

[\[Internet Archive copy\]](#); C. F. W. Walther announced and reviewed this book in [Der Lutheraner, vol. 28 \(Jan. 1, 1872\), pg. 55-56](#); [Latin text](#) has been run through Google Translate, somewhat polished, and copied into the text, although it can be rather choppy; where these were followed with a translation in this publication, the Latin was left intact, and the translation was translated into English. — There is a play on the word “Engel” which is the Catholic priest’s opponent’s name and also the German word for “angel”.]

[\[Table of Contents\]](#)

Lutheranism Before Luther,

or

The Old Evangelical

Christianity

Renewed by Luther

and

The New Roman

Papacy

Revealed by Luther

Through Thorough Answers to

Three

Fundamental Questions

raised by Father Arnold Engel, *Soc. J.*,

Against the Lutheran Religion,

briefly proven and defended

by

Dr. August Pfeiffer.

St. Louis, Mo., & Leipzig.

Published by Fr. Dette.

1872.

[Table of Contents]

- [Preface, p. 1](#) (“...no religious settlement can be hoped for between us, that deceitful peacemakers are not to be trusted, and that it is best to defend the truth to the death, as God wills”)
- [The Three Questions from the Papists \(1615\)](#)..., 34
- [Recently Proven Lutheranism Before Luther, Foreword, 39:](#)
- [The First Chapter, 43; Answer, 43;](#) (“Whether and at what time did the Pope fall away from God’s Word?”)
- [Question 1, 44;](#) (“Whether the Roman Pope had fallen away from the faith and become the Antichrist?”)
- [Question 2, 50;](#) (“When and at what time did the Roman Pope apostatize, or which of the Roman bishops was the first to begin the apostasy?”)
- [Objections to this answer / First Objection, 61; Answer, 62;](#) (“Whether all the people in the whole world were blind, deaf and dumb, that no one noticed the invading Pope and resisted him?”)
- [Second Objection, 65;](#) (“this would mean that the Roman church would be overwhelmed by the gates of hell, which is nevertheless contrary to Christ’s promise”)
- [Third objection / Answer, 67;](#) (“He claims that if the papacy were not right and not from God, it would not have stood for so long”)
- [Fourth objection / Answer, 70;](#) (That Luther “himself especially confessed that all good and the core of Christianity remained in the papacy”)
- [The Second Chapter on the Second Question / Answer, 74; Answer, 81;](#) (“Whether the so-called Evangelicals can be called catholic, and who were of their faith before Luther?”)
- [First Objection, 93; Answer, 95;](#) (“there must nevertheless have been a visible church at all times...for where was it to be found before Luther? either with them or nowhere.”)
- [Second objection, 101; Answer, 102;](#) (“Luther himself demanded of other enthusiasts that they should either prove their calling or perform miracles....he had performed no miracles”)
- [The Third Chapter / Answer, 107;](#) (“Has anyone ever been saved by the so-called new gospel?”)
- [First objection / Answer, 109;](#) (“that all our ancestors under the papacy before Luther’s time are damned”)
- [Second objection, 110; Answer, 112;](#) (“we ourselves recognize many in the calendar as excellent saints”)
- [Third objection, 120; Answer, 123;](#) (“no one can be saved apart from the true church, but now there is only one true church, namely his own”)
- [Fourth objection, 130; Answer, 131;](#) (Luther “himself did not trust himself to be saved on that basis.”)
- [Fifth objection, 138; Answer, 139;](#) (“against Luther’s person, ...such a man could not be driven by God’s Spirit”) Point [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10.](#)
- [Sixth objection / Answer, 154](#)(“four motives from Augustine... apply to his papal and not to our Evangelical Church”)
- [The Vindicated Lutheranism Before Luther, 157;](#)
- [The First Chapter, 165;](#) (“Mr. Nameless not only answered nothing to my *Lutheranism before Luther*, but nothing at all”)
- [The Second Chapter, 175;](#) “briefly repeated answers to the three fundamental questions”
- [The First Question / 1, 179; 2, 181; 3, 183;](#) (“Which of all the Popes was the first to apostatize from Christ’s Word and His Church”)
- [The Second Question / 1, 185; 2, 186; 3, 187;](#) (“name a single person who died before Luther and believed the same as Luther”)
- [The Third Question / 1, 189; 2, 190; 3, 191;](#) (“name a single person who died happily after Luther’s time, adhering to Lutheran doctrine”)
- [The Third Chapter, 192;](#) (“the entire harlotry of Mr. Nameless”)
- [Nihil ad rem \(sarcastic by Father Engel\), 194;](#)
- [The First Question, 198;](#)
[Answer by Pfeiffer, 203;](#)
- [The Second Question, 205;](#)
[Answer by Pfeiffer, 206;](#)
- [The Third Question, 207;](#)
[Answer by Pfeiffer, 208;](#)
- [Father Engel’s improved Nihil ad rem is finally and conclusively dispatched, 217;](#)
[The Slightly Improved Nihil ad rem \(by Engel\). With annotations by Pfeiffer, 224;](#)
[Transcript of hoax letter / Refutation, 239;](#)
- [Anti-Papistic Panoplia \[weapons\] \(Bibliography\), 251;](#)

The

Nobles, Noble, High and Great, High and Good
honorable gentlemen,

Mr. Johann Joachim Rothe,
Elector of Saxony. Amtmann of the Leipzig district;

Mr. Hans Adam Stiel on Bennewitz,
Elector of Saxony. Amtmann of the Meissen district;

Mr. Benedict Kresse,
Electoral Saxon. Procurator of Meissen;

Mr. Philipp Erhard Nester,
Electoral Saxon. School district administrator;

my

Patrons, fathers, brothers-in-law, patrons
and most valued friends

I wish you all the pleasure of body and soul that God
desires!

My dearest gentlemen and most valued friends!

Many people wonder how it is that we Evangelicals cannot come to an understanding with the papists or bring them to recognition after a century and a half of strife.

It should be noted that at the beginning, when the papal abuses and errors were addressed, the papal side was anxious for remedial and amicable action. For it was notorious at that time that great errors, vexatious dealings and harmful abuses had crept into the papacy, which it would certainly be expedient to remedy and put in a better state, as is evident from the instruction given by the Pope himself in 1522 to his fine nuncio, [Franciscus Cheregatus](#), for the Diet of Nuremberg and the reply given to it by the estates of the empire (in Hortleder in the Causes of the Evangelicals War 1. 1 p. 6 and by Goldast in the Imperial Statutes P. 2 T. 1 p. 31, also cited in this treatise).

But because on our side righteous confessors would never have abandoned any point of faith once recognized as true from God's infallible Word,

they may have opened their eyes more and more on the papal side and realized that in this way the Pope and the papacy should probably even be grabbed by the throat: Instead of change and improvement, it was rather thought of ways and means to prevent the errors and abuses from being revealed and rebuked or at least, as much as possible, covered up and whitewashed again.

And for this purpose this devil's discovery is most conveniently recognized: that the listeners or laymen should not be allowed to read any of the writings of the Evangelicals, or even the Holy Scriptures themselves; or that those who contradict the Pope should be persecuted and destroyed with sword and fire, that they should not enter into any scriptural dispute with them, but should merely insist and maintain that the Pope cannot err in matters of faith.

The papacy, struggling with death, has been advised to do this again to some extent, and the course of the Gospel has gradually been hindered (for if you blindfold a man and take away his torch and guide, he is bound to grope and fall). Just as Satan also gave this little piece to Muhammad, who cut off the necks of all those who would only murmur against his religion or dare to interject the slightest thing against the Koran; therefore his followers have so far remained in thrall, and the papists cannot boast that they have converted a Turk in Turkey in ten years, as stately as they otherwise tend to lie in the distance and cut out of their deeds in the East and West Indies.

From this it is clear enough what futile work the same people are doing who, in such matters, advise a syncretism (a compromise procedure) or who fantasize about proposals to unite us and the Papists. [LC–MS officials attending RC meetings, e.g. Nafzger and others.] For we cannot in good conscience abandon a single article that has been irrefutably proven from God's Word; the papists, on the other hand, cannot abandon an article previously condemned by the Pope without prejudice to the pope's reputation (i.e. without damaging the pope's reputation in advance by making such a concession). Either they would have to admit in this way that the Pope could err in the faith, in which case his reputation would be gone; or we would have to admit that the Pope could not err, in which case our whole religion would be gone, and we would have to believe and do everything the Pope wanted us to do. Or, since *pro forma* (apparently) only one and the other would be remitted and indulged (conceded), the Pope would retain the free power to take it away and abolish it again at his discretion in time. As long as the Pope remains Pope and we Evangelicals remain Evangelicals, a reasonable person can easily see that no religious settlement can be hoped for between us, that deceitful peacemakers are not to be trusted, and that it is best to defend the truth to the death, as God wills.

Now to come nearer to this main point (on which the whole papacy insists): whether the Pope is the infallible judge of all religious controversies, and whether he can err in matters of faith, we unhesitatingly say No to the first and Yes to the second, and prove this without prolixity,

because the popes have often grossly erred in doctrine and faith. The papists themselves cannot deny that [Liberius was an Arian](#), Celestine a Nestorian [[disputed by papists](#)], [Vigilius](#) an Eutichian, and so on, so that [Alphonsus a Castro](#) (*L. 1 cont. Hær. c. 4*) expressly writes: These are too impudent flatterers of the pope, who suppose that he cannot err at all in explaining Scripture. And that one would say that the Pope is no longer Pope if he stubbornly errs in the faith, he replies that this is to play jokes in serious matters. For so, he says, let anyone pretend that no believer can err in the faith, for if he errs and becomes a heretic, he is no longer a believer.

Is it therefore a vain pretext of the papists when they say that the Pope can indeed err in matters of faith and become a heretic, namely when he speaks as a private person for himself, but not when he speaks as a Pope on Peter's throne, since the Holy Spirit will not let him fall. But not to make light of how inconsistent it is that the Pope as a private person should be full of the infernal and as a Pope full of the Holy Spirit, one only asks for a report and resolution (explanation), whereby one may then infallibly know and recognize when the Pope speaks as a Pope and when he speaks as a private person. They can give us no better information than this: then the Pope speaks as a Pope when he promulgates a public decree and bull to the Church.

But then we tread further on their foot and prove that the Pope has also often erred in his decrees;

and this we can now show in two ways.

First of all, in matters of faith, a Pope sometimes repealed and rejected the previous decree by a new one. Thus [Pope Nicolas I](#) decreed that those who had been baptized in the name of Christ alone should not be rebaptized (*c. a quodam. Dist. de Consecr.*). On the other hand, [Pope Pelagius](#) decreed that they should be rebaptized (*c. revera dist. eadem.*). [Pope John XXII](#) declared him a heretic who would say that expropriation (or that one possesses nothing of one's own either for oneself or with others) is a meritorious work founded on the example of Christ and the apostles (*in Extrav. ad condit. Canon. Tit. 14 de verborum signif.*). Nicolas, on the other hand, recognized it as right and good (*c. exiit de verborum signif. in 6*). How [Clement VIII](#) had [Sixtus V's](#) Latin Bible, provided with a papal bull, corrected in more than a thousand places, and afterwards, by virtue of another bull, prohibited it, can be read about in *Sixt. Amamæ Antibarbarus Bibl. de Jamesii Bellum*. But where one Pope decrees contrair (contrary) to the other, one of the two must necessarily err in his decree, as, moreover, [Adrianus VI](#), himself a Pope and among the papists an irreproachable witness (*l. 4 Sentent. de Sacram. confirm. art. 3*), confesses and says that it is certain, *quod pontifex possit hæresin per decretum asserere*, that a Pope can decree heresy.

This is proved by the fact that the

popes have often in their decrees imposed such doctrines on the Church which run directly counter to the revealed Word of God, from which it certainly follows that they have erred in such decrees. For although the papists sometimes speak carelessly enough of Holy Scripture and their judicial office in matters of faith, they cannot escape it; they must finally, whether they like it or not, present themselves before this tribunal (court). Just ask a papist: Who is the proper judge in religious matters? he will confess: The Pope. If you ask further: Who has ordained and made him so? he will answer: Christ. If you ask still further: How can you prove this? he will nevertheless refer *volens volens* (he may want to or not) to the Holy Scriptures and say from Matt. 16[:18]: You are Peter etc.

But that in the papal *Jure Canonico* (canon law), in the Trent and other papal conciliar documents many things are decreed that are contrary to the clear word of God, this has been sufficiently demonstrated and proven by our own. For this time I will only take the trouble to explain in detail that the Pope has deviated from God's explicit Word (and no less from the twelve hundred years of practice or exercise of the Church *) and has thus grossly erred as Pope in the faith

*) *Conf. Chemnitius. P. 2. Exam. p. 302. Heilbrunner in Uncatholic Papacy Art. 18. c. 1. et 2. Gerhardus L. de Cana §. 43. Hülsemannus Against Hager, Disputation 20, qu. 7. Dreierus Disputation Antipapist. 34. p. 1066. 8. and others.*

through the prohibition of the chalice, which was first proclaimed in this way in the Conciliar of Costnitz in 1415: Although Christ administered this sacrament under both species, yet, *hoc non obstante*, notwithstanding this, the custom was justly established that it should be taken by the laity only under one species of bread, and on the pope's authority in the Conciliar of Trent (*sess. 21. c. 1. 2.*) is confirmed on the banns.

If I now explain and prove that this is wrong and contrary to God's Word, it follows that the Pope is lacking in faith as Pope and is therefore by no means an infallible judge who can be safely trusted in matters of faith.

But here I want to present the divine commandment and the ungodly prohibition of the blessed cup in Holy Communion *in a distinct and orderly manner*.

The divine commandment or institution of Christ, distinguished by three holy evangelists and the apostle Paul, gives me four reasons in particular against the papists, which will probably leave them unchallenged.

So I'm closing for now:

I. What Christ has ordained together, Paul also received from him and gave in his name to his Corinthians and to all pious Christians who are able to examine themselves properly, should be left to them and nothing should be taken from them. For what God gives, he wants to be accepted by men; he will not regret his gifts (Rom. 11:29), what God joins together (ordained together), let no man put asunder (Matt. 19:6).

The unkind distinction or the difference made between commandment and institution (something can be instituted by God, but therefore not commanded to all) will be refuted below in Fr. Let it be called commandment or institution, but he who understands himself to do so must use it thus and not otherwise, as it is commanded or instituted. (*Conf. infra p. 380. 409.*)

But now Christ has decreed that Paul also received from him and in his name gave his Corinthians and all pious Christians who are able to examine themselves not only to eat of the blessed bread, but also to drink of the blessed cup. As he ordained his body to be eaten sacramentally in the bread, *ὡσαύτως*, the same He also gave his blood in a cup to drink, saying, "Drink ye all of it" (Matt. 26[:26-29]). This is what happened. They all drank from it (Mark 14). It is said of the cup of the New Testament in His blood as well as of the bread: Do this. Because He thus commanded to do both, the papists are so wrong that they do only one.

Therefore, all pious Christians should also be allowed to have the cup.

It is certainly a childish objection when they say: Yes, the apostles were clergymen, it was a different matter with them. For at that time they were not there as clergymen or consicientes (performers of the sacrament), as the papists tend to say, but as communicants (enjoyers). And as in their person other Christians are joined to the

first, namely to eat; so also to the other or to drink. For otherwise it would follow that the Lord's Supper is only for the clergy and that nothing belongs to the laity. Thus Paul, too, entrusted to his Corinthians as laymen at the Lord's command what Christ had previously entrusted to his disciples; indeed, he wanted to send his Corinthians back to Christ's institution and exhort them to keep the Lord's Supper according to it (1 Cor. 11:23 ff.).

I conclude by saying:

II. What Christ has bequeathed and bequeathed to all Christians in his testament should be left to them unimpaired. One does not despise a person's testament when it has been confirmed, and does nothing to it, nor does anything to it (Gal. 3:15). What would you think of such an executor of a will who would conceal half of it and hand over only the other half?

Now not only Christ's body, but also his blood, as a valuable inheritance *) is specifically bequeathed and left (expressly) to all Christian communicants: This cup is the New Testament in my blood (Luke 22[:20]), and such a testament is confirmed with the death of the *testatoris* (testator). Heb. 9:16-17.

Therefore let it be left to them without restraint. Now

*) Bellarmine admits this *in l. 4. de Euchar. c. 27. §. fourth reason*. Although Masenius prefers to say viaticum, which was opposed by D. Sam. Bened. Carpzovius *Exam. blas. p. 916*.

consider this, you gentlemen papists, and give advice and say (B. the Judges 19, 30).

So I conclude for the third time:

III. Those who belong to the new covenant of grace and are to receive forgiveness of sins as well as the clergy are also to be given the seal of the new covenant, namely the blood by which the new covenant is confirmed, according to Christ's intention and decree (Heb. 9:12, 14). The same blood is shed for all for the forgiveness of sins, according to the words of institution.

Now the new covenant includes the whole church of the New Testament, all Christians (Jer. 31:31) and therefore also all those who, as Christians, partake of Christ's Lord's Supper. In Christ's name, not only the clergy but all who believe in Him are to receive forgiveness of sins (Act 10:43).

So also the blood, the blood of the new covenant, is to be imparted to all those according to Christ's institution. If one might think that they could get away with the pretext that they are indeed made partakers of this blood through the body of Christ, Paul has already (1 Cor. 10[:16]) anticipated this when he says: "The blessed cup which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? From this I conclude that whoever wishes to partake of the blood of Jesus Christ sacramentally must use the ordinary means by which it is communicated according to Christ's institution, namely the blessed cup (which is the sacramental communion or communication not of the body but of the blood of Jesus Christ, just as the blessed bread is the communion or

communication not of the blood but of the body of Jesus Christ). But now all Christian communicants are to partake sacramentally of the blood of Jesus Christ, as the papists themselves admit. Consequently, they must all use the blessed chalice.

So, fourthly, I conclude:

IV. Whoever is to proclaim the Lord's death in the practice of the Lord's Supper, and is to examine himself before the ordinance of the same, should not only eat of this bread, but also drink of this cup for thus says Paul: "Let a man (namely, one who wishes to partake of the Lord's Supper, in short, every communicant) examine himself, and then let him eat of this bread and drink of this cup. (Dear one, do you not hear here that one thing is to be done as well as the other?)

Now, not only clergy, but every person who wishes to partake of the Lord's Supper should proclaim the Lord's death at the service of the same and examine himself before the service of the same. It is considered unnecessary to mention anything else here.

But now I also come to the ungodly and unchristian prohibition of the chalice by the Roman pope. Of the same I make the following conclusion without any prolixity:

Whoever changes and mutilates the sacrament of the Lord's Supper contrary to Christ's order and institution, so that he takes half of it away from Christians, is a church robber, a heretic, an *anathema* or accursed.

I will demonstrate and prove this according to all three pieces:

Whoever violates the Lord's Supper is (α) a church robber, I prove it:

No papist can deny what the Pope has decreed in Rome. Otherwise we might have come closer together long ago.

A Pope has decreed that the separation or mutilation of Holy Communion is a sacrilege or church robbery. *)

For thus says Gelasius (*competimus dist. 2. de consecr.*): We come to know that some receive only the body of the Lord in the Lord's Supper and abstain from his holy blood. They should either take the sacrament entirely or abstain from it altogether, *Quia divisio unius et ejusdem mysterii non potest sine grandi sacrilegio provenire*: for the separation of a sacrament cannot take place without great sacrilege. That means decreed by a Pope!

Thus no papist can deny that the separation of the Lord's Supper is a sacrilegium or theft from the church, as [Peter a Soto](#) readily admits. **)

Anyone who mutilates the Lord's Supper is a heretic.

(β) I therefore prove this: whoever holds with the Manichaeans against the true church is a heretic as well as the Manichaeans.

*) He satisfied Pistorius here with no objection (dem Pistorius, der vergeblich das zu leugnen versucht, hat gut geantwortet) Heilbrunner im Uncatholic Papacy. 716

**) His words *lect. 10. de Euch.* These are: *far away I doubt all violation A grave sacrilege of the sacrament It is also a sin. mortal; violated But the sacrament, when it is not observed institution itself and the complete meaning. For what greater violation of the thing instituted by Christ than when the parties, from which that one itself to stand He wanted, are they being taken away?*

Those who violate the Lord's Supper hold against the true Church with the Manichæans, for they violated the Lord's Supper and did not want to use the chalice, for so speaks of them Bishop or [Pope Leo I](#) around the year of Christ 450 (*serm. quadragesim.*): *The Manicheans receive the body of Christ with unworthy lips: but they refuse to draw the blood of our redemption with a sacrilegious pretense*: the Manichæi take the body of Christ with their unworthy mouths, but the blood of our redemption they refuse to drink, with true ecclesiastical robbery. And it is certainly beyond doubt that at that time the orthodox were distinguished from the Manichæans by the fact that the latter did not wish to receive the Lord's Supper in both parts or in both forms, as they say, since the true Church had used it in both parts up to that time, after Christ's institution. Therefore, those who disrupt the Lord's Supper are heretics.

(γ) Whoever mutilates the Lord's Supper is an *Anathema* or cursed.

This I prove: whoever takes away and abolishes anything from God's Word or institution is accursed. You shall not add to what I command you, nor shall you take anything from it (Deut. 4:2 and 12:32). It is said: Cursed is he who does not fulfill all the words of the law to do them (C. 27:16). If anyone does so from the words of this book (and why not of the parts of this sacrament?), God will take away his part from the book of life and from the holy city and from the things written in this book (Acts 22:19).

Thus, the first proposition remains firm: anyone who violates the sacrament of the Lord's Supper contrary to Christ's institution is a church thief, a heretic and accursed.

Here it can easily be summarized (i.e. concluded): the Pope and his jurors are mutilating the sacrament of the Lord's Supper contrary to Christ's institution. For *hoc non obstante* [this notwithstanding], regardless of the fact that Christ instituted it in both forms or parts, the Council of Constance, confirmed by the Pope at Trent, wants the laity to use it in one form or another.

How can I do otherwise than to summarize and conclude thus: therefore the Pope is, as I said above, a church thief, heretic and *anathema*. Which is certainly not a whitewashed slander, but the plain, though coarse and bitter truth.

However, we also want to hear our counter-argument about this, so that no one can say that we have done them violence or injustice or have condemned them unheard and unproved. What objection do they have to this?

They need four excuses in particular, which can easily be taken away from them:

First of all, they refer to the example of Christ and the apostles, who themselves are said to have given the sacrament to the laity under one form. But how do they prove this? Simply just badly. They say that Luke 24 says that Christ was recognized by the disciples at Emmaus when he broke the bread; no wine is remembered there.*)

*) Quite crudely Becanus *l. de comm. sub. utraque c. 3. §. 4. I infer*; he says, *that Christ instituted twice Eucharist, once In Jerusalem at the last*

Dear God! If we inferred so childishly from Holy Scripture, how they should make a mockery of it! For, first of all, it is still to be proved that *) the Lord's Supper is spoken of there, but it is only said that by it or at that time **) they recognized Christ, when, according to His custom, He wanted to break and distribute the bread that had been broken or prepared for breaking in the Jewish way, as He usually did (Matt. 14:19). After all, they had just sat down and were about to start eating. Then they saw Christ breaking bread in his usual way and at the same time making himself known to them in his usual form. Jansenius ***) also admits this and says that these disciples could not have recognized Christ during the sacramental dispensation because they were not present. Moreover, it is not even evident from this history that anyone has eaten a morsel, sacramental or otherwise, but when

supper before the passion, and once at Emmaus, after the resurrection, there under both species, here under one; there The Apostles were present, who then were made priests, here two disciples, who are still were laymen. But truly if This is a sacrament instituted for the laity, where the words of institution? so the layman must always communicate under one, or Both species are not only not necessary, but completely them unlawful it is, that themselves Papal They deny and they say: before Church to have ordered both to the laity, because of the Manichaeans, after having prescribed one for Hussites and others. Or at least repeated It is a Sacrament, and thus repeated either with or without wine, what do they obtain? adversaries? If without wine, then it will be permissible to consecrate, following the example of Christ, even without wine, for some they deny Conf. Tanner. disp. V. of the Eucharist. Q. 2. d. 1 n. 12.

*) Conf. Gerhard. T. 3. Conf. Cathol. p. 1117 et L. de Carna §. 56.

**) Neither for necessary is a fraction to receive as a means of knowing, but it suffices was a moment of recognition made.

***) Harm. c. 46. Conf. also Wilhelm. Estius on Luke XXIV. 30.

Christ hands or presents the broken bread, their eyes are opened, or Christ presents himself to them at the same moment in his usual and familiar form, whereupon he disappears without further exchange of words (v. 31). But they leave their food and drink and go away (v. 33).

But when Acts 2:42 says that the Christian community remained among others in the breaking of bread, we can finally admit (although it is not yet a foregone conclusion, as can be seen in Lyranus, Lorinus and others) that this is understood of the Lord's Supper, but it does not follow that the bread alone is mentioned, and therefore the blessed cup is not also understood. Christ entered there to eat the bread (Luke 14:1), as this expression is also common among us. So without drink? In the Lord's Prayer we ask for daily bread, therefore without drink? The Hebrews and Greeks, on the other hand, call the whole meal drinking (XXXX *συνποσιον*), so there was nothing to eat? *) Is it for the sake of such a synecdochic figure of speech that a divided meal, lacking either food or drink, is to be sung (fictitious) and not rather confessed that thereby a whole *δειπνον* or meal is insinuated (implied)? But further, when St. John says there, There are three that bear witness on earth, the Spirit, the water, and the blood (1 John 5:7), not only the holy Fathers, but also the papists well admit that by the blood is seen the sacrament

*) Conf. Casaubonus *Exercit XVI. n. 38. against Baronius.*

of Holy Communion; as the ancients, according to the testimony of Augustine (*T. 3. 1. 4. de Doctr. Christi, c. 21.*) the ancients also used to call the Lord's Supper *Sacramentum calicis* or the sacrament of the cup: should Christ's body therefore be excluded and it follow that the Lord's Supper was held under the form of wine alone? It is also still unproven that the whole Commune (congregation) of those who remained at the breaking of bread consisted of laymen. (Conf. Act. I, 14, 15, c. II. 1, 42, 44, 47) Therefore, the Papists may well leave Scripture at peace in this dispute.

Secondly, they invoke the authority of the church, believing that even if Christ and the Apostles do not use the same form, the church has the power to order it.

By what power alone should the Church change a sacrament of the New Testament in its essential parts (for with harmless indifferent things it is a different one)? *) Were she free to take away one of the essentials, why not the other, and thus abolish the whole sacrament? Certainly, as little as the Jewish Church was allowed to abolish circumcision and the paschal lamb, it had to remain with God's order, not as long as it wanted to, but as long as God wanted to, so little may the Christian Church presume to do so. The church is subject to Christ as the wife is to her husband in all things (Ephesians 5:24). What would the husband say if his wife

*) Conf. Hülsem. *against Hagerum, diss. XX. qu. 6.*

only wanted to do half of what he commanded? Christ told His disciples that they should teach what He commanded (Matthew 28:20). Ye are my friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you (John 15:14). My sheep hear my voice and follow me (John 10:27). It follows from this that the church or congregation [*Gemeine*] which undertakes to change and mutilate Christ's testament must not be Christ's obedient bride and friend, but a faithless slayer and his enemy. It is true that the papists on John 6 take it upon themselves to prove [see also [Prof. David Scaer](#)] that it is not a duty, but a will, to use both forms, because Christ thinks of eating alone at different times. But apart from the fact that by naming eating, drinking is not excluded, but included, and is therefore several times expressly named (vv. 53, 54, 55, 56), it has been sufficiently shown by Dr. Heilbrunner (p. 694) and many others that in the place referred to, it is not the sacramental, but the spiritual partaking of Christ, which is done by faith, that is meant. *)

Thirdly, they come up with their concomitance (especially among the simple) and claim that the body of Christ is not without blood. Whoever receives his body also receives his blood at the same time, even if the blessed cup is not given to him, Fr. Bruno Lindner in his *Labyrinth of Lutheran Reformation* (p. 204) uses this subtle simile. As an example, he says, a pious

*) Conf. Hülsem. *ibid.* q. 2. §. 4. 5.

man bequeaths a thousand thalers to a hospital in his will; he has divided them into two sacks, but the executor delivers them in one sack. The lords of the hospital will certainly ask little about whether they receive the thousand thalers in two or in one sack, if they only get hold of all the money bequeathed to them in the will.

But, dear one, did not Christ also know this and yet ordain the chalice in a special way? He must certainly have had his holy reasons for this, and must also have known ways and means to sacramentally grant us Christians his body and then also his blood. Should not Christ's will and command be placed before all rational reasoning? What if a prelate were to give something to his servant, but the servant were to refrain from doing so on the pretext that it was of no use? Why don't you do it the way I want it done? Would it not be fitting for us to let Christ do as He wills in this case, to take our reason captive to the obedience of Jesus Christ and think: if the Lord had told me to do something greater, should I not do it? How rather, since He says to me: You shall eat of this bread and drink of this cup, according to the instruction of Naaman's servants (2 Kings 5:13).

If it is a matter of reasoning, I would also say that it is right to baptize in the name of the Holy Spirit alone, for where the Holy Spirit is, there is also the Father and the Son.

Yes, we want to come even closer to them with their

reasoning and say: Either the blessed cup at the Lord's Supper is of some use or not? If it is of no use, why did Christ ordain it? Does he ordain such things that are of no use? And what good is it to the clergy that they need it in a special way? But if it is of some use *), and Christ has intended a special grace through it, why is it not also granted to the laity, who are Christians and need and desire God's grace as much as the clergy? Furthermore, if the sacrament is received in one form, the clergy always receive it twice **). Once *vi consecrationis* (by the power of consecration) the body under the form of bread and the blood under the form of wine, the other time *vi concomitantiae* (by virtue of the fact that the blood is contained in the flesh), the blood at the same time with the body and the body again at the same time with the blood. And it is by the same consequence that every man is baptized three times, for when the Baptist says: In the name of the Father, the person baptized is already baptized; for where the Father is, there is also (propter *omovonσίαν*, because Father and Son are co-essential) the Son, and so on. But if the whole **)

*) So Thomas in *1 Cor. II. read 6*. Both (bread and cup) are about perfection Sacraments This one because of its perfection for refreshment, and also for the sake of representation passion, and also because of efficiency health of body and soul. Conf. and *P. 3. qu. 7. art. 2. Tit. Conclus. §. ad Prim.*

***) Vid. Luther T. 3. Jen. in the report of both forms, f. 592. a. §. the very finest.

***) Guil. Durandus *l. 4. Rationalis c. 54. §. The Church instituted* The Church instituted that (victim) after both The consecration is

sacrament is not received under one form (as the papists will not say that the wine is confused [changed] into Christ's body), then the poor laity receive only half of it, and the other half is maliciously withheld, since Christ has destiuiet (intended) the whole sacrament for them.

But to come to the point, if Christ's body is accompanied by his blood, it does not follow that because the body is sacramentally partaken of or eaten, the blood is also sacramentally partaken of or drunk. After Christ's institution, his body is to be eaten and his blood drunk. For he says: Eat, this is my body; drink, this is my blood. He does not say: Drink, this is my body. And Paul says that we should eat of this bread, not drink it, and drink of this cup, not eat it. Although Christ's blood is present with his holy body, it is not drunk under the blessed bread, as [Pope Innocentius III](#). 1. 4. of the altar mystery c. 21 himself rightly reminds us. *) When a meal is prepared with wine there is indeed

taken to show that only the host recipient not sacramentally full receives the Sacrament. For even though in the sacrifice consecrated There may be blood, but not yet. is there sacramentally, to that The bread is the body, not the blood, and the wine is the blood. It signifies, and not body. Therefore, because it is not under only one species completed Sacrament or sign, this Sacrament must be completed before the priest does so. utatur, l. 4. c. 42. n. 1. Edit. Lugd. 1612. Conf. Hulsem. contra Hagerum, d. 20. q. 11.

*) The words are: *Although under the appearance of bread blood Let it be taken with the body, and under the species of wine let the body be taken with the blood, yet neither the blood under the species of bread nor the body under the species of wine. is drunk or Because just as blood is not eaten The body is not eaten nor drunk, so neither under the guise of bread is drunk or under the guise of wine It is eaten. As the whole soul is in any part, yet not in any part He sees, but only in the eye ; thus The blood, although present in the body, is not drunk in the body or in the bread.*

wine, but the same wine is not drunk when one eats. With bread there is otherwise water, but the water in the bread is not drunk when the bread is eaten (so that the objection of Cornelii a Lapide ad Joh. VI. p. 343 and Georg Stengels, in ovis paschalibus Embl. 48. p. 228, that one can eat and drink at the same time with a cold dish. Because Christ here does not take bread and wine and with them his body and blood together and, according to the given peasant parable, is called a cold dish, but eating and drinking separately). In sum (to summarize): Christ wants to present (prepare) a whole meal for us and give us His body to eat and His blood to drink in a special sacramental way. How He can and will effectuate this, we leave to Himself; we have done our part if we do it as He has ordered.

The above simile of Fr. Lindner's money-bag serves as much as nothing to the point. For if Fr. Lindner reckons Christ's body and blood as two different items of the will, which are contained in two sacks, as bread and wine (which simile is crude enough), it follows that the papists give the laity only the empty sack of one item, namely the unblest rinsing cup, but thievingly misappropriate the bequeathed inheritance, namely Christ's (in their opinion) peculiarly transformed blood. But if the entire legacy (bequest) of the thousand thalers is under each figure, it follows that the clergy will always receive it twice. But because Christ at his

institution bequeathed as much to one as to the other, and Paul, as he received it from the Lord, gave it to his hearers, as has already been proved, the Lord's Supper must either be given to both clergy and laity under one form (as Lindner says in a sack), or to both under both forms twice, so that according to Christ's will one receives as much as the other.

Fourthly, they tend to cite all sorts of dangers and concerns if the chalice were to be given to the laity. The blessed wine could easily be spilled and thus the sacrament could be dishonored and desecrated. There could also easily be a shortage of wine and the whole sacrament would have to be omitted.

But Christ saw and knew such dangers and contingencies beforehand, and yet commanded us to drink. For when God commands something, He already stands for all danger. For example, if the people in the Old Testament had wanted to cut a piece of the ear instead of the foreskin on the pretext that it was not so dangerous, how would God have regarded them! And can the priest not drop the so-called hosts as well as spill the wine? Should the whole sacrament be abolished for the sake of this danger, which is to be avoided? The Church has not worried about such a danger for over a thousand years after the institution of Holy Communion. *)

*) This was warned by some in the Council of Trent. *If the Church of all twelve centuries, even with the greater poverty would work, reason to find could, with what dangers these to meet would go, to ours these*

Moreover, in this case the papists are under a quite erroneous delusion about transubstantiation or transformation, and thus make the danger greater than it is. They think that the blessed bread is transformed into Christ's body, and the blessed wine into Christ's blood, just as the water at the wedding at Cana is transformed into wine, so that a careless priest spills Christ's blood himself when he apparently spills the wine.

This alone is an unfounded imagination. There is no μεταουσία or transformation here, but a κοινωνία, communication or communion of the body and blood of Jesus Christ (1 Cor. 10:16). The symbols, bread and wine, are the ordered means by which Christ's body and blood are communicated to us, and (so to speak) the Vehiculum (means of administration), so that He wants to enter us sacramentally at the time when the sacrament is partaken of after its institution. But if such blessed means, bread and wine, are not partaken of sacramentally, then Christ does not wish to be further bound to them or sacramentally united with them; and so the wine that is not partaken of sacramentally, but is poured out carelessly, is not Christ's blood, but only mere wine. And that we may be quite clear in this: the sacramental purification of the bread with the body and of the wine with the blood of Christ does not take place before reception and in the hands of the priest,

storms much more inclined inconveniences to them from Gerson brought to meet. V. Peter. Sweet. l. 6. Hist. Conc. Trid. p. 609. Albertus M. in Summa de Sacra. You distance 6. Tract. 2. c. 1. He said: Wheat and wine are either everywhere, or easily available from nearby. to use Sacraments They are brought.

but at reception, in the mouth of the communicant, so that the wine which the priest spills is indeed consecrated for sacramental use, but is not yet truly united sacramentally with the blood of Jesus Christ, much less confused or transformed into Christ's blood. But what then, you may say, if the communicant himself is careless with the wine he has already received? Answer: (1) Is not the same danger to be feared with the blessed bread? (2) That which is not partaken of by the communicant, but washed down or spilled, is not the sacramental presence of the blood of Christ. Otherwise the life of the soul or body is in the blood as long as it lives (Lev. 17:11, 14). Therefore the soul does not remain with the shed blood of a living man, but retracts, withdraws. So also Christ does not want his sacramental presence to be bound to the uselessly poured out wine, but it remains mere wine apart from its use. Just as baptismal water, apart from its use (as the teachers themselves do not deny), is nothing other than mere water. *Tolle verbum*, says Augustine, *et quid est aqua, nisi aqua?* Take away God's Word, what is one water better than another? What other annoying absurdities follow from the papal transformation *), I may not now reprove, but I cannot but cite only one story, which Aeneas Sylvius (afterwards called Pope and [Pius II](#)), l. 1. dict. et fact. Alphonsi n. 39. f. 475:

*) Conf. Danhauer *Hodom*. P. 2.

"Anthony, a native of Sicily and a Dominican friar, delivered a sermon before King Alphonsus and raised new questions about the Sacrament of the Altar, to which the king replied: Rabbi, I beg you one thing: someone opened a golden vessel in which he had placed the Holy Sacrament a month ago and found nothing there but a worm. This worm could not have grown from the pure gold that was enclosed everywhere; nor from the *accidentibus* (accidental properties, e.g., taste, shape, color, etc.), which existed without a *subjecto* (essence). Thus, from Christ's body, the worm grew. But from God's essence, nothing can come forth but God. Therefore, the worm would be God. My dear friend, what do you say to this? Then the monk fell silent."

So much for [Aeneas Sylvius](#). If this monk had been wise, he could easily have broken away and said that the bread locked up for purposes other than sacramental use was nothing but bread, and thus done to him what usually happens to bread that has been locked up for a long time.

Yes, they say, but what is to be done where no wine can be had, or with the *abstemious*, i.e. those who do not drink wine at all? Resp: That is a strange question, which seems to me almost as if someone wanted to say: if on an island there were only men and no women to be had, how should marriage be arranged there? Or, if a Saracen struggling with death in the sandy Arabian desert converted to the Christian faith, to get no water at all,

whether and how he should be baptized? That, I think, is out of the question. Just as a man and a woman are two essential elements belonging to the marriage state; just as water is an essential element belonging to baptism, so that without man and woman no marriage state can be performed, without water no baptism: so bread and wine are *materia sacramentii*, i.e. the earthly elements of this holy meal expressed in the foundation, which no creature has power to change. If, therefore, these essential pieces cannot be obtained (although the Christian Church has not complained of a lack of wine for more than a thousand years, since it has been poorer than it is now), then one must leave it alone and be satisfied with Augustine's *Crede et manducasti* (or with the spiritual benefit of faith) and be assured that God will accept the good will for the deed in such things.

Finally, as for the *abstemious*, water-drinkers, or those people who by nature have an abhorrence of wine, I must confess that I have never known a person who, even if he did not otherwise like to drink wine, could not have overcome himself in this sacred work and taken a small quantity from the blessed cup without disgust, in fiery devotion and out of love for his Savior. But supposing that one or the other could not do so, should so many thousands of pious Christians be deprived of half of the sacrament for the sake of one or the other water drinker? In my youth I knew a noble matron *) who could not eat

*) Thus *Brugerinus*, l. 1. de. *cibis* c. 24... of a peasant in *Normandy*, who never ate neither meat nor bread, likewise l. 2.

or smell bread, should the blessed bread have been abolished for her sake, or should the sacrament have been shared only in the form of wine (as they say)? If one person in a house had not eaten lamb before, should everyone in the whole house have gone without Easter lamb for the same reason? *)

In this way it is now hopefully sufficiently proven that the pope, with his prohibition of the cup, acted contrary to Christ's express word and clear institution **) and was also grossly mistaken *definiendo* (in his statutes), that he was therefore justly suspect of Christendom, and that Luther was well authorized to denounce this as well as other gross errors.

Just as no shepherd's servant is authorized to remain silent when he sees that the shepherd wants to become a thief against his master; indeed, when a conflagration arises, anyone who notices it first may cry out and warn of harm. *Insults to religion belong to all as a public crime.* (If harm is done to the faith, it is a public crime and affects everyone at the same time).

c. 6. of a maiden at *Chaurum* in Picardy, of honest family, about 16 years old, who could not smell, much less taste, the least bit of bread.

*) *De aliis falso prætexti solitis incommodis conf. D. Aeg. Hunnius Tr. de sacram, c. 12. de cæna p. 621 seq.*

**) *These will give more about this Papist. sacrilege Chemnitius Exam. P. 2. p. 298. seq. Hunnius l. c. Heilbrunner unkathol. Pap. art. 18. Balduinus Natis in Disp. Becani de communic. sub una; Menzerus in the account of communion under both characters, Gerhardus l. de Cæna c. 9. Hulsemannus Pisp. 20. manual. contra Hagerum p. 1357. seq. Danhauver. Hodom. Pap. T. 2. p. 647. s. Hopfnerus Disp. V. Reihingius Retractat des Cathol. Manual, p. II. Art. 10. defensio Dantisc. p. 788. s. Carpzov. contra Masen. p. 901. s. Scheiblerus de fide Cathol. P. II. et alii.*

But how is it (someone might object and say) that the Pope and the papists do not want to recognize such an obvious execution of this and similar points? Answer: In this case the Pope is not interested in Christ's honor, but in his own honor and respect. If, after the prohibition of the chalice has been passed, he were to allow the laity to drink the chalice again, it would appear as if he had erred in his previous prohibition, and rather than admit this or allow a slight to his papal reputation (honor) to fall, he would send all alleged heretics to hell, as Hosius *de expresso Dei verbo p. 60* makes quite clear in this case.

As for stiff-necked papists (I am not talking about the stupid ones who groan under the yoke), some of them are zealous about the Pope out of gross ignorance, not reading our writings, indeed the Holy Scriptures themselves, not knowing our opinion, zealously hereticizing and condemning us from mere hearsay of their own, and yet not even knowing, when it comes to it, what is heretic, what is church, what is Catholic? They blaspheme because they know nothing about it (Jude 10), which is an evil bad habit. Nevertheless, it is not for any honest honest man to call someone a thief and not know whether he has stolen. And they are so full of heretics and yet do not know what we believe, indeed not what they themselves believe. God have mercy on blind people!

Others, especially the champions and ringleaders, who have read our writings correctly and have grasped our opinion and

reasons, act against better knowledge and conscience (without God's just judgment giving them the wrong mind to believe strong errors or to believe nothing at all), respect the reputation of the person for the sake of benefit (Jude 16), they speak according to the Pope's mouth for the sake of their belly. If they did not have fat benefices, a good kitchen, good idle days, honor, respect with him, or could expect the same with us, they would probably let the Pope be Pope.

Among which of these two latter classes is to be reckoned the one against whom the following writing is directed, namely a Jesuit, Fr. Arnold Engel (who, after this writing had been written out for the first time and had come to his hands, registered with me, also sent me his Greek and Latin *poems* under the title *Virtutis et honoris aedes* [Hall of Virtue and Honor], *ad complananda amicitiae adyta*, as he writes, i.e. to seek confidential friendship), must be counted among them. All appearances are that he has copied his entire work from others, has not yet read our writings properly, has not examined the passages from Luther and others himself, (especially since so much can be seen from the scripto [book] sent to him, that he focused more on poets and prophets), so that out of Christian love I would like to hope that he had written this more out of ignorance than against better knowledge and conscience, which I must, however, leave to God, as the one who has made his heart known. At least he is not as impudent and rude as another of his fellow Jesuits, Fr. Georg Hiller, Rector of the Jesuit College in Eger, who wrote his

Velitationem Selbensem (mainly directed at Mr. M. Joh. Georg Pertsch) to me, but peppered it with unreasonable invective, which Mr. Pertsch, my dear brotherly friend in Christ, will be man enough for.

However, the aforementioned Fr. Engel, but without his name, has so far circulated the following three tracts in Moravia and Silesia. The first is called: “Three fundamental questions about the Lutheran religion founded in and taken from the writings of Martin Luther”. The same three questions are proponed (recited) in Old Franconian rhymes, which, however, this author (writer) did not make, but rather rehashed from the so-called Predicant Latin, the first part of which was refuted by M. Heinrich Nicolai, pastor of St. Andreä in Hildesheim, in 1609, and sent to me by a good friend after this answer was written, and somewhat improved and glossed (annotated).

The second is called: “Good Evangelical-Catholic Confession of Faith, to all in general who love God, the truth and their own salvation, for the salutary report of honest good Catholics of the ancient holy Roman Empire, recited from the clear words of God.” This is only translated from *Fr. Maseni Confessione fidei ex claro puroque; Dei verbo*, or “Confession of faith from God's clear and pure Word”, which can be found, p. 1. *Meditatae concordiae*. But because Mr. Johann Thomä, J. U. D. Sachs. Council and Consistorii-President already in

1666 opposed his *Confessionem fidei orthodoxam* or “Orthodox confession” *), and I know nothing to improve on this, as to my knowledge Masenius has not yet replied, so I have not taken a futile effort in refuting it, but hereby want to refer the reader to the said learned and rightly theological jurist.

The third is: “Contents and list of the royal, ducal and princely, also many count, baron and other high nobility, as field marshals, generals, colonels, officers, together with highly learned councillors and court officials, *SS. Theologiae, Juris, Medicinae, Philosophiae* doctors, professors, licentiates, superintendents, preachers etc., distinguished, artful, famous men, who in this short time, from all corners of the world, from all nations, from Mohammed and paganism, from Lutheran-Calvinist and other sects, have been convicted and enlightened by God and his holy word, and have come to the old Roman Catholic faith with special comfort and peace for their souls and consciences.” This list, which is mixed with many *falsis* (forgeries), has already been spread by others and finally needs no great refutation; **in the end, we cannot keep those who do not want to remain with us.** It was no different for Christ;

*) *Orthodox Confession of Faith Confession of P. Jacob Masenius S. J. thus opposites, as from inspection and comparison of both, which one is more in the word of God May it be harmonious, pious one. to the reader clearly can, works and study Joh. Thomae. J. U. D. Councillors Sax.- Altenb. Consistory Presidia and h. t. to the Community Ambassadors Ratisbon. A. 1666.*

many of his disciples went behind him and no longer walked with him, so that Jesus said to the twelve, "Will you also go away?" (John 6:66-67). God grant that in the time of grace all who have departed may consider from what they have fallen and repent and do the first works (Rev. 2:5). Otherwise it will not be our fault that we have lost them, but theirs that they have left us. The papists, however, because of their great following, must not be so high-minded; their great following does not harm the lies and our small following does not harm the truth. Christ says that when he comes (the time is drawing ever nearer), he will hardly find faith on earth, that is, few honest, orthodox Christians (Luke 18:8). In summary (in conclusion) let go of what will not remain, we have already hardened ourselves to it.

However, for the reasons indicated at the beginning of the following writing, I have decided to refute the three fundamental questions [the first of 3 tracts by Engel, [see p. 31](#)], and I have done so with this offer, if Engel, with the help of learned fellow believers (whose eternal salvation I not only desire from the bottom of my heart, but would also like to promote as much as is in me), would meet me with reason and in one or the other would hear me further, to meet him with such leniency as he will always use. It is true that these fundamental questions of his and similar general objections have often been rehashed by the Papists and have long been sufficiently answered. Dr. [Balthasar] Meisner [in 1615] has thoroughly discussed them against the [Jesuit Leonh. Lessius](#), in a "[*Catholic consultation*](#)

on Adopting the Lutheran faith and Abandoning the Roman Papist Faith”, that nothing could have been raised against it without a Hungarian pleban Michael Vörosmarus opposing him with a childish assessment, which, however, Dr. Meisner also refutes. Thus, since in the name of Margrave Christian Wilhelm such causes of his apostasy were published, by order of the most glorious king in Denmark, Dr. Jaspas Rasmussen Brochmand answered them sufficiently in Lucerna “*Prophetic sermon opposite the Pontifical truth mirror*”, and since on that side something was answered again, he refuted it evenly with convincing arguments.

Without mentioning more of the same now (of which the content of this paper will provide more), it should be mentioned here that in 1615 the papists sent these three questions (which Fr. Engel rehashes here) to Georg Renner, Superintendent of Eger, with the following offer: The Catholics offer to become Lutheran if the Lutheran preachers give correct and thorough answers to the following three questions. [^](#)

I. Who was the first founder of the papal church (if it is not to be the true Apostolic Church)? And what new doctrinal articles did the Pope introduce? Which Lutherans opposed him at that time? Which ones left Lutheranism at that time, and which ones remained Lutheran?

II. In what place, in what city or country were Luther's teachings taught in every point or article, piece by piece

for fifteen hundred years before Luther's time, or were the sacraments administered in the same way as the Lutherans do today?

III. Whether they can certainly demonstrate and prove that only one person who died in Lutheranism was saved?

To this M. Renner sent them a short and correct answer, with a counter-offer: if they could sufficiently show and prove 1. that they alone remained in all points with the doctrine of Christ and His Apostles, had added nothing to it, had perverted nothing; 2. that we [Lutherans] do not have the doctrine and sacrament of the Holy Apostles; 3. that through the new papal doctrine only one man has been saved, then he and all evangelical preachers would immediately become papal. Whereupon they finally remained silent and yet remained papists against their promise (against their given word).

It was even better with the otherwise noble Jesuit [Jacob Reihing](#). For when he introduced the same reasons in [his book](#), called *[Murus civitatis sanctae, h. e. Religionis Catholicae fundamenta](#)*, of which he claimed that Count Palatine [Wolfgang Wilhelm](#) had been persuaded to adopt the papal religion, Dr. Balth. Meisner tore down such papal walls in his work *[Muri Babylonis Romanae destructi](#)*, against which [Jacob Reihing](#), only concerning the first two reasons, once published *[Angelic Guards of the Holy City](#)*, but after Dr. Meisner soon followed up with his *[Expulsion of the Papist Guards](#)*, this distinguished Jesuit was so convicted in his conscience by the grace of God,

that he recanted his opinions, his previously [Dr. Hoë's Evangelical Handbook](#), thoroughly refuted it, turned from a zealous champion of the Roman Church into a staunch confessor of the evangelical doctrine, and subsequently defended it vigorously through stately writings against the papacy.

If this little writing of mine should produce such effects (success), I would confess that I have never spent my time and labor better in my life. If not, it will be enough for me that my simple-minded fellow believers, to whom I have diligently accommodated myself and endeavored to be clear and brief, may be more firmly established in their faith by this answer, when it reaches them, and may be preserved against such papal attacks.

But the fact that I now feel compelled to attribute this contemptuous work to my esteemed gentlemen is not because they need such a preservative against Fr. Engel and his ilk for their person, but rather because I am assured that they would dispute his papacy with far better reason than he would our Lutheranism or ancient Christianity renewed and reformed by Luther. But partly because I would like to present them with a small token of my acknowledgment and a small memorial of so many good deeds, which I cannot replace, and therefore at least I would like to make my debt known to the world; partly because I can still have two witnesses from among them (to whom I had added two others

in the first edition, but who have since passed away in the old-age of the evangelical faith and the world), that on October 31, 1677, I answered these three fundamental questions of Engels, without vain glory, in an hour, in such a way that my audience at the time hopefully enjoyed it, which must be an indication of a good thing. For an evil cause otherwise needs many dicentes (many who speak of it), like a rotten fish needs many spices. However, I have replaced the absent ones with two like-minded noble patrons, and on this occasion also wanted to not so much pay off my debt to the most esteemed House of Roth and Kress in something, but only to testify.

Please, therefore, look upon this memorial and gift, not of marble or metal — as its merits require — but of paper, with as favorable cheerful eyes as my strength can muster, as it is offered with a sincere heart, and remain devoted to the poor giver with persevering consideration and friendship.

On the other hand, I will not refrain from imploring the unfathomable abyss of divine mercy that He may pardon them and theirs with all the blessings of body and soul that they themselves have requested, that he may direct all their official duties and other *actions* for the honor of His Holy Name, for the gracious pleasure of the most worthy father of the country, for the great benefit and piety of the fatherland and for their own glory and well-being

and to preserve the precious supplement of the true faith in them until the end of their blessed lives, and may God grant them, late in life, when they are old and full of life, the joy of seeing infinitely what they have always believed here.

Leipzig, in the year 1683, July 20.

To my most honored patrons and benefactors

Most devoted to prayer and service

Aug. Pfeiffer, Dr.

Recently Proven **Lutheranism Before Luther.**

Foreword. [^](#)

When St. John in the vision (Revelation 12:7) describes the conflict in heaven which Michael and his angels had with the dragon, since the latter was defeated but not victorious, even a simple-minded person easily realizes that we are not talking about the heaven of the triumphant saints [*Seligen*], for there the devil is no longer allowed to start a conflict, but about the heaven of the contending church here on earth, where the kingdom of heaven is being built for the dear God, and where the devil is busily trying to stir up conflict wherever he can. Now in the above-mentioned place John has in mind his special regard for the laudable [Emperor Constantine the Great](#) *) (as he himself interpreted this vision from his own person), on whose side the Grand Prince Michael and his angels were, so that his opponent [Maxentius](#), whom Satan and his infernal angels supported, did not triumph, but both he and those who opposed Constantine after him, namely [Maximinus](#)

*) Eusebius *l. 3. de vita Constant.* Theodoretus *l. 1. c. 15.*]

and [Licinius](#), had to bite the dust and leave room and space for Christ with his Gospel *).

But this old drake never does otherwise, and to this day does not refrain from fighting against the evangelical truth, which in these last times has been brought to light again by the holy armor and the man of God Luther, not only by his invisible evil angels and factious companions, who revolt along with him and leave their principality and original dignity, but also by his visible angels, the false prophets, in whose mouth he has been a false spirit until now.

One such Engel, namely [Arnold Angelus](#) [see [here](#)] (apart from which name there is nothing English about him), stood out a short time ago and rendered faithful service to his prince, Satan, in denying the Evangelical truth, with a booklet called: "Three Fundamental Questions about the Lutheran Religion" **), with which he (almost like Joab in 2 Sam. 18:14 with his three spears against Absalom) intends to run through all Evangelicals at once.

Whether, indeed, the author has not put anything on the track of which one would like to say: Behold, that is new! and that not, has already been said and answered a hundred times (without him having chosen a new way of writing and presented his things half poetically, half in prose, or half rhymed, half unrhymed, almost to the point like Petronius Arbiter his Satyricon, although the verses are not his, but

*) Conf. D. Cluverus *ad h. I. p. 93. 94.*

***) Printed in 1677 in Groß-Glogau by Erasm. Rösner.

old and embarrassed enough, namely forged and published eighty years ago under the name of Predicant-Latin), so that I could well have been relieved of my present endeavor; a high person, who sent me the above-mentioned three fundamental questions to answer, induced me to examine them more closely and, because they immediately came into my mind as an appeal against the Evangelical Reformation festival held in these lands in the year 1677, to refute them in the pulpit for the edification of my listeners, since by the grace of God I hope to overthrow in one hour what this Engel, no doubt through quite a headache, built up in several weeks.

And I could and would have left it at that, especially if, according to the advice of a noble man, every writer should be obliged to examine himself whether he dared to take an oath that the world could not do without his book (according to which *rigor* [stringent regulation] much good would nevertheless remain on the way).

Because, however, not only the aforementioned high person, the reply extracted and sent to him from the sermon mentioned, has pleased him and by his most gracious letter not only testifies to his great pleasure, but also exhorts this writer to publish it, which various of my listeners also demand, so that they could be all the more firm and, in case of need, oppose such Engel, even if he came to them, I have expanded such an answer a little and, under such a title,

to which it actually aims, namely *Lutheranism before Luther*, I want to publicize it in a well-meaning way.

For which reason I am also quite refreshed and, as it were, hounded by the unpleasant audacity of this Jesuit, who does not discolor himself, in an attached list of the persons who joined the papacy after Lutheranism came into being, to also touch the high Electorate of Saxony, under whose protection of grace I now live, and to write that from the beginning of Lutheranism only two rightly Lutheran electors of Saxony (namely Elector Joh. Friedrich, and Elector Joh. Georg I.) may be counted, so that he may nevertheless see what the present noble and rightly evangelical-minded elector considers preachers in his lands. Please, the dispassionate reader may consider the matter sensibly and not be displeased by my intention.

The First Chapter. ^

Of the first fundamental question.

Whether and at what time did the Pope fall away from God's Word?

Of which the author sets this rhyme p. 1:

You preachers all cry out
That the papacy is the great apostasy
From Christ's church and His Word;
I ask: how, when, in what place
Did this apostasy first happen,
Who else saw it before you?
We count from St. Peter's
Two hundred and thirty popes and more,
All thirty-three of whom
Were martyred for the faith's sake:
Of these popes, name us all
The first who fell away? etc.

Answer. ^

This is the old song which the papists have long sung, their
intention being

(as also in the following questions), since they have no intention to proceed in the main controversy, to make a diversion (to lure us into another field), to historical disputes, and to lead us away from the Scriptures. But because they continue to mislead the simple-minded with such questions, there is no harm in our repeating the answer as often as they repeat their question.

But two things are asked: 1. Whether it will happen? 2. When will it happen? Both must be spoken of differently.

Question 1. [^](#)

Whether the Roman Pope had fallen away from the faith and become the Antichrist?

In the first part: Whether it is done? I would like to answer, as Eliphaz did (Job 4:2): You may not like it when people try to talk to you, but who can refrain from doing so? No more unpleasant music can surely be in the ears of the papists than when we call the Roman Pope the Antichrist, yet they always make it so obvious to us that we cannot refrain from it.

That therefore the great apostasy from the faith, of which Paul speaks (2 Thess. 2:3), has already happened, and that the Antichrist has come to the Church, and that this Antichrist is none other than the Roman Pope [regarded not as a single person, but as an ever-living enemy in

many successive persons *)], has hitherto been superfluously proved by our theologians **). [Conf. [this blog post.](#)]

For this time I will only give the author the following to consider: The Antichrist is described in divine Scripture, especially Dan. 11:2, Thess. 2; 1 Tim. 4; 2 Pet. 2, Revelations 13 et seq., with such colors that he will have his seat in a city situated on seven mountains (Revelations 17:9, 18.), between two seas (Dan. 11:45), which was a ruler of the whole world: that is beyond all doubt the city of Rome; there he will be in the temple of God (2. Thess. 2:4; 2. Pet. 2:1) or in Christendom as a god, even exalting himself above all that is called God and worship (Dan. 11:36-37; 2 Thess. 2:4), he will adorn and embellish his apostasy and error with lying signs and

*) Not to those who doubt To the Pontificals to them. Augustine Triumphus of Ancona *on power Popes qu. 3. art. 7.* Regarding the office and authority papacy all the Popes who have been from the beginning and will be until the end of the world there are none but one Pope. And Gloss. *in Prooem decretal. in the word Resecatis:* The Pope is considered the same person with him, who succeeds him. Conf. Dorscheus *Religion Scrupei scr. 20. p. 429* and Dannhauer *Hodomor. Pap. Phant. 2. p. 386. 591.*

***) Let the author cite and refute, if possible, Heilbrunner's uncathol. Papacy, *Art. 14. c. 3. p. m. 303. s.* Hunnic *on the Church p. m. 315. s.* It is written in *Revelation, chapter 17.* Gerhard *Conf. Cathol. I. 2. P. 1. a. 3. c. 6. p. 524. s.* and in the refutation of the Papal Morgenstern *from p. 429. to the end of the book,* Calov *Matceol. Papist. p. 211.* Brochmand *F. libris de Antichristo.* Dannhauerum *Hodom. P. n. 580. s. and Antichristo sp 934. s.* Thummium in *Papa Antichr.* Sam. Ben. Carpvov *Exam. Masenii p. 305. s.* Christ. Grossium *of the author Pope Rom. Ilijf 7. 9. 18.* Georg. Hartmann *Widerlegung des Luther Labyrinths P. Brun. Lindners p. 376. s.* He will certainly find that act. And add They will be able to from Calvinists Dounamus, Junius, Willetus, Sutlivius and others; about the same argument, Chamierus *T. 2. Panstr. L. 16. etc.*

miracles (2 Thess. 2:10 et seq., Revelations 13:13; Matt. 24:24), he will forbid people to marry and eat the food that God has commanded and granted (1 Tim. 4:3), [he will despise rulers and blaspheme majesties](#) (2 Pet. 2:10; Jude 8), he will persecute the faithful confessors of Christ and become drunk with their blood (Revelation 17:6, 13:15 19:13), while he will give his own a strange character and marks (Revelation 13:16-17, 19, 20), he will tamper with people through avarice with fictitious words (Dan. 11:38; 2 Pet. 2:3, 14-15; Jude 12), he will be revealed through the Word in the Last Times (2 Thess. 2:3, 8; Revelation 14:16 fg.) and finally be destroyed by the coming of Jesus Christ (2 Thess. 2: 8; Revelation 19:20).

Whoever, in such a bright light of the Gospel, does not see or know these lineaments (basic features) of the Antichrist in the Roman Pope, must surely be blind in his soul or want to become blind. For truly, does not the Pope sit in Rome? Does it not mean to exalt oneself above God and the worship of God, if one is not ashamed to change and mutilate God's order and sacrament? To dispense from the holy Ten Commandments? *) If one punishes one's own statutes higher

*) Thus Innocent III. *on the concession The Prebendary Chapter. He proposed.* And Angelus of Clavasio *The Pope's voice: Unless* the Pope could dispense against God's law, it would not seem that God was a good Father of the family, if He had not forgiven Shepherd over the flock his own, who could consult with all those who come and necessarily Nor could it be said that the Pope is the general commissioner of God assumed into fullness of power, the opposite of which is determined 2. q. 6. *who knows himself and 24. q. 1. whatever.* And *what* I am talking about the commandments second table, say the same about all the precepts of the Old and New Testaments. Whence the Lord Archbishop of Florence in *the Summa*, says, that he heard from those worthy of the faith, that Pope Martin V. held in consultation with many learned men He dispensed with a certain man in sacred theology and canon law who had received sister his wife etc. Gabriel Vasquez. *in 3. Thomas T. 3. Pisp. 216. n. 60. p. 435.* when he had cited the saying *1. Cor. XI.* I have received from the Lord: and he had said Luther from thence to collect for each species, responds: This argumentation frivolous it is, because although we might concede that this was Apostolic commandment, nevertheless the Church and the Supreme Pontiff could that for just reasons to abrogate.

than God's commandments, for example, marriage to priests more severely than adultery and fornication? Indeed, if one explicitly wants to be called God? *) Who brags and flaunts more with miraculous signs than he? **) Who, under penalty of excommunication, forbids clergymen from marrying and eating certain foods at certain times, but he? Is it not despising rulers and blaspheming their majesties to depose emperors and kings, ***) to incite subjects against them, not only to make them kiss their feet but also to trample them underfoot, †)

whatever. And *what* I am talking about the commandments second table, say the same about all the precepts of the Old and New Testaments. Whence the Lord Archbishop of Florence in *the Summa*, says, that he heard from those worthy of the faith, that Pope Martin V. held in consultation with many learned men He dispensed with a certain man in sacred theology and canon law who had received sister his wife etc. Gabriel Vasquez. in *3. Thomas T. 3. Pisp. 216. n. 60. p. 435.* when he had cited the saying *1. Cor. XI.* I have received from the Lord: and he had said Luther from thence to collect for each species, responds: This argumentation frivolous it is, because although we might concede that this was Apostolic commandment, nevertheless the Church and the Supreme Pontiff could that for just reasons to abrogate.

*) So Nicholas to Emperor Michael of Greece *D. 96. canon. sufficient evidently:* Quite evidently It is shown, from the secular not to be bound by power It is absolutely impossible to dissolve the Pontiff, whom it is clear from the pious Emperor Constantine was called God: nor could God be called by men. to be judged, is manifest. Therefore he does not reject the title. Conf. Statl. Exposition of the causes of the refused Council of Trent, *p. 279. seqq.*

**) Conf. Nic. Hunnius in *the Roman Church, not Christian, ch. 8. p. 152. s.* and others to be cited below.

***) They will give more. The authors cited above. Let us note this time sight insolence Boniface VIII. in Albertus designated. For when here, according to custom, the confirmation of his election, by the Pontiff through orators He would ask, the holy father, girded sword and crown; adorned with imperial regalia, going out into public He exclaims: *I am Caesar and Pope*, adding convitiis in, Albertum Conf. Alb. Kranzius *Saxon. l. 8. c. 36. Platina in Bonif. Y III. Cuspian in the life of Albert. 8.*

†) Thus with Alexander VI. Charles VIII. King of France kissed the feet

like schoolboys with whips and rods, *) to be his grooms and saddle-servants?? **) Did the Roman tyrants and persecutors shed more innocent Christian blood than the Roman popes, as the collation (comparison) of the old and new books of martyrs will sufficiently prove? Does he not then give his own the so-called *characterem indelebilem*, or the

would have been sent to the celebrant would have served water, then The priest's rite in the porch in a certain way castle holy angels to be painted he wanted to reports Fr. Guicciardinus *Hist. Ital. l. 2.* From Charles V. indeed Caesar after Africana Having returned to Rome with victory, he undertook the same duty for himself. was performed, there not only Pope Paul III was painted but also marble I fell. He commanded, about whom this poem exists: *From Libya Caesar; the Roman victor, arrived in the citadels and went golden on the snowy hills. He triumphed, but you triumph more, Paul, conqueror. For he gives kisses to yours. feet.* Conf. John Wolfius *Lection. memor. T. 2. p. 508.* The matter of Frederick I being trampled upon by the Pope is well known to the common people.

*) is attested by Henry II, King of England. Historians summoned Berenice or Bernegger *in the future trumpets of peace against Scioppius p. 189.* He, of course, after being killed, even though alien Crime, Thomas The Archbishop, besides that naked on feet Therefore, a foreigner of religion is; by command The Pope in the sanctuary, like a child in school, with rods punishment gave, from each one men The religious, of whom a large crowd had gathered, were given three or five blows. welcoming, happy that nothing is more serious He would suffer. Whence congratulates To himself James King of Britain *Deci, for the Jure Regio p. 144.* that The Kings of England, the tricorne, the servile deity I obey no more. They would not venerate the monks' rods with their skin. They wear them. The rest of the story is about Henry IV, King of France. Thuan *Hist. l. 113. in Ann. 1595.* how the absolution heresies to obtain from the Pope foreign Of the ambassadors to wash one's own skin necessary He had, Pope to each one verses Psalm 50. recited by the rod of the supplicant ambassadors and seeing By touching and thus, since he could not ride the horse, he almost felled the saddle .

**) Ceremonial Roman *l. 3. sect. 7. tit. on reverences, which Popes are exhibited:* Caesar as soon as he sees I will reveal the Pope. Head touching that knee land He venerates and again when he approaches the steps of the throne he bends his knee and kisses the Pope's feet, and *l. 1. s. 2. tit. Order of the procession:* Caesar holds the staff while the Pope holds the horse He ascended, and I received horses I have been bridling for several times. leads horse Popes. That If the Pope does not ride a horse but a saddle would be carried, Emperor or King if are present, must be present itself chair to carry on one's shoulders.

indelible spiritual mark? Who is more masterful than the Pope at taking people's money with indulgences and other devices (which would require a whole lexicon*) to explain? Does not the tax of the apostolic chamber lie before the eyes of the world?**) Has not the Pope been sufficiently revealed by the angel who flew through the church heaven with the eternal Gospel (Revelation 14:6), so that now even the children know him? What would the papists give if it were as certain from God's Word that St. Peter was Pope as that the Pope was the Antichrist?

Since, therefore, according to Scripture, either the Pope or no one at all is Antichrist, let no angel be surprised that I and people like me cry out as honest predicants (which predicate [designation] is also given to Christ Himself, Mark 1:39. and elsewhere, and therefore is not disdainful to us, but honorable, so that when the papists call us predicants, or scriptuarios, scribes, or fidesolarios, sole believers, likewise when the Calvinists call us Majestaticos or majestics, and the Socinians Trinitarios or Trinitarians, we are always as much harmed as a crayfish that is drowned, or a sparrow that is thrown from a tower, or a mole that is buried alive); we must cry out confidently,

*) I read here it deserves Bernegger, *lcp* 169. 179. Let there be no greed If it is lacking, the Pope devised a tax (urinary) Vespasian disgraceful) *brothel*, leaving sometimes 20. thousand of leaders, so testified please to himself that Juvenal: *The smell of profit is good in every matter.*

**) Conf. execution of the causes of the denied Concilii sub finem.

not sparingly, lifting up our voice like a trumpet, (Isa. 58:1.), even though it may annoy the devil and all his angels.

Question 2. [^](#)

**When and at what time did the Roman Pope
apostatize,
or which of the Roman bishops was the first to begin
the apostasy?**

Now as to the other part of the main question: when did it happen that the Pope fell away? or which of the Roman bishops was the first to become a wolf and a biting sheep? it is not necessary to rack one's brains on this point; one could well answer with a mere *non liquet*, I do not know. For as little as I need to name the year, month, day or moment when the devil fell away, it is enough that I know and experience that he has fallen away: so it is enough that I know and prove that the Pope, as he now is, is the Antichrist, that I see and know him, even if I cannot specify, know or point out the year and day when he first became so. For when Paul (2 Thess. 2:7) says that the *Mysterium iniquitatis* or the wickedness of Antichrist stirs and scents itself secretly, he sufficiently indicates that the antichristian kingdom or papacy will not fall in one place, but *sensim et sine sensu*, gradually (without one noticing it), from time to time, so that one does not notice it until it has already taken over. It is therefore

incongruous to ask in what year and on what day so many frightful errors were introduced, or in what year and on what day the Pope gained so much power? for neither of these happened in one year and on one day, but gradually and successively.

And of the abuses and errors that are in the papacy, no reasonable person can deny this. There the enemy sowed the tares while the people were asleep and so did not notice the tares until they had grown (Matt. 13:25). So the devil took the opportunity, after the righteous teachers of the church had gone to sleep, but the following bishops were lazy and the authorities were safe, to come and sow the papal tares. But should tares not be tares, should error not be error, even if one cannot say at what time and hour it sprang up? [Alphonsus a Castro](#), l. 5. *adv. hæc.* himself confesses of the agnoëtes (ignorant), *apud neminem reperiri, quando coeperint*, that it is not to be found in any of them when they originated: are they therefore not to be heretics? Our Savior himself accuses the Jews of apostasy from Abraham's faith (John 4:40). He calls all who came before him (namely in their own name) thieves and murderers (John 10:8). But he was never asked to specify the year and day when the first apostasy occurred.

And what need is there of many words? The papists themselves know well, and must confess it, that their grumpen, or the things wherein we are contentious, were not introduced in one year,

but at different times. The marriage of priests was not abolished from the time of Christ and the apostles, but only several hundred years after the birth of Christ. The chalice was forbidden to the laity about three and a half centuries ago in the [Council of Constance](#). This Pope and that Pope added something to the Mass to commemorate his name *) until it finally became such a large beggar's cloak. As can be read in Platina in *vitis Pontificum* and in Polyd. Vergilio de *Invent. rerum*, among others. How also the invocation of the saints, purgatory, and other such things have been gradually imposed upon the people, has been stately explained by Dr. Heilbrunner in his *Uncatholic Papacy*, (Art. II. c. 4. p. 190. etc.) and by Dr. Chemnitz in his *Examination of the Council of Trent*. Of the Mass, the Council of Trent itself readily

*) Jodocus Clichtoveus in *his Anti-Luther*: And other supreme Pontiffs, other sacred canon particles to have added are handed down etc. *Rationale divinor, offic.* l. 4. c. 38. confesses this The secret (of the canon) is not given all at once by one, but in parts by many. *compositam ! Conf. Heilbrunner. Uncathol. Papacy. Art. 8. c. 4. p. 144.* et Joh. Jac. Beck *Lutheranism before Luther*, p. 334.

1. Den lutoitum hat erdacht Papst Coelestinus.
2. Das Confiteor, Wie Platina Will, Damasus.
3. Das Kyrie Eleison, Silvester und Greg. M.
4. Das Gloria in excelsis, Telesphorus.
5. Et in terra pax, Symmachus.
6. Dominus vobiscum, to be repeated seven times, Clemens und Anacletus.
7. The Collects, Gelasius.
8. The Gradual, Greg. M.
9. The Alleluia, Damasus.
10. The Tractum, Telesphorus.
11. The Sequentias, Nicolaus.
12. The Lectiones Evang. et Epist., Damasus..
13. Das Symbolum, Marcus und Damasus.
14. The Offertory, Greg. I. and VII.
15. The Prefaces, Leo I. and Pelagius II.
16. The Sanctum, Sixtus.
17. The Incense, Leo III.
18. The Our Father, Greg. M.
19. The Lamb of God, Sergius I.
20. The Complendas and Secretas, Greg. M.
21. The Ite missa est, et benedicamus, Leo I. etc.

Although and of them not more They are more suitable than the common watch.

and freely admits (Sess. 22) that much wrong had crept in, whether in time of vice or in the impiety of men, that it was either the fault of the times or of the people. But they do not know how to name the year and day, time and hour of such abuses that have crept in.

Thus the papists would do better if they left us unmolested (unbothered) with the time and hour of their established errors and either proved that no errors against God's Word can be found in their doctrine, or endeavored to change the errors faithfully pointed out to them. If any false coin has crept into a city or a country, a coin expert has done his part if he states and proves that the coin has a false strike or is not of good quality, but it is not necessary for him to state the name of the tipper, the place and the day on which it was struck; nor does it follow that because such things cannot be stated, the false coin should be passed as good and correct. If, therefore, an evil habit, such as disorder in clothes and the like, has broken down in the common being, then a prudent politician (statesman) has done his part when he proves that the same habit is contrary to the laws and statutes, he does not need to specify the day and time when people first fell into such a habit; for it goes without saying that evil customs do not creep in all at once and on one day, but gradually, with one person taking advantage of something, then another, and the authorities remaining silent and watching through their fingers. Thus, for instance, if a

physician were to say to the patient: I see you are not in a good skin; where you need nothing, you will not do well for long: but the patient would begin to expostulate (argue with him) and in short have the physician tell him the day and hour when he became unhealthy, otherwise he would not believe that he was unhealthy. Wouldn't that be a fantasy? For it goes without saying that the evil constitution of the body is not always introduced by an act (a certain circumstance), but can also be gradually accumulated through many excesses against diet (the orderly way of life). Or if a prudent builder were to say to someone: Your house is dilapidated, and if you do not help it, it will soon collapse over your head: but he would demand to determine the day when the house became dilapidated. For it is well known that such things happen little by little, at first without notice, and do not become apparent until they have taken over. Or if a pilgrim were to go astray, an honest man of integrity would show him the right way, and he would neither believe nor follow until he was told at what place, where and at what hour he had lost the right way. Or if a man was found slain in the forest and would not admit that he was dead until it was proven when and by whom he had been slain. Or if someone fell into the water, asleep or otherwise, and did not want to be pulled out by passers-by until they told him how he got in, and

when he fell, what would one think of such strange minds? Well then, here it is quite eadem ratio (likewise): is it not enough that we show the papists their gross errors from God's infallible Word in an obvious and tangible way? that we clearly demonstrate that their teaching runs counter to the clear Word of God in many respects and is therefore false and incorrect? If they do not want to recognize this and allow themselves to be advised, then we have done our part when we know and point out that they are mistaken; after all (because they are no better and do not want to be instructed) we have little interest in when and how they began to err.

Nevertheless, I cannot refrain from pointing out to Fr. Engel that in this case the Pope himself had previously taken a much softer line and had himself confessed with good will that all kinds of errors and abuses had crept into the papal court from time to time. Let him diligently heed the instruction which *) [Adrian VI](#) gave to his legate Franciscus Cheregatus at the Imperial Diet of Nuremberg in 1522, where he speaks thus, among other things: "You should also say that we freely confess that God allows this persecution of his church to happen because of the sin of people, and especially the priests and prelates of the church". — The Scriptures say that the sins of the people flow from the sins of the priests. This is why Chrysostom says: Since our Savior wanted to cleanse the sick city of Jerusalem, he first went into the temple

*) Conf. Hortlederus Causes of the Protestier. War, *T. 1. p. 6.* Goldastus in the Imperial Statutes, *P. 2. tem. 1. p. 31. tomo. 3. concil. f. 968.9.*

that he might first punish and cure the sins of the priests (like a good physician who cures the disease from the root). We know well that for several years now there has been much impropriety in this Holy See, with abuse of spiritual things, violation of orders or commandments, and otherwise all things have been turned to evil. No wonder, therefore, that the disease has risen from the head to the limbs, as from the popes to other lower prelates. We have all gone astray, each one has gone his own way, and for a long time not one, not even one, has been found to have done good. Therefore it is necessary that we all give glory to God and humble our souls to him. Let each one of us consider by what he has fallen and judge himself rather than be judged by God in the day of His wrath. As much as it behooves us to do in this matter, you may promise that we will make every effort to reform first this Roman court, from which perhaps all evil has emanated, so that as the disease flowed from there to all subjects, so that from there healthy reformation may again take place in all of us. We consider ourselves to be so much more strictly bound to accomplish this, the more we see that the whole world is desirous of this reformation. — But let no one be surprised if we do not correct all errors and abuses from the very beginning. For (NB.) this disease is very obsolete and not of one kind, therefore we must heal it (NB.) step by step and confront the serious and more dangerous diseases first, so that

we do not destroy all things with the haste of reformation. For all sudden changes (says Aristotle) are dangerous to make in the community, and one that almost runs dry will draw blood. From these and the following it can be seen that the Pope himself must not have been comfortable with the matter at the time, and there is no doubt that the papists, having regained their breath, are heartily sorry that [Pope] Adrian let himself out so openly *). And that is enough for now of the gradual creeping in of errors and abuses.

But as far as the power assumed by the Pope is concerned, as the soul and heart of the papacy, we are also well aware of how the Roman bishops did not ascend to the papal chair *uno saltu*,] with one leap, like the peasant in his boots, but *per gradus*, as it were in stages and steps. The first bishops of Rome initially kept to their *terminis* (limits) like other bishops, taking no part in worldly affairs, but waiting for their office and thanking God when they could have peace and quiet.

In subsequent times, however, their former piety gradually waned and they left their confines. It is not unknown to bring only one or the other of these, as about the year 191 A.D., [Victor, the Roman bishop](#), began to seek a prerogative above others, and [undertook to banish](#) those who would not keep the

*) Indeed, Fortune Palavicinus, with Hist. Conc. Trid. I. 2. c. 7. § 8. confessionem this one Pontifical would have mentioned § 10. seq. he/she thinks to have been whiteness too much and ardor untimely .

paschal with him. But Irenaeus contradicted him, so that he had not yet been able to attain the true winged powers, and this was thus *aetas primatus affectati*, the presumptuous papacy.

In the fifth century the Roman bishops already went further, began to draw all ecclesiastical affairs to Rome, to summon other bishops before them, but nevertheless they still remained submissive (subject) to the Roman emperor, did not want to have the title of an ecumenical or universal bishop (which the popes later accepted with all their will), so that [Gregory the Great](#) (in Epist. ad Eulog. Gr. (in Epist. ad Eulog.) himself calls the one who would do so the forerunner of Antichrist; and this would be *aetas primatus inchoati*, the papacy begun.

In the seventh century [Boniface III](#) first obtained from the emperor's murderer Phocas the sovereignty that he should be *Episcopus Oecomenicus*, a general bishop, and the Roman Church the head of all churches, which he, as a desired tool of Satan, accepted with both hands, and this was *aetas primatus confirmati*, the confirmed papacy.

Finally, in the 9th century, [Gregory VII](#) otherwise Hildebrand (certainly a real hellfire) completely arrogated to himself *de facto* (in fact) complete power over clergy and secular and all people on earth and Henry IV. and cast Henry IV under a spell; then, according to all appearances, *aetas primatus consummati*, the age of the complete papacy, as Luther later encountered and revealed it, was raised, just as this Hildebrand [[Pope Gregory VII](#)] had been considered and proclaimed the living Antichrist long before Luther's

time. *) Otherwise, the pope's growth is usually presented according to the different ages of the man, so that he is seen for the first time in Victor as a child or embryo (child in the womb), in Boniface III as an adolescent or boy, in Leo III as a youth or bachelor, in Gregory VII as a man, and in Leo X as an old man. More of this can be found in Dr. Nic. Hunnius's *On the Apostasy Rom. Eccl.* § 33. ad 238. Keßler in *Papacy*, p. 57 s. Dannhauer *Antichristosoph.* p. 947 s. u. P. 1. Hodom. 626. sc. Scherzer in *System.* 1. 28. p. 849. and others.

Indeed, the papists themselves cannot deny this, and in this case (as far as the growth of papal power is concerned) Fr. [Valerianus Magnus](#) ([in Judic. de Cathol. Regul. Credendi](#), 1. 4. c. 2. p. 81.), when he says:

"After the apostles had departed, the bishop of Rome began to be great, for the reason which, however, has not yet been proved, because he succeeded the apostle Peter in the Roman bishopric, to whom the Lord Jesus seemed to have given something before the other apostles. This advantage of the Roman bishop, the farther we have come from the times of the apostles, (NB.) the more it has been revealed to the world:

*) Aventinus *l. V. Annals.* p. 455. And most people said the same thing then. *Anti-Christ sitting in the temple of God.* And p. 470. Most of them good open, just, frank, simple, *then the empire of the antichrist to have begun* professed. Conf. Hoë *Præf. in c. 17. Aopc.* Heilbrunner. *Art. 14. c. 4. p. 378.* Dounamus *de Papa Antichr.* p. 137. s. et alii.

partly because the church, after surviving persecutions, has become the more free, partly because more such cases have occurred in which he (NB.) has been able to make use of his authority over other bishops. However, there has been no lack of those who, as soon as such a beginning of the Pope appeared, wanted to discharge themselves of it. As soon as general religious assemblies began to be held after the persecutions had ceased, an order was established among the bishops so that the large number of them could be brought into unity. Many bishops were placed in charge of one and called supreme or archbishop. These in turn were subordinate to a patriarch. Their oldest seats were Rome, Antioch and Alexandria. Jerusalem and Constantinople were added later. Meanwhile the Roman bishop (NB.) was not satisfied with retaining the supreme position, but always claimed (NB. *jurene an injuria?* rightly or wrongly?) that as Christ's governor he was entitled to a general authority over the whole Church, which had been left first to St. Peter and then to his successor, in which dignity he had no equal. A large proportion of Christians have submitted to such authority of the Roman popes. (NB.) Most of them objected, but some of them remained in communion of faith with him, and considered him to be the first patriarch and supreme among the bishops, contradicting this only by saying that he alone should be Christ's governor, and that they were therefore not considered heretics, but ecclesiastics, because they withdrew themselves alone and their church from his visible head without

violating the faith.”

So much for Fr. Valerian, in whose Discurs (treatise) there are indeed various things to be remembered, but one can nevertheless see as much, as even sensible papists well know, that the Pope has not always been as he was in Luther's time, but that he has gradually grown and spread.

Objections to this answer. [^](#)

But what, on the other hand, does Fr. Engel interject that is worth mentioning?

Four things, all of which we want to look at one after the other and close all the loopholes.

First objection.

First of all he asks p. 1: Whether all the people in the whole world were blind, deaf and dumb, that no one noticed the invading Pope and resisted him?

The verses he uses are thus:

No heretic ever came so nimbly,
 One knew its origin, place and end,
 Whoever was with him, whoever was with him,
 And against him the churches' doctrine protects;
 How did the Pope do it?
 That no one pays attention to his error?
 Where does he get such great strength,
 That he abolishes the divine word,

And all over the world
 Not a single person opposes this? etc.
 Have the watchmen all been silent?
 And also get cheated by the pope?
 Or were they all blind, deaf, mute,
 That no one resists the Pope's error?

Answer. [^]

In the same way the Jews could have concluded against Christ: You say that we have fallen away from the faith of Abraham; but when did it happen? and were there no righteous watchmen to recognize it? were they all dumb and blind? Whatever, according to the papists, Christ himself could have answered, they would like us to answer.

Recently: In the beginning, of course, the *Mysterium iniquitatis* (mystery of wickedness) was not noticed, the Antichrist came secretly and gradually (2 Thess. 2, 3), later he was noticed, he was also (as Facius in *Catalogus Testium veritatis*, Gerhardus in *Confess. Cathol.* and others), it has been sufficiently contradicted *), but nothing has helped. But it does not follow:

*) Out of thousands we will bring one, Philip the Fair, King of Gaul, writing to Boniface VIII: *We wish to know that you will be subject to us in spiritual and temporal matters, etc.* Thus he writes: *Philip, by the grace of God, King of the Franks, to Boniface, who holds himself out as supreme Greetings, Pontiff. a little whether none. Let him know Your greatest folly, in temporal matters us not to be subject to anyone, of churches and prebends The collection belongs to us by royal law etc. But we consider those who believe otherwise to be foolish and insane. Given etc.* That was rough enough!

that the Pope was not noticed soon, that once he was noticed he could no longer be controlled; therefore he did not come at all. By this, I could also conclude: Nero was not a tyrant. For should no one in Rome have noticed him? and should they not have stopped him after they noticed him? Yes, it can be concluded in the same way: I did not notice my illness at first, now that I notice it I can never control it; therefore I am not ill at all. I did not notice the fire in my house at all; now I notice it, I can never put it out; therefore my house is not burning, and so on.

But how it came about that the pope, after he had gained the upper hand and was noticed, could no longer be controlled, Luther well remarked when he wrote (L. 1 Jen. Germ. f. 289): The Romanists have drawn three walls around themselves with great agility, so that they have protected themselves up to now, that no one could reform them, through which the whole of Christendom has fallen horribly.

- First, when they have been pressed with secular power, they have sat down and said that secular power has no right over them, but that the spiritual is above the secular.
- Secondly, when someone wanted to punish them with Holy Scripture, they countered that it was fitting for no one to interpret Scripture but the Pope.
- Thirdly, when they were threatened with a council, they said that no one should call a council except the Pope.

Thus they have secretly stolen the three rods from us, that they may be unpunished, and have seated themselves in the safe fortification of these three

walls, to do all mischief and wickedness, etc. Finally, since they have gained the upper hand, they have deafened the poor and mostly simple-minded people and preached to them *caecam obedientiam*, blind and mute obedience, that they must believe everything they are told and not ask why, whether it is right or wrong? *) But if the Pope immediately orders them to commit vices, they must accept them as virtues; indeed, if he immediately orders them to **) hell, they must follow and not ask: what are you doing? Praise God that our eyes have finally been opened and that we have torn ourselves away from this tyranny of the soul; whoever still

*) Bellarmine *l. 4. of the RP c. 5.* As the Pope commanded something which is not good, or which It is useless, it is not absurd to say, to be able to cry, although it is not of subjects to judge in this matter, but simply to obey. The Catholic Faith teaches all *virtue* to be *good*, everything *vice* to be *evil*; *but if the Pope erred, by commanding vices or by prohibiting virtues, the Church would be obliged to believe that vices There are good and bad virtues*, unless one wishes against one's conscience. to sin, (*sc. according to the warnings*) *Apostolic 2 Thess. 5, 21; 1 John 4. 1.*) Similarly Gregorius of Valencia, *Tom. 8, disp. 1, 9, 2, p. 5.* Held Everyone believes that which is the opposite of that. It is actually true, if synod He has decided that it is a matter of faith. Indeed, Angelus de Clavasio so to the delirious sky to promise dares: *I, He said, " I believe it is true." the opinion of 8. Thomas; nay, I say more, that sometimes Such a mistake is possible. to be meritorious; for example, someone listens to someone preacher famous or bishop to have preached someone He believes in error and is simple in mind, ready to obey the faith. nevertheless to be corrected. For works are judged by intention. Alipuando that It is with sin. venial: For example, an old woman believes in the Trinity. to be one woman (oh my goodness) Arcadian !)* and because he believes that the Church holds it thus, he believes so. And yet it is not heretical, because conditionally believes etc. Indeed, unless I am mistaken, this Angel looks at the same as ours. order.

**) *D. 40. c. If the Pope.* If the Pope, neglecting his own and his brother's salvation, is found useless and slack in his works, and moreover silent about good, which is more harmful to himself and to all; nevertheless he leads countless peoples in droves with him to the first captivity of hell, to be scourged with many plagues for eternity. His faults are here to refute presumes mortal no one: because He will judge everyone, he is from no on to be judged.

wants to remain under it and does not yet realize it, who can help him?

Second Objection. [^]

Secondly, he argues that this would mean that the Roman church would be overwhelmed by the gates of hell, which is nevertheless contrary to Christ's promise (Matt. 16). His verses from p. 3 read thus:

Christ always keeps with His Church
 All day long until the end of the world,
 He provides them with teachers,
 Until we go to meet him there.
 Why didn't he put up a fight?
 That the Pope had not perverted them?
 The Holy Spirit always rules them,
 Teaches and leads into all truth.
 He does not depart from her seed's mouth
 From the time of Christ until now,
 Remain with her for eternity,
 How did the Pope seduce them?
 She is the house set on a rock,
 No wind or weather hurts them.
 No trickery or cunning will harm her,
 Because it is a pillar of truth.
 You will not prevail over hell,
 How was it destroyed by the Pope?

Answer.

All these and similar promises of Christ do not apply to a particular church in this or that place,

called Rome or Constantinople, but to the universal church or the whole Christianity in the whole world, in which God already knows His own (2 Tim. 2:19), even though they can no longer dwell in this or that place. It is impossible that the universal Christian church should be completely annihilated according to all its members, but it is possible that this or that particular church may fall away, and Christ with his gospel may move from it to another place and thus remove the lampstand from its place. There were churches of Christ among the Corinthians, Ephesians, Colossians etc. as well as among the Romans, as Paul's epistles show, but they have fallen; indeed in Jerusalem and Antioch (where the disciples were called the first Christians, Acts 11:26) there were Christian churches even earlier than in Rome, and yet they have fallen. But without them, Christians remained elsewhere in the world. This is also the reason why the whole of Christianity on earth did not perish or be overwhelmed by the gates of hell, even though the Roman Pope became a wolf and consumed much in Rome. Therefore he could not strike his claws everywhere, but had to suffer elsewhere from people who told him the truth. For example, the Greeks, whom he also wanted to seduce and bring under his yoke, answered [Pope John XXII](#): We firmly believe in your great power over your subjects; we cannot tolerate your excessive pride; we cannot satisfy your avarice. Devil take you, Pope, but God be with us! (Joh. de Mandavilla Anglus.) [[Internet Archive](#)]

Third objection. [^]

Thirdly, he claims that if the papacy were not right and not from God, it would not have stood for so long, but would have perished long ago. (Acts 4:38).

Of this he waxes poetic, though from another's mouth, p. 4 thus:

What does not serve God must perish,
 The advice of men cannot stand;
 But what comes from God himself,
 You never dampen or separate that.
 Is the papacy now the stuff of men?
 How come it didn't disappear for long?
 It would be impossible for it to still be standing,
 If Christ himself had not founded it, etc.

Answer. [^]

So the Turks could also conclude for their Muhammad (the secular Antichrist): If the Koran and the Turkish religion were not right and not from God, it would have perished long ago, but now it has stood for almost eleven hundred years, and thus probably as long, indeed longer, than the rightly confirmed papacy, and is therefore far from right. *) The Jews had not only been able to reason against the

*) Sfort himself acknowledges this. Palavicinus *Hist. Cone. Trid. I. 1. c. 27. § 8.* for when he had reported that Luther had alleged for himself That is what Gamaliel said: *If it is from men This plan, this work will be destroyed: if it is from God, you will not be able to to dissolve that:* immediately He adds: *For what reason would it be made, Mohammed also superstition, and idols worship to be from God, when through so many centuries not yet to dissolve they could.* But wouldn't it be permissible to replace the same with Fr Angelo now?

apostles in the same way and insist with much better justification on the unaltered succession (line of office) of their high priests than the papists on their popes, in whom there are excellent gaps and inaccuracies (Conf. C. Nic. Hunnius in pelle ovina papatui detracta a § 599. ad 863). Yes, Judaism has not yet completely perished up to this hour and is therefore far older than the papacy, is it therefore right? In short, that which is not of God must finally perish, though not today, though not this year, but finally and in time. And it is precisely for this reason that the papacy, having risen to its highest heights, must begin to fall shamefully.

Yes, you say, how has the Pope fallen, since he still sits stiffly and firmly in Rome in all things? Answer: Yes, even if the Pope *ratione existentiae* (as far as his existence is concerned) has not yet fallen out of the world (this remains reserved until the future of Jesus Christ, 2 Thess. 2:8), he has nevertheless fallen out of the hearts of men as far as his existence, authority and prestige are concerned (this is the very heart of the papacy). He no longer has the prestige and honor he once had. When I say that this or that great minister has fallen, it is not necessary that he should break his neck; it is enough that he should no longer be recognized for what he was before. Most of the kingdoms and countries that had previously done him the greatest honor and brought him the best revenues, such as Germany, England, Holland, Denmark, Sweden, Hungary and Prussia, etc..., think nothing

more of him, and although some still adhere to him, it is nevertheless (if the truth be told) only a mirror fence, it is ratio status (happens out of prudence) and in this case it goes with some potentates, as with the great children, who know Ruprecht or Popanz well, but for certain reasons do not want to name him. The Pope's authority is now only precaria, enforced and begged, no one can be deposed by him, much less trampled underfoot or chastised with rods, they respect his ban as much as fulgur ex pelvi (colophony flashes), his bulls for water bubbles, which is why he is not as finished with it today as he was before. And although at times high chiefs come to him again, it is either for lack of the right answer to some sophisticated (captious) questions or Jesuitical snares, or out of human foresight, or because now the Pope has put on the fox skin again and treats them somewhat more politely; if he would deal with them again as before, they would probably soon come to us again.

Nevertheless, the Pope has attributed this to the angel who flew through heaven and cried out with a loud voice: Fear God and give him glory, etc., whose successors can say with truth: Babylon, the great city, has fallen (Revelation 16:8). For the rest, let us be patient until the Lord comes, when we will find out whether that which is not of God can endure forever. (Revelation 18:10.)

Fourth objection. [^]

Fourthly, the author quotes p. 5, 8 various testimonies from Luther, and that he himself especially confessed (Tom. 4. Jen. Germ. f. 409) that all good and the core of Christianity remained in the papacy.

Answer. [^]

In the passages quoted and others like them, Luther meant to say nothing other than what St. Paul usually says: the Lord knows his own, even in the midst of the wicked crowd. Much good has indeed remained in the papacy, such as Scripture, Baptism, the Lord's Supper and the like, but it does not follow from this that the papacy is good in and of itself. When I say that in this dunghill (forgive the expression) lie the most precious oriental pearls and jewels, I do not therefore consider the dunghill itself to be a jewel. Thus Luther truly did not consider the Pope's dung to be a jewel, although there were still good jewels hidden under such dung, which he suo nitori restituit (restored to their splendor), collected again (ceu e stercore Enniano margaritas, like the pearls from the dungy verses of Ennius) and cleaned. One must therefore distinguish the papacy, i.e. the falsifications of doctrine, superstition and human deceit on which the papacy consists, from that which has remained good under the papacy.

But since Luther has sufficiently explained himself in the place mentioned

and refuted Father Engel before he was born, the reader will feel no annoyance that I place his own words here: I hear and see, saith he, that the rebaptizing is done by some for the reason of making the Pope angry, as they would have nothing of the Antichrist, etc. Indeed, this is a loose foundation, from which they will build nothing good; in the same way they would also have to deny the whole of Holy Scripture and the ministry of preaching, for we certainly have everything from the Pope and would also have to make a new Holy Scripture. So we would also have to abandon the Old Testament, so that we would have nothing of the unbelieving Jews, etc. It is all a fool's work. Christ also found abuses among the Jewish people of the Pharisees and scribes, but he did not therefore reject everything they had and taught (Matt. 23). (This is now followed by the words challenged by Fr. Engel, that he might think to hunt up something great). But we confess that under the papacy there is much Christian good, indeed all Christian good, and that from there it has come to us (what is it? Indulgences, sacrifice of the Mass, monastic orders, pilgrimages, etc.? oh no! just listen further), namely we confess that in the papacy is the right Holy Scripture, right Baptism, right Sacrament of the Altar, right Keys for the forgiveness of sins, right preaching, right catechism, as the ten commandments, the articles of faith, the Lord's Prayer. Just as he also confesses again (though he condemns us as heretics) that with us and with all heretics are the Holy Scriptures, baptism, keys, catechism, etc. O how hypocritical you are here! How hypocritical am I

then? I say (NB.) what the Pope has in common with us, he in turn is so hypocritical to us and the heretics, and says what we have in common with him. I say that under the Pope is the right kind of Christianity, indeed the right kind of Christianity and many pious and great saints. Shall I stop being hypocritical? (Here follows his explanation, which Engel should also have added.) Hear for yourself what St. Paul says (2 Thess. 2). **The Antichrist will sit in the temple of God. If the Pope, as I do not believe otherwise (Aurige aures, Fr. Angele, prick up your ears, Father Engel!), is the real Antichrist, he shall not sit and reign in the devil's stable, but in God's temple.** No, he will not sit with vain devils and unbelievers, or where there is no Christ or Christianity, for he is to be an antichrist, therefore he must be among the Christians. And because he is to sit and rule there, he must have Christians among him. God's temple is not called a heap of stones, but holy Christendom (1 Cor. 3), in which he is to reign. If, then, Christendom is under the Pope, it must truly be Christ's body and member; if it is his body, it has the right spirit, gospel, faith, baptism, sacrament, keys, preaching office, prayer, holy Scripture and all that Christendom should have. We are all still under the papacy and have such Christian goods from it, for he persecutes us, curses us, banishes us, chases us away, burns us, strangles us and deals with us poor Christians as a **true Antichrist should deal with Christianity.** Now such Christians must indeed be properly baptized and righteous members of Christ,

otherwise they could not obtain such a victory against the Antichrist through death. We do not rave, as do the riotous spirits, that we reject all that the Pope has under him, for then we would also reject Christendom, the temple of God, with all that it has of Christ. Rather, we contest and reject it (Fr. Angele, Sensibus hæc imis, res est non parva, repone! Father Engel, take this very deeply to heart, this is an important piece!), that the Pope does not want to remain with such goods of Christianity, which he inherited from the apostles, but adds his devil's addition to them and over them and does not use such goods for the improvement of the temple of God, but for the destruction, that one holds his commandment and order higher than Christ's order. Although in such destruction Christ nevertheless preserves his Christianity, just as he preserved Lot in Sodom (2 Peter 2[:7-8]), so that both remain, the Antichrist sits in the temple of God through the work of the devil, and yet the temple of God is and remains God's temple, preserved through Christ. Until then Luther, with whose clear and distinct words, in which he gave Father Engel complete satisfaction to his vain objection, we close the first question.

The Second Chapter. ^

On the second question.

Whether the so-called Evangelicals can be called catholic, and who were of their faith before Luther?

Answer. ^

This question again contains two questions or points. 1. whether today's Evangelicals can justifiably be called catholic?

Of which the author rhymes p. 9:

You preachers boast a lot,
As if your teaching were catholic;
But this is what it means to be catholic,
That every time and place remains one.
What did not permeate all time and land,
That was never recognized as Catholic.

Above all, a conclusion must be drawn as to what "catholic" actually is and means? *)

*) Conf. Heilbrunner. Uncathol. Pope. p. 481. Dannhauer *Theol. Consc. T. I. P. 2. p. 566. et Hodom. Pap. I. p. 423. s. Hülsemann Brev. e. 7. § 23. Tenzel in der Rettung wider Frommen, p. 1149. Gerhard de Ecclesia § 149. s. B. D. Scherzer. Diss. on the Catholic.*

Catholic means as much as universal. Now if the papists understand by the Catholic or universal religion that which has always been in vogue or at least known in all places in the world from the time of the apostles (to which the author seems to be aiming), then their religion is by no means to be called Catholic, for it has neither been known at all times nor by all people. Not at all times, for example, the prohibition of Holy Scripture and of both kinds in the Lord's Supper, which among other things is a part of the papal religion and doctrine, has been unknown for a thousand years and more after the Apostles' time; nor by all people, for Fr. Engel will at least be so kind as to confess that, for example, the Spaniards in the New World (as he will also let pass for a country) have not encountered any papists and co-religionists. Let it now go according to the rhymes:

What did not permeate all time and land,
Catholics never recognized that,

so the papal religion must certainly also be un-catholic.

Or do they understand by the Catholic religion that which, after the times of the apostles, has always had the greatest following and the most applause, then again their religion cannot be called catholic, for the Arians have also had the greatest following before (so that Emperor Constantine said to the Roman bishop Liberius: What a little piece of the world you are, who hold it alone with this boy [Athanasius] and want to separate the unity of the whole world [which is Arian]? To which Liberius

joyfully replied *): Even if I am alone, the true faith is not diminished because of this; for before there were only three of them who resisted the royal edict [in Daniel's time]. And today, the Muhammadans will not give in to them, but will easily raise again as many who hold with Muhammad as those who hold with the Roman Pope.

Or do they wish to understand by the Catholic religion that same faith which the holy Apostles spread throughout the world in their time, and which all righteous Christians throughout the world, wherever they may be in heaven, subscribe to? and although unknown to one another, yet united under their head Christ Jesus in one faith and mind, so not the papists, but we Evangelicals have the true apostolic catholic religion, as has been sufficiently demonstrated and proven by our own on all points of our religion. **) Since Bellarmine himself admits that if only one province retained the true faith, it could still be called well Catholic, if only it were clearly proved that it was the one that had been Catholic at one time or another; the papists must truly be satisfied and let us pass for well Catholic if we only prove (which has long since been done) that our present faith was Catholic before, namely at the time of the apostles.

*) *Ὁν διὰ τό εἶνει με μόνον, ο της πίστεως λόγος ελαττονται χλ.* Conf. Theodoret *l. 2. Hist. c. 16. T. 2. p. 236.*

**) Conf. Chemnitz *Exam. Concil. Trid.* Heilbrunner, Uncatholisches

But that the common man among us does not call himself Catholic, but the Papists do, is because they do not understand the word ["catholic"] properly (as even the thousandth Papist does not understand it thoroughly); but therefore the Papists are as little catholic as a quack is a doctor, although the peasants call him so. Thus certain heretics are called Catharos, the pure, Gnosticos, the wise, Angelicos, the English, etc., and yet they are not considered to be so in the slightest.

Here Father Engel, with others of his kind, wants to insist on the everlasting succession or unchanging succession, and thinks it necessary that such faith should be brought from one bishop to another in a certain place from the times of the Apostles until today, when he thus rhymes p. 10:

David says yes, the skies clear
 God's Word reveals us,
 Day and also night indicate it,
 Where is your succession (uninterrupted sequence)?
 Shows us from one time to the next,
 Where your faith would wander?

But such visible succession and consequence as the papists want to have (to which Psalm 19:1 ff. does not fit, as it speaks of the spreading

Papacy. Hülsemann's *against Hagerum Disp. 6. p. 240. s. D. 17. p. 772. D. 19. p. 1027. 1089. etc.* Warning to Evangelical Christians that they should avoid the papal doctrine and adhere to the Lutheran, *T. 1. Consil. Theol. Witteb. p. 161. s.* Dr. Müller. Admonition to the Christian congregation at Hamburg against Jansenium.

of the Gospel by the holy apostles, not in a certain place, but now and then in the whole world), is not necessary. It is enough that the faith remains in the divine Scriptures and in some people's hearts at all times. The Jews did not consider this discovery, otherwise they could have said to John the Baptist, Christ and his apostles: You refer to Moses and the prophets, but that is not enough, you must show us people after the times of the prophets who have continued your teaching in a certain place in an unchanging sequence, otherwise we will not believe you, no matter how well your teaching agrees with the writings of the prophets.

So it is with the unalterable succession and following of the Roman bishops, of which the papists make such a cruel boast, still far from being as clear and correct as they pretend. If we want to look at the individuals, the chain of bishops in Rome is very badly connected. It is still unproven today that Peter was the first bishop of Rome; nor do they know to this day who was Peter's next successor (successor in office), as Barth. Caranza (in summa Concil. et Pontif. p. 12) says that in re tam perplexa (in such a confused matter) he wants to leave the *judicium* (judgment) to the reader, let him think what he will of it. How many vacancies (times when the office was vacant) and gaps, and often no Pope at all in the world, and often the matter was so doubtful that one did not know who was pope, cook or waiter in Rome? The papal residence has not always been at Rome, but for many years [at Avenion \(Avignon\)](#) in France,

from the year 1305 to 1377. At times there have been two, or even three popes at once, each of whom had a special following and cast the other under a spell; thus in the time of [Frederick Barbarossa Alexander III](#) and [Victor \[IV\]](#) around the year of Christ 1159. Likewise in the time of Henry II there were Benedict IX, Sylvester III and Gregory IV, Gregory IV. three terrible beasts or monsters, as Platina calls them, about the year 1015. From the time of [Gregory XI](#), who transferred (transferred back) the papal see from Avignon to Rome, the Roman Church again received two, and finally, like Cerberus, three heads or popes, from the year of Christ 1380 to 1417, when three popes, named Benedict XIII, Gregory XII, John XXIII, were deposed and Martin V was elected in their place. And even today the popes themselves do not know who has been the right Pope for the past 37 years? That for a time a woman, and indeed a whore, was Pope or rather popess in Rome, the papists do not want to have it said, nor do we want to burden them with it, but so many historians testify to it, who either lived before Luther's time or were not Lutheran, that they cannot deny it.

*) I will now let this be a beautiful, unchanging sequence and succession of bishops!

*) Conf. Gerhard *de Ecclesia* 197. p. 382. s. and more on this argument will be given by Heilbrunn himself. *Art. 13. c. 9. p. 503. s.* Dannhauer. *Hodom. P. I. p. 445. n.* Hunnius *Apostas. Rom. Eccl. Gisb. Voeticus Disp. Sei. P. V. p. 445. s. et alii.*

But if we want to go into the doctrine, the papists should still prove the hour when the first supposed Pope Peter taught uniformly with the Council of Trent, or that the same doctrine was propagated by his supposed, especially closer successors, of which more later.

The other part of the question is whether it can be proved that people lived before Luther who believed the same thing?

Here the author or his predecessor makes great fun with himself with rhymes, and it seems as if he has acquired a special poetic rapture or furor (poetic rage and enthusiasm), as the reader will see from the following verses (p. 9, 10):

Go ahead, name one, God give who it is,
Pope, bishop, priest or layperson,
Who taught and believed as you do now,
Where does he have his chair and seat?
Where was his pulpit and government?
Where and how many sacraments are there?
Where was his parishioner and parish?
Were they a little or a lot?
What part of the world did they have?
Do you live near the Jordan or the Rhine?
In Hungary, Poland, Russia, Prussia,
In Saxony, Hesse, Thuringia, Meissen,
In Bavaria, Bohemia, Austria,
In Scotland, England, France,
In Lievland, Moscow, Tartary,
In Sweden, Swabia, Switzerland, Turkey?

In which city, town, village and hamlet
 Didn't your gospel stick?
 Where was your church, where has it gone?
 Who wrote one of her titles?
 Who first brought God's Word to her?
 Where did she continue to plant it?
 How was it taken from her so soon?
 Through whom did it come to you again?

Answer. [^]

This question: whether before Luther there were Lutherans or Christians of the same mind or faith as Luther? has been answered so often by our own people that it almost makes us sick to open our mouths any further. *) But because this bad and small joke thrown in the way has already led many a man to fall away and fall into hell, it is said: It is never said enough, that it is never enough learned (What is never learned enough can never be remembered too often).

It is to be deplored, however, that these so bad misgivings gave the otherwise praiseworthy Margrave of Baden, Lord Jacob, the last push to apostasy, as can be seen in the causes given out under his name (p. 16.): Finally, he (Dr. Pappus in the Colloquio)

*) Conf. besides others Balduin *Disputation on the true Church of Christ before the times of Luther*. Meisnerus, Reineccins, Joh. Jac. Beck in *Lutheranism before Luther*. Kesler in *Lutheranism*, p. 258. s. Heilbrunner. *Uncathol. Papacy. art. 15. c. 7. p. 498. s. Religious Scruples sent to the University of Wittenberg, Tom. I. Consil. Theol. Witteberg p. 194, etc.*

was asked to point out to at least one person in 1500 years who had confessed and believed in the Lutheran religion in all respects, or to confess that his religion was new and had remained unheard of and unpreached in the world since the Apostles up to Luther, and then to proceed with the disputation (the scholarly dispute). So that he nevertheless kept us waiting for a long time, but finally, in order to withdraw himself from this matter, he made this decision: since he was urged to appoint a person who, for 1,500 years, had believed to be entirely equal to the Augsburg Confession, he hereby, in the name of God, would name and appoint St. Augustine for this position; and that he could carry this out happily, he asked for three or four months of reflection, during which he wanted to go home and bring this about. However, the Margrave did not expect this time, but had previously professed his allegiance to the papal religion.

But I am still more astonished at the well-known apostate, Andr. Fromm (who, as an old Licentiatuſ Theologiae, ought reasonably to have had a better scholarship), that he, among others, in his return, (p. 407) comes up with such an old refrain: it is impossible to name only one teacher in all the 1500 years who would have agreed with Luther in all the necessary doctrines; whoever reads only one day in the old *Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis* (church writers) will soon see that the Lutheran faith, as far as it is Lutheran, is not to be found therein. But I

for my own part, to whom this treacherous man formerly sought special friendship in Wittenberg, am sufficiently assured for many reasons that he not only had a fickle, reckless mind (in that he lied his way through all the religions tolerated in the Holy Roman Empire, swore by them, played with perjuries no differently than children with their nuts, and, if he wished, was able to shed Crocodile's tears), but also (how much Engel emphasizes him in his listing) not to find a quite thorough theological scholarship, which I must conclude not only from the fact that only shortly before his apostasy he desired to hear the Hebrew grammar from me, as then professor of this language, so that he could better understand the Old Testament; but also that he first had to grasp the difference between Evangelical and papal doctrine from the meager *Epitome Coturii* and similar little books; so that although his poor soul is deplored by us all, the merits of his person are not deplored so highly by anyone of understanding. This time you have not caught a great fish, but only a mediocre frog!

But to the point. When the question is asked whether there were Lutherans before Luther was born, it is soon understood, even by the most simple-minded, that this is not a question of the name [of "Lutheran"], whether anyone before Luther's birth bore the name Lutheran? But it does not follow from this that before Luther's birth no one believed what he taught; just as it does not follow that at Antioch people first called themselves Christians, and therefore no one before that time had adhered

to Christ. No, according to faith, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, even Adam and Eve, were also Christians, for there is salvation in no other, nor is there any other name given among men by which we must be saved (Acts 4:12), and the fathers as well as we (Acts 15:11).

But if we now speak of doctrine, I say without hesitation that all orthodox believers before Luther were certainly in agreement with Luther in the fundamentals of Christian doctrine and in the articles of faith necessary for salvation, and died blessedly on the same faith, for the stubble, wood and straw built on such grounds at times, or errors believed in out of ignorance but not defended against conscience, were consumed in the last heat and did not hinder their salvation.

The papists, however, are not yet satisfied with this, but demand, in short, that we should tell them where and which people in 1500 years before Luther held with him on the points of doctrine necessary for salvation? If we do not do this, then our doctrine should and must be new and wrong.

But this is in truth an unnecessary, unreasonable, impertinent and highly prejudicial (dangerous) request. It is unnecessary because the Lord knows His own, even though we cannot name them. Their names are written in heaven, although no catalog (list) is kept of them on earth. Is it not enough, then, if I and you are assured for ourselves that we believe no other gospel than that

which Christ has preached to us in His Word? God grant that many before us have been of our faith? Each one must be careful for himself to give an account to God (Rom 14:12). We will, moreover, find ourselves together in heaven.

The Jews, then, were more discerning than the papists of today; they did not desire that Christ should make known the names of people after the time of the prophets who taught the very things he taught; and if they had so desired, Christ would have rejected them in short order, for it was enough that their false doctrine and the abuses they had introduced were presently and obviously proven to them from God's Word. So it is likewise enough that we have so far sufficiently shown the papists that our doctrine, in which they contradict us, is founded in God's Word, whereas their errors are contrary to the divinely revealed Word, and it is then easy to understand that those who were saved before our time must necessarily have held with us and the Scriptures, and not with the papists against the Scriptures, for one would say that they were saved on a faith that is contrary to God's Word. But this was better understood than angels by a famous papist, named [Valerianus Magnus](#) *), who confesses that even if the devil himself should bring against the universal Church a single text or saying from Holy Scripture, against which the

*) His words in *Commentary on Man infamous etc.*, p. 28. These are: *If the devil brings against the whole world The Church has one sacred text, which the entire Church would violate, I would believe the Devil against the Church, let alone Luther, however much infamous.*

Church taught, he would believe the devil against the Church, let alone Luther, however evil he was called.

It is unfair, for we are supposed to present them either oral or written witnesses. They will never ask for oral witnesses, for we cannot present them as long as they are dead, to confess their faith, and in that case the papists would truly admonish me, as that unlearned judge who said to the lawyer who had invoked Bartholus and Baldus: "Well, if they are honest men, let them come in, we want to hear them! So here, too, it would mean: Well, let Jerome, Ambrose, Augustine etc. come in, we want to hear them. But I think they would still receive as little attention as Luther, for the Papists are not concerned with the dear truth, but with the preservation of their church status. But if they ask for written witnesses, it is again an unfair thing. For the righteous teachers of the first church, before the papacy arose, either wrote nothing at all, or their true writings have not come down to our time, or those that remain, the Pope has subsequently falsified, mutilated, and removed, whatever does not serve his purpose, as is clearly shown in the main defense of the apple of the evangelical eye (c. 35) is clearly shown and proved to him (p. 347 fg.), where also among others (c. 36) the falsification of the Nicene Council, carried out treacherously and dishonorably by three popes, is irrefutably discovered. So also those who, after the time when the papacy

arose, bravely opposed the Pope, have been put out of the way, their mouths stuffed with earth and steam, their writings burned and destroyed, how can we identify them? It is just as if an unjust judge were to tear up the documents (evidence) of a party he does not favor in front of their eyes, put the witnesses they have produced in a dark dungeon, and then say: Now show us your letters and documents! *)

But the eye of divine Providence saw this beforehand and therefore watched over and prevented it for our good, so that these harpies were not allowed to lay their claws on the writings of the holy prophets and apostles, however good an opportunity they might have had to do so; indeed, they had to take the rod to their backs, so that, praise God, we can name enough people who were in agreement with Luther's teaching on all points before the Pope was thought of. Here we want to give the papists the choice of choosing Paul or Peter (whether perhaps the latter would be more acceptable to them as the supposed first Roman pope); we are obliged to show that our Augsburg Confession agrees with their epistles in all articles; if, on the other hand, they can thoroughly assert their Council of Trent from this or another apostle, then they shall win, and we shall have lost forever.**) If they make an attempt and prove to us

*) Kesler will give more in the *Papacy*, *ch. 3 qu. II. p. 542. 8.*

***) Convenience Popes with Peter in doctrine, office, morals, deeds and studies briefly exhibited Hunnius *On the Church*, *pm 306 s.*

from Peter or Paul the Pope's presumptuous power, their monasticism and nuns, their indulgences, their purgatory, their mass, their one form, their prohibition of food, their invocation of the deceased saints and their images, and the like,*) so we would rather become papal today than tomorrow, how can we make a better stand against them?

But they themselves know and realize that the matter will not go this way, because the apostles are too well evangelical in their writings, hence Eck confessed that the Augsburg Confession could not be refuted from Scripture. And Alb. Pighius (1. 1. de Eccles. Hierarch. c. 4) expressly confesses that their cause would stand much better if they had never entered into Scripture with us. **) That is why the Pope subsequently decided to take the Scriptures away from people's eyes, hands and hearts, and I can easily imagine how much they regret that this did not happen sooner. This is a clear indication of an evil conscience and an unrighteous cause, for the fact that someone is so despondent is due to his own wickedness, which convinces and condemns him; such fear comes from the fact that someone does not dare to take responsibility (Wis. Sal. 17, 10 and 12).

*) Conf. warning that papal teaching should be avoided, etc. *Consil. Witteb. T. p. 141. s. ubi erroneus dogmas of the Pontificals succinctly you have refuted, as Articles of the Aug. Conf. briefly stated to be from Sacred Scripture ib. p. 161. f.. Vel conf. Execution of the causes of the denied Council of Trent, p. 135. 277.*

**) His words are: *His doctrine if mindful We would have been, not being heretics to be informed or If we were to be convinced from the scriptures, our affairs would*

Nevertheless, the ancient Doctors of the Church did not do this, but invoked Scripture against everyone, as when, for example, St. Augustine says in the Book of the True Church Among Others (c. 16):

Therefore let all this be set aside, and let them (the Donatists) prove their church, if they can, not from what the Africans speak and pretend, nor from the conciliar and religious assemblies of their bishops, nor from the writings of the teachers, much less from the signs and wonders which can deceive, because we have already been warned and protected against them from the Word of God; but from the books of the law, from the prophecies of the prophets, from the hymns of the psalms, from the voice of the shepherd, from the preaching and works of the evangelists, i.e. from the unquestionable books of Holy Scripture, etc.

And is it of no help to the papists that they object that all other heretics also appeal to Scripture, [as does Prof. Biermann!] and from where can we be more assured of correct understanding than they? But this has already been sufficiently answered by others. *) In brief, it should be noted that not only heretics and false teachers in Christendom appeal to Scripture (like all evil lawyers to the Corpus Juris), but also, to a certain extent, Jews and

certainly be in a better place. But while to show off For the sake of talent and learning with Luther He descends into a contest of scriptures, aroused This is what we see, unfortunately! fire.

*) Conf. besides others Dorscheus I. *Dedic.* of his exculpated religious scruples.

Turks also do so. But each party has its own particular precedent or preconceived opinion, which is why they do not accept this or that otherwise clear and distinct passage, but rather bend, stretch and direct the words according to their own meaning, contrary to the clear appearance, and thus willfully make a blue haze for themselves, so that they cannot see the bright light of truth. Thus the Jews refer to the Old Testament Scriptures, but they do not wish to interpret them in any other way than according to their Talmud. The Mohammedans accept the whole Bible in so far as it can be comported (united) with their Koran. A papist, before he even looks at the Scriptures, already has the *præjudicium* (the preconceived opinion) that the same cannot be understood in any other way than according to the sense of the Roman pope; otherwise it may read and sound as it will. A Calvinist and Socinian has the *præjudicium* (the preconceived opinion) that he does not want to accept certain points in any other way than in accordance with reason and natural principles. The Anabaptists and enthusiasts have the *præjudicium* (the preconceived opinion) that true understanding must be directly infused or inspired into them apart from the Holy Scriptures, etc. And in this way it is no wonder that they all lack the right understanding; for they do not desire to learn the truth from the divine Word before their eyes, but to force the falsehoods conceived in their minds from the Scriptures; the Scriptures are not to be a lamp to their feet and a light to their path, but to follow their own will-o'-the-wisp. They desire

not to follow the rule of St. Hilarius: The best reader of Scripture is he who expects an understanding rather from what is said than from what he implies, and who relates rather than brings, and who does not force what he had presumed to be understood before reading to appear to be contained in what was said, i.e. as much as: This is a true reader of Scripture, who does not bring the understanding of the passages into Scripture, but expects and brings it out of it, and does not force Scripture to say what the reader had in mind before reading Scripture. On the other hand, because no such prejudice can justly be brought to bear upon us (as Father Engel is further requested to prove), but because we take God's Word without any regard to human authority (reputation), without any pretentious pretense of reason, without any fantastic imagination of a special revelation apart from Scripture, in Christian simplicity and humility, solely as the light to our feet, it will not let us go astray, but will lead us into all truth.

But this request of the papists (that we should name people after the time of the apostles who held the same view as Luther) is also impertinent, for this has already happened long ago. Chemnitz (in his Examen C. T.), Gerhard [in his LL. CC. *)] and others have sufficiently cited consensus (agreement) in every article of the ancient Doctors of the Church. Dr. Pappus **) [**) Conf. Dannhauer *Theol. Consc. P. I. p. 556.*] has, according to

*) Let us add from the Calvinists Dan. Chamierus in *Panstratia*.

his promise, proved the evangelical doctrine from Augustine alone. And although after the time Fr. Jak. Masenius wished to draw Augustine to the papal side, yet the same Dr. Sam. Ben. Carpzov shut him up. We can also read about this in L. Ant. Augustine Reiser, *Evangelical-Catholic Witness and Confessor of the Truth*, published in Frankfurt in 1678. To make matters worse, our religion has been proven from scribes (writers) who lived after the time of the true Fathers, as Dorsch from Thomas Aquinas, Dr. Gerhard in his *Catholic Confession* has also compiled with great diligence the papists known from Luther's time who are on our side. Why do the papists not answer from these and similar writings?

Finally, this request is prejudicial (dangerous) to the papists themselves, for they cannot do what they demand of us in their own place. Nevertheless, they are commanded to name a single righteous Doctor of the Church (especially one who lived and wrote in the first 500 years after the birth of Christ) who agrees with them on all points of doctrine that are controversial against us, since they had them in their hands and could have falsified them as they have at other times, and thus could have patched one into the other as they pleased. They do indeed prove, or rather endeavor to prove, their doctrine from the Fathers, but only piecemeal, from these this, from the others another, but from none everything *). But if this is to be true, then we can also do the art,

*) Conf. Tenzel, *against Frommen*, c, 5 p. 715. s. Erasmus Sarcerius *on the Consensus of the true Church and the Fathers etc.*

we want to bring up testimonia (testimonies) from all of them rather than they do. We also know very well what kind of mirror fencing there is among the papists. A Dutchman named Jacob Laurentius, in the *The subtleties of Papal reverence towards the Fathers*, gave them very strong pills to swallow and proved that when the Fathers of the Church appear to speak the word to them, they lift them up to heaven and accept everything, whether it is written by them, by the Fathers themselves, or by others under their name; but if they are not for them, despise them, say that they have spoken *privato spiritu*, out of their own heads, have gone too far in their zeal, or say that they are falsified, that the books referred to are not theirs, but *scripta supposititia* (subterfuged writings) or foundlings, *) and whatever else is of their nature. Since they themselves do not want to depend on the Fathers, would it not be best if we remained solely with the Holy Scriptures, as with such a book that the Fathers themselves accepted and that we and the papists must accept in both parts?

Engel objects to this in two particular ways.

First Objection. [^](#)

First of all, Fr. Engel objects that there must nevertheless have been a visible church at all times, to which the people could have adhered, for where was it to be found before Luther? either with them or nowhere. So

*) Conf. also main defense, *c. 35. p. 351.*

much is to be taken from the confused unrhymed rhymes p. 11 and 12, of which, nevertheless, I do not wish to deprive or defraud the reader, they sound poorly enough:

The apostolic church reverend
Go out through the world everywhere,
There is no tongue and speech either,
In which one may not hear her voice.
What has happened to your church?
That no man could hear or see them?
The small stone with Daniel The big one
Picture crushes quickly,
Became a great mountain and spread out,
That he fills the earth wide:
So the church grows, remains standing forever,
All other realms pass away before her.
Is now your church the same stone,
How he soon became so small again,
That for many a hundred years
The corner was under the bench,
And finally hid so deep,
That you are looking for him in the mouse hole?
The church is a burning Lucern,
Which shines in the world far and wide,
That everyone may see their light,
She can't stand under a bushel,
Still under the table or in a secret place,
Like your church with its word.

It is a city built on a mountain,
 That everyone hears and sees them.
 Their gates are open day and night,
 To her comes the power of all nations.
 Their sun and moon lost none of their light,
 The Lord wants to be with her forever,
 Their little ones are to become a thousand,
 The most powerful people on earth.
 But you mouse in the dark
 And shows your church in Nowhere Town,
 Before you there were neither a thousand nor one,
 How can you be Catholic?
 You want to lead us into the desert,
 Christ promises to travel out.
 You say: He is in the hall or room,
 But he tells us: Never believe him.
 Who then follows Christ's counsel and word,
 It will probably remain unheard by you.

Answer. [^]

It would be desirable for the church to have its public and visible free exercise (activity) at all times and to be in constant flourishing and prosperity. But this does not always happen; it may well happen, and has happened very often, that the visible church or congregation, which publicly professes the true Christian faith, and is to be seen in this or that place, is covered with the clouds of affliction, stirred up either

by false teachers or cruel tyrants, that its outward splendor fades, and nowhere can one find a respectable assembly that freely and unhinderedly proclaims the pure Word of God and the sacraments in complete perfection. *) Thus, that at the time when the Antichrist will tyrannize over the holy Christian Church, it will be a wretched, corrupt, darkened and obscured, is attested not only by the prophecies contained in sacred Scripture and the confessions of the ancient teachers of the Church, but also by the papal teachers themselves. Holy Scripture clearly states that in the times of Antichrist the false teachers will flood everything with prophecies, hypocrisy, miracles and signs in such a way that, where possible, even the elect may be led astray (Matt. 24:24, 2 Thess. 2:9, 1 Tim. 4:1, Rev. 12:7, etc.). Among the ancient teachers of the Church, St. Augustine says (in Ps. 9):

The third persecution of the Church is still to be expected, which Antichrist will arouse; it will also be the most harmful, because it will be continued with violence and deceit, for violence it will show in worldly government, deceit in miraculous works.

And before this he says:

Because it is thought that the Antichrist will rise to such heights of vain glory

*) Conf. Gerhard *de Ecclesia*, c. 8. p. 276. Heilbrunner. Uncathol. Papacy. p. 546. s. Nic. Hunnius, *pelle ovina* §. 296. s. Calov *Mataeol. Pap.* p. 204. Statement of the Danzig Catechismi Against Fr. Carl, p. 887. Laur. Lælius, Against Fr. George at the end of three questions of the Church and Holy Communion, *qu. 2. p. 58. s.*

he will be permitted to do such things against everyone, and especially against the saints of God, that at the same time some weak believers will truly be led to think that God has completely omitted the providence of human affairs.

Jerome writes (on 2 Zephaniah) thus:

"It seems almost blasphemous in the first place that it should be said of the church that it will be unpaved and desolate, that wild beasts will dwell in it, and that it will be said with scorn, as it were, that this is your city devoted to the wicked, which dwelt so securely, saying in its heart: 'I am he, and there is none else!'. How has it become so desolate that beasts dwell in it? But whoever considers what the apostle says (1 Tim. 4) and Christ says about the Last Times (Luke 18:8) will not be surprised at what is said about the desolation of the church under the reign of the Antichrist. Papal teachers themselves confess the same about the antichristian times.

Cardinal Bellarmine says (1. 3. de P. R. c. 7):

It is certain that the Antichrist's persecution will be the greatest and most severe, in such a way that it will abolish all the ceremonies and sacrifices of the Christian religion.

So he also says later:

The Antichrist will remove all worship that is now practiced in the church.

Thomas Stapleton (libr. 3. Princ. doctr. c. 2):

Of course, in the time of the antichristian reign, the church will be driven into the wilderness, and for that time in the wilderness, that is, in secret places, in caves and corners, in wastelands, where the saints hide themselves away, the church will be found. Since it has now been proven above

that the Pope is the Antichrist, why are they surprised that the church has become so inconspicuous at the time when the Pope has risen to the highest? At least they themselves must confess that it is possible (when their supposed Antichrist comes) that the Church could lose its appearance.

But it is also easy for the papists to prove that not only can it happen, but that it has often happened, that the Church has become inconspicuous, even invisible (as far as free toleration and free confession of persons are concerned). Dear, where was the true church of God to be seen in Elijah's time, when the altars of the Lord were broken, God's covenant was forsaken, and Elijah thought he was left alone and had no more fellow believers under heaven? (1 Kings 19). The Baal priests could also have left and said like Fr. Engel: Where is your church? where has it gone into hiding? Nevertheless, there must be a visible worship service, which is either with us or nowhere; for in the land of Judah the altars of the Lord are broken, and otherwise he considers none acceptable! The Pharisees could have said at the time of Christ's Passion: there must be a visible church, which is either with us or (as the man of very sweet ideas, Fr. Engel, says) nowhere! For the apostles had crawled to corners and could not be seen. So, since after the time of the apostles the whole world was flooded with the Arian heresy, and the orthodox did not thirst to move, but had crawled, not indeed into mouse holes in which the papists probably sought their sacrament again

*)), but into cryptas terrae (as Amularius speaks, 1. 4 c. 21 de Eccles. Officiis) in crevices and caves, could not the Arians have also splurged there: the church is either with us or nowhere! where is your church? in the holes of the earth. Is it the city built on a hill, or is it the light under a bushel?

However, even though the church can become inconspicuous, even invisible, according to its outward appearance and splendor, the whole church does not perish because of this; there remain now and then in the world some who, according to the simple guidance of the divine Word, are preserved by the Holy Spirit in the truth of faith for eternal life, which God, the Knower of hearts, knows best. Thus in the days of Elijah he knew 7,000 whom Elijah had not seen; in the time of Christ's passion he knew the apostles and other Christ-lovers in their corners; in the time of the Arian persecution his little group in the cave of Mount Ausenæ **) and others; the holy seed cannot be completely eradicated, even if it is overgrown with weeds and cannot be seen; the Lord always knows his own, otherwise let whoever will see them. We will hear more about this in the third question.

*) Read William Holder *mouse disemboweled* so ridiculous, like recycling Cato to laughter to invite may.

**) Marian. *Histor. Hisp. l. 7. c. 2.* With Spain a propitious deity try it out in a small way that Christians hand, with which in Ausena mountain Pelagius had taken refuge in a cave, named after the Cova Longa, where arrows and stones were sent by the sign of Mauritius miracle to reflect on themselves lying down They were seen.

The scriptural passages cited by Fr. Engel in this connection have been sufficiently answered by our own (if cited at the beginning of the reply to this objection). In Ps. 19:5, Matt. 5:14-15, and elsewhere, it is not the church that is alluded to on account of its constant pomp and appearance, but the holy apostles on account of their public, penetrating preaching, and is compared to a mountain and a lantern, although it may be applied to the apostolic church, and may also be used of the church in general, but that one speaks *de jure* and not *de facto*, not of what happens at all times, but of what should rightly happen. The stone in Daniel (E. 2:34.) is not the Church, but Christ Himself, of which Father Engel may, if he pleases, take counsel in my *Dubiis Biblicis* P. I p. 890 s. Otherwise the Church of the New Testament is indeed called a mountain (Ezek. 2:3, Mic. 4:2). But not because it is to remain in constant splendor and bloom, but because it was prefigured by Mount Zion (Heb. 12:22), otherwise it can also be called a rose in the valley because of its outward condition (Song 2:1). Finally, Christ (Matt. 24:26) does not speak of the church but of Himself: If they shall say unto you, Behold, he is in the wilderness, go not forth; behold, he is in the closet, believe it not. For just as the lightning goes out from the east and shines even to the west, so will the future of the Son of Man be. Now, the vain wise men could be more suitably applied to the papists, for the hermits in the desert cry out, as it were: behold, here is Christ, with us is the nearest

way to come to him; likewise the monks cry out at the top of their voices in their chambers and hermitages; but I will not endure it. Otherwise we have John's prophecy of the church, that it will have to flee into the wilderness (Revelation 12:6). Which also Stapleton himself confessed above.

Second objection. ^

Secondly, Fr. Engel uses this as his argument (p. 13 fg.): Luther himself demanded of other enthusiasts that they should either prove their calling or perform miracles. Now Luther himself had no special calling to show for his new doctrine, and yet he had performed no miracles, so that he was not authorized to do so, but was obliged to adhere to the ancient Catholic doctrine. He also speaks of the calling of other evangelical preachers, among others, p. 16 (but in prose, so that if Engel were worthy of comparison with Job, one could say of him, as Jerome T. III. Epist. ad Paulinum speaks of Job: *Prosa incipit: versu labitur: pedestri sermone finitur*, in prose it begins, in verse it proceeds, and in prose it ends again): It follows from this that the ordinary calling is not by the doctorate, nor by the secular power of the authorities, but Paul, an apostle, called Timothy and not a prince or secular lord, and so it will remain and be kept until the end of the world. Because neither Luther, nor a single Lutheran or Calvinist preacher can explain and prove his rightful calling by means or without means, it is so difficult for the servants of the word

that they have not yet been able to answer or translate it from any Lutheran Dictionarium (dictionary). It is certainly very subtle!

Answer. [^]

Although the papists, like the Jews there, say: What new doctrine is this? (Mark 1:27), Luther has by no means brought up a new doctrine, but has brought forth the old apostolic doctrine again, as he himself solemnly protests (Tom. 7, Jen. Germ. f. 206, 2). He has, as it were, drawn out the light of the Gospel, which the Pope had placed under a bushel *) contrary to law and equity (Matt. 5:16), and placed it on the lampstand. Is Luther's teaching therefore as new as the teaching of Christ and the apostles, and could he have said with Irenaeus: Christ is for me the Archivis, Christ is my old archive; and with Tertullian: That is truer, that which was first, that which was first, that from the beginning, that from the beginning, that from the Apostles, that is most truly what is first, that is the first, that is from the beginning, that is from the beginning, that is from the apostles. And it is truly laughable when another great speaker, named Tanner **), says: Thus the Lutheran Church (or doctrine) is new, although not

*) Conf. Gerhard *Conf. Cathol. l. 2. p. I. p. 1101.*

***) In his words *P. 2. Anat. A. C. demonstr. 2. n. 153.* these are: *Therefore by that very fact the Lutheran Church is new, if not with respect to the fathers of Christ, yet with respect to the time that preceded Luther: how do we say that this or that habit or form of clothing is new, which has not been in use for several recent centuries.*

in the view of Christ's time, but if we look at the time immediately before Luther. But with such "new" doctrine we already want to go to heaven, which is new in the eyes of the Pope, but old in the eyes of Christ.

Well then, for this doctrine, new according to the papacy but old according to Christianity, Luther needed no other calling than the one he had. He was duly called to the preaching office in the Wittenberg church by his presbyterate or priesthood, to the teaching office at the university by his professorship, and to the teaching office throughout the world by his doctorate, according to the nature of the time. For it was understood that he was to present the Holy Scriptures correctly and preach no other gospel than that which had been revealed, unless one were to say that he was called to teach contrary to the Word of God. So in this case there is no need either to show a direct calling or to perform miracles (which Luther has fairly demanded of the Anabaptists and similar enthusiasts, because they invoke revelations and apparitions in addition to the Scriptures); indeed, even the papists have already protested that they would not believe us if we were to perform miracles, as has been sufficiently demonstrated by others *).

*) Fornerus in *Palm. Triumphat. l. I. c. 39.* writes: *Even if you had published some truths miracles, but not yet therefore or you to receive you would be, or religion or doctrine yours would be to be approved.* He adds among other things: *Paul forbade the angel to be believed from heaven, if something else evangelize the Galatians, which was first preached by Paul They had received. You judge, you. arbitrators Be, is it not greater than any? good angels than miracles also true authority ?* Conf. Dannhauer. *Theol. Conse. T. I. p. 473. and Aleth. Victr. p. III. s.*

Nevertheless, the excitatio or awakening of Christian zeal and heroic spirit in this calling of Luther's is an extraordinary work of the Most High, as has been splendidly demonstrated by Dr. Nic. Hunnius in the obvious proof of Luther's calling and others *), and what Fr. Engel otherwise cites from Luther and his Reformation work has long since been answered **) and discussed, so that Engel might well have stayed at home.

Finally, as far as our, the Evangelical preachers' call to the preaching office is concerned, we do not base it on the doctorate, nor do we have it from the secular authorities alone, but from the whole Christian congregation [*Gemeine*]. For according to ancient apostolic custom, it is for the latter to appoint preachers in the name of God. So the apostles and elders, together with the whole Christian congregation, chose men from among them to be sent to Antioch and wrote, among other things: It seemed good to us, being unanimously assembled, to choose men to

Dorscheus Religious Scruple p. 382. and about falsehood boasting of the miracles of the Pontiff Nic. Hunnius on the *non-Christian Roman Church* § 131 s.

*) About wonders Luther's consort Thummius *Luther the Wonderworker* opposed to Forero 1623. Dannhauer *Memoria Thaumasiandri*, p. 61. c. 10. p. 52. 68. Gerhard *de Eccl.* §. 286. s. Miller p. 445.

**) Conf. can Gerhard *on the Ministry of Ecclesiastical* §. 118 s. Meisner P. 2. *against Lessius*, article 3. Hopfner in *Saxon Evangel. century Part I* 2. c. 6. Brochmand *Conf. Apology. mirror Brandenburg* P. 4. p. 231. 6. s. Müller in *Luther defending and defense Luther defensi* c. 2. 3. 4. Dannhauer *Hodom. Pap. PI* p. 26. s. Kesler *Lutheranism*, p. 21, seq. Balduin *Phosphoro true Catholicissimi against Pazmannus*, l. 3. c. 13 sp 152. s.

send to you [Acts 15:25 *]). From this we can conclude that whoever is ordinarily called by the true apostolic church, according to ancient apostolic custom, to be a preacher, has a rightful calling, which Christ does not send directly to anyone's house today, but rather through the church, as his bride (John 3:29), household honor (Psalm 68:13) and treasurer. Hence Paul also says: "It is all yours. Understand, not only because of custom, but also because of law (1 Cor. 3:22). It is incumbent upon the church to test the teaching spirits to see whether they are from God before it hears them (1 John 4:1). But now we are duly called by the true apostolic church (Fr. Engel has the heart and proves the contradiction) to preach, and therefore we have a legitimate calling. And so we do not respect it, but rather congratulate ourselves that we do not have the papal mark on us. Moreover, so many of our own have already legitimized (justified) our calling that Fr. Engel will not read it throughout his life, let alone refute it. He should try his luck and apply himself to Nic. This year, in Demonstr. Minist. Luth. p. 326 s. Baldwin, Phosphor. true Cath. L. III. c. 12. p. 138, 145, and Cas. Conse L. 4. c. 6. them 4. p. 1036 seq.; Mullerum, Anti-Jansen. § 486 - 493; Hulsemannum, Apol. of the minister organization; Haberkorn, on the ministry of Ev. truth and effectiveness c. §7. 241 sp 199 s.; Tarnovius on the ministry c. 1 q. 1; Hutterum in

*) Conf. et Act. I, 15. s. VI. 23.

thorough report against Sigism. Ernhofer; Sam. Ben. Carpozov, Exam. Masenii p. 1045 s.; Laurentium Laelium in defense of Luther; and other similar writers, he will certainly find in such evangelical Dictionariis (dictionaries) what he has not yet known.

The Third Chapter. ^

From the third question.

Has anyone ever been saved by the so-called new gospel?

The author (writer) thus raises this question in rhyme p. 21:

I ask, how did you forget?

That a man has been saved,

Who died here in your doctrine?

Just tell us one or more.

Have you proof and appearance from God,

That they would be with him in heaven?

Answer. ^

The Gospel of Christ, as it is revealed in God's Word and known by us, may finally be called new by the author (the author) according to Tanner's explanation above, namely in view of the papal abuses that have taken place, for the sake of which the old Gospel had to be renewed. But if he now asks of it: whether any one has ever been saved by it?

I answer briefly and well: none ever otherwise. Neither Luther nor we desire to be saved in any other way than by the grace of Jesus Christ, just as the fathers did (Acts 15:2); for there is no other salvation, nor is there any other name given to men by which they are to be saved (Acts 4:12). As the question is asked there: What shall I do that I may be saved? Paul and Silas answer: Believe in the Lord Jesus, and you and your household will be saved (Acts 16:31). And this is precisely the core of our evangelical faith, on which Adam was already saved (Genesis 3:15), on which many thousands and thousands have also been saved with us, whom it is not possible to count, nor is it necessary to name: for the Lord already knows those who are His!

It is said: *neganti incumbit probatio* (he who denies something owes the proof). Who, then, has brought the papists the unfavorable news that our evangelical doctrine has ever been condemned by a person who sincerely adhered to it and lived by it? And again, it is not unreasonable to ask them whether anyone has ever been saved as a result of the Council of Trent? Forgive me, Father Engel, for borrowing your verses a little and also saying:

I ask, how did you forget?
That a man has been saved,
Who died here in your teaching;
Just tell us one or more,
Have you proof and appearance from God,
That they would be with him in heaven?

On this question, however, Fr. Engel has gathered together everything

he could find, and objects to our answer in six ways.

First objection. [^] _^

First of all, he thinks that it will follow that all our ancestors under the papacy before Luther's time are damned, because that is what his rhymes say:

You preachers shout and scream,
Your doctrine brings only salvation.
Are then in sixteen hundred years
All Christians gone to hell?

Answer. [^] _^

No. The Lord knows his own. There have been the dear firstfruits of God, the little baptized and soon to be dead children, who have not agreed with the Pope in their hearts, but have kept their true evangelical faith received in Baptism, because they have not sinned against knowledge and conscience, who wants to condemn them? There have been many thousands of pious, afflicted Christians who, under the Pope's yoke and tyranny, have sighed and wept in secret under the Baalite monkeys, just as the 7,000 did in the days of Elijah, because they could not control him; who will condemn them? At all times there have been so many brave, joyful, public confessors of the truth, who have told the Pope more than he would have liked, indeed have often confirmed and sealed their profession of faith with their blood, as can be seen from Flacious's *Catalogo testium veritatis*,

the Centuriatoribus Magdeburgens [*Magdeburg Centuries*], the *Historia martyrum Lud. Rabi, Gerhardi confessione catholica* and similar books, who wants to condemn them?

But it is a wonder that the Jews did not ask Christ and the apostles the same question before:

You and your disciples shout and cry out,
Your teaching brings only salvation;
Are then in several hundred *) years
All Jewish people gone to hell?

Father Engel, consider what Christ and his apostles could have answered here, and he accepts the same from us as a favorable answer **).

Second objection. [^](#)

Furthermore, Fr. Engel points us to the calendar instead of the Bible and says that we ourselves recognize many in the calendar as excellent saints, of whom it is certain that they died well in the papacy. His rhymes (in which, with the reader's good will, we will add a few little bells this time) are thus p. 23:

If you cannot yet understand the matter,
just look at the calendar: ***)

*) After the time of the holy prophets.

***) Kesler will give more information on Luther's writings, p. 271. 276. Dorscheus 14. Religions-Scrupel, p. 385. Beck. in *Lutheranism before Luther*, etc.

***) Here we finally have the clavem (key) to the most important religious controversy! God grant that the calendar with the papal saints arrives only better than with the thunderstorm.

In it you will find both young and old,
 From land and estates manifold',
 Many popes, many thousands of martyrs,
 Many bishops, teachers, confessors,
 Many virgins, widows, wives, *)
 From the time of Christ until today,
 Salvation through signs clear **)
 God in the world makes manifest,
 As you yourselves confess,
 Because you call them holy with us. ***)
 Which bear witness to the papacy,
 With good and blood, with life and limb,
 And let themselves be robbed of it all
 So much for our old beliefs,
 Which they planted on us,
 How they had heard him first. ††)
 St. Paul ††††) calls us to see their end,
 And always follow their faith.
 Will you now be blessed with him?
 So also tune in with their faith.

*) Nevertheless, it is good that there are also saints among married couples.

**) Not as clear for everyone as Engel thinks.

***) They are pure and holy, but (as our Savior speaks there) not all. See Keslerum, in the Papacy, c. 3. q. 8. p. 435 s.

†) The Pope and his champions are otherwise unaccustomed to giving up martyrs (there is no mention of the first Roman bishops), but to making martyrs; they do not commit to leave life, but to take it.

††) Namely read from human statutes, not from holy scripture.

††††) He has neither seen nor heard of the papal calendar and its canonized saints.

But do you believe in new *) wisdom?
 So look for a new **) paradise.
 You and your faith alike
 Does not belong in the old kingdom of heaven.
 Because everything in it is pontifical ***)
 So no new Christian comes in here, †)
 That's why you'd better never have been born,
 When body and soul were lost forever!

Answer. ^

Whoever has died or dies as a papist, that is, in stubborn insistence on the pope's abominations and errors, we consider him neither holy nor blessed, he is called whatever he wants, he is also in the calendar wherever he wants, for it says: The relics of many are buried in lands whose souls burn in hell. (Many of their souls are already burning in hell, whose relics are considered a great sanctuary here, and therefore also whose names have been placed in the calendar). However, we do not say

*) In view of the old papal abuses.

**) The new Jerusalem that is above. But older than the papal religion.

***) That would be a lot if it were true from the right heaven. But because we know what is papal (better than Fr. Engel and his ilk), we would not believe it if an angel from heaven said it, let alone a poor Fr.

†) But surely a newborn Christian, a new creature in Christ Jesus? Let us hope so completely.

††) Mutatio nomine de te formula narretur! (Turn the saying around and apply it to yourself!) O that you would be wise, Father Angel, and consider this!

that all those who died under the papacy have gone to hell. The Lord knows His own, namely those who, although they remained *quoad externam societatem* (physically) with the papal following, nevertheless adhered *quoad societatem internam* (with their hearts and minds) to the true evangelical religion; those whose faith was hidden from the world, who even in the midst of the dark papacy did not believe everything they were told or wanted to believe, they had *puriore aures labiis docentium* (what was presented to them with impure uncircumcised lips, they accepted with circumcised pure ears), what was read to them in the antichristian intent, they grasped with Christian understanding, tested everything and kept what was good. In particular, the fire or heat of the last agony consumed the papal stubble and the human stubble, so that they themselves (when the devil was rightly afflicting them) felt and recognized that their own works, the intercession of the saints and the like would not hold sway, and so they relied solely on the precious bloody merit of Jesus Christ, and by his grace, who casts out no one who comes to him (John 4), who will not break the bruised reed nor snuff out the smoldering wick.

In this case God's care is to be recognized and highly praised, that even so, when it was time to depart and take their last breath, the people were pointed solely

to the merit of Jesus Christ. This is shown by the questions in their old church records *):

1. Minister: Are you glad that you are to pass away in the right faith in Jesus Christ? — Sick person: Yes, with all my heart.

2. Minister: Do you truly confess that you have not lived so Christianly and honorably according to the will of God as you ought to have done? — Sick man: Yes, I confess it from my heart.

3. Minister: But are you sorry from the bottom of your heart for these sins of yours, great and small, as God recognizes them? — Sick man: Yes, from the bottom of your heart.

4. Minister: Do you firmly believe that you cannot be saved in any other way than through the innocent death of Jesus Christ alone? — Sick person: Yes, I believe it with all my heart.

5. Minister: Do you firmly believe that our dear Lord Jesus Christ, true God and man, was crucified and died also for your sake, to save you from eternal death? — Sick person: Yes, I believe it with all my heart.

6. Minister: Will you also forgive from the bottom of your heart all those who have ever done you wrong or harmed you, and will you likewise ask that others who have offended you with words and deeds may also forgive you? — Sick man: Yes, I desire it with all my heart.

*) In Hortulo animæ, A. 1519. Nuremberg. Johann Leisentritt, cathedral dean of Budissin, in his catholic parish book, printed in Cologne in 1590: Similar vide in Agendis Mogunt. p. 71. Herbipolit. p. 94. Colon, p. 334. Salisb. p. 10. etc. Conf. Chemnit. *Exam. Concil. Trid. PI p. 143.* Gerhard *on the Church*, § 178. Dannhauer *Theol. Consc. PI p. 607. etc.*

7. Minister: Will you therefore on this confession depart blessedly from and commit your poor soul to the faithful hands of Christ Jesus? — Sick person: Yes, with all my heart, etc. *).

If the sick or dying person answers yes to these questions either with words or by gestures and waving, he has finally been addressed thus: If you can no longer answer me, then give me a sign, because your noble soul is still with you and you have breath, then you should place all your hope and trust in nothing else but the merit and death of Jesus Christ, in this his death you should immerse yourself completely, cover yourself with him and unite yourself with him, if the Lord wants to condemn you, then say in your heart (you cannot do this with words): O merciful Lord Jesus Christ, I place your so painful death between your judgment and my poor soul, I cannot help myself against you in any other way. If you are afraid that God would abandon and condemn you (which he undoubtedly does not want), then say: O almighty, eternal God, my merciful Creator, between your unspeakable goodness and my innumerable sins and wickedness I place your only begotten Son Jesus Christ, my Redeemer, bitter death; I humbly offer you his great merit for all my sinful infirmities. So between your just wrath against me I place with all confidence the same merit and the death of my dear Lord Jesus Christ, for I know well that

*) You will also find such good evangelical questions in Mr. Joh. Philips, Bishop of Bamberg's prayer book, A. 1606. at Bamberg, *p. 213. s.*

such is the most pleasing and acceptable sacrifice to you. Is this not a good evangelical consolation for death?

So I would not know how to improve the testament that [Cardinal Hosius](#) *) (otherwise not the best) finally made, if he had left out the addition of the intercession of the Mother of God. I come to you, he says, O most gracious Father, I come to you and bring you none of my own merits, but many of the merits of your Son, my Lord and Savior Jesus Christ: because with his most precious death he has done enough for you, not only for my sins, but also for the sins of the whole world, I bring to you the merit of this death, in which alone I have placed all my hope and trust. This is my righteousness, my satisfaction, redemption and reconciliation: my merit is the death of my Lord. How could an Evangelical speak better than Hosius up to this point?

Yes, [Bellarmine, the Cardinal](#) **), after he has argued long and broadly against us about justification, the truth at last presses out such a good evangelical confession: because of the uncertainty of our own righteousness and the great danger of an undercurrent of vain conceit,

*) *Fol. 484. Oper.* The words seem worthy, which are read here: *Wherefore I come to you, most merciful Father, I come to you burdened with none of my own, but with the many merits of your Son, the Lord and my Redeemer, Jesus Christ: who, by his precious death, has made abundant satisfaction to you not only for mine, but also for the sins of the whole world, I bring to you the merit of this death, in which alone I have all my hope and confidence fixed: this is my justice, my satisfaction, my redemption and my propitiation: my merit is the death of my Lord etc.*

***) *De Justif. l. 5. c. 7.* Because of the uncertainty of one's own righteousness and the danger of empty glory, it is safest to place all one's trust in the mercy and kindness of God alone.

this is the surest thing, that we should put all our trust in God's mercy and grace alone. This, when viewed in the light of day, is as much as saying: it is safest to finally become a good evangelical and abandon the uncertain opinion of the Council of Trent.

Well then, such people, who departed before their last end, even before Luther's time, died and were saved in the papacy, that is, in the place of Christendom where the Pope tyrannizes, but by no means because of the papacy, that is, in the pope's doctrine and the human state, and therefore not as papists, but as evangelical Christians. Even if no one called them that, the Lord recognized them as such *).

But that even among the papists someone can well die Evangelical in his heart, Fr. Engel will deny this all the less, because some of his co-religionists gladly confess that among the Lutherans many of them can die Catholic. Thus speaks the Jesuit Martin Bresser (l. 5. de Conse, c. 20): I say I. There are also among the erring some who are not in willful ignorance of the saving mysteries and the true Church. For it is not to be doubted that there are many in the lands filled with false religion to whom such mysteries and divine truth have not been sufficiently explained, or who, through weakness of intellect, cannot well comprehend them. From this it follows that there are many among the false believers who are not actually heretics. — It further follows

*) Con. Keslerus Lutheranism , p. 557. s.

that many of them, especially young people, die blessed among the heretics. Since they have received the sacrament of holy Baptism, are born again and endowed with faith and other gifts of the Holy Spirit, they have not lost them even through gross wicked sin; indeed, if they have already lost them, I see no reason why they should not regain them through true repentance. Although I respect that it rarely happens outside the true church. If anyone should object that no one can be saved apart from the true Church, I answer that because they have been baptized and adorned with the gifts of the Holy Spirit, they have not departed from the faith received in Baptism through any deliberate heresy, so they are not, however, apart from the true Church. And for this very reason we want to hope for the best from these ancestors of ours, as well as from many who still live under the tyranny of the pope, out of Christian love.

But if someone were to object that since things are as easy to die with the Papists as with us, it could not do much harm if, in order to avoid awkwardness, one stayed with them for a while, because all's well that ends well. Answer: There is a great difference among the people who are under the pope's tyrannical yoke, and who either out of ignorance and simplicity cannot penetrate (see through) the depth of Satan, the power of the papal errors and how strongly they contradict their catechism or the Scriptures, or out of inability to resist, must suffer

and allow to happen what cannot be changed, and (realizing that it is not right) secretly sigh over it; and among those who are once fully enlightened and have tasted the heavenly gifts and the good Word of God and the powers of the world to come, and yet fall away to the papacy out of all kinds of human rejection. These err through weakness, and what they do, they do with a simple heart (Gen. 20:6), with whom God is patient and, as Dr. Luther says, favors them somewhat. But these sin out of evil intent, against better knowledge and conscience, deny Christ with His gospel before men, and feign to the Pope for the sake of their belly or good days, which is why Christ wants to deny them again before His heavenly Father and give them the reward of hypocrites; because they sin wickedly in grace, he will look upon them with righteous disfavor and award them double punishment as servants who know their master's will and yet do not keep it. It would be a fool who would willfully enter a house of pestilence under the pretext that one and the other had nevertheless escaped; so they are even greater fools who therefore fall away to the papacy and rely on the fact that in the end they can depart on Christ's merit, just as if they were assured that the Lord God would give them this wickedly despised grace of repentance and not rather, because they despised him, despise them again, abandon them, go away in a wrong spirit and fall into sin against the Holy Spirit; just as the papists take good care of such newly-caught birds

in order to ensnare them all the more firmly with their errors, and therefore tend to inflict more superstition on them than on those who have always lived with them, more of which can be read in Dr. Dannhauer Salve Reform. p. 553.

Third objection. [^]

Thirdly, Fr. Engel vehemently argues that no one can be saved apart from the true church, but now there is only one true church, namely his own, so that no one can be a true Christian apart from it. To this he goes first with these rhymes p. 21:

You yourselves must confess freely,
That there is only one church on earth,
One faith, one spirit, one baptism, one God,
And a heaven after death,
Nobody acquires the same there,
Who dies in sects here.
What was not in Noah's Ark,
That must drown completely etc.

Again he proves this from Luther's own words (Tom. 3. Jen. f. 512, 1), and bases on them a syllogism or conclusion, by which he intends to kill all Lutherans like flies with one stroke. His words are these (p. 25): This being said, the question is: where is this church to be found? To this Luther answers and gives the marks and characteristics of the true church of Christ, in which alone salvation is to be found.

1. Where God's holy Word is preached, there is no doubt that there

must certainly be a Sancta Ecclesia Catholica, (holy universal church), a Christian holy people.

2. The Christian Church or the Christian holy people is known by the holy sacrament of baptism, where it is rightly taught, believed and used according to Christ's order.

3. Know the holy Christian Church or a Christian holy people by the holy Sacrament of the Altar, where it is rightly administered, believed and received according to Christ's institution.

4. The holy church or people of God is known by the power of the Keys, by which sins are remitted and retained according to Christ's command.

5. One knows the holy church by the proper calling and manner of the ministers of the church.

Where these things are, there is the true saving church of Christ, apart from which no one can be saved. But now Luther expressly confesses that all these things are with the Roman Church alone. Thus he confesses that there is no salvation to be found anywhere but in the Roman Church alone. Let us set his words before the whole world from 6 Tom. f. 92, p. 1, from which the thorough truth may be recognized. These are Luther's words: First, under the Pope remained holy Baptism, then (secondly) in the pulpit the text of the holy gospel in every country's language. Thirdly, the holy forgiveness of sins and Absolution, both in confession and in public. Fourthly, the holy Sacrament of the Altar, administered to Christians at Easter and throughout the year, etc. Fifthly, the calling or ordination to the parish office, the preaching office of pastors, to bind and loose sinners and to comfort them in death and otherwise, for the custom

has remained with many that the Crucifix is held before the dying and they are reminded of the suffering of Christ, on which they should rely. Finally, prayer has also remained under the Pope, as the Psalter, the Lord's Prayer, faith, the Ten Commandments, etc. From this Luther concludes that the true Church and the Holy Spirit were to be found nowhere but in the papacy. *) All this agrees with what we have drawn from 2 Tom. Witteb. and 3. Jen. on the first question, where Luther confesses that the true Holy Scriptures, Baptism, the Sacrament of the Altar, the Key to the forgiveness of sins, the right office of preaching, the catechism, the Lord's Prayer, the ten commandments, and the articles of faith are to be found in the Roman Church. From all of which this irrefutable syllogism (conclusion) is drawn: only in the true Church of Christ can salvation be attained. The Roman Church is the true Church of Christ. Therefore, salvation can only be attained in the Roman Church. So not with the Lutherans, Calvinists and Anabaptists. All Lutherans, and indeed all Calvinists, admit the premise. The conclusion is proved irrefutably from the passages and confessions of Luther referred to: there is the true church of Christ, where the Holy Scriptures, baptism and the sacrament of the altar are rightly understood. According to Luther's confession, these things are rightly understood in the Roman Church. Hence there is the

*) With all due respect, Luther did not mean to say that the true church and the Holy Spirit were to be found nowhere but in the papacy, but Luther concludes this much in the above-mentioned place: where now such pieces still remain, there the church and some saints have certainly remained, etc.

true Church of Christ, apart from which no one can be saved. If the preachers can bite this little nut without breaking their teeth, they must have strong teeth. From this it is clear that no Lutheran can be sure that one who has died outside the Catholic Church has been saved. So far, Father Engel, who truly considers himself nothing common in this syllogism (conclusion).

Answer. ^

When it is said that no one can be saved apart from the true Church, it either has this meaning: whoever does not dwell in the place where the true church has its visible and public worship cannot be saved, and the papists themselves will not admit this rule, for it would follow that those papists who live among the Turks in the service or in hiding in evangelical places, or who are nurtured there, could not be saved because they do not live in the place where, in their opinion, the true church is. Or it has this understanding: whoever is not attached with his heart to those who have the true faith, they may be wherever they want, even if they are in caves and crevices as in the time of the Arians, cannot be saved; and so I let it pass. But in this way Fr. Engel's little nut will be easy to chew. For if Father Engel wishes to maintain something against us, it is not merely with his four-legged syllogism (conclusion) set on screws and stilts that he says: In

the true Church of Christ alone is salvation to be attained. The Roman Church is the true Church of Christ, therefore salvation is to be attained in the Roman Church alone. But he must draw his conclusion rightly logically (according to the laws of reasoning) and artfully:

Whoever adheres to the true catholic Church, that is, to the universal Christianity on earth, which has the true Christian faith, he alone can be saved, and this is precisely Dr. Luther's opinion, whose own unadulterated words (Tom. 3, Jen. f. 512) are these: Accordingly I believe that there is a holy Christian church on earth, that is, the communion [*Gemeine*] and number or assembly of all Christians in the whole world, the one bride of Christ and His spiritual body, of which He is also the one head. — And this same Christendom (NB.) is not only under the Roman Church or the Pope, but in all the world, as the prophets proclaimed that Christ's gospel should come into all the world (Ps. 2. Ps. 19). So that among Popes, Turks, Persians, Tartars and everywhere, Christendom is scattered physically, but gathered spiritually in one gospel and faith under one head, which is Jesus Christ. For the papacy (NB.) is certainly the right antichristian government, etc. (Fr. Engel should just read on and see what grist for his mill he will find in this place, which he himself has carelessly chosen). Now let us also hear the postscript:

Whoever lives in the Roman Church or belongs to it, he alone belongs to the true

Catholic Church or to universal Christianity on earth.

Therefore, only those who live in the Roman Church can be saved.

But this postscript is false and erroneous, namely, that he alone and no one else in the whole world belongs to the true church of Christ except those who live in the city of Rome and the church of the same district, for just as Rome is not the whole world, so also the Roman church is not automatically the whole of Christianity on earth. The epistle to the Romans is not addressed to the Corinthians, but the Roman and Corinthian churches are different congregations to whom Paul wrote. The Roman bishop was not the bishop of Constantinople, but each had his own flock and congregation (Acts 20:28, 1 Peter 5:2). John must write to seven bishops in seven churches (Rev. 1:20, C. 2 f.). But Father Engel should thank God if we were so kind as to admit the postscript without alone in this way:

Whoever lives in the Roman Church belongs (although not alone, but together with others) to the true Catholic Church or universal Christianity on earth.

But this, too, cannot be left aside by us so badly and without distinction, but one must know that the term “Roman Church” has two meanings. Either by the Roman Church is meant the multitude of those who cling to the Roman Pope as the supposed head of Christendom and infallible judge of the faith, whose abominations and errors, as the merit of

supposed good works, the doctrine of doubt, invocation of the saints, Mass, the one form, indulgences and the like, and who heretically condemn and persecute other, and indeed rightly evangelical Christians, without reason against God's Word and Christian love. In short, the group of those who heartily agree with the Pope and his abominations. Of these, however, we do not confess that they belong to the true Catholic Church or to universal Christianity on earth. Or by the Roman Church is meant the remnant of the ancient Roman Church, or the pious Christian hearts among the outward group of the Roman Church now described, which do not quite understand such depths of Satan and groan over the abomination (as at the time of the Council of Trent the thirst of many anguished hearts and consciences for the blessed cup was sufficiently felt), but they only adhere to the divine Word and, especially in the last hour of death, do not rely on their own merit and works, but solely on the bloody merit of Jesus Christ, and of these I allow the following postscript to pass:

Those who, although they essentially abide in the Roman Church, do not adhere with their hearts to the Roman Antichrist, but to the Lord Christ, belong to the true Catholic Church (and to this Luther goes in his book of the Private Mass and the Consecration of the Priests [Tom. 6, Jen. f. 92. 1] and says: that some saints remained under the papacy, in whom Christ preserved the Christian faith).

Furthermore, Fr. Engel's prosyllogism or proof conclusion (that the papists teach God's Word correctly and treat the sacraments correctly) is just as good. Formally, therefore, he must conclude:

Where the Holy Scriptures are rightly interpreted, taught clearly and purely, the holy Sacraments are rightly administered according to Christ's institution, and the Office of the Keys is rightly administered according to Christ's order (Luther has nothing of the papal ordination of clergymen), there is the true Church of Christ or such a community [*Gemeine*] to which one can safely adhere and in which one can find the true faith, on which all who have remained in it have been saved. We concede this premise. But not the following epilogue:

In the Roman Church, that is to say, in the outward group attached to the pope, the Holy Scriptures are taught clearly, etc.

Therefore, the true Church of Christ is with him.

The same postscript or saying is false and never admitted by Luther, who admitted that many good things remained in the papacy (such as Holy Scripture, baptism, the Lord's Supper, the keys, the catechism, etc.) according to their nature, but by no means that the Pope and papal teachers administered and treated all these things rightly according to God's Word and Christ's institution. Luther, in the above-mentioned and answered place (Tom. 4, Jen. f. 409) and elsewhere, sufficiently explained himself and desired that a reasonable distinction should be made between the papal errors (which he expressly

calls diabolical additions) and between what remains good and useful in the papacy, as the Scriptures and sacraments by their nature, which nevertheless the Pope has not been allowed or able to destroy entirely; so that one should not accept or reject everything without distinction, but examine everything and retain what is good (1 Thess. 5:21). A distinction must be made between the Pope (whom he considers to be the real Antichrist in the place just mentioned), together with his horde who condone his abominations in their hearts and defend them with mouth and hand; and then between the temple of God or Christendom, in which Antichrist sits and tyrannizes, since there are nevertheless many whom God, like Lot in Sodom, preserves among the wicked (2 Peter 2), so that the Pope cannot deny that there are some who, although they do not always publicly contradict him, do not agree with him in their hearts. In sum, among the papacy there are some who belong to the true universal church, with which they are also united in the same spirit and faith, although outwardly they are among the pope's crowd. Therefore, by confessing that much good remained under the papacy, Luther did not confess that the papacy was good in itself or that the papal church was the true church, just like the papists, although they must confess that under so-called Lutheranism or the papal church was the true church, that under so-called Lutheranism or Evangelical Christianity much good has remained (such as the Bible, baptism, as they allow children baptized by and with us to pass for Christian children, and do not baptize them otherwise etc), they will not admit that Lutheranism is therefore good in and of itself or that the

Lutheran Church is the right one. I hope that Fr. Engel's little nut will have been bitten open in this way and, praise God, it has left me without any toothache. But I have to joke again and say: anyone who can read Fr. Engels' or his predecessor's rhymes or verses without straining or earache must have good ears.

But because Fr. Engel is so fond of nuts, I will give him another little nut to bite into and ask him to send it back to me well-bitten:

Where the Word of God is not rightly expounded, but covered up and put under the bench, nor is it presented clearly and purely, but merely interpreted and falsified according to the mind of a man who is more often than not incapable of interpreting the Scriptures, who not only can err in matters of faith, but has often grossly erred; the holy Sacraments are not administered correctly, but Baptism is given to the bells against equity, half the Lord's Supper is stolen and taken from Christians, and both Sacraments are adorned with all kinds of human trappings; where the Office of the Keys is not used correctly to calm the consciences of poor sinners, but is abused for the judicial coercion and torture of consciences, etc., The true church is by no means to be found among them. Engel cannot reject this precept, having once accepted it himself. Likewise, he cannot deny, and I am always ready to prove to him, the following rejoinder:

Among the popes, God's Word, Sacrament

and Office of the Keys are treated in this way. This is now known throughout the world.

Consequently, the true church is not to be found among the papists (insofar as they are papists).

On the other hand, I conclude:

In those who preach the Word of God purely and simply without human addition, without reflection (consideration) of human opinion, without falsification and rational interpretation; in whom the Sacraments are administered without restraint according to Christ's order and institution; in whom the Keys of the kingdom of heaven are rightly used to calm the consciences of repentant sinners, both publicly in the pulpit and secretly in the confessional — these are the true church.

Among us Evangelicals, God's Word, Sacrament and Office of the Keys are treated in this way.

This means that the true church can be found among us Evangelicals.

Id quod erat demonstrandum. (This is what had to be proven). Upon request, Father Engel should be told either the prologue or the epilogue, if he then only wants to confess the conclusion and give himself up.

Fourth objection. [^](#)

Fr. Engel further argues that no one else could be saved on the basis of Luther's doctrine, for he himself did not trust himself to be saved on that basis. Now no one could have greater assurance of his salvation from Luther than

Luther himself, who doubted his religion and salvation until his death (p. 30). For this reason he was so unstable in his religion and doctrine that he changed it noticeably almost every year, according to the saying: Today yes, tomorrow no, is Luther's Latin; in this case (p. 40) he refers to the weathercock, since this point has been sufficiently proven. In addition to this (he says) the Lutherans themselves are also divided among themselves, the Augsburg Confession has been changed, increased, diminished, bogged down, and mutilated many times by the preachers *), of which he makes a big deal out of Laurentius Forer's estimate of the Saxon apple of the eye (p. 48 f..), and from this (p. 52) wants to attribute the fraudulent spirit of disunity to all Evangelical teachers.

Answer. [^]

At first I am almost surprised that Fr. Engel makes so much talk here of assurance of salvation, since he knows well that according to the papal doctrine no man can be assured of God's grace, of the forgiveness of his sin and of salvation; indeed no one, not even the Pope himself, can be assured (if he fully accepts their doctrine) that he is a baptized Christian, let alone a clergyman. For they believe that no sacrament

*) The papists are joking in such a licentious way; so he says soon afterwards, p. 48: Nicolaus Selnecker helped to forge the Lutheran Card-Cordi-Book. If Luther now calls the Pope's Decreta per anagramma (by means of a transposition of letters) Drecketa, or others call the Jesuits Esavites, Jesuzwiders or Suiten, then the Elbe and the Rhine are set on fire. They alone want to keep the privilege (prerogative) to revile.

is valid if the priest does not have the intention or the resolution to do what the Church does. *) For how can the Pope be certain that the one who first consecrated him had the intention of consecrating him? Indeed, that the one who baptized him had the intention of baptizing him? Whether he had not gone somewhere else with his thoughts? Or had not been good to his parents or to himself, and the like, and thus both his consecration and his baptism would count for nothing. In this way, everyone must also doubt whether the priest had the right intention in his consecration (consecration of the elements) or in his absolution. I will therefore conclude:

If one cannot look into the heart and see in it its intention, thoughts, a purpose and actual opinion, one cannot be certain, even according to papal teaching, that he has conferred the sacrament of baptism or any other sacrament. (This sentence is based on the Florentine and Tridentine conclusions).

Not a single person, and therefore not a single clergyman, except God, can see into the heart, and in it his intention, thoughts, purpose and actual opinion. (Christians, Turks, Jews and pagans confess this).

Consequently, one cannot be certain of any papal priest

*) Thus the Council of Florence, ap. Caranzam *Session 7. Canon XI*. This seven sacraments three are perfected, namely by things like matter, words like a form, and very good Ministerial conferring the Sacrament, with the intention to do that The Church does. Of which if something If it is missing, the sacrament is not completed. He refused. Council of Trent. Here the law merits D. AEgid. Strauchius in 3. Purim Sermon, p. 148. s. Heilbrunner Uncathol. Papacy. p. 96.

having conferred baptism or other sacraments on anyone.

Indeed, they are so entangled in the doctrine of doubt that Osorius, a Jesuit *), expressly writes: if someone had lived as blessedly as John the Baptist, and had raised the dead every day, and if the angels, even Christ himself, had appeared to him every day, he could not be certain that he was in grace with God. How then can the papists give another greater assurance of salvation than they themselves have? Why then is Fr. Engel not more concerned with his own assurance of salvation than with Luther's? Who, to be sure, may have been meek and timid at first in the face of such great works begun ex dictamine carnis (when the flesh challenges him) and human weakness, but who, as his knowledge and enlightenment increased, despaired as little of his religion as of his own salvation.

But as far as his inconstancy after his perfect enlightenment is concerned, he is subjected to violence and injustice. The weathercock, to which Engel refers, has long been thoroughly refuted by Dr. Jac. Heerbrand, in his refutation of the supposed recently hatched evangelical weathercock, on which Fr. Engel can, if he considers it advisable and up to the task, try his salvation. How certain Luther was otherwise, once he had fully recognized the abomination of the Pope, of his doctrine, and

*) *Conc. 1. sup. Evang. dom. VII. post Trin.*

what a weathercock he was, the papists experienced in many ways and especially at Worms. Not only did he, despite all persuasion, venture in, saying: although he should have known that there were as many devils in Worms as tiles on the roofs; but although he also had the whole empire before him afterwards; although Cajetan had done him enough good and evil, he nevertheless held his ground, not as a weather vane, but as an iron wall, did not deviate to the right or to the left, and no man could beg or force the six letters revoco (I revoke) from him. *)

But that Luther, nevertheless, many things which he still believed before his perfect enlightenment, and defended in his first books, as for example, purgatory, one kind of form, the pope's reputation, and the like, he, afterwards, having been perfectly enlightened from God's Word, candide (open-heartedly) recanted and refuted himself. Therefore he is as little to be called a weather vane as Augustine, when he writes libros retractationum or books of recantation, which example Luther himself applies to himself (T. 2. Jen. f. 133). As little, indeed, as Bellarmine, the Cardinal, himself with his Recognitions. I therefore conclude that what Luther believed or said before and changed afterwards was either wrong or right. If something was right and was afterwards changed by him, that is to be proved; for example, it must be proved that the

*) Conf. Joh. Conr. Goebelli Augs. Conf. and Jubilee Sermons, P. I. p. 554. f.

doctrine of purgatory is right; but Meissner's treatise on indulgences and purgatory still stands unchallenged, since in the preface he demands all papists to answer that honor should be given to Father Engel by it. **But if what Luther recanted was wrong, then he did right and praiseworthy that he recanted it.** **For to err is human, but to persist in recognized error is diabolical.**

That, moreover, one wants to argue one thing and another, since Luther is said to have disagreed with himself in his last writings, is sufficiently rejected by our own *) and proved that Luther's words were treated unfairly, as he himself often complained of during his life, as when he says (Tom. 6. Jen. f. 210):

What should I say? How should I complain? I am still alive, I write, preach and read daily, and there are still such poisonous people, not only among the adversaries, but also false brothers who want to be our part, who dare to use my writings and teachings directly against me, who let me watch and listen, whether they know that I teach differently, and want to adorn their poison with my work, and seduce the poor people under my name, what will become more and more after my death? Yes, I should justly answer for everything because I am still alive. Again, how can I alone feed all the devil's mouths?

*) Conf. D. Heilbrunner, in the innocent Luther, Müllerus in *Luth. def. c. 21. p. 546. s. Lælius contra Sartorium, p. 171 s. Dr. Zeemann, contra Ungersdorf. c. 27. p. 295. s.. Heerbrand in dispatch of the weather vane, Kelerus in *Anti-For. p. 421. s..**

Especially those (as they are all poisoned) who do not want to hear or notice what we write, but only practice with all diligence how they may most shamefully pervert and corrupt our words in every letter, etc.

But if the papists have a desire to see weathercocks, they should look at their own teachers, who are really the Pope's weathercocks. Since the wind comes from Rome, when the Pope desires it, they say what they otherwise know better. Once, when Michael Bayus, an otherwise learned man, had disputed some papal decrees, and was therefore discussed in the name of Pope Gregory XIII by Cardinal Franciscus Teletus, he replied *): He was prepared to revoke everything in the deepest humility (Luther was not such a weathercock, although a cardinal also talked to him), but he was only surprised that the Pope, for the sake of the cause, had sought such a distinguished man at such great cost to him. His holiness could only have sent the smallest dog with a note (namely one plate lick to the other), that would have been enough, he would soon have wanted to recognize everything he had ever spoken and written as null and void. Let that be a weathercock to me!

What else is objected to regarding the disagreement of the Evangelical teachers, and especially to the change in the Augsburg Confession, are of very poor import (probative value). Fr. Engel should not only have read Laurentius Forer's

*) Witnesses of *Mainz*, Dannhauer *Hodom. Pap. PI* p. 1343.

outline, but also the main defense of the Evangelical “apple of eye”, since Laurentius Forer and other Calumnians have had their mouths sufficiently shut and it has been proven that what Philip Melanchthon, for example, did for himself at his own discretion could not or should not be detrimental to princes and estates and the entire Evangelical Church. *) If Engel has a heart, let him set about it and defend Forer!

Even if misunderstandings still occur here and there among Evangelical teachers today, this does not change the doctrine. We have our unaltered Augsburg Confession and Christian Book of Concord, that is: our general confession of faith; whoever keeps it is our fellow believer; whoever does not want to, we cannot keep.

If, however, the papists ever want to make too much of one or the other's obstinacy and curiosity with us, we ask that they first sweep in front of their own door and look a little at the terrible divisions **) and cat-wars of the Roman Popes, the abominable repugnancies of papal rights ***), the dissensions of the papal councils †), the divisions of the papal teachers ††),

*) Conf. quoque Keslerus *Anti-Forero l. 2. sed. 3. c. 3. de consideratione, an mutata Aug. Conf. tollat Eccl. Lutheran unity?* p. 249. s. Mylius in *A. Conf. p. l. p. 5. etc.*

**) Conf. explanation of the causes of the denied Council p. 384. Jamesius in *bello Papali: assertion of the Danzig catechism. p. 461. Tenzel, contra Prori, p. 552. s.*

***) Osiander in Pope not Pope .

†) Gerhard on the Church' §. 237.

††) Conf. Flacius on contradicting, dissenting. Pontif. Pappus in *Contra*

they will truly find enough to sweep; may they first pull the enormous beam out of their own eye before they make such an effort because of the splinter in our eye. In this case the papists say: Physician, heal yourself! and yet there is neither measure nor end to the boasting of the unity of their church. For their “unity”, as with the Turks, is only enforced and does not consist in the unity of the Spirit through the bond of peace (Eph. 4:3), but in the power of the Pope and the secular arm.

Fifth objection. ^

Fr. Engel also, as is the manner of these people, finally brings up much against Luther's person, so that he maintains that such a man could not be driven by God's Spirit or used for such an important work, that one could not follow his doctrine without spiritual danger, for

1. ^ He confesses that he got into the religious business out of ignorance (p. 38), doubts whether he began his Reformation in God's name (p. 31).
2. ^ His doctrine was new and had never been heard before in the world (p. 42).
3. ^ He was in league with the devil and had learned from him to deny the mass (p. 43, 46).
4. ^ The longer he taught, the angrier people became (p. 35, 42).
5. ^ He had falsified the Holy Scriptures, stolen entire chapters and books,

dictionibus Doctor of the Roman Church, Nic. Hunnius, in the Papacy himself destroying and skinning give sheep p. 110. s. Osiander, in Pope not Pope. Kesler against Forer, pp. 446, 508 and 722 at the end of the book. Defense Catechism Dantesque p. 807 s. Andrew Chrasthofius in the Jesuit war, etc.

- so that his own curse befell him (from Tom. 4. Witteb. f. 393. I). Whoever takes away or changes a title or letter is said to be of the devil (p. 37, 39).
6. ^ He had spoken shamefully against God, the Blessed Virgin Mary and the saints (p. 39).
 7. ^ He had blasphemed the authorities (p. 38).
 8. ^ He had been rude and licentious in words (p. 40), and vile in deeds, confessing himself that nothing but hell was due to him for his life (p. 43).
 9. ^ He was condemned as a heretic by the Pope and emperor on account of his doctrine (p. 32, 33, 39).
 10. ^ He had called himself a heretic, a liar, a specter of the devil, poison, pestilence and hellfire, also a father of all violators of the sacraments (p. 41) and had warned others against his doctrine (p. 41). How could such a man show others the way to salvation?

Answer. ^

First of all, the papists should know that **we do not base our faith on Luther's person** *) and authority, as they are with the Pope, which Luther never desired, but protested against (Tom. 2 Jen. f. 81. and elsewhere); **but on God's Word** and believe it, **because his doctrine is according to Scripture**. If we can now be convicted of error from it, let us abandon it, even if it appears ten times in Luther's writings; but they will never be able to accomplish this.

*) Conf. Muller *Lutheran def.*, p. 8. 549. Gerhard Rebuttal of the Morning Star. p. 57. Dannhauer *Theol. Consc. T.* lp 563.

Here Fr. Engel makes it rather coarse and truly disguises himself as an immodest Fr. Engel when he says p. 52: These are real clumsy fools and dolts who say they do not believe in Luther, and deny their origin and arch-father, etc. They refuse to call themselves Lutheran when they are driven into a corner and into a stable of necessity. But we can retort here with every right and say: These are real clumsy fools and dolts who say that we believe in Luther! Which one of us is to be named who says that he believes in Luther? If Fr. Engel is honest, let him name him! Nevertheless, we do not refuse to be called Lutheran in certain respects and in distinction, because we recognize the evangelical doctrine brought to light by Luther to be right, but not because we adhere to a new doctrine brought up by him (as the papists, who first gave us the name, blaspheme). In the same way, the orthodox have also suffered in the past from being called Athanasians, because at that time the Arians also called themselves Catholics, and otherwise no distinction would have been made. So the so-called Roman Catholics do not refuse the title of papists, even if they do not believe in the pope. Yes, what does Fr. Engel mean, do the Franciscans believe in Francis, the Dominicans in Dominic, because they allow themselves to be called after them?

But why do I dwell on a matter that has already been settled?

*) So you must say, says Luther (Tom. 2. Jen.):

*) Conf. Gerhardus *de Eccl.* § 156. 160. T. 2. Conf: *Cathol-*, p. 1151.

Luther is a knave or a saint, I have no interest in that, but his doctrine is not his, but Christ himself. For you know that the tyrants do not deal with it by killing Luther alone, but they want to destroy the doctrine, and because of the doctrine they attack you and ask you whether you are Lutheran? Here you really must not speak rude words, but freely confess Christ, that Luther, Claus or George preached him; **forget the person, but you must confess the doctrine.**

Although we would not have to accept Luther's person so highly and defend all his words and works (just as the papists themselves will not allow themselves to be driven into the trap of defending all their Popes' deeds and words, but think that nothing escapes doctrine through their lives), nevertheless, because the Papists have not yet brought anything against Luther that has not been sufficiently rejected by our people *), I cannot yet allow Luther to be reviled by Engel.

But it is now world-famous how the papists deal with Luther's writings, not unlike the devil with the Psalter, as Luther himself saw and lamented **). But the Jesuits are masters in this art above others, which is why they have been criticized by us

Höpfnerus in *Saxon. Evangel. S. I. P. I. c. 3. p. 48.* Tenzel against the pious, p. 1151.

*) Vid. D. Heilbinner. in Innocent Luther, *Mulieri Luther's defense* and his defense. Tenzel's *Rescue Against the Pious* etc.

***) In Art. Smalcald. T. 6. Jen. f. 510. et T. 7. Jen. f. 234.

on various occasions. Perhaps Fr. Engel has also heard of this, as Dr. Phil. Heilbrunner at the Post-Colloquio (subsequent conversation) at Regensburg thrust his *Crimina falsi* or lies down the throat of the dissolute spitter [Conrad Vetter](#), in the presence of distinguished princely persons from both parties; since only the Most Serene Count Palatine Philipp Ludewig read the passages quoted in Luther himself and immediately saw how his words were handled, so that Vetter stood in the pillory for several hours with scorn and ridicule, almost like a knave caught stealing, and the Jesuits must be ashamed of him [to this day](#). The same. Dr. Garthius also rejected him at the colloquium (discussion) in Prague *). And if Fr. Engel were to be taken to task for his quoted passages from Luther, which, as can be easily proven, he did not even look at himself, but **pieced together from others without understanding, and only quoted the passages and not Luther's own words** (perhaps because he is sufficiently assured that at that time the poor people in Moravia, Silesia, Bohemia, etc., were not allowed to read Luther's books and had to believe him on his mere assertion), he would certainly fare no better than Vetter.

Taking a single rogue trick as an example for this time, and thus, as it were, recognizing the ass by his ears, he wants, among other things, to make his poor simple-minded people (p. 42) believe that Luther called himself a poison and a pestilence,

*) V. Acta et Postacta Colloqu. Pragensi s.

and afterwards cites passages where Luther says that he is a pestilence and death to the pope. In the same way, someone could say that Christ called himself a poison and a pestilence, because he says that he wants to be a poison to death and a pestilence to hell. So I ask everyone, friend or foe, is this honestly done? Should we trust such a person more?

Father Engel (p. 49) also commits similar dishonest acts when he attributes the following words to Luther from a letter to Philipp Melanchthon dated September 2, 1530: "When we shall have escaped violence and obtained peace, let us easily amend our deceits, lies, and errors", and he refers to David Chytraeus's book on the Augsburg Confession, although Luther does not speak of his own deceptions and lies, but of those of the Papists, and reminds us that even if he and his own should make one or another mistake in the course of the matter, he would not have forgiven the truth and the main thing. His words in Chytraeus (f. 219 b.) are thus: "For I am perhaps all too certain in such gross deceit (of the adversaries). Because I know that you can provide nothing there, except that which might affect our person, that we might be scolded too lightly and inconsistently. But what is the matter? Such things can easily be restored by consistency and truth. I would not want anything to be wrong, but I say that if it happens, it will not be lost. For if we are safe from violence and obtain peace, let us (NB.

Fr. Engel open your eyes!) easily put to rights their cunning and lies and our errors, for his mercy reigns over us. Be confident and undaunted, all you who hope in the Lord; now you hope in the Lord, for you are doing his work, which cannot be done without hope and trust in him. So much for Luther. And such deceptions and lies of Fr. Engels can, if he so desires, be brought to his attention at any time.

But I will, moreover, remind the reader of a few points in each of the editions cited against Luther, and refer him to other writers for further information. Now

1. that Luther confesses that he fell into the far-reaching religious work out of ignorance, he only indicates that he was not at first at ease with the matter, which lay solely on his neck, and that he had not imagined himself so important and great. I was alone (says he, Tom. 1. Jen. f. 4) and through imprudence fell into the bargain, and because I could not draw back, I not only conceded much to the Pope in many high articles, but also worshipped him willingly with real earnestness, for who was I then, wretched despised brother? more like a corpse than a man, who should oppose the Pope's majesty, before whom not only the kings of the earth and the whole world, but also heaven and hell (that I should speak thus) were horrified, and all had to be governed solely by his commands. Thus Luther confesses his human weakness, which he felt at that time non in complemento, sed in primordiis reformationis (not in

execution, but in the beginning of the work of reformation), but in which Christ Jesus was mighty. Is that something unreasonable? *Omne principium grave* (All beginnings are difficult)! Should his work therefore not have been from God? (Luther never doubted this and therefore sufficiently answered for it against Eck himself *) [Tom. 1. Jen. f. 362]). Did not Jeremiah also feel and confess such things? Lord, says he, you persuaded me, and I let myself be persuaded; you were too strong for me and you won. But I have become a mockery every day, and everyone laughs at me (Jer. 20:7).

2. That Luther should have called his doctrine new and previously unheard of in the world, is why the Jesuit [Conrad Vetter](#) has already recently had his mouth shut by Heilbrunner with scolding and ridicule (in the *Post-Coll.* at Regensburg, p. 45). **Not Luther **), but the Pope has hatched completely new and unheard-of doctrines in the world for a thousand and more years after the time of Christ**, as for example the prohibition of the cup in the Lord's Supper (see D. Hülsemann v. Hager *Disp.* 20 p. 1427). Alph. a Castro (1. 8. de hæresibus v. indulgentia p. 140. 2) is also very clear about indulgences and says: "Against the destruction of indulgences I will argue little, because no thing that is disputed in this work has been less

*) Conf. Kesler *Lutheranism*, p. 64. s. Hartm. *Against P. Brun. Lindner*, p. 677.

***) Conf. Kesler *Lutheranism*, p. 245.

clearly stated in sacred Scripture, nor less reported by the ancient teachers. But there is therefore no need to take occasion to destroy them, because they have the appearance of having been slowly and belatedly used and accepted in the Church. For (NB.) many things have become apparent and known for the first time in recent times, which the old teachers (NB.) did not know, etc.”

3. That as far as temptation from the devil is concerned, Christ and all his saints had it, and so it is no wonder that Luther was not spared from it either. But that Satan, among others, tempted Luther and tormented him with the thought: How can you justify the fact that you have caused so much evil with your blasphemous celebration of the Mass? It does not follow from this that holding Mass is right, any more than if Satan said to a murderer: "How can you justify killing so many people? it follows that killing is right. For when the devil wants to bring one to despair, he does not hold virtues against him, but vices, to which he must give himself up in his conscience, so that Fr. Engel could well have stayed at home with this story *). About the legend that Satan sat on Luther's shoulder, he himself (as Fr. Engel relates p. 46) would not have laughed unjustly and said (if it were true): He may well be on the neck, but not in the heart. Suppose the devil had made such a haze for the emperor, should Luther therefore be the devil? Satan was close enough to Job's neck,

*) Conf. Müllerus *Luth. def.* p. 396. Hartmann. *l. c.* p. 488. *s.*

for he struck him with evil swarms from the sole of his foot to the crown of his head (Job 2:7). He therefore remained God's beloved child. How Satan, in the form of a terrible night owl, beguiled Pope John from the Roman Council in 1411 is recounted by Nic. Clemangis (in Wolf's Lect. memorab. Cent. 15. p. 765). Is that why the Pope was the devil? But what does Fr. Engel think of the Popes who were sorcerers? Satan must have sat not only on their necks, but right in their hearts! Incidentally, we would like Fr. Arnold Engel to prove this story even better. That Bzovius (T. 19. Annal. Eccles. A. 1516. § 26. p. 347), Petrus Tyraeus (tr. de Dæm. et loco infern. part. 2. c. 21. n. 4, p. 55) and other enemies of Luther tell it thus, is by no means enough. They did not choke on the first lie. This fable actually sprang from Lichtenberger's vision or painting, which he made of Luther (as in Val. Herberger in the Herzpostille on the Day of the Raising of the Cross p. 11. p. 433). This Lichtenberger had painted a monk with the devil sitting on his neck. Various people pointed this painting at Luther. The latter accepted it as familiar and said to Dr. Just. Jonas: Doctor, look at the picture properly. The devil is not in this monk's brain or heart, but on the outside of his neck; he is an expelled devil (John 12:31). He shall never come into my heart, my Lord Jesus reigns there, but from the outside he sits honestly on my neck, and he hurls

the Pope, the king of England and all that is mighty in the world at my neck, etc.

4. The fact that Luther complains that people become more angry in the bright light of the gospel happens *per accidens* or accidentally and is not the fault of the doctrine, but of the people who abuse the good doctrine. But it is not Luther alone, it is already Noah, the preacher of righteousness (Gen. 6:5), the pious Lot (2 Peter 2:5, 7, 8), the zealot Elijah (1 Kings 21:10), the spiritual prophet Isaiah (Isa. 53:1) and Jeremiah (Jer. 15:10), even the heavenly teacher Christ Jesus with his listeners (Matt. 11:20), and the man who can make all boys pious is said to have arrived with the papists up to this hour. One finds among the papists in this case probably as great of complaints as those made by Luther *).

5. That Luther falsified the Scriptures is not an angelic, but a quite diabolical falsehood, of which one finds sufficient and detailed information in Keßler (Luther. p 74), Müller (c. 2 p. 292) and others. But if Engel wants to know who falsifies the Bible, let him do me the favor of looking up the main defense of the apple of the evangelical eye (c. 34 p. 33); he will certainly give it more clearly.

6. That Luther would have blasphemed God or any saint is quite false, and is sufficiently rejected by Dr. Müller (c. 8 p. 220).

*) Conf. Phil. Heilbrunner. *Post-Colloq. p. 121*. Kesler Lutheranism, *P. I. c. 2. q. 12. et P. 2. c. 2. q. 2*. Tenzel. *against Pious, p. 1146*. ex Joh. Paul. Oliva.

What harm is there to Luther in the insult which Christ himself had to suffer? But that otherwise the papists, by ascribing divine honor and predicates (attributes) to the saints, have blasphemed God, and that the saints themselves have been defiled by such flattery, and that they will one day be ill-repaid for it, is otherwise sufficiently proved, and in this case Father Engel is to be further served at his distant request.

7. Who holds the authorities in contempt, Luther or the Pope? much could be said about this. On the one hand, it is certain that Luther did not trample on the authorities, but legitimized (brought to honor) their status to such an extent that they can no longer be the Pope's footstool *). But that Luther nevertheless at times treated kings and princes somewhat harshly in other respects, not as authorities, but as persecutors of the Gospel, or even as its opponents, by engaging with him in scholarly controversy, they partly deserved it, and some of which they brought upon themselves; it would have been better if they had waited and let others argue scholarly, so they would have been treated according to their station. A king who does not want to be put to shame or checkmated by a private person does not have to play with him, for in the game he is not regarded as a king but as an opponent. Thus Luther had to treat kings and princes who, without just cause, became involved with him because of doctrine, as his theological opponents according to the requirements of the matter.

*) Conf. Müller in warning against Jansenium, p. 61. s.

They approached him unjustly and were unable to submit to his heroic spirit, much less resist him. Let Luther's own explanation be accepted in this case (Tom. 2 Jen. f. 207 b): "I also know well that my writings have almost all been of such a kind that at first they were regarded as if they were from the devil, and one feared that heaven would soon fall in; but afterward things soon changed. It is now a different time to touch the great heads, so unfamiliar before, and what God has in mind will be seen in its own time. Not that I excuse myself, as if there were nothing human about me, but that I may boast with St. Paul: though I am too hard, yet I have ever spoken the truth, and no one can blame me for hypocrisy . If I ever make a mistake, I would rather speak too harshly and blurt out the truth too unreasonably than be hypocritical and keep the truth. But if the great lords are annoyed by my free, harsh writing, they leave my teaching unchallenged and wait for theirs, I do them no wrong. If I sin in this, it is not they, for whom I am only doing right, but God alone who should forgive. More of this can be found in D. Keßler (Luther. p. 208), Müller (c. 22 p. 572), Lenzet (p. 441 fg.) and others.

8. To remember something partly of Luther's manner of speaking and writing, partly of his life, it is not to be denied that Luther had a peculiar, free style (expression) and finally that his shoes did not fit

everyone's feet; only, the time brought it with it. A hard wedge was needed for a hard branch and a sharp lye from an evil head. Thus it must be confessed that at that time, according to the old German way, the words were coarse and harsh (although at that time people were not angry about Luther's way of writing, nor did they take him to task for it, as something strange), but the heart and the opinion were good, whereas today some people are refined and polite enough in words, so that they may not call *sine petitione veniæ* (without asking for forgiveness) a whore, who asks neither God nor man for forgiveness when they hurt and blaspheme. But is it not better to have a defiled piece of gold than an over-gilded piece of dung? I mean, beautiful, stately realities and an honest, German mind, presented with coarse and seemingly crude words, rather than human deceit and lies presented to the people with splendid and polite words? Would those who have so far shown themselves so diligent in collecting Luther's coarse sayings and, like beetles, rummaging through the dung, have done much better if, like bees, they had gathered together the honeycomb that can be found beneath such words; if they had examined everything about him and not kept the seemingly bad words, but the things that are good in truth. Luther, for example, is held in very high esteem when he calls the Pope's decrees Dreck; but did not our Savior do the same when he says Beelzebub, a fly-god, is a filthy idol? Of this Fr. Engel (if the Hebrew crabs are not too

difficult for him to pick) can read my *Dubia Bibl.* p. 1 p. 386 and p. 2 p. 18. Do the papists therefore consider Francis the great saint to be an impostor, that he said out of contempt for the devil: *Aperi os tuum et stercorisabo tibi in illud*, which cannot be translated in any other way than: **open your mouth, I will shit in it** (in the legend *Francisc. num.* 149). **A cruder turn of phrase, if one wants to make such a big deal outwardly, will not be found in any of Luther's writings.** In sum, Luther never spoke too harshly against the Pope and his supporters, they deserved it even more harshly; he never said it to them so roughly, they made it even rougher, as has been sufficiently demonstrated by our own *), *Quid mirum, si candide scapham, scapham dixit?* (What wonder if he roundly called every thing by its name?)

Furthermore, as far as his life is concerned, he has not yet been proved a knave. Erasmus himself, his adversary, gives him a good testimony of his irreproachable conduct (*L. XI. Ep. 1 p. 372*). And if this were also proved to him, nothing would escape the doctrine: a farmer can sow good seed with unwashed hands. A thief can certainly show me the right way: Christ himself gives the advice that one should do according to the words of the Pharisees and not according to their works (*Matthew 20:3*). The papists themselves confess that the Pope may well live an angry

*) *Conf. Müller c. 18. p. 487. Heilbrunner, Unsch, Luth. Brochmand. Confut. Apolog. speculi Brandenb. p. 1625. Tenzel contra Frommen, p. 238. 239. etc.*

life (just as it is not difficult to see a reverse decalogue [ten commandments] from the life of the Roman popes, and there is no sin of which one should not find a clear example in one or the other Pope *)), and yet decide rightly from faith. Why don't we leave the person alone, let the Pope remain the Pope and Luther the Luther, and speak of the matter? Especially since the papists know well that they can justly bring nothing on Luther, but we can bring much on their Popes, that their ears may hurt from it, which shall easily be proved to Father Engel on request. For the rest, when Luther says that nothing but hell is due to him for his life, he means that it will be severely judged; but that is also where David is going (Ps. 143:2): "Lord, enter not into judgment with thy servant: for in thy sight shall no man living be justified". And Augustine (1. 9 conf. c. 13): *Væ etiam laudabili vitæ hominum remota misericordia* (woe also to the otherwise praiseworthy man, if God will regard him without mercy).

9. That Luther was condemned by the Pope and the Emperor is something old, but the question is: was this justified? The Pope did it out of hatred, the Emperor out of misunderstanding, so what does Luther and his teaching matter? It is a small thing for me, says Paul, that I should be judged by you, or by a human day (1 Cor. 4:3).

10. Finally, could anyone be willing to believe Father Engel

*) Conf. Hunnius *pelte ovin. detr. 129. 194. Botsaccus demonstrates that the Roman Church is not holy: Phil. Heilbrunner Postcoll. p. 114. s. Beck Lutheranism before Luther. p. 226.*

that Luther himself wrote: "I am a heretic, a liar, a specter of the devil, I warn you against my teaching?" For what heretic and deceiver will be so nonsensical and speak to the people of himself: I am a heretic, do not follow me? Or if one should be so foolish, who would be so foolish as to follow him? Indeed, if that is what Dr. Luther wrote, why does one not allow his writings to be read freely and publicly in the papacy, for then no further warning would be necessary? But enough of this objection.

Sixth objection. [^](#)

Finally, Fr. Engel cites four motives from Augustine (1. contra Epist. Fundam. Manich. c. 4), which have preserved him in the bosom of the Church, and thinks that they apply to his papal and not to our Evangelical Church, namely 1. The concord of all nations; 2. the peculiar authority confirmed by miracles; 3. the uninterrupted succession of bishops; and 4. the name Catholic, which the Church retains under so many heresies (p. 47 fg.).

Answer. [^](#)

Augustine adds, however, that if his adversary were to prove the truth to him in such a way that he had no reason to doubt, all this should not prevent him.

In Ep. 105 he also says of the episcopal succession; above all he adds: ...although we do not rely so much on such proofs as on Holy Scripture. Furthermore, it is to be noted that the Church, on which Augustine then looked, was in a different state from that which the papists now show us, as has already been proved by others *). Distingue tempora (distinguish the times)! Not to mention that these marks, although outwardly moving to some extent, nevertheless do not hold the sting. The Jews could have resisted Christ in the same way and emphasized: 1. the unity of all Jews, as well as of all peoples converted to the true God, who had to keep to Jerusalem; 2. the strange authority (reputation) confirmed by miracles; 3. the uninterrupted succession of their high priests: 4. the name Jewish, Abraham's seed, God's people. That I now say nothing of others, which could have had one or the other of these marks upon them: so that they are not yet the true ones, whereby one can know the true church sine formidine oppositi (without refuting oneself).

And so, my dear fellow believers, you have seen sufficiently how this armor-bearer of the Antichrist, indeed of Satan, who has disguised himself as an angel of light and apostle of Christ (2 Cor. 11:13-14), has fought against our evangelical church, but has not defeated it. Now to this Engel and

*) Conf. Dorscheus 16 Religious Scruple, p. 397. s. Carpzov *Exam. Masen.* § 227. 238.

similar angels, who endeavor to teach a different gospel, one can boldly say: Anathema (let him be accursed)! (Gal. 1:9) But thanks be to God, who has given us the victory through Jesus Christ our Lord!

Amen.

The Vindicated [^]

Lutheranism Before Luther,

in which the Previous Treatise
Against a Nameless's so-called

Nihil ad rem

(Nothing to the point),

(which is added word for word with a constant rebuttal),

is further established

by

August Pfeiffer, Dr.

To the learned priests of the Jesuits I wish them temporal and eternal well-being.

Dear Sirs etc.

After a distinguished person sent me a tract scattered in Moravia and Silesia under the title: Three Fundamental Questions about the Lutheran Religion Founded in and Taken from the Writings of Luther, to answer, I did not do so out of curiosity, but rather in demonstration of my debt to another tract, which I called "Lutherthum vor Luther" (Lutheranism before Luther) in view of its main purpose and content.

Not a word of my treatise has been answered for years and days, so that I thought that the truth so palpably presented would have induced the author of such a work, if not to retract it, at least to remain silent. Finally, a short time ago, someone was found whom I must call Anonymum (nameless), because he conceals his name and place as well as that of the printer (although I must now believe that it is Fr. Arnold Engel, whom I initially did not want to trust with such a completely tasteless writing), who sent me the enclosed scribbled piece of paper (which from the outside looks very similar to a pasquill [defamatory pamphlet], and because

atroces injuriae [serious slurs] against my honest name were in it, it would have been treated as such); since he supposed to prove that I had not correctly stated the *statum quaestionis* (status of the dispute), and thus answered the three questions submitted *nihil ad rem* (nothing relevant).

Now, at first I did not unreasonably hesitate to enter into such nameless ruses with anyone again. For, on the one hand, it is not possible to argue with larvae without a certain counterpart; on the other hand, even the most simple-minded person can see from a mere comparison of my treatise and this shrewdness that the author has not only answered nothing to the point, but nothing at all. Moreover, the author must be convicted by his own conscience that there is nothing good and no honor to be gained from his argument, therefore he must seek *latebras* (hiding places) as a fugitive enemy, must not honestly face his opponent, but thinks it is enough (*ne nihil dixisse videatur*, so that one does not always object that he said nothing) that he makes himself a little useless as a nameless man, so that, even if his scribble paper [*Scharteke*] were to be disgraced, he could still remain with honor.

But because he refers me to the learned Jesuit fathers (from which I conclude that the good man must be of the unlearned kind and one of the *fratribus ignorantiae* [brothers of ignorance]), and consoles them that they will put forward a little deeper questions (for I myself can easily imagine that they are finally ashamed of such foolish questions) and continue to instruct me and those like me

little by little, I have decided to pay no further attention to this simplicium (simpleton) or to refer to O. Melchior Nicolai's Nothing to do with Keddium and let the matter come to you as learned and wise people, in order to recognize impartially which of us two has answered nihil ad rem (nothing valid).

But in order that such an answer may be all the more readily given by you, I shall divide this booklet into three chapters:

1. In the first chapter I shall briefly describe the noblest and most important points, to which Anonymous (whom I shall call this time Nameless for the sake of the German reader, *citra injuriam* [without insult]) has answered nothing at all, but has passed over them entirely with a not altogether noble silence, so that this mute angel has not spoken at all with the tongues of men, let alone with the tongues of angels.

2. Next, in the second chapter, I will repeat my recently given answer to the three fundamental questions, from which it will be quite evident how faithfully Mr. Nameless has acted in presenting my opinion.

3. Finally in the third chapter, I will also refute with good reason and rationality, albeit in a joking manner, that which he objected to here and there without reason and rationality. And so that one may see without difficulty what the matter is based on, I will make every effort to proceed formally, so that Mr. Nameless may learn that we nevertheless study not only (as he thinks) grammar, but also logic in our younger years.

If now a learned and intelligent man from

among you will answer me with good reason or only suggest (put under the foot) the answer to this good socius (fellow), I will meet him with all modesty, as I myself am hostile to quarrelling, since instead of the reasons for proof, mere invective is used (as is also done here Nameless); I appreciate education and good gifts, also in those who are not one with me in religion (*virtute caret, qui alienam non æstimat*, he who does not appreciate the virtue of his enemy has none himself); calling God to witness that I do not write these few things for the sake of vain glory, much less to hurt the person (yet it is not to be considered an insult to say and prove what is true); but with a hearty desire to entertain my own in the knowledge of the truth, and possibly to further others in it (*utinam nemo pereat*, may all be helped!). Who knows how long it will last with you as well as with me, since now, as I write this, death threatens us both almost daily to move out of time into eternity, since there is no respect for the person, but each will have to give account for himself. In doing so, I offer myself without any danger that I will not be treated as unkindly as Mr. Nameless (who omits the most noble points and only touches something here and there, not unlike a rooster hopping over glowing coals), but will give you honest, thorough and complete satisfaction, then to give you the right and the victory, indeed without any delay to declare myself and

to humbly ask the Pope in Rome for an *absolutionem ab hæresi* (indulgence for heresy).

But if you would remain completely silent at such a friendly request, you will not blame me for interpreting your *silentium pro tacito consensu* (silence as consent), or at least for thinking that he who does not answer cannot answer, and that I therefore not only maintain the unconquerable and alone saving evangelical doctrine before and after, but also defend it against you and your kind to the death.

But to send this present wretched man or his like back to me with such embarrassed, miserable grimaces will be disgraceful to yourselves and harmful to your cause, and you will expose yourselves and your religion to further ridicule in this way. I must almost believe that you want to do exactly as the Talmudists (Bab. Sanhedr. c. 2. f. 91) relate: that when some from Africa wanted to dispossess the children of Israel of the land of Canaan before Alexander the Great, Gebiha said to the Pasiha sages: "Only give me leave to go and quarrel with them before Alexander the Great, for if they win the judgment, you can say that you have overcome one of our lesser ones, but if I receive the judgment against them, say that the Law of Moses has overcome you. So perhaps you are now thinking: if this wretched socius (companion) is overcome, we can say that they have only overcome a poor unlearned brother of ours; but if he receives something, we can say that the good cause has won. I assure you, however, that

people of understanding will have quite different thoughts about this, and will rather look at the matter in this way: dear God, must not this be a desperately wicked thing, where one goes year after year without answering, and yet at last does such wretched things as a moderate village schoolmaster could refute among the Evangelicals! Which was also my thought when I first read this piece of writing.

Incidentally, Mr. Nameless should know that the time for whose use I must give an account to God will henceforth be far too noble for me to quarrel with any unlearned dupe of his kind. Someone else will be able to do it for him and his kind in the future, *Quod quis per alium facit, ipse fecisse putatur* (what one accomplishes through another is attributed to him).

However, I ask you once again, who have a better grasp of both your doctrine and ours, to consider the matter carefully, and I wish from the bottom of my heart that God will enlighten you through his Holy Spirit and govern you in such a way that we can live together as friends in heaven forever!

Meissen, August 16, 1680.

The First Chapter, [^]

which introduces

The Silent Engel,

or

A thorough proof,

that Mr. Anonymous or Nameless not only did not respond to Dr. August Pfeiffer's *Lutheranism before Luther* on the matter, but that he did not respond at all.

That Mr. Nameless not only answered nothing to my *Lutheranism before Luther*, but nothing at all, I prove according to his request quite honestly, completely and without much dicentes (verbiage):

He who does not even assume (cite or touch upon) the documenta and argumenta or proofs on which Dr. August Pfeiffer bases his *Lutheranism before Luther*, does not even assume (cite or touch upon), much less endeavor to overturn and refute them, has not only answered nothing to such *Lutheranism before Luther*, but nothing at all.

In his so-called Nihil ad rem, Mr. Nameless has not even assumed (cited or touched upon) the documents and evidence on which Dr. August Pfeiffer bases his *Lutheranism before Luther*, much less has he attempted to overturn and refute them.

Consequently, Mr. Nameless not only answered nothing about *Lutheranism before Luther*, but nothing at all.

No one will be able to deny the majorem or antecedent clause. For I am either an opponent or a responder. If I am the opponent, then the responder must assume (cite) and overrule my objections, or he gives me the victory; if I am the responder, then the opponent must excipiate (defend himself against) my responses or allow them to pass, and so he gives me another victory.

The Minorem, or Postscript, I shall now proceed to explain according to the most important and distinguished points, and prove that Mr. Nameless does not assume (cite or touch upon) any of them, much less endeavor to overturn and refute them.

I have proven in my *Lutheranism before Luther*:

I. That the Pope as Pope can err in matters of faith and has grossly erred (p. 3 fg.) and indeed in the following form:

Where a Pope as Pope rejects in matters of faith what another Pope as Pope has decreed (decided), then a Pope as Pope must have erred in faith. For yes and no cannot be true at the same time in a matter.

But now this and that Pope as Pope has often rejected in matters of faith what another Pope as Pope has decreed (decided), as p. 12 proves. Thus a Pope as Pope has erred in matters of faith.

Mr. Nameless says nothing about this or anything else.

Furthermore, anyone who has decreed or established something contrary to Christ's clear institution in matters of faith has grossly erred in matters of faith. For if Christ's institution is right, then everything that happens contrary to it must be wrong.

But now this and that Pope has decreed and established something contrary to Christ's clear institution, namely by the prohibition of the cup in Holy Communion, as has been proven (p. 7 f.). Thus he has grossly erred in matters of faith.

Mr. Nameless says nothing about this. Without saying anything at the end about the difference between commandment and institution obiter (above) and yet not proving it, and no doubt not knowing it at all; but more about this below in the third chapter.

II. That the Pope is a robber of the church, because he has changed and mutilated the holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper in a heretical manner contrary to Christ's order and institution (p. 12 f.). Which is thus proved:

Whoever mutilates the holy Sacrament is a church robber (juxta c. comperimus dist. 2. de consecr.), holds with the heretics (the Manichaeans according to Leo I. Serm. quadr. IV.) and invites God's curse upon himself (Deut. 4:2. c. 27, 26., Rev. 22:19).

The Pope did so at the Council of Constance and Trent (p. 13 f.).

Mr. Nameless says and answers nothing about this.

III. That the supposed transubstantiation or transformation of the blessed bread and wine into the body and

blood of Christ is false and vexatious (p. 24 f.). Which is thus proved:

What is a communication of the body and blood of Christ is not the body and blood of Jesus Christ himself. For something else is what is communicated, something else is the communication or the means of communication.

Now the blessed bread and the blessed wine are a communication of the body and blood of Christ (1 Cor. 10:16). Therefore etc. Not to mention the annoying consequences (of which p. 26 f.).

Mr. Nameless says and answers nothing about this.

IV. That the Pope of Rome is the Antichrist (p. 44 f.). Which is thus stated:

He who has all the marks on him so that the Word of God designates the Antichrist is the Antichrist. *Ob relationem signi et signati* (for signs and things signified belong together).

The Roman Pope has such characteristics (according to Dan. 11:2 Thess. 2:1 Tim. 4:2 Pet. 2, Rev. 13 et seq.), as proven p. 45 et seq. Therefore etc.

Mr. Nameless says nothing about this.

V. That it is not the papists but we Evangelicals who are to be called Catholic Christians (p. 74 et seq.):

Whoever adheres to the same religion that the holy apostles spread throughout the world, and thus adheres to the orthodox Christians throughout the world who hold with the apostles, is a Catholic. Unless one wants to say that

the apostles and those who adhere to them are not Catholic.

Now, however, it is not the papists, but we Evangelicals who are of the same religion (as proven by Chemnitz in the Exam. Concil. Trident, Heilbrunner in the *non-Catholic Papacy*, Hülsemann *against Hager*, it. T. 1. Cons. Theol. Wittenb. p. 161 s., Dr. Müller in the admonition to the Christian community of Hamburg against Jansen, etc.), and whoever does not want to believe it, only contest our doctrine directly (with striking reasons). Therefore etc.

Mr. Nameless says nothing about this.

VI. That the invariable succession (uninterrupted order) of the Roman bishops is false and unprovable, both as to persons and doctrine (p. 78 fg.). Which is thus proved:

Where it cannot be proved who was the first, second or third pope, and often not even who was Pope, there is no unbroken succession. For in an unbroken succession there need not be a lack of some; where only one link is missing, the whole chain is broken.

But in the papal list we do not know who was the first, second, third, and often not even who was Pope.

Mr. Nameless says nothing about this.

VII. That the Roman popes and the papists have falsified the writings of the holy fathers and the councils. For which reason I have referred p. 86 to the principal defense of the Evangelical apple of the eye c. 35 and 36 (as where such is evidently shown and proved), to which, however, Mr. Nameless does not object or reply.

VIII. That the Evangelicals rightly appeal to the Holy Scriptures before others (p. 90). Which is thus proved:

Whoever accepts Holy Scripture alone without human addition and respect (consideration), without rational interpretation, without imagination, rightly appeals to Holy Scripture before others who want to judge Scripture either according to the meaning of the Roman Pope (like the papists), or according to their reason (like the Calvinists and Socinians), or according to an imaginary revelation (like the Weigelians and Anabaptists).

The Evangelicals, and they alone, allow the Holy Scriptures to be valid in this way. (Despite this, someone proves the opposite!)

Therefore, they alone and above all others rightly refer to the Holy Scriptures.

Mr. Nameless does not reply to this.

IX. That the Council of Trent cannot be proved from any righteous Church Father, so far as it is contrary to our evangelical doctrine (p. 92), as an example:

The theft of the chalice is not to be proved from any righteous church father, for it was first ordered after the times of the Fathers in the Council of Constance, and was not approved by any church teacher before that time, as is proved by Heilbrunner Art. 18 c. 2 p. 674 f., Hülsemann Manual. A. C. against Hager. Disp. 20 p. 1427 s.

The chalice screw is a piece of the Council of Trent.

Therefore, a piece of the Council of Trent cannot be proven from any righteous church teacher.

Mr. Nameless says nothing about this.

X. That the true church can be invisible and has been at times (p. 120 f.). Which is thus proved:

What was hidden and incognito (unknown) was civiliter (humanly speaking) invisible; for we do not want the word "invisible" to be understood in any other way.

The true church has been hidden and incognito (unknown) at times, as in the days of Elijah, the apostles, the Arians, etc. Therefore etc.

Mr. Nameless says nothing about this.

XI. That the evangelical faith is ancient, but the papal faith is new (p. 102 f., p. 145 f.). Which is thus proved:

This faith is the same as that of Christ and the apostles, indeed of all the early fathers (p. 102 f., p. 107 f.).

Now the Evangelical faith is precisely the same. The papists prefer to prove the opposite only in a single article. Therefore, etc.

On the other hand, the faith that crept in long after the time of Christ and the apostles is a new faith and not the old Christian faith.

The faith of the papists as papists first crept in after the times of Christ and the apostles, as our own have shown (p. 50 f., p. 145 f.). Therefore etc.

Mr. Nameless does not reply to this.

XII. That Luther had a rightful calling to his doctrine

and Reformation (p. 103). This is thus proved:

Whoever had a calling to teach and preach God's Word rightly, implicitly had a calling to teach and preach against the papacy, because the papacy as papacy is against God's Word. Luther had such a calling, or else he must have had a calling to teach against God's Word. Therefore etc.

Mr. Nameless does not reply to this.

XIII. That evangelical preachers have a lawful calling to the preaching office (p. 104). Which is thus proved:

Whoever is duly called to the preaching ministry by the true apostolic church has a legitimate calling.

Evangelical preachers are duly called to the preaching office by the true apostolic church (as proven p. 153 f.). Therefore etc.

Mr. Nameless says nothing in response.

XIV. That the papists themselves must finally approve and endorse the evangelical doctrine of the justification of a poor sinner before God (p. 114 f.). This therefore proves itself:

Those who place all their confidence not in their own works, but solely in God's grace and the merit of Jesus Christ, endorse the evangelical doctrine of justification.

Many papists have done this. Therefore etc.

Mr. Nameless answers nothing.

XV. That the true Church of Christ is not to be found among the Papists as Papists, but

among the Evangelicals. (p. 127.)

Where the Holy Scriptures are rightly taught, the holy sacraments and the Office of the Keys are rightly administered, that is where the true Church of Christ is to be found.

This is not the case with the papists, but with the Evangelicals. Therefore, etc.

Mr. Nameless answers nothing.

XVI. That with the papists no man *vi hypotheseon* (on account of the many conditions) can be assured of his baptism (p. 130. fg.).

If one cannot look into the heart and see its intention (disposition), thoughts, purpose and actual opinion, one cannot be certain, even according to papal teaching, that he has conferred the sacrament of baptism or other sacraments on someone. (Concil. Florent. ap. Caranzam Sess. 7. Can. XI. & Conc. Trid.)

Not a single person, and therefore not a single clergyman, except God, can see into the heart and its intention (attitude), thoughts, purpose and actual opinion. Christians, Turks, Jews and pagans confess this.

Consequently, no papal priest can be certain that he has conferred baptism or other sacraments on anyone.

Mr. Nameless answers nothing.

XVII. That Luther is unjustly blasphemed and reviled by the papists is proved p. 133. f. p. 71 f.

Mr. Nameless answers nothing.

XVIII. That there is no unity of doctrine among the papists (p. 71. f.). For where popes, papal decrees, concilia, and teachers are variously opposed to one another, there is no unanimity to boast of. This happens in the papacy, as the writers cited there have clearly shown.

Mr. Nameless answers nothing.

XIX. That the name Lutheran is harmless to Evangelicals in its proper sense. For if (according to the papal confession) someone can call himself an Athanasian, Franciscan, Dominican, etc., for the sake of just causes, and therefore does not follow that he believes in Athanasius, Franciscus, Dominicus, etc., nor can anyone be blamed if he calls himself a Lutheran for the sake of just causes (namely, because he adheres to the ancient Christian apostolic teaching purified again by Luther) and distinguishes himself by this name from the papists, Calvinists and others who all hide under the name Catholic.

But now this can happen according to the papists' own confession. Hence also this.

Mr. Nameless does not reply to this.

XX. That the Jesuits are publicly convicted of many *Criminum falsi* (forgeries) (p. 141. f.).

For he who accuses Luther of atrocious deeds and yet not only cannot prove them, but must publicly retract them upon rejection, is convicted of *criminum falsi* (forgery).

This happened to Conrad Vetter and other Jesuits. Therefore, etc.

Mr. Nameless answers nothing.

Whether these twenty points (of which, however, more could be added with little effort) are what Mr. Nameless means when he says: "There are indeed many other unrhymed pieces here and there, which the gentlemen's godparents and brothers-in-law (who can help it that Mr. Nameless is not allowed to ask godparents?) easily notice about themselves: I leave that up to them. But in order that men may know what is unrighteous or not, I have repeated them here somewhat more clearly, not against Mr. Nameless (who will probably remain speechless here to the end), but against the learned Jesuits, whom he praises, in all simplicity (Judges 19:30): Now consider this and give counsel and say! Either the prefix or suffix duly overturned or the conclusion sincerely confessed! Meanwhile I will go further.

The Second Chapter, [^]

which contains

briefly repeated answers to the three embarrassing and tasteless so-called fundamental questions.

After the papists well realized that they would not get along with us Evangelicals from Holy Scripture, in that of the presumed power of the Pope, of monastic vows, indulgences, purgatory, mass, one form, invocation of the deceased saints and images, etc., there is not an *altum silentium* (deep silence) in it, not a syllable, letter or title, but our doctrine of the

justification of a poor sinner before God and other articles of faith are as clearly and brightly recorded therein as if they were written with pure rays of the sun (hence Albert Pighius 1. 1. de Eccl. Hierarch. c. 4. wishes that one had never entered into scriptural controversy with the heretics), they have endeavored to take the Scriptures out of the hands of their own (who are not yet completely hardened in error), but to make a diversion for ours (to dissuade them from the main point) and to lead them away from the Scriptures; have thus fallen on a number of questions which do not concern any point of faith, but only amount to mere historical disputes and *res facti* (facts).

Among other things, the Jesuits, according to their profundity, have concocted three questions (like the three frogs [Revelation 16:13]), that they might think to deny us great sweat; to which, however, they have been answered so often and in so many ways, that one wonders how these impudent flies, so often swatted away, can yet always return.

Although one now finally likes to repeat the answer as often as the question (*nunquam enim satis dicitur, quod nunquam satis discitur* [what one never learns enough is not said often enough]), the papists should nevertheless know that one is not exactly obliged to answer all strange, even cheeky questions, but one can either reject them immediately and say: What is that to our dispute? Nothing. An honest disputator (controversial theologian) otherwise remains with the *statu Controversiae* (the controversial question itself), which is now this: Has the Pope fallen away from the true faith? If we now prove that

such a thing has happened, we have done it, and it is all the same to us who was the first. Or else we can follow the example of Jesus Christ, who gave such an answer to his snobby questioners: I also will ask you a word, and if you tell me, I will tell you by what authority I do these things (Matt. 21:24). So they could also be presented with enough intriguing questions, so that they would be late enough with the answer, as an example:

Where in the whole world can the original (genuine document) of the *Donatio Constantini* (Donation of Constantine *) and the Cession (declaration of concession) of Rome and the French lands be found? And one could protest that if one did not point fingers at the place and the same original, one would take the whole work for a poem and fable.

Likewise: What was the name of the man to whom the Apostle Peter granted his first bull of indulgence with his leaden seal at Rome, and in what year, month and day did this happen? For that it was done by Peter is presupposed by them, as *Extrav. de Poenit. et Remiss. cap. Unigenitus*: *Unigenitus Dei filius thesaurum indulgentiarum per B. Petrum, Coeli clavigerum, ejusque successores suos in terris Vicarios commisit fidelibus salubriter dispensandum etc.* (i.e. the incarnate Son of God, through St. Peter, who bears the keys to the gates of heaven, and

*) The papists claim that Emperor Constantine the Great gave the Papal States to the Pope.

his successors, his vicars on earth, has entrusted the treasury of indulgences to the faithful for salutary administration, etc.). And at the same time it would be protested that, if the indulgence as well as its nature and time were not mentioned, it would be considered a human act and a money-making scheme for the avaricious popes.

Likewise: Who of all the teachers of the Church in the first thousand years after the Ascension has served, used or expressly approved of Communion in a single form? And if no one can be named, let the use of the Lord's Supper in a single form confirmed at Constance and Trent be regarded as a disgraceful ecclesiastical robbery.

Such and similar questions could be put to the papists in great numbers and then said: If you do not tell me these things, I will not tell you yours either (Matt. 21:27).

Just so that Mr. Nameless can see what bad subtleties (whistles) are contained in his so-called fundamental questions, I will show in each case

1. that they are quite silly and inconsistent and unworthy of an answer. Nevertheless,
2. answer them briefly and to the point. And
3. ask a counter-question, the answer to which is appropriate to his question, or by answering which he must at the same time answer his own question and put the sword into our hands against himself.

The First Question. [^](#)

**Which of all the Popes was the first to apostatize
from Christ's Word and His Church,**

in such a way that he set something against the articles of the Christian, universal, well-declared, lawfully accepted faith, as an article of faith? As Mr. Nameless himself states the *statum quaestionis* (state of the question) *pro dexteritate ingenii* (according to his mental acumen).

This question is

1. not worth answering.

For it is enough if I have proved so much from Holy Scripture that the Pope is apostate and the Antichrist (cf. Luther, p. 55, seq.). But as to which was the first, that does not affect the matter; nothing is thereby lost to us, and nothing is gained by the papists, though we say: *Non liquet* (that is uncertain), let it ultimately be whoever it will be (p. 64).

The papists believe that if one does not want to say directly (exactly) or can show with fingers which Pope fell away first, then they have won and we have lost. Their conclusion is thus this:

He who cannot or will not say which Pope, and at what time, first apostatized from the true faith, must necessarily confess that none of all the Popes has apostatized.

The Lutherans cannot or will not say which Pope apostatized first. They must therefore necessarily confess that none of all the popes has apostatized.

Then I answer: *Connexio Majoris* or the consequence in the antecedent clause is and remains eternally incorrect. For if this is to be true, it must also follow in this way:

He who cannot say at what time the angels fell away from God must necessarily confess that no angels have fallen away and therefore no devils.

Whoever cannot say which of the Jews first fell away from the old Abrahamic faith and became a Pharisee (abrogated God's commandment through his writings, taught *μετεμψυχωσίην* or the soul's journey from one body to another and similar false things), must confess that no Jew at all became a Pharisee or fell away from the ancient Israelite religion.

He who cannot say who first became an [Agnoetian](#) must necessarily confess that no heretics, called [Agnoetians](#), have ever been in *rerum natura* (in the world).

Anyone who cannot say who was the first to make and distribute a counterfeit coin at the time of the tipper must confess that there is no counterfeit coin.

Whoever cannot say who impregnated this person outside of marriage, when, where and how it happened, must confess that she is not a whore.

He who cannot tell who made the first stab at a man executed with many wounds, must confess that the man was not stabbed at all.

He who cannot say who has brought up this or that impiety or evil habit must confess that it is not an evil habit at all and the like (v. supra p. 68. seq.).

But now neither the papists nor any man can actually say all these things: Dear fellow, should therefore no devils have been, no Pharisees and [Agnoetians](#) have been,

should therefore no false coin, a dead man alive, an evil habit good?

But if a papist must now confess that it is enough to know that the devil is apostate, that the Pharisees are false teachers, that the Agnoetians are heretics, that the [counterfeit] coin is not good, that man is dead, that custom is contrary to the law, Let the origin and beginner be what they may, they cannot possibly blame us if we use the same answer and say that it is enough to prove that the Pope has fallen away from Christ's Word, let the first be what it may; because, like false coins, i.e. habits, doctrines, etc. can creep in unnoticed or gradually, as the example of the Pharisees and Agnoetians clearly testifies. Just as one cannot really say in what year the Greek Church fell away, whose apostasy and partial errors the papists themselves must nevertheless confess.

2. easy to handle. [^]

But because Mr. Nameless nevertheless demands with such storm and horror to know the first Pope who apostatized, I could indeed refer him back to my Lutheranism, since I (p. 58) opened my thoughts in this case and named Boniface III as the first confirmed Pope, Gregory VI as the first Pope suspended in all pile. However, he is also free to consult Elias Reusner Isag. Histor. to see how the latter describes the life of the Antichrist and shows how he was an embryo or closed fruit for the first 277 years (p. 50); a child

for the following 294 years (p. 58); a boy for the following 290 (p. 70); a youth for the following 292 (p. 79); a man for the following 274 (p. 89); and an old man from Luther's time until now (p. 99). But in order that he may have further occasion to exercise his ingeniolum (to exert his poor intellect), I will finally place as the first Pope who fell away from Christ one whom the Engel himself chose to call after Gregory VII, no matter which one he chooses. By way of example, Leo X may be the first to apostatize from Christ's word and the true Church. In order that I may obtain this against Fr. Engel, I must first prove that Pope Leo X apostatized, which I do as follows:

If Luther did not fall away from Christ's Word and his church by teaching such articles of faith as Leo X considered false and contrary to the true Christian faith, then it follows that Leo X fell away from Christ's Word and his church and did not do right by holding Luther's articles of faith false and contrary to the true Christian faith. For one of the two must finally be true: either Luther was right in teaching such articles of faith (e.g. the justification of a poor sinner before God through faith in Jesus Christ alone, etc.) against Leo X, and in such a case Leo X must have fallen away from the faith: or Leo X was right in holding such articles of faith to be false and contrary to the true faith, and in such a case Luther must have fallen away. In summary (the final result is): One must have apostatized, Leo or Luther.

But Luther did not fall away from Christ's Word and His Church, etc.

Those articles of faith that are irrefutably and rock-solidly founded in God's Word are right and not contrary to the Christian faith.

All the articles which Luther has defended against Pope Leo X are firmly founded in God's Word, as has been proved a thousand times by our own, and let only Mr. Nameless or another more learned than he have the heart to prove the contrary of any such article, **or give us direct (in clear words) cause to prove it.** Therefore, etc.

But if Pope Leo X is proven to have apostatized, then he is either the first Pope to apostatize or he is not. If he is, he may remain so. If he is not, let Mr. Nameless name one who fell away before him, that is, who before him held the articles which Luther defended against the Pope to be false and contrary to the Christian faith, and let us then abandon Leo X and put that one in his place. Let him only confess that in Luther's time the Pope had already apostatized, and let us treat lightly whether this or that man was the first. When I see that the arsonists have set fire to a city, I must confess that the fire has been set; no matter who started the first fire.

3. To reject with a counter question. ^

It is now again desired that one should say which was the first Pope actually so called, that is, the first who wished to be *Princeps & caput visibile Ecclesiae, supremus*

& infallibilis fidei iudex & oecumenicus Christi vicarius (visible head and regent, supreme and infallible judge in matters of faith and Christ's vicar for all the world)? If the Papists tell us this, we will immediately tell them the first Pope who fell away from Christ and the true Church. For whoever has pretended to be the head of the Church, an untrustworthy judge in matters of faith and Christ's governor, has fallen away from Christ and the true Church, be he who he will, and has lived where and when he will. Peter and the first bishops of Rome, who kept within their terminis (boundaries) and did not desire to be Popes in the above sense, may in this case only leave them out of the mix. For Peter hardly came to Rome or was not a Pope, nor did he demand to be one, as Mr. Nameless, for the sake of popular brevity, has this time only Dr. Calov Mataeol. Papist. sect. 1. contr. 9. & 10. p. 26. f. to read about. But one will have to name someone of the type, to which Thom. Stapleton. Relect. Prine, fid. contr. 1. q. 5. art. 3. p. 158. himself gives the following testimony: *Enormia & horrenda fuisse Pontificum Romanorum flagitia, imo vix ullum peccatum nominari posse, quo illa sedes turpiter maculata non fuerit, maxime ab anno DCCC. & infra., i.e. the Roman popes have committed gross and cruel crimes, and hardly a sin can be named, so that the Roman See has not been defiled from the year 800 and onwards has not been defiled. A papist confesses this without being unmarried (voluntarily)! Thank you, Mr. Stapleton, for the good report,*

in which we do not know how to remember a single word, and we are once again obliged that as soon as Stapleton or another will name the first of such aforementioned birds, we will immediately name again the first Pope who fell away from Christ and his Church.

The Second Question. [^]

Can you name a single person who died before Luther and believed the same as Luther?

This question is once again

1. not worth answering.

The fact that people lived before Luther who did not bear Luther's name, but did bear his teaching, has already been mentioned in *Lutheranism* p. 83. But that one should mention those people by name is both unnecessary and unfair.

Unnecessary, for it is enough that I know that Luther's faith agrees with God's Word, and that the papists hold many articles contrary to God's Word. **Whoever was saved before Luther's time must necessarily have held to the Scriptures together with Luther in the articles of faith, especially those that belong to the foundation of salvation, and not with the papists against the Scriptures, for one would say that one was saved before Luther by a faith that is against God's Word. In this way, everything finally comes back to proving one's faith from God's Word, while the papists may twist and turn as they please.**

It is unfortunate, because the people who were with us before Luther,

together with their writings, have been removed and suppressed, and their histories and writings have been falsified in many ways. It would therefore be necessary either for all the people before Luther to be presented to us alive, or for all their writings to be delivered to us together, unadulterated, and then it would be necessary to see how many, and whether not a single person before Luther believed the same thing as he did.

2. Easy to handle. [^]

To this question: "Can you name a single person who died before Luther and believed the same as Luther?" I answer without hesitation: "Yes. You go on to ask: Who is it? Answer: Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Paul, Peter, and in sum all the evangelists and apostles died before Luther, and yet taught the very things that Luther believed: in spite of the fact that Mr. Nameless proves the opposite! Cf. Lutheranism p. 87 fg. Cornei, a Lap. ad Gal. 1. This is the canon of faith, which The apostle here delivers, if a new dogma arises somewhere, let it be examined, whether It agrees with the received and ancient faith of the Catholic Church, which first Paul and the Apostles preached, so if Let it be found by her. to disagree, to be considered heretical and anathema. All the Fathers follow this Canon. — That is, this is the right rule of faith or guideline which the apostle Paul points out here (Gal. 1:8): if a new doctrine arises anywhere, that it should be examined and tested to see whether it is compatible with the ancient faith of the Catholic Church, which St. Paul and the other Apostles have taught. Paul and the other

apostles first preached, so that if a doctrine is found to be contrary to the same apostolic faith, it may be considered heretical and accursed. All the Fathers follow this rule and guideline. This is certainly a clever speech by a Jesuit, who was undoubtedly more learned than Fr. Engel, and which the latter may well put behind his ear. And in this way the holy Doctors of the Church have been saved before, especially Augustine, on the very faith which Luther had, or which, according to the rule given by Corn. a Lapide, agrees with the ancient faith of the Catholic Church, first preached by Paul and the other Apostles, as proved in Luther p. 92. Just as many, indeed all other righteous Fathers (Doctors of the Church), as of ours Gerhard in LL., Eckhard in Gomp. Theol. Patr. and others.

3. To be rejected with a counter-question. [^](#)

On the other hand, it is also desired that one single righteous Doctor of the Church be named, whom both the papists and we recognize, who has taught in all the articles the same as the Council of Trent (p. 92), or that one single article be named which is in dispute between them and us, in which all righteous Doctors of the Church unanimously hold it against us with them. As soon as they do so, let us meet at once and become popish without delay. Is this not enough? But both this and that will happen ad Calendas Græcas (never again).

But in this case the papists do not trust the peace of the land itself; they do not accept the Fathers (Church Fathers) any further than where they hold them in good standing. Otherwise they speak of the matter much differently. Laurel a Villa de rat. stud. Theol. 1. 4. c. 6. obs. 1: It is plain that all the Fathers, however illustrious by the innocence and learning of their lives, from time to time offend by word and writing; i. e. it is known and evident that all the Fathers and Doctors of the Church, however much they excel in holiness and learning, are nevertheless often absent orally and in writing. Possevinus l. 12. c. 23 says: Fathers very often deviate from the goal; i.e. the Fathers very often miss the right purpose. Salmeron disp. 4. super. 2 Tim. 3. com. 15. writes: In the Fathers some less certain and inconstant truths, some more probable, sometimes more serious lapses occur; i.e. in the writings of the Fathers one finds many things that are quite uncertain, many that are only credible, and sometimes serious errors. Bellarminus l. 3. de V. D. c. 10: That the principal of the Fathers in some cases did not fall lightly; i.e. the most distinguished of the Fathers committed no small mistakes and errors in certain matters. And this very one reminds us salutarily (l. 4. de V. D. c. 22) that the holy fathers must be examined according to the Scriptures (if they themselves desire such a thing), that we may accept those which are in accordance with the scriptures, reject those which are contrary to the scriptures; i.e. that we may accept what is in agreement with the Scriptures, and reject what is contrary to them. What else do we desire? What else is our singing and saying, supplication and entreaty, but this?

But if the Fathers are to be set aside in this way and only the Holy Scriptures are to matter, then we will soon be done with the papists. Mr. Nameless only consider the collation (comparison) of the old and new Roman faith in Hunnius in Praef. Comm. Ep. ad Rom. and what is already stated in *Lutheranism* p. 87, 88 and elsewhere, as well as in this defense Cap. 1.

The Third Question. [^](#)

Can one name a single person who died happily after Luther's time, adhering to Lutheran doctrine?

This question is once again

1. not worth answering.

For if I only know that my doctrine is in accordance with Christ's words and is right, and that one can therefore die blessed on it, then I have no interest in whether or not I can name one or more who have really persevered in this doctrine to the end and have been saved. If a credible person tells me that this is the right way to the city, then I am satisfied and go the way shown on their word, even though they do not name any people who have gone this way. Since God himself points out the way to heaven in His words and says, "This is the way to go, neither to the right hand nor to the left" (Isaiah 30:21), let us confidently follow in God's name and go this way; whoever else may go and have gone this way. And indeed it is strange that the papists themselves say that no man can be assured of his own

salvation, and yet want to speak of another's salvation or desire assurance of it.

2. Easy to handle. [^]

At his request I answer briefly: Yes, people have indeed been saved on Luther's doctrine, and no one has ever died saved on any other teaching than this one (p. 107 f.). But the question is: Who was saved on Luther's doctrine after his time? Answer: John Brenz, Martin Chemnitz, Aegid. Hunnius, John Gehard, etc.; likewise John Frederick, Elector of Saxony, Christian III, King of Denmark, Charles, Prince of Anhalt, etc.

Yes, you say, how do you want to prove that? Answer: Precisely from where you want to prove that Jerome or Augustine or others have been saved. Let us hear, then, from what you would prove to one who would not concede it that Jerome and Augustine were saved. Certainly not from direct divine revelation, nor from the relation (report) of an angel who saw them in heaven, which would not be believed on your say-so, but you would have to prove it from the following conclusion:

Whoever has persevered in the true faith in Jesus Christ to the end has been saved (Matthew 10:22).

Now Jerome and Augustine persisted in such a belief to the end, which, out of Christian love,

one presumes to be true of those who described their lives and deaths. Consequently etc. But this is precisely what I can also subsume (assume) from the said persons and from their vitis (biographies) described by credible people. If Father Engel does not want to accept this, he cannot prove to me in any other way that Jerome, Augustine or any other of the old church teachers died blessed; for who came back and told Father Engel?

3. To be rejected with a counter-question. [^](#)

But now it is likewise desired that on the papal side a single person should be named who has been saved by the papal faith contained in the Council of Trent? Such a person should be expressly named and (as Nameless says) pointed to with a finger: This Procopius, this Peter, this Girg (ex Dialecto Galilaea, i.e. as they speak in the village) died a good papal death and was saved. Yes, I say still more, it is impossible that one could die blessed on such a papal faith confirmed in the Council of Trent, no matter who he is, even if he died wherever and whenever he wanted, which I prove thus:

Whoever dies in the Trent faith dies in such a faith, which is false and contrary to Christ's words.

Anyone who dies in such a belief, which is false and contrary to Christ's words, dies as a heretic.

Anyone who dies as a heretic dies in mortal sin.

He who dies in mortal sin will not be saved.

Consequently, he who dies in the Trent faith will not be saved. Therefore, whoever wishes to die saved must not die in a good Trent way, but in a good evangelical way, i.e. in the faith which we

have according to the Gospel, just as many before and after Luther's time have died blessed thereon, who lived among the Papists, but according to their heart's confession did not belong to the Papacy, of which mention is made in my Lutheranism, and Fr. Engel may further see at will in my refreshing lessons (edit. 2. p. 509. s. Dom. 6. Trin.).

So Mr. Nameless sees that such quaestiunculis (little missives) are not the end of the matter, but only a short reprieve, a vain evasion and loss of time! It must finally come to a written dispute, whether the papists like it or not. But if it only comes to that, we are undaunted and take comfort in the certain victory:

As God is God and His Word,
Must devil, Pope and gates of hell
And what clings to him
Finally become shame and mockery,
God is with us and we are with God,
We want to achieve victory!

The Third Chapter, [^]

**in which the entire harlotry of Mr. Nameless can be
found with necessary annotations.**

For the benefit of the Christian reader, nothing further need be said, and I could very well have laid down my pen. But so that Mr. Nameless does not have to complain as if the slightest thing had been concealed from him, tucked under the bench, and remained unanswered (for which, however, I have much to complain about him), I will go through his entire tract

and penetrate what is not relevant to the main point.

And because Mr. Nameless, as I notice, likes to joke and cannot make fun enough of his father and brother-in-law (not unlike a monkey when he finds a little nut), I have sometimes had to let something slip in, not *animo injuriandi* (with the intention of offending), but *cum homine jocosio jocandi* (to add joke to joke), and this according to Solomon's admonition (Proverbs 26:5): Answer the fool according to his foolishness, lest he think himself wise (which can be clearly seen from his blunder).

I confess that in the present calamitate publica [general plague] ([in the year 1680](#), when I wrote this for the first time, while the pestilence was raging around our borders) I am not exactly joking. But who can resist it when it is so obvious? The zealot Elijah could not refrain from mocking the Baal priests, even though it was a dry and fierce time: "Cry aloud," he said, "for he is a god; he worketh, or hath work, or is in the field, or peradventure sleepeth, that he may awake (1 Kings 18:27). Ergo animis linguisque favete (So, dear fellow, watch out)!

This is the full text:

[It appears that Father Engel, or “Nameless”, put words into Pfeiffer’s mouth, in a mocking sense, in both “Questions” and “Answers”; it is Pfeiffer comments in the footnotes that are to be studied.]

Nihil ad rem *) [^] _—

from

August Pfeiffer **)

Doctor of the Holy Scriptures
and Pastor Primarius of St. Afra in Meissen

to the

Three Fundamental Questions **Against the Lutheran Religion**

published in Dresden in 1679.

*) Father Engel snatched the title from those whom Father Kedde refuted.

**) Change the name and the story is about you (The name is different, the matter concerns you)! Dr. Aug. Pfeiffer published his *Lutheranism before Luther*, but Mr. Nameless published *Nothing to the Point*. *Juris naturae est ut suum cuique tribuatur* (Natural law determines that to each his own shall be apportioned).

The

Nobles, Noblemen, Grand Nobles, High and Well-Beloved,
gentlemen of the law,

Mr. Hans Adam Stiel auf Bennewitz,
Electoral Saxon Senior Official of the Meissen district,
and bailiff in Meissen;

Mr. Johann Zacharias Finsinger,
Electoral Saxon Procurator;

Mr. Philipp Erhard Nester,
Electoral Saxon School Board Administrator;

Mr. Gottfried Jauch,
Electoral Saxon Clerk *);

of the

Dr. August Pfeiffer,
your faithful intercessor with God **),
Patrons, fathers, brothers-in-law, benefactors and friends.

*) If this honest man will not send a Gratia (letter of thanks) because of the Dedication, Mr. Nameless may not blame him, for he has long since died before the unnamed old book has come in, and indeed died so blessedly in the Evangelical catholic faith that Mr. Nameless has cause to wish with Balaam: Let my soul die the death of this righteous man, and let my end be like his end (Leviticus 24:10). Yes, the other also died in the order, so that Mr. Nameless may not trouble himself on their account in the future.

***) No more than is reasonable and in accordance with the apostolic exhortation (1 Tim. 2:1 f., Jam. 5:14 f.).

It is quite astonishing that to these three so often repeated 1) as well as to many other questions the Lutheran preachers always answer *Nihil ad rem* (missing the point)! 2), as much as Fr. [Jodocus Kedde](#) has often tried with printed tracts 3), and that because they do not reach the *Statum quaestionis* (the actual question) 4). Dear Sirs,

1) *Ridetur chorda qui semper oberrat eadem* (He who always plays the same tune makes himself ridiculous). Poor people often count their money, because they don't have much. It's the same with Fr. Engel and his consorts (journeymen).

2) I hear here one who says it, but none who proves it, *Quis autem erit innocens, si accusasse sufficiat* (Who would be innocent if accusation proved guilt)?

3) Poor Fr. Kedde had little reason to make an effort. He has received more answers than he would have liked. He has finally had to go bankrupt and owe the answer to many honest people, whom he has provoked. If Father Engel likes to conduct his defense, he is free to do so.

4) *Felix qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas* (Happy is he who succeeds in grasping the reason of things)! Miracle upon miracle, that in such high subtleties (sophistry) [the 3 Questions]: Which Pope first fell away from the true faith? Whether anyone before Luther taught the same as he did? Whether anyone was ever saved by the Lutheran religion? which a poor little peasant, even a child of ten, can grasp without difficulty and headache, the poor preachers cannot reach the *Statum controversiae* (the main point of controversy)! Yes, thank another, you masters of high minds, that you do not hold us to our simplicity in Christ (2 Cor. 11:3)

such is the nature of Dr. August Pfeiffer's answer 5), which he calls a thorough answer 6), since he nowhere reaches the *statum quaestionis* (the actual question). Perhaps the reason is that he overlooked the matter only at the top; since he confesses that he answered these three fundamental questions to his auditorium (audience) in one hour on October 31, 1677 7). Therefore, my kind request 8) to the honorable gentlemen is that they allow themselves to

and with the Holy Scriptures, as good *Scripturarios* (scribes), and with such high confused questions, which are nevertheless *υπερ νουν, υπέρ λόγον, υπέρ πάσαν κατάληψιν* (beyond all reason, understanding and knowledge) and completely exceed our understanding, only seek to divert (distract us from the main point).

⁵⁾ Grand merci, Monsieur, pour la bonne recommandation (Many thanks, good friend, for the excellent recommendation)! It's my pleasure to engage you another time!

⁶⁾ It will probably also remain thorough for Mr. Nameless, who only barks against it in vain, not unlike a despondent dog in its hole where no one sees him.

⁷⁾ This matter did not need more time and effort. It is much easier to knock over or blow over a miserable little card house than to extend it; just as this very *Scharteke*, on which Fr. Engel deliberated (labored) and tormented himself for years and days, and yet was finally ashamed to give his name, was knocked over in a few days during *horis succisivis* (hours off work). Rest assured, Jesuits, your arts are not so far off. We know full well how high they extend.

⁸⁾ Who could refuse such a polite person?

gently and politely persuade their father-in-law and brother-in-law to consider the matter a little more deeply and diligently 9) until he understands the *Statum quaestionis* (the actual question) properly, so that he can give the answer without much *dicentes* (chatter) 10). And in order that the matter may be properly seen, I will present each question to my honorable gentlemen in turn, together with the *Statum quaestionis* (the actual point in dispute), so that they may know what the answer is: *Nihil ad rem!* 11)

The First Question. [^]

It is desired to name the first of all the popes who has fallen away from Christ's Word and his church 12).

9) For it is no child's play with such high papist subtleties (sophistry). There are headaches. *Scilicet* (Of course)!

10) But a fool can ask more in one line than the cleverest doctor can answer in ten or more. The thorough answer wants to be at least longer than the question.

11) Well then, let it be done! *Quid dignum tanto feret hic promissor hiatu* (Far enough has the speaker opened his mouth, what great things will he bring)?

12) In short, the first who called himself *Principem et Caput Ecclesiae et Oecumenicum Christi vicarium* (the head of the Church and Christ's general vicar) was the first Pope, and it was the same Pope who first fell away from

Status quaestionis (What is this actually about)?

Another is: Articulus fidei 13) (an article of faith) and quite another: Lex, Mandatum, Decretum, Statutum, Prohibitum, Ordinatum 14) (law, commandment, prohibition, order, etc.). For the New Testament contains all the

Christ's Word and his Church. But who was the one who called himself that, the papists will know best. It is true that the word papa was previously general and was given to every bishop. But it is reported of Gregory VII that he appropriated such a previously common name to himself alone, and ἀντονομαβηκῶς (as with the name belonging to him alone) wanted to be called Papa or the Pope, from which Mr. Nameless can obtain further advice from Dr. Scherzer in his Anti-Bellarmin. Disp. 1. p. 5.

¹³⁾ Mr. Nameless would have done well if he had clearly expressed what he actually called articulum fidei or an article of faith? For because his old co-religionists at the Colloquium (religious discussion) at Regensburg considered everything that is written in Holy Scripture to be an article of faith, or as they usually say: quidquid sub revelationem divinam cadit (what is revealed by God), among other things also that Tobias' dog wagged its tail (Tob. 11, 9. as can be seen in Sess. 11, p. 353), one is quite surprised that Mr. Nameless now wants to consider a divine commandment and an order contained in His Word as no article of faith.

¹⁴⁾ Mr. Nameless himself here mixes mandatum and ordinatum, commandment and order, without order and distinction, and yet wants to blame me afterwards that I do not distinguish between commandment and order (which is also an order), Turpe est Doctori, cum culpa redarguit ipsum

articulos fidei (articles of faith) of the Old Testament, since the old law has been abolished, and we Christians have one faith with the ancient Jews, but not one law ¹⁵). It is now desired to know which of all the popes first apostatized from the ancient articulis fidei (articles of faith) ¹⁶), that is, that he was the first to set up an article of faith that was contrary to the previous, universal, well-explained, and legitimately accepted Christian faith ¹⁷). For something is easily

(it is shameful for a teacher if his reproach falls back on himself).

¹⁵) Here it would have been fine if Mr. Nameless had made a reasonable distinction between Legem Positivam et Moralem (between the Levitical ceremonial as well as the political law of the market and the sacred law of virtue or the ten commandments). The latter can be changed and abrogated, but by the one who gave it and by no other. But this is perpetuae obligationis (of eternal validity), and binds Christians as well as Jews, so that in this way Jews and Christians have one and the same law, which serves as friendly news to Mr. Nameless. Rudes discere possunt, eruditi judicare; scioli neutrum (the ignorant can learn, the learned can judge, the half-knowledgeable neither).

¹⁶) Without further ado: the doctrine of the justification of a poor sinner before God by faith in the Savior of the world is an ancient article of faith, which was already held by Abraham Gen. 15:6, and even by Adam and all the fathers, Gen. 3:15, Acts 15:7, 8, 9. The Pope has shamefully departed from the same ancient article of faith (Council of Trent Sess. 6). What further testimony do we need? Does this not mean that he has fallen away from an ancient article?

¹⁷) Without much dicent (babble) I therefore conclude that

explained anew ¹⁸⁾, just as something is easily changed in this or that use or law ¹⁹⁾, yes also easily a new article of faith, which is not contrary to the previous one, but is revealed anew by the Lord God, can be presented to the world, as Christ the Lord ²⁰⁾

whoever, contrary to Christ's order and institution, has made the use of Holy Communion in one form an article of faith, has made it an article of faith contrary to the previous Christian common, well-declared, and legitimately accepted faith. For the former Christian common, well-declared, legitimately accepted faith was that the Lord's Supper should be used in both forms, as they say, as proved in the preface to my *Lutheranism*. But now, contrary to Christ's decree and institution, the Pope has made the use of Holy Communion in one form an article of faith. For the learned Jesuit Balthasar Hager holds that it is an article of faith among the papists that communion sub una (the partaking of the Lord's Supper under one form) is not an abuse (in Dr. Hülsemann, Manual. Disp. 19. q. 6. §. 3. pag. 1247). Consequently etc. And Mr. Nameless can be served with several quite willingly.

¹⁸⁾ That would be a good thing if only it were reasonable, honest and orderly.

¹⁹⁾ In external and harmless ceremonies I also allow it to apply caeteris paribus (in quite the same circumstances).

²⁰⁾ Christ the Lord had power to do this; for this reason alone the Pope and no man may imagine that he is also free to change the divine law at his pleasure or to make new articles of faith (as Leo X in his bull of 1520 banished Luther for saying, among other things, that the Pope had no power to enforce articles of faith (T. 1. Jen. 258 a), for that would mean exalting himself

brought many new articles of faith to the Jews, which they had previously known only obscurely or not at all in the Old Testament, and thereby, as also afterwards through the teaching of the Holy Spirit, gradually enlightened the world more and more. But when a new article comes forth, contrary to the previous faith, so that it brings with it not something new to expand and explain the faith, but to overthrow and destroy the previous true faith, this cannot happen without tumult, outcry and general horror, and thus not without great confusing astonishment ²¹. As one also

above all that is called divine worship (2 Thess. 2:4). What God, what Christ once commanded to believe and to keep, cannot be abolished by any human commandment, prohibition, order or whatever you want to call it, but should be kept rigidly and firmly, until he himself abolishes it (Matt. 28, 20., Joh. 10. 27. c. 15, 14. etc. Conf. Hülsem. in form. Conc. art. 18. § 8. p. 924).

²¹) A thief likes to steal incognito (unrecognized) and therefore seldom makes a fuss and a shout by stealing, but it does not go off without shouting, horror and confusing astonishment when the theft becomes known and obvious. So the Pope did not make a fuss and a shout, but rather secretly intended to make money by stealing from the whole world, taking the married state from the clergy and the blessed chalice and Bible from the laity; Nevertheless, when this theft was discovered, it did not pass off without tumult, outcry and general horror; the clergy were outraged beforehand, and the robbed church shouted so much to the Pope afterwards that his ears hurt. (Conf. *Lutheranism* p. 60 fg.)

soon noticed in the beginning the “apostasy” of Martin Luther ²²⁾, who was not such a great prince and high person known to the whole world, but only a simple monk.

Responsio (answer) by Dr. August Pfeiffer ²³⁾. [^](#)

22) There is no doubt that one of the two, Luther or the Pope, must have fallen away from Christ's word and his church. But that it is not Luther but the Pope who has fallen away has been sufficiently proven by our own to this day. Mr. Nameless should just get hold of Nic. Hunnius' booklet, called *Apostasia Ecclesiae Romanae* and the like.. If, then, the Pope was, as it were, the robber and murderer, against whom Luther has justly raised a tumult and a clamor, although he was only a simple monk; for a thief and a conflagration may be denounced by any household member, be he who he may. *Illata religioni nostrae injuria tanquam crimen publicum ad omnes pertinet* (A harm done to the faith affects everyone as a public crime). But it is no wonder that Luther's beginning was soon noticed. For Luther went straight out and publicly attacked the Pope. But the Pope had insidiously crept in beforehand, until he had established himself so firmly that everyone was afraid of him and was either not allowed to persuade him at all, or else only to his detriment. *Intravit ut vulpes, regnavit ut lupus. Illic non facile deprehendi, hic compesci non poterat* (He crept in like a fox, he dwelt like a wolf. At first his behavior could not be easily noticed, later it could not be prevented).

²³⁾ This is not Dr. August Pfeiffer's formal answer, but rather a few fragments pieced together from his answer by Mr. Nameless, without judgment, indeed out of slovenly malice. The correct answer was recently repeated in the previous chapter. Mr. Nameless may now properly reply.

Pope Sylvester and Gregory the Great added the Kyrie eleison to the Mass [p. 52] ²⁴).

Martin V. dispensavit cum quodam, qui acceperat Germanam suam in uxorem (gave indulgence to one who took his own sister as wife) [p. 47] ²⁵).

The Pope forbids the clergy to marry ²⁶) (p. 47). The tax of the apostolic chamber is before the eyes of the world ²⁷), and so there are many other abuses in the papacy (p. 49).

Consequently!

Dear Sirs, see how this ²⁸) is an answer.

Mr. Nameless may now properly reply.

24) That would finally be the very least, and we could well suffer the Kyrie Eleison in and of itself, if only the papists would let go of their Mass or would keep it for themselves alone.

25) That was rough enough!

26) However, this is a departure from the faith and a doctrine of devils, as Paul considers it in good evangelical terms. 1 Tim. 4:1, 3.

27) Which masterfully summarizes the holy Ten Commandments according to the Brigitta Revelation in a compendium (a short saying) of ten letters: Da Pecuniam (Give money)!

28) Namely this, what Mr. Nameless represents (depicts) so unreasonably and maliciously. If this is to apply, that one snatches something from the words of another here and there and then puts it together without understanding, then I want to see who can finally answer ad rem (something belonging to the matter)!

Nihil ad rem! [Nothing to the point]

He did indeed begin to answer p. 15 quite aptly: Non liquet [I do not know ²⁹]. After that he spoiled it with a loud Nihil ad rem.

The Second Question. [^]

It is desired that a single person be expressly named: Martin Balzer, Hans Probst, Michael Bürger zu Smyrna, Franz Graf in Flandern, Philipp Domherr in Bethlehem, Conrad, des Kaisers Lothar General, Georg Bischof zu Upsala, Marcus Diaconus zu Memphis etc. ³⁰), who died before Luther and believed the same as Luther.

29) *Quid inde* (What follows from this)? In this case my *non liquet* (I do not know) is not prejudicial (of such a nature that it overturns my proof). For if I finally know that Caius is a thief, what is it to me who was the first thief before Caius? To the question: is Caius a thief? I can probably answer yes, and if one asks further: who stole just before Caius: non liquet, I don't know. Caius must therefore hang, whatever may be the case with the first. So if I know that this Pope is a false believer, it matters little which one was the first before him, one attacks praesentem (the present one). Is this not a fitting answer?

30) These are strange ideas! Why does he not speak: Marcolphus priest at Capernaum, Aesopus exorcist at Bethsaida, Thubalkain bell-ringer at Sidon, Mephiboseth calcant at Jerusalem etc.?

Responsio (reply) by Dr. August Pfeiffer.

All those before Luther who believed exactly what we Lutherans believe now, believed exactly what Luther believed, even if they were not called Lutheran (p. 83 fg. ³¹). O thou holy nihil ad rem ³²!

Second answer by D. August Pfeiffer. [^](#)

The Pope has falsified all the books in the whole world, so that now one cannot find a single one in any book that would have been believed in agreement with Luther (p. 83 fg. ³³). Dr. August Pfeiffer thinks that the Pope would not have had such great power in the world

31) Anyone who can find this gibberish answer attributed to me in my book (p. 83. fg.) must have big eyes. It seems that the author here is not only nameless, but also quite shameless and conscience-less. Let everyone read my answer (1. c. p. 83. fg.) and briefly and well above.

32) O thou scoffer of the saints, worthy that all the saints, as often as thou callest upon them in good papal terms, answer thee Nihil ad rem!

33) That the Pope searches all corners of the whole world, and that he falsifies all books in the whole world, I have never said, neither p. 86. fg. nor otherwise, but rather indefinitely that the Pope has falsified the writings of the Fathers, of which Mr. Nameless can read the 35th chapter of the main defense. That I do not understand my words absolutely and universally (quite generally and unconditionally), an honest man can see, among other things, from the fact that I say (p. 91. fg.): We can prove all the articles of our Christian, evangelical faith from the still existing Patribus (Church Fathers): so the Pope must not have scratched out everything.

before ancient times. ³⁴⁾ How did this happen? The whole Greek empire began to oppose the Pope soon after the year of Christ 400, so how is it that the Pope has searched every corner of the world, scraped out all the Christian books among the Greeks, Turks, Moors, in Spain, among the pagans, all of Asia and Africa? Be prepared, dear Nihil ad rem!

The Third Question. [^]

It is desired that one or even more of them be named who have been saved by the new gospel, or more clearly, by the new (as they call it) Evangelical-Catholic faith, that is, in a word, by the Lutheran doctrine of the time of Martin Luther's apostasy ³⁵⁾. Such a one should be expressly named

34) I do not mean this alone, but this is readily confessed by understanding papists (*Lutheranism*, p. 59 f.), but for this reason he may well have falsified some books, though not all, but some, since he became powerful: though not all, yet some have been scratched out. But anyone who has been caught stealing several times is not believed much anywhere. Therefore, Mr. Nameless does not unfairly seal his quite unrhymed exception (objection) with these words: Send yourself, you dear Nihil ad rem! (sc. Domini Anonymi, cujus inepta replica immediate praecesserat (namely what Mr. Nameless brings forward, whose foolish reply follows shortly before).

35) It is strange, however, that Mr. Nameless so eagerly desires to name a man who has been saved by our doctrine, since the papists readily confess that no one, be he

and pointed out with the finger ³⁶): This Procop, this Peter, this Girg was a good Lutheran and died and was saved after the time of Luther.

Answer by Dr. August Pfeiffer. [^]

No one has ever been saved in any other way (p. 107). ³⁷ Adam already (Gen 3:15) and many thousands and thousands have also been saved with us. The Lord already knows his own. Now my honored gentlemen have the thorough reply of their father-in-law and brother-in-law, from which it appears that he has not grasped the *statum quaestionis* (actual point of contention) ³⁸), and I ask very kindly ³⁹) that you will kindly give him what he desires; and that you do not desire a long, tedious, roundabout answer ⁴⁰), but with a few: yes or no.

who he may, can be assured of salvation in their religion, as is proved in *Lutheranism*, p. 131.

36) What? Should one point fingers at the saints in heaven like that? An *pulchrum est digito monstrari, et dici, hic est* (Is it such a beautiful thing to point fingers at someone and say: see, this is the man)?

37) Whoever cannot or will not believe it, let him prove the opposite.

38) It is to be hoped that both question and questioner will be so conceived that the latter will not choke himself loose, but the latter will become the scorn of the children.

39) The blows of the lover mean well, but the kiss of an enemy is a dishonor (Proverbs 26:6).

40) It is said: *Dum brevis esse laboro, obscurus fio* (I wish to be brief and thereby become incomprehensible). The dear gentlemen are not served by a thorough and detailed answer: for then they are seized and cannot move any further. They would rather have everything up front and out of hand, so that they can still keep their excuses.

As an example ⁴¹⁾ when asked: Who was the first to move the imperial chair from Rome to somewhere else? Answer: Constantine the Great. Was anyone among the Christians holy after the time of the apostles? Answer: yes. St. Laurentius, Sebastianus, Anthony the Great, Athanasius, Augustine, Basil the Great, Heinricus, Beonardus, Wenceslaus, Martinus, Afra, Elisabeth, Hedwig, Brigitta. Has anyone been saved by the Mohammedan

41) How soon you realize when someone is a good didacticus (teacher)! Otherwise, however, Mr. Nameless could also have provided other edifying questions as an example, to which it would be possible to answer honestly, completely, without any addition, as for example: Has there been a woman among the popes? Answer: Yes, [Joan VIII](#), as impartial Historici (historians) testify in large numbers (Vid. Gerh. de Eccl. §. 179. Gisb. Voëtius Disp. Select. P. V. p. 445. s. It would then be the case that one would accept Stephanus Forcatulus' conjecture (ap. Salmuthum Not. ad Pancir. P. 1. p. 411) that this man was a man when he assumed the papal dignity and was later metamorphosed (transformed) into a woman, quod credat Judæus Apella (believe it, whoever will)!

Likewise: Have there also been popes who falsified the holy Nicene Council? Answer: Yes, Zosimus, Boniface I, Celestine I, as proven in the main defense c. 36.

Likewise: Who was the right Pope from 1380 to 1417? Answer: Non liquet (we don't know!).

sect? Answer: Non liquet ⁴²⁾, no one is known.

So, gentlemen, if the preachers cannot answer, they would have been relieved of the trouble long ago if they had answered and confessed publicly before the whole world in all honesty, roundly and without any addition: Non liquet, one does not know ⁴³⁾. And there one will be able to progress slowly, and the Jesuit fathers will already put forward a little deeper questions ⁴⁴⁾ and thus instruct them further bit by bit ⁴⁵⁾. That is why your father-in-law and brother-in-law ⁴⁶⁾

42) Non liquet (one does not know) is answered dubitatively (doubtfully) if one leaves the matter undecided and does not know how to resolve (decide) on yes or no (Conf. Er. Polletus Histor. Fori Rom. 1. 4. c. 15. p. 391). Is therefore Mr. Nameless either a wicked Catholic, who still doubts and leaves it a moot point whether anyone has been saved by the Mohammedan sect? or a wicked grammarian (linguist), who does not know what non liquet means? However, I don't want to argue about that. Both can be true.

43) Nothing will come of it this year, but the Jesuit Fathers may yet better reflect on questions.

44) If they bring deeper questions (but that they are not too deep and taken from the low C), then the answer should also fall deeper.

45) For this, you most honorable must also be somewhat learned, (but not much in particular) HH. Fathers of the Jesuits have many thanks! But we kindly ask you to proceed little by little, so that we do not soon become too clever.

adds in vain his long list of Lutheran books, to which the Jesuits have not yet replied. For how do they want to have anything further to do with the Lutherans, as long as the Lutherans do not even understand the *Statum quaestionis* (the real question) ⁴⁷).

And if one wants to do something about faith, they always come out with the grammar and want it to be known all over the world that they have leafed through Despauterius and Clenardus ⁴⁸). Yes, they linger wherever they can, for example over a little word or a verse, whether it is rhymed, whether it is beautifully spoken in German or even make an *incidens* (create an incident), so that they may not proceed to the main thing ⁴⁹).

They present themselves as

46) Unfortunately in vain, for I hear that the answer will be very unfortunate.

47) Why didn't Mr. Nameless leave me alone, because he also blames me for not reaching the *status quaestionis* (the real issue)? Nothing is achieved by boasting alone, any dreamer can do that. *Manus nostrae oculatae sunt, credunt quod vident* (our hands have eyes, they believe what they see). Now is no longer the time when all the Dutch *suspiria* (flatulence) of the Pope and his priests are taken for oracles (oracles of God).

48) So let Mr. Nameless leaf diligently through not only Despauterius and Clenardus, but also Caleptnus and Dasypodius, and indeed through all the Jesuitical *Bachantentröster* (mnemonic devices for lazy students) one after the other, and see whether my *Lutheranism* can be refuted from them and the twenty points mentioned here in the first chapter thoroughly resolved (rejected).

49) This is our bitter complaint about you in general and about Mr. Nameless in particular. He has truly taken the main thing by the scruff of the neck in this matter! We poor Evangelicals will probably feel it for a while now.

if they wanted to discuss theology, and do not understand what catechism is ⁵⁰), as can already be seen in the papal catechism by [Johann Friedrich Mayer](#), Superintendent and Doctor of Holy Scripture, published in Leipzig by Christian Kirchner in 1676, where he ascribes this to all Jesuits, while he does not understand the difference between catechism and *theologia morali* (the moral doctrine) etc. ⁵¹), just as the godfather

in general and about Mr. Nameless in particular. He has truly taken the main thing by the scruff of the neck in this matter! We poor Evangelicals will probably feel it for a while now.

50) Should we not understand what the Catechism is? Est brevis et perspicua rudiorum in fundamento religionis fidei et vitae Christianae e scriptis Prophetis et Apostolicis petita institutio (it is a brief and clear instruction for beginners in the initial foundations of the doctrine of faith and the Christian life, drawn from the prophetic and apostolic writings). The boys here know this. Shame on Mr. Nameless for speaking so boldly. Lying is a shameful thing to a man, and he can never come to honor (Sit. 20, W).

51) Just as if in the *Theologia morali* (moral doctrine) (which is otherwise also occupied circa *praecepta decalogi*, as a part of the Catechism [dealing with the Ten Commandments]) something could be true that is false in the Catechism. However, Mr. Johann Friedrich Mayer does not need my defense, he is old enough, ask him, let him speak for himself (John 9:2). He will know how to meet Mr. Nameless, if only he will register, pro dignitate (according to dignity).

and brother-in-law in his preface does not understand the difference between commandment and institution. ⁵²⁾ Should the Jesuits ⁵³⁾, such learned men, deal with such people about more profound things than they can grasp? Who would not be laughed through the fingers if he wanted to discuss rhetoric (oratory) with a blacksmith? ⁵⁴⁾

52) To speak briefly of the matter, the difference between commandment and institution is a useless cricket, which Greg. de Valentia Tom. 4. Disp. 6. q. 8. punct. 5. p. 1322. and Martinus Becanus Disp. de Commun. sub utraque c. 1. and others have concocted, since they pretend that something can be instituted by God and yet not be commanded, in order to assert that both forms are indeed instituted by Christ, but are therefore not commanded to all. But their mouths have been honestly shut by Meisner, Phil. sobr. (P. 2. sect. 2. c. 3. q. 14. p. 1035. fg., Gerhard. de Coena §. 34. p. 28., Hülsem. in Form. Conc. art. 13. sect. 1. §. 1. fg., which clearly prove that for whom God has appointed something, He has commanded it eo ipso (precisely thereby). Although not all men are commanded to use the Lord's Supper absolutely and without distinction, yet those who use it are commanded to keep it according to Christ's institution without addition, substitution or alteration. Defiant Mr. Nameless, and get to work on the three! O that poor bunglers would stay at home!

53) It is best that they say it themselves or have it said by their students, otherwise you wouldn't know. They are indeed so badly learned, but not all of them, not even most of them: Sunt rari nantes in gurgite vasto (it is a large body of water on which only a few swim). We already know, praise God, how valuable their art is and are not at all afraid of their profundity. Si ipsis machaera est et nobis urbina est domi (our weapons are no worse than theirs).

54) I praise you, Father and Lord of heaven and earth,

Now this also should not be forgotten, that if one wants to answer, one should be mindful of Kedd's rules, which are all too often prescribed to preachers ⁵⁵, namely that Calvinists, Socinianists or other abominable heretics could not make use of the same answer in the same way ⁵⁶).

that you have hidden these things (your secrets) from the wise and prudent (speakers) and have revealed them to babes, yes, Father, for so it has been pleasing in your sight (Matt. 11:25). Nevertheless, let Mr. Nameless be assured that there are also among us such smiths who make fetters to chastise fools. Let him beware for his own person and come no more!

55) Satis pro imperio (often enough, if you had to command here), We have never conceded to you that you should dictate rules to us as you please. Extra territorium jus dicenti impune non paretur (whoever speaks justice beyond his borders will not be obeyed).

56) Similarly, the papists have been told all too often that if they want to prove that their church is the true church, they should prove it with such reasons as Jews and Turks could not also use against Christ and Christians. According to Mr. Nameless' wish and will, however, I have above (p. 170) provided such an argument (reason) for our church that no papist, Calvinist, Socinianist or other heretic will be able to use for himself. Let him also in this case be recommended (recommended) my *Lutheranism* (p. 90 fg.). Since I have already given so much information that there is no other religion which, without praëjudicio (presupposition) and other abstractness, bases its faith on bright and clear passages of the divine Word, since the articles of faith are dealt with ex professo et ceu in propria vel principali sede (so quite deliberately that they are principal and core passages).

There are indeed many other unrhymed pieces here and there ⁵⁷), which the gentlemen's godfathers and brothers-in-law will easily notice about themselves; so that it may well be felt that the dear Doctor may have acted terribly too hastily ⁵⁸). It is therefore my kindly request that you remind him of this quite gently, that he take the work in hand again for a while ⁵⁹), it might perhaps turn out better the next time ⁶⁰).

If he cannot yet find his way into it, I will **gradually** instruct him further at his due request and entreaty.

57) In short, whoever attributes many absurdities to me and proves none, I will honestly, completely, without any addition, and publicly consider him a liar before the whole world until the proof is presented. A thief is not so wicked as a man who is in the habit of lying, but in the end they both go to the gallows (Sir. 20:27).

58) I want to assure Mr. Nameless that there was no need for haste. The questions are already old and hackneyed enough. But he himself does not hurry, but takes another year to consider: whether it is more honest to remain silent or to prostitute his cause once more (to expose it to public scorn)?

59) There was no need to ask, everything was done with pleasure. Mr. Nameless only accept generously.

60) He who delights in the law of the Lord and speaks of his law day and night is like a tree planted by streams of water, which yields its fruit in its season, and its leaves do not wither, and whatever it does turns out well.

But the wicked are not like this, but like chaff scattered by the wind (Ps. 1:2 fg.). And so it will be with Mr. Nameless

with his chaff, which will fly to him again, wherever he wants under the sky, and bring this good teaching with it:

Ah calida gaudens posthac formace quiescas,

Ex chartis celebris non potes esse tuis!

(In future, you'd better stay at home by the warmth of the stove;

Never would you gain honor with your scribbling!)

The Still Established ^

Lutheranism before Luther,

whereby

Father Arnold Engel's
improved

Nihil ad rem

is finally and conclusively dispatched

by

Dr. August Pfeiffer.

For a long time I wondered whether Father Engel's last note, which he entitled "The somewhat improved Nihil ad rem", [Nothing on the matter], needed any reply, since I could find nothing in it that could give the slightest cause for concern to a sane person who has read my Duplicam or Defended Lutheranism before Luther.

There, in the first chapter of the same, I had presented him with twenty points, to which he had failed to reply in his rejoinder, had also, for the sake of better correctness, propounded everything syllogistic (in conclusion) or, since *res facti* (fact) was, *liquidio* (irrefutably) remonstrated (presented) by witnesses, so that he could have found the *nervum rei* (the actual fact) without much reflection; But in his repeated reply he did not assume (touch upon) a single one of these twenty points, much less answer them formally, since I had previously stipulated to accept *fine silentium pro consensu* (that if he remained silent, this should be considered a concession). Must I therefore presume from him in this case either a great ignorance in theological controversies or a malicious obduracy against the bright and clear truth, that he, although he is *αυτοκατάκριτος* (sufficiently

convicted), nevertheless does not wish to give God the honor and place to the truth.

In the second chapter I had properly reassumed his three fundamental questions (listed in his own words) and proved quite clearly for each one that it was

1. unnecessary to answer,
2. easy to answer and
3. easy to reject with counter-questions.

He should now have correctly explained and proved for each question that 1. the answer was indeed necessary, 2. my given answer was not correct or sufficient, 3. the counter-question was easy to answer. But he passes over the first and third with complete, though not too general (noble) silence, since he must nevertheless confess that, as far as the first is concerned (the necessity of the question), a righteous Christian or Christian teacher should, according to Paul's admonition, refrain from asking foolish and useless questions, considering that they only give birth to quarrels (2 Tim. 2:23). He should refrain from such people who are addicted to questioning, from which arises envy, strife, blasphemy, evil suspicion, scholastic quarrels of those who have broken minds and are deprived of the truth (1 Tim. 6:4). But as far as the third (of the counter-question) is concerned, a counter-question to a question is free, since an unreasonable or impudent Adversarius (opponent) can sometimes be brought ad *εξεμωθίαν* (to silence) or even ad absurdum (so that he can go no further), just as Christ himself drove his adversaries into silence in this way (Matt. 11:24). We are free to do so, especially since **you papists are not our judges, but**

our counterparts, and therefore not only authorized to question us, but also to answer us. From my direct answer (to the question itself) you have indeed endeavored to offset one and the other, but you have brought forward nothing for which I have not already given you complete satisfaction, as I gladly leave the judgment to every reasonable reader. And in this way I could have spared myself the trouble of this appendix.

But because this time you have taken it upon yourselves to include the general lie of Elector John's apostasy and the missives (circulars) issued by Elector John Frederick, as well as other notorious calumnies (recognized slander) against the doctrine and several distinguished confessors and righteous teachers of our church, I have nevertheless, both for the sake of truth and out of a special obligation, so that I am most humbly bound to the high electoral house for the sake of many graces and good deeds, I also want to answer these other harangues, but on the condition that I will never again engage in such harangues (which also ultimately bring you little honor, as they are not suitable to be placed in libraries, but belong to other places where there are human statutes), since the apostle Paul departed and faithfully discourages all honest Christians from doing so with these words: Avoid a heretical man when he has been admonished once and again (this has now happened to you) and know that such a one is wrong and sins more than he who has condemned himself (Tit. 3:10-11).

But the fact that I have been a little more frank in this answer and have told the Father the bitter truth with a laugh, so to speak, is something he should not attribute to me, but to himself and his own way of writing. For since he has not dealt with any realia (presented facts) in his essay, nor has he given a proper answer, but has only wandered and fantasized, out of sheer desperation quaevis obvia (grasped whatever comes into his head) without any reflection, in order to somehow excuse himself or to cast a stain on our teachings and our teachers in the eyes of his own people, I have wanted to chastise his rashness a little and, following Salomoni's admonition, answer him according to his folly, so that he will not think himself wise. If a wicked servant runs away, then one must follow him on his strange detours, even against his will, not qua eundum, but qua itur (where one should go, but where he ran away), since one would also take care of viam regiam (the straight road).

There is therefore nothing more to be done in this matter than that Father [Engel] should either give God the glory and at least confess with his silence that he is not equal to this matter: or, because these questions have now been sufficiently debated (discussed), he should endeavor to advance new, more important and wiser things against the disputed articles of our religion, namely from the Holy Scriptures, as the one principle of faith (reason for faith), to which it must finally come after long questioning and refutation.

If he dares to do the latter, well then, let him come forth freely in public, put his honest name before his writings (for not good angels, but the light-shunning evil angels, dwell and muse in darkness), proceed in proper good order as an intelligent disputator (learned fighter), and I will treat him with such discretion (respect) as he perhaps does not now seek from me; as I hereby promise, as soon as he has published his books: *Theses fidei orthodoxae decisas* (Decisions on questions of orthodox confession) and *Lutherus Orthodoxus and Heterodoxus* (Luther as Orthodox and Heterodox), of which he has had copies made (which he has promised), I hereby promise not to delay him with my well-meant concerns about them, but to answer briefly and concisely to everything, whether there is still hope of winning his poor soul. Meanwhile I wish with Paul (Ephes. 1:17 f.): That the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, may give you the Spirit of wisdom and revelation for the knowledge of Himself, and enlightened eyes for your understanding, that you may know what is the hope of your calling, and what are the riches of His glorious inheritance in His saints, and what is the exceeding greatness of His power in us who believe according to the working of His mighty power which He has wrought in Christ.

Date Leipzig Anno 1683, Sept. 18.

The Slightly Improved *Nihil ad rem.* [^]

(With necessary annotations.)

As I feel, you, noble, firm, highly respectable gentlemen, to whom I attributed my answer, have done something fruitful (for which I thank you most sincerely), because your lord brother-in-law, godfather and intercessor with God, Dr. August has clearly grasped the *statum quaestionis* (the actual question in dispute) ¹⁾, so that I am confident that he will understand the rest, in which he is stumbling, even if his brothers-in-law and fathers-in-law persist in giving him a helping hand ²⁾.

Although he tries hardest to prove in his reply that we are not much better, as if he would be satisfied if only we, together with the Lutherans, did not count for much ³⁾,

1) How could such praise from such a highly learned Jesuit not tickle me and make me proud!

2) It is certainly true: *Non uno ictu cadit arbor* (the tree does not fall in one fell swoop), Fr. Engel still has to smear a lot of such tricks before he will make me and my patrons papal. *Non defensoribus istis tempus eget* (time has no need of such defenders).

3) That's pretty sharp! Father Engel perhaps thinks that I am like that envious person who would like to lose one eye just so that the other would lose both,

meanwhile he does not realize ⁴⁾ that if our Roman Catholic faith (as the Lutherans otherwise pretend) had not declined in any way, it would by no means have required a reforming Luther to improve our church in order to reduce (restore) everything to its ancient state. If we do not pass well because of this, then it is better for a Lutheran doctor to pass, to make up for our shortcomings ⁵⁾, but not to excuse himself because of our infirmity ⁶⁾.

or like that impudent harlot before King Solomon who said, "It is neither yours nor mine" (1 Kings 3:26) *Scilicet ex suo ingenio alios judicat* (because he judges others according to his attitude). But he does me wrong. Praise God, I am not yet driven by necessity to make such an unreasonable and desperate resolution. *Non obtusa adeo gestamus pectora Poeni* (we are not yet such hardened people)!

4) Well, who can remember everything? But who can remember the intention (purpose) that Fr. Engelhad developed for me from the answer I gave?

5) That is indeed my intention (intention). But nothing will stick with Fr. Engel and his stubborn people. *Receptivum recipit non ad modum inprimentis, sed ad modum suæ receptivitatis* (if one presses something into a soft material, the latter absorbs what is pressed in only as far as its receptivity allows, not as far as the person pressing it in wishes). *Interdum medica plus valet arte malum* (sometimes the disease is more powerful than the medicine), if you crush a fool in a mortar with a pestle like grits, his foolishness will not leave him (Proverbs 27:22).

6) To ask a counter-question means with Fr. Engel as much as to excuse himself with the frailty of another. Now

In the first question as to which of the popes was the first to apostatize, he does not understand *Statum quaestionis* (the actual question) 7). Because he thinks it is a question of who was the first Pope to sin 8). And this we allow, that on the one hand it may not always be known (just as it is not known when the angels have sinned; when the Jews have become Pharisees; who first counterfeited the coin, etc., all of which is done secretly and unnoticed); but the question is, which Pope, as Pope, as head of the holy church, as general teacher and father on the chair of Peter, has publicly apostatized from the true faith by uttering and publicizing (publishing) a scattered false doctrine, so that he, by papal authority, by this falsehood of his, prescribed to the whole church

Christ Himself did this (Matt. 21:24); how can He possibly account for this infirmity in Father Engel's view?

7) Oh, how did I get so soon back on the lazy side? Shortly before, Fr. Engel said that I had grasped the *Statum quaestionis* (the actual question) much better; how can that be if I don't understand it at all? *Mendacem, oportet esse memorem* (the liar must have a good memory).

8) But how does Fr. Engel know that this is what I mean? I have not said it anywhere in explicit words, so he cannot conclude it definitively from my answer, nor look into my heart; and if he could do so at once, he would still find that I do not understand the question *de errore morali, but doctrinali* (of the error in life, but in doctrine), who erred in doctrine and falsified it? For if the question is asked in this way: who was the first Pope

and imposed on it, has been the first to lead his Christians into a heresy? ⁹⁾

Dr. Pfeiffer, however, by answering that one could not know, seems to me as if I were asked approximately: when or at what hour today all the great bells were rung in our house and all the great guns were fired, and I answered: I do not know, just as I do not know at what hour the carpenter's boy got up? when the gatekeeper had breakfast? or which horse was led out of the stable first? ¹⁰⁾

to have sinned, the papists themselves cannot exclude Peter. For there is no difference here, they are all sinners and lack the glory they should have before God (Rom. 3:23).

9) Father Engel has already been sufficiently convinced that we do not think that the Pope immediately promulgated (publicly proclaimed) this and that heresy by firing up all the heavy artillery and ringing all the bells, but that he initially introduced it in a malicious, thieving manner until it became established and could no longer be resisted; Fr. Engel himself admits that one cannot know when the Jews became Pharisees, why? Because the Pharisees did not ring any bells. But what if the Jews had also said to Christ and the apostles, we do not believe that the Pharisees are wrong, you tell us which Pharisee first publicized (publicly proclaimed) a false doctrine on Mose's chair and forced the people to do so. Whatever Christ and the Apostles could have answered here, we can also answer Father Engel and his ilk.

10) Oh, dear beautiful Similia (parables)! Must not your father be a man of good invention!

Is this not *nihil ad rem*? We are not asking here about a secret theft ¹¹⁾, but about a public riot or outrage.

On the other hand, Dr. Pfeiffer answers: either it would be Boniface III or Gregory VII or Leo X ¹²⁾. If so, he confesses ¹³⁾ that other ancient popes, several hundred years earlier, taught a true faith from which the Lutherans had fallen away.

11) Yes, that is what is being asked. The question is about a theft that was initially committed secretly and then broken out in public (e.g. the chalice at the Lord's Supper). It goes without saying that if someone wants to steal something, he does not make a commotion, does not ring the bell or unloose the pieces, but sneaks in and enters secretly, so that one can know as little, indeed much less, about it than when the carpenter's boy got up; only when the theft becomes known, there is certainly tumult and unrest. Can Father Engels' English mind not even grasp such lofty speculations (thoughts)?

12) I have said that it is as much for us to make Fr. Engel the first Pope (as the papists describe him) as he wishes; it is enough for me to say that the Pope *in praesenti* (the present Pope) leads false doctrine and has really departed from the true faith. If this is wrongly said, let Father Engel prove it. But if it is rightly spoken, what further trouble is he to me?

13) Not at all. *Conditio nil ponit in esse* (when I state something conditionally, I do not claim that it really exists). But is this not silly enough: if Boniface III is the first Pope, then the preceding popes must have had the right faith; for, dear one, if Boniface III is the first Pope, i.e. the first to call himself *caput visibile Ecclesiae et infallibilem iudicem fidei* (the visible head of the

Dr. Pfeiffer goes on to say that this was the first such apostasy who claimed that Communion under one form was an article of faith¹⁴).

Behold, dear sirs, how shameful it is not to know the difference between faith and commandment. For communion under one form is not an article of faith, but a commandment of the church¹⁵), just as it was forbidden by the commandment of the holy apostles not to eat the strangled flesh and blood (Acts 15:19)¹⁶). And he who transgressed such a commandment, though he sinned grossly against

Church and the infallible judge in matters of faith), then no others have preceded him. Just as when I say that Julius was the first Roman emperor, it goes without saying that I do not statuare (assume) any previous Roman emperors.

14) But Father, where is the answer to my syllogism (conclusion)?

15) Communion under one form is not a Christian church commandment, but a prohibition of the Antichrist, who thereby elevates himself above everything that is called God and worship.

16) Rhyme it! The apostolic ordinance concerning blood and suffocation was only an *ordinatio ad certum tempus et locum restricta* (an ordinance given for a certain time and place), not a perpetual ordinance, which should last until the Last Day, or until the Lord comes, as Paul speaks of Holy Communion (1 Cor. 11:26), but which was intended only for a certain time and for people to avoid scandal, *studio promovendae συμπολιτείας Judaico-Ethnicae* (to enable the Jews and Gentiles to live together) (*ut synagoga cum honore sepeliretur* [so that the synagogue would be buried with honor]), which is why the Christians in general were not bound to it. See further on this (1 Cor. 8:8, f. Col. 2:16).

obedience, nevertheless did not become a heretic, just as he becomes a heretic who eats meat with the Catholics during the fasts. Meanwhile Dr. Pfeiffer (p. 199 f.) is surprised that I make a distinction between commandment (decree) and between the articles of faith, since it is an article of faith that the dog of Tobiah wagged his tail ¹⁷). Thus (p. 212 f.) he thinks that the catechism and theologia moralis (the moral doctrine) are one. Because what is false in the catechism cannot be true in moral theology ¹⁸). And (p. 213)

17) I am quite surprised when I consider the papists' hypothesis (assertion), since they consider quicquid sub revelationem divinam cadit, what is revealed by God, to be an article of faith; hence [Fr. Tanner](#), also a Jesuit, is forced to confess at Regensburg that it is also an article of faith that Tobiah's dog wagged its tail. But if this is an article of faith, why do they not want to regard God's commandment as an article of faith? Does the tail of Tobiah's dog serve more for faith than God's commandment? So Father Engel, to get out of this dispute, can do no better than to refute Father Tanner, give a better definition (explanation) of the articles of faith and be satisfied.

18) I have said that what is true in the Theologia moralis (moral teaching) cannot be false in the Catechism. Likewise: Theologia moralis (the moral doctrine) versire also circa praecepta Decalogi (deal also with the ten commandments) (suggest Fr. Engel only looks up Herm. Busenbaum's Medull. Theol. Mor. L 3. de praeceptis Decalogi & Ecclesiae, which is a part of the Catechism); does it follow from this that the Theologia moralis and the Catechism ut sic (taken as a whole) are one and that there is no difference between them? O Corydon,

he says that the difference between the institution and the commandment is a useless whim, and refers to the most learned of his people, who do not know this difference. And nevertheless he holds it against me above (p. 199) that I seemed to him to mix or confound the two ¹⁹).

Finally, he asks the Catholics to name someone who was the first Pope. But he also forbids them to name Peter and the other ancient first Popes (whom Luther refers to), especially not a good one, but a vicious one. Oh, isn't that ridiculous enough?

Corydon, quæ te dementia cepit (O good fellow, where is thy understanding)?

19) Fr. Engel makes a vain distinction between institution and commandment. The same distinction I hold with other theologians in this matter to be null and void, for what Christ has instituted, he has obligated (committed) to instead of commandment, not indeed promiscuously (without distinction) all and every man, but those for whom the institution was made or who avail themselves of it. For example, not all men are commanded to marry indiscriminately, but those who cannot live chastely apart from marriage and wish to marry are commanded to observe certain marriage laws which they should not transgress. Thus the supper is not commanded to be used by all men without distinction, but those who need it, or communicants, are bound by Christ's institution. But since Father Engel once so sharply emphasizes he difference between institution and commandment and yet subsequently fails to take note of it himself, one must rightly remind him of this, so that he becomes more witty.

But why is Pfeiffer afraid of Peter? ²⁰⁾ Because the Lutherans, just as they do not keep the commandments of other Popes, do not keep Peter's commandment either ²¹⁾, for he (Acts 15:19) forbade Christians to eat certain foods ²²⁾. Now because Luther wanted to bring everything back to the ancient apostolic state,

20) The ridiculous Engel uses poor discretion everywhere. I had asked who the first Pope was, but protested that I could not estimate (recognize) Peter and the first pious bishops of Rome, who kept themselves within their own jurisdiction and terminis (boundaries), as popes, because they were not entitled to the description of Pope according to the papists' opinion, since the Pope is Episcopus Oecumenicus (the universal bishop) and caput visibile et infallibile Ecclesiae (the visible head of the Church, incapable of error), which Peter and the first bishops of the Roman Church did not demand. Is that why I am afraid of Peter? No, I love him, I represent his honor and I do not want to have him soiled with the title of Pope, as the papists take it.

21) Peter's commandment (although it is attributed to James, not Peter [Acts 15:13-20], so that it seems that Father Engel must be very careful about the Pope's biblical prohibition, even if he is not a layman), the papists take as little notice of it as we do, because they also eat sausages. And if Fr. Engel is presented with a hare or partridge, he will not ask for long whether they have been slaughtered, shot or strangled. Is the commandment of St. Peter kept according to the scholarly opinion of Father Engel?

22) Such an apostolic prohibition of eating is not given to all Christians in general, much less recommended as a meritorious work, but is prescribed by the apostles only to certain Christians for certain measures and times and with certain intentions, namely to avoid offense.

why did he not introduce or improve it again for you as well as for us? ²³⁾

On the second question, that only one is mentioned who before Luther believed the same as Luther, Dr. Pfeiffer introduces (cites) the apostles and evangelists as an example: for they had believed just what Luther and we. ²⁴⁾

Hence Fr. Engel cannot prove from this the Pope's prohibition of meat, so that he weighs down the whole of Christendom.

23) If the ancient apostolic state does not require eating blood and asphyxiated food, why do you papists do it yourselves? But if it is (as it cannot be otherwise) an order directed to certain people *ad interim* (until further notice), which is only considered to make it easier for Christians living among the Jews to win them over and which is abolished after the complete demise of the Jewish state, why does Father Engel rub our ears with this? He reads of the continuous abolition of such apostolic order of time in Baronius T. 1. Annal. ad. ann. Chr. 51. §. 24. p. 498. Yes Augustine (T. 6. 1. 32. contra Faustum c. 13 coi. 484) says already in his time: *Quis jam hoc Christianus observat, ut turdos vel minutiores aviculas non attingat, nisi quarum sanguis effusus est? aut leporem non edat, si manu a cervice percussus, nullo cruento vulnere occisus est? Et qui forte pauci adhuc tangere ista formidant, a coeteris irridentur* (Who among the Christians still keeps the commandment that he should not eat pigeons or other small fowl unless their blood has first run out? or that he should not eat a hare if it has been killed by a blow behind the ears without a bleeding wound? And whoever still binds himself to it, and they are few, will be laughed at by the rest).

24) Father may prove the opposite.

Secondly, he tries (proves) it from books which he says are nowhere to be found, but threatens very much that if they still existed, he would clearly try (prove) it. This, too, is probably nihil ad rem. ²⁵⁾

In answer to the third question: who among the Lutherans from Luther's time has been saved, Pfeiffer first of all names sainted John Brenz, who teaches: if you want to be eternally damned, keep the commandments; ²⁶⁾ who believes in two gods, the old one from eternity and the young one ²⁷⁾ who was born of human nature sixteen hundred years ago; who believes that Christ's body and blood are not only in all bread and wine, but also in all cheese and beer

25) That means, I think, a rain of fools! I prove it from books which, according to my own statement, are nowhere to be found! Non entis nullæ sunt passiones (what does not exist, nothing can be said of it). I only say that not all the books of the previous Doctors of the Church are to be found, and therefore one cannot insist so strongly on their complete consensus (agreement). However, I am always ready to prove Luther's doctrine piece by piece from the books of the Doctors of the Church that are still extant, in specie (in particular) from Augustine, even though this has already been done by others, to whom I referred Father Engel. Is the nihil ad rem (not belonging to the matter) whistled? I have indeed whistled ad rem (belonging to the matter) (if it should be called whistled), but Fr. Engel did not want to dance, that I make use of the expression from Matt. 11:17.

26) To answer briefly and well: It is not true. Fr. Engel, reject these words from Brenz or remain a calumniator and liar in the meantime!

27) This is also not true. Prove it, Engel!

and so on. etc. ²⁸); who introduced the ubiquity (omnipresence of the body of Christ), which was recognized in Dresden, Leipzig and Wittenberg around the year 1571 for a *Renovatio omnium Haeresium* (renewal of all heresies). He also mentions the sainted Aegidius Hunnius, who alone in half a preface (preface) of seven sheets committed over a hundred brand-new lies. ²⁹) *Test Conrado Andreæ* (according to the testimony of C. Andreä) in his truthful Luther etc. ³⁰). They are saints!

28) Where did Brenz write this? He taught the omnipresence of human nature, but did not introduce it first. But if Fr. Engel wants to have it proven from the Holy Scriptures and *Patribus* (the Fathers of the Church), then let him come forward and he will be gladly and willingly granted it.

29) This is a hundredfold lie by Fr. Engel, which will be shoved back down his throat until he proves it. The Jesuit Adam Tanner, in the first chapter of his *Apologetici*, has indeed set forth a hundred lies of the preachers (Lutheran preachers), which they are supposed to have committed in the preface to their *Apologeticus* (defense treatise), but he merely set them forth and did not prove or convict them of them. Engel repeats this liar without proof, *Ab ove majori discit arare minor* (from the old bull the young one learns to plow). It seems that Fr. Engel is of the same kind of angel, since the chief one is a liar from the beginning and a father of lies (John 8:44).

30) That is the right one. *Huic committas, si quid recte curatum velis* (only commit when something is to be done properly!) Fr. Engel only looks up Dr. Phil. Heilbrunner's *Postcolloquium Ratisbonense* and innocent Luther, there he will see what a cousin Conrad Andreä is. Brenz and Hunnius, by the way, will remain saints before such an evil angel.

I am surprised, however, that Pfeiffer forgot his own surname ³¹⁾ and was not blessed before all others whom his patriarch or Saxon pope ³²⁾ canonized (canonized): Two Lutheran Pfeifers (so it says in *Theat. Diabol. fol. 142. 145. in Dipnosoph. Luth. F. 268. 269.*), after they had received the Lutheran communion and been comforted by the prebendary Justus Menius with the words, the devil has strangled them, one of whom was found under a hazel bush, the other by a little book near Gleich and Meelburg coal-black and dead ³³⁾; But Luther canonized

31) What is Father Engel's business with my surname, which I inherited from my honest ancestors? I am not a Pfeifer because my name is already that, just as Fr. Engel is not an angel because his name is already that. Has the devil taken a few Pfeifers, what's the matter with me? After all, many angels have become devils without prejudice to Father Engel (and without it harming Father Engel in any way).

32) Who made him that way? Himself? Prove it. Or did his co-religionists do it? which are they? But if neither he nor his co-religionists did it, why is he called so? why do people speak so vainly? *Scilicet hoc nisi dixisses mortuus esses* (you had to say that, it weighs on your heart).

33) The history (story) of these two Pfeifers (so that Fr. Engel makes fun of them) is to be found in Luther's *Table Talk* (c. 9), of the devil and his works (p. 117. edit. Jen. A. 1591). But that Luther should have canonized them and proclaimed them saints is a Father Engel's "truth", i.e. a diabolical lie. Luther says no more than that they could not be condemned outright, even though Satan had power over their bodies,

them both and proclaimed them Lutheran saints in his heaven, where the bugs dance and smell sweetly. But why? Ask Conrad Andreaä. ³⁴⁾

Now the brothers-in-law see what kind of saints Dr. Pfeiffer has: I ask very nicely ³⁵⁾ that they persuade him to insert them into the Lutheran calendar, so that one has something to laugh about. ³⁶⁾

He also names the Elector of Saxony, Hans Friedrich, why not Friederich III or Duke Hans' father, who first subscribed to the Augsburg Confession? He just knows that the first at Lochau was well Catholic ³⁷⁾ separated and forbade Luther to marry, nor

but that their souls could still be preserved because they had repented and converted. Is that really so wrong? Paul says there that he wants to hand over the bloodshedder at Corinth to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, so that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus (1 Cor. 5:5).

34) That's right! He likes to lie just as much as Father Engel.

35) Oh yes, I ask for it myself! Who could deny such a dear Engel anything?

36) *Ridiculum caput* (ridiculous gossip)! Woe to you who laugh here, for you will weep and howl (Luke 6:25).

37) Good Catholic, but by no means papist. For thus writes Luther (who also delivered two funeral orations to this Elector), to Dr. Joh. Rühel (Tit. 2. Jen. f. 527): My most gracious lord, the Elector, departed the day I left you, between five and six, almost at the time when Osterhausen was corrupted, with gentle courage, fresh reason and understanding, has taken the sacrament in both forms and has taken no unction. He also left us without Mass and vigils,

to hold mass in the castle church at Wittenberg. The other, however, fell away from Luther in his dying hour, reunited with the Catholic Church and is repentant, blessedly separated in God. As can be worldly ³⁸⁾ seen from the letter of his son, this same Hans Friedrich, to both dukes in Bavaria, whose certified copy is not only in the great Collegium Societatis Jesu in Prague, but also in Vienna in the Professed House (at that time in 1677 with R. P. Cornelius Gentilotti of the theological faculty dean), as follows:

and yet he was buried in fine splendor. If Fr. Engel has other news, will he let us hear it? He may also point out the electoral mandate, since Dr. Luther is forbidden to take wives. But what else was negotiated pro tempore (according to the circumstances of the time) with the Augustinians concerning the Mass can be read in T. 2. Jen. f. 2. seq. and soon afterwards (p. 9. fg.) Dr. Luther's account of the abuse of the Mass. But Fr. Engel has a good way! He smears into the feast and proves nothing, just as if we were here to give all Jesuit lies room and space.

38) A truly worldly lie, which Father Engel almost compels me to prove in more detail, since he not only sent me this lie about Elector John's apostasy and Elector John Frederick's letters in addition to this hoax, but also had his subordinatos emissarios (subordinate emissaries) spread it from time to time in this electorate. However, so that Father Engel, if he has not yet lost all honor, will not be subject to this in the future, the following serves as good news and thorough information:

Transcript [^] of the above-mentioned letter.

Our kind services, and what we always honor, love and do good before the high-born princes, kind dear uncles. It is with a saddened heart that we announce to both your loved ones that the high-born, our gracious dear Lord and Father, Duke Hans,

Refutation of the above-mentioned letter.

I. I do not see what Fr. Engel and other papists will gain by such poems. For suppose Elector Frederick, John and John Frederick had become papists (as is never to be proved) quid inde? (What follows from this?) Their example gives us no consequence or obligation that we should therefore also become papists, just as the papists will not understand themselves to become Evangelical, even if we could prove to them that Emperor Charles V, Ferdinand I, Maximilian II and others would have died well as Evangelicals.

II. But it is and remains a false spargement (blown out rumor) and an eternally unprovable untruth, so that although Andr. Fabritius (Præfat. Harm. Conf. Aug.), Fr. Nass. (in the Rejection f. 25. 40. and Cent. 5. Verit. Evang. c. 65) Pistorius, Jod. Kedd. Christoph. ab Ungarsdorff (in the Gratulation to the Austrian Estates) and still more recently in 1679 a coward, G. W. I. Philo-Germanus (in his Ephemeridibus of the rise and fall of the Lutheran

Elector of Saxony, passed away on Friday, almost at the ninth seiger (stroke of the hour) to the day, as a Christian prince with death, whose soul the almighty Father through Christ our Lord will have mercy on. The same our dear Lord and Father, of blessed memory, had previously, in his weakness, been prompted by the Spirit of God and thereby heartily moved to turn to the old Christian religion and to reunite with the mother of the holy Christian Church, and also thereupon, according to

Gospel and Melanchthon's Augsburg. Conf.) the most mildly Christian Evangelical electors have wanted to slander, but they were rejected by ours, as Dr. Zeämann (already 72 years ago in the thorough rejection of Ungersdorff's notorious blasphemy p. 318 f.), Dr. Gerhard (Conf. Cathol. 1. 1. gener. Append. p. m. 325), Dr. Schmid (Disp. secul. p. 38) and a few years ago by Dr. Hieron. Brückner, F. S. Hofrathe, (in the thorough presentation, also repeated in the year 1681), even in this present year 1683 by Dr. Abr. Calov. (in discuss. mendaciss? relationis etc.) pro dignitate (according to merit) and have been so illuminated that I cannot sufficiently wonder at Fr. Engels and his like cruel impudence (shamelessness) and impudent whoremongering that they are nevertheless always allowed to come up with such long-spouted lies.

III. As regards in particular Elector. Johann, Luther, together with Philipp Melanchthon, attended him during his illness and his blessed end at Schweinitz, Luther also gave him a splendid testimony of his steadfastness in the evangelical truth in two funeral sermons he preached (which can be found in T. 5 Jen. f. 479), although the report of his apostasy does not quite accord with this.

Christian order, accepted and received all the sacraments, the body of Christ, holy confession and unction in fervent love and humility, and immediately had a printing issued in his dear principality that all new orders of the church should be abolished, that Luther and other preachers and followers of the sect should not be tolerated; and in an elegant testament, burdened us, as a son of his love, with this condition that

IV. But if one wanted to consider Luther's testimony suspicious in this case, the same is to be proved from papists. Abr. Bzovius Annal. Eccl. ad Ann. 1532 writes: vocatos ad decumbentem Lutherum et Melanchthonem, qui eum agonizantem invenerint, sensibus penitus oppressis: agonem diuturnum fuisse et valde durum, eundemque ad tribunal supremi judicis euntem horrendos edidisse rugitus, quos forsitan negotium Lutheranum expresserit: that is, Luther and Melanchthon had been summoned to him in his illness, but they had found him in his final stages. He had died a very difficult death and had cried out terribly against his going to the divine judgment seat, to which the Lutheran cause had perhaps brought him. If this is true, he must not have been converted according to the Papists! Laur. Surius Append. ad Chron. Naucl. p. 619 writes: Excessit e vivis Saxonise Dux Johannes, Lutheri Patronus: There died Duke John of Saxony, Luther's protector. And further: Utinam ille princeps eam constantiam in Catholicae Ecclesiae doctrina retinenda declarasset: Would to God that this prince had shown such steadfastness in the Catholic religion (as in Luther's cause). Joh. Cochläus, Luther's sworn enemy, writes in his *Histor. Mart. Lutheri* of Elector John that he had persisted in the Lutheran confession against the two highest powers and sovereignties. Lud. Guicciardinus *Comm. rer. memorab.* writes: Johannes

the hereditary homage of the subjects and government of the principality should not take place until we confirm with our princely dignities and words and promise that we want to carry out his love's last Christian will in all points, etc. And in honor of God, and in accordance with the promise we have made to our Lord and bodily father, and which we recognize as our debt, we are therefore earnestly resolved in our minds to carry out your love's

Saxo, Septemvir ille, Protestantium Princeps, Lutheri vero Mæcenas et Patronus singularis, mortem obiit, cui par filius, succedens Joh. Fridericus, Lutherum nihilo secius coluit amplexusque est, that is. John, Elector of Saxony, a protesting prince, Luther's special protector, died, who was succeeded by his son John Frederick and, like his father, held the same opinion as Luther. These and similar people must certainly not have heard of the papal lies.

V. Of Elector John Frederick, it is also false that he ever wanted to become a papist. If he had ever had it in his mind, it would have been at the time when he was imprisoned and his life was in danger, especially when he applied for the interim, whereby he heroically made his Evangelical confession of faith and in the written declaration, which he made to His Majesty's delegated secret councillors, the two Granvella and Dr. Georg Sigismund Selden, Vice Chancellor, in Welser's garden in Augsburg on July 5, 1548, he used these words, among others: Therefore also my gracious dear lord and father, of godly memory, I and others, out of good and sound understanding and knowledge, have adhered to the same confession for many years by proper ways and means, until the recognition of a general free and impartial council, whereby my godly Lord and Father NB. has endured to his grave, and I

last will with all diligence, to utterly root out all seductive sects and teachers (into which, unfortunately, his love, we and our subjects have been deceitfully led, and which have not a little annoyed us against your love and other Christians), to hate and persecute their followers and teachers, and to humbly submit to the universal Christian Church, and henceforth, with the help of the Almighty, to establish in our principality a

VI. Thus the letter attributed to him here also betrays itself sufficiently as far as the style of writing is concerned, which is not Saxon, but Bavarian (as can be seen in Dr. Brückner's introduction p. 34), hence the conclusion that it was not a Saxon, but some Bavarian from the hand of the dear Elector or under his name who made such a letter, distributed it and sent it to distinguished places in a malicious manner.

VII. Especially since there are many things in it that go against the obvious historical truth and all reason, so that the poet seems to have been deceitful and malicious, but not inventive enough to be a liar. For example, the letter is dated August 24 in Elector Johann Friedrich's name from Wittenberg, since on the same day the Elector was not in Wittenberg but in Torgau, where he had already departed on August 20. In the letter, Duke Johann Friedrich calls himself Elector Johann's only son, since he had another brother, Duke Johann Ernst, who was studying in Wittenberg at the time, and who died 21 years later, only one year before Elector Johann Friedrich. Should Elector John Friedrich have forgotten him and not thought of his brother? It is

true Christian religion, and if we should be too weak for this Christian work and encounter something burdensome under it, we hereby most kindly request your dear ones, as our innate friends and highly moved princes, lovers and promoters of the old Christian religion, to be helpful and steadfast in this and not to abandon us in times of need, and to have us in our youth and our country and people in such

further reported that Elector John died on Friday almost at the ninth stroke of the hour to the day, since it happened on Tuesday, August 13, 1532 in the morning at 10 o'clock (as Sleidan, Buchholzer, Paul Eber and others testify). It is reported that Elector John made his will shortly before his death in his weakness, as it was made three years before his death. There is also talk of a mandate or printing against Luther and his followers, of which no one else has the slightest knowledge, nor has such a mandate ever been carried out. On the contrary, after the death of his father, Elector John Frederick showed all his will to the University of Wittenberg, summoned Luther and others to the table on August 19, and soon after the beginning of his reign, at the first Diet, discussed with all the estates how the abominations and abuses introduced under the papacy could be completely abolished, as can be sufficiently proven from undeniable documents (records). But how does all this agree with the letter written by Fr. Engel? How his lies melt like butter in the sun!

VIII. Thus also what is reported in this letter of Elector John's elegant testament, is flatly contrary to the true will of the same (as its content, as far as religion

command, as our very friendly and special trust is in your dearest. On the other hand, we wish to prove ourselves to your loved ones with all our ability so that the highly intimate and confidential affection that the House

is concerned, Dr. Zeämann includes in his writing from the original of the Saxon chancellery), as he tells his lords and ladies that they should promote and handle God's Word and gospel, that they should not allow themselves to be turned or frightened by it, neither with threats nor insistence, whether at councils, imperial diets or otherwise. On the other hand, the elegant testament mentioned in the missive is not to be found in any princely Saxon archive.

XI. However, the fact that one refers to the letter found in the Electorate of Bavaria's archives and its certified copy (authenticated copy), which is said to be found here and there in Prague, Vienna, and elsewhere, cannot, despite all the reasons given so far, settle the matter. For it can be admitted and conceded that the letter purporting to be the original is now in the Electorate of Bavaria's archives (notwithstanding the fact that the certified copies differ in several words), but the question is whether the same letter purporting to be the original is the true original of Elector Johann Friedrich's letter? If it is, then the supposed original must be presented to the most illustrious successors of Elector Johann Friedrich *ad recognoscendum* (for recognition), hand and seal held against other correct, unsuspecting, undeniable letters of the same Elector and thus the truth or falsity of the same brought to light. Nor is it even plausible that Elector John Frederick should have so imploringly asked the two dukes of Bavaria for advice and assistance in this matter, since not only did he not have to expect any

of Bavaria and Saxony had for each other years ago, as your loved ones undoubtedly know, may once again be refreshed and maintained in a friendly manner.

particular hardship in this work, but also, since some hardship and difficulty would have befallen him, he would have had his cousin Duke George of Saxony and other papal spiritual and secular princes at hand, who would have helped him with all their will. Not to mention the fact that not only did the desired envelope from Bavaria fail to materialize, but also that no written reply at all can be found in the Saxon archives, so that, according to all the circumstances, it is a vain rotten fish that any papist would have been so bold as to pass off as good.

X. The fictitious letter also runs counter to other undeniable records and reports. For example, that in the year 1532 Elector John helped to obtain the religious peace from the imperial majesty with great effort and much expense until a council was held, which he would probably have let stand if he had had some affection for the papacy or some doubt about the Evangelical religion. Luther wrote to the Most Reverend Elector in the same matter during his illness, and was also answered by the Elector, whereupon Luther himself visited him in his illness and was present at his death, so that no time at all can be seen when the apostasy should have taken place, as the above-mentioned writers prove and explain even more extensively. Now, my dear Fr. Engel, how do you stand with the lie? Where is your mouth now? I would like to say from Judges 9:38. Do you still believe that Elector John, in his dying hour, fell away from Luther, and Elector John Frederick wrote the above-mentioned and otherwise slandered letter with the same intention? Then bring up better documents (proofs), refute what is stated; or shut your blasphemous and lying mouth! *Di mentem tibi dent tuam Philoeni!* (Dear fellow, the gods give you back your mind!)

Date in our city of Wittenberg, on Saturday, August 24, 1532.

By the Grace of God John Frederick, Duke of Saxony, Elector, Landgrave of Thuringia and Margrave of Meissen etc.

Heading of the letter from the outside:

To the High-born Princes, our kind dear uncles, Mr. Wilhelmen and Mr. Ludwigen, Counts Palatine of the Rhine, Dukes of Upper and Lower Bavaria.

He also names the King of Denmark, who said ³⁹): If I had lived in Luther's time and had been able to get hold of him, I would have drowned him in the bay, for he has filled our royal and princely houses with so

39) Dear fellow, who said it? From which writer is it taken? Christian III, King of Denmark, had a much different attitude towards Dr. Luther. He always read a passage from the Holy Scriptures before dinner, as well as an exposition of the Epistle to the Galatians, and especially Luther's books themselves, in a loud voice, as many listened to him. Even on his deathbed, he read Luther's words from chapter 1 with passion and devotion. V. 1: Christ gave himself for our sins, that he might redeem us from the evil world (Conf. Brun. Quinos disce mori P. I. p. 34. b. 39. b.), should it be plausible that he would have had the author drowned? His

many princes' children, because they are not allowed to become bishops, cardinals, or clergymen, that in the end they have to go begging for an increase of people. *Multiplicasti gentem, non magnificasti laetitiam* (The number of the people has increased, but not the pleasure).

On the other hand, Pfeiffer replies that he cannot expel anyone, because the Catholics also deny that anyone of their Catholic faith can be assured of his salvation ⁴⁰). But he lets the Catholics go in their supposed error, pays no attention to them ⁴¹) and rather answers *ad rem* (to the point).

Thirdly he answers: no one has been saved except through good Lutheranism, ⁴²) whoever does not want to believe this, let it remain so.

This is now the substance (the main thing, the core) of Dr. Pfeiffer's answer 43): he seeks in every possible way

royal princes and descendants have not yet been allowed to ask the Pope for a cardinal's hat or bishop's mitre.

40) But isn't it true? Why doesn't Fr. Engel answer my argument? The wretched "angel" can't even speak with human tongues.

41) Finally, when I have done my part and told them the truth, I must certainly let the stubborn ones go and think: He who is evil, let him still be evil, and he who is unclean, let him still be unclean; but he who is righteous, let him still be righteous, and he who is holy, let him still be holy (Rev. 22:2).

42) When and where and how did Fr. Engel prove the opposite?

43) Not the substance (the core) of the reply, but

and manner to draw the matter elsewhere and deduce it from us ⁴⁴), for which reason he rather wanted us to answer his Lutherans with a long list ⁴⁵), for which purpose he seeks out a whole content of all kinds of matters of faith and propositions (conclusions), so that we might rub against them, so that he might make himself invisible among such a mixture and mishmash of so many matters, and that it would not be noted that he had answered our three questions *hactenus nihil ad rem* (hitherto nothing pertaining to the matter) ⁴⁶).

Fr. Engels's gibberish and puffery. How beautifully he presented my reply, and how stately he rejected it, is shown by appearances. *Mala mens, malus animus* (evil mind harbors evil intent).

44) I am expressly answering Fr. Engel's questions and follow him step by step, how can I deduce him? He is like the wolf who accuses the lamb, standing down by the stream, of the muddy water!

45) I know we will have good peace because of the answer, but I want to bring the same list back as a new monitorium (a new reminder). *Tolle, lege, P. Angele! Si legere non pigebit, legisse non poenitebit.* (Take it, Father Engel, and read. If you do not put off reading, you will not regret it).

46) Which of us proceeded properly, and which made an incomprehensible tangle and mishmash? Who answered *nihil ad rem*, indeed nothing at all? Let the sensible reader judge, but let Father Engel (who has now shot his arrows in this matter) know that my speech and answer to such miserable and empty shrewdness as he has sent me so far have come to an end.

I. ^

Anti-Papistic Panoplia

or

List of Writers and Books,

written against the papacy and only mentioned in passing in these treatises for the sake of brevity; whereby the papists are at the same time reminded of so many backlogged items which they still owe to this day.

Citing the causes of the refusal of the Council of Trent. 4 Strasbourg 1566 and Dresden 1629; can also be read from word to word in Friedr. Hortleder's L. 1. von den Ursachen des deutschen Kriegs c. 47.

Friedr. Balduin Dr. Tr. on the true Church of Christ before the times of Luther.. 4. Witteb. 1617.

EjUSD. Notes in the dist. Becani about communion under one. 8 Witteb. 1610.

EjUSD. Phosphorus True Catholicism against Pazmann. 4 Witteb. 1626.

M. Joh. Jac. Beck, Lutheranism before Luther. 4 Nuremberg 1643.

Theod. Berenice of St. Bernegger Proaulium Trumpets of peace against the classics Scioppi. 4th Argent. 1620.

Joh. Botsacci Dr. Demonstration, that the Roman Church is not holy. 8. Witteb. 1629.

- Casp. Erasm. Brochmandi Dr. Lucerna sermons Prophets opposites mirror truth Pontif. 4 Rostoch. 1640.
 Ejusd. Apologia. 4th Hafn. 1653.
 Ejusd. Book V. on Antichrist. 4th Hafn. 1628.
- Abr. Calov Dr. Mathaeologia Papistica. 4th Witteb. 1656.
 His judgment. Refutation most deceitful report on the letters of Joh. Frid. Elect. 4 Witteb. 1683.
- Sam. Ben. Carpzov Examination of the New praxeos. J. Masenii. 8 Witteb. 1677.
- Dan. Chemieri Panstratia Catholica. Fol. Argent. 1629.
- Mart. Chemnitii D. Examination of the Council of Trent. Fol. Francof. 1585.
- Theological Council of Wittenberg. Fol. Francof. 1666.
- Joh. Conr. Dannhauer Dr. The Pope's Spirit Hodomoria. 8 Argenti 1654.
 Ejusd. Antichristosophy. 8. Arg. 1640.
 Ejusd. The Open Book of Consciousness s. Theology conscience. 4th Arg. 1662. 1667.
- Defension of the Gdansk Catechism against Fr. Carolus, or thorough exposition and assertion of the fundamental articles of evangelical doctrine. 8. Gdansk 1651.
- Joh. Georg. Dorschei Dr. Thomas Aquinas Confessor. 4 Francof. 1656.
 Ejusd. Mysaria Myssae.
 Ejusd. Abolished religious scruples. 12th Strassb. 1660.
- Christiani Dreieri Dr. Antipapistic Disputation. 4th Regiom. 1661.
- Matt. Flacii Illyrici L. on the contradictions and dissensions of Pontiff. 4 Basii. 1565.
- Helv. Garthii Dr. Garthius Prague Colloquia. 4th Witteb., 1610.
- Joh. Gerhard Dr. Loci Theologici. Fol. Francof. 1657.
 Ejusd. Confessio Cathol. 4 Jen. 1634.
 Ejusd. Thorough and modest answer to the papal morning star. 8 Jen. 1628.

- M. Joh. Conr. Göbell's Augsburg Confession and Jubilant Sermons. 4th Augsburg 1633.
- Christiani Grossii Dr. Tr. on Authority Roman Pontiff. 8. Stetini 1645.
- Petr. Haberkorn Dr. Tr. on the truth and efficacy of the Gospel ministry. 4 Giessæ 1457.
- M. Georg Hartmann's Thorough Refutation of the Labyrinth of Lutheran Reformation by P. Bruno Lindner. 8 Cüstrin 1662.
- Main defense of the Apple of the Evangel. Eye. Fol. Leipzig 1630.
- Dr. Jac. Heerbrand's Dispatch of the alleged recently hatched Evangelical weathercock.
- Dr. Jac. Heilbrunner's Un-catholic Papacy. Fol. Laugingen 1614. It. Dr. Zeämänn's evident Proof of the un-Catholic papacy.
- Dr. Phil. Heilbrunner's Postcolloquium Ratisbonense. 4th Laugten 1602.
- Ejusd. Innocent Luther against Conrad Vetter.
- Henr. Höpfneri Dr. Saxonia Evangelica. against Cudsenium. 4th Lips. 1625.
- Ejusd. Disp. on the Theology, a good part on the Antipapistics. 4th Lips. 1672.
- Joh. Hülsemann, Dr. Manual of the Conference of Augustana against Balthus Hager. 8 Witteb. 1673.
- Ejusd. Apology for the minister ordination. 4th Lips. 1657.
- AEgid. Hunnius, Dr. on the true and Roman Church. 8. Witteb. 1604.
- Ejusd. Tr. On the Sacraments. 8. Witteb. 1590.
- Nic. Hunnius, Dr. Apostasia Eccl. Romanæ 12. Lubec. 1632.
- Ejusd. Sheepskin Papacy removed. 8 Lubec. 1637.
- Ejusd. Roman non-Christian Church. 12. s. Witteb. 1630.
- Ejusd. Papacy destroying itself.
- Ejusd. Obvious Proof of Luther's Calling. 12 Lübeck 1628.