

Both in sermons and writings Zwingli and his friends wrought with zeal and ardour to throw the light of the gospel round this subject, and Christian truth here proved itself to be a leaven penetrating the whole mass of the people, filling and governing the mass by its power. The insurrectionary and turbulent spirit of the Anabaptists, both in regard to things civil and ecclesiastical, having been completely exposed by the public disputation, and deprived of its baleful power, their proceedings fell into a general unpopularity, which immediately showed itself in expressions of confidence in the government and its measures, addressed to it in answer to a renewed summons on its part. “Our persons and pro­perty,” wrote Regenstorf, “dear sirs, we shall place at your dis­posal, so long as you continue to rule in a Christian spirit; for although we had some grievances to complain of, we have, on the other hand, borne in mind the lessons of the evangelists and apostles, which show equally to you and to us how one part is to hold itself in reference to the other; and we gratefully recognise your love, your toil and trouble, and that you have removed from us some burdens. Continue to act towards us as affectionate fathers towards their sons; plant the good, root out the evil, as that which of itself cannot long endure.”[[17]](#footnote-17)

It was here also the power of divine truth which put an end to an insurgent spirit which had widely extended itself, and threatened to dissolve all civil order. The merit, however, of having effected this great good, next to the divine mercy belongs to Zwingli, who saw, with penetrating glance, all the exigencies of the occasion, who shaped the course of proceeding in the light and accord­ing to the prescriptions of the Word of God, and who, by the energy of his preaching and writings, bowed the hearts both of rulers and ruled under its sacred influence. After the Anabap­tists had lost all authority and respect among the people, their chief men were, at Zwingli’s advice and intervention, set at liberty, with a serious admonition to amend their ways. They soon, however, began again to hold meetings, and to spread their doc­trines among the credulous. Manz and Blaurock were accord­ingly again imprisoned, a fate which Grebel only escaped by a speedy flight. About the same time some followers of this sect perpetrated at St. Gall, where they were greatly on the increase, a deed of horror which opened the eyes of all to the dangers to be apprehended from these fanatics. In an out of the way house at Muehlegg, near St, Gall, there lived an octogenarian peasant, Schucker, with his five sons, who all, with the remaining members of the family, and the servants, had taken up Anabaptism. On Shrove-Tuesday, the 7th February 1526, many of the sect were assembled here. A calf was killed, and a feast made, the partici­pators in which got so inflamed by the deep potations of wine in which they indulged, that, as Bullinger mentions, they spent the whole night amid extraordinary gestures, contortions, dialogues with each other, visions, and revelations. Towards morning, Thomas Schucker came up to his younger brother, Leonhard, with the gall of the calf in the bladder, saying, “Bitter as gall is the death thou shalt suffer. Kneel brother.” Leonhard obeyed the summons. Thomas took up a sword, and with the words, “The will of the Father is accomplished,” his brother’s head rolled at his feet. All present shrunk back horror-struck, and fled from the fratricide. He, however, ran with the reeking sword, clad only in his shirt and trousers, to the burgomaster, Dr. Joachim Vadian, and shouted in his ears, “I proclaim to thee the day of the Lord.” The fanatic was taken into custody, and he was executed on the 16th February.

Universal indignation was expressed at this act of enormity, and the people vehemently called upon the government to put a stop, by measures of severity, to such disorders. Blaurock, as a foreigner, was whipped out of the town, and banished the land. Manz, and two Anabaptists from the country, on their refusing to make any recantation or promise of amendment, were put to death by drowning.[[18]](#footnote-18) Zwingli had no share whatever in these proceedings, having, notwithstanding the attacks made upon him by the Anabaptists, always advocated the adoption of mild measures, because he would *alone* work through the light and the power of the Word of God, and through it alone disperse the mists of error. Indeed, the complete victory gained in Switzerland over the Anabaptists is to be ascribed to the use of this weapon. The contest, however, cost the Reformer, as he himself expresses it, more sweat than his fight with the Papacy; nay, he calls the latter, in comparison with this, but child’s play. But sweat and toil were not here in vain. For the new church came out of this trial, purified and strengthened, and proved itself solid, like the house built by the wise man upon the immovable rock, against which the storm roared and the waves lashed in vain. Zwingli himself, in carrying on this contest, became only the deeper versed in the knowledge of the Word of God, while, at the same time, he was especially led, by his studies on the subject, to per­ceive the intimate connection subsisting between the Old and New Testaments.

In two quarters, however, the evil consequences of this strife of opinions made themselves visible, and opposed serious obstacles to the progress of the Reformation. On the one hand, this wild offshoot was, with mischievous joy, represented by the Papists as the natural consequence and fruit of the free preaching of the gospel, so that, on this ground, the enemies of the gospel succeeded in many places in suppressing it, and in stilling the thirst which had recently been awakened for its healing waters. On the other hand, these divisions exerted an injurious influence medi­ately on the farther development and conformation of the Refor­mation, by opening up a new source of dissension, the so-called “Supper-contest” between Luther and Zwingli and their respec­tive friends and scholars. We shall now proceed to survey this important contest more narrowly, in so far as it concerns Zwingli.

5.The Doctrine of Zwingli and of Luther in regard to the Lord’s Supper.—The Idiosyncrasies and Different Development of their Minds.—Origin of the Strife about the Lord’s Supper.

The like contest which Luther had to carry on against the Anabaptists in Saxony, Zwingli had to maintain against the same enemy in Zurich, nay, the fanatics in Zurich, as it has been above mentioned, borrowed their names and their party badges from their German co-religionists. While Luther was sojourning at the Wartburg, (from April 1521 till March 1522,) his colleague and former fellow-labourer in the work of the Reformation, Dr. Andrew Carlstadt,[[19]](#footnote-19) had entered into connection with fanatics from Zwickau,[[20]](#footnote-20) who boasted of direct revelations from heaven, who rejected infant baptism, and attacked and with infuriated ardour, sought to overthrow the existing order in church and state. Under the influence of these people, and hurried away by his ill-regulated zeal for reformation, Carlstadt endeavoured, in union with some heated spirits, especially from amongst the students, to revolutionise, in a turbulent and violent manner, which gave deep offence to many, the whole institutions of public worship. The Mass was suddenly abolished, and the Supper, without preparation of heart and confession of sin, administered in both kinds, the altars were cast down, the monks who showed any disinclination to the new system of things were maltreated, and the images were thrown out of the churches. Luther, when he heard at the Wartburg of these riotous proceedings, repaired, trusting in the protecting arm of God, instantly to Wittenberg, and restored order by the power of his preaching, which he con­tinued before a great concourse of people for eight days succes­sively, and won over Carlstadt again to more wholesome labours in the service of the Church and the University. When Luther set his face against these violent attempts at reformation, he was not the less convinced of the necessity of abolishing, in the course of time, everything in public worship and ecclesiastical arrange­ments, which had a tendency to compromise the honour of God, and the merits of Christ, and thereby to do injury to the salvation of the soul. Like Zwingli,[[21]](#footnote-21) he held it to be his chief commission faithfully to preach the Word of God, and leave it to the Lord to appoint the time and the hour when a reform for the weal of His Church should be undertaken. Among the ordinances of public worship which, in the Papal Church, had departed the widest from its original institution and import, to the great detriment of the salvation of souls, the Mass occupied the first place, which had usurped the place of the Supper appointed by Christ. Both the Reformers, accordingly, after they found in Christ salvation, and in the Word of God the true light, by which to prove and test all existing ecclesiastical ceremonies, were filled with a holy indignation against the false doctrine spread by the papists, “that the Mass is a sacrifice,” the merits of Christ’s sufferings being thereby depreciated, and the doctrine of the apostles, that a sacrifice for sin was made once for all by Christ, practically annulled;[[22]](#footnote-22) both likewise recognised in the asseveration, which was the natural fruit of this doctrine, “that the priest, in the Mass, daily offers up Christ for the living and the dead,” the grand source of the Church’s corruption;[[23]](#footnote-23) and both united in demanding that this sacrament should be brought back to the simple state in which it was instituted and exemplified by Christ,[[24]](#footnote-24) and that the Supper should be administered in both kinds. With the conception of the sacrificial character of the Mass, there is closely connected the false doctrine adopted by the Papal Church through the resolution of a Church-Council, held at Rome, 1215, “that the bread and wine are changed into the real and essential body, and into the real and essential blood of Christ, by the priestly consecration at the Supper.” In the conflict waged against this doctrine, the different intellectual peculiarities of the two Refor­mers, and their different intellectual visual powers, now in diametric opposition, now approximating very closely, arising from a difference in spiritual education and manner of life, made themselves felt so sensibly that these two great men, who stood upon one and the same foundation of faith, became involved in a gigantic contest that occupied them much till their deaths, and tore asunder the church, renovated by them, and placed by them on the one rock of salvation, Jesus Christ, into two mighty fac­tions. We shall now direct our attention to the diverse views of the two Reformers upon this subject ere we proceed to the detail of the conflict itself which unhappily broke out between them.

From the standing-point of faith on God alone and his Word, which Word must he held to explain itself, Zwingli had, at a very early period, arrived at the conviction that the transub­stantiation doctrine of the Papistical Church is false, and that it has put an erroneous interpretation on the words of the institu­tion of the Holy Sacrament, “This is my body,” and “This is my blood,” from which erroneous interpretation the false dogma is derived. Christ has, by His death on the cross, accomplished an eternal redemption and propitiation for our sins, of which we can alone be partakers through faith. To this propitiatory death the Holy Supper refers us, by the symbols of bread broken and wine poured out. The reality, *i.e.,* the fruit, of the redemption and propitiation, we appropriate to ourselves alone by *faith.* Hence both the expressions, “eating the flesh of Christ,” and “drinking His blood,” are to be understood figuratively for “believing on Jesus Christ, who was crucified, and shed His blood for us.” The bread broken and the wine poured forth into the cup make pre­sent to us, in a figurative sense, the crucified body of Christ, and His blood shed for us. He who, in true faith, partakes of these symbols in the Supper, *to him Christ is as near as if He were dying for him at that very moment on the cross;* for Christ, who is everlasting God, is omniscient at all times, and his sufferings are eternally fruitful. (Heb. ix. 14.)[[25]](#footnote-25) In this sense, the Holy Supper has been given and appointed to be an eternal sign of the love of Christ, and its intention is to make present to us, as often as it is celebrated, Him who suffered for us on the wood of the cross in such a manner that, with *the eye of the soul,* we may behold Him alone, admire and *embrace Him with lively faith.* Now, just as certainly as this touching of Him by faith is far more precious than the touching even of His body, (for many have touched Him materially to their destruction, but no man has contemplated Him in faith in the above described manner without benefit,) just as certainly is it this contemplation and partaking alone which is required. While we are, by faith, assured of that which the symbols represent to us, that Christ has atoned for our sins, our soul is freed from the hunger of despair, and we are everlastingly quickened with the heavenly nourishment of God’s love and grace.” This view of the partaking of the Supper Zwingli con­ceived to be grounded on the words of Christ, John vi., in which Christ himself explains how the expressions, “eating his flesh,” and “drinking his blood,” are to be understood. Christ incul­cates here, ver. 26, upon the Jews, who sought earthly food from Him, the necessity of labouring for heavenly food, which “endureth unto everlasting life,” and He designates “himself,” ver. 35, as “the bread of life which everlastingly quickens him who comes to him, and believes on him.” In what manner He is the bread of life, He explains in the words, ver. 51, “The bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world.” This, my self-sacrifice, for sinners, will propitiate the world again to my Father, which propitiation is nothing else but a restoration to life; thereby, by my giving myself up, and dying, I become a food for souls, on which they may nourish their hopes, and be certain of the mercy of God; for how could the Divine mercy deny anything to poor sinful man, having given up the Son for him. Thus my flesh, in so far as it is killed, is a food, *i.e.,* a hope and consolation of the soul. When Christ says, ver. 54, “Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life,” and in ver. 47, “He that believeth on me hath everlasting life,” it is clear that “eating His flesh” and “believ­ing on Him” are *one and the same thing,* for if not there would be two different roads to salvation; the one *by the eating of His flesh,* and the other by *believing on Him.* It is thus of *faith,* and not of bodily *eating,* that Christ here speaks. This is still more clearly evident from the conclusion of his address, ver. 61-63. The Jews, not comprehending, or not being willing to compre­hend, the gracious, though figurative, speech of Christ, and his disciples murmuring over the “hard saying,” Christ adds, ver. 63, “It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you they are Spirit, and they are life.” Can plainer words be used to repel the opinions and assertions, more froward than pious, that the substance of the bread is changed into *flesh,* or that Christ is bodily and essen­tially partaken of in the Supper, than these: *the flesh profiteth nothing?* That Christ is here speaking of His own flesh is clear, for it was this alone which was the subject of discourse, and this they had to eat, as they thought, which, for the Jews and the disciples, was a hard saying. But *how* does his flesh profit nothing? Plainly *for eating,* as the disciples understood His words, and which foolish conception He would here dissipate. Otherwise, the flesh of Christ is of great, nay, of incalculable value, but *as slain, not as eaten. Slain* it has delivered us from death, but *eaten* it profits us nothing. He who is truth itself tells us this, therefore it must be so. “The words,” He continues, “that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life.” What words? “He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood hath everlasting life,” and, “He that believeth on me hath everlasting life.” These words,—that Christ on the cross is our redemption and salvation, believed by us, and received into the depth of our hearts, procure for us everlasting life. These are the words that Christ spoke that are spirit and life.

Another passage which Zwingli brought forward in proof that by “eating Christ” is to be understood “believing on Christ,” he took from 1 Cor. iii. 4. Paul teaches here that they of old are just as worthy as we, having had the same God whom we have, the same Christ whom we have, although they set their hopes upon the promised, we upon the already come, Messiah; yet God was displeased at them when they were disobedient. Among other things which he says they had not less than we, were “the same spiritual meat,” and “the same spiritual drink.” But it is undeniable that they neither ate the bodily flesh, nor drank the bodily blood of Christ, He not having become man till many hundred years afterwards. Therefore their *eating* must have been nothing else but their *believing* on Christ, who, at a future day, was to give His body, and shed His blood for them. If, however, they had “the same spiritual meat” which we have, as the apostle says, and they did not eat his body, or drink his blood, our eating of the body and drinking of the blood of Christ can be nothing but our believing on Him who died for us. In the light of these passages of Holy Scripture, Zwingli proceeded to an explanation of the words of institution. If the eating of Christ’s flesh and the drinking of His blood signifies, according to the declaration of the Lord himself in the gospel of John, believing on Christ, and if He corrects the misconcep­tion of the disciples with regard to the bodily partaking of His flesh with the words, “the flesh profiteth nothing,” the same phraseology in the words of institution must have the same sense as here, for Christ cannot possibly desire us to eat His flesh, which he so distinctly states in John vi. profiteth nothing. The Word of God contains no contradiction of itself, but it exhibits a beautiful harmony throughout, if we but rightly understand it. Holy Scripture is replete with figurative language and expres­sions, and Christ employs such modes of expression, both when speaking of the doctrine of the kingdom and of His own person, as, “the seed is the Word of God;” “the field is the world;” “the harvest is the end of the world;” “I am the vine.” These are all figures of speech of a similar form with “this is my body and this is my blood.”

Just as Zwingli, after weighing the words of institution in connection with the above passages, had obtained the conviction that they were not to be taken literally, but figuratively, and was seeking for a fitting expression to make the image intel­ligible and comprehensible to every one, there came to him, in the summer of 1522, two learned men from Holland, John Rhodius and George Sagan,[[26]](#footnote-26) with a treatise, in the form of a letter, from the Dutch lawyer, Cornelius Honius or Hoen, upon the words of the institution. Honius understood the words in a figurative sense, and he found the figure in the copula­tive “is,” which he rendered by “signifies.” This explanation of the figure pleased Zwingli extremely well, because it seemed to him at once to correspond with the sense, and to be simple and intelligible to every mind, and because it withdrew the chief foundation for the papistical transubstantiation-doctrine, which rested principally upon the strict literal sense of this small word.[[27]](#footnote-27) Above all, however, Zwingli found himself compelled, by a regard to the context, to take the words of the institution in the figu­rative sense, and to explain “this is” by “this signifies.” Luke relates the institution in the words, chap. xxii. 19, “And he took bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, and gave unto them, say­ing, This is my body which is given for you: this do in remem­brance of me.” Here we must not disjoin the words, “this is my body,” and “which is given for you,” but we must allow them to stand in their natural connection, which is, “this is my body which is given for you.” From this it is clear that Christ speaks of His body, which was given up to death for us, and farther, that the bread is not this body, because if so, then a loaf of bread must have been given up to death for us. Christ points to the bread, and says, “This is my body which is given for you.” Mark here how the words of Christ present the key to their own explanation in the little word “is,” which must not be under­stood, as it stands between bread and body, in the literal, but in the figurative sense; therefore, the bread “signifies” my body which is given for you, or the bread is a sign of my body. But how does the bread in the Supper signify the body of Christ? To this I answer with Christ, inasmuch as it is “*given for us.*”Christ means by these words only to say that the bread is the sign that He hath given up His body to us for death, which His following words demonstrate, “this do in remembrance of me.” Here we learn for what purpose the figure of bread has been appointed, namely, as a *memorial* of Christ, and that the bread is not the body of Christ, but signifies or *symbolizes* it, we, in break­ing of bread *remembering* Him through the sign before us. Paul gives the words of the institution in 1 Cor. xi. 24, thus: “This is my body, which is broken for you.” *Given* for you, and *broken* for you, signify the same thing, Paul here alluding only to the resemblance which lies hid in the transaction. The words in reference to the cup, Luke xxii. 20, gives thus: “This cup (cup for that which was contained in it) is the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you.” That these words of Christ may be clearly seen, compare those given by Paul, 1 Cor. xi. 25, which are the same, “This cup is the new testament in my blood.” The sense is shortly this: The cup is the new testament, which is sealed in my blood, shed for you. Here we see, first, that neither Luke nor Paul says the cup is the blood of Christ, from whence it is to be concluded that the other evangelists had no intention to speak differently from them. Although they say, “The cup *(i.e.,* the wine) is my blood,” they mean to assert nothing more than the cup is a sign, a signification, a memorial of the blood of the new testament which has been shed for us. To the objection that is here made, If the cup is the new testa­ment, it is likewise the blood of Christ, for Christ’s blood is the new testament, I reply: The blood of Christ is not the new testament, but the pardoning merciful remission of our sins, as in Jer. xxxi. 34, and Heb. viii. 12, 13, is the new testament; but the blood of Christ has obtained this remission. Hence it is clear that the blood of Christ is not the new testament, but the blood of the new testament, *i.e.,* the blood through which the new testament, to wit, the remission of sins, has been acquired. In the like sense, in the old testament, the blood with which the people and the book of the law were sprinkled, was called the blood of the testament, but never “the testament.” Nor do we find that the blood of Christ is anywhere called “a testament,” although it is called “the blood of the new testament,” Now, if the cup here signifies the new testament, we must admit this only to be a figure of speech similar to that by which Moses calls circumcision the covenant, although it was but the sign of the covenant, Gen. xiii. 13. In the same manner, the cup in the Eucharist is called the testament, because it signifies the blood of Christ by which the new testament was acquired.

Finally, I cite the words of Paul, 1 Cor. xi. 26, “For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord’s death till he come.” Here the word “show” means nothing more than praise, exalt, magnify, a signification which it has in 1 Peter ii. 9, and in various passages of the Old Testament. Paul would say that the Christian Church is not to omit glori­fying the death of Christ till He come at the last day.

In the above manner, Zwingli proves that the words of the institution of the Holy Supper, if taken in their proper connec­tion, do not admit of the literal acceptation, but speak decisively in favour of the symbolical sense. This view found at once confir­mation and illustration in the passage in Exod. xii. 11-27, where the Pascal sacrifice or Lamb is called “*the Lord’s Passover*”although it only symbolises or commemorates it. We have already seen how the attention of Zwingli was called by a dream to this passage, which seems to speak most unequivocally of all for the figurative sense of the words, “This is my body.” Let us now see how he carries out the comparison between the two pas­sages, and establishes his view.

In Heb. x. 1, it is said that the law has “a shadow of good things to come.” As however, amid all the shadows and pre­figurations which are fulfilled in Christ, none bear a stronger resemblance the one to the other than the Paschal Lamb of the Old Testament does to the crucified and slain Christ of the New Testament, all the apostles and all the fathers of the Church are of the mind that the Paschal Lamb is the finest type of the death of Christ, and that Christ himself is the real Paschal Lamb, by which believers, delivered from the slavery of sin, are brought into the heavenly Canaan. Hence Paul says, 1 Cor. v. 7, “For even Christ, our Passover, is sacrificed for us,” &c. Christ himself shows this by word and deed, for He says, two days before the Passover: “Ye know that after two days is the Passover, and the Son of man will be delivered into the hands of men to be crucified, alluding plainly in these words to the circumstance, that in this Passover *the Lamb* should be slain that taketh away the sins of the world. During the Supper He said, deeply moved, “With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer;” to the end, namely, that He might abrogate the old, and institute the new solemnity, and change the commemoration of a single people delivered from Egyptian bondage into that of the world redeemed from the dominion of the devil and of death. As none can deny that the festival that was once celebrated as a commemoration of redemption from bodily servitude has passed into that of our Supper or Eucharist, in which we rejoice, not indeed over bodily deliverance, but over the propitiation of the world again with God, through His Son, there is undoubtedly no passage in the Old Testament more worthy of examination than that which treats of the institution of the old Passover. For in Holy Scrip­ture upon like subjects the expressions are like.

*There* the Paschal Lamb is called “the Passover,” or “the sacri­fice of the Passover,” while in reality it only signified the Passover, or was a symbol of it; *here* “bread and wine” are called “the body and blood of the Lord.” Shall we not *here* adopt the figurative signification, when we admit it *there,* everything being so similar and corresponding; *there* a commemoration is appointed, *here* likewise; *there* it is the redemption of the body, *here* the redemption of the soul, which is celebrated. As *there* a symbol of commemoration was appointed before the event itself took place, the commemoration of which was to be held by coming generations, so *here the symbol of Christ slain for us was insti­tuted before He really was slain,* while for coming generations it was to be the symbol of the slain Redeemer. *There,* on the evening preceding the day on which the redemption was to be accomplished the figure was instituted; *here* likewise the figure was appointed on the evening before the day when the redemp­tion was accomplished, when Christ, the true herald, proclaimed, “It is finished.” But why do I seek in these single particulars to compare the shadow with the reality, when in every believing soul, as soon as the word passover is pronounced, the recollection of the death of Christ is at once vividly recalled? Why will we not recognise in the same light the figure of speech employed in the Supper, which figure we perceive so plainly in the type, especially since all is clear when we concede it; all is dark, confused, unintelligible, inexplicable, when we deny it.

In conjunction with the Word of God, properly interpreted by itself, Zwingli’s *faith* led him to a right recognition of the sig­nificance of the Supper. In the light of faith he shrunk before the dreadful consequences of the transubstantiation-doctrine, on the ground of which, the bread and wine were worshipped, and salvation, instead of being sought through faith in Christ, was placed in the outward partaking of the elements. “We are fallen,” says he, “into such gross folly as actually to believe that if we but saw the bread, it would bring to us salvation. Nor was this folly enough; what we saw we worshipped, forgetting our own principles, in which all, both ancients and moderns who have written on the subject are agreed, namely, that the *humanity* of Christ is not to be worshipped at all; God alone is to be worshipped. But no man has seen God at any time. Why do we worship, then, anything visible, since God alone is to be worshipped, and He is invisible? In what sophism can those take refuge who teach that the Eucharist, as they call it, is to be worshipped? Do we see that any one of the apostles *adored* the Supper when Christ instituted it in His own commemoration? Ah! our souls are so entangled in the meshes of this error, that I fear if truth itself were to stand revealed before our eyes, we should not accept it. To what is our faith directed? or on what is it grounded? Is not God the object of it? Why do we hesitate, then, to break loose from ceremonies? Why do we place our hope on things to which Christ never directed it? Is not our salvation to be found alone in Him who is the Saviour of all the ends of the earth?”

Zwingli, although he had come to the firm conviction that the word “is” in the institution of the Supper, must not be taken literally, but in the sense of “signifies,” by no means desired the adoption of any change in the formula itself; “for,” thus he expresses himself, “when it is said, ‘this *is* my body,’ the sacra­ment is much more solemn and sublime than when it is said “this *signifies* my body,” wherefore we desire not a letter of it changed. The significance of the Supper in this point of view he illustrated by the following image, as ingenious as it is pertinent:—“As the father of a family who is on the point of journeying to a distant land, gives to his spouse his best ring, on which his image is engraved, so our Lord Jesus Christ at his departure has bequeathed to His bride, the Church, His image in the sacrament of the Supper. This His image he delivered over to us with the words: ‘This is my body, this is my blood. Do this in remembrance of me, and show by thanksgiving, praise and prayer, that I, the husband of your souls, have purchased you.’ When the father of the family, at handing over the ring to his spouse, says: ‘See in this *myself’* he gives much more than if he said, ‘See, this is my ring;’ yet he gives not himself bodily, for he is, as we have said, on the point of departure. Himself, however, he presents in all his marital faithfulness and love, just as if he said: ‘Thou shalt not be only assured of my faithfulness and love to thee, but also of this, that I am wholly thine, and therefore I give to thee this ring as a symbol and pledge.’ Thus Christ, also, when He was on the point of going for us to death, presented us the bread and wine with the words: *This is my body,* and *this is my blood,* although He was even then about to withdraw his natural body from the earth, and transplant it into heaven. Nevertheless, He presented him­self to us wholly in His mercy and faithfulness, as if He said: Now I go for you to death, and soon thereafter I shall again depart from hence. Ye shall not, however, doubt therefore of my love and care for you. *I am entirely yours with all that I am.* In testimony of it, I give you the symbol of this my sacrifice and of my last will. When ye now, by this commemorative Supper, see this bread and this cup presented to you, you are to think *of me,* that I have given myself up for you, and *ye shall so think of me as if you saw me before your eyes.* In this manner, we really glorify the Supper of the Lord through the presence of Christ, for, through the contemplation of faith, He is as present to our mind as the symbols of His body crucified for us, and His blood shed for us, are present to our senses.” This view of the sense and significance of the words of institution, as well as of the Supper itself, Zwingli had obtained at a much earlier period[[28]](#footnote-28) than that at which he conceived it expedient to make them known. “I testify before God,” are his words, “that, with His glory alone in view, I have, for several years, conversed in private upon this subject with many men of learning, because I was unwilling to spread anything abroad amongst the people inconsiderately and rashly which might excite dissension. But the more I consulted, the more I found to concur with me in opinion. Often, too, have I besought the Lord that He would point me out the way in which this most important matter of all, in the judgment of the simple-minded, might be represented in a manner intelligible to all, that, for the future, this sacred solemnity of the Church “might tend to edification and salvation.” Meanwhile, Zwingli, in his sermons, impressed upon his hearers with emphasis the duty of seeking salvation *through faith in Jesus Christ,* who died for us, warning them against applying to any creature the vene­ration and worship which are due to God alone. The bread and wine of the Supper are *holy* in the transaction, because through them Christ is realised by the believing soul, but extraneously to the transaction it is but bread and wine, for Christ dwells in heaven, at the right hand of the Father, but on earth, in the hearts of believers, and not in pyxes.” For the rest he awaited in pious resignation the right moment of time, when the Lord should reveal this truth to His people, by himself, or by others.

At the time when our Reformer had gained this standing-point, through the course of that zealous yet cautious investigation after truth peculiar to his mind, Luther, under the impulse of a fiery and living faith, was striving to unwind himself from the errors of Transubstantiation. The former was disgusted at the open idolatry practised through the Sacrament; the latter found him­self, in the first instance, hurt in his faith by his change of opinions, accustomed, as his mind had been, to the exaltation of the out­ward act of the Sacrament, a natural consequence of the doctrine of Transubstantiation.[[29]](#footnote-29) Hence Luther inculcated with such earnestness faith,[[30]](#footnote-30) as a main requisite to a blissful partaking of the Sacrament, that, out of the outward act[[31]](#footnote-31) *(opus operatum),* of the Papal Church, there might be an act of faith *(opus operantis),* a partaking of the Sacrament without faith being not only valueless but injurious to man, like bread and wine taken unseason­ably. That, however, which rests alone upon the outward partak­ing of the elements, and the conception that there is in them the body and blood of Christ, is not the true faith. “If you,” writes Luther, “in the trials which the devil puts you to, or, in the hour of death, were to say: I have taken the Sacrament, and I believe that it is truly the body and blood of Christ, the devil would rejoin; I believe it too. Thus this your faith helps you not, and the devil has won, and will trip up your heels, so that there is no help for you more. But if you say: Look, thou tyrant, or devil, and death, I have received the Sacrament, in which my Lord Jesus Christ truly vouchsafes that His body and blood are *mine,* and that He hath given me *all* that the words contain in them, then he must flee before you.” “To the believer, then, this Sacrament is a sure sign that He is made one with Christ and His Church, and that Christ, together with His life and sufferings, has become *his own.*”[[32]](#footnote-32)Carried forward by His faith, Luther shot ahead of the papistical doctrine of Transubstantiation, it affording no consolation to him. On the other hand, he was unable to free himself from the con­ception that Christ, in some incomprehensible manner, was bodily present in the Sacrament, such an idea being too inti­mately associated with his peculiar cast of mind, and too much entwined with his whole style of thought and conception. Thus he arrived at the doctrine, “that in the Sacrament two things are presented to us; *first,* The body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ in bread and wine; *second,* The great and glorious promise which is offered to every partaker of the Sacrament, that the body of Christ has been given for *us,* and His blood shed for *us,* for the remission of our sins. This view he established, as the Papal Church does the doctrine of Transubstantiation, with the words of institution, “This is my body given for you, this is my blood shed for you.” He was, indeed, at times strongly tempted to go beyond this view of the significance of the ordinance, and to behold in the bread and wine *symbols* of the body and blood of Christ; but, accustomed as devout monk to honour and adore the bodily present Saviour in the sacrament; and, besides, over­mastered by an imagination which allowed him to contemplate the spiritual only in the sensible form,[[33]](#footnote-33) he found the words of institution according to his interpretation so strong and power­ful, as to cause him to say. “Avaunt! to all such temptations.” “I acknowledge,”[[34]](#footnote-34) he says, at a later period, when speaking of these trials, “that if Dr Carlstadt, or any one else, had been able to convince me that a sacrament is nothing but bread and wine, he had done me a signal service. I have suffered so much vexation in regard to this matter, and have so wrestled and wriggled myself upon it, that I had very gladly been clear of it, for I very well saw what a great stroke I could deal the papacy through it. And I have had two who wrote to me more cleverly than Dr Carlstadt upon it,[[35]](#footnote-35) and who did not mangle the words either according to their own ideas. But I am *caught, and cannot get out.* The text is all too powerful for me, and the words will not out of my head. Yet this very day, if any one were to prove to me on solid grounds that simple bread and wine alone were there, I should be no longer so attacked. I am but too inclined to this view when I feel the Adam within me.” This confession, which Luther made at the outset of the dispute, gives us a deep insight into his heart, and explains his extreme sensitiveness and irrita­bility whenever this subject came under discussion; it touched an open wound in his otherwise great soul. These different modes of conceiving and representing the significance of the Supper, in reality very nearly related to each other, although in the outward form, in many respects, very different, result from the diverse intellectual character of the two Reformers, the basis of faith being the same in both. Zwingli was endowed by God both in regard to the phenomena of nature and the relations and affairs of life. These splendid endowments found food and nourish­ment which suited them along the flowery path of his youth and education. On the mountain summits, where heaven and earth are parted by a sharp drawn line, the reflective soul finds every­where occasion to admire the majesty of God outshining all the works of creation, while the understanding is sharpened and invi­gorated by the contemplation of the manifold objects which meet the eye within the range of vision. A profound and pensive intel­lect, with a predominant imagination, are Luther’s characteristics. The rougher and thornier the path of his youth and education were, the more deeply and intensely he turned his inner glance[[36]](#footnote-36) to the mysteries of his own being, where his imagination created a world of its own, which bore but little resemblance to outward relations. As to his eye, heaven and earth mingled with each other in one grey mass of fog and mist, his powerful imagination invested every emotion which awoke in his soul, every thought that arose there, in a visible tangible form.

The mental development of the two gifted youths, who began their studies at a time when intellectual life moved in two sepa­rate currents, corresponded also with the very differently formed impressions of their earlier years. The dry and barren learning of the schools, in the cultivation of which the best spirits of the middle ages exercised themselves, had lost, with many, its splen­dour and importance, and from Greece and Italy there arose the light of a better culture, in the spread of the knowledge of the dead languages, and of the glorious master-works of antiquity. God led the son of the Swiss mountaineer, the tender-feeling, sharp-witted, Zwingli, into this school, which afforded his intellect the requisite nourishment. Luther, the son of the Saxon plains, was conducted by another and a steeper path, that better corresponded with his peculiar cast of mind. Many deep-thinking men in Ger­many had already turned their regards from the superficial train­ing of the schools to fathom the soul, in order to sound in its depths the sacred mysteries of the life in God and the Saviour. And what they saw and felt in moments of spiritual awakening they set down in deeply-drawn characters for the instruction of mankind. God led the miner's son, the ardent Luther, into the deep shafts and passages in which these learned men have depo­sited their treasures, often, indeed, covered with a thick coating of dross. But both these youths the Lord had destined to one and the same great work; Zwingli was not to pitch his tent in the outer court of the Gentiles, nor Luther to dissipate his energies in dreamy contemplation behind cloister walls, and in the twilight of the mystics. By the mysterious process through which God conducts the men who seek Him to their proper stations in His kingdom, he led them both to Holy Scripture, to the apprehension of eternal truth, and to the feet of Him who alone is the true teacher. Thus the two greatest men of the time, the representatives of different kinds of intellect, and different directions of thought, stand before us with the combined testimony they sent forth,—“The Word of God is the only direc­tory of faith and practice; in Christ alone is salvation to be found,”—as two bright examples of the glory of divine teaching, and the power of the gospel. The Christian, indeed, suffers a pang, that one of them, under the influence of error, yielded so far to the bent of his natural disposition, as at times to compro­mise the love, which is the bond of perfectness, towards his brother, who stood on the same foundation of faith as himself. Yet God’s thoughts are not our thoughts; He allows the greatest minds to be overtaken by some infirmity, that we may give our hearts unreservedly to Him who knew no sin, and in whose mouth there was no guile.

6. How the Contest regarding the Supper broke out, and with what reasons Zwinglirebutted the objections ofLuther against his doctrine of the Supper.

Luther had, by his authority, and by the power of his preach­ing, restored order at Wittenberg, but the authors of the disturb­ances had not been converted from their opinions. The German people, who in many parts of the country sighed under severe oppression, often exercised with great injustice on the part of the civil and spiritual authorities, rose, in 1521 and 1525, in fierce insurrection against their tyrants. The Zwickau prophets took part in this rebellion, and the notorious Thomas Muenzer, in Thuringia and Suabia, exercised a very important and baleful influence in it.[[37]](#footnote-37) Carlstadt, too, gave himself up again to his former spirit of fanaticism, and abandoned, on his own respon­sibility, his post as professor and preacher in Wittenberg, to preach at Orlamuenda, near Lena, one of Wittenberg’s affiliated churches. Under his influence the images were here broken to shivers, and thrown out of the churches, and public worship altered in accordance with his views. In order to give his opinions a wider dissemination, he erected, at Lena, a printing-press, from which he issued a series of small publications, to the great displeasure of Luther. He had, in one of these pieces, entitled, “Whether it can be proved, by Holy Scripture, that Christ is present in the Sacrament with body, blood, and soul,” delivered the opinion (1524), that Christ, at the institution of the Supper, referred in the words, “Take, eat,” to the bread, on the other hand, to himself in the words, “This is my body.” From hence he drew the conclusion, that neither bread nor wine are changed into the body and blood of Christ, as the papists teach, nor that the body and blood of Christ unite with the wine, as Luther’s opinion was, but that the bread and wine are only symbols of Christ’s broken body and shed blood, and that the ordinance of the Supper is a *solemn commemoration of the body of Christ given for us.*

Luther expressed his just indignation at the seditious propen­sities of the Zwickau prophets, and Carlstadt’s despicable beha­viour; in his work,[[38]](#footnote-38) “Against the heavenly prophets,” and in an Appendix to it, “On Images and the Sacraments,” he assailed with great vehemence the view Carlstadt had expressed on the Supper. This gave rise to a violent paper-war betwixt Luther and Carlstadt.[[39]](#footnote-39) In the end, Carlstadt was forced to quit Orlamuenda and the Saxon territory, being threatened with banishment for dis­obedience. He now directed his erring steps to the south, whither his friend Muenzer had proceeded, to take part in the insurrection of the peasants in Suabia. His work upon the Supper, which was disseminated with great zeal, operated like a firebrand in Ger­many, many having already quarrelled with the Transubstantiation of the Roman Catholic Church without either adopting Luther’s artificial solution of the difficulty, or being able to form a more satisfactory one of their own from Scripture. The strife upon this subject came to none more unseasonably than to the truly pious Zwingli, whoever treated what was holy with a tender reserve, and would have it so treated by others. He had already in private gained so many friends for his own view as developed above, and which had its firm foundation in the Word of God, that he ventured to hope “it would pass into the hearts of the faithful without the noise of angry warfare. For nearly all to whom he opened it, breathed freely, and looked gladly up like people returning from the darkness and solitude of a dungeon, meet­ing the gracious light and kind friends.” “Now Carlstadt comes forward,” continues Zwingli, “with his declaration, a too strained one, as even his most ardent followers admit, after they had weighed the sentiments of the ancients upon the subject which I produced to them. I have also learned that Carlstadt had resolved to come to Zurich for the purpose alone of talking over this subject with me, upon which he is grossly ignorant. Some,[[40]](#footnote-40) however, in their dark fanatical spirit, have so strongly dissuaded him from a meeting with me, that he has not even saluted me when he saw me. Nay, the medicine they have given him has operated in this respect so powerfully, that he neither at Basle nor at Strasburg spoke a syllable with the ministers of the Word upon that subject. Those also to whom I have just referred, as being filled with a dark fanatical spirit, were well acquainted with my views of the Supper, although they could by no means be brought to accede to them. No sooner, however, had they heard of Carlstadt’s declaration of opinion, than they hasted to Basle[[41]](#footnote-41) themselves, brought his books on their backs hither, and filled not only cities, towns, and villages with them, but even the hamlets. The result, however, by no means corresponded to their expectation, for very few adopted the opinion, as I think, deterred by the hardness and violence of the interpretation. What should I now do who have to preach the Word of God in Zurich? Although a great part of the brethren were agreed, in regard to the main point, (for each had for himself learned through faith and my preaching how unreasonable it is to look for flesh and blood in that which Christ, speaking of His body and blood, has declared to be spirit and life,) yet they withheld their consent from so rash an interpretation. I say, what was I to do, who saw Carlstadt thus running eagerly to the goal but missing it? Was I to repel the people back once more to their former error against my own convictions. I did this: I began immediately to explain the figurative meaning (trope) which lies in the words of our Lord, and I did it with so much success, that the brethren comprehended all I had to say, ere I was half through with the explanation I had to make. When could I have more seasonably come forward with my opinion than just then when the subject had been broached in so dangerous a manner? Nay, would it have been at all wise to have kept silence?”

To this step, Zwingli was in part also induced by a resolution of the Zurich Council which forbad the dissemination and read­ing of Carlstadt’s writings. Although the Reformer disapproved of such a measure in itself, he had double cause to find fault with it here, inasmuch as it had a tendency to suppress the truth along with error. He accordingly expressed openly his disapprobation of it, and effected its withdrawal. At the same time, he com­bated the error which lay in Carlstadt’s view, and established the truth by an exhibition of his own opinions. This difficult task he had not only to perform in Zurich, but also elsewhere, as the contest so passionately entered into by Luther and Carl­stadt began to burst out in various places. Thus the two parsons of Reutlingen, Matthew Alber, who adhered to Luther’s views, and Conrad Hermann, who approved of Carlstadt’s explanation, desired to hold a public disputation upon the subject, and in this manner involve the community in the dispute. As soon as Zwingli heard of this intention, he wrote a letter to Alber, stating his opinions at length, and strongly dissuading him against a disputation. Zwingli adjured Alber “by Jesus Christ, the Judge of the quick and the dead, (so strong was his language,) to show this letter to none of whom he did not cer­tainly know that he was firm in the faith on one Lord.” The letter, however, was widely circulated in Southern Germany, in Switzerland, and in Alsace, a dissemination which Zwingli indeed himself aided by sending copies of it to friends on whom he had reliance, such as Bucer and Capito[[42]](#footnote-42) in Strasburg, Œcolampadius in Basle, &c. They all expressed their decided approval of the contents. Intelligence of Zwingli’s views upon the sacrament reached Luther also, who, however, had not the least idea that the Zurich Reformer had gained these by an independent study of the Word of God, or that they differed in any respect from Carlstadt’s. Under this impression, he wrote on the 21st Decem­ber 1524, to Amsdorf: “Carlstadt’s poison is spreading fast. Already Zwingli and Leo Jud have adopted his opinions.” Carlstadt now occupied in Luther’s heated imagination the same position to Zwingli and his like-minded friends in Southern Germany, as Thomas Muenzer did to the insurrectionary peasants in Thuringia and Suabia. Had Luther exercised but a small degree of self-control, he would have soon perceived how ground­less his suspicions were, and that Zwingli’s views of the Supper had just as little origin in the fanaticism of the heavenly prophets as that spring flowers derive their blossoms from wintry storms. Nor did they know that this calm and temperate champion of the faith was to all insurrectionists, to use his own words on the subject, “as favourable as to the devil.” But instead of confining himself to a calm examination of the subject in the clear light of truth, he gave full rein to the fury of a fancy enkindled by passion, and falsely attributed to Zwingli and his friends[[43]](#footnote-43) opinions, motives, and qualities of soul, which were as far from him as midnight darkness is from the noontide light. Thus Luther never got free of the mistake that Zwingli denied *the presence* of Christ in the Supper, while the latter distinctly says: “That he regards the Lord’s Supper without the presence of Christ in it as an enormity, before which every Christian must shudder.”[[44]](#footnote-44) But, according to him, Christ, who has all life in himself, and gives life to all who believe on Him, is not present in *the lifeless bread,* but *in the believing soul.*

Keeping, then, the grounds in view, with which Luther com­bated Zwingli’s view, and those with which the latter defended himself, let us, for the sake of clearness, represent them both as delivering their sentiments in their own words:—

*Luther:* The sixth chapter of the gospel of John, on which you build your view of the holy Supper, speaks not of this sacrament at all; why do you refer to it?

*Zwingli:* For this reason: you draw into the sacrament *material* flesh and blood. It is this very passage which gives us a solu­tion of the bodily eating of the flesh and blood of Christ, by the statement which it makes, “that it profiteth nothing.” As you, on the other hand, make this corporeal partaking essential to the sacrament, how could I better answer the error than in the words of Christ himself, with which he corrects in his disciples the very same error? Christ teaches here the gospel; the Jews and his disciples were led astray by his words, and stumbled at corporeal flesh-eating. If now in the sacrament any one fall erroneously upon the idea of eating material flesh, the antidote for this error is to be sought in the place where it was first grown.

*Luther:* When Christ, however, says, John vi., “The flesh profiteth nothing,” He is not to be understood as speaking of His own flesh, but of the nature and infirmity of flesh generally, as in Isaiah xl. 6, “All flesh is grass.” Christ’s meaning is, that carnal understanding profiteth nothing, He by no means saying, *“My* flesh profiteth nothing;” for how could he mean this, since it is by it we are redeemed?

*Zwingli:* It is true, in the first place, that carnal understand­ing profiteth nothing. On the contrary, it is hurtful. Christ however is not here speaking of carnal understanding, as you maintain; for by speaking of carnal understanding in the bad sense, He would not have replied to the doubts and objections of the disciples, which had reference to corporeal eating. Hence the answer of Christ must regard the corporeal eating of His flesh in such a manner as to remove these doubts and objections; for if not, then He has not corrected their misconception at all, but has begun a new discourse about carnal understanding, which is contrary to His custom, whichever is to resolve doubts, and to explain His misunderstood words. Moreover, the narrative itself tells us very distinctly that Christ *did* reply to the mur­murs which His disciples raised in regard to the bodily eating of His flesh. For it runs thus: “When Jesus knew in himself that his disciples murmured at it, he said unto them,” &c. These words plainly show that He is about to resolve that point, which caused them difficulty. Farther, the succeeding words show that he continues to speak of the former subject of discourse, and abides by it, “Therefore said I unto you, that no man can come unto me except it were given unto him of my Father.” For He thrice at least repeats the sense of these words. In short, the point in dispute was the eating of His flesh, of which Christ says “that it profiteth nothing,” as they understood it. But in the second place, that Christ does not say *my* flesh, but simply *the* flesh, can create no misunderstanding, for His language had reference to no other flesh but His own. Nor does He say *my* Spirit it is which quickens, but simply *the* Spirit that quickeneth. But every believer understands that He is here speaking of His Spirit, although He does not expressly say *my* Spirit. In the third place, the flesh of Christ profits us much, for it was cruci­fied for us. The Jews and the disciples, however, would not rightly understand this, referring what He said to corporeal eat­ing. Therefore Christ says my flesh eaten profits nothing, but crucified it brings us the greatest good which the history of man has ever witnessed.

*Luther:* The words of the institution are, “This is my body; this is my blood;” and these words we must believe, for he who believes not every word that Christ has spoken will be damned.

*Zwingli:* This is true, but we must first see that we rightly understand the sense of Christ’s words. For to misunderstand Christ’s words, and to build our faith on this misconception, is not believing Christ’s words, but our own misunderstanding of them. It is well said, all the words of God are to be believed without reserve, but first of all we must understand the words ere we believe them. Else through the not understanding of them we deceive ourselves, while we think to maintain our mis­understanding by crying out, “We are to believe God’s word.” We must therefore seek to comprehend rightly the words of insti­tution, by comparing them with such passages as, “the flesh profiteth nothing;” “the field is the world;” “John is Elias;” “the rock was Christ.” Then we shall find that they express a figure, for “this signifies my body,” or “this is the symbol of my body,” as which they must be understood.

*Luther:* I will have no “figuratising”[[45]](#footnote-45) of the word of God; we must take Christ’s words in their plain natural sense, “this is my body.”

*Zwingli:* Then it follows that the bread is changed into the very body of Christ. The Roman Pope then is right in his doc­trine of Transubstantiation, and Paul is wrong when he says, 1 Cor. x. 17, “We are all partakers of that one bread,” here call­ing that bread which is in reality the body of Christ,

*Luther:* The words of Christ are not to be understood as implying that the bread is changed into the substance of the body of Christ, but that while we bless the bread the body of Christ unites with the consecrated bread, and while we bless the cup the blood of Christ unites with the wine. Hence Paul, 1 Cor. x. 16, calls the *consecrated* cup the communion of the blood of Christ, and the bread broken the communion of the body of Christ.

*Zwingli:* But in the first place, you must not translate “the cup of blessing” in the passage quoted, but “the cup of thanks­giving,” for the Greek words, *ευλογια* and *ευλογειν*,[[46]](#footnote-46) signify thanks­giving, or to give thanks, and not to bless or consecrate. In like manner, the place in Psalm cxiii. 2, where the same word occurs, ought not to be rendered, “Blessed be the name of the Lord,” but, the Lord’s name is to be praised, or given thanks to. The word communion is here taken for community or congregation. Hence this is the meaning of the words: The cup of praise or thanks­giving with which we give Thee praise or thanks, or which we drink with thanksgiving, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? For we are all one bread and one body, since we all are partakers of one bread with one another. Paul will in these words turn the Christians at Corinth from idolatrous worship and sacrifice, and he propounds this doctrine to them: “Ye are another community than that ye should eat in the community of idolaters; for you are the community of the body and blood of Christ. When ye then take the sacrament, and eat and drink with one another, ye show that ye are one body and one blood;” to wit, the body of the Church manifesting itself through faith on the Lord Jesus Christ, who gave his body and his blood for them. Now Paul calls the believers the community or communion of the blood of Christ, as may be clearly deduced from the words, “for we being many are one bread and one body, for we are all partakers of that one bread.” Mark how plainly he calls us one bread and one body, for the reason that we eat together of one bread. This is the true sense of the passage.”[[47]](#footnote-47) Moreover, if the words, “this is my body,” are not to be understood, as you admit, in the sense that the bread is changed into the real body of Christ, it is evident they are not to be taken in their plain and natural sense. What then, I pray you, is their meaning, in your opinion?

*Luther*: They signify the bread and they signify the body of Christ at once in the sense, “This is bread and this is the body of Christ, or in the bread is the body of Christ.”

*Zwingli:* Thus the words of our Lord are not plain and simple, but are to be understood in a twofold sense, if they designate bread and the body of Christ. If bread remains bread, and if in the bread the body of Christ is partaken of, then they are not taken in their plain natural sense, but they form what is called a synecdoche.[[48]](#footnote-48) For Christ did not say, “in the bread is my body,” but He said, “bread is my body.” Do you see, dear Luther, how you yourself depart from the plain and natural signification of the words, and declare them to contain a figure of speech? What reasonable ground have you now to set up against the view that they ought to be understood as a conditional or figurative form of speech, seeing that you yourself maintain them to be a synecdoche, and thus figurative?

*Luther:* The bread is bread, and at the same time also the body of Christ; both the bread and the body of Christ are partaken of in this sacrament in a wonderful and to us inexplicable manner.

*Zwingli:* Christ called upon the Jews to believe Him for the very works’ sake, if not otherwise; for the *wonders* were done so openly, that none could deny them. Show us then here the *wonder,* that we may see and believe it. For Christ has before­hand prophesied, “For there shall arise false Christs and false prophets, and shall show great signs and wonders; insomuch, that if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect.” If then we are to be cautious in respect of wonders, even where they are actually wrought, how much more in respect of those that are not done at all, and that are nowhere in the Word of God given out as such.

*Luther:* The body of Christ is not partaken of in a gross or sensible manner, but in a way known to Christ alone.

*Zwingli:* Yet it must be partaken of in a very gross and carnal manner, if the words are to be understood in their plain and natural sense. For in this sense they are: this bread is this my body given for you. Now it is a gross body, a body covered with wounds and strokes that has been given for us, and consequently, it is this body which must be partaken of by us, if the words are to be taken in their plain, obvious and natural sense; or, if not, please to show us, by passages from Holy Scripture, in what other way He is to be partaken of?

*Luther:* The body of Christ is everywhere, for He governs and fills all things.

*Zwingli:* Then the angel proclaimed to the women an untruth when he told them, “He is not here, but is risen.” And Christ, who is the truth itself, has spoken what is untrue, for he repeatedly assured his disciples he would be no more in this world, that is in his humanity.

*Luther:* The humanity of Christ is everywhere present, and tills all things as wheat tills a sack, and He is also in a peculiar manner present in this sacrament, that we may know where to find him.

*Zwingli:* The assertion that the body of Christ fills all things is opposed to the words of the angel, and were it true, would destroy the reality of His ascension and make it a deception. The assertion, then, is an absurd one, which is entirely coined out of your own brain, and contradicted by the written Word. In respect of the second part of your reply, it is contradicted by what Christ says in respect of the time in which we live, that is to say the interval between his ascension to heaven and the day of judgment, Matt. xxiv. 26-27. “Wherefore, if they shall say unto you, Behold, he is in the desert; go not forth: behold, he is in the secret chambers; believe it not. For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be.” It is also in opposition to the articles of the Christian creed, “He is ascended to heaven, where he sits at the right hand of God, the Father, from whence also he shall come to judge the world,”&c. Finally, it is at variance with the words of Christ, Matt. xxvi. 64, “Hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of power,” &c. Lo! the Son of man sits at the right hand of God, and from thence reveals His power and glory from this time forward, as He him­self says. And from this time forward we are not to seek for Him anywhere else, but at the right hand of the Father.

*Luther:* What we assert does all take place in a manner invisible, for Christ does not descend to us and again ascend to heaven by a ladder or by a stair.

*Zwingli:* It is, however, contradicted by the words of the angel, Acts i. 11: “This same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen Him *go into heaven.”*

*Luther:* Yes, so He will come to judgment. But this passage has no reference to His presence in the Supper.

*Zwingli:* Holy Scripture only teaches that He will come a second time to judgment, and forbids us to seek for Him anywhere but in heaven, at the Father’s right hand. Nay, Christ calls those false prophets who shall point to Him as here or as there, and says, *“from henceforth* ye shall see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of power.” In this time, which he designates with the words “from henceforth,” we are now living. Therefore, we will contemplate Him there where he is. For wherefore should He unite His natural body with the bread in the Supper?

*Luther:* That it may confirm and assure our hearts and faith.

*Zwingli:* It is the Spirit, as Christ himself tells us, that quickens, the flesh profiteth nothing. And this Spirit is, accord­ing to His promise, to abide with us, and teach us what we are to speak, so that we require to take no thought what to say, Matt, x. 19.

*Luther:* By the corporeal eating, the remission of sins is in part given to us.

*Zwingli:* That Christ by his death has atoned for our sins, having become a curse for us, is a truth so oft repeated in Scripture, that it is not necessary here particularly to state it. But if sins be forgiven by the natural partaking of the body of Christ, the sins of the disciples would have been already pardoned at the Supper. In this case, the blood of Christ shed for us would not alone cleanse us from all sin, as the apostle John assures us in his 1st Epistle, chap. i. ver. 7, but the draught of wine at the Supper would effect this purpose also. For what reason then did Christ die on the cross? Or, are there two paths to justification, one by faith and another by the corporeal partaking of the body and blood of Christ? Into what an abyss of confusion do we plunge ourselves, when we leave the Word of God, and indulge in our own idle imaginations?

*Luther:* In the bread the very thing is presented to us which is proclaimed by the preaching of the Word.

*Zwingli:* But what are we to make of such passages as, “He who believeth on me hath everlasting life,” “No man cometh unto me except my Father draw him.” If a man can really give the salvation which he preaches in so substantial a form as this, why do we not make those who hear the gospel, but who believe it not, even against their will, partakers of the draught, which is bitter indeed to them, but of healing power?

*Luther:* You are so obtuse and so unspiritual that you com­prehend nothing at all of these high things, which must be spiritually understood. It is those only who *believe* who partake of the body of Christ naturally.

*Zwingli:* Yet we *believe,* and yet do not partake of the body of Christ in a natural manner.

*Luther:* We must believe that we partake in this Sacrament of the body of Christ, and they who believe this, they partake of it.

*Zwingli:* Take care of making a dangerous sport of *faith,* now attaching one sense to it, now another, according as it suits your purpose. Is not saving faith this: to believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, and to place our trust alone in Him? Why con­found so dishonestly a sound faith in Christ with notions entirely contrary to the language and spirit of Scripture? Is there in the whole Bible the slightest intimation that we are to believe that the body and blood of Christ are to be partaken of naturally united with the bread? What apostle has ever said: “We *believe* that we have eaten or drunk thee?” Have not all with one consent confessed: We believe that thou art Christ, the Son of the living God? You, however, would perform a certain jugglery before the eyes of the simple-minded, and you screen and defend your vain conceit under the holy name of faith. And you stigmatise us with the names of heretics, false teachers, and unbe­lievers, for not accepting this vain conceit of yours, because we have learnt something very different from the Word of God. We however set our confidence in God through Jesus Christ, know­ing that this faith alone saves us, and not your silly dreaming. For nowhere do we learn from the Word of God that Christ is corporeally partaken of in the Supper, but most surely we learn that we are to feed upon Him in the sense of believing on Him, John vi. May God grant you grace better to know Him and His Word, Amen.

These are the chief objections which were made by Luther against Zwingli’s views, which the latter triumphantly repelled, with arms borrowed from the chamber of God’s Word. The dis­pute, indeed, branched itself out into various questions, some more nearly, some but very distantly, connected with the Sacra­ment, as, for example, the relation to each other of the two natures in Christ, As it is impossible for us to pursue the debate into the ramifications into which it spread, we abstain from entering farther into this question here. Zwingli, making a complete refutation of Luther’s view by the Word of God, and establishing His own upon it, his opponent became more and more pressed to make use of those arguments which the Roman Catholic Church have advanced in defence of Transubstantiation. From this point of view, Luther ascribed to the Sacraments an importance in dia­metric opposition to his earlier statements, and which not a little jeopardised the doctrine of justification by faith. If he formerly taught, “Before God we have quite enough to do to believe the gospel; but now He will have us to serve men, and to make a profession of the faith which we bear in our hearts by some out­ward signs before the world,” he now mounted to the thoroughly papistical assertion, “When I present to you the bread, I present to you God with all his gifts.”[[49]](#footnote-49) He compared now the Sacra­ment to “the sun,” which daily rises, and describes its circuit in the heavens, remaining ever the same sun. Immovable and unchanged, whether man see and feel it or not, the same to the blind, or to him that closes the window, so that it neither shines upon, nor warms him, so also the Sacraments, when celebrated according to the Word of God, are in their nature complete and perfect, and saving works of God. In contrast with this com­parison, which ascribes to the Sacrament far too high a position and importance, to the detriment of the glory of Christ, Zwingli illus­trated the position of the Redeemer, exalted to the right hand of God, by the same figure. “Consider,” says he, “the sun, which, being a limited body, is not in two places at once. Yet it enlightens the whole earth, so that Indian and Spaniard, Mus­covite and Moor, behold it, although none of these lands or peoples are in contact with the sun’s disc. Thus, the Sun of Righteousness, Jesus Christ, real God and man, is, with the splendour and glory of His divine power and nature, everywhere present. On the other hand, the body of His humanity is only in one place, at the right of the Father, but yet He is everywhere gazed on, and contemplated by the eye of the soul and faith. He is our satisfaction, although He is but in one place, namely, in heaven. Nor shall we wish Him down as little as we should desire to draw the sun to the earth. There above, at the right hand of the Majesty on high, He sits enthroned in glory, casting down upon us the beams of His grace, and disseminating upon those who are round about Him the rays of light, joy, and bliss.”

Luther allowed himself so far to be carried away by the false view he had once adopted as to make the assertion: “Although a knave, or an unbeliever, take or give the Sacrament, he takes the right Sacrament, that is, Christ’s body and blood, just the same as if he acted most piously.” To this Zwingli answered, “Christ says, He who eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood abides in Me, and I in him. None would be bold enough to maintain that a knave, or an unbeliever, is in Christ, and Christ in him, which yet, according to your statement, would be true. It is certain that the impious partake of the Sacrament in the symbols of the body and blood of Christ, and, indeed, to their damnation. But believers alone partake of Christ by faith truly, and hence they abide in Christ and He in them. The statement, that faith is not necessary to preach the gospel, and to dispense the Sacrament, is directly opposed to Holy Scripture, and is an arrow from the Pope’s quiver. Paul says, 1 Cor. iv. 2, ‘More­over it is required in stewards that a man be found faithful.’ But how can a man be faithful to God, his Lord, without believing on Him, and loving Him? The office of the ministry[[50]](#footnote-50) above all requires faith; for, he who does not possess it, is no servant of God, but a servant of the devil, and administers his word. The same holds, in the administration of the Sacrament, the celebra­tion of which is one of the duties of the Christian ministry. He who has not faith would sooner conjure the devil than the body of Christ.”

*Luther:* Yes, it comes all by the power and Word of God.

*Zwingli:* Were not devils expelled by the Word of God, and the blind made to see? Look more narrowly at the words of Peter, Acts iii. 6, “In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, rise up and walk.” Has not the impotent here been made to stand up by the power of God? Has not Peter pronounced the name of Jesus upon Him? But no man can call Jesus Lord, except by the Holy Ghost. It is, however, the believer alone who speaks and acts in the Holy Ghost. Attend to the passage, in Mark xvi. 17, “And these signs shall follow them that believe: in my name shall they cast out devils,” &c. Observe here to whom it is that the Lord grants power to work wonders, and to act in His name, it is to *those who believe.* Whoever, then, in the stead of Christ, discharges the office of the ministry, and dispenses the Sacrament, must have faith above all things.

7. The Different Manner in which Zwingli and Luther conducted the Contest; the Result of it.

Having thus stated the arguments and counter-arguments advanced by Zwingli and Luther in this disputation, we shall now cast a glance at the spirit in which each of them waged the contest.

“While we think it must be clear to every unprejudiced mind that Zwingli had on his side the Word of God, rightly un­derstood, we shall also find that he conducted the contest, in which he became involved without any fault of his, in such a manner as became a Christian. Unhappily the same cannot be said of Luther. We must not, indeed, leave out of view that this eminent man had suffered much from youth up, that he had come through a rough school, where, of necessity he had to take on a rough outside, if he would not altogether sink into intellectual apathy and imbecility. He himself, indeed, confesses: “My hull may be somewhat hard, but the kernel is tender and soft.” Unfortunately he exposed only to Zwingli the hard rind. While he with justice regarded himself as a chosen vessel of the Lord for the reformation of the Church, he committed the great mistake of looking upon every opinion or doctrine he himself espoused as a truth of God,[[51]](#footnote-51) and of infallible certainty. From this point of view it was natural to regard those of his adversary as suggested by Satan.[[52]](#footnote-52) Accord­ingly, at the very outset of the contest, he spoke the terrible words which permitted no change or modification of his views afterwards:[[53]](#footnote-53) “One party must belong to the devil, and be God’s enemy; there is no middle way.” How very differently Zwingli judges of his position to his opponents! He was as convinced as Luther was of himself that he was a servant of God, and called to co-operate in the great work of Reformation, but he never forgot that *we are all men liable to err.* Accordingly, he began every disquisition on this important subject of debate with prayer to God for illumination; while Luther began or ended every one of his with some reference to the devil.[[54]](#footnote-54) In his very first writing on the subject in his letter to Alber, Zwingli prays: “Almighty God lead us on the right path, and if we are about to undertake anything against Thy truth, O send Thy angel, that we may not be turned aside to the folly of ignorance or of love of vain-glory, but that He may thrust us to the wall till our foot be crushed, that is, till the impure carnality be quenched, that we no more blaspheme the name of God.”

With what mildness and love does he reply to Luther’s heavy accusation that the devil had whispered him his doctrine! “You write, dear Luther, ‘that the devil has taken possession of us; we had indeed read that Christ hath died for us, but we receive it not into our hearts.’ We do not know what better to say to this than to reply in the words of Paul, ‘Who art thou that judgest another man’s servant?’ (Rom. xiv. 4.) If we repeat to you the sum of what we believe and teach, you either say we have learned it from you—and is it not wonderful that if we have learned it from you, you do not recognise your own doctrine?—or you say we do not believe our own confession. What are we to do? We can do nothing but joyfully bear the reproach, and lay our case before the just Judge.”

Zwingli, in the course of the contest, having established many self-contradictions against Luther, that he might be led to reflect he too was subject to error, assures him: “I say this in truth, not to make any insulting reproach against you, but *to hold up your­self to yourself.* How can you refrain from saying, when your own assertions are held up to you, “I have made a mistake?” How short, but how healing for all the churches were these simple words! Is there among mortals one that with right can be called free from error? Nothing unusual would happen to you were you to say, “I am mistaken.” For we all go wrong in many respects. Then, indeed, something quite unheard of would happen to you were it to be said Luther has never stumbled, never erred. Nay, it were altogether blasphemous were we foolish enough to ascribe to you that which alone belongs to the Supreme Being. Reflect how much trouble you will spare the poor people of Ger­many, who all entertain this view, which you will not espouse, or will not dare to espouse if you speak this single word. Conquer, yes, undoubtedly conquer, will our opinion; but if you oppose it, the victory will be all the more dearly purchased; all will congra­tulate themselves upon it if you but say, “I am mistaken.” To err, to stumble, to deceive oneself, is human; and you will not deem anything human foreign to you.” With the greatest anxiety and tenderness he endeavoured to extricate his opponent from the meshes of passion in which he had wound himself, and to gain him over to a more gracious and dignified management of his cause. “There were many,” he says, “ere your ill-temper laid itself, who, in the heat of the debate, treated of this important subject, upright and conscientious men they were, whom you spared not in a manner consistent either with your own or their dignity. I now appeal from Luther in a passion to Luther appeased and pacified. For it cannot escape you how dangerous it is to take counsel of anger, self-conceit, obstinacy, and ill-humour, and other passions; with what boldness and insolence they pass themselves off as justice, courage, firmness, and dignity. Give up, I pray you, your scolding, which is disreputable, and cease to overwhelm us only with hard words. Not as though I cared for such blasts; I have, thank God, pretty well accustomed myself to them, and stand upon a rock which does not reel, and which gives me a sure footing against the storm; but I greatly prefer to see truth coming forward in its own might and strength than to see a man making himself unamiable by the use of unmeasured language, which always gives cause to suspect there is pride at bottom. Let us reflect also that God is a spectator of this contest: He who knows better than we ourselves the spirit in which we act. Let us also consider that not only the whole of Germany but the whole of Christendom, not only the present but future centuries to the end of time are our judges, and that they will form a juster judgment of this matter, because they will be less infected by passion.” With a tender pastoral fidelity he sought to prevent this conflict from disturbing the peace and interests of the renovated Church; and with this object in view, he composed all his first treatises in the Latin language, that the subject might be discussed among the learned, and that only after they had come to a solution of it, it might descend to the common people. “It was my opinion,” he writes to Luther, “that you also should conduct this dispute in the Latin language, that it might be first sifted by the learned, and the community only then be made acquainted with it when a satisfactory solution had been arrived at.” But Luther disappointed this well-conceived intention. With the impetuosity of his character, he threw the gauntlet amongst the people, and strove to rouse and animate them against Zwingli and his friends. When this subject came, however, to be discussed among the people, Luther and his friends found to their deep disappointment, that their measures had produced entirely opposite results to that which they anticipated. They then, in direct opposition to the prin­ciples they had formerly propounded in reference to the freedom of the Church, made themselves guardians or tutors of the people. They got prohibitions passed against the dissemination of the writings of Zwingli and Œcolampadius, and caused their followers, in various places, to be persecuted; “For now,” wrote Luther to the landgrave of Hessen, “it is a war to the knife with the Sacramentalists,” as Zwingli and his friends were called by their opponents. Zwingli was deeply grieved and justly indignant at this behaviour of Luther and his party. He tenderly upbinds the wounds of the Christians, who found themselves lacerated in their inmost souls by this strife, in these words: “Hold, dear Christians, *to the Lord;* not to Paul, nor Peter, nor Luther, nor Zwingli. It is evidence of a weak, not to say sluggish faith too plain, ‘to which side shall I now turn, as these two hold different opinions.’ For who are we, that none are to dissent from our opinions? Is it not a true saying, that every man is a liar? Cling, then, to the Lord, and carry on His work unweariedly, and give no countenance even to the most learned, or to the most pious, to imagine it is a sin if any be not of their opinion.”

In reference to the prohibition of his books, in total abnegation of the principles of Christian freedom, which Zwingli had brought so powerfully into play against the popedom, Zwingli expresses himself in the following terms, in a writing against Dr Strauss:[[55]](#footnote-55) “Tell me, which of the two appear to have a suspicious cause. Those who allow the writings of their opponents to circulate freely and without violent restrictions, combating them in an open and manly way before their respective communities, or they who bark against their opponents before the simple-minded, write publicly against them, and calumniate them in writings, which they very much recommend to the perusal of their flocks; but when their antagonists reply or explain, shout instantly, while they prohibit their writings, “they are not to be listened to at all; a grosser heresy has never lifted its head?” Which think you separate from the Word of God and his Church? You or we? We let your writings, the pope’s, and every anti-Christ’s writings be freely read, and combat your errors alone with the sword of the Word of God.[[56]](#footnote-56) You, on the other hand, mean to accomplish your objects by prohibitions. You, Strauss, do this, and others besides you, and you mean to introduce a new power and tyranny amongst us? What has the pope done but issue the command: ‘Let that alone. Don’t read that. It is heretical?’ When you now, in like manner, banish the truth from your churches, what are you but new popes, who deprive the community of their free judgment, and move the princes just as the pope did to protect your errors. This is departure from the Word of God; this is separation and schism. But the path to unity is to allow freedom to all, to bring before the congregation everything that can make for or against an opinion, and then to leave the people to judge for themselves. For God is not a God of division, but of unity; He will not allow those to err who are assembled together in his Spirit; He will cause peace, unity, and concord to effloresce in the churches.” Thus Zwingli, at the same time that he defended the honest convictions of his soul, defended ecclesiastical liberty against that new species of tutelage to which Luther and his followers would subject it.

While Luther thought he must bring prominently forward his great merits as a Reformer compared to Zwingli, in such language as: “We dare vaunt ourselves that Christ has been first preached by us. If the popedom were as terrible as of old, these people would be as still as mice. But now Zwingli reproaches us with denying Christ. Such is the reward we get for acknowledging these people;”[[57]](#footnote-57) our Reformer satisfied himself, in reply to such groundless imputations, with a simple defence of his own in­dependent part in the work of Reformation. “When you make the boast that you were the first to lug forth the Bible from under the bench, you go, methinks, too far. If we examine who by their philological acquirements made it first known, we shall find it was, some years ago, Valla,[[58]](#footnote-58) and in our own times, Erasmus, the pious Reuchlin and Pettikan. Without their assistance, neither you nor others had effected what has now been done—I mean in so far as the work may be ascribed to man. But who dare boast himself? Is it not God alone who gives the increase? Are not Paul’s words here in their place, 1 Cor. iii. 6, 7: ‘I have planted, Apollos watered; but God gave the increase. So then neither is he that planteth anything, neither he that watereth; but God that giveth the increase;’ and ‘Not unto us, O Lord, but unto thy name be the praise.’ On the other hand, I shall gladly recognise your merits. Although there were not a few, my good Luther, who knew the sum and sub­stance of true religion as well as yourself, yet none in all Israel dared to come forward to the fight, so terribly they feared that dreadful Goliath that stood opposed to them in his full panoply and power. Here, here you were the true David, anointed by the Lord for the work. Wherefore, all believing souls will never cease to sing with joy and gladness, ‘Saul hath slain his thou­sands, but David his tens of thousands. Now, as for myself, dear Luther, I have ever reverenced my teachers as fathers. If, then, out of the fulness which God has granted to you, anything had flowed to me, why should I not acknowledge it? Why, above all, if I had learned the contents of the gospel from you, should not I confess it? But I shall candidly tell you how it is. There were many distinguished men, long before the name of Martin Luther became famous, who truly recognised in what the essence of religion consisted, and who were instructed by very different teachers from those whom you suppose. For in respect of myself, I testify before God that I learned the substance and chief con­tents of the gospel partly by the perusal of John and the writings of Augustine, and partly by the diligent study of the Epistles of Paul in the original Greek, which, with this hand, I copied out eleven years ago, (1516,) eight of which years you have been ruling like a king.” In such a modest and amiable spirit Zwingli answered Luther’s hard words, never for an instant forgetting that they stood *upon the same basis of faith.* While he repelled Faber, who sought to extract advantage from this dispute between him and Luther in the preliminary skirmish before the Baden Disputation, with the observation, “Luther and I will be truly *one* without your interference, for we have one faith in Jesus Christ,” he endeavoured to bring Luther himself to the conscious­ness of this unity in faith, reminding him of the contest between Paul and Barnabas, on Mark’s account, as told to us in Acts xviii., “Here, in truth, the noblest vessel and armoury of God, Paul, was in the wrong. For why should not Mark join them in the work of the gospel, he having never denied it, although he had left them in Pamphylia, and had gone to Jerusalem? Here Bar­nabas, a decisive, resolute, but at the same time mild and tem­perate Christian, was in the right, while Paul was in the wrong. Although the dispute betwixt them waxed so hot that they parted from one another, yet they were again *one.* For Paul, in 1 Cor. ix., which he wrote long after their dissension, makes honourable mention of Barnabas. We then humbly pray Luther, by the same spirit in which we all live, in which he has preached the gospel, as we also believe it, by the same spirit in which, at the last day, we shall have wished to preach it, to reflect that he is not exalted above error, since Paul himself, in the heat of temper, went too far, who yet, in respect of doctrine and holiness, is equal to, or even surpasses, all the apostles. We know Luther’s courageous advance against the Papacy, when none ventured it. We know, at the same time, however, which, with God’s grace, he will also admit, that his knowledge and learning are but of moderate dimensions; let him therefore beware lest the devil tempt him to pride. God has given him strength of soul enough, let him turn it to His glory, and sure we are that we shall be in all respects one with him. May the God of truth grant this. Amen.”[[59]](#footnote-59)

While Zwingli in this contest was much superior to his anta­gonist in the clear establishment of his position by passages from the Word of God, which to every unprejudiced mind must be convincing, he at the same time greatly excelled him in the pious delicacy and reserve with which he handled things sacred. How wisely and tenderly selected are the images by which he illus­trated his conception of the significance of the Supper. It is enough to remind the reader of the image of the royal marriage ­ring, and of that of the sun. We cannot, however, restrain our­selves from mentioning a third, which he made use of in his sermon at Berne to represent that the bread and wine of the Eucharist distinguishes itself above all other bread and wine, in significance if not in substance. “The flower in the phillet of the bride is far more glorious there than if it stood alone and for itself, although the same flower. Thus, likewise, the stuff and substance of the bread in the Holy Supper is the same as in other bread, but the dignity and solemnity of this holy transac­tion lends to it a peculiar character, that in this respect it is not like other bread, but holy bread.” Luther, on the other hand, often gave way to rude and coarse expressions,[[60]](#footnote-60) which Zwingli always encountered with meekness, or at most, with some “cheer­ful witticism,” as he expresses himself. An example of this kind is to be found in his address to the Christians at Esslingen, in which he is led to give way to his sense of the ludicrous, by the dark and confused combination of the ideas “fleshly” and “spiritually,” on the part of the Lutherans. “When we say,” he writes, “we have *one* faith with them, to wit, confidence in the death of the Lord Jesus Christ, and this is ‘to eat His flesh’ and ‘drink His blood,’ they reply to us, ‘Oh! but there is another eating of His flesh, and drinking of His blood, to wit, a “spiritual-fleshly.”’ On our objecting, ‘To eat the flesh fleshly profits nothing,’ they reply, ‘Nay, that is all done spiritually; you don’t understand it, and are infidels, fanatics, hypocrites, and revolutionists.’ Mark, I pray of you, which of us is false and fanatical. We speak accord­ing to the Word of God, which teaches us that ‘to eat Christ,’ is ‘to believe on Christ,’ John vi. 35; you make an invention of your own, and speak of a fleshly-spiritual eating, which is an idea somewhat resembling ‘a wooden poker.’ Judge your own selves which of us be fanatics—we who give so clear a sense to spiritual eating, setting the fleshly eating behind it, or you, who make a painted representation with words, that is neither under­stood nor believed by any creature on earth. If I understand the word ‘fanatic’ aright, those fanaticise who, by things which they do not understand, fall into a passion, and talk arrant non­sense, at the same time persuading men they themselves under­stand it very well, others do not. They act like that impostor of a painter who pretended to the younkers he painted churches, but, if they were not legitimately born, they could not see them. Now the younkers would pass for legitimate, and they one and all acknowledged they saw the churches. It is so in our case. When some great doctor blusters and says, ‘He who believes not this is no Christian,’ each is ready to swallow it, and let himself pass for a prim, pious, and Sunday Christian.”

Among Zwingli s friends and followers who took part in the polemical war against Luther, there was no one who more distin­guished himself than Leo Jud, who brought together, in a special publication, the views of Luther and Erasmus, as they main­tained them before the outbreak of the dispute, in order to esta­blish that at that time they spoke of the spiritual presence of Christ, and the spiritual partaking of Christ, in precisely the same terms as Zwingli now did. This work, however, which appeared under the assumed name of Ludovicus Leopoldus, instead of opening the way, as it ought to have done, to a reconciliation with Luther, had the directly contrary effect in the opinion of Lavater.[[61]](#footnote-61) Luther was profoundly offended at the reproach, that he stood in open contradiction to himself, though made in terms the most sparing to his feelings. Œcolampadius’s participa­tion in the contest was of greater importance to Zwingli’s cause. Endowed with a rare meekness and suavity of temper, he brought his solid learning into the service of his venerated friend, and while Zwingli directed his attention principally to establishing the accordance of his doctrine with Scripture, Œcolampadius under­took to prove its agreement with the opinions of the orthodox fathers. The activity of both in their separate provinces filled up the proof in beautiful harmony and completion, while each, in the spirit of a staunch friendship, was ready to repel any false accusation directed against the other. There occur to us here the words Œcolampadius used to the fourteen Suabian pastors, who, in a polemical writing entitled “The Syngramin,”[[62]](#footnote-62) directed against himself, thought it their duty to depreciate Zwingli. He defended his friend, and replied, “Did you know how much he does and suffers for Christ, you would certainly show him greater honour.”

On the side of the Lutherans, there took part in this contro­versy chiefly the Wittenberg town-pastor Bugenhagen or Pomeranus,[[63]](#footnote-63) John Brenz, pastor in Schwaebish-Hall, Wilibald Pirk­heimer,;[[64]](#footnote-64) Osiander in Nuenberg, and some others of less note.

If we glance at the result of this contest for both parties, we shall find it was much more favourable for Zwingli and his friends than they might have been led to anticipate. Our Re­former, however, possessed far too profound a knowledge of the human heart, and of the motives which influence the great majority in their opinions and judgments, not to be well aware how difficult was the stand that pure and naked truth had to make against the gigantic power of prejudice and traditionary belief on the side of Luther. “I know,” he says, “how difficult it is to combat a delusion that has struck its roots deep into the hearts of all. For our very veneration of Christ seems to justify a vehement defence of those outward signs, which we call sacraments; and we think if we acquit ourselves of this task, we have done some great thing, while our first object ought to be more and more to resemble the great Master, whose name we bear. The contest is dangerous with so many and so furious enemies. For each will pass for most pious, by raging most furiously.” Although, however, his position was a difficult one, and although Luther, not only by the wonder-working power of his richly metaphorical and popular language set the whole mass of popular prejudices in motion for his view, but also threw into the scale the whole weight of his personal authority and personal convictions and passions, Zwingli’s cause travelled on from one victory to another, while he, as he says himself, always allowed the truth to appear in her own person, and with her own power­ful authority, nor made her disagreeable by the use of unmeasured language, which always gives reason to suspect pride; inasmuch as the simple-minded and single-hearted Christian much more gladly listens to truth, when she makes her appearance in her own simple robe, than when she stalks forth oppressed with a load of ornaments, and proceeds to hector and to bully.

Thus Zwingli's doctrine of the Supper spread rapidly through the whole of Switzerland, forwarded by the convincing advocacy of his writings, which breathed the spirit of Christian mildness and charity, admirably blended with manly resolution and sound sense. While at the religious disputation in Berne 1528, an overwhelming number of the preachers and men of learning from Switzerland, Southern Germany, and Strasburg, with the excep­tion of Althainer of Nurnberg, and Burgauer of St. Gall, gave in their adhesion to his doctrine; the clergy of the Margraviate of Baden, with the exception of Dr. Strauss, were not behind in expressing their concurrence, and as Zwingli could count upon at least the half of the population of Augsburg, the preachers of that town gave publication to similar views with his own, in a writing which they issued on Palm Sunday 1527. “As God in the Old Testament commanded that His mercy and redemption should be yearly commemorated at the feast of the Passover, without doubt, for the purpose of awakening true confidence in Him, who is alone able and willing to save, so Christ our Redeemer, in the last Supper immediately preceding His suffer­ings and death, commanded his disciples, while he himself fed them with faith, seriously to ponder his unmeasurable love towards us in the work of redemption, saying, ‘This do in remembrance of me.’ And Paul says, ‘Ye do show the Lord’s death till he come,’ without doubt that our confidence towards him as to our only Redeemer, may be awakened, strengthened, and sustained, if so be that we bear in mind that the Son of God himself has taken upon Him our sins, and is the true Paschal lamb which taketh away sin, for He hath given His body as a propitiatory sacrifice for us, and hath poured out His blood for the pardon of our sins, to cleanse our conscience from dead works, and to confirm the New Testament, the covenant of grace betwixt God and us, that our sins are forgiven, and that we are endowed with a right understanding of God, are become his people, and he our God, as he hath promised us, Jer. xxxi.” Ebrard observes that this conception of the significance of the Supper closely resembles Zwingli’s.

But even in places where Luther and his party could recklessly proclaim their views, Zwingli had resolute adherents of his doctrine. At the instance of Pirkheimer and Osiander, who in their polemical works surpassed even their exemplar in Witten­berg in passionate vituperations of the Swiss, Zwingli’s writings had been prohibited in Nurnberg; yet here John Haner and the famous painter, Albrecht Durer,[[65]](#footnote-65) had the courage to espouse and defend his doctrine. Nay, in Wittenberg itself, he had his adherents, as Capito informs us, where Luther, by the force of his authority, suppressed, in a manner keenly felt by his nearest friend Melanchthon[[66]](#footnote-66) any opinions that differed from his own; and the same was the case in Brunswick[[67]](#footnote-67) and other places. In the towns on the Rhine, in the whole of Holland and East Friesland, as Bucer mentions to Zwingli, 9th July 1526, and in France, his doctrine of the Supper had free course among the Evangelicals, so that Zwingli could write with good reason: “If we look to it closely, we shall perceive that the majority of Christians are of our way of thinking,” and in a letter to Osiander, he ventured to express the confident hope, “that within the period of three years our opinion will be the preponderating one in the half of Europe.”[[68]](#footnote-68) This result of the polemical war, so favourable for Zwingli, was not unknown at Wittenberg, and was even admitted, however reluctantly, by Melanchthon and Luther. The former wrote to the elector, John Frederick, “that the doctrine of the opposite party had the assent of many men who had a name for learning in Germany;” and Luther let the Germans know, by his bitter taunts,[[69]](#footnote-69) the deep disappoint­ment he felt at this result. The soul of this great man, in truth, clouded itself more and more in the conduct of this strife, to which result domestic and public misfortunes also contributed their share. The plague raged at this time in Saxony, and had changed Luther’s house, as he expresses it, into a lazaretto; he himself was laid low, by a very dangerous attack, which he thought would prove fatal. Under the weight of these sorrows, he thought the day of judgment, with all its terrors, was about to burst on the world, and, in feverish excitement, he would strain every nerve for the suppression of the dangerous heresy, which he regarded the doctrine of his adversaries to be.

Zwingli, however, had no reason to be proud of a contest, carried on with a man standing so high in public esteem. Although he enjoyed the satisfaction of seeing his opinion, which he main­tained with all Christian patience and mildness, winning one victory after another, he had too much penetration not to be aware of the pain which the members of the Reformed Church felt on its account. The question, “To which side shall I now turn, since Luther and Zwingli are at variance?” revealed the deep rent which tore evangelical Christendom during the progress of a controversy which separated two men whom all believers held in high estimation. Besides all this, the evangelical party were not only subjected to hear daily from the papists the taunt, “You would hold to the pure Word of God, and now you quarrel among yourselves about it,” but likewise to see Pope, Emperor, and the Roman Catholic princes, drawing closer to each other, in measures which had for their object the total suppression of the Reformation, while, under the injurious influence of the Supper-controversy, they could arrive at no union among themselves. These distressing circumstances lay heavily on the hearts of many evangelical men, whose intellectual eye was not dimmed by pas­sionate excitement, and induced them to think of ways and means to effect a reconciliation between the champions of both parties, and to extinguish the controversy. We shall now turn our attention to these attempts at reconciliation, and see with what success they were attended.

8. The Attempts at Union.

Even before the actual outbreak of the controversy betwixt Luther and Zwingli, when Luther had seized an opportunity of assailing Zwingli, who had not yet answered him, the Strasburg divines, Capito, Bucer, and Hedio, endeavoured to bring about an understanding between the two great men, whom all venerated, and thus to prevent the great scandal, which would inevitably accrue to the Reformed Church, through an open dissension of opinion. Zwingli they begged, in the meantime, not to reply to Luther’s invectives, and they sent to Luther, as early as 1525, Gregorius Chaselius, professor of Hebrew, to represent to him and his friends what a dangerous conflagration might arise if so bitter and intemperate writings as they had published against Zwingli should be answered by him in the same spirit, at the very time that they ought, with combined energy, to combat the power of the Pope. They might interpret the words of institution of the Holy Supper in the manner which they thought to be consistent with truth, rejecting all they held erroneous and false; but they ought to bear in mind those great truths which they held in common with the Swiss, and regard and recognise them as brethren. Chaselius was to embrace this opportunity of impart­ing to Luther and his friends a better opinion of Zwingli and Œcolampadius, one more correspondent with truth, and more con­sistent with the great services they had rendered to the Church of Christ.

Gladly as Zwingli, out of love to peace, acceded to the desires of his Strasburg friends, stern and obdurate was the demeanour of Luther. “Satan,” said he, in a work in which he replied to them, “is not a man, nor the world, but a prince, and the god of the world. Who should not rejoice that Zwingli and Œcolampadius’s holiness, and their churches, are so much lauded by you? Yet I cannot well comprehend what you understand under this holiness and these churches. We dare boast that Christ was first proclaimed by us. If they be assured of their faith, let them come forward and convict us of error. Either they or we must be the devil’s servants, there is therefore here no place for coun­sel or mediation. ‘What communion hath Christ with Belial?’” In this manner, the bands of mediation, knit by Christian love, were torn asunder by Luther’s rude hand, and the union sought after ruthlessly stifled. He drew Bucer himself into the contest in the end, while all hope vanished from the meek and temperate Capito, of reconciling with his opponents, “the furious Orestes,” as he calls Luther, in a letter to Zwingli. But there was another who mourned over the rent that these controversies spread through the Reformed Church, who formed the resolution of working out an understanding and reconcilement. This was the highly intel­lectual preacher, John Haner[[70]](#footnote-70) first of Frankfort-on-the-Maine, afterwards of Nurnberg. It was he who induced the noble- minded and richly-gifted landgrave, Philip von Hessen, to under­take the task of mediation between the angry brethren. In March 1529, the opening of the second Diet at Speyer, so im­portant for the reformed Church, took place, at which, under Faber’s and Eck’s influence, it was resolved, 24th March, with an overwhelming majority: “Where the edict of Worms, (which had in view the suppression and extirpation of the Reformation,) has been put in force, all religious innovation, as hitherto, remains forbidden; but where it has been departed from, and where its introduction without tumult is not possible, no farther steps at least, shall be taken in reformation, no questions of controversy shall be discussed, the Mass shall not be forbidden, no Catholic shall pass over to Lutheranism, the Episcopal jurisdiction shall not be declined, and *neither Anabaptists nor Sacramentalists*[[71]](#footnote-71) *shall be tolerated.*” The reformed princes and deputies of towns handed in against this resolution the famous Protest, “*because the majority has no power in questions of conscience.*” In reference to the suppression of the Reformation, the Protest said: “Although it be generally known that in our states the holy sacrament of the body and blood of our Lord is administered in a proper and befitting manner, we cannot accept the terms of the edict against the Sacramentalists, because the Imperial letter of convocation has not spoken of them, because they have not been tried, and nothing can be decided on so important a matter before the next general Council.” The adherents of Zwingli’s doctrine of the Supper owed this just regard to their interests as much to the skilful and influential mediation of the landgrave Philip von Hessen, and Sheriff James Sturm of Strasburg, as to the sense of justice of the other Protestant princes and deputies. Melanchthon also, who had come to Speyer with the Elector of Saxony, writes: “What just reproaches would we draw upon ourselves by condemning a doctrine without having heard those who would defend it.” Eck and Faber’s plan of dividing the Evangelicals, in order the more easily to suppress them, was thus frustrated. Upon Philip von Hessen’s, however, desiring to form a defensive alliance between the reformed princes and towns, to hold in check the papal party who were closely united under the Arch­duke Ferdinand, the princes under the influence of Luther refused to join it unless the adherents of Zwingli’s doctrine of the Supper would give up their opinions, and accept Luther’s doctrine of the sacrament. On this account the Landgrave felt himself the more induced to enter into Haner’s proposal, and to endeavour to effect an understanding and reconciliation between the two Reformers. With this object in view, he invited from Speyer Zwingli and Luther, with their friends, to a disputation upon the subject of dispute, at Marburg, and wrote on the 9th May 1529 to Zwingli: “We are at present busily engaged in bringing together to a suitable place of meeting Luther, Melanchthon, and others, who are nearly of your opinion upon the sacrament, to see if the almighty and merciful God would grant us grace to compare the said article of belief upon the foundation of Holy Scripture, and enable us to live in a harmonious and unanimous understanding upon the point, for at this Diet the papists knew not better to defend their perversions, abuses, and corruptions, than by saying that we who pretend to cling to the pure Word of God are not united in doctrine and faith among ourselves; and verily if we were united, their knavery would soon come to an end. Wherefore our most gracious request to you is, that you would use your best endeavours to put the matter upon a right foundation, and bring us all to one Christian and unanimous sentiment.” Zwingli was ready at once to accept the invitation of the Land­grave, although he would rather have seen Strasburg, or some other town more between Wittenberg and Zurich fixed upon as the meeting-place of the conference. “If, however,” he answers the Landgrave, “Marburg is to be the place of meeting, I shall pray the Lord that He may conduct me safely thither to the praise of His glory. And I shall, indeed, repair thither, even although my lords of the Council should not be quite agreed about it, if only it be not against the will of God, and the weal of His Church; for I entertain the confident hope that the ray of truth, when we come together, will enlighten our eyes, so that we shall give the honour to truth, and let her reign.” The town-sheriff, James Sturm, who supported the Landgrave’s invitation to Zwingli, expressed his hope that, “as the prince was ardently desirous of his presence, he might, if not with his opponents, with the prince himself, effect much good, and I have every confidence that it will be to the glory of God, and the general advantage.”

At Zwingli’s request, the landgrave, in two separate letters, had besought the Councils of Zurich to grant the Reformer the necessary leave of absence to attend this friendly (not disputa­tious) conference. The little Council were unable to make up their mind upon the conceding of this request, and finally they resolved to leave the decision in the hands of the great Council, conceiv­ing they could not well dispense, in the then dangerous position of the country, (immediately after the Capeller war,) with the advice and assistance of Zwingli, and also that they ought not to expose the excellent man to the dangers of so distant a jour­ney in part through a hostile territory. Zwingli, with whom anxiety for the union and peace of the reformed Church out­weighed every political and personal consideration, thought it best not to await the decision. He took the road on the night preceding the first month of harvest, accompanied by Professor Collinus[[72]](#footnote-72) from Zurich to Basle, leaving behind him a letter addressed to the little and great Councils, in which he explained the motives that led him to take this step. “The lords of the common Council,” he says, “not having expressly refused me leave of absence, but having resolved to bring the matter before you on the ensuing week, I feared, on the one hand, that your Worships might not concede my request, while, on the other hand, something has, in the meantime, transpired to precipitate affairs, so that I am unwilling to wait till next week. While realising the present state of warlike matters, the dangers, the scarcity, which might induce me to remain here, I have also con­sidered the grace of the ever faithful God, who has never aban­doned us, and who will overrule all for the well-being of His own people, and for His own glory. I have therefore in haste taken the road, because I foresaw, from your great fidelity towards me, and the care you have of me, you would not have given me any leave of absence at all.” After acknowledging the great dangers to which he exposes himself, he continues: “It appeared to me not proper that I should be absent, because a full deliberation would have been thereby rendered impossible, and the journey of many excellent men of the opposite party have been made in vain. And they might have interpreted my non-appearance to a desire to shun so friendly a conference. On which account I most humbly beseech your Worships not to interpret my hasty departure to any slighting of your authority, contempt of which I cannot bear to see in others, but to reflect that my absence from the conference might prejudice the truth, and your good name. Finally, my lords, have good hope towards God, that if He permit us to reach the end of our journey, He will grant to us His help to defend resolutely His truth, and not to disgrace His Church.” He farther begs that as the men of Basle had resolved to send along with Œcolampadius a deputy of the Council, (Ralph Frei had been appointed,) they would send after him Councillor Ulrich Funk to Basle. “The chief men of my most gracious lords being so bowed down with age and bodily infirmity as to make a long journey too onerous for them; for we shall have to ride through dark pathless woods, through bush and brake, to which hardships not every one may be exposed.” In con­clusion, he recommends them and his journey with all the faith­ful to the protection of God. His departure was so secret that it was only at Basle he begged Master Stoll “to mention to his wife as much as it was expedient for a wife to know; for I took leave of her without letting her know anything more than that I had gone to Basle, where I had some business to transact.”

During his absence Comthur Conrad Schmidt preached for him, a very talented, courageous, and learned man, as Bullinger calls him. Zwingli’s enemies leapt for joy when they heard of his secret departure. “He has taken leg bail with the rogues,” said some; “the devil appeared to him and ran off with him,” said others. In Graubund a report was circulated he was drowned at Bruck, along with four Councillors. Such malicious and absurd stories were, as Bullinger observes, invented and told without number. The Zurich Council resolved, in the end, to grant the leave of absence, and sent after him, without delay, Councillor Ulrich Funk, with a servant, and a safe-conduct-box to Basle, where the Reformer had happily arrived, and was lodged with his dear friend Œcolampadius. On the 6th of Sep­tember the two Reformers went on board a vessel with some reliable merchants, and in thirteen hours reached Strasburg by water, and proceeded straight to the house of Canon Matthias Zett.[[73]](#footnote-73) Here they sojourned till the 22d September; Zwingli preached with great acceptance in the town. They then pro­ceeded on their journey, accompanied by the Town-Sheriff James Sturm, and the ministers Bucer and Hedio, by a circuitous route through the territory of the Palatine of Zweibruecken to the Hessian fortified town of St. Goar, and from hence, under Hessian escort, in the company of the Councillor James of Taubenheim, to Marburg, where they arrived on the 29th September, and took up their quarters in the first house east-ward of the Bears’-Well.

In sad contrast to the gladsome readiness with which Zwingli exposed himself to the dangers of a distant journey, his serene courage, the joyous hope that animated him, that the proposal of the Landgrave might turn out to the honour of Christian truth and Christian love; in sad contrast to this, is the mood of mind in which Luther and Melanchthon regarded the Conference, and the secret arts they employed to prevent its being holden at all. Melanchthon wrote to the Elector John Frederick of Saxony, begging him *to deny to Luther and himself leave of absence for the journey;* for Luther feared: “It might neither be good nor salutary to speak much upon the subject with their opponents, seeing there was no hope at present of bringing, at least, the heads of the party to a better way of thinking. I know, however,” he continues, “how much this matter lies at the heart of the landgrave, and fear that if Luther should decline this Conference with his opponents his Highness might then manifest no small favour and condescension to Zwingli. The doctrine of our oppo­nents is, besides, extremely attractive, and rejoices in the assent of very many men having a great name for learning in Germany;[[74]](#footnote-74) on this account a conference is all the more dangerous. But most lamentable of all is the singular demand, ‘that in the event of the Conference’s taking place, some of the *Papists should be admitted,* in the capacity of impartial witnesses, as otherwise, no impartial judges being present, the Zwinglians might easily boast of victory.”[[75]](#footnote-75) Upon the Elector’s declining to do this hole and corner work which Luther and Melanchthon suggested to him, they turned to the Landgrave. Melanchthon, among other things, wrote to him, “Martin fears that no good fruit will come of this Conference. Wherefore, ought it not to be a matter of consideration whether or not it be good to undertake it at all?” Meanwhile, Melanchthon passed his time in unspeakable anxiety on the subject, and bitterly repented that he had not consented, at the Diet of Spires, to the condemnation of Zwingli and his adherents. Luther wrote to the Landgrave: “Although I have but poor hopes of such a peace, your Royal Highness’ zeal and care in this matter are much to be commended, &c. &c., for in truth I will not leave the opposite party the glory of being more inclined to peace and union than I am. But I have especially to beg that your Royal Highness would be graciously pleased to ascertain if this party be at all inclined to recede from their opinion, for if not the evil will be aggravated. For of what use is a meeting and a conference, if both parties are determined not to yield? It appears to me as if they sought, through the zeal of your Grace, to effect a piece of work out of which no good will come. I know the devil well, and what he seeks, but may God grant that I be here no prophet. For if there were not some base design, and if they really were in earnest after peace, they had hardly entered upon the affair so grandly, and with the aid of so mighty and great princes; for by God’s grace we are not so wild and profligate. They might long ago, and even still, by writing, have made their humble endeavours to obtain peace, as they boast of having made them. For I know well that I shall not yield to them a hairbreadth; nor can I, because I am per­fectly certain that they are in the wrong, while they, on the other hand, are in doubt. And this is sure, that if we do not yield, we shall separate from one another without fruit.”[[76]](#footnote-76) The Landgrave had just as little disposition to give way to these scruples as the Elector of Saxony, and so Luther was forced to make up his mind to the journey to Marburg, however reluctantly, if he would not positively offend the Landgrave, and throw him entirely on the side of Zwingli. Accompanied by Justus Jonas, Melanch­thon, Caspar Cruciger, Frederick Mecum, Justus Menius, and the Chur-Saxon Ammann von der Tann, who was given him for escort, Luther took his way over Halle, Gotha, and Eisenach. Not finding at Kreuzburg, on the Hessian frontier, any written assurance of safe-conduct through the country of the Landgrave, he could not resolve on proceeding, but waited till he received a formal letter of safe-conduct from Philip.[[77]](#footnote-77) The Landgrave was very angry at this exhibition of mistrust. “Zwingli,” said he, “has come hither with his people all the way from Switzerland without desiring from us a safe-conduct, while Luther demands one, as if he could not trust us.” The Saxons arrived at Marburg on the 30th September, a day after the Swiss and Strasburg men, and put up at the Hotel of the Bear (No. 53 Bare-foot-friar Street.) The Landgrave, however, invited both parties, imme­diately after their arrival, to take up their residence at the Castle, hoping by this means to bring the leaders nearer, and to inspire them with friendly sentiments towards each other. Philip enter­tained them at the Castle in a right princely manner, so that Justus Jonas was led to make the observation, “We are treated thus magnificently in these Hessian woods, not from love to the Muses, but from a regard to the glory of God and of Christ.”

According to an arrangement proposed by the Landgrave, Zwingli and Melanchthon, on the one hand, and Luther and Œcolampadius, on the other, were to converse together, and endea­vour to come to a mutual understanding, it being considered dangerous to permit the two more vehement leaders, excited as they were by the recent polemical war in which they had been engaged, to dispute all at once, while it was held that the way to an understanding could be more easily smoothed by Œcolampadius and Melanchthon, who were meeker and more inclined to make concessions. On Friday the 1st October, Zwingli and Melanchthon were conducted, after public worship, into a private chamber, that these combatants might try their strength on one another. The Saxons having never taken the trouble to make themselves acquainted with the views and doctrines of the Swiss from their own writings, but having blindly adopted every report about their lives and doctrines, however absurd it might be, brought a long catalogue of heresies with them to Marburg, with which they intended to charge their adversaries. At the very commencement, Melanchthon had to learn that his concep­tion of Zwingli’s views was incorrect. He accused the Swiss Reformer of heterodoxy upon the divinity of Christ and the Trinity, while Zwingli proved that in both these doctrines he entirely concurred with the first creeds of the Church. To this singularly erroneous opinion, the Saxons had allowed themselves to be led astray by the report concerning a writing of the same Lewis Hetzer, who first commenced the breaking of the Church images in Switzerland, (see Fourth Section, Chapter vii.) in which he denied Christ’s divinity and the Trinity, which writing, however, had been suppressed before publication at the interven­tion of Zwingli. In Luther and Melanchthon’s rambling and confused notions about Swiss persons and events, Hetzer and Zwingli were confounded, so that, while they had hitherto laid to the charge of the latter, without any scruple, all the heresies of the former, Melanchthon was not a little astonished when Zwingli convinced him that he had nothing in common with these and similar fanatics, but, on the contrary, was at strife with them, being not less vilified and hated by them than Luther and Melanchthon were by Thomas Muenzer and his companions.

The second heresy the Saxons laid to the charge of Zwingli related to his doctrine on original sin. From the distinction Zwingli drew between the original corruption of our nature, of which he had a deeper conception than most, and actual sin, they fancied, according to the false reports they had heard, that he denied original sin altogether, and placed the essence of sin in the actual outward deed, like the Pelagians and Papists. Here Melanchthon and he were at one, “that original sin is a defect derived from Adam, which renders it impossible for man to love God, and which damns him.” In the same manner, Zwingli answered Melanchthon’s empty accusation, that he denied, like Thomas Muenzer, the illumination of the Holy Spirit by the Word, explaining himself thus: “The Holy Ghost works in us justification through the Word preached and apprehended, that is, through the *soul and kernel* of the Word, through the thought and will of God wrapped up and delivered in the human Word.”[[78]](#footnote-78) It was more difficult to come to an understanding on the doctrine of the Supper. Melanchthon avoided any profound discussion of this question, seeking, like an eel, to escape his opponent, and assuming a thousand forms like a proteus;[[79]](#footnote-79) but he was soon made to experience that he was opposed to one who was not to be outdone by any such gymnas­tic dexterity, and who was perfectly able to keep a firm hold of the subject of examination, until it was more closely investigated. Zwingli took up a pen and wrote down the arguments, objections, and admissions of Melanchthon, so that he might not be able to shift or change his ground. The latter admitted that we *partake* *of the body and blood of Christ spiritually, by believing on Him, who hath given himself for us.* He likewise admitted that in John, chap. vi., the Lord speaks of corporeal eating, declaring it to be *profitless,* the Capernaumites fancying they were to eat His flesh corporeally, and drink His blood corporeally. He farther declared, that they, the Lutherans, did not hold the view that the body and blood of the Saviour were received into the mouth in any defined or gross manner, but that this body was truly par­taken of, although in a manner hid from the sense of our faculties. To this, the reply was made by

*Zwingli:* This hidden manner, however, cannot be proved by Scripture.

*Melanchthon:* It is proved by the Lord saying, “This is my body, this is my blood.”

*Zwingli:* The body of which the Lord speaks in these words is, however, alone His real material body, which can only be in one place, and not everywhere at the same time; as Augustine thus speaks of it.

*Melanchthon:* Although Augustine says it, I cannot accept it.

*Zwingli:* The Lord himself speaks thus, in reference to his body, in the Gospel of John xvii. 11: “And now I am no more in the world;” and in other passages he propounds the same truth.

*Melanchthon:* The words of Christ, “This is my body,” are clear, and I adhere to them in their plain and simple sense.

*Zwingli:* It is a false assumption that your interpretation gives the clear sense of these words.

Not being able to come to an agreement on this point, they both agreed to break off the conference, which had already lasted six hours, and which, at least, impressed Melanchthon with the conviction that Zwingli was not “the ignorant fanatic” he had been often represented. In the conference betwixt Luther and Œcolampadius, which lasted three hours, the former conducted him­self in a manner which discovered so much obstinacy and pre­sumption that Œcolampadius, on passing Zwingli, whispered into his ear, “I have fallen on a second Dr. Eck.”[[80]](#footnote-80)

These interviews being declared ended on the Friday evening, Zwingli, confiding in the truth of his doctrine, and. according to the principle which he always conceived himself bound to maintain, namely, that every Christian has the right and liberty, in all matters of religion, to form his opinions for him­self, according to the rule of God’s Word, and under the guid­ance of the Holy Spirit, expressed his desire that a public Dis­putation should be held, to which every one who wished it should have admission, and at which every one should be free to decide for himself what opinion he should adopt. While Luther, on the other hand, held it neither to be expedient nor salutary that the Disputation should be thrown open to every one, the landgrave and his councillors, in concurrence with Duke Ulrich, of Wirtemberg, decided this preliminary, to the effect that a select circle only of nobles and deputies, with the principal men of learning, especially of the Universities of Marburg and Wittenberg, should be present. There were accordingly but twenty-four auditors at the commencement of the Disputation, which number, however, was increased in the course of it, and rose to between fifty and sixty, on the arrival of John Brenz, Osiander, and Agricola (of Augsburg.)[[81]](#footnote-81) The Landgrave’s Chancellor, John Feige, opened the Disputation, in a speech, in which he exhorted the members “that they should act, as had been done on like occasions, when learned men came together, who had previously written some­what sharply against each other, that is, they should banish from their minds all ill-humour and bitterness of feeling. Whoever should do this would, at the same time, discharge his duty, and obtain glory and commendation. Others, however, who disre­garded unity, and who obstinately persisted in some notion once adopted by them (the mother of all heresies), would thereby afford indubitable evidence against themselves that the Holy Spirit did not rule in their hearts.”[[82]](#footnote-82) The Landgrave, so simply attired that no one could have taken him for a prince, took his seat at the same table, at which Zwingli and Œcolampadius, on the one side, Luther and Melanchthon on the other, sat to decide whether the Reformed Evangelical Church, resting on one basis of faith, was henceforth to remain united, or whether it was to be rent into two great parties. The poet Cordus, cried in name of the Church to its here assembled leaders: “Puissant princes of the Word, whom the august hero Philip has called to avert from us schism, and to show us the way of truth; the imploring church falls at your feet, drowned in tears, and conjures you, in Christ’s name, to set forward the good cause, that the world may recog­nise in your resolutions the work of the Holy Ghost himself.” Before the Conference began, Luther took up a piece of chalk, and, in large letters, he wrote upon the table the words, “This is my body,” with the object, doubtless, that, when arguments failed, he might all the more firmly cling to the outward letter, since, verily, he was resolved not to yield a hairbreadth.”

The Conference began between Luther and Œcolampadius, Luther defending himself, in a long speech, against the imputation that he, in any respect, agreed with the doctrine of the Supper held by bis opponents; he was at variance with them here, and would be for ever so, Christ himself having said, with sufficient clear­ness, “Take, eat, this is my body.”[[83]](#footnote-83) By the letter of these words he would abide. If his adversaries had anything to advocate against the truth he would hear it, and answer it. Œcolampadius replied, after calling upon God for illumination, “It is undeniable that, in the Word of God, figurative modes of expression occur; thus, for example, “John is Elias,” “The rock was Christ,” “I am the vine.” A similar figure is contained in the words, “This is my body.” Luther grants there are tropes in the Bible, but the latter passage is not one of these. He inquires: Why should the spiritual partaking exclude the corporeal?

*Œcolampadius:* Christ teaches the Jews, John vi., who thought He exacted from them the eating of His real body, and the drink­ing of His real blood, that He was, in verity, eaten and drunk when He was believed upon, for that His flesh profited nothing! Now, that which Christ rejected in John vi. He cannot well be sup­posed to have admitted, or commanded, in the words of the Holy Supper.

*Luther:* The Jews thought they were to eat Christ like a piece of “roasted pork.” By the spiritual partaking, the corporeal is not annulled.

*Œcolampadius:* To impute such a sense to the words of Scripture is to give them a sense somewhat gross. That Christ is in the bread is a notion, and no subject of faith; it is dangerous to ascribe so much to the outward thing.

*Luther:* If we, at God’s command, raise a straw-halm, or a horse-shoe, from the ground, it is a spiritual act. We must regard Him who speaks, not that which is said. God speaks, and miserable man must listen. God commands, the world has to obey, and we all ought to kiss the Word, and not take upon ourselves to look for arguments.

*Œcolampadius:* But of what use is the partaking by the mouth when we have that by the Spirit ?

*Luther:* I do not concern myself as to what we require, I look only at the words as they stand written: “This is my body.” It is to be believed and done unconditionally. It must be done. If God were to command me to eat dung, I should do it, knowing well that it would be wholesome for me.

Zwingli now took part in the dialogue. He began by admi­nistering a sharp rebuke to Luther for his declaration at the very outset of the debate, that he was resolved not to depart from the opinion he had formed; for, in this manner, all farther instruction out of the Scriptures was rendered impossible. Scripture must always be interpreted by Scripture. Were we to adhere to the letter of the text we must conclude that Christ had full brothers. The sentences of Holy Scripture are not dark or enigmatical, like the oracular responses of the demons, but they are clear and plain, if we only compare the one with the other. He then went into a more minute exposition of the section in John vi., and drew from it the conclusion: “If the Lord here expressly testifies that His flesh profiteth nothing in the corporeal partaking of it, He certainly would neither have enjoined upon His disciples, nor upon us, in the Supper, the doing of a profitless thing, that is, the corporeal eating of His body. To this He says : ‘When ye shall see the Son of man ascend to where he was before,’ from which they might conclude that they are not to eat really, or corporeally, of His flesh.”

*Luther:* In the gospel, “brother” signifies a cousin, or a rela­tion. The words of institution cannot be so explained. Christ says, “This is my body,” and it must be so. When Christ says, “the flesh profiteth nothing,” He is not speaking of His own but of our flesh.

*Zwingli:* The soul is nourished by the Spirit, not by the flesh.

*Luther:* The body is eaten by the mouth, the soul does not partake of it corporeally.

*Zwingli:* It is then a food of the body and not of the soul.

*Luther:* I have said, and say it again, the body is not corpo­really eaten into our body, and will reserve it, whether the soul also eats it.

*Zwingli:* You say this, however, without being able to prove it by Scripture. Besides, you first denied that the soul eats the body, and now you will have it reserved.

*Luther:* Your whole object is to catch me in my words.

*Zwingli:* No; but you speak of things that contradict each other, and it is necessary to point out the truth.

*Luther:* I abide by the words of Christ, “This is my body.” They are the words of God. If the Lord were to set before me wooden apples, and command me to eat them, I should eat them, knowing they would be wholesome for me, and I dare not ask, why?

Zwingli now proved, by various passages of Scripture, that the sign is often put for the thing signified, and that the words of the Sacrament especially are to be so explained. He censured Luther for employing so silly an example as that of the wooden apples. Such illustrations were not in place. We know that God neither commands us to eat wooden apples nor dung as His body. The Word of God reveals to us His holy will; it is light, not darkness. God sets before us nothing incomprehensible, if we will but only rightly understand His Word. Hence, if one passage is not clear to us, we must compare it with others, and, in this manner, investigate into the sense. Thus the Virgin Mary asked, Luke i. 34, “How shall this be?” and the angel answered her question. In the same manner the disciples asked, John vi. 52, “How can this man give us His flesh to eat?” Why should not we also endeavour to discover, from Scripture, how the words of the Holy Supper are to be understood? They have, however, been interpreted by Christ himself, who showed in what manner His flesh was to be eaten, and His blood drunk.

*Luther:* We are not to examine whether *is* may be taken for *signifies,* for so we fall into *interpretising;* but we are to take the words in their simple sense, “This is my body.” From thence, pointing at the words written before him, the devil himself cannot pull me. When I enter into subtle inquiries about their meaning, I lose my faith and become a fool. Wherefore, give glory to God, and take and believe the simple plain letters as they stand.

*Zwingli:* I exhort you likewise to give God the glory, by departing from the false interpretation you have put upon the words of Scripture, by an assumption of the very thing to be proven, *principii.* Where is your major proposition, (that the words bear this sense,) proved? We shall not so readily let the passage in the sixth chapter of John slip out of our hands, as it throws a steady light upon the point in dispute, and shows us distinctly how in truth and verity we are to eat Christ’s flesh and drink His blood. Come, doctor, you must sing us another song than this, for this won’t do.

*Luther:* You are becoming personal.

*Zwingli:* I ask you, Doctor, if Christ did not mean here to correct the misunderstanding of the Jews, who fancied they were to eat His real flesh and drink His real blood?

*Luther :* Mr Zwingli, you mean to take me by surprise; the passage has nothing to do here.

*Zwingli:* Certainly the passage has to do here, and breaks your neck, Doctor.

*Luther:* Not so boastful, remember you are not in Switzerland now, but in Hesse, where necks are not so easily broken.

*Zwingli:* In Switzerland there is law and justice, as well as elsewhere, and no man’s neck is broken there for naught. I have only made use of a common phrase, when I employed this ex­pression to the effect that your case was gone, that you could do nothing but submit, seeing that the words of Christ in the sixth chapter of John totally overthrow your doctrine.

The Landgrave here interfered, saying to Luther, “I hope my learned friend the Doctor will not take ill what has been said.” If Luther had but reflected on his usual threat, “we shall bring the villain to the gallows,” he would have perceived that he had no great reason to complain of Zwingli’s expression.

It being now exactly noon, the Conference adjourned till after dinner. In the afternoon, Zwingli read the following extract from Luther’s Sermon on the sixth chapter of the Gospel of John, “Christ himself says the flesh profiteth nothing, and again, my flesh gives life, how do we reconcile this? The Spirit reconciles it. Christ means that the corporeal eating of His flesh profits nothing, nothing profits *but the faith* that He has given His flesh for me, and shed his blood for me. If I believe that Christ is the true Son of God, that He hath descended from heaven, shed His blood for me, saved me, made me righteous and alive from the dead, I have enough.” Melanchthon had explained this passage in a similar way.

*Luther:* I make no inquiry how Melanchthon and myself formerly explained this passage. Prove to me that when Christ says “This is my body,” it is not his body. I take my stand and abide, and not without grounds, by the words “this is my body,” but yet I do not the less acknowledge that Christ’s body is in heaven, and also in the Sacrament. I am not concerned as to its being against reason and against nature, if it be not against faith.

*Zwingli:* This statement, however, undoubtedly contravenes the articles of faith, “He hath ascended to heaven,” &c. &c. If Christ’s body be in heaven, how can it at the same time be in the bread? God’s Word teaches us that Christ was in all points made like unto His brethren, Heb. ii. 17. His body then cannot at the same time be in different places, because this is contrary to the nature of a real body.

*Luther:* If He hath been in all respects like to *us,* then He has had a wife and black eyes. I have said it before, and say it again: I will have nothing to do with the Mathematica!

*Zwingli:* I am not speaking of the Mathematica, but of the Word of God. He then, in order to show that Christ, although of Divine nature, had taken upon Him the form of a servant, and been made like to us, cited in the Greek text the passage from Philip. ii. 7.

*Luther:* Let Greek alone, quote it in Latin or in German.

*Zwingli:* Excuse me; during the last twelve years, I have only made use of the Greek New Testament. If Christ then has been made like to us, this is to be understood of His human nature. Accordingly, His body, like every other human body, is finite.

*Luther :* I admit that Christ’s body is finite.

*Zwingli:* If it is finite, it is also limited[[84]](#footnote-84) and can only be at one and the same time in one place, that is in heaven, and not in the bread. But now you teach that the body of Christ is every­where present.

*Luther:* You always seek to entrap me. If I speak of the body of Christ, I will not have it that one speak or think of a place; *I will not have it at all.*

*Zwingli :* What sort of language is this? Are we only to have what you will, Doctor ?

*Luther :* The schoolmen have also maintained that a finite body can be in several places at once. The universe is a body, and yet it cannot be said that it is in any definite place.

*Zwingli:* It ill becomes you, Doctor, to have recourse to the onions and flesh-pots of Egypt, to the Sophists; I, for my part, pay no regard to the Sophists. If you say that the universe is nowhere, I beg all intelligent men to test the truth of this asser­tion; you were, however, to make good that the body of Christ was at one and the same time in more than one place.

*Luther:* Christ says, “this is my body.” Now the Sacrament is dispensed in many places at once, in which one partakes not only of bread, but of the true body of Christ, hence Christ’s body is in many places at once.

*Zwingli:* This does not follow from the words of Christ, the sense of which we are here investigating. You ever assume that your understanding of these words, which we declare to be an erroneous and false one, is the right and infallible one, and proceeding from this false assumption, you avail yourself of the sophism of reasoning in a circle. Instead of which, your proper business is to prove and establish your understanding of these words to be the true and right one. That the body of Christ, however, is limited or circumscribed like our own, and consequently, can only be at one time in one place, is a doctrine taught us by the Fathers. Thus Fulgentius[[85]](#footnote-85) says: “The Son of God has taken upon himself the quality of real humanity, and yet not less that of real divinity. Born of His mother in time He is yet from all eternity, in virtue of the Godhead which He has from the Father. Born of man, He is man, and bound to a definite place; as He emanates from the Father, He is God, and consequently omnipresent. In His human nature, He was when on earth absent from heaven, and He left the earth when He ascended to heaven: in His divine nature, He abode in heaven when He descended, nor did He leave the earth when He ascended.” You, however, dear Doctor, have written ere now, “Every thing is full of the body of Christ,” and “if Christ had not suffered in His divine nature, He were not my Redeemer.”

*Luther:* Fulgentius is not here speaking of the Supper. Moreover he calls the Supper a sacrifice too, and yet it is none.

*Zwingli:* Fulgentius is here speaking of the qualities of Christ’s humanity, and maintains that it necessarily follows that as man He can only be corporeally present in one place. If that is true in respect of Christ’s humanity in general, it is likewise true of His presence in the Supper. When Fulgentius, however, terms the Supper a sacrifice, he does it in the same sense as Augustine, who calls it a sacrifice as he himself explains his meaning, because it is a commemoration of the once offered sacrifice of Christ.

Luther, after a few struggles, was obliged to admit this, but fell immediately into his old habit of reasoning in the circle, and drew the conclusion that Christ’s body may be in many places at once, because He says, “this is my body,” conse­quently He is now *there* in the bread.

Zwingli quickly rejoining: Is He *there in the bread?* then *there* is surely in one place. Methinks, Doctor, I have you.

*Luther:* As God will, let Him be in one place or not, I leave that with God; to me it is enough, and I abide by it, that He says, “This is my body.”

*Zwingli:* It is evident to every one that you argue from a false assumption, that you describe a reasoning in a circle, and that you thus, intrenched in your own opinion, obstinately close your eyes against all instruction from the Word of God. This is but a miserable spite on your part, Doctor. In like manner might some wilful disputant misinterpret the words of our Lord to his mother, “Woman, behold thy son,” persist in repeating them, and, despite all remonstrances, never cease crying, No, no, you must take the words of Christ as they stand, and hold simply by them, “Woman, behold thy son.” Would he achieve aught else here, but a miserable perversion of the words of Christ? It is just what you are doing, Doctor. The holy Augustine writes: “We dare not believe that Christ in human form is everywhere present, we dare not, to establish His divinity, abstract the *reality* from His body. Christ as God is omnipresent, yet by reason of His true body He is in one place, in heaven.”

*Luther :* Augustine is not here speaking of the Sacrament. The body of Christ in the Supper is not as in one place.

Zwingli declining to reason any farther with an opponent who withdrew himself from every species of close and consecutive argument, and who overleapt with such wonderful audacity the manifold contradictions into which he plunged, Œcolampadius now took it upon him to answer Luther. In reply to Luther’s last assertion, which had been already thoroughly disproved by Zwingli, and which was in direct contradiction to his own former admissions, Œcolampadius observed: “If the body of Christ is not *locally* in the Supper, then it is not there as a *real* body, for, as is well known, it belongs to the essence of a body to be in one definite place. Let us examine, in all friendship, what kind of presence this is of the body of Christ.”

*Luther:* You will not bring me a single step farther. If you have Fulgentius and Augustine on your side, we have the rest of the Fathers.

*Œcolampadius:* Please name these Fathers, and quote the pas­sages you refer to. We trust we shall be able to prove to you that they are of our opinion.

*Luther:* We decline naming them. Augustine wrote the pas­sage you have quoted in his youth, it is moreover very unintel­ligible. Besides, I do not concern myself as to what the Fathers teach on this head, but I abide by the words of Christ, (Here he pointed again to the words written in chalk upon the table, “This is my body.”) See, so they run. You have not driven us out of this stronghold, as you proudly imagined you would do, and we concern ourselves no farther about proofs.

*Œcolampadius:* If it be thus, the Conference had better be closed. We have appealed to the Fathers of the Church for the purpose of showing that we have advanced no new doctrine. We do not build upon them, but upon the Word of God. Every one knows who Augustine was, and that when he expressed his sen­timents, he not only delivered his own opinions, but those of the whole Church of his day.

Thus the Conference concluded. The Chancellor, Feige, who for his part adhered to the Zwinglian doctrine, was dismayed at the upshot. But, even yet, he exhorted both parties earnestly to cultivate peace, as he had done at the beginning, and entreated them to think of measures which might promote unity. Luther observed, “I know of no other measures but that they give glory to the Word of God, and believe what we believe.” The Swiss replied: “We cannot do so, for our conscience forbids it. We believe that Christ’s body and blood are present in the Supper to the believing soul, but not in the bread and wine.” Luther: “We have then done with you, and commend you to the just judg­ment of God: He will discover who is right.” Then Œcolampadius said: “We do the same, and have done with you.” Zwingli, how­ever, was so deeply moved by Luther’s obduracy of temper, that he was unable to articulate a single word; *his eyes, as every one saw, were swimming in tears.*

Although there were no Papists at the Conference, as Luther and Melanchthon desired, to decide which party gained the vic­tory, there were yet those present who were quite competent to pass a correct and impartial judgment upon it, and they have done it. The Landgrave of Hessen, who bestowed the greatest attention to the Disputation throughout, declared, on his dying bed, that he had been won over to Zwingli’s views by the argu­ments the latter had advanced on this occasion. Thus, on the Tuesday following Paul’s conversion, 1531, he wrote to Zwingli in these terms: “You must not doubt me that I shall, by God’s grace, continue steadfast in the truth, and neither regard Pope nor Emperor, Luther nor Melanchthon, and I hope, in course of time, to bring the other abuses to an amelioration.” Professor Franciscus Lambert makes a similar confession in regard to him­self. He had left Zurich, where he had been brought by Zwingli to a deeper acquaintance with evangelical truth, had gone to Wittenberg, married there, and lived on terms of the closest friendship with Luther. From Wittenberg he came to Stras­burg, and from thence to Marburg, where he was appointed pro­fessor in the newly-founded High School. United to both the Reformers by the ties of friendship and of gratitude, he had not quite resolved, although more inclined to Luther’s doctrine, which view to adopt. At the commencement of the Conference, he set before himself to be, as he said, like *a sheet of white paper,* on which he prayed that the finger of God might write the truth; and, when it was concluded, he acknowledged that the finger of God had written on his heart the doctrine which Zwingli had developed from the Word of God.” Even Seckendorf, a warm defender of Luther and his doctrine, confesses, “Luther behaved at this Conference in a rude and arrogant manner, and did nothing else but call upon the Swiss to subject themselves to his opinion.”

Such was the judgment passed on the conduct of both parties, by men who stood in a position disconnected from both. There being little hope of arriving at a more favourable result by a continuance of the Conference, the Landgrave came to the reso­lution of dissolving it. The sudden breaking out of a pestilen­tial disease, known by the name of “The English Sweat,” from whose ravages each was desirous of escaping, perhaps hastened this decision. Philip, however, was unwilling that the Reformers should separate without publishing some testimony of their agreement in the principal truths of the gospel. Zwingli, too, expressed himself thus: “Let us acknowledge in what we agree, and, in regard to the points on which we differ, let us not forget that we are brethren. Peace will never prevail in the Church, unless, without compromising the great doctrine of salvation by faith, difference of opinion be permitted to exist in things of sub­ordinate moment.” The Landgrave expressed his full accordance with this sentiment, and requested they should publish, for a testimony to friend and foe, the doctrines which they in common believe and confess, in a particular document. Upon its being resolved to accede to this request, Luther was chosen to draw up the document, a task, in his present temper of mind, of no easy execution; “I will put the articles together in the best way I can; they will still not approve them,” said he moodily. He was deceived; the articles drawn up by him were, one and all, accepted by the Swiss, upon a few alterations being made in expression. We give these articles as follows, in the shape in which they were approved of by both parties, and we subjoin, in the notes below, the short observations which have been preserved to us from Zwingli’s pen.

1. We believe and acknowledge, on both sides, with one heart and soul, that there is only one true and natural God; the Cre­ator of the heavens and the earth, and all creatures; and that this God is one in essence and nature, three in persons, namely, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, entirely as established at the Council of Nice, and as it has been read and sung through the whole Christian Church in the Nicene Creed.

2. We believe that neither the Father nor the Holy Ghost, but the Son of the Father, who was true and essential God, became man, and by the working of the Holy Ghost, without the co­operation of a man, was conceived and born of Mary, a pure virgin, according to the flesh, entirely in body and soul like other men, yet without sin.

3. That this God and son of Mary, in person inseparable,[[86]](#footnote-86) Jesus Christ, was crucified for us, was dead and buried, arose again from the dead, and ascended to heaven, where He sits at the right hand of God, Lord over all creatures, from whence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead.

4. We believe that original sin, derived from Adam, descending to us by generation, is a sin sufficient to condemn all men, and that if Christ had not come to our aid by His life and by His death, we must have eternally died on account of it, so that we could never have entered the kingdom of God, nor obtained salvation.

5. We believe that through faith on Jesus Christ that hath died for us, we are redeemed and freed from original sin, and every other sin; without this faith, we cannot be set free from any sin, by any external work, observance, or ordinance what­ever.[[87]](#footnote-87)

6. That this faith is a gift of God, which we acquire by no inborn, nor by any outward merit or work, nor through our own power, but the Holy Ghost vouchsafes it, and works it in our hearts, how and where He wills, when we hear the gospel, or the Word of God.[[88]](#footnote-88)

7. That such faith is our justification before God, on account of which God regards us as just, righteous, and holy, without any works or merits of our own; and by this faith frees us from sin, death, and hell, graciously accepts us and saves us for His Son's sake, on whom we believe, being by faith made partakers of the benefits of justification and sanctification through Christ. Hence all ordinances and vows deemed necessary to salvation are damnable.

8. That the Holy Ghost, to speak scripturally,[[89]](#footnote-89) vouchsafes this faith or His gifts to none without the previous preaching of the Word or gospel of Jesus Christ,[[90]](#footnote-90) but He works[[91]](#footnote-91) and operates faith, on whom, and as He will, by and with the preached Word, Rom. x.

9. That baptism is a sacrament, appointed by God, for the awakening of such faith, or to serve as a sign of it. And since God’s command: “Go ye and baptise,” and God’s promise: “He that believeth and is baptised,” &c., are comprehended in it, it is not a mere sign or badge among Christians, but a sign and work of God,[[92]](#footnote-92) in which our faith[[93]](#footnote-93) is demanded, and by which we are born again.

10. That such faith by the working of the Holy Ghost, after we have arrived at justification and sanctification, produces good works in us, love to our neighbour, devotion to God, patience under the cross.

11. That confession or counsel-seeking?[[94]](#footnote-94) from a pastor or a neighbour is not commanded, and shall not be compulsory but free, may, however, be useful for anxious, tempted and disquieted consciences, principally by reason of absolution or evangelical comfort, which is the true absolution.

12. That the magistracy, civil laws, tribunals, and ordinances, where they exist, are wholesome, are commanded by God, and by no means forbidden, as some Papists and Anabaptists teach; but that a Christian chosen or born to a civil office, can be saved just as a father or a mother, a husband or a wife.

13. That we may either hold or give up the so-called traditions and ecclesiastical ordinances appointed by man, when they do not conflict with the revealed Word of God, according as the sentiments of the people may be, by whom we are surrounded; and in this, our duty is to avoid giving offence, and to endeavour to farther peace,

14. That infant baptism is right and necessary, since children are thereby received into God’s grace,[[95]](#footnote-95) and into the bosom of the Church.

15. We believe and held, all of us, in regard to the Holy Sup­per of our dear Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, that it ought to be dispensed in both kinds, according to the institution of our dear Lord Jesus Christ. That the Mass is no work by which one can acquire or obtain for another, be he dead or alive, mercy and the forgiveness of sins. That the sacrament of the altar[[96]](#footnote-96) is a sacrament[[97]](#footnote-97) of the true body and blood of Christ, and that the spiritual partaking of this body and blood is a matter of especial need to every Christian. In the same manner we agree in regard to the use of the sacrament, that the sacrament, as well as the word delivered[[98]](#footnote-98) and ordained to us of God, moves weak con­sciences, through the Holy Ghost, to faith and love.[[99]](#footnote-99) And although we cannot come to a union of opinion as to whether the real body and the real blood of Christ are bodily present in the bread and wine, yet each party ought to manifest Christian love towards the other, in so far as conscience permits it, and both ought earnestly to supplicate the Almighty God, that He would confirm by His Spirit the true understanding of His Word in us. Amen.

This important document, by which a union or agreement in the principal doctrines of Christianity was declared between the two sister churches, was signed by both parties. An important step was here made to a reconciliation, and if, in the spirit of love, they had gone on with the erection of the edifice on this basis, we should long ago have arrived at a true union of heart. But unhappily the good spirit which animated Luther in the composition of these articles, soon appeared ready to abandon him. The Landgrave earnestly besought both parties to be united, and to regard one another as brothers. Zwingli, magna­nimous and noble as he always was, came forward to Luther, with tears in his eyes, saying: “There are none in the world with whom I should more desire to be at peace than the Wittenbergians.” But the hand stretched forward in largeness of heart was pushed back by Luther, with the hard words: “Ye have another spirit. I am surprised that you regard me as a brother, whose doctrine you recently stigmatised as false. You surely cannot hold much of your own doctrine.” This narrow-minded obstinacy of spirit gave deep offence, not only to the Swiss and the men of Strasburg, but also to the Landgrave. “Choose between the two,” said Bucer, “either you recognise none as brother who differs from you in opinion in but *a single* point, and then you have not one brother on earth, no, not even in your own party, or you accept individuals who differ from you, in which case you must accept us.” Upon the Landgrave’s exhorting both to show bro­therly love to one another, Luther said: “I shall testify to my opponents the love that a man bears to his enemy.” At length both parties yielded so far to the repeated entreaties of the Land­grave, as to promise that for the future they would no longer irritate or give offence to each other by violent writings, words, or invectives.[[100]](#footnote-100)

If we regard the disposition of mind in which the two parties left Marburg, we shall find it thoroughly correspondent to that in which they came, and the spirit which they manifested in the Conference. Zwingli could write with a good conscience: “We have the consciousness of having acted with a pure mind towards God. Posterity will acknowledge it. Truth has so manifestly gained the victory that, if the shameless and obstinate Luther be not beaten, there never was any one beaten; of course, only in the judgment of an impartial and intelligent judge, for Luther never ceases boasting he was not beaten. The Hessian nobles and clergy have nearly all deserted him. The prince himself has issued the command that our books may be freely read, and that no clergyman adhering to our opinion dare be farther persecuted or deposed from his office. The Conference has also borne *this good fruit,* that the Papists need no longer hope that Luther will return to them, as we are agreed in the other doctrines of Chris­tianity, according to a declaration made to this effect.”

He felt deeply hurt, indeed, at Luther’s obstinate exclusiveness and pre­judice, and feared that Lutherdom might, in the end, prove as great an incubus to Christianity as the popedom; yet he was ani­mated by the joyful hope that truth in the end would triumph. The warm friendship which the noble-minded Landgrave testified towards him, richly recompensed him for the repulse he had met with from his opponent. It is a fine spectacle, many of which the great time of the Reformation presents to us, to see the most magnanimous prince of his age, who loved to manifest on occa­sions princely splendour, walking in close friendship with the son of the Toggenburg herdsman in the community of a noble cause. Elevated and strengthened by this lofty feeling, Zwingli returned to Zurich, full of good resolves. (See below, Section ix. 1.) Very different was the mood of mind of Luther and his friends in Marburg, and upon the home-journey. The leaning of the Landgrave, of his courtiers and divines to Zwingli’s doctrine, had not escaped them, and a feeling of uneasiness came over them, when they trod the apartments of the prince’s palace. “Take care,” said Luther to his friends, “that we do not sneeze too hard, else blood will flow.” Justus Jonas writes to Zwingli, envious at the Landgrave’s friendship towards him, “When you have done reforming the boor’s caps, you will fall, tooth and nail, on the prince’s ermine-hat.” Luther thus gives expression to his thoughts in writing, on his departure from Marburg: “I crawled,” says he, “like a worm in the dust, and so tormented was I by the devil, that I thought never more to have seen nor wife nor child; I, the comforter of distressed souls, was without comfort.” In Marburg he had denied *love,* his conscience gave evidence against him that he had done so, and peace abandoned his soul. Nevertheless he boasted of having gained the victory over his antagonists in all the articles, and called them “awkward in disputation, and inex­perienced in it.” In this, however, he only justified what Zwin­gli said of him, “Luther acts like unskilful swordsmen, who, when they are disarmed, say their opponent knows not the art.”

The Marburg Disputation, despite the partial failure which attended it, was of signal importance to the Reformed Church. In the first place, the attention of the followers of both the Reformers was turned, by the Marburg articles, to the common ground of faith on which their doctrine stood, a gain which is not to be deemed small. That which Zwingli was always maintaining, in this respect, Luther now confessed by the com­position of this remarkable document. Then, in consequence of the reciprocal promise not to continue the strife, a calm set in after the feverish excitement, which was extremely grateful to all. And this calm was of the utmost consequence to the Reformed Church, for it was threatened by a heavy tempest from another quarter. The Emperor Charles V. crossed the Alps from Italy, in the spring of 1530, for the purpose of holding the Augsburg Diet, so celebrated even in the history of the Reformation itself. The Evangelicals were, upon good grounds, anxious for the safety of their Church, being well aware that Charles had given his promise to the papal ambassador at Bar­celona, to employ all the means in his power for the extirpation of heresy in Germany, (see Section vi.) After having lived with the Pope five months long, during the winter 1529-30, in Bologna, and taken counsel with him, he arrived in Augsburg, accom­panied by Faber and Eck, and with his feelings, excited by his Dominican Confessor Garzia de Loaysa, who expressed the sentiments that animated him thus: “The true rhubarb for heresy is force.” Next to the gracious providence of God, the reformed Church owes it to the firmness and courage of the reformed princes and deputies, but, above all, to the address and prudence of the Landgrave of Hessen, that the blood-thirsty plans of Eck, Faber, and the Spanish monk were not carried into execution. This Diet was also attended by Reformed divines; on the side of the Lutherans, by John Brenz and Melanchthon, the latter of whom presented to the Emperor the Augsburg Confession, as composed by him; on the Zwinglian side, by Bucer and Capito, (at first they did not appear ostensively,) who handed to the Emperor, (probably through James Sturm,) a creed drawn up by them in the name of the four Imperial towns of Strasburg, Constance, Memmingen, and Lindau, the so-called Four-Towns-Confession (Tetrapolitona.) The two head Reformers remained at a distance from the Diet, Luther at Coburg, where he com­posed the heroic hymn beginning, “Eine feste Burg ist unser Gott,” Zwingli at Zurich, where he drew up, in the course of a few days, his own clear and well-founded Confession of faith, which he sent off by a special messenger to Augsburg[[101]](#footnote-101) As the Papists employed the difference of doctrine between the two parties with wily cunning, to divide them, if possible, the Lutherans enjoyed a much higher respect from this quarter than the Zwinglians, who, it was thought, could not be treated with sufficient contempt. Nay, not only was the proposal made to bring about a reconciliation between the Papists and the Lutherans, but steps were taken towards effecting it, a commission being appointed to draw up the conditions under which it should take place. Eck and Melanchthon found themselves appointed members of it, and appear to have got on very smoothly together.

In these circumstances, the Zwinglians, or to use the German designation, the Reformed party, had much to hear, both from Papists and Lutherans. Bucer and Capito complained bitterly in a letter to Zwingli: “You can imagine nothing less conciliating, nothing ruder and more grating to the feelings than the behaviour of the Lutherans towards us. The Landgrave of Hessen alone, who is verily an instrument in the hand of God, for the promo­tion of His own glory, confesses his faith with courage and firm­ness, and has already openly maintained it before the Emperor, and to every one else.” Of Melanchthon’s behaviour, the Land­grave himself writes to Zwingli: “But what shall I say of Philip Melanchthon, who goes backwards like a crab, and has been with his timidity a hurtful man to the gospel of Christ; for he is fallen into an error, and cannot get out of it, and many hang upon him; but he shall not, if God will, deceive me.” But the attempts at reconciliation between Papists and Lutherans were soon abandoned, and Melanchthon himself saw that he had been practised upon. Bucer and Capito availed themselves of this circumstance, (without doubt under the influence of the Land­grave and James Sturm, the Town-Sheriff,) to make farther attempts at reconciliation between the Reformed and Lutherans. In their Confession of Faith they had, without denying in their sense Zwingli’s doctrine of the Supper, accommodated their expressions so far to the Lutheran doctrine, as to adopt the fol­lowing formula: “Christ gives in the Supper His true body and true blood, to be truly eaten and drunk, as a food of the soul.” The Lutherans at Augsburg having become more accessible to the Reformed after the deception put upon them by the Papists, and Melanchthon having meanwhile instructed himself better upon the reformed doctrine, and shown himself more disposed to it, Bucer and Capito repaired to him, and to John Brenz, to make fresh attempts to procure a mutual reconciliation, which attempts were made by Bucer with unwearied zeal. Bucer’s object was a thoroughly Christian and noble one. He himself was more a clear and practised speaker than a deep thinker, much more con­siderable as a practical clergyman than as a man of learning. But it was these very qualities which enabled him at a glance to understand and appreciate the manner in which simple evangelical Christians, who were puzzled by the exact distinctions of the theologians, took up and judged of the matter in dispute. “Many persons,” he writes to Zwingli, “cannot bring themselves to regard the words of institution as a figure of speech; they hold firm to this, that Christ is present in the Sacrament, and will not farther examine whether He be in the bread or the wine, in the transaction or the heart. Were you to induce these people to take the words of institution figuratively, and to hold only the *spiritual* presence, they would be led astray upon the gospel itself, and speedily fall away from it. We should here follow the example of a skilful and wise physician, who, when he finds the patient having an antipathy against pills, pre­scribes his medicine in a mixture. We also should invest the truth in a phraseology to attract the great multitude of Chris­tians.” Starting from this point of view, he designed, after the example of the Four-towns-Confession, a doctrinal formula, in which each party might find their own views, and which each might interpret for itself. Melanchthon and Brenz appear to have approved of Bucer’s idea. He accordingly set out for Coburg in order to induce Luther to agree to it, while Capito set off for Zurich to gain Zwingli for it. Luther might well bring himself to approve of the formula, containing, as it does, that “Christ’s true body and true blood is given in the Supper to be truly eaten and drunken as a food of the soul.” A doubt, however, on the one hand, that the Swiss would hardly subscribe it, and, on the other hand, the feeling that such a settlement of the dispute was more factitious than real, determined him to reject Bucer’s pro­posal. He thus expresses himself in a letter to the Duke Ernest of Luenenburg: “At your Grace’s request, I have long ere this given Bucer an answer in the negative, but in the friendliest and gen­tlest manner possible. For it is not possible to arrange upon the ground of his plan; nor were it good to do so. But as to what Bucer pretends, that the dispute is one of words, I am willing to give my life for it, it is not this, were it indeed so, such a split would be soon closed up, and ought never to have been made. I am, too, disposed to union, as I told him, in many words, at Coburg. My opinion is, that, for the present, enough has been done till God gives further grace, and that we ought, on both sides, to desist from farther writing against each other upon the subject, having sufficiently admonished each other, and sufficiently learned each other’s opinion. *shall pray, and hope till all be well.* Your Highness may rest assured that, next to Christ, nothing lies nearer my heart than that these people were fun­damentally one with us. No death is so bitter that I should not willingly suffer it to attain this object.” What a different lan­guage of conciliation is here from that which marks his polemical writings! You feel, in nearly every word, that “*another spirit*”breathes in him from that which moved him to thrust away the hand of Zwingli, offered to him in conciliation. Zwingli, like Luther, but in a more decided manner, rejected Bucer’s artificial attempt at a settlement, for nothing was more opposed to his straight-forward soul than equivocation. He admitted, indeed, that he could find his view expressed in the formula pro­posed by Bucer, if the words were only rightly understood and interpreted.[[102]](#footnote-102) “We do not in any manner reject or blame,” he writes on this subject to the Council of Basle, “the confession which our much loved friends and Christian fellow-citizens of Stras­burg have presented to the Diet at Strasburg; on the con­trary, we esteem and hold the same to be Christianity right and good. But that we are to resign a clear and fundamental under­standing of the words, ‘this is my body,’ &c., as we have formerly received, taught, and preached it, for a dark equivocal formula, you can by no means desire from us, as we should thereby give our­selves the appearance as if we had been formerly in error, and had maintained what was untrue. We may therefore leave the confession of our Christian fellow-citizens uncensured, since it in no respect affects us. But if a confession be desired from us, we shall express our opinions and views in clear intelligible language. When you report to us that you cannot so understand the words of the Strasburg Confession, that ‘Christ gives us in the Supper His true body and His true blood to eat and drink as a food for the soul,’ as if thereby Popery or Lutheranism were about to be set up again, we, for our part, cannot look upon it in any other light, than that in the words, ‘*gives to eat,’* the presentation is understood, and thus salvation is made dependent on the priest who presents, if not now, yet eventually. We, however, do not live for the present time and for ourselves alone, but for the future, and for men in another age, and if we were not now to maintain the truth, even to death, what confusion should we be heaping up in store for coming generations?”

Thus this too artificial attempt at union was met by Luther and Zwingli with a formal declinature. Both, however, earnestly longed for peace for themselves and for the Church they had reformed. Both recognised with their whole heart and soul, that He alone can give peace and true union who turns the hearts of men like the streams of water. To Him Zwingli had applied at the very beginning of the unhallowed strife,[[103]](#footnote-103) in the noble prayer which we shall here insert: “Fill us, O Creator, God, and Father of all, with Thy gracious Spirit, and drive from the minds of both sides all the clouds of misunderstanding and passion, as Thou didst of old force the raging waves of the deluge into the deep by Thy powerful winds, and causedst fruits and plants to the full to spring up and to ripen again on the surface of the all- nourishing earth. Put an end, O God, to the struggle, to the quarrel, and to the blind passion. Arise, O Christ, Thou glorious Sun of righteousness, and shine on us with Thy mild rays. Alas! while we strive, we forget but too often to wrestle after holiness, which Thou requires! from us all. For Thou knowest, O Lord, that we never come out of these worldly contests bettered, since they are works of the flesh, that sully every one that mingles in them, while the righteous ever decline them to their own salvation. Preserve us, therefore, O Lord, from such strife, that we may not misuse our powers in them, but turn them with all earnestness to the work of sanctification.” The Lord heard the prayer of these men, whom He had chosen to a great work. Zwingli could, a few weeks before his too early death, report of the conflict as of something gone by; he was able to deliver a glorious testimony to the power and effect of the Sacraments, and to manifest that he recognised the significance and importance of these means of grace in all their depth. To the same God of peace Luther also turned himself, and thus the true peace came ever more and more over his mighty soul, so that he could write in the letter to the Duke of Luenenburg quoted above: “If God would grant it, (namely that we be united,) I shall joyfully die and take my departure, so God will.” His desire was fulfilled. Just before he set out on his journey to Eisleben, where he died (1546), he sent for Melanchthon and said to him : “I must acknowledge, that in the matter of the Supper there has been too much done to which Philip answered, “Doctor, let us draw up a document in which the matter may be softened.” Luther replied : “Yes, dear Philip, I have thought much and often upon this, but the doctrine itself will be brought into suspicion; I commend it to God, the Almighty. But do something after my death.” Melanchthon fulfilled this last wish of his venerated friend, with all the more sacred fidelity, that his own convictions likewise impelled him to it. The Spirit that leads believers ever nearer to the truth, conducted also this faithful witness to a view of the Holy Supper that was very closely related to Zwingli’s. A few months before his death, (29th October 1559,) he was requested[[104]](#footnote-104) by his prince, the Elector Frederick of the Palatinate, to record his sentiments in writing upon this subject. Hesshussius,[[105]](#footnote-105) a polemical clergyman, endeavouring at that time to rake up the embers of the old strife with a wild phrensy, “My heart’s desire is,” wrote Melanchthon, “that the Church newly planted through the preaching of the Word, may everywhere enjoy peace and rest. I am therefore greatly pleased with the opinion of your Serene Highness, that all strife-loving clergymen should be dismissed from their pulpits, that divisions may not be sown in the young tender church, and the weak in faith offended. In this strife, it were best that we adhered to the words of Paul: ‘The bread that we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ ?’ and that we emphatically taught the people the benefit of the Sacrament, whereby many might be induced to take a liking to this pledge, and use it often. The word ‘communion’ ought to be explained in the following way: Paul speaks not like the Papist, that the bread is changed, nor does he speak like those of Bremen[[106]](#footnote-106) that the bread is the *essential* body of Christ; nor like Hesshussius, that the bread is the *true* body of Christ; but he says that the bread is the communion of the body of Christ, through the bread one commonalty[[107]](#footnote-107) is made with the body of Christ. The Son of God is present at the preaching of the gospel, and undoubtedly works also *in believers* through the dispensation of the Sacrament appointed by Him. He is, how­ever, not there for the bread’s sake, but for man’s sake, as He says: “Abide in me and I in you;” and, “I am in the Father, and you in Me, and I in you.” And with this true consolation, He makes us members of himself. So the old Fathers of the Church explain the Lord’s Supper. But now some teach, (the Papists,) that the bread and the wine are changed into the body and blood of Christ; others, (the ultra-Lutherans,) that *with, in, under,* and *beside* the bread and wine, the body and blood of Christ are so united respectively, that the one must be emphatically and corporeally present with the other; some, indeed, (John Brenz,) that the body and blood of Christ are everywhere present in all ends and corners of the world. Of such *monstrous* opinions, the ancient and very learned Fathers knew nothing. Nor shall I strive with these quarrelsome individuals, who pur­sue idolatry and murder, with their new and gross conceits of the Lord’s Supper, but I shall simply advertise what, according to my poor understanding, in my opinion, ought to be undertaken for the peace and edification of the Church. I abide by my opinion, that all public disputation on the subject ought to be forbidden to both parties. I invoke the Son of God, our Lord Jesus Christ, who sits at the right hand of the Father, and gathers to himself by the preaching of the gospel an ever-during communion, that He would teach, guide, and preserve all of us, and each one in particular.” In this manner Melanchthon discharged Luther’s last legacy of love, by exhorting and directing the church, which they had both been instruments of reforming on the basis of faith in Christ, and according to the directory of God’s Word, to cultivate peace, harmony, and union. It is an ennobling spectacle, to see the champions of the fight, on the evening of their lives, when the small patchwork of human knowledge vanishes before the awful splendour of the eternal light, at length stretching out to one another the hand of peace, and recom­mending her to the renovated communion of the Lord as a sacred legacy. And ought we here below, now that they have gone up to the great Supper of the Lamb, and entered into it, to cling to the infirmities of their flesh, and testify our community of saintship with them, by reviving these infirmities after they had been laid aside by themselves as a worn-out, ragged, and unsightly garment? May the Lord of the Church, who knows His disciples by their manifesting love to one another, fill us with His love, that we who believe on His name, may eat of the Holy Supper of love according to His mind and according to His Spirit.

1. Even the Anabaptists, while they often, by their pretended direct revela­tions, placed themselves higher than the written Word, recognised its authority, in so far that they represented their doctrines and observances as founded and enjoined in Scripture, although they often took up its utterances in a spirit too literal, and often understood them quite falsely. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Arius, the well-known false teacher, presbyter of Alexandria in the first half of the fourth century, denied the equality in essence of the Son with the Father. Although his doctrine was condemned by the Church, the sect called after his name maintained itself for a considerable time, and much disturbed the peace of the Church. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. An attempt has been made to prove that Anabaptism constructed itself out of the various sects of the middle ages. In Zurich, however, this cannot be shown to have been the case. The principles of the Anabaptists might indeed find a favoured soil where such seeds existed, but in general it is without doubt true what Hase says in his work entitled “The New Prophets.” “Anabaptism has had its originators and heads in various regions; but everywhere among the people of German extraction, where the Reformation has reared its standard, we meet with Anabaptists without any proveable connection with each other, and in so multiform shapes, that any individual origination is out of the question. We can only conclude that they shot up simultaneously upon the common soil of the Reformation. Anabaptism, a posthumous natural son of the Reformation, bearing a full family-likeness to the first-born son. Protestantism, fighting with the latter against the Papacy, had of necessity to fall out and part company with it. Rebaptism was the solemn rite by which it formed itself into an exclu­sive sect. Yet rebaptism was but the outward badge of Anabaptism falling on the eye, like the cup of the Hussites.” [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. We have learned above in the Sixth Section the melancholy end of his father on the scaffold. The money which the hoary-headed father drew from foreign princes, in violation of his oath and duty, the son dissipated in rioting and debauchery. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. William Roeubli was a native of Rotenburg on the Nekar; parson at Basle he caused the Bible, instead of the relics, to be carried in a procession, and, in consequence, was obliged to flee and came to Zurich, where, as we have seen above, he made an ostentatious marriage, as the first ecclesiastic who renounced celibacy. Zwingli passes this judgment upon him; he was bold and loquacious, but had little understanding [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Thomas Muenzer, born at Stolberg on the Harz, had studied at Wittenberg, and was afterwards preacher at Zwickau, where he, with like-minded friends, the so-called “Zwickau prophets,” founded the sect of the Anabaptists. Banished from Saxony, he came over to Suabia, where, chiefly by the sermons of these fanatics, the peasant insurrection was excited to Waldshut. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. They called it a “dog’s bath,” “an invention of the devil,” or when they would use milder language, “an invention of the pope and anti-Christ.” [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Such a “Supper” Hubmeier celebrated at Waldshnt, a military captain by his side, surrounded by shouting and drinking soldiers, with the resonance, now of a light song, now of a pious psalm in wild confusion. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Hottinger, in his “History of the Confederates during the Church-schism,” 2d Section, page 34, has incorrectly given the contents of this decree of the Council, it being, according to him, to the effect that all children are hence­forward to be baptised before their eighth year, on the penalty **of** banishment. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. According to Bullinger’s testimony, who was present both at this and the former Disputation with the Anabaptists, Zwingli answered their objections in the same way, and with the same arguments as he employs in his afterwards published writing, “Baptism, Anabaptism, and Infant Baptism;” and as he himself says as much, we have thought proper to take from it what concerns this section. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Baptism by water, or ordinary baptism. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. The baptism of the Spirit, or inward baptism. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. The baptism of water and doctrine at once. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. The baptism of water and the Spirit at once. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. Augustine, the famous Father, and Bishop of Hippo, (born a.d. 354, died a.d. 430,) says in his book against the Donatists, (an anabaptistical sect of his time,) “as in the murderer (the thief on the cross) salvation was accomplished, although baptism could not be applied, (yet spiritually, it was not a wanting through faith,) so also by baptism salvation is effected.” Such is the belief of the church general in reference to infants who are baptised, who truly have not yet believed with the heart unto righteousness, nor confessed with the month unto salvation, which the murderer could do; on the contrary, when the sacra­ment is performed upon them, they oppose the words spoken in baptism by their cries, and yet no Christian will assert they are baptised in vain. If, how­ever, a divine recommendation of this ordinance be demanded, (although that which the universal church believes, not appointed by any Council, but every­where, and at all times observed, may justly be regarded as having been ordained by the apostles,) we may truly learn what the baptism of infants signifies by looking to the circumcision of the former people. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. Under this name was understood the so-called “Decatalia,” *i.e.,* a collection of papal laws and rescripts. These were vulgarly called, “The Book of the Pope.” [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. Asingle individual, “Suesstrunk,” was beheaded by the sword for vitupera­tions of the government, continued opposition to the laws, and excitement to rebellion [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. This punishment they suffered, not for their religious opinions, but for their obstinate resistance to the civil authority. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. His name was, properly speaking, Andrew Ralph Bodenstein; he is, how­ever, generally called Carlstadt, after his birth-place of this name in Franconia. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. The so-called “Zwickau prophets.” The most important members of this society were Nicolas Storch, a cloth-maker, Martin Cellarius, Marx Huebner, and the notorious Thomas Muenzer. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. Thus he speaks particularly in reference to images, in his preaching against the Anabaptists, during the first eight days after his arrival in Wittenberg. “Idols, they are called, on which the heart hangs like pears on a tree; of which there have been many among the heathen, and of which there are many at this day in the popedom; which are not simply looked at, but are looked at with confidence, such an image being regarded as a god, and heretics having worshipped such images in which confidence is placed. Such may be pulled down, but only by the lawful civil authority, for such images are not only looked at with the eye, but are looked at with devotion, with confidence, and adoration.” [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. *Zwingli:* The pretence of popery, that it offers up Christ for other men, it has itself invented. The pretence is without foundation in the Scriptures, and from it two impugnments of God, and two great crimes, have arisen. The first impugnment of God consists in this, that the worth and preciousness of the suf­ferings of Christ are darkened. Christ, who was true God and man, is of so great and infinite value, that His death, He being only once sacrificed, is rich and pre­cious enough to pay for the sins of the whole world to all eternity. Now, popery giving out its sacrifice for sin, the matter stands thus; either Christ, by His suf­fering once for all, did not complete redemption, or redemption is no longer of avail. Both are impugnments of Christ. The other impugnment is, that no man can offer a greater sacrifice than *himself,* as Paul teaches, Rom. xii. 1; mark, this is the highest sacrifice which a man can offer, himself. Whoever pretends to offer Christ, takes the honour from Christ and gives it to himself. *Luther:* That Christ is offered in the mass is a blasphemy against God, and an enormity, and the worst sin which can be committed. Christ has been once sacrificed; now He requires nothing more but that we praise Him to all eternity. The sacrifice of Christ once made holds good for ever, and we are saved by believing on it. If any­thing is erected at the side of this sacrifice it is a blasphemy of God. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
23. *Zwingli:* The false opinion that the Mass is a sacrifice has implanted and encouraged every vice. For all robbers, usurers, traitors, murderers, adulterers, have had the opinion, if mass were said for them it was all right with them. And it cannot but be that such have been often led to commit sin on this very ground. It is very visible in the Masses they have paid for, and the benefices they have founded. Popery, however, had not enough in robbing the living of their money to discharge her masses; she brought the dead into the bill also.

    *Luther:* From the moment that the Mass was proclaimed to be a sacrifice, from that moment the devil easily drew the money and property of all the world to himself, and, by the force of riches, he brought into the priesthood, avarice, ambi­tion, pride, unchastity, all villany and baseness, to the total extinction of a true priesthood, till at length the world knew nothing more but mass-priests and their sacrifices, with which all men were deceived who weened that, by their money, they could obtain forgiveness of sins, and everlasting life. [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
24. Zwingli’s opinion on this point is well known, it having found currency and recognition in the Calvinistic Church. Luther expresses his sentiments in this manner: “The nearer our Masses come to the first *Mass* of Christ, the better with­out doubt they are, and the farther from it, the more dangerous. An effort is to be made above everything else, that we may safely and happily come to a true and right knowledge of this Sacrament, that all may be set aside which has been added to the first and simple institution of it by human devotion and zeal, such as *mass-robes, ornaments, chanting, prayers, organs, candles,* and the whole pomp of visible things, and that we may turn our outward eye and our inward soul to the pure institution of Christ, and maintain nothing but the Word of Christ, by which He has ordained, instituted, and completed it.”—Wai.ch, vol. xix. p. 35. [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
25. Exposition of the Eighteenth Article of the Propositions. [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
26. According to an account, the truth of which, from various hints in Zwingli’s and in Luther’s writings, appears to he in the highest degree probable, the two Dutchmen had first repaired to Luther, 1523, requesting him to intimate his concurrence in the contents of Hoen’s letter. From anxiety lest a desecration of the sacrament might ensue, Luther declined the request, although Carlstadt urged him to comply with it. Hereon they came over Basle to Zwingli at Zurich, who found the views of Hoen correspondent with his own. [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
27. The ever-repeated proof for the doctrine of Transubstantiation is contained in the words: “Christ said, This is my body, and this is my blood, consequently bread and wine are understood as changed into the real body aud blood of the Lord, as often as the priest pronounces these w ords at the consecration.” [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
28. When this view first presented itself fully to Zwingli’s mind cannot be accu­rately ascertained. It is probable that he saw the error, and rejected the doctrine of Transubstantiation at the same time with that of the Adoration of the Saints, saint-worship and deified bread equally compromising the merits of Christ, and that immediate faith upon Him, by which alone we can be saved. The first evidence of his change of opinions is contained in a letter to his teacher and friend, Thomas Wyttenbach, of the 15th June 1523. That his new views, how­ever, had been, at this time, completely developed, we know from his own con­fession: “For a greater number of years than it is necessary here to state, I have held the opinion, which I expressed in a letter to Alber, 16th November 1524, and in the Commentary, (March 1525.). My intention, however, was not to publish it to the world without due consideration, &e. &c.” [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
29. Luther also allowed the adoration of the Sacraments. “Let it be free,” he says, “to every one to worship Christ in the Sacrament or not; he neither sins who does it, nor he who does it not, for Christ has not enjoined it. It is thus free to worship Christ in the Sacrament or not, because he will have it free, and has given no command on either side. Therefore let him worship who will, and let him worship not who will not; neither one nor other sins; nor is there heresy on either side. If I may or may not worship God *in the living man,* why not in the Sacrament, as His body and blood are certainly present?” [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
30. Luther undoubtedly had not such clear ideas in reference to the object to which faith is to be directed, and on which it should rest, as Zwingli had. “By the former, faith was more an exalted pious disposition of the soul, sometimes leaning on what was very mediately divine.” [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
31. It is remarkable that the two Reformers drew from the same circumstance or transaction different conclusions, and yet arrived at a similar result. For example, of the crucifixion Luther says, “that the outward transaction saves none; else this most important of all transactions had certainly saved the Pha­risees and the Roman soldiers; their salvation, however, did not take place, because faith failed them.” Zwingli deduces from the same event the inference, that sensible handling and perception save no one, else the soldiers who crucified Christ, and the Pharisees who had the immediate view of that which procured the salvation of the world, had been saved. It is the spiritual contact and con­templation by the eye of faith which make us partakers of the redemption achieved by Christ. [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
32. Luther and Zwingli here agreed almost literally in that which they both regarded as the chief thing in the Sacrament; it was the sweetest consolation to both that Christ had become *ours,* and both admitted that the believer had the assurance of it in the Supper. At the outbreak of the dispute, Luther, carried away by his passion, confounded the subsidiary with the main-point, and pro­secuted a conception which, in his opinion, as stated in the text, the devil him­self might hold with an energy and an emphasis as if life and an salvation depended upon it. [↑](#footnote-ref-32)
33. When he prayed for his sick friend Melanchthon, our Lord God “must pre­serve him.” “For,” he continues, “I threw him the sack before the door, and rubbed his ears with all the promises of prayer, that must be heard.” [↑](#footnote-ref-33)
34. To the very dear friends of God, all Christians at Strasburg, 15th December 1524. [↑](#footnote-ref-34)
35. In my opinion these are probably Rhodius and Sagan, who, as above men­tioned, are said to have visited Luther with Honius’s letter. [↑](#footnote-ref-35)
36. We shall here, for the sake of clearness, present a short summary of the chief parallel events of their lives, in order to show more distinctly how they approach towards and diverge from each other.

    Zwingli and Luther were, as is well known, born within a few weeks of each other, Luther on Martinmas 1483, Zwingli on 1st January 1484. Their parents were pious, upright peasants; Zwingli’s, affluent and indulgent to their children; Luther’s, poor and austere. Whilst Zwingli’s teacher, George Buenzli, was dis­tinguished for learning and gentleness of disposition, we only know Luther’s master at Mansfield, as a savage school-tyrant, who flogged his pupil one fore­noon fifteen times. Zwingli’s parents liberally relieved their son from all the cares of earning his livelihood, Luther had to beg his scanty meal with singing. Both excite admiration by their fine voices. Luther’s brings him the means of support from widow Cotta in Eisenach, while Zwingli’s had nearly introduced him to a cloister life. About the year 1502, both became acquainted with the Scriptures; Zwingli in Basle, at the feet of Wyttenbach, Luther in the library of Erfurt, where he sees a complete Bible for the first time. About the year 1505, Zwingli finds in Leo Jud a friend that remains faithful to him during his whole life, while Luther loses in a terrible manner such an one in his Alexis, which induces him to seek a cloister. From 1506-1510 Zwingli, as parson of Glarus, wrestles against the temptations of life, and combats the corruption of his country, while Luther suffers under inward trials, and the malice of the monks. Zwingli, by the study of the classics, pierces to a deeper acquaintance with the Bible, while Luther, by reading the writings of the mystics, arrives at the same result. In the year 1510 Luther, in 1513 Zwingli, go to Italy, enthu­siastic advocates of the papacy. Both are surprised in the Milanese at finding another ritual for the mass—the Ambrosian. Luther, in his journey, becomes acquainted at Rome with the thorough dissoluteness of the lower classes of the Roman clergy. Zwingli, in his Italian campaigns, has his eyes opened to the total corruption of papal misgovernment. In the year 1517 both found peace of soul through faith on Jesus Christ, and while Zwingli, resolute to proclaim the Word of God without respect of human laws and doctrines, attacks the pil­grimages and the adoration of the Virgin; Luther, from the same standing-point, attacks the sale of Indulgences, and without intending it, shakes the papacy to its foundations. “When I assailed this abuse,” he wrote himself afterwards, “I was yet a monk, and the most absurd Papist in the world, so drunk, so drowned in Papal doctrines, that had I had the power, I should willingly have put all to death who refused obedience to the Pope.” [↑](#footnote-ref-36)
37. It cannot be shown that Carlstadt took part in the civil insurrection. He appears rather to have confined his violence to ecclesiastical affairs. [↑](#footnote-ref-37)
38. Among other eccentricities which Carlstadt displayed is the following: He laid aside his ecclesiastical costume, strutted about in a grey coat and felt hat, like a peasant or artisan, had himself called neighbour Andrew, and wished to be subject to the judge at Orlamuenda. [↑](#footnote-ref-38)
39. Zwingli writes, at a later period, in reference to the manner in which Luther and Carlstadt fought with each other, to the former, in the following terms: “Your everlasting complaints, that nobody has replied to what you have written against Carlstadt, have forced me to a perusal of your polemical writings. But, gracious heavens, how little that is solid and well considered does one find in them? I have only seen, in the whole affair, two blind fighters rushing into single combat. Carlstadt, indeed, is on the tract of truth, but ignorant of the true significance of the figures, he transposes and perverts the words senselessly, like some raw recruit, who has, indeed, courage and arms, but without skill, not knowing on which parts of the body he must fasten his arms. Thus, instead of the har­ness, he binds the helmet on his breast, the greaves he puts on his forehead, and with the arm-rings he covers his legs, out of the coat of mail he makes a helmet, and out of the helmet a quiver, out of the javelin a bow, and out of the bow an arrow. So Carlstadt went into battle. But you, too, though trained to war, rush into the arena without consideration, and without arms, and make him who is inexperienced in the use of his arms so ridiculous to all, by heaping upon him every possible jibe, jeer, and sally of wit, that no eye could recognise him again in the form in which you paint him. Nay, by your noisy exaggerations and invectives, you have set the spectators in the dilemma of not knowing whether to laugh at or compassionate the poor man.” [↑](#footnote-ref-39)
40. Grehel Manz and their friends above-mentioned. [↑](#footnote-ref-40)
41. Here Carlstadt had got some books printed. [↑](#footnote-ref-41)
42. Capito wrote (January 1525) to Zwingli: Bucer is wholly at one with you in the matter of the Supper, although he was at first more devoted to Luther’s view than I could have expected in a man of such penetration, but it may be, he had the circumstances of the times more in his eye than the cause of truth.” Luther received his information of the Swiss Reformation, and the course it took, mostly from travelling students, who exaggerated all, and represented many things falsely. Isolated infringements of the laws of fasting, and isolated iconoclastic excesses communicated by such tale-bearers, were generally regarded at Wittenberg as things approved of by Zwingli, and severely censured, as is very evident from Melanchthon’s letters to Hummelberger of Ravensburg, and to Hess in Silesia. Zwingli’s independent standing, and his great merits in the work of the Reformation, were unknown to Luther and his friends at Witten­berg; they weened the Swiss Reformation was but a distortion of the light that beamed from Wittenberg. [↑](#footnote-ref-42)
43. To these belonged, besides his colleagues in Zurich, Œceolampad in Basle, and Bucer and Capito in Strasburg. [↑](#footnote-ref-43)
44. See Zwingli’s letters to Martin Bucer of 12th February 1531. [↑](#footnote-ref-44)
45. “Figuratising,” (Zeichelei,) Luther accused Œcolampadius of, because he explained the words of institution to be, The bread is a *figure* of my body, follow­ing Tertullian in this. Zwingli, on the other hand, explained them, The bread *signifies* my body, following here, as his authority, Ambrosius. Luther accused him of “figuratising.” Œcolampadius and Zwingli, however, are so much at one in their views of the Supper, that the one often uses the phraseology of the other. [↑](#footnote-ref-45)
46. See Luecke’s Commentary on John, Vol. ii., page 62, *ευλογειν* and *ευχαριστειν* are cognate expressions, which were both employed in the usual Jewish thanks­givings before meals, . . .; *ευλογειν* relates more to the external form of it, while *ευχαριστειν* expresses more the contents. The exegesis of this distinguished Lutheran doctor accordingly confirms Zwingli’s idea. [↑](#footnote-ref-46)
47. Luther had before this explained and commented on this passage in the sense of Zwingli in his “Sermon upon the solemn Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ.” [↑](#footnote-ref-47)
48. This figure of speech Luther employed very often, whether it suited or not, while he censured tropes used by his opponents, in the strongest manner. Synec­doche is the trope according to which a part is taken for the whole. [↑](#footnote-ref-48)
49. You may now, then, cries Zwingli to him on this, make yourself the admin­istrator of all the gifts of God, as the Pope has done. [↑](#footnote-ref-49)
50. Luther, in the course of this dispute, in reference to the ministerial office, fell into an awkward contradiction of his former principles. In the “discourse upon the New Testament,” he says, “Therefore, if they have but faith, all Christian men are priests, and all women priestesses, be they young or old, master or servant, wife or maid, learned or unlearned.” At an after period he held the opinion that if the devil himself would only become pious enough to allow himself to be ordained, he might discharge the office of the ministry very well, and dispense the Sacrament. [↑](#footnote-ref-50)
51. He gives the most distinct expression to this sentiment in a writing under date January 1539. See De Wette’s Letters, Book iv. page 155. [↑](#footnote-ref-51)
52. “I hold that I alone have stood (not to speak of the old) in twenty tempests and commotions which the devil has blown. First, there was the popedom; yea, I think all the world should clearly know with how many whirlwinds, bulls, and books the devil through the same hath raged against me, how he has torn me to pieces, and brought me to nought, (without my having sometimes a little stirred them up,) and yet effected nothing by it, except that they increased their wrath and fury till this day without ceasing. And just as I was almost dying of fear with this raging of the devil, he breaks in another hole, through Muenzer and the insurrection, that he may blow out my candle altogether. And as Christ stops up this hole, he drives in some panes of my window, through Carlstadt, roars and howls that I thought he would carry away light, wax, and wick at once. But God helped his poor wind-light here too, so that nothing was quenched. Then came the Sacramentalists and the Anabaptists, and drove in door and window, to extinguish, as they thought, the light. Verily, they did their best, but they did not accomplish their will.” [↑](#footnote-ref-52)
53. Luther had written, in reference to his doctrine of the Supper, “that in the event of his being pressed by any extremity to say or teach anything else, he would have it known that it was false, and a suggestion of the devil.” Zwingli justly characterises this declaration as a plain confession of despair. [↑](#footnote-ref-53)
54. Zwingli writes, upon one of such conclusions to a book of Luther’s: “The best of it all is, that he closes his book like the parson who lectured his people thus: ‘Mark, if you don’t better yourselves, and I too, we shall all go to the devil. To which may the Lord help you and me, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.’ So Luther ends saying, ‘If I should say anything different, I here publicly make known that it is false, and a suggestion of the devil. To which may my Lord and Saviour help me, Jesus Christ.’ His former book he began with the devil, this one he ends with him.” [↑](#footnote-ref-54)
55. This Dr. Strauss was a restless spirit, who had been thrown into prison at Eisenach, for insurrectionary attempts. He was now induced to publish a very rigmarole work against “the unwholesome doctrine of Magister Zwingli.” Œcolampadius was of opinion Zwingli should not waste time upon him. He, however, answered him more from regard to the Margrave of Baden than to Strauss. [↑](#footnote-ref-55)
56. In another place, Zwingli thus describes the position he takes up to the writings of his antagonists: “We forbid no doctrine to be brought before the Church, be it rank popery, or Lutheran refined, or be it muddy and dirty, and therefore quite unlike Luther, (whose name in German admits of a pun, in the sense of pure, clear.) We stand over it, however, with the thrashing flail of the Word of God, and winnow and sift it properly. We then find in many a writing that it has not more substance than corn in a bad year; it is sheer chaff. Your polemical writings too may be freely read among us, but when they are thoroughly thrashed, they yield little else but straw and chaff. They are like the fig-tree that makes a great appearance with its leaves, but on which there is no fruit.” [↑](#footnote-ref-56)
57. This statement of Luther is untrue. Although he nowhere recognised the merits of Zwingli, we see how the latter mentions him, page 76. [↑](#footnote-ref-57)
58. Laurentius Valla was born at Piacenza, 1416. He had laboured in many of the towns of Italy as a teacher, with great acceptance. He laid the Church under obligations to him by his historical researches, and by his notes on the New Testament, to which Zwingli here refers. Much persecuted by the monks, he died at Rome, 1465. [↑](#footnote-ref-58)
59. Can there be a greater contrast than that of Luther’s language in reply to the above of Zwingli? “Well, then, since they are so abandoned, and make a mock of all men, I shall give them a Lutheran warning, saying, Cursed be such love and union into the abyss of hell, because such union not only tears miser­ably the Church in pieces, but, after the manner of the devil, mocks at and befools it. No, ’tis not for me, dear friends of peace and love. If, after hav­ing murdered the father, mother, wife, and children of a man, whose own life I intended to take, I should turn and say to him, Let us have peace, dear brother. we shall be good friends, the matter is not so great that we should quarrel about it, what should he say to me? How dearly he ought to love me! Now, the fanatics murder Christ my Lord, and God the Father in His Word, my mother Christianity, along with my brethren, and they would slay myself, and they say I ought to be at peace with them—we ought to cultivate love towards each other!” [↑](#footnote-ref-59)
60. Having once, pronounced the extraordinary idea, that the body of Christ is everywhere present, in every leaf, in every grass-stalk, on the table, and under the table, he goes on: “Now there come other fanatics who pretend, ‘Is it so? Is Christ’s body at all corners? Oh, then, I’ll gobble and drink Him up in the wine-houses, in plates, glasses, and pots; there is then no difference betwixt my table and the Lord’s table! Oh, how we shall eat Him up!’ Such scandalous swine are we incorrigible Germans that we have neither sense nor reason, and when we hear of God we pay as little respect as if the subject were a Merry Andrew. And God knows I write such things very unwillingly, because I know it must come among such dogs and swine. But what am I to do? The fanatics are responsible for it, who compel me to it. Now, listen to this, you sow, dog, or fanatic, you who are but an unreasoning ass, you will not so soon eat, drink, and handle Him as you suppose, although Christ’s body is everywhere present; nor shall I speak with you of such things. Go, sow, into your stye.” We can assure our readers that this passage is by no means the most striking proof for the statement in the text. [↑](#footnote-ref-60)
61. Lewis Lavater, Zwingli’s third successor at the Great Minster of Zurich, published a valuable history of the Sacramental Controversy. [↑](#footnote-ref-61)
62. John Brenz, with thirteen of his colleagues, published this polemical book, which will be reviewed in the life of Œcolampadius. He studied at Wittenberg, and was always a faithful follower of Luther, by whom he was much and fre­quently commended. [↑](#footnote-ref-62)
63. Bugenhagen was a native of Pomerania, and usually went by the name *of* Pomeranus, from the place of his birth. His attack against Zwingli was con­tained in a published letter addressed to Pastor Hess of Breslau, and as Schenkel well remarks, displays just as profound a comprehension of the Zwinglian doctrine of the Supper, as that which is to be found in most Lutheran polemical works of the present day. He manifests no comprehension at all of Zwingli’s specific standing-point, and doltishly reproaches him with “confounding the little word ‛is’ with ‘signifies,’” saying that in this his whole theology consists. This insignificant production received at the hands of Zwingli a thorough and masterly refutation, of which it was not at all worthy. [↑](#footnote-ref-63)
64. Wilibald Pirkheimer was at an earlier period much more attached to Zwingli than to Luther; he had, like the Zurich Reformer, enjoyed a classical education. It is remarkable, that the men who had been so educated, but who yet had not soared into the higher regions of a living Christian faith, and thus had not penetrated into the sanctuary of Christian truth itself, but were content to take up their position in the outer court of the Gentiles, were at first greatly prejudiced against Luther. They feared from his ardent and strenuous labours in the faith, which made light of all their select forms, injury to the cause of the newly awakened classical culture. Such men were Erasmus of Basle, Dr. Zasius of Freiburg, Briesgan the famous jurist, and Pirkheimer. Zwingli, who united to their classical tastes Luther’s lofty and far-reaching faith, defended him in letters addressed to them, and compared Luther in a letter to Zasius with the prophet Elias. With Erasmus he had a rupture on Luther’s account; for, highly as he honoured classical culture, and those who possessed it, and above all Erasmus, faith stood still higher in his estimation. Upon the out­break of the Supper-controversy, all the men of the above stamp defended the much more Roman Catholic ideas of Luther, and repaid Zwingli’s noble-minded efforts at mediation between them at an earlier period, by joining the former in proclaiming the doctrine and person of the Zurich Reformer heretical and damnable. Luther manifested his grateful sense of this favour, especially towards Pirkheimer, by assuming as true all the perversions of Zwingli’s doctrine which the latter had allowed himself in his polemical writings, instead of examining Zwingli’s writings for himself, and it was from so false a standing- point as this, that Luther combatted Zwingli and his doctriine. (Compare what Ebrard says in the second vol. of his Dogma of the Supper.) [↑](#footnote-ref-64)
65. In an interchange of words which he had with Pirkheimer upon this subject, the latter said, “what you say cannot be painted.” Upon which Durer replied, “But what you say cannot be *written,* not to speak of painting.” [↑](#footnote-ref-65)
66. Melanchthon, Luther’s best friend, wrote in a letter some years after his death: “Luther was by all his great virtues hasty and passionate. I was often obliged to manifest a slavish subjection to him, as he frequently followed the humour of the moment, and then consulted little his own dignity and the general good. *He could not well endure contradiction.*” [↑](#footnote-ref-66)
67. Where Laffards, first Rector in the High School, concurred in Zwingli's doctrine. [↑](#footnote-ref-67)
68. Luther’s view could only hold its ground, where, either directly or indirectly through his scholars and friends, the whole weight of his personal authority was thrown into the scale. The phenomenon is hence easily explained, that outside of Germany, Zwingli’s view was adopted with hardly any opposition. [↑](#footnote-ref-68)
69. “We Germans are such blades, that whatever is new we fall to it, and hang on it like fools. And he who would withstand our folly makes us more foolish than before; but if none withstand us, we soon get tired, and begin to gape about for something new. The devil has thus the advantage that no doctrine or con­ceit, however absurd it be, can lift its head above water with us without finding advocates, and the more absurd it is the more readily it will find supporters.” [↑](#footnote-ref-69)
70. John Haner writes afterwards, in December 1529, to Bucer, on this subject: “I was the first who took the trouble of persuading the landgrave, Von Hessen, to attempt a reconciliation between the contending parties, and this took place even as early as the first Diet at Speyer.” [↑](#footnote-ref-70)
71. So the adherents of Zwingli’s doctrine of the Supper were called after the example of Luther. [↑](#footnote-ref-71)
72. According to the account of Bernhard Uriss the bookseller, Christoffel Froschaucr accompanied him also. [↑](#footnote-ref-72)
73. His wife, the learned Catherine Zett, so famous by her correspondence with Superintendent Kahns, writes in one of her letters to Kahns: “I was fourteen days maid and cook when the dear homely men Œcolampadius and Zwingli were here at Strasburg, in the year twenty-nine (1529), in the journey, along with our folks to Marburg to Dr. Luther.” [↑](#footnote-ref-73)
74. “Did it stand thus with Luther’s lauded confidence in the self-evident clear­ness and simplicity of his doctrine?” inquires Ebrard. [↑](#footnote-ref-74)
75. Melanchthon sought to defend this very strange proposal, by saying that the Papists, when they saw the Lutherans and Zwinglians collecting together in a large body, might say, with some show of reason, they were hatching a con­spiracy against the Emperor. But Ebrard justly observes: “He does not desire to have the Papists present simply as witnesses that no conspiracy was forming against the Emperor, (by theologians!) but, in fact, as umpires, to the end that the Swiss might have the worst of it. It is here evident that behind the lofty- sounding phrases of Luther of the immoveable certainty of his doctrine, and the contemptibleness of his opponents, there lay concealed the greatest anxiety and fear on his part, lest these very adversaries might carry off the victory in public estimation. So he says, ‘It is not well that the landgrave has much to do with the Zwinglians; he has more inclination to them than is good. The matter is of that kind that it easily affects men of acute minds, such as I hold the Landgrave to be.’ Thus he was so far untrue to himself and his own honour as to desire papistical auxiliaries in this matter as ‘impartial.”’— Ebrard, “The Dogma of the Holy Supper,” Second Part. page 304. [↑](#footnote-ref-75)
76. Ebrard remarks upon this in his “Dogma of the Supper,” Second Part, page 306. “How naive! Zwingli is *challenged* to a public disputation, and is willing to come. Luther is full of anxiety, but now blames Zwingli for having sought and occasioned the disputation, and again that he wavers in his opinion. Luther will not leave the glory of pacification to his adversary, but requires he should have testified in writing ‘his humble endeavours for peace,’ and demands this from one who, for years long, had replied to his outbreaks of passion in an humble and pacific spirit. He assures him ‘we are not so wild and profligate.’ Luther demonstrates the inutility of a disputation where ‘both parties come together with the resolution not to yield,’ and concludes from hence that Zwingli must yield, for he (Luther) will come with the resolve not to yield a hair­breadth. What self-irony! Luther did not come to prove and to weigh, free of prejudice, the arguments of his opponent, but from the very first to reject them. He did not come with any confidence in the truth of his doctrine, that it would sustain a fair trial, but he came concealing behind the pretensions which he put forward that his adversary from the first, that is before the hearing and exami­nation of the arguments of both the parties, should make the promise that he was willing to yield; he came concealing behind this *the fear,* the consciousness of the factitious character and impotency of his own arguments. He did not come with the consciousness of being a man liable to err, whose mind, however clear and well-intentioned, was yet of limited capacity, but he came with the consciousness of unerringness and infallibility, he came in a subtle *self-deifica­tion,* which cannot be denied.” [↑](#footnote-ref-76)
77. What a strong contrast does this pusillanimous anxiety present to the noble heroism which eight years before he showed on his journey to Worms. The heroic spirit appears to have departed from him after he plunged into this unhappy controversy, bearing with him all his passions into it. [↑](#footnote-ref-77)
78. Dr. Julius Muller, in the third number of “Studies and Criticisms,” year 1856, has admirably and most perspicuously developed the relation between the efficiency of the Holy Ghost, and the means of grace in the Word. The result of the investigations of this able divine very nearly agree with Zwingli’s, although he makes no reference to him. [↑](#footnote-ref-78)
79. The relation is taken from a confidential letter of Zwingli’s to Vadian. [↑](#footnote-ref-79)
80. Œcolampadius’s remark had reference to Eck’s coarse and arrogant demeanour at the Baden Disputation. Certainly a heavy charge against Luther, but unfor­tunately one that was too well merited. [↑](#footnote-ref-80)
81. When Zwingli speaks only of twenty-four, and Brenz of fifty or sixty, as being present, the difference is reconcilable, on the ground that Zwingli speaks of the number at the beginning, Brenz of that in the course, or at the end, of the Disputation. Luther having written to Brenz not to come to Marburg, and the latter having written to Osiander, and others, dissuading them from making their appearance, they did not arrive in Marburg till a day and a half after the Dis­putation had begun. [↑](#footnote-ref-81)
82. A very plain hint to Luther. [↑](#footnote-ref-82)
83. *Which is given for you,* Luther, with good reason, always let drop. [↑](#footnote-ref-83)
84. Luther could never comprehend that the two ideas, finite *(finitum)* and limited *(circumscriptum)* were synonymous, and he would never admit that what is finite is necessarily limited. He hence involved himself in a confusion of ideas from which he could only save himself by his boldly setting all consequences at defiance. [↑](#footnote-ref-84)
85. Fulgentius, Bishop of Ruspe (died 533), made himself chiefly known by his defence of the Augustinian doctrine of predestination and election. [↑](#footnote-ref-85)
86. If He were not inseparable in person He could not be the Saviour of all. For His ability to save is derived principally from His divine nature, although it is only in His human nature that He hath suffered. [↑](#footnote-ref-86)
87. It is hence faith, the spiritual partaking of the body and blood of Christ, and not the reception of the sacrament, which alone brings justification to us. [↑](#footnote-ref-87)
88. This article is very important; according to it, pardon of sin is not extended to us by the presentation of the Sacrament. [↑](#footnote-ref-88)
89. For it is also written, “Go and preach,” &c., &c.; and, “Faith cometh by hearing,” &c., else the preacher’s office were abolished. [↑](#footnote-ref-89)
90. By the gospel we understand generally the outward proclamation of the Word. [↑](#footnote-ref-90)
91. He the Spirit, and not the outward Word, gives faith; hence His part in the work is stated with peculiar prominence. [↑](#footnote-ref-91)
92. Baptism is here called a work of God that none may despise or con­demn it. [↑](#footnote-ref-92)
93. Faith is demanded either from him who receives the baptism, or from him who brings a child to receive baptism, to wit, from the father or the mother, faith to the effect that the individual to be baptised believes the promise, and desires to be admitted into the communion of the Church, or that he will be instructed in the faith when he comes to years of discretion. [↑](#footnote-ref-93)
94. Our opponents call confession that which we call seeking of counsel. For this reason, both expressions are here used. They also employ “absolution,” to designate what we express by evangelical comfort. [↑](#footnote-ref-94)
95. That is, they who have been made partakers of grace, are impressed with the sign of faith. [↑](#footnote-ref-95)
96. They call it the Sacrament of the Altar; we the Holy Supper. [↑](#footnote-ref-96)
97. A sacrament, *i*.e., a sign of the true body and blood of Christ. Accordingly it is not the true body of Christ himself. [↑](#footnote-ref-97)
98. That is, as Christ hath instituted it in His own words. Hence we should beware of changing the words, or thinking lightly of them. [↑](#footnote-ref-98)
99. The meaning of this passage is the following: We ought so to keep the sacrament as Christ has instituted it. But Christ has instituted it in com­memoration of himself, *i.e.,* that we may show forth His death, thank, praise, and extol Him, that He has been crucified, and has died for us. This showing forth avails to our comfort and confirmation in the faith. [↑](#footnote-ref-99)
100. What Zwingli did out of a spirit of pure Christian love, out of a feeling of the duty of a united combination, even under existing differences, out of the feeling of hope that reconciliation might yet be effected, was interpreted (by Luther and his worshippers) as if he had done it from necessity, and a feeling of weak­ness—as if he had been under the necessity of begging for the great honour of Luther’s friendship, and had not obtained it. Did there not much rather lie in it (Zwingli’s deportment) the noble and the upright recognition of the greatness and merits of his opponent? Did there not lie in it the open testi­mony that his conscience, and his conscience alone, prevented him from pur­chasing, at the price of a denied conviction, the union which he so ardently desired? Did there not lie over against the proud Luther an act of humility and self-denial on the part of the free Swiss, who in no respect stood in need of Luther’s favour?—Ebrard, “The Dogma of the Holy Supper.” Part ii. page 341. [↑](#footnote-ref-100)
101. Bucer and Capito wrote on the 23d June 1530 to Zwingli, that two passages in this confession gave great offence at the Diet; the Papists were offended at the passage at the end of Chap. X., where Zwingli compares the higher orders of the Romish clergy to wens and humps; the Lutherans at that, which speaks of those who look back to the onions and flesh-pots of Egypt, an allusion they applied to themselves. [↑](#footnote-ref-101)
102. The words certainly were always understood and explained by Luther and Zwingli differently, according to their different modes of contemplating things, especially the word *true* and *truly.* For Luther, from his point of view of scholastic realism, the sensibly perceptible, and at the same time tangible, was alone the *true,* while Zwingli, with John, (as also with Plato,) regarded the super-sensual and eternal, which withdraws itself from the perception of our senses, but which again is contemplated by the believing soul, by the pure heart, as *the true* and *truly.* The “*true”* bread is neither barley-bread nor wheaten-bread, but the “*eternal”* Word of God, which became flesh in Christ, and which eternally nourishes and strengthens our soul. The “*true”* light is not that which affects our corporeal eye, but our soul. Thus for Zwingli the “*true*”body of Christ, of which the believing soul becomes partaker in the Supper, is not the sensible body of Christ, but His whole divine and human appearance and redeeming work, which He accomplished by divesting-himself of His heavenly glory, and offering himself up in sacrifice for us. This, however, is not present to the senses, which can just as little seize hold of and grasp it as they can perceive God. The believing soul alone, the pure in heart alone, see God. It is only the believing soul, too, which is able to recognise Christ as the God-man, and to appropriate to itself His redemption-work. To her Christ and His redemption are always present. From the standing-point of the higher intellectual contemplation, there is neither past nor future, but one eter­nal present. This spiritual, believing contemplation *(contemplatio fidei)* is ele­vated, enhanced, and confirmed by the partaking of the Holy Supper. It is, however, always as different from the idea which we bear in our souls of sensible things, as God is different from the world. [↑](#footnote-ref-102)
103. In the introduction to his “Friendly Exegesis,” (“Amica Exegesis.”) [↑](#footnote-ref-103)
104. Melanchthon died April 1560. He was born at Bretten in the Palatinate, 16th February 1497. [↑](#footnote-ref-104)
105. Tileman Hesshussins was born at Wesel in the year 1527. He was one of that class of men who, possessing Luther’s passionateness, without his great intellect, pass themselves off as double-refined Lutheran. For his unmeasured advocacy of a one-sided view of the Lutheran doctrine of the Supper, and the persecuting spirit he manifested towards all who did not agree with him in it, he was divested one after the other of his professorial and clerical offices in Goslar, Magdeburg, Wittenberg, Heidelberg, Brunswick, Wesel, Jena, &c., in all which places he excited the most odious animosities. A synod of 20 ministers formally condemned at Koenigsberg, in 1577, the doctrinal opinions of this Lutheran zealot. He died in 1588. [↑](#footnote-ref-105)
106. Under this designation we are to understand the polemical divines Timann and Westphal, who persecuted with great violence the pious minister Albrecht Hardenberg, simply because he cultivated friendly relations with John Lasky and the Swiss. [↑](#footnote-ref-106)
107. Melanchthon here refers to the comparison Augustine draws between the many grains of corn which form *one* loaf of bread, and the many grapes which go to form *one* wine, with the members of the Church who are made *one* body in Christ, through partaking of the Supper of the Lord. [↑](#footnote-ref-107)