

TWO SETS OF THESES
DOCTOR MARIN LUTHER

The University of Wittenberg was founded by Frederick the Wise in 1502. Since the Elector wished his University to be one of the best, he spared no effort in the search for good men to staff the faculties. Nor was he hesitant in the erection of new buildings nor the expenditure of considerable sums for books.

But, what is more important, he set it up on the order of the University of Paris and other German universities. This had to do, naturally, with the undergraduate and graduate schools, the number of men on the faculties, their remuneration, admission requirements for the students, etc.

What interests us here were the disputations, which, as it were, were well-nigh a regular part of the curriculum. The four types of disputations, in which Luther, as a Professor *ordinarius* of the University, had to take part, were

1. A. Luther, as Professor *ordinarius*, as well as every *Magister* of the Theological Faculty, had to debate according to his regular turn every Friday during the school year. During the vacations the Baccalaureates conducted disputations on successive Fridays, from which Luther and the other members of the theological faculty were excused.

B. Once a year Luther and the *Magistri* of the theological faculty had to take part in a public and formal disputation.

2. *Die feierlichen Vierteljahrsdisputationen*. The University of Wittenberg had four schools or colleges; an undergraduate college of Liberal Arts and three graduate schools, i.e. Theology, Law, and Medicine. Each such school had its Professor *ordinarius* and each such Professor had to conduct a formal disputation once a year. Thus the name - *Quarterly Disputation*. Of Luther's activity on these occasions we have until now no definite material. Weimar

Edition 39 II, p. XI #9 lists one possibility from the year 1519 with the title "*De Lege et Fide*" consisting of 16 theses. It is printed WA 6, 33 F.F.; St. Louis (W2) 19, 1416 f. and is #403 in Aland's *Hilfsbuch zum Lutherstudium*.

3. *Promotionsdisputationen*. These disputations, as the name implies, took place whenever someone was to be promoted to the doctorate. The aspirant had to defend in open debate theses written for him. It was, one might say, a public oral examination. If successful the promotion itself usually took place on the same day or soon thereafter.

4. *Zirkulardisputationen*. In this type of disputation a group of men would *in turn* defend against arguments made against this or that thesis. That is to say, they would go around the *circle* and then begin again.

There were other types of Disputations but these are the four main methods followed. For further reading and information on this subject consult:

A. *Weimar Ausgabe 39 II, XXXIII f.f. which I have used and which lists*

B. *Urkundenbuch der Universität Wittenberg, Vol. 1, 1926 - W. Friedensburg.*

C. *Die Disputationen und Promotionen an den Deutschen Universitäten vornehmlich seit dem 16. Jahrhundert, Beiheft zum Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen 11, 1893, S. 30 f.f.; Ew. Horn.*

D. *Zur Geschichte der akademischen Grade und Disputationen, Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen 11, 1894, S. 201 f.f.; G. Kaufmann.*

E. *Geschichte der Universität Wittenberg, 1917, S. 312 f.; Friedensburg.*

According to a Gutachten of the Philippistic Wittenberg professors of 1577 the practice of holding disputations fell by the wayside soon after Luther's death. Because these men had their

own ax to grind this is only partly true. Be that as it may, when these Cryptocalvinists were put out of office, the practice of holding disputations came once again to full flower. How long it lasted I don't know. But we do, for example, have 16 sets of theses by Aegidius Hunnius from 1593 - 1595 on the Augsburg Confession. After that the disputations slowly but surely went out of style.

-0-

Both of the "Disputations" which now follow are *Zirkular-disputationen*. But the disputations themselves are lost. In fact the first set of 20 theses, because it is numbered V., is obviously part of a larger set which is lost. But this should be borne in mind when Thesis 2 is read. Only one other point should be noted. The opening words of Thesis 1 on excommunication read: "*Errant ecclesiarum propositi*." I have taken the liberty of translating *propositi* as *pastors and elders*.

The ^Disputation on Works etc. is found WA 7, 231; St. Louis (W2) 19, 1418 f. and is #356 in Aland.

The Disputation on Excommunication is found WA 7, 236; St. Louis (W2) 19, 902 f. and is #211 in Aland.

Doctor Paul Drews was editor for both. The translation has been made from the Weimar Edition.

QUESTION.

WHETHER WORKS PREPARE FOR JUSTIFICATION

1520.

PROPOSITIONS ARGUED BY MARTIN LUTHER

IN THE YEAR 20

V. WORKS PREPARE FOR JUSTIFICATION

1. Just as nothing justifies except faith so nothing sins except unbelief.
2. Justification is characteristic of faith in the fourth mode just as also sin is a characteristic of unbelief.
3. Faith, unless it be without the least particle of works, does not justify. In fact, it isn't even faith.
4. It is impossible that faith be without constant, many, and great works.
5. Works done after Justification do not justify, although in the Scripture they are called righteousnesses.
6. Works done before Justification do not make guilty, although in the Scriptures they are called sins.
7. Whoever is born of God does not sin nor can he sin.
(I John 3,9)
8. Whoever says that he does not sin is a liar and the truth is not in him. (I John 1,8)
9. To the extent that fruit has anything to do with the substance of a tree, just so much do works have to do with Justification and guilt.
10. If in faith one could commit adultery, it would not be a sin.
11. If in unbelief you worship God, you're perpetrating an act of idolatry.
12. Faith completely destroys trust in good works as well as

despair caused by evil works.

13. In connection with sins faith diminishes the conscience and enlarges the conscience in connection with merits.

14. Unless we all become liars God cannot be truthful to us.

15. No one's unbelief makes void the truth of God.

16. Our iniquity commends the righteousness of God, and nevertheless he is a just punisher of iniquity.

17. The truth of God abounds to his glory in our lie and yet we are rightly judged as sinners.

18. Although evil works should not be done that good may come of it

19. Still evil works have been and are being done that good may come of it.

20. Neither faith nor righteousness comes from works, but works come from faith and righteousness.

M. D. XX.

A DISPUTATION OF DOCTOR MARTIN LUTHER
ON EXCOMMUNICATION ETC.

1. Pastors and elders of churches err when by excommunication they seek personal revenge and advantage.

2. The punishment of excommunication should be imposed on the basis of the humility of sorrowing pastors and not on the basis of the pride and haughtiness of angry pastors.

3. It's not enough in a matter against the Lord that one writes in a pretty fashion: In the Lord we command and demand.

4. The apostle ordered the evil-doer to be given over for the ruination of the flesh that the spirit might be saved. (I Cor. 5,5) Therefore they teach incorrectly who think that by excommunication the soul is handed over to the devil.

5. The ruination of the flesh takes place in penitance and by a return to one's senses for the advantage of the spirit and the renewal of the inner man.

6. And so the apostle does not deny brotherly love to him whom he has ordered separated from the congregation (II Thess. 3, 14f.)

7. A person to be excommunicated because of wickedness of soul and public crime is already cut off before he is publicly excommunicated.

8. Therefore public excommunication is a sure sign of inner excommunication.

9. Public excommunication is not an effective and infallible sign of inner excommunication, but quite often a fallacious sign.

10. An unjust excommunication does not harm the one publicly excommunicated but harms only him who has excommunicated and those consenting thereto.

PROMOTION DISPUTATION OF JOHANNES MACCHABAEUS SCOTUS 1542

DISPUTATION

1. The visible Church is the assemblage of saints, to which many hypocrites have been admixed, nevertheless consenting to the true doctrine of the Gospel and the legitimate use of the Sacraments.

2. I call those saints who in this life believe the Gospel and are reborn by the Holy Spirit, who truly call upon God with the assurance of a Mediator and have an inchoate obedience.

3. The Church is joined to the Gospel according to the Word of the eternal Father concerning His Son: This one hear. (Mt. 17,5). It is not bound to the bishops nor to a regular succession of bishops.

4. When the bishops are opposed to the Gospel we are forced by divine mandate to drop them as accursed according to the dictum of Paul: If any one teach any other Gospel, let him be anathema, (Gal. 1,8), that is, let him be considered accursed and by divine judgement excluded from the Church, a cast-off and a fugitive, lest the contagion pollute others, as is said in the Psalm: He put on the curse as a vestment etc. (Ps. 109,18f.)

5. Human polities are joined to a certain succession. They have laws and the power of interpreting their laws. They have grades of persons, i.e. kings and dukes. They have also another glory, that is, the power, wealth and ability for getting things done, as witness the great things done by Alexander and Scipio.

6. The Church is not such a polity but a dispersed body which is spread throughout the whole earth without an external head, without power, without human glory, that is, without wealth and without grades of human dignitaries.

7. But the Church has a head, Christ, who is present with His members, and it both rules and defends and has a glory because

it knows and worships God and does great things, just as Elijah, Elisha, Paul and other believers waged a most bitter battle and were truly unyielding against the devil with the result that many were freed from eternal death.

8. In the Church there ought to be decisions and the ~~text~~ interpretation of Scripture is a gift. Nor is the power for interpreting Scripture regal or praetorian, that is, it is not necessary to obey anyone because of an authority based on order.

9. Moreover, that the present day bishops are idolaters and enemies of the Gospel is clear because they defend multiple idolatry and many pernicious errors which war with the Gospel.

10. Every invocation of the dead is a manifest idolatry such as in the worship of saints as one is wont to call it.

11. Multiple idolatries are in the papistical mass.

12. It is impious for the sacrificient to say that he offers the Son of God since no sacrifice has been instituted.

13. It is impious when he says that he aids others and merits the forgiveness of sins.

14. It is impious that they pray for the dead.

15. In short whenever the Sacrament is transferred to a use other than that which has been instituted it is no Sacrament.

16. It is manifest idolatry to imagine that the monastic estate merits the remission of sins or life eternal.

17. The prohibition of marriage is manifest impiety and a wicked, stubborn and diabolical defense of fickle unrestrained desire. Nor is it to be doubted that God is horribly offended by any kind of wickedness, unrestrained desires and cruelty.

18. There are multiple idolatries in the doctrine of the adversaries concerning justification. They depreciate sin. They do not allow one to give due honor to the Son of God. They command

those, who are repenting, to doubt perpetually. Since no prayer is possible, if the mind is ignorant of the promise of reconciliation, it flees God. And Paul says: Through Him we have access to God. (Rom. 5,2) Moreover there is no Church where there is no prayer to God.

19. We, to the contrary, speak correctly that man is justified for Christ's sake freely, not on account of our own virtues or works. It is the same thing that in our Churches it is rightly said: By faith alone man is justified.

20. And faith signifies trust in the mercy given for Christ's sake, by which trust we believe that our sins are remitted for the sake of God's Son, the victim and mediator. Nor is it possible that sin against conscience exist at the same time with this faith.

21. We say that this ~~trust~~^{us} is necessary in every prayer and that doubt fighting with this faith is certain to be sin. Therefore most sweet is the voice of Augustine in Ps. 88: "To all eternity Christ will reign in his saints. This God has said. This God has promised. And if this were not enough, this God has also sworn." (Ps.89.6) Because therefore the promise is sure not because of our merits, but because of that one's (Christ's) mercy, we ought to believe and pray etc.

22. Even if new obedience is necessary nevertheless it does not satisfy the Law of God and there remains in the reborn in this life actual and original sin, darkness in the mind and security and also insolence in will and heart.

23. It is most certain that these evils are sins in their very nature, that is, a vitiating opposition to the Law of God and worthy of God's anger. Therefore the Church is to be constantly taught that it recognize and learn these sins, that the reborn please God by faith for Christ's sake, that the inchoate obedience

is pleasing for the sake of Christ, the priest, who brings our offerings to the Father just as Peter says: Offer spiritual offerings acceptable to God through Jesus Christ. (I Pet. 2,5)

24. The doctrine of satisfaction among the adversaries is an error and an impiety and the fount of many errors.

25. Since therefore the adversaries and their bishops defend these three errors with such devilish pertinacity, they are to be dropped and cursed just as if they were anathematized. We do not desire the friendship of those, who do not want to be friends of God with us and over against their curses we console ourselves with the word of the Psalm: They curse and you bless. (Ps. 109,28)

J. Machabaeus Scotus.

A]
DISPUTATION OF THE REVEREND FATHER, DOCTOR MARTIN LUTHER, CONCERNING THE CHURCH, MASTER JOHANNES MACCHABAEUS SCOTUS REPLYING FOR THE ATTAINMENT OF A LICENSE IN THROLOGY.

Preface

This disputation is proposed concerning that great article, which is called the Church Catholic, concerning which there is a very great contention between us and the papistical adversaries, who in an admirable fashion have perverted this truth. Therefore it is necessary that we resist and refute them because the Church is a congregation of such a nature which we are not able to comprehend unless the Holy Spirit shall have revealed it, because it is in the flesh and appears visible^y, it is in the world and appears in the world, but is nevertheless neither the world nor in the world and no one can see it. Therefore they easily enter a dream world who do not have a proper grasp of the terminology involved.

B]

DISPUTATION OF MASTER JOHANNES MACCHABAEUS SCOTUS DR. MARTIN LUTHER

PRESIDING.

Preface of the Reverend Father in Christ Dr. Martin Luther.

This disputation has been proposed in that great article of the Church Catholic, concerning which there is a very great strife now between us and the adversaries who have horribly perverted it. And with diligent care and investigation it is necessary for you properly and aptly to distinguish and thoroughly know the thing itself in order to resist the raging adversaries. The Church moreover is a congregation of such nature, which human reason is not able to apprehend, unless the Holy Spirit reveal it. It is and appears in the flesh and nevertheless is not the flesh; it is and is discerned in the world and nevertheless is not the world. To the extent that a person does not rightly distinguish and make use of the word 'Church' in its proper meaning, he is easily deceived and in turn deceives. But that's enough, it's your turn to talk; whoever has an argument, say on.

A]

Arguments

I Against 18.

Believers are not able to pray without doubt. Therefore doubt is not a sin or impiety.

I prove the antecedent with this syllogism: Sinners are not able to state that they are heard because they are sinners. Moreover God does not hear sinners. Believers are sinners. Therefore they are not able to state that they are heard.

Response. From Sacred Writ we know that there are two classes of sinners or two-fold sinners. Some have sin but it does not rule over them. They do not serve or obey sin but fight it. Truly there is another class of sinners, which obeys sin, is enamored of sin and does not fight it. But it sins with a certain amount of avidity. The major premise is true that God does not hear

sinners. Concerning those, who have given themselves to sin, it is true; concerning those truly, who battle sin, it is not true.

B]

Contrary Arguments

(I) Against 18.

The pious are not able to pray without doubt. Therefore doubt is not idolatry.

I prove the antecedent with the syllogism: Sinners are not able to state that they are heard by God. The pious are sinners. Therefore the pious are not able to state that they are heard by God.

Macchabaeus to the major: There are two kinds of sinners. Some sinners have sin so, that they do not serve it, but they themselves dominate it, that is, they do not allow sin to rule in them. The others are sinners who obey and serve sin, who sin with a certain avidity and willingness. They do not fight sin. Concerning this second kind of sinners the major is true. Truly it is false in regard to sinners of the first kind.

B]

(Ia)

The Pope argues so: Christ is with us until the end of the world. Therefore we are not able to sin.

Response. The whole argument is false, because Christ is among us for this purpose that if we sin in anyway he himself raises us up and sustains us if only our will inclines to him.

B]

(Ib)

Faith is knowledge, therefore not righteousness, because faith is in the intellect and righteousness truly is not.

Response. The righteousness of Christians is not in the category of quality but in that of relation, because it is the

reputation of righteousness whereby God reposes us righteous.

B]

(Ic)

The remission of sins is dependent on the condition of penitance. Therefore it is not by faith alone.

I respond that penitance pertains to justification as a cause without which there is no justification or as a terminus a quo. But there is quite another cause of the remission of sins and of justification than our penitance. If the remission of sins were to depend on the condition of our penitance, it would be entirely uncertain.

B]

(Id)

Fear is prescribed for Christians. Fear has doubt. Therefore doubt is commanded and is not impious.

Response. Filial fear is prescribed for Christians, which is joined with faith and it never encompasses doubt under it. Servile fear is not prescribed, which is full of unbelief, doubt and impiety.

B]

(Ie)

Those, who have sin, do not have a good conscience. The reborn have sin. Therefore they do not have a good conscience.

Response. The reborn have sin, that is, remitted sin, but not against conscience. Where, asks Paul, is he, who knows the mind of God? (Rom. 11,34) that is, he is talking about the mind, that is, the unrevealed wisdom of God. Doubt is not sin when it has to do with material things. Those things are not sins which have to do with untainted nature, but doubt is from corrupt nature. It is, therefore, vitiating.

B]

(If)

If there is a double promise, there is a double faith. But there is a double promise, therefore also double faith.

Response. It is the same promise but it turns about one or the other object.

B]

(Ig)

Doubters are heard. Therefore it is no sin.

The example of the leper proves the antecedent: Lord, if thou wilt, thou canst make me whole. (Mt. 8,2)

I respond that this leper, even if he had a certain doubt, nevertheless firmly believed, that he also wished and was able to be healed by Christ. He conquered that doubt. We ought to imitate his example. Besides, this must be said about the promise of grace; in so far as we doubt concerning spiritual things, that ^{u b} ~~doubt~~ is sin. Contrition is not the principle cause of doubt, but sin is.

B]

(Ih)

The Scripture says that certain sins are not remitted. Therefore one ought to doubt.

I prove the ^g antecedent from Mt. 12: Whoever sins against the Holy Ghost, to him it is not remitted. (Mt. 12,31)

Response. The argument proceeds from the same thing as if I were to say: Whatever covers everything, covers itself as well. Heaven covers everything. Therefore it covers itself as well.

A]

II Argument Against 22.

The Holy Spirit does not dwell in those who have sin. The Holy Spirit dwells in the believers and reborn. Therefore the

believers do not have sin.

The major is proved: They, who are of God, do not sin, is said by John. (I John 5,18)

Response: John says that they, who are born of God, sin not unto death for the Holy Spirit dwells in the infirm and in those having sin, who fight against sin.

B]

II Against 22

The Holy Spirit does not dwell in those who have sin. The Holy Spirit is in the pious and reborn. Therefore the pious and reborn do not have sin.

Response. Mach.: I deny the major. For otherwise the Holy Spirit would not be dwelling in the human race.

I prove the major from John when he says: Whoever is born of God does not sin. (I John 5,18)

Response: This is the meaning of John: Whoever is born of God, does not sin, that is with a sin unto death. True the Holy Spirit dwells in the infirm and struggles against sin and finally conquers sin in them.

A]

III Argument Against the same.

Whoever heals removes the causes of death. Christ has healed us. Therefore he has removed the causes of death.

Response. A person is able to so heal, that he does not at all remove the root. But to the minor. Christ has not healed us, that the root of sin does not remain in us, but truly burgeoning with sin and bringing forth sin he does not impute it to us.

B]

III

Whoever heals, removes the causes of death. Christ has healed us. Therefore he has abolished the causes of death.

Response. Christ has healed us by imputation, not as though he also has abolished the root of sin; but that this root, springing up and breaking forth, is not imputed to us.

Against: Therefore it is a sort of temporary cure as the medical men call it.

Response. He has reserved for them a perpetual cure in the next life. Here it is sufficient, that ^{by} a beginning and by imputation sin be absent and righteousness present.

A]

IV Argument

Against 15.

The abuse does not abolish the substance. Therefore in the mass of the adversaries there is a true Sacrament.

Response. An abuse of the substance abolishes the substance. And the adversaries in their mass abuse the substance of the Sacrament, and a change in the institution is not (only) an abuse, but it abolishes the substance, as also our proposition (maintains), because the institution of the Sacrament is the very substance and to change the substance is an abuse. They alter the institution itself and having removed the institution the substance also is taken away. They abuse the institution, therefore also the substance and as a consequence there is no ^S sacrament. Therefore outside of what is instituted it is an abuse, that is, (the abuse) abolishes the very substance of the institution and the institution itself, because the institution itself is the Sacrament. Therefore the Sacrament is abolished where the institution is abolished.

B]

IV Against 15

An abuse does not abolish the substance. Therefore in the mass of the adversaries there is a true Sacrament.^e

Respond. An abuse outside of the institution of Christ abolishes the substance. For a mutation of the institution is a change of the substance. When therefore the adversaries in their mass abuse the Sacrament outside of the institution of Christ, they change the substance of the Sacrament. And consequently they have no true Sacrament.

A]

(V) Against

An abuse, not abolishing the institution of Christ, does not abolish the substance of the Sacrament. The adversaries as soon as they have offered afterwards accept (the ^Sacrament). They do not abolish. Therefore they do not change the substance.

Response. I deny the minor, because they using do not use rightly. For they (the priests) alone accept. They do not communicate (the ^Sacrament) to the Church but apply it for others. Therefore the whole institution is vitiated.

B]

V

An abuse, which does not abolish the institution, does not abolish the ^Sacrament. But the abuse of the ^Sacrament among the adversaries, that they offer it to God, does not abolish the institution of Christ. Therefore it does not abolish the ^Sacrament.

Response. Master Macchabaeus: I deny the minor.

I prove the minor because afterwards they accept according to the institution of Christ.

I respond to the probation in this way that they offer the ^Sacrament for the sins of others, as they denote the whole remaining work. In addition also, this is against the institution of Christ, the priests alone and themselves privately receive the ^Sacrament. They do not communicate an uncorrupted ^Sacrament to the

Church. This preceding sacrifice violates the substance of the
^S
 sacrament.

C]

V

Disputation of Macchabaeus Luther presiding.

The institution being removed the substance is also taken away. It's true, an abuse does not abolish the substance but here the use of the institution is removed. Therefore the very substance of the ^Ssacrament is taken away.

A]

(VI) Against

Just as Baptism is not made of non effect even though vicious and superstitious rites, such as exorcizing, precede it, nor does this abolish the substance itself, so also in the ^Ssacrament of the Altar a preceding abuse, such as offering, is not able to abolish the principle use.

Response. You must distinguish between superstitious rites and manifest blasphemies and impieties such as when they offer the Son of God ex opere operato for sins, which is the greatest blasphemy and this destroys and vitiates that which follows.

Response - Luther. Moreover the words of institution are to be observed: Take and eat, this do in my commemoration. But they themselves offer for others. They do not communicate to the others. They stand alone, they speak with themselves, they do not remember the suffering and death of Christ. Therefore they do not only abuse the true institution of Christ but the very words of the papists are portentous redoing the institution itself. (Here German) And they were really worried when they forgot whether they had consecrated the ^Ssacrament or not. Later they made the rule: (Here Latin) If you put on the alb when you wish to ^Cconsecrate,

if after you shall have wished to consecrate and you shall have forgotten, then you have consecrated with the first intention. They corrupted, they changed the institution.

B]

VI

Against the solution that a preceding sacrifice violates the substance of the ^S sacrament.

Just as Baptism is not vitiated, even if certain impious superstitions precede, that is they do not abolish the true use of the ^S sacrament, which follows, so it follows that that preceding abuse does not abolish the subsequent and principle use of the ^S sacrament.

Response. Macchabaeus: One must distinguish between superstitious rites and manifest impieties. For there is a great difference between these. Moreover, that it has been manifest blasphemy of God and impiety, to offer the ^S sacrament to God as a sort of offering, this is obvious. Also, in addition, when they teach that through that work worked, the remission of sins is effected when men receive the ^S sacrament.

Luther solved it so: You must observe only the words of Christ, with which he instituted the sacrament: This do in my commemoration. The adversaries do not use the ^S sacrament in memory of Christ, just as Christ instituted it, but they make an utterly new substance of the ^S sacrament. For they speak in the consecration to themselves alone so that they are scarcely able to hear themselves. Also they are always in doubt as to whether they have rightly said the proper formula of consecration so that also because of the danger of forgetfulness there is a written council ^{se} extant: Before you go to the altar you ought to say the consecration to yourself and decide that you rightly want to pronounce it; if afterwards in the proper order you pronounce against the

institution of Christ, God condones this sin to you because of that first intention^o of the mind. All these things are nothing. For when the ^Sacrament was instituted for the commemoration of Christ, it was a public remembrance, the words of institution were publicly pronounced. So first of all they impiously abuse the ^Sacrament. Secondly also certain manifest blasphemies change the institution of Christ in this when neglecting the remission of sins, they do not add the remission of sins connected with the ^Sacrament but offer it as a kind of satisfaction for those who have become delinquent after Baptism.

C]

VI

They themselves make a new substance and thing because they make an offering; also they abolish the final cause because the remembrance of Christ's death is no longer there. Rather they stand mute doing nothing but these ceremonies, and it's doubtful whether they say the words. There should be a public memorial of Christ's suffering but the papists abolish all these things, changing the institution, transferring the use etc.

A]

(VII) Against 18.

I ask whether the saints are able to state certainly that they have the Holy Spirit.

Response. Surely, they are able to state that they ^{have} ~~have~~ the Holy Spirit.

Against

The saints perpetually feel their infirmity and doubt in their members. Because of these things, therefore, they are not able to state that they have the Holy Spirit.

Response. It is true, only the saints really feel their sins. But just as they feel that they have sin, so they feel that they

have the Holy Spirit striving against sin and resisting the flesh. Just as Paul says: The Spirit struggles against the flesh, (Gal. 5,17) that is, a person has a need for a Holy Spirit, who fights against that which the flesh is always doing.

B]

VII Against 18.

I ask whether the saints ought to state certainly that they have the Holy Spirit?

Response. Macchabaeus: All saints are truly persuaded that they have the Holy Spirit.

Against this response.

The saints feel infirmity in their members. Therefore on account of that infirmity they are not able to state with certainty whether the heart has received the Holy Spirit.

Response. The antecedent is true. The saints feel that they have sin, but nevertheless they also at the same time feel that they have the Holy Spirit fighting against sin just as Paul says: The flesh lusts against the Spirit and the Spirit against the flesh. (Gal. 5,17) To feel that is the true work of the Holy Spirit. Wherefore whoever have been so tormented, they have been confirmed with the most certain sign that they have received the Holy Spirit.

A]

VIII Against 6.

Joshua, Solomon and David had definite grades of dignity. They all were members of the Church. Therefore members of the Church have definite grades of dignity.

Response to the major: They were not only just members of the Church, but rulers and governors (Here the manuscript breaks off. Page 158 of the Weimar Edition.)

B] a sacrament. In the abuse of the sacrament there is an element and word. Therefore in the abuse of the sacrament there is a sacrament.

W II Against 6.

Joshua, Solomon and David had certain grades of dignity, wealth and the glory of things accomplished. Joshua, David and Solomon were members of the Church. Therefore members of the Church have certain grades of dignity, wealth and the glory of things accomplished.

Response. Macchabaeus: the major, if rightly understood, is true: where the word is, that is, rightly understood and apprehended by faith, and the element made use of according to the institution of Christ, there you have a true sacrament. But thus the minor will be false. For even if the outward words are in the Church but also governors. So as twofold persons they did things. First of all they were political leaders and illustrious princes in this polity, who had grades of dignity, glory, wealth and the triumph of things accomplished. Then they were members of the Church of God. As such they did not have those things. In fact they were ridiculed and held in contempt by the other peoples and nations as is evident from the histories.

B] his magicians has the word and element. Therefore he has the sacrament.

IX Against the same.

The Israelite people had princes, dukes and kings. The Israelite people was the Church of God. Therefore the Church of God ought to have princes, dukes and kings.

Response. From pure particulars nothing follows. The Israelite people had princes, kings etc. because this pertained to its polity which it had, not in so far as it was the Church of God. Moreover it was the Church in so far as it by faith waited for the future promised seed, that is, Christ. The Israelite people was the Church of God, in so far as it had the one leader, the Son of God, and in so far as it by faith expected the future promised Messiah.

B] Wherever there is an element and word of God, there there

X Against 15.

Wherever there is an element and word of God, there there

is a ^S sacrament. In the abuse of the ^S sacrament there is an element and ^W word. Therefore in the abuse of the ^S sacrament there is a ^S sacrament.

Response. Macchabaeus: The major, if rightly understood, is true: Where the ^W word is, that is, rightly understood and apprehended by faith, and the element made use of according to the institution of Christ, there you have a true ^S sacrament. But thus the minor will be false. For even if the outward words are in the papistical abuse of the ^S sacrament, nevertheless they are not rightly understood. Therefore also they are not able to be apprehended by faith as they ought. For when it is so, it also follows, that they are unable to use the element rightly according to the institution of Christ.

Luther added this.

The ^W word and the element is the ^S sacrament. The devil with his magicians has the ^W word and element. Therefore he has the ^S sacrament. This dictum of Augustine is to be rightly understood; Where the ^W word is, namely done according to the institution, and where this ^W word is believed, and where the element is, namely made use of according to the institution of Christ, that is, where the element and ^W word of institution is, there there is a ^S sacrament. But outside of the institution of Christ this dictum pertains not at all to us. For the ^S sacraments have their power by virtue of the institution, which God wants just so as He has commanded it. Therefore unless the institution and meaning of the institution precede, the form avails absolutely not at all. It's an element plus the sound of words. In days gone by the papists transmuted the institution and they now use the ^S sacrament in an entirely new way contrary to the institution of Christ.

C]

X

The Word and the element make the ^S sacrament. This is false. Augustine should be understood so: According to the institution of Christ. Otherwise any incantation would be a ^S sacrament. Augustine is speaking of the institution. The mere form of words and of a ^S sacrament does not constitute a ^S sacrament unless the auth⁽ⁿ⁾ority of the command and institution precedes.

B]

XI

To obey those in authority is pious and holy. The bishops have been placed in authority. Therefore to obey the bishops is pious and a holy work.

Response. (M.L.) This text of the letter to the Hebrews does not disagree with our position when it is properly understood. For it adds: To obey those in authority, namely those who are vigilant in the care of souls, just as though~~t~~ the authority had been turned over to them, this is a pious and holy work. But if the major is accepted in this way, I deny the minor. For our bishops are not vigilant for us, but are pernicious wolves against the conscience of souls, being vigilant much more that souls are destroyed rather than saved. They do not practice^c the care of souls.

B]

XII

The assemblage of believers is not visible. The Church is the assemblage of believers. Therefore the Church is not visible.

Solution M.L. On account of its confession the assemblage of the Church is visible. With the mouth confession is made to salvation. (Rom. 10,10)

Another Response. We have posited "visibilis" from the part of a subject^b, you understand, from the part of that which has been

predicated. We say: The Church visible is an assemblage, not: The Church is a visible assemblage. But I deny the major in this syllogism, because even if among us it is within, that is, we are not able to discern faith, nevertheless we see the faithful.

Sequence D.M.L. From its confession the Church is known, according to that quoted passage of Paul: With the heart it is believed to righteousness, but with the mouth confession is made to salvation. (Rom. 10,10) It is necessary that the Church be concealed under the flesh, but it is not the flesh nor does it live according to the flesh, so also the Church exists in the world, but not is it the world itself nor does it live according to the world. It is in the person and nevertheless not is it the person nor according to the person. In so far therefore as it is in the flesh, in the world and in the person, it is visible, namely from its confession.

B]

(XIIa) Against the same.

Articles of faith are not seen. I believe the Church is an article of faith. Therefore the Church is not seen.

Response. There are 4 terms. For articles of faith are not seen, that is, these propositions, but the object ^{or} subject is seen. You do not see this proposition: I believe that God created heaven and earth. And yet I see the subject, heaven and earth.

C]

XII

The assembly of the saints is visible since with the mouth confession is made unto salvation. Even if the Church is in the flesh it is not according to the flesh, even as Paul says: Not fighting according to the flesh. (Rom. 8,12) Even if therefore the Church is visible in this life.

B]

XIII

The Jews before Christ did not have this ^Wword: This one hear. (Mt. 17,5) This is my beloved Son. The Jews were the true Church. Therefore the true Church is not bound to this ^Wword: This is my beloved Son.

Response. I deny the major. For even if this ^Wword was most excellently given at the Baptism of Jesus, nevertheless from the creation of the human race it has always been heard in the Church of God in other words, although somewhat obscurely. I could recite many testimonies of ^Scripture but we are satisfied with this ^Wword of the Psalm: Kiss the Son. (Ps. 2,12) For what else is that but that heavenly voice at the Baptism of Christ saying: This is the Son etc.?

D.M.L. God says: I will be today and tomorrow. (Heb. 13,8) The Jews believed in a future Christ, we truly believe in a made known Christ. Therefore they have believed with us in the same Christ.

C]

XIII

Christ yesterday, today and forever. (Heb. 13,8) The fathers believed in the same Christ as we do, ours having come, their's not yet come. Therefore as far as this ^Wword is concerned: This one hear, (Mt.17,5) even though it was not given until the Baptism of Christ still it was already there in the promise of the seed.

B]

XIV

The Gospel is not preached everywhere. The Church is born from the preaching of the Gospel. Therefore the Church is not spread throughout the whole earth.

Response. Macchabaeus: What is then this ^Wword of the Psalm: Their sound has gone out to the ends of the earth?(Ps. 19,5) For even if not openly, nevertheless it is manifest that wherever God has his saints he also defends them in a miraculous way in the very midst of the enemies of the Gospel.

B]

XV

True faith is able to be increased. Faith without doubt is not able to be increased. Therefore without doubt there is no true faith.

Response. Macchabaeus: Doubt corrupts faith. Faith moreover is able to be increased so, that in this life it does not reach its highest grade. Truly in no way does it have doubt connected with it.

These things D. M. Luther: Doubt remains in the saints and reborn and is active in them, if not always, nevertheless off and on. Moreover doubt is the work of the Law. For the Law effects doubt in the souls, the Gospel truly consoles and certifies the soul. Moreover these two, certitude and doubt, fight bitterly with each other. For the Holy Spirit through the Gospel works certitude in us against doubt and contr^ariwise the Law urges doubt against the certitude of the Gospel, just as Paul says: In my members I meet with another Law fighting with the law of my mind. (Rom. 7,23) Nevertheless they fight so among themselves that certitude always has the upper hand over this recurrent murmuring doubt. For even if doubt appears greater nevertheless, the Holy Spirit cooperating, it is weakened by certitude so that it does not rule any more in hearts but is a slave. Moreover, never so long as we are in this life is this certitude perfect nor is it able to be, for it is always afflicted by doubt. In the future life it will be perfect all doubt having been removed.

Moreover at this time I AM NOT ARGUING ABOUT THOSE RARE MOTIONS BY WHICH THE Holy Spirit occasionally enflames the hearts of some almost to that perfect certitude as when we talk about Augustine's mother. But these things, which we have said above, happen almost always in most cases. Moreover we have spoken therefore lest we despair in these bitter battles, and we have a firm consolation that God, even if there are remaining sins and doubts in us, nevertheless wishes to save us by imputation and his gift, the Holy Spirit.

C]

XV

True faith can be increased. Faith without doubt cannot be increased. Therefore faith without doubt is not true faith.

Doubt remains in the believers, if not constantly yet at intervals and in the hour of temptation. Doubt is an impulse from the Law, the Gospel consoles; and so just as Law and Gospel battle so also certainty and doubt. These two battle, but nevertheless so that certainty conquers doubt even though doubt is always murmuring: (Here German) There's nothing you can do about it. (Here Latin) For I have another law etc. (Rom. 7,21) Doubt is a servant, it prepares for certainty, it is intended to serve the greater, that is, Christ who is stronger than doubt. No matter how weak faith is it nevertheless triumphs through Christ. Therefore these words should not be understood so as though certitude were so strong that it does not have doubt now and then. But in the next life doubt will be abolished and certainty will reign supreme. Here faith verily has an obnoxious and rebellious doubt and so we have need of the consolation and comfort of the Holy Spirit who rules and conquers doubt in us.

B]

They, who are living under the control of the flesh, are to be excommunicated. The bishops are not living under the control of the flesh. Therefore they are not to be excommunicated.

BI Response. I deny the definition in the major. For excommunication is a major matter and has to do with more than that it concern itself with the flesh alone. Moreover Paul says these things about that Corinthian, (I Cor. 5,5) namely the one to be excommunicated, when he was living in the ruination of the flesh, in order that his spirit might be saved. The bishops, as Paul says himself, have been anathematized, that is, they are the curse itself.

BII Response. I deny the major. For to excommunicate is something else than to give over to the ruination of the flesh. He put on the curse as a vestment. (Ps.89,18) Therefore excommunication is a major matter, more than the ruination of the flesh, and Paul well says that they should have the ^e affects in the body to the salvation of the soul. (I Cor. 5,5)

B]

XVII

Whom God elected, he is truly elect of God. God elected Judas. Therefore Judas is truly elect of God.

Response. There are four terms. The major speaks concerning true election to salvation, the minor truly concerning another. For Christ selected Judas for the ministry that he should be an evangelist and one of his great apostles.

B]

XVIIa

No Christian is a hypocrite. Judas and Ananias were Christians. Therefore not hypocrites.

Response. Judas and Ananias were Christians indeed on earth but not before God.

(The A manuscript left off on page 158 of the Weimar Edition and now continues on page 165. There is no connection with the foregoing A Manuscript.)

Church. So far as number is concerned they are Christians. They are numbered among the Christians.

A]

(XVIII) Against 1

Hypocrites consent to the Gospel. Therefore.

Response. Because they fictitiously consent they are not true Christians, because Paul says: False brethren have come in, in order that they might explore our liberty. (Gal. 2,4) Just as moreover the papists now want to make peace with us that we should concede something and they in turn grant something to us and thus obscure the Gospel. This is a group of wolves. They disguise themselves that thus they might subvert us. The papists want the doctrine of the Gospel. But in very truth they want it corrupted and not pure.

A]

(XVIIIa) Against 1

Your proposition is not a sufficient enumeration of the parts of the Church. Therefore it is false because the Antinomians have the same parts. Therefore your Church is the same as the Antinomian Church.

Response. The Antinomians do not consent to the Gospel rather they corrupt the doctrine of the Law, which being lost it is not possible that there be a pure Gospel. For with the word 'Gospel' we do not understand the promises only but also the doctrine of the Law, because when we speak about repentance, we at that moment are talking about the Law. The antinomian monsters have this peculiarity that they laugh at us and state that there is no sin when nevertheless the text says: The poor are evangelized (Mt.11,5)

that is, the remission of sins is announced to them. But they dispense with sin, they wink at it, they consent to it and teach to sin. Further, they who have no sin, have no need for the Gospel.
B]

XVIII

Those who consent to the doctrine of the Gospel, are participants in the kingdom of God. Hypocrites consent etc. Therefore they are participants in the kingdom of God.

Response. Hypocrites do not truly consent, according to the passage: They worship me with the lips, their heart truly is far from me. (Is. 29,13)

C]

XVIIIa

The Antinomians deny sin entirely. Therefore they also deny the remission of sins and the Gospel itself. And so they do not have the pure profession of the Gospel.

A]

(XIX) Against 1

If the Church of the papists has not had the remission of sins, then it has not been Church, because outside the Church there is no remission of sins. Therefore it has been no Church.

Response. (M.L.) The Church has always been, even though not visible. But where have the external notes remained? In the Church of the papists the true Scripture has remained and has been conserved by the wonderful counsel of God. Baptism has remained, the Sacrament of the Altar, absolution was kept by a divine miracle. And so many have died in the true faith and have hated the papists and monks, as my own father, when he had come close to death and the monks threw his good works at him, (Here German) he wanted to hear nothing of these works, (Here Latin) but wished to die in the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ. And he hated

the papacy very much. Again many good monks, such as Bernhard and Bonaventure, have lived who have been saved. But they did not have things so clearly then as we have them now. Again many children have been saved, whom God has liberated. The outward signs have been there, the absolution of the keys, Baptism, even if afterward they were perverted; they have had the text of the Gospel, but afterwards with a great profanation on the part of the bishops.

B]

XIX

The remission of sins is (not) outside the true Church. In the papistical Church there was no remission of sins. Therefore at that time there was no true Church.

Response. D. M. Luther: There has always been Church, also among the papists, for truly Baptism has always remained and the text of the Gospel has been preserved by a divine miracle. There have therefore been many, who, thoroughly instructed through that text concerning the benefits of Christ, have rightly used their Baptism. These, since they were true members of the Church, have been saved. Many, even if not in the course of life, nevertheless at the time of death got to know Christ through the oft heard text of the Gospel, just as also my father rejected all the crazy inanities, which they recited to him and wanted only to believe in the Son of God. It's true, the monks and bishops have been manifestly impious after Baptism, denying Christ, but again among them there have been believers and members of the true Church, such as Bernhard, Boneventure and many good laymen or lay brothers. So even if not obviously, nevertheless secretly and here and there, there has been sufficiently in the papacy some part of the true Church.

B]

XIXa

If the Church of the papists were not true, neither would the Sacraments be true. But they have the true Sacraments. Therefore also they are the true Church.

I prove the minor: The power of the keys belongs only to the Church, but the sacraments are a part of the keys. Therefore.

Response. In the papacy the true Sacraments are with the few, that is, the faithful. For in the Church there have been many divinely saved.

B]

XIXb

Whoever sees in God all things perfectly is omnipotent. The saints see in God all things perfectly. Therefore they are omnipotent.

Response. M.L. This is nothing of moment. Stick to the dictum of Isaiah who says: God is our father and Abraham does not know us. Moreover to what extent the dead see our body, this is not for us to explain. We pray to God and let the dead rest.

C]

XIX

The Church was in the papacy and also the remission of sins although to a great extent depraved. When in the agony (of death) people indeed took refuge in the sufferings of Christ and clung to the text of the Gospel. Some always remained even though all the bishops and monks defected. (Here German) Our Lord God had his own (Here Latin) in those dark days. They also had the external notes, Baptism, absolution.

A]

(XX) Against 22 and 20

It is necessary that one or the other of contraries be

false. There are contraries in these two propositions. Therefore one of them is false.

I prove the minor because actual sins are against conscience. Actual sins remain in the reborn. Therefore sins against conscience remain in the reborn.

Response. Not all actual sins are against conscience because the just man falls seven times in a day and rises again. Therefore having sinned he falls seven times in a day. And because they are not against conscience he does not loose his righteousness.

Against. I prove the minor: Every word or action against the Word of God lies heavy on the conscience. Our words and actions are against the Law of God. Therefore they lie heavy on the conscience.

Response. D.M.L. There is no sin so small that it does not vex and pain the conscience. It murmurs against the conscience as the flesh against the Spirit. But Christ in the sinner's behalf restrains the Father and the Holy Spirit abounds so that God neither destroys nor damms. Even if the devil stings our heel he nevertheless does not destroy. The conscience conquests where Christ helps since grace and victory are in us. A sin against conscience is that which is against the Holy Spirit.

B]

XX

Actual sins are sins against conscience. Actual sins remain in the reborn, therefore also sins against conscience.

Response. Machabaeus: There is a poor definition in the major, for Christ also says: The righteous man falls and rises seven times a day.(Prov. 24,16) But because he rises, his righteousness is not ruined on account of the committed sin.

I prove the major: Every word or action against the Law of God presses on the conscience of the reborn. Actual sins are

words and actions against the Law of God. Therefore they press on the conscience.

Response. M. Luther: I concede that there is no sin which does not vex and murmur against the conscience, but the benefit of Christ, which the reborn apprehend by faith, overflows and entirely abolishes the sting of sin and conscience.

This Luther, Macchabaeus added: The saints sin ignorantly against conscience as is evident from the history of Genesis, where Isaac denied his wife and said she was his sister.

C]

XX

No sin is so small that it does not vex the conscience. It murmurs against the conscience and hinders it. Moreover the Holy Spirit resists that malicious attack and heals the contrite conscience. Where the conscience is not ruled by the Word the Holy Spirit does not move the heart. Sin in the conscience can be forgiven and remitted.

A]

(XXI) Against 1

Every definition, which is too narrow in scope, is false. Your's is of such a nature. Therefore etc.

I prove the minor because your's does not include the papistical Church which is Church.

Response. It is true, the papistical Church is Church, but it is malignant.

A]

(XXIa) Against

Their Sacraments are true Sacraments. Therefore it is a true Church, because were it not a true Church it would not have the true Sacraments.

Response. (Most likely Luther) They have true Baptism in

the papistical Church and there have been many who have retained the true doctrine from the text of the Gospel. On the other hand they have not had the true Sacraments nor the true keys. They have not had true Baptism and the Sacrament.

A]

(XXIb) Against

The power of the keys belongs only to the Church. The Sacraments are a part of the keys. Therefore.

Response. (M.L.) Equivocations confuse. The papacy is that, which after Baptism denies Baptism and changes it into a satisfaction; so also they change the keys into satisfactions; so also they have taught concerning the Sacrament, which doctrine nevertheless has flow^{ed}n through impure pipes to some believing men. But they themselves have afterwards crucified Christ.

(Here German) Those, however, such as Bernhard, Bone^{vent}ure, and in addition boys and girls, who have come to faith, are to be excepted. (Here Latin) But the true papacy denies Christ and is opposed to his Gospel. Consequently they ^{have} ~~have~~ retained Baptism but afterwards they have perverted it. They don't want to be saved through Baptism but by their works and the satisfactions of the monks as their books testify. (Here German) Therefore one has to except the little children, who have been saved.

✠

#####

B]

XXI

Every definition too narrow in scope is bad. Your definition of the Church is too narrow in scope. Therefore it is bad.

The min^vor is proved because it does not comprehend the papistical Church, which nevertheless is Church.

Response. The papistical Church is a malignant Church.

D.M.L. The papistical Church is that Church, which after Baptism denies Baptism and which after absolution denies absolution and transforms it into satisfaction. But there are also those in the papistical Church, who have used Baptism well, whom together with the children God has saved by his admirable counsel. They have been received.

C]

XXIb

The papal Church is the one, which after Baptism, the Sacrament and the keys, denies Baptism, the Sacraments, the keys and abuses them. They teach contrary things. They despise and deny the Gospel and transform it. And they produce new laws for themselves and make an institution (of the Sacrament). However, there were many under the papacy who clung to Christ but they were driven out of the papacy. The papal Church wanted to be saved by its ceremonies, works and absolution without faith.

A]

(XXIIa) Against 4

Christ directed (people) to the scribes and pharisees. Moreover they were enemies of Christ and the Gospel. Therefore the bishops are not to be deserted.

Response. (M. Luther) Christ directed (people) to the seat of Moses but he did this because of the ministry of the Word. For they were teaching the Law as the clear text has it: Whatever they may say, do, but do not act according to their works. (Mt.23) So we also hear the Anabaptists teaching the Gospel. (Here German) We want to hear them, (Here Latin) but we do not want to do according to their works. Moreover the papists are not teaching the Gospel nor do they want to hear it. (Here German) therefore our rule is: (Here Latin) If they do not want to hear, tell it to the Church etc. If he will not listen, let him be to you as

a publican. (Mt. 18,17) Once during childhood there was faith, but now the papists, knowing the truth, fight with the truth, they deny Baptism and the accepted Word.

A]

(XXIIb) Against 21

We are not dammed because of inherent characteristics. Doubt is naturally present. Therefore etc.

I prove the major, because God looked at what he had made and they were good, Gen. 1. (Gen. 1,21)

Response. They were good, which he made, but God did not make doubt. Doubt was not created, but it came into corrupt nature. Man was created to know God, not that he should doubt concerning God. And the text says: God saw what he made and they were very good. (Gen. 1,21)

A]

(XXIIc) Against 15

This proposition seems to want that there be no true Sacrament in the Sacrament of the Altar unless then when it is distributed. Against: If Christ is present only in the distribution after the words have been recited and afterwards is not present, it follows, that Christ is present or absent by the whim of men. But the consequence is false. Therefore etc.

Response. D.M.L. I deny the first sequel. This is what it wants to say: In the distribution he is present. But the distribution having ceased he is not present. Therefore he will be present by the whim of men, and I respond: You ought not call it human whim, rather it is the command of God, it says: Take and eat. (I Cor. 11, 24) Christ is present for the faithful partaker, who takes and believes, who partakes with faith.

A]

(XXIIId) Against 10

Sainted saints therefore are not to be invoked because they have neither omnipotence nor consciousness or because they do not see our prayers. Against this I prove, that they see everything, and it is a scholastic argument: Whoever sees himself as having within himself all things perfectly, he sees everything. But the sainted saints see in God everything perfectly. Therefore perfectly do they see our prayers.

Response. (D.M.L.) This proves the ability for seeing everything, but not omnipotence. Augustine says that there is a seeing of the will as opposed to that of the eyes. Moreover there is a little known word of Gregory: Does not he who sees everything, does he not see omnipotence? This statement ought not prevail. We pray to no one except God alone. The Holy Scripture ascribes sleep and ignorance of us to the saints, as the text has it: Abraham does not recognize us nor does Jacob know us. (Is. 63,16) And again Isaiah: You only God etc. (Is. 37,16) Because of this we pray to the living God only and deny that the dead do anything. Nor are we able to know whether the dead see God or not.

A]

(XXIIe) Against

The papists say that there is a great difference between the saints of the old and the new testament.

Response. That's a lie. Augustine refutes them. Besides the authority of the papists has no standing among us. They are men of God and ignorant of him. A soul separated from the body knows nothing, whether it is buried or not, it neither understands nor cares.

B]

Love justifies, therefore not faith.

I prove the antecedent ^{rom} for the dictum of Christ, when he says to Magdalene: She is saved, because she loved much. (Luke 7,47)

Response. Christ does not say in that place that love is a cause of justification, but a sign only.

B]

XXIIId

Those, who see in God all things perfectly, are omnipotent.

The saints see in God all things perfectly, therefore the saints are omnipotent.

D.M. Luther against this argument that it is nothing of moment. The dictum of Isaiah obtains when he says: God is our Father, Abraham doesn't know us. (Is. 63,16) For to what extent the dead see this our state, cannot be explained. We pray to God and let the dead rest.

C]

XXIIa

The devil also can use the Gospel text but afterwards he perverts it and inserts false opinions. That's just what the papacy teaches: Not that one is saved by the death of Christ but by works and our own satisfactions.

C]

XXIIc

If Christ is present in the distribution, afterwards he isn't. Even if some of the bread is left he is absent and not absent by the whim of man.

Response. The sequence is not valid, because Christ says: Take and eat etc., (I Cor. 11,24) and this is not man's whim.

C]

XXIIId

God alone is to be served. Therefore the saints should not

be invoked for Scripture ascribes sleep to the saints, and Isaiah: Abraham does not know us. (Is. 63,16) These words are enough for us. Besides, let's let them sleep and the question whether they see. |
A]

(XXIII) Against 3 and 6

The best constitution is that which is constituted according to a geometric proportion. In the Church there ought to be the best state. Therefore there ought to be grades.

Response. The Church has gifts not according to the dignity of grade or of human polity. The Church has gifts, grades given by God not by human reason.

B]

XXIII

The best state is according to geometric proportion. In the Church there ought to be the best state. Therefore the state of the Church should be according to a geometric proportion.

Response. In the Church there are diverse gifts from God but not according to the dignity of grade, wealth etc. which constitute a geometric proportion. But there is by far another reason for this than that of political order. For God is the author of that.

A]

(XXIV) Against the same

God is the author of order. There is no order in the Church. Therefore God is not the author of the Church.

I prove the minor from proposition 6 because the Church is dispersed throughout the earth.

Response. Ecclesiastical order is spiritual not material.

B]

XXIV Against the solution

God is the author of order. In the Church there is no order.

Therefore God is not the author of the Church.

I prove the minor because you say, the Church is scattered.

Response. The minor is to be denied. There is indeed an order for the Church but it is not political rather is it in the Spirit and in spiritual gifts.

A]

(XXV) Against

Where the Church is, there is the ministry. But the ministry requires a regular succession. Therefore etc.

Response. It does require one, but not such a one as we have in the papacy. It does not require a regular succession joined to a place, for they argue thus: Peter dwelt in Rome. We Roman bishops are Peter's successors. Therefore we ought to dwell in Rome. This is no consequence.

(M.L.) The succession is joined to the Gospel. If Bugenhagen's episcopal successor in this Church teaches the devil, I should not obey him, because it says: Flee false prophets. (Mt. 7,15) (Here German) One should see where the Word is (Here Latin) according to that. Not because he succeeds but because he enters into his footsteps. Where the Word is, there is the Church. (Here German) That is proper. (Here Latin) We ought not argue so: Some years back the Gospel was in Wittenberg. Therefore it is also there now. A bishop is to be believed, not because he succeeds the bishop of some place, but because he teaches the Gospel. The Gospel should be the succession.

B]

XXV

Where the true Church is, there is the ministry. The ministry requires a regular succession, which does not exist without political order. Therefore the Church is joined to the regular succession of Bishops.

Response. The ministry requires an ~~ordained~~ regular succession indeed of bishops, namely those who have gifts in harmony with the ministry, not because of the place as the adversaries teach: Peter sat as the first of the Roman Popes. Therefore all the Roman Popes of Rome, following in regular succession, have Peter, his seat.

These things Luther: The Gospel ought not be the succession in the Church whereby they follow the true bishops in the ministry. This won't do! Because the first ones taught, they teach. Rubbish! They are not bishops, but heretics, and as Paul says, are to be anathematized, (Gal. 1,9) because (true bishops) teach, to them as to the first ones, obedience is due. But on the contrary, then to them, as heretics, opposition is due.

C]

XXV

One should pay no attention to a regular succession for we have the command: Beware of false etc. (Mt.7,15) The succession (Here German) should rest on (Here Latin) the Gospel because we are joined to the Gospel not to the persons, who teach the Gospel. Bishops are not to be acknowledged on the basis of succession but on the basis of evangelical purity.

A]

(XXVI) Against the same

It is not possible to obey, where there is no power. The Church is to be obeyed. Therefore there ought to be power there.

Response. We are talking about praetorian or political power, that it should not be in the Church. A spiritual ministry does not deny spiritual authority but civil.

B]

It is ~~not~~ necessary that there be in the Church authority. Authority is not without a regular succession. Therefore in the Church there ought to be a regular succession.

Response to the major: The authority of the Church is in spiritual gifts. Our propositions truly deny that there is in the Church a political authority. They do not deny a spiritual authority.

A]

(XXVII) Against 15

Accidentals do not corrupt substantially. Therefore accidental abuses do not abolish the substance of the Sacrament.

Response. The major is to be denied because contrary qualities corrupt the substance, when they (these qualities) derive from the accidents.

B]

XXVII

An accidental does not corrupt the substance. And abuse is accidental. Therefore abuses do not corrupt the substance of the Sacrament.

Response. I deny the major, because qualities and dispositions, which are accidentals, corrupt the substance.

A]

(XXVIII) Against 1. An argument of Doctor Bugenhagen.

Christ does not describe these notes of the Church as posited by you, nor does he say: You ought to be Christians, because you have the Gospel and the Sacraments. Furthermore, the papists being in possession of these notes, do not recognize us as Christians. But Christ does say: In this all may know that you are my disciples, if you shall have love. (John 13,35) Therefore the note of the Church is love.

Response. I deny the antecedent because Christ in the last

chapter of Matthew says: Go, baptizing them in the name of the Father etc. (Mt. 28,19) In addition love also is comprehended in the Sacraments.

A]

(XXVIIIa) Against

Christ says that his disciples are not through this the Church but he does say that all unbelievers may know them through this, and he then speaks of love which appears openly.

Response. It is not a regular note. But the true note is the profession of doctrine. Nor is the Church able to be condemned except by unbelievers. The adversaries recognize neither love nor the Sacraments.

B]

XXVIII Dr. Bugenhagen

Christ says that the external note of the Church is love. Therefore not rightly do you say that the external notes are the confession of pure doctrine and the legitimate use of the Sacraments.

I prove the antecedent because Christ says to his disciples who are his true members of the Church: All may know that you are my disciples, if you shall have loved one another. (John 13,35)

Response. Love is comprehended under those two notes, which we have posited. Love is the visible note of the Church and the Sacraments are the regular notes. God has comprehended this charity in the purity of doctrine.

C]

XXVIII Bugenhagen

Christ does not say: You should recognize Christians from this that they have the true Gospel and Sacraments, because the papists also have the same thing. But Christ does say: In this all unbelievers may know that you are my disciples if you love one

another. (John 13,35) Therefore love is a mark of the Church: for what is the Church if it isn't disciples of Christ? Moreover he is speaking of love which is externally apparent.

Response. Love is also comprehended in the profession of the pure doctrine for love is nothing except in the profession of the Gospel. Neither in doctrine nor love do the adversaries want to recognize us as Church.

A]

(XXIX)

Repetition of the argument of a certain youth by Bugenhagen

The bishops have come down to our times by a regular succession in the Church, even if not through a civil election, nevertheless they have come into the succession through a call and ecclesiastical election. Therefore they have the regular succession from the time of the apostles and as a consequence they are not to be deserted but rather to be heard, because Christ says: Whoever hears you hears me. (Luke 10,26) And they are the successors of the apostles.

Response. (Most likely Luther) They are called by men, but not by God, except those who have been called by the Holy Spirit to the ministry of the Word. But they have not been called by the Spirit of God because they don't care about souls, seeking rather dignities and wealth. Therefore if you're talking about bishops of this sort, they are not ordained. They have their regular successions but that is nothing to us.

A]

(XXIXa) Question

It is asked: Should not one stay with them because of that very succession?

The answer is given: (Most likely Luther) Certainly not, because we have the Gospel. They don't. And Christ says: Whoever

hears you, hears me. (Luke 10, 26) (Here German) Before this however it is written: (Here Latin) preach, baptizing etc. (Mt. 28, 19) (Here German) When they are sent, they are to preach and baptize etc. Where they do not do that, (Here Latin) then they are to be deserted. In the schools the boys thoroughly studied the Gospel and they have been saved. So also the schoolmasters and parish Churches, (Here German) they have done it, they have preserved the Church. (Here Latin) The Church has not been preserved by the bishops.

B]

XXIX

The bishops from the time of the apostles have come down to us by a regular succession through an election and vocation. Therefore they are to be obeyed.

Response. (Most likely Luther) They have been elected and called by men, but the bishops have not been called by the calling of the Spirit of God. Therefore even if they succeed in the regular way, not on that account are they to be obeyed, but on account of the Gospel in accord with that dictum of Christ: Whoever hears you, hears me. (Luke 10, 26) They themselves truly condemn the Gospel. They are the chains of the Church.

C]

XXIX Another

By election, call or ordination the bishops have come down to our times. Therefore they have a regular succession. For there never has been a bishop except from succession by election from the time of the apostles until now. Christ also says: Who hears you etc. (Luke 10, 26) Therefore also today the bishops should be heard and not rejected.

Response. (Most likely Luther) Let's leave to them their dead successions. What's that to us? But this is the question:

Whether one should adhere to them? Also Christ says: Go and preach etc. (Mt. 28,19) (Here German) That has to come first, (Here Latin) otherwise they should not be heard. The school teachers and parish priests preserved the text of the Gospel and the canticles. They were the nerves and reins of the Church. They saved some doctrine. The bishops preserved nothing.

A]

(XXX)

Against 21 An argument of Master Philip Melanchthon

To determine between the true righteousness of the heart and hypocrisy is not possible for man. Therefore that doubt ought to remain in people, namely, whether they please God or not.

I prove the antecedent^e because God is the inspector of hearts.

I respond to the antecedent^e: A judgement of righteousness is not in others but to judge the righteousness of one's own heart is possible for anyone of the spirit through the Spirit of God. The spiritual man discerns all things.

Philip Melanchthon. On what basis does he determine this?

Response. (M.L.) He judges this from the Word of God. For were we to judge on the basis of the judgement of the heart, we would then err, but we judge through the Word and Sacraments. For as long as we judge from the Word, we know that we are pleasing to God.

B]

XXX Phil. Melanchthon

A distinction between the true righteousness^e of the heart and hypocrisy is not possible for man. Therefore we are not able not to doubt.

I prove the antecedent^e because God alone is the inspector of hearts.

Response. A true distinction between righteousness and

hypocrisy in others is not humanly possible but it is God's prerogative; in ourselves we are able to distinguish through the Spirit of God, who teaches to us the Word, through which we are certain.

C]

XXX Philip

To determine between true righteousness of the heart and hypocrisy is not humanly possible. Therefore doubt should remain in individuals because God alone is an inspector of hearts.

Response. We have the command that we should state that we please God, not that we should doubt. That's why God has instituted Word and Sacrament that he might confirm us.

A]

(XXXI) Against 8 Vitus Winshemius

The Church is joined to the ministry of the Word. Paul, Eph. 4. Therefore it could never happen that all the ministers would err at the same time and as a consequence it must needs be that there be an order in the Church, in which the promise of truth may be.

Response. (Most likely Luther) It is true, the Church is joined to the ministry, to the Gospel, not to the ministers. These ministers are gifts to the Church, not its bosses. A recognition of the truth pertains to ministers. The ministry of the Word makes ministers, not do the ministers make the ministry of the Word. The Word (Here German) that's what does it.

B]

XXXI Winshemius

The Church is joined to the ministry, Eph. chapter 4. Therefore it could never be that all ministers would actually err, and as a consequence it is necessary that there be some sort of order in the Church.

Response. (M.L.) The true Church is joined to the ministry, namely that of the Gospel, but not to the ministers, for ministers are gifts given by God to the Church. The ministry truly makes ministers, not to the contrary do the ministers make the ministry of the Word.

C]

XXXI Ephes. 4

The Church is joined to the ministry. Therefore it cannot be that all the ministers would err at the same time. Therefore it is necessary that there be an order in the Church in which the judgment of doctrine is. The promise of truth pertains to the ministry and that promise is efficacious.

Response. The Church is joined to the Gospel. The ministry of the Word makes ministers. The ministers do not make the Word.

A]

(XXXII) Against 1 and 6. An argument of Veit Amerbach.

Propositions 1 and 6 are opposed to each other. Therefore one of them is false.

The antecedent is proved.

The following oppose each other: That in 1 you say the Church is an assemblage of saints, to which many evil persons have been mixed, that it is a congregation.

In 6 you say that it is a scattered and dispersed assemblage not having a head. Now to be congregated and scattered are contraries. Therefore this is a contradiction.

Response. The Church, whose members are dispersed corporally, are united and gathered in the spirit, they are spiritually congregated in Christ.

A]

(XXXIIa) Against

You say that the Church is visible, also as the ancients

said: The Church is militant. Therefore the solution does not obtain that the assemblage, consenting in doctrine, is an internal thing, and rightly has it been proposed in the emperor's book of conciliation, that the Church should be as a house.

Response. These members agree in doctrine, they are joined to the head Christ, they are united by the Spirit.

A]

(XXXIIb) Question

I ask whether there is a difference between the universal Church and a particular Church?

Response. There is.

Against. The Wittenberg assemblage is a particular Church. For the most part they are new men, so also in the catholic universal Church there are many good and bad. I ask: Therefore you say, it is a dispersed body and a visible assemblage?

Response. We have defined the universal, not the particular Church, and in both propositions we are talking about the universal Church.

B]

XXXII Amerbach

The first and sixth propositions are opposed. Therefore one or the other is false.

In the first you say that the Church is a congregation, in the sixth, that it is an assemblage spread throughout the whole earth.

Response. The Church, whose members are bodily dispersed, is united in the Spirit, for it agrees in Christian doctrine and has one teacher, the Holy Spirit, and one head, that is, Christ.

A]

(XXXIII) Another argument

Either there was no Church 30 ~~X~~^Y years ago or there was a Church among the papists. But there was no Church 30 years ago. But the Church of the papists remains. Therefore that Church is until now, because nothing has been changed.

Response (M.L.) There never has been nor will there ever be Church except unde r the adversaries, that is, among adversaries because we are tormented, we are slandered. That doctrine has been in the Church, but not brought to light nor were the errors of the papists un~~v~~covered, as now. There is Church under the Turk, the pope, devils, but it does not follow that they themselves are the Church.

B]

XXXIII

Against the same

Either there was no Church 30 years ago or there was Church among the papists. But there was none among the adversaries. Therefore there is none.

Response. M.L. There never ha~~x~~ been nor will there ever be Church except among adversar~~y~~ies. Therefore also there was Church 30 years ago even if not so well known as now and completely among enemies. We now also are living among adversaries, for they oppress us with their lies, the devil and his angels, but then the Church was not so well known as now. But it does not follow: Therefore those adversaries are the Church.

C]

XXXIII

There never was nor is there nor will there ever be Church except under and among adversaries, i~~n~~ fact under the devil, because the Church is subjected to persecut~~io~~n. (Here German)
 Enemies must needs be over and among Christians. (Here Latin)

Under the Turk, the papacy there are many Christians but from that it does not follow that the papacy is Church. Many now appropriate to themselves our showers, (Here German) but one sees from where it comes. (Here Latin) Also Erasmus dedicated himself to speak with our words. But all the scholastic teachers proved doubt from the scripture: No man knows either love etc. (Eccl. 9,1)

B]

XXXIV

Christ says: If you shall have done all, say, you are useless servants. (Luke 17,10) Therefore we are not able not to doubt.

Response. This passage does not command doubt but wants to teach lest some trust be placed in works.

B]

XXXV George Major D.

We are justified by faith joined with works. Therefore not by faith alone.

I prove the antecedant from Paul when he says: With the heart it is believed to righteousness, with the mouth confession is made to salvation. (Rom. 10,10) Likewise Peter: Make certain your calling. (II Pet. 1,10)

Response. Macchabaeus: He does not speak as though confession were a cause of justification, but that it is required to it.

D.M.L Whoever perseveres to the end will be saved.

END.

A DISPUTATION ON THE CHURCH

DOCTOR MARTIN LUTHER

The disputation, here translated into English for the first time, is found in 39II, Abteilung Werke of the Weimar Edition of the Works of Luther. It includes pages 145 - 184. Three manuscripts available to the editors of the Weimar Edition have been printed in full or in part. All three, A, B and C have been translated for the sake of completeness.

The theses were written by Melanchthon. Luther presided and from time to time stepped in and gave answers to the various arguments advanced against the theses. Sometimes he also added to the answer given by Scotus.

Johannes Macchabaeus Scotus had been born in Scotland and was of noble lineage. Having studied in Cologne he then matriculated in Wittenberg on Nov. 25, 1540. At Melanchthon's recommendation King Christian of Denmark called him as professor to Copenhagen. However, the king insisted that he first acquire his doctorate. This disputation was the Promotion Disputation, that is to say, a final oral examination to demonstrate his competence for the doctorate. He was successful, went to Denmark and died there in 1557.

Recently a friend of mine complained that too many articles in Journals as well as all too many books consisted of a half a page of text and the rest notes. He doesn't know the worst of it. An article in the July-September 1946 issue of the Journal of the American Oriental Society has no less than 3 full pages of footnotes explaining the other footnotes. Therefore I've put the Bible references etc. into the text itself enclosing them in ().

I neither apologize nor make any claims for my translation. It's a free country.

"Je naeher Luther desto besser der Theologe." By repeating this axiom I want publicly to thank Dr. Wm. Oesch of Oberursel im Taunus, Germany. For he first really brought home to me the importance of reading Luther. Prof. John Meyer also closed his remarks at the Centennial of our Seminary by saying: Back to Luther through Luther to the Scripture.

One does not need to comment at length on this disputation for it speaks for itself. But some thoughts should be noted. In Manuscript A XXIIa a thought is raised against the 4th. thesis. In that thesis it is asserted that the bishops should be anathematized. When Luther answers he makes use of Mt. 18,17. Luther's answer shows that he could use that passage over against "PAPISTS" and "ANABAPTISTS". He here uses the passage from Church body to Church body. He did not restrict its use to the local congregation ONLY.

Another point I want to make is Manuscript B XXII. There Luke 7,47 is not read correctly and Macchabaeus does not do too well with his answer. Luther gives a better solution or interpretation. He says:

Urøgendum
est
utrumque

1. Fides tua te salvam fecit. Quia hoc ad mulierem dixit, ostendens non dilectione, sed fide omnia meruisse, ergo fides accepit remissionem peccatorum.
2. Cui minus dimittitur, minus diligit. Ergo remitti est ante deligere. Quare et illud sic intelligitur. Dimittuntur ei peccata multa, quia dilexit multum.

Et dicitur hoc adversus superbum Pharisaeum, qui definiebat, eam esse peccatricem. Imo respondet Christus: Adeo non est peccatrix, ut iam non solum fide vos praeveniret, sed etiam caritate superaverit. Et in iustitiam legis pervenit, ad quam tu sectando legem adhuc abes. Igitur non illi, sed tibi dico, ut iam scias etiam foris absolutam et non iam peccatricem a vobis habendam esse, quia melior est vobis. Plus diligit quam tu, et iustior est lege quam vos. Ideo nec secundum legem volo eam haberi peccatricem apud vos, et etiam publice eam absolvo, ut quae etiam in vestra legis iustitia vos vicerit et condemnet. Est ergo inversio rhetorica. Ipsa est peccatrix, imo ipsa est iusta, tu vero peccator, quia facit foris, quae tu non facis. Et peccata eius scias esse remissa. Sic ostendit Christus displicere sibi peccatricem appellari ab eo, qui maior erat peccator et y trabe

sua neglecta festucam istius iudicat. 3. Ipsa parabola confirmat remissionem gratuitam esse priorem et sequi dilectionem, quia is, cui plura dimittuntur, plus diligit. Recte, ait Christus, iudicasti, ergo rectum est dilectionem sequi remissionem peccatorum. Facit autem hysteron proteron contra Pharisaeum, ut eam etiam publice absolutam ostendat, ut dixi, coram mundo. Quia non solum credit coram Deo, sed etiam ostendit suam fidem mundo, ergo et coram mundo est iusta et non amplius peccatrix.

	Fides occulta	
... remissio		...iustitia
	caritas publica	

Ibi tua fides (dicit) sal.

Ideo

Hic tibi dico, qui publice eam damnasti. Wie gefaellt dir das? Ich speche sie auch fuer euch und nach eurem eigen Gesetz recht, quia dimissa ei peccata esse debetis concedere et non peccatricem iudicare." [Die Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch=lutherischen Kirche. Goettingen - Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. 1952 p. 190 n.2]

So far as the doubt is concerned with which many of the arguments have to do, everyone knows that the Council of Trent inculcates and commands doubt in and among the Romanist Devotees. How it works out in practice is truly horrifying. Note the following "Oeffentliches Schuldbekenntnis" from the 12th. century.

"Ich bitte gewegedes (um Hilfe, Fuerbitte) unte gedinges (und Fuersprache) mine frouwun sancte Mariun, minen herren sancte Petrum unte alle gotes heiligen, daz sie mir helfente sin (helfen) daz ich so lango gevristet werde, unze (bis) ich mine sunte reht geriuwe (bereue) unte rehto gebuozze." [Bekenntnisschriften p. 439 n.3]

In addition to that last quote the invocation of saints - Heiligenverehrung or Heiligenanrufung - is exemplified by Atharinus, Cochlaeus and Emser from many that could be chosen.

Catharinus: "Haec indubitata est veritas. Alioquin omnia tolleremus suffragia, quae et pro defunctis fiunt et pro vivis, et negaremus Christi unum corpus et plura membra invicem se iuvantia." [Apologia Pro Veritate - Corpus Catholicorum - Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung - Muenster Westfallen. p. 246]

Cochlaeus: "Weil wir denn wissen, dasz die Anrufung der Heiligen allezeit in der Kirchen bis von Aposteln her im Brauch gewest und in der Schrift nicht verboten ist, so foerchten wir garnicht, dasz hierin die andern christliche Nationes (die viel aeltere Christen seind denn wir Deutschen) in gemeinem Concilio dem Luther mehr Glaubens und Beifalls sollten geben denn S. Hieronymo wider Vigilantium, denn S. Athanasio, Basilio, Ambrosio etc., denn so altem Gebrauch der Kirchen, welchen Gott selbs mit

soviel Wunderwerken sichtiglich bis auf diesen Tag allezeit
bestaetiget hat." [Bekennnisschriften p. 424 n. 3]

Emser: "Testatur hoc etiam oriens quam occidens. Nec natio
sub coelo est, quae non magnam partem incolumitatis suae divorum
precibus post Deum acceptam ferat. Quoties enim iam nautae
senserunt, quid sibi in mari periclitantibus divi Nicolae invocatio
profuerit? Quot mortui Martini intercessione etiam post obitum
eius pristinae vitae restituti sunt? Et ut de penatibus etiam
nostris agam, nunquam Agrippina Severino suo et aliis innumeris,
nec Augusta Uldrico nec Herbipolis Kiliano nec Bambergae Heinrico
et Kunnegundi nec Constantia Cunrado nec Basilea Panthalo nec
Argentina Otiliaw nec Bavaria Vuolffgango nec Hassia Elizabethae
nec Slesia Hedvigi nec Misna Bennoni (ut reliqua taceam) tam
ingrata erit, ut post tot accepta patronorum suorum beneficia
Zuinglio nunc tandem contra communem omnium sensum credat, nihil
posse apud Deum divorum preces et suffragia."
[Schriften Zur Verteidigung Der Messe - Corpus Catholicorum
p. 65f.]

Since the undersigned has had the pleasure of translating
that which follows, he leaves to the reader the delight of the
foregoing.

Philip K. Press