Unica Oblatio Christi: Eucharistic Sacrifice and the first Zürich Disputation

KEITH D. LEWIS

Summary: *The First Zürich Disputation (January 29th, 1523) between Ulrich Zwingli and Johann Faber was the earliest Reformation-era public debate of the doctrine of the eucharistic sacrifice. While Zwingli was at an early and relatively fluid stage in his rejection of eucharistic sacrifice, Faber's defense employed not only traditional scholastic sources but other authoritative supports previously unused in the defense of doctrine. Nevertheless, the polemical atmosphere of the exchange between the two both during and after the disputation precluded true clarity and potential common ground on this issue.*

For ten long years, our opponents have written many books asserting that the mass is a sacrifice, and yet not one of them has defined what sacrifice is or is not [Philip Melanchthon, *Apologia Confessionis* XXIV, XII, 15 (1531)].

The fact that Swiss reformer Ulrich Zwingli rejected any notion of eucharistic sacrifice and insisted on a strictly anamnetic eucharist early-on in his emergence as a reformer, is well-known. Yet for all that has been written concerning Zwingli's eucharistic theology,¹ surprisingly little attention has been paid to the actual circumstances of his initial rejection of the doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice in the theological context of the First Zürich Disputation of January 29th, 1523, during which the vicar-general of the diocese of Constance Johann Faber (1478-1541) emerged as an impromptu and reluctant debating opponent to Zwingli, with whom Faber had been on friendly terms.² This is especially surprising, when one considers that the Zürich meeting appears to have been the first public debate in the sixteenth century between a controversial theologian and a major reformation personality concerning the doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice.

The primary purpose of this study is to examine more closely the actual theological interplay between Zwingli and Faber concerning the question of

anamnesis and sacrifice, specifically within the context of the disputation and the protracted literary polemic which followed in the months after the January meeting. Main emphasis will be on Faber's March 1523 *Warlich Underrichtung*, in which he sought to redress inaccuracies of the Hegenwald version of the meeting, and on article XVIII of Zwingli's *Auslegung der 67 Schlußreden*, which appeared in June of 1523 and sought to expand on the 67 propositions for debate which Zwingli had rushed into print the night before the disputation.³ In so doing, it is hoped that an early window will be provided through which to view the formation of fundamental theological misunderstandings on both sides concerning the complex and often problematic issue of eucharistic sacrifice during the pre-Tridentine period.

The wording of article XVIII, which was the final article discussed at the Zürich meeting, left no doubt that Zwingli rejected the use of sacrificial language in describing the mass: "Christ has sacrificed himself once and for all eternity as a true and sufficient sacrifice for the sins of all believers; therefrom, it follows that the mass is not a sacrifice, but rather a commemoration (*Widergedechtnuß*) of the sacrifice and confirmation of the salvation which Christ has won for us."⁴ Faber must have been genuinely surprised to have been met with such a theological challenge from Zwingli. Prior to the January 1523 meeting, only scant reference to the mass could be found in Zwingli's works,⁵ and all of Zwingli's overt challenges to church authority had occurred in 1522, while Faber was absent from the diocese on an extended stay in Rome.⁶ Moreover, Faber and Zwingli had in the past collaborated in pursuing the reform of abuses within the diocese of Constance.⁷ Prior to the mention of article XVIII, Faber had consistently avoided engaging in debate with Zwingli, in accordance with the instructions of his ordinary Bishop Hugo von Hohenlandenburg (1447-1528), whom Faber was representing.⁸ Yet eucharistic sacrifice was the one issue which prompted Faber to bypass the bishop's instructions by means of the somewhat casuistical distinction that he would respond to Zwingli on this issue "as a Johann" rather than as vicar of the diocese.⁹

According to the Hegenwald report, Faber initially appealed to tradition, which is a line of argument he would later pursue in his *Warlich Underrichtung*: "Master Ulrich, you say in your conclusions that the mass is no sacrifice. Now I will prove that for over 1400 years the mass has been considered a sacrifice ... for *missa* is a Hebrew word, called *sacrifice* by us; also the apostles called the mass a sacrifice"¹⁰ Zwingli responded that Faber would have to prove the sacrificial nature of the mass from scripture. Based on his own exegesis of Hebrews 9:12-26, but also likely due, at least in part,

to the 1522 appearance in Zurich, of Leo Jud's German translation of Luther's *De abroganda missa privata*,¹¹ Zwingli objected strenuously to what he regarded as a doctrine of "many sacrifices," – an objection which would be fundamental to his concomitant insistence that the eucharist was *only* commemorative. The liturgical celebration cannot be the *liturgica oblatio* of the Roman church and cannot constitute any act of sacrifice or intrinsic forgiveness, even in a highly qualified or limited sense, for this would be tantamount to a questioning of the efficacy and sufficiency of Christ's unique and wholly sufficient sacrifice on the cross.¹² Rather, the mass is an act of affirmation and confirmation of this one unique sacrificial atonement on the cross, and demonstrates one's faith in the efficacy of this historic never-to-be-repeated act of redemption.

Fundamental to Zwingli's rejection of a eucharistic theology which he believed promoted the notion of multiple sacrifices was his presupposition that *sacrifice* was synonymous with *killing*. Thus, Zwingli contends that Christ cannot also be offered in the mass as sacrifice, for the Holy Spirit speaking from the scriptures makes it clear that Christ can only be sacrificed once (*semel*), in a sacrifice which surpasses in efficacy and power those of the Old Testament, and which redeems the sanctified (*geheiligten*) for all eternity [Hebrews 10:14].¹³ If Christ were to be sacrificed frequently as the high priests of the Old Testament had done to atone for the sins of the people, this would also mean that Christ would have to *die* frequently.¹⁴ Continued insistence on a sacrificial eucharist was largely a self-serving ploy by "papists", who "contrary to the bright scriptures of God, have made the mass into a sacrifice for the living and the dead in order to preserve their erudite titles and protect their avarice."¹⁵ According to Hegenwald, Zwingli did concede that *missa* did not come from Latin or Greek, but pointed out that Faber still had not presented scriptural proof that the mass was a sacrifice.¹⁶ He then issued the challenge that if Faber could prove any of the 67 *Schlußreden* to be incorrect or that the mass had in fact been regarded as a sacrifice since the time of the apostles, Zwingli would reward him with a "rabbit cheese"¹⁷. With that, discussion of Article XVIII, at least as it is reported by the 34 lines in Hegenwald, came to an end. But this brevity is deceptive. In addition to having drawn Faber into the debate in the first place, discussion of eucharistic sacrifice had charged the atmosphere of the impromptu theological disputation, and was major factor in the abrupt break-up of the meeting. Furthermore, it would become the primary focus of the ensuing literary polemic between Faber and Zwingli in the months following the disputation.

To what was Zwingli objecting? Most Reformation scholarship no longer accepts the notion that Protestant rejection of the sacrificial nature of the mass was a reaction to some sort of “monstrous late medieval distortion of doctrine.”¹⁸ Conceptually, fundamental differences between the patristic and medieval views of eucharistic sacrifice were almost imperceptible, Lombard’s collection of patristic texts continuing to provide the essential framework for eucharistic theology up to the sixteenth century. Controversy prior to the Reformation had dealt exclusively with teaching transubstantiation rather than with laying the doctrinal foundations for eucharistic sacrifice,¹⁹ the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries being “innocent of all originality” regarding theological speculation about the mass as sacrifice. At the same time, Zwingli’s initial rejection of sacrifice cannot simply be dismissed as echoes of medieval heretical movements,²⁰ but must rather be viewed against the more orthodox backdrop of late medieval eucharistic theology and praxis; although it had never been the intent to deny the sacrificial character of the mass, a number of factors led to its de-emphasis, which unwittingly helped create a climate in which Zwingli’s outright rejection of eucharistic sacrifice would seem to be almost a natural development.

Zwingli’s obviously legitimate insistence that Christ could only die once, and his fundamental stress on the mass as a commemoration of Calvary were not innovative, but were in fact integral to fifteenth and sixteenth-century eucharistic theology. Emphasis on anamnesis rather than sacrifice is found in a cross-section of popular preaching on the eve of Reformation. The entire liturgical event was viewed as a sort of allegorical play, a *memoria et repraesentatio passionis* which served as a didactic tool for instructing the faithful in the passion of Jesus.²¹ The actual consecration, transformation and consumption of the elements of bread and wine memorialized (but never repeated) the sacrifice of Jesus on the cross. Christ had died *semel in cruce*, in support of which Hebrews 9:11 was typically cited. One received the fruits of Christ’s sacrifice, i.e. the *effectus passionis*, through meditation on the passion and reception of His corporeal presence in the elements of bread and wine in the text of liturgical commemoration. It was presupposed that because such liturgical anamnesis made present the eternally effective sacrifice of the cross, the mass itself had a sacrificial character which was derived (but never distinct) from the one sacrifice of the cross.²² But the presupposition was by no means emphasized. In particular, strong emphasis on anamnesis by Scotus himself²³ contributed to a *de facto* de-emphasis on sacrifice, which helped create an implicit trichotomy between the sacrifice of the cross (*Kreuzopfer*),

the sacrifice of the mass (*Meßopfer*), and their unified liturgical commemoration.

Such fractionation had particular implications with regard to Zwingli's above-mentioned conviction that any notion of eucharistic sacrifice necessarily connoted the idea of "many sacrifices". Nowhere in late medieval theology was the act of consecration regarded as a sacrificial act in itself. Because of the uniqueness of Christ's sacrifice, the mass was spoken of as a *commemoratio* or *recordatio passionis* but never as *passio Christi*.²⁴ Nevertheless, there were growing notions of the limited efficacy of the fruits of the mass, due in part to objectifying tendencies of nominalism concerning such terms as *spiritualia*; *memoria*, and *representatio*, but also due to increasing emphasis on mass stipends.²⁵ All of this contributed to a growing perception of separation between *Kreuzopfer* and *Meßopfer*; the almost inevitable result, as Iserloh states, was that "the mass became detached from the sacrifice of the cross, and was considered separately."²⁶

Such lack of theological precision regarding the eucharist becomes especially significant, in light of the fact that Zwingli's education had been largely nominalistic, with particular emphasis on the *via antiqua* of Scotus.²⁷ Consequently, his philosophical presuppositions about the eucharist were deeply rooted in the same context which produced such shifting emphases concerning the eucharist. In particular, the above-mentioned tendency to consider the cross separately from the mass made it possible for Zwingli, in good conscience, to reject references to "eucharistic sacrifice" and assert that the mass was *only* a commemoration, while in his own mind remaining unquestionably faithful to the sacrifice of the cross.²⁸ Indeed, Clark pinpoints the problem when he remarks that the above factors, especially Scotism, "may have given a handle for the Protestant assertion that in the Eucharist there was no more than the commemoration of a past sacrifice."²⁹

The imprecision and fluidity of such shifting emphases in late medieval eucharistic praxis would prove problematic not only for Zwingli, but for Faber as well, whose own intellectual formation in the *via antiqua* of Scotus while at Tübingen provided the predominant framework in which he viewed theological questions.³⁰ The fact that both Zwingli and Faber had been formed in similar philosophical backgrounds could have proven beneficial in bringing about a commonality of language, yet the strong defensive posture taken up by both men early on in the debate would in fact render almost impossible any sort of *modus loquendi* concerning eucharistic sacrifice.

The years 1522-1526 saw a succession of theological treatises concerned with a defense of eucharistic sacrifice.³¹ Nevertheless, the observation has

been made that the controversial theologians writing such treatises, although more eloquent than their predecessors, said “no more and no less” than those before them, and were “seldom thinkers of the first rank” because of their almost exclusive concern with preserving the “deposit of faith” regarding the eucharist.³² Nor has Faber’s defense and explication of eucharistic sacrifice been regarded as exceptional. Lepin does not even include him among those he considers to be the “important Catholic theologians” defending the doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice in the period 1520-1540, while another scholar dismisses Faber’s theology as being of “marginal value;” the remarkable statement has even been made that “John Eck must be given the credit for spotting the weakness of Zwingli’s sacramental theology.”³³ To be sure, elucidation of the essence and subtleties of Faber’s eucharistic theology, especially with regard to the relationship between eucharistic anamnesis and eucharistic sacrifice is not without difficulties. Faber, as did many other controversial theologians, found himself required by circumstances to undertake the difficult task of defending doctrine which had either been understressed or even non-existent in his own theology.³⁴ Nevertheless, it can be argued that Faber’s response to Zwingli presents a pre-Tridentine articulation of eucharistic sacrifice which goes well beyond traditional definitions in both its scope and its methodology.

At the outset of his defense of sacrifice in his *Warlich Unterrichtung*, Faber rebuked Zwingli for “treating of the eucharist in such a cavalier and shameful manner” in having offered Faber a prize if he could prove article XVIII to be wrong. But before the end of his *Warlich Unterrichtung*, Faber himself would claim confidently to have “won the prize” (i.e. the rabbit cheese) from Zwingli.³⁵

Faber began by agreeing with Zwingli’s contrasting of Old Testament sacrifices and the sacrifice of the cross. One should not doubt that the only-begotten son, the word of God become man, was sacrificed on our behalf. The animal sacrifices of the patriarchs, prophets, and priests of the Old Testament were only a likeness (*bedeutniß*) and figurative foreshadowing of the sacrifice of Christ’s flesh and blood on the cross, conveyed to us in our reception of the eucharist.³⁶ Consistent with late medieval eucharistic praxis, Faber also maintained with Zwingli that the mass was a commemoration (*gedechtnüß*) and thanksgiving.³⁷ Unlike Zwingli, however, Faber argued that the mass was both commemoration *and* sacrifice, unceasingly offered by the holy Christian church throughout the entire world in order that one may participate in the effects of the blameless, perpetual sacrifice of Jesus on the cross, “whereupon God incarnate shed His blood for us.”³⁸ The sacrifice of

the mass proclaimed and commemorated that the Son of God had died for the unjust and promised righteousness (*geröde*) for the sinner. Only through participation in this anamnetic proclamation of the death of Jesus could one fully share in the *effectus passionis*, thereby becoming victorious and truly reconciled with God.³⁹

A key element in Faber's emphasis on eucharistic sacrifice is his appeal to tradition in the form of the *consensus fidelium*. In his report to the imperial government in Innsbruck, Faber remarked that Paul had approved many things not explicitly written in scripture, and that it was on this basis that "the Christian church everywhere has accepted and celebrates daily this sacrament of our Lord in the Mass, which is regarded as sacrifice."⁴⁰ Similarly, Faber argued in his *Warlich Unterrichtung* that he could find no one from the time of the twelve apostles down to the present who has denied the sacrificial nature of the mass, with the exception of Luther, whom Faber describes as "a hater of all priests and a destroyer of the Christian religion."⁴¹ Popular and canonical acceptance of eucharistic sacrifice proves its validity, for the "eastern and western churches, the entire world, and all priests from sunrise to sunset and midday to midnight have regarded this sacrament as a sacrifice for more than 1000 years." He continues that a sacrificial mass has been part of the Latin canon for over 1200 years, and that the Greek liturgy also uses the word *sacrifice*.⁴² Faber further asserted that such an appeal to ecclesial acceptance of eucharistic sacrifice could not be refuted by Zwingli, because the inerrancy of the church had been established by Luther.⁴³

Although Faber himself valued the authority of the medieval doctors,⁴⁴ he clearly perceived that reference to scholastic authorities would have been rejected out of hand by most of his Zurich audience, not to mention Zwingli. Therefore, in the spirit of his close friend Erasmus' exhortation *ad fontes*, Faber turned to the testimony of the fathers in order to buttress his defense of eucharistic sacrifice, just as he had done in his *opus* against Luther.⁴⁵ Moreover, although most of the limited number of church fathers who had written on the subject of eucharistic sacrifice were readily available accessible in medieval *compendia*, Faber relied on his recent manuscript searches in Roman libraries in order to find new patristic support closer to the time of the apostles than hitherto had been utilized.⁴⁶

Such support he had found in a manuscript copy of Irenaeus of Lyon's *Adversus Haereses*, the use of which by Faber marked the entry of the second-century church father into the body of sixteenth-century controversial theology,⁴⁷ and which would be mirrored three years later in Johannes Eck's 1526 *De Sacrificio Missae*, in which Eck cites passages of Irenaeus which he

states he himself has not read in the original, but rather in an excerpted form which he credits to Faber.⁴⁸ After reiterating the well-known Eusebian account of the link between Polycarp, John the Evangelist and Irenaeus, Faber writes that this same Irenaeus “wrote several books against the Ebionites, Valentinians and other heretics of his time – five of which I have had copied but which you and your company have not yet seen.”⁴⁹ Faber continues that “This same Irenaeus shows us how Jesus took the bread and wine, and giving thanks said ‘*this is my body and blood*,’ thus teaching a new sacrifice of the New Testament which the church receives from the holy apostles and offers to the heavenly father throughout the world.” Faber then emphasizes that his proof was “not just that of 900, 1000, or 1200 years, but is from the twelve apostles themselves.”⁵⁰

In addition to his pioneering use of Irenaeus, Faber also utilized other more frequently cited patristic texts in defense of his position. He cites Ambrose, “who has written six books on the sacraments [in which] he expressly states that the sacrament [of the eucharist] is a sacrifice.”⁵¹ In an effort to counter perceptions of a repeated sacrifice in the mass, Faber asserts the essential union and oneness of the *Meßopfer* and *kreuzopfer*, writing that all of Christendom understands that the sacrifice under the form of bread and wine is in no way new, but is rather the same sacrifice as that of the cross, from which the mass derives its status as living sacrifice and cup of eternal life. In order to respond to Zwingli’s assertions that the mass had been turned into a sacrifice for the living and the dead, Faber appeals further to two orations of Ambrose in which the latter defends the *godly and divine nature* of the eucharist and its corporeal reality, which is *offered for both the living and the dead*.⁵² It is Zwingli’s view of the mass which Faber insists is a human invention, which cannot stand up to the authority of the fathers and of Christendom.⁵³

Zwingli’s exegesis of Hebrews 9 had been fundamental to his rejection of eucharistic sacrifice, both because of his above-mentioned equation of *sacrifice* with *dying*, as well as his perception of the sacrifice of the cross as a static, never-to-be repeated historical event. Regarding the latter point, Faber agreed, for Christ had been “sacrificed visibly and bodily on the wood of the cross once for all time.” The difference was that in Faber’s view, this one unique sacrifice was perpetually mediated in the eucharist, and it was in this sense of a sacrificial *property* rather than sacrificing *act* that one could speak of the eucharist as sacrifice.⁵⁴ In support of his assertion of the unity between the sacrifice of the mass and the sacrifice on the cross, Faber paraphrased John Chrysostom’s *In Epistolam ad Hebraeos*.⁵⁵ The mass was

not a new sacrifice each day, but rather one sacrifice in commemoration (*gedechtniß*) of His bitter suffering and death on the cross. This one eternal sacrifice is offered daily at the altar, and maintains its oneness of identity with the *Kreuzopfer* by means of a real presence, "for we do not sacrifice one lamb today and another tomorrow, but always the one lamb who was sacrificed for our sins." Given acceptance of the real presence, a denial of the sacrificial nature of the mass *as derived from its unity with the cross* would in Faber's view be tantamount to asserting the impossibility that the body of Christ was divisible, "for there can be only one Christ for all time and in all places, and thus one body and one mass for all of Christendom."⁵⁶

Faber's use of Chrysostom's homily on Hebrews, which previously had been misattributed to St. Ambrose, was far from unique. The text had been included in the *sententiae* of Peter Lombard as a support for the doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice; as Clark remarks, "no text was more constantly quoted by the Catholic theologians, both before and during the Reformation, to explain the doctrine of the Mass."⁵⁷ Yet earlier misattribution and frequency of usage notwithstanding, the Chrysostom text provided an eloquent patristic foundation in support of Faber's perception that it was in fact a growing disjunction of the oneness of the *Meßopfer* and *Kreuzopfer* that was the fundamental issue at hand, particularly in light of the scriptural argument based on Hebrews that Christ could only die once (*semel*) seemed to preclude any notion of the mass as sacrifice.⁵⁸ And it would in fact be the Chrysostom text which Zwingli would find the most difficulty addressing in his *Auslegung*.

Article 61 of Zwingli's *Schlußreden* had questioned the notion of an indelible character in priesthood, and had argued that the primary sacerdotal responsibility was preaching the Word of God.⁵⁹ Faber inferred rejection of a priesthood predicated upon the notion of eucharistic sacrifice, and responded with an emphasis on the sacerdotal element in the liturgical commemoration of the sacrifice of the cross. It was the priest who perpetuated in the mass *nothing less than that which Christ gave to us*, namely, His sacrifice on the cross.⁶⁰ Only through the sacerdotal effication of the real presence of Christ in the elements of bread and wine could the sacrifice of Christ on the cross achieve fullness of expression, intrinsically necessary if one were to benefit fully from Christ's non-repeatable act of redemption. Thus, the inseparable nature of the *Meßopfer* and *Kreuzopfer* was seen by Faber as being necessarily connected sacerdotally with the anamnetic exhortation of Jesus to the disciples of the Last Supper. Such insistence by Faber on the inseparability of the last supper and the sacrifice of the cross was in

fact atypical of early pre-Tridentine theologians, and it has been even suggested that had there been greater emphasis on this inseparability by controversial theologians, Protestant objections to the doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice might have been ameliorated.⁶¹

Intrinsic to Faber's defense of a sacerdotal element in his defense of a sacrificial dimension of the liturgy was the controversial question of the *principalis offerens* during the mass. As stated above, later medieval theologians did not hold the act of consecration to be a sacrificial act in itself. Nevertheless, there was often disagreement, especially in fifteenth-century theology, as to whether it was Christ Himself or the priest acting *in persona ecclesiae* who perpetuated the sacrifice of the cross (Opferdarbringung).⁶² Scotism had stressed the latter, since the entire liturgical commemoration of prayers and ritual rather than the single act of consecration was regarded as perpetuating the sacrifice.⁶³ Thomism on the other hand, tended to regard the celebrating priest as acting *in persona Christi*, since the sacrifice of the mass was identical to the sacrifice of the cross, and since the same victim was also present.⁶⁴

The Scotist rather than Thomist emphasis would seem to have offered potentially fertile ground for an attempt to reconcile Zwingli's position with that of Faber, particularly given its stress on anamnesis rather than sacrifice, and the fact that Faber's educational background was Scotist. Yet, Faber, perhaps in part due to his strong desire to defend the above-mentioned sacerdotal component of the mass, seemed to downplay his own scotist background and lean more toward the *via moderna* of Thomas, although in a modified fashion. Christ does not in Faber's view directly perpetuate the sacrifice of the cross, but enables the church to do so in the person of her priests, i.e. *sub sacerdote Christi* rather than *in persona Christi*.⁶⁵ Faber cites support for this sacerdotal "anamnetic imperative" from Cyprian of Carthage and Theophilactus of Bulgaria (d. 1108), both of whom had emphasized the importance of the priesthood as an essential bridge between the eternal sacrifice of the cross and the temporal perpetuation of this same sacrifice in the eucharist.⁶⁶

Zwingli had challenged Faber to prove eucharistic sacrifice on the basis of scripture, and had made clear at the start of the disputation that he regarded the presence of the scriptures in Hebrew, Greek and Latin as sufficient mechanism for confirmation and validation of any doctrinal decisions reached at Zürich.⁶⁷ Although Faber objected to the idea of attempting authoritative interpretations of scripture in such a localized context, he nevertheless responded to Zwingli's challenge, but on an etymological rather exegetical

basis. In so doing, Faber turned from the fathers to his own contemporaries who had to varying degrees embraced tenets of Christian humanism. Faber thus insisted that *missah* was Hebrew, properly translated as *oblatio* or *sacrificium*, and invoked the *Complutensian Polyglot* of the cardinal-scholar of Alcalá, Francisco Ximenes de Cisneros (1436-1517), specifically pointing out that the Latin which corresponded to the Hebrew text of Deuteronomy 16:10 read “oblationem spontaneam manus tuae quam offeres iuxta benedictionem.”⁶⁸

Then, in an effort to stem the potential objections that the Spaniard de Cisneros would be regarded as partisan because of his close association with papacy and empire, Faber cited additional support from “our own pious countryman Doctor Johannes Reuchlin, who in his dictionary under the letter ‘mem’ writes that ‘Missa is a sacrifice which is offered to the Lord on-high as a propitiation (*leybpfennig*) in itself.’ So it is in Deuteronomy 16:10.”⁶⁹ Faber then declared that on the basis of the aforementioned arguments and his “faithfulness to the Targum,”⁷⁰ he had proven that the mass was “nothing other than the sacrifice of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which down to the present day has been called missa or liturgia in Greek,” and had thus met Zwingli’s challenge by “overthrowing” article XVIII of Zwingli’s 67 *Schlußreden*. Faber concluded that he had made known the truth concerning the eucharist, and that the matter could rest until he dealt with Luther’s *De abroganda missa privata*.⁷¹

A much overlooked fact is that the June publication of Zwingli’s *Auslegung der 67 Schlußreden* was primarily a response to Faber, who although never named, is clearly synonymous with *the papists and their beliefs* mentioned throughout the *Auslegung*. Article 18 was the second-longest of the expanded and explicated 67 *Schlußreden*, and focused on the eucharistic sacrifice.⁷² Zwingli reiterated his insistence that Hebrews had stated clearly that Christ had died once, and that the mass therefore could not be a sacrifice. To argue to the contrary would call into question the perfection and efficacy of the one unique sacrifice of the cross.

Clearly, Faber’s attempt to argue that sacrifices must be understood in the context of the unity of the *Kreuzopfer* and *Meßopfer* continued to be synonymous in Zwingli’s mind with the notion of a repetition of sacrifice. Thus, for Faber to have argued that the word *sacrifice* was found in scripture was in a sense meaningless, for it was rather the etymological issue of how precisely one was to *define sacrifice* which emerges with full force in the *Auslegung*. Zwingli reiterates his contention that *sacrifice* was synonymous with *killing*, pointing out that the Hebrew *zaba*, Greek *thyein*, and Latin

sacrificare all mean to *kill*. Although he admits that the German word *opfren* does not mean to *kill*, but rather *donate*, *honor*, or *lend*, he insists nevertheless that when one speaks of Christ one must understand *opfren* to mean *suffering and dying*, for this, he argues, is how it is understood in the language from which the German word *opfren* comes.⁷³ In contrast to this interpretation, Zwingli charged that “the papists fight as did Dr. Martin Plantsch of Tübingen on the day of the Zurich Disputation,”⁷⁴ who agreed that Christ, in accordance with Hebrews, could only be sacrificed once, but who was nevertheless offered up in the mass without dying again. One cannot make such distinctions between *offering up*, *suffering*, and *death*; all are one and the same when speaking of Christ’s passion, and contradistinctions were simply fabricated by *slaves of the mass* in order to maintain their profits.⁷⁵

Unfortunately, Zwingli had not explored the ramifications of his own argument that *opfren* meant also to honor, donate or lend. Could it not have been argued that the linguistic reception and usage of *opfren* in a passive “having-been-killed” rather than “killing” sense demonstrated that one could speak of the mass as a sacrifice without implying a repetition of the death of Jesus? Such an argument might have helped bridge the growing chasm over whether one could speak of eucharistic sacrifice in *any* legitimate sense. But accepting Zwingli’s premise that sacrifice *must* be understood strictly as the act of killing or dying, insistence that commonly accepted eucharistic theology espoused a plurality of sacrifices was inevitable and indeed logical. And no one, Zwingli argues, can offer up Christ except Christ Himself, which he has done already. Therefore, the only offering up to God which one may continue to make, and indeed the highest sacrifice one can make, is of oneself, just as Christ has done for us.⁷⁶

But, in spite of Zwingli’s trenchant refusal to accept any sacrificial language being linked terminologically with the eucharist, there was still an indication in his *Auslegung* five months after the disputation, that although he and Faber had not met in their respective views of eucharistic sacrifice, they at least had been treading common ground. In a manner which seems to approximate the emphasis on the unity between *Kreuzopfer* and *Meßopfer* espoused by Faber, Zwingli is still able to describe the liturgy as an anamnetic renewal of the one sacrifice on the cross: “The body and blood of Christ are an eternal legacy, inheritance or testament; in eating and drinking thereof one does not sacrifice. Rather, one remembers and renews [*ernüweret*] that which Christ has done, once and for all.”⁷⁷ The commemoration is a warranty by which we recognize and believe in the warranty of our salvation through Christ, who although offered up only once, has become a gate and valid

offering for the sins of everyone, and whose suffering is eternally effective: "one eats and drinks his flesh and blood in this faith, recognizing that it has been given as a confirmation of the fact that our sins are being forgiven, *as if Christ had only now died on the cross* [emphasis mine]." ⁷⁸ Was this not essentially what Faber had been arguing in defending a unity between *Kreuzopfer* and *Meßopfer*, i.e. a *mediation* of the *effectus passionis* rather than a repetition of the sacrifice? When placed in such juxtaposition, Zwingli's eucharistic position in the first half of 1523 emerges as one far less revolutionary and intrinsically incompatible with the pre-Tridentine Catholic position hitherto believed.

But Zwingli's distaste for abuses in the area of mass stipends and his intense dislike of any notion of an efficaciously limited sacrifice had contributed strongly to his dogged resistance to *any* mention of sacrificial language in describing the eucharist. Late medieval perceptions of an efficaciously limited mass and the resultant disjunction between *Kreuzopfer* and *Meßopfer* had indeed contributed to circumstances conducive to Zwingli's almost facile rejection of the doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice and concomitant insistence that the mass could be nothing more than a specific finite non-sacrificial commemoration of the *passio Christi*, the latter being infinitely effective for one's salvation. At the same time, one must question whether Faber's well-intended determination to avoid medieval theologians and theological terminology in his response to Zwingli had in fact hampered his ability to respond effectively, in that he failed to emphasize sufficiently the larger liturgical context of the scotist position and its emphasis on commemoration and sacrifice.

The failure of Zwingli and Faber to come to terms regarding the impasse over the eucharist must not be dismissed simply as mutual intransigence and a lack of distinction between sacrificial essence and sacrificial act. It is also illustrative of certain fundamental theological differences between them which emerged during the course of their post-disputation literary exchange, particularly with regard to the relationship between temporality and the infinite. In Zwingli's view, there could be only one sacrifice of Christ, not just because of Hebrews 9, but also because this one sacrifice was rooted in a temporal historical moment was never to be repeated. ⁷⁹ It was only through a liturgical, *non-sacrificial* anamnesis that the sacrifice of the cross was perpetuated, without which there could be no intermingling between the infinite realm of God and the temporality of history. Faber, on the other hand, had laid heavy emphasis on the one sacrifice of the cross as being eternally perpetuated temporally in the mass through the instrument of the priesthood

on behalf of the church. This was the specific “anamnetic imperative” of Jesus at the Last Supper, by which the historic act of redemption on the cross retained its temporal efficacy. Each individual mass is no new sacrifice, but through the priesthood and the eucharistic elements became a commemoration (*Wiedergedechtnus*) and perpetuation of the “once-for-all” sacrifice of the cross; it is only mistakenly perceived as a new and separate sacrifice because of its finite temporal objectification. It was this linkage, and indeed, essential oneness, between the redemption of the cross and the sacrificial commemoration of the mass which was fundamental to Faber’s eucharistic theology. Without it, there could be no “sacrifice of the mass”, and indeed, it was rejection of such a union between *Kreuzopfer* and *Meßopfer* which seems to have played a fundamental role in at least Zwingli’s initial rejection of eucharistic sacrifice.⁸⁰

In spite of the impasse, one of the most important results of the theological interaction between Faber and Zwingli which had originated in the disputation and had been played out in the ensuing literary polemic was that it spurred Zwingli toward producing a much more detailed, comprehensive, and credible presentation of his understanding of doctrine in his *Auslegung der 67 Schlußreden*; similarly, Faber produced at least a provisional Catholic definition of the previously vaguely-defined doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice, and would later turn to a defense of other controverted areas of doctrine.⁸¹ Unfortunately, such a process of “reciprocal conditioning” occurred in an atmosphere of contentiousness and polemic, which ultimately led not just to clarification concerning differing views of the eucharist, but to polarization as well. As polemic from both sides replaced constructive dialogue, the understanding of theological differences took a back seat to the ardent defense of one’s own position, which blinded both Zwingli and Faber to the possibility of fundamental theological agreement, and ultimately rendered hopeless any chances of a mutually agreeable definition of the nature and relationship of eucharistic sacrifice and commemoration. Henceforth, Zwingli’s treatises on the mass would seek to define what set his view of the mass apart from the Catholic position, while Faber’s later works would be largely defensive in tone rather than seeking common ground.⁸²

In looking at Faber’s response to Zwingli, some summary observations can be made. Although little of Faber’s *opus* the previous year had been devoted to the question of sacrifice, his theological encounter with Zwingli prompted him to attempt to restore a sense of the unity between the sacrifice of the cross, the last supper, and the liturgy. Its centrality as a theme in his *Warlich Unterrichtung* as well as in his other theological writings in the

ensuing four decades brought the issue to the forefront of controversial theology. Furthermore, the methodology he employed in the process was above all else innovative. Faber saw that the circumstances and aftermath of the First Zurich Disputation required that he formulate a credible defense of eucharistic sacrifice which would have to be based on new fonts of authority. His conscious eschewing of the use of medieval theologians in his response to Zwingli, his use of scripture and contemporary Christian humanist scholarship, and his heavy reliance on patristic support all indicate a mind and methodology attuned to the changing religious and intellectual currents of the sixteenth century. Such an innovative methodology would exercise a strong formative influence on other controversial theologians, whose theological treatises, along with Faber's, would ultimately help shape the language of Trent concerning eucharistic sacrifice as well as other doctrinal issues. Faber's Zurich encounter with Zwingli and the resulting theological exchange demonstrates that the Tübingen-trained theologian certainly merits recognition as one of the "important Catholic theologians" grappling with this crucial doctrinal issue during the pre-Tridentine period.⁸³

St. John's Seminary

Notes

1. There is considerable disagreement concerning Zwingli's early eucharistic theology, particularly with regard to the dating of his rejection of transubstantiation and the real presence. Moreover, largely on the basis of an argument from silence, his rejection of transubstantiation has often been presumed to include a willing and conscious rejection of the real presence, although even the famous letter to Thomas Wyttenbach in June of 1523 can only be said with certainty to reject transubstantiation, and Zwingli in fact even seems to affirm the real presence in his *Auslegung* (esp. ZW II, 143). As Bosshard points out, part of the difficulty in achieving a precise understanding of Zwingli's eucharistic theology in 1523 is a paucity of sources [S.N. Bosshard, *Zwingli, Erasmus, Cajetan: Die Eucharistie als Zeichen der Einheit* (Wiesbaden, 1978), 12]. For a good example of the spirited debate over the chronology and doctrinal presuppositions of Zwingli's early eucharistic theology, see the sometimes acrid exchange of letters between Köhler and Bauer in *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*: W. Köhler, "Zu Zwinglis ältester Abendmahlsauffassung," 45 (1926), 399-408; K. Bauer, "Symbolik und Realpräsenz in der Abendmahlsanschauung Zwinglis bis 1525," 46 (1927), 97-105; and Köhler's "final response" to Bauer in "Zur Abendmahlskontroverse in der Reformationszeit, insbesondere zur Entwicklung der Abendmahlslehre Zwinglis," 47 (1928), 47-56. See also W. Köhler, *Zwingli und Luther. Ihr Streit über das Abendmahl nach seinen politischen und religiösen Beziehungen* (Leipzig, 1924); Gottfried Locher, *Zwingli's Thought: New Perspectives* (Leiden, 1981) esp. 220; and Albert Hyma, "Hoen's Letter on the Eucharist and Its Influence upon Carlstadt, Bucer, and Zwingli," *Princeton Theological Review*, 24 (1926), 124-31.

2. Research on Faber has been negligible in comparison with other controversial theologians. For bibliography, see Herbert Immenkötter, "Johann Fabri (1478-1541)," in *Katholische Theologen der Reformationszeit*, ed. Erwin Iserloh (Münster, 1984), and Christian Radey, *Dr. Johann Fabri, Bischof von Wien (1530-1541), Wegbereiter der Katholischen Reform, Rat König Ferdinands* (Dissertation, Vienna, 1976). For a complete list of Faber's numerous works, see *Verzeichnis der im Deutschen Sprachbereich Erschienenen Drucke des XVI. Jahrhunderts*, vol. 6 (Stuttgart, 1986) 554-561; cf. Wilbirgis Klaiber, *Katholische Kontroverstheologen und Reformer des 16. Jahrhunderts* (Münster, 1978).
3. Faber's account was published in March by the Freiburg im Breisgau printer Johannes Wörlin, under the full title *Ein warlich underrichtung, wie es zu Zürich by dem Zwinglin uff den nün undzwentzigsten tag des monats Januarii nest verschinen ergangen sey* [hereafter cited as Faber, *WU*; the work is incorrectly attributed to Johann Fabri von Heilbronn in the *British Museum Catalogue of Books* (v. 70, 247)]. In addition, Faber sent a brief *Bericht*, or report of the disputation to the imperial government in Innsbruck, published by J. Mayer, "Die Disputation zu Zürich am 29. Januar 1523," *Katholische Schweizer Blätter*, 11 (1895), 51-65, 183-195 (Hereafter cited as *Bericht*). The Hegenwald account [vol. I, 442-469, *Huldreich Zwinglis sämtliche Werke*, ed. by Emil Egli *et al.*, (Berlin, Leipzig, Zürich, 1905-), hereafter cited as *ZW*] was published on March 3, 1523, as *Handlung der Versammlung in der Stadt Zürich auf den 29. Januar 1523*. Often inaccurately treated as official *acta* of the disputation, the report was reputedly written by a Zürich schoolmaster named Erhart Hegenwald, but there is no known Zürich archival record of Hegenwald, and it was long ago theorized by Mörikofer that "Hegenwald" was in fact a pseudonym for Zwingli himself [Johann Caspar Mörikofer, *Ulrich Zwingli* (Liepzig, 1867), vol. I, 160]. Regardless of authorship, the biased nature of the Hegenwald account is now widely accepted [e.g. G.R. Potter, *Zwingli* (Cambridge, 1976), 103; Heiko Oberman, *Masters of the Reformation: the Emergence of a New Intellectual Climate in Europe* (Cambridge, 1981), 191; Bernd Moeller, "Zwinglis Disputationen. Studien zu den Anfängen de Kirchenbildung und des Synodalwesens im Protestantismus," *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, Kanonische Abteilung*, 56 (1970), 275-324]. For Zwingli's 67 *Schlußreden*, see *ZW I*, 458-65. In the aftermath of the disputation, he expanded his 67 *Schlußreden* in the form of his *Auslegung der 67 Schlußreden* [*ZW II*, esp. 111-57 for the text of article 18; for translation, see Carl s. Meyer, *Luther's and Zwingli's Propositions for Debate* (Leiden, 1963)]. An acrid and biting satirical account of Faber and his role at the disputation appeared the following September under the title *Das Gyren Rupffen* (The Plucked Vulture). Likely written by knight-in-exile Ulrich von Hutten, the work is of marginal theological significance. For a fuller treatment, see Keith D. Lewis, "Ulrich von Hutten, Johann Faber, and *Das Gyren Rupffen*: A Knight's Last Campaign?" *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, 78 (1987), 124-146.
4. Hegenwald, *ZW I*, 460.
5. The mass was described as "hearing the word of God" and "partaking of Him in the eucharist," which is the heavenly bread (*himmelsche brot*) received and eaten by the people (*got niese*). Old testament holiness, which had been sought through bloody sacrifices (*vihischem blüt*), was now replaced by the holiness of the New Testament. This new testament was centered in the blood of the eternal God, for Christ had stated that the cup of his blood was that of a new and everlasting testament. Zwingli further

spoke of the church of Christ as won through His blood, and argued that communion *sub utraque* should be allowed since it was apostolic practice and has been instituted by the Lord himself [*Von Erkiesen und Freiheit der Speisen* (16 April, 1522), ZW I, 74-136; 134; *Apologeticus Archeteles* (22/23) August, 1522), ZW I, 249-327; 320). But other than a paraphrase of the words of institution at the last supper (*Apologeticus Archeteles*, ZW I, 323) we hear nothing further concerning Zwingli's eucharistic beliefs, nor do we have any indications of his adhering to anything other than a thoroughly orthodox position, until his issuance of the 67 *Schlußreden* in preparation for the January disputation.

6. The main purpose in Faber's trip to Rome was to consult library resources for patristic manuscript material to be included in his extensive theological response to Luther, which in August of 1522 was published in Rome by Marcello Silber as *Opus adversus nova quaedam et a christiana religione prorsus aliena dogmata Martini Lutheri* [hereafter referred to as *opus*; citations are from both the original 1522 edition as well as from the critical edition by A. Naegele, *Malleus in haeresim Lutheranam* (1524), in *Corpus Catholicorum*, 23/24, 25/26 (Münster i.W., 1946, 1952) hereafter cited as CC]. For Faber's presence in Rome, see K. Schottenloher, "Johann Fabri in Rom, nach einen Berichte Jakob Zieglers," *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, 17 (1908) 31-47.
7. Zwingli and Faber had collaborated in removing from the diocese of Constance Italian indulgence preacher Bernardino Sansone, whose activities were uncomfortably similar to those of Tetzl [Iganx Staub, O.S.B., *Dr. Johan Fabri, Generalvikar von Konstanz (1518-1523) bis zum offenen Kampf gegen M. Luther (August 1522)* (Einsiedeln, 1911), 117]. None of Zwingli's treatises explicitly critical of church authority, beliefs, or practices appears prior to 1522. Furthermore, there is in fact considerable evidence to suggest that in 1522, Zwingli was regarded by Rome as a strong supporter of the interests of the papacy. See in particular J. M. Stayer, "Zwingli Before Zürich: Humanist Reformer and Papal Partisan", *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, 72 (1981) 55-68.
8. Bishop Hugo appears to have been neither interested nor theologically competent to attend the disputation in person. Furthermore, the Constance cathedral chapter did not take Zwingli seriously as a reformer in his own right, believing as they did that the upcoming meeting was a *disputazione d. Ulrici Zwingli in negocio Luterano statuta* [August Willburger, *Die Konstanzer Bischöfe Hugo von Landenburg, Balthazar Merklin, Johann Lupfen (1496-1537) und die Glaubensspaltung* (Münster, 1917); Manfred Krebs, ed., *Die Protokolle des Konstanzer Domkapitels* (Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für die Geschichte des Oberrheins, vol. 106), 267, # 7510]. In addition to Faber, the Constance delegation was completed by Martin Plantsch and Georg Verghans, both of whom had received the doctorate in theology from Tübingen. As Oberman observes, the Constance delegation was really a "Tübingen delegation" (Oberman, *Masters of the Reformation*, 216-17).
9. Hegenwald, ZW I, 555
10.ouch haben die aposteln missam sacrificium geheissen" (Hegenwald, ZW I, 555); cf. the mistranslation in Samuel Macaulay Jackson, ed., *Selected Works of Huldreich Zwingli* (Philadelphia, 1901), p. 100: "and also the apostles were known as *missam sacrificium*."

11. Zwingli sat on the board which oversaw the publication of books in Zürich, and would thus almost certainly have been acquainted first-hand with Jud's translation and thus with Luther's identical objections to the notion of repetitive sacrifice. For a fuller treatment of Jud, who was Luther's principal translator for German-speaking Switzerland, see Karl-Heinz Wyss, *Leo Jud, Seine Entwicklung zum Reformator: 1519-1523*, (Bern, 1976).
12. If one were to carry the argument in article XVIII to its logical conclusion, it would be formulated as such: If the mass is in any way a sacrifice, then the sacrifice of the cross is no atonement at all, for this would be tantamount to saying that the sacrifice of Christ on the cross was insufficient for our redemption. Therefore, if the mass is a sacrifice, it is a meaningless sacrifice, for we have no longer in been redeemed in Christ. As Richardson formulates it, "Zwingli understands...that the Supper is a pledge of something Christ *did* for us on the Cross, rather than a pledge of his abiding presence which does something for us *now*" Cyril Richardson, *Zwingli and Cranmer on the Eucharist* (Illinois, 1949), 17.
13. "Mit einem opffer hat er erfüllt die geheiligten in ewigkeit" (Hegenwald, ZW I, 556). Whether Zwingli meant this sense of redemption in terms of election is unclear at this early stage in his theology.
14. Hegenwald, ZW I, 556. Zwingli's rejection of the ubiquity of Christ and his insistence that Christ's localization in heaven precluded any notion of a real presence was a much later development in his theology. It does not seem to have been an issue for Zwingli at this early stage. Hence, one finds no discussion of the real presence.
15. Hegenwald, ZW I, 557; the same argument had earlier been raised by Luther.
16. "Wir wissen ouch wol, das missa nitt vom latin oder vonn kriechischer sprach kumpt; aber ir thünt kein geschryfft dar" (Hegenwald, ZW I, 557); cf. Jackson's mistranslation (p.102): "We also know well that *missa* does not come from *Hebrew* (emphasis mine) or Greek; but you present nothing from the scriptures."
17. Hegenwald, ZW I, 565-6; *leporinus caseus*; i.e. something rare or extraordinary, usually used in a sarcastic sense. The allusion is likely classical, most probably Marcus Terentius Varro, *De Rusticae*, 2, 11, 4, who speaks of the *coagulum leporinum* in this vein. Zwingli's usage of the term in the context of his dispute with Faber was perhaps inspired by *Käsjäger*, which was a popular disparaging term for the clergy during the nascent Reformation [Frederich Lepp, *Schlagwörter des Reformationszeitalters* (Leipzig, 1908), 3].
18. This notion received the greatest prominence in B.J. Kidd's *The Later Medieval Doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice* (London, 1958), in which, as the title implies, Kidd argued that the concept of eucharistic sacrifice was a late medieval distortion of the mass which could be traced back to "innovations" by Aquinas (p. 38). Clark has sufficiently discussed the fundamental and numerous weaknesses of Kidd's book, which he charitably refers to as "an unfortunate publication" [Francis Clark, S.J., *Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Reformation* (London, 1967), 45-49].
19. The unprecedented nature of the sixteenth-century challenge to, and rejection of, this doctrine is clear: Lepin, *L'Idée du sacrifice de la messe d'après les théologiens depuis l'origine jusqu'à nos jours* (Paris, 1926), 214, 241; Clark *Eucharistic Sacrifice*, 76-78; Erwin Iserloh, *Die Eucharistie in der Darstellung des Johannes Eck*, (Münster, 1950), 57; Erwin Iserloh, "Die Wert der Messe in der Diskussion der Theologen vom

- Mittelalter bis zum 16. Jahrhundert," *Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie*, 83 (1961), 44-79; Bosshard, *Zwingli, Erasmus, Cajetan*, 21.
20. For example, comparisons such as with the Waldensians, in the same manner in which attempts have been made to link Luther with Wycliffe and Hus. For a fuller discussion, see Joachim Staedtke, "Voraussetzungen der Schweizer Abendmahlslehre", *Theologische Zeitschrift*, 16 (1960), 19-32.
 21. Willi Massa, S.V.D., *Die Eucharistiepredigt am Vorabend der Reformation: Ein material-kerygmatische Untersuchung zum Glaubensverständnis von Altarssakrament und Messe am Beginn des 16. Jahrhunderts als Beitrag zur Geschichte der Predigt* (Siegburg, 1966), 93; Erwin Iserloh, *Die Eucharistie*, 66.
 22. Iserloh, *Die Eucharistie*, 139.
 23. "Missa non aequivalet passioni Christi, licet specialius valeat, pro quanto ibi est specialior commemoratio oblationis, quam Christus obtulit in cruce, juxta illud Lucae 22. et I. Cor. c. 2. *Hoc facite in meam commemorationem*, quia fit Missa tam repraesentando illam oblationem in cruce, quam per eam obsecrando, ut scilicet per eam Deus acceptet sacrificium Ecclesiae...quod Eucharistia oblata acceptatur non ratione voluntatis Christi ut immediate offerentis, ratione ergo voluntatis Ecclesiae generalis, illa autem habet rationem meriti finitam, et esto quod acceptaretur ratione voluntatis Christi ut offerentis, hoc est instituentis oblationem, et dantis sibi valorem, et acceptationem, tamen non aequivaleret, nec acceptaretur sicut passio Christi, et ita esset meritum finitum, cui correspondet bonum debitum virtute sacrificii (*Quodlibet*, XX, n. 22)."
 24. Massa, *Die Eucharistiepredigt*, 95-99.
 25. "DaB in der Messe die *memoria* und *representatio* des Opfers am Kreuz gefeiert wird, ist ja nicht so sehr in Frage gestellt, sondern daB diese *memoria* selbst ein Opfer ist, und daB sie ein Opfer sein kann, ohne die Einheit und Dieseligkeit des Opfers aufzulösen (Iserloh, *Die Eucharistie*, 72).
 26. Iserloh, *Die Eucharistie*, 149.
 27. W.P. Stephens, *The Theology of Huldrych Zwingli*, (Oxford, 1988), 6.
 28. As Cyril Richardson observes, "Zwingli's eucharistic doctrine is grounded on two presuppositions. One is theological and concerns his view of faith. The other is philosophical and has to do with his Nominalism and humanism. His opinions on the Lord's Supper are the religious and logical consequences of these factors, and, indeed, are unintelligible apart from them" (Richardson, *Zwingli and Cranmer on the Eucharist*, 5,8).
 29. Clark, *Eucharistic Sacrifice*, 327.
 30. For Faber's presence at Tübingen, see Heinrich Hermelink, *Die Matrikeln der Universität Tübingen*, vol I: *Die Matrikeln von 1477-1600* (Stuttgart, 1906), 150; and Staub, *Dr. Johan Fabri*, 16.
 31. Iserloh, *Die Eucharistie*, 20; the plethora of such treatises was also recognized by those at whom they were directed. In 1531, Philip Melanchthon remarked in this *Apologia* for the Augsburg Confession that "Sie [die Widersacher] haben zehn ganze Jahre viele Bücher geschrieben, daB die Messe ein Opfer sei, und ihrer keiner hat noch nit definiert, was Opfer sei oder nicht sei" (*Apologia Confessionis*, XXIV, XII, 15).
 32. Clark, *Eucharistic Sacrifice*, 91.

33. Lepin, *L'idée du sacrifice*, 253-5; Hugo Laemmer, *Vortridentinisch-katholische Theologie des Reformations-Zeitalters aus den Quellen dargestellt* (Berlin, 1858) 62; B. A. Gerrish, "The Lord's Supper in the Reformed Confessions", *Theology Today*, 23 (1966), 224-243, 240.
34. Iserloh, *Die Eucharistie*, 131.
35. Faber, *WU*, f 3.
36. Faber, *WU*, e 4; Faber's stress on Old Testament imagery as prefiguring the sacrifice of the cross (and the mass) was a common theme throughout the Middle Ages, due largely to Aquinas' reply to the objection that Hebrews 10:14 seemed to demonstrate that Christ could not be sacrificed in the mass [*Summa Theologiae*, 3a, quae, 83; F. X. Arnold, "Vorgeschichte und Einfluß des Trienter Meßopferdekrets auf die Behandlung des eucharistischen Geheimnisses in der Glaubensverkündigung der Neuzeit", in *Die Messe in der Glaubensverkündigung*, ed. by F.X. Arnold (Freiburg, 1953), 124].
37. Faber, *WU*, e 4. In his *opus* (p 4; CC I, 249), Faber had emphasized the commemorative act of the mass as the visible proclamation in the church of the once-for-all redemption on the cross. This *liturgica oblatio* followed the typology of the Old Testament, especially with regard to the notion of affirmation of a covenant. Jesus was referring to this unbloody perpetuation of His covenant and sacrifice when at the Last Supper, he instituted the sacrifice of the mass according to the words of scripture.
38. Faber, *WU*, e 4.
39. Faber, *WU*, c 4.
40. (Faber, *Bericht*, 193-4)
41. Faber, *WU*, f 2.
42. Faber, *WU*, f 2; cf. Faber's *opus* (p.3; CC I, 247): "Addo, quod haec eadem verba (i.e. *sacrificium*) in missa Graece scripta reperiuntur, qua et iam diu Graeci utuntur ac uti fuerunt, testantibus haec vetustissimis codicibus."
43. Faber, *WU*, f 2. Likely a reference to Luther's 1518 *Ad dialogum Silvestri de potestate papae responsio* (WA I, 644-686, esp. 662), before Luther had made a definitive break with Rome.
44. See for example his *Declamationes divine de humane vite miseria* (Augsburg, 1520), es. ii-iv, in which Faber praises the use of both Christian and pagan authors from antiquity, but also defends use of scholastic authors.
45. Faber, *Opus*, p. 4; CC I, 48.
46. Faber's activity in collecting manuscripts is detailed in Giovanni Mercati, "Scritti ecclesiastici greci copiati da Giovanni Fabri nella Vaticana," *Bessarione*, 37 (1921), 88-120; largely through the intercession of Swiss Cardinal Matthäus Schiner (1465-1522), Faber had gained access to a number of libraries and collections [see Albert Büchi, *Kardinal Matthäus Schiner als Staatsmann und Kirchenfürst*, V. II, (Freiburg i.d.S., 1937), esp. 438]. For Faber's personal library, which Urbanus Rhegius once stated with hyperbole "rivalled the Ptolemaic library at Alexandria," see Alphons Lhotsky, "Die Bibliothek des Bischofs von Wien Dr. Johannes Fabri (1530-1541)," in *Festschrift Karl Eder zum 70. Geburtstag* (Innsbruck, 1959), 71-81.

47. Faber appears to have been responsible for bringing this work of Irenaeus to the attention of the sixteenth century by way of Erasmus, who relied heavily on Faber's manuscript in his own 1526 edition of Irenaeus. See especially José Ruyschaert, "Le manuscrit 'Romae Descriptum' de l'édition érasmiennne d'Irénée de Lyon", *Scrinium Erasminium*, ed. by J. Coppens (1969), v. 1, 263-276.
48. Johannes Eck, *De sacrificio missae libri tres* (1526), ed. E. Iserloh, *Corpus Catholicorum*, 36 (Münster, 1982), p. 91.
49. Faber, *WU*, f 2.
50. Faber, *WU*, f 2; cf. Faber's remark about the same Irenaeus passage cited in his *opus* against Luther: "Haec Irenaeus, non Thomas, non Occam, Ricardus aut Scotus, sed doctor vicinus temporum apostolorum: (Faber, *opus*, p. 4; CC I, 248).
51. Faber, *WU*, f 1; Ambrose, *De sacramentis libri sex* (*Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, 73, 13-85, esp. 55, 5, 21). Ambrose was of particular importance to Faber's acceptance of eucharistic anamnesis, and is cited similarly in his *opus* (CC I, 247, esp. n. 1); cf. an almost identical use of this same passage from Ambrose in Eck's *De Sacrificio Missae*, (CC v. 36, p. 86, esp. n. 21).
52. More than likely Ambrose's *De Mysteriis* (*Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, 73, 113-116).
53. Faber, *WU*, g 3.
54. Put simply, such a formula might read "Christ was the sacrifice, Christ is present, so too then is the sacrifice." What Faber does not explore is the potential implications which Zwingli's rejections of eucharistic sacrifice held for the doctrine of the real presence in light of Faber's stress on this as the necessary bridge between the *Kreuzopfer* and *Meßopfer*, i.e., if Christ is corporeally present in the eucharist *because* the mass is united with the sacrifice of the cross, would Zwingli's later rejection of the real presence then be the logical and necessary outcome of his rejection of any sacrificial character in the mass?
55. John Chrysostom, *In epistolam ad Hebraeos* (*Patrologia Graeca*, v. 63, 131).
56. Faber, *WU*, f 4.
57. Petrus Lombardus, *Sententiae in iv libris distinctae*, lib. iv, dist. 12, cap. 5; Clark, *Eucharistic Sacrifice*, 75, see also Iserloh, *Die Eucharistie*, 109-110.
58. The problem of reconciling Hebrews 9 with eucharistic sacrifice, which had also been an area of theological speculation during the patristic period, continued to be an area of focus during the later Middle Ages. Ironically, it was due in large part to Zwingli's rejection and Faber's defense of eucharistic sacrifice that emphasis on the unity of the *Kreuzopfer* and *Meßopfer* would become a standard point of Catholic controversial theology, and would ultimately find its way into the eucharistic decrees of the Council of Trent. (Iserloh, "Die Wert der Messe," 66); cf. Johannes Betz, *Eucharistie in der Schrift und Patristik*, in *Handbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, ed. M. Schmaus, vol. 4, pt. 4a, 20-23.
59. "Von dem character, daß die priester in den letzten zyten sind innen worden, weyßt die götlich gschryfft nüt. Sy erkennen ouch kein priester, denn die das gotswort verkündend. Denen heist sy eer embieten, das ist: lyblich narung zudienen" (Zwingli, 67 *Schlußreden*, ZW I, 464-65).
60. Faber, *WU*, f 1.

61. Iserloh, *Der Kampf um die Messe in den ersten Jahren der Auseinandersetzung mit Luther* (Münster, 1952), 342; see also Clark, *Eucharistic Sacrifice*, 267 and Iserloh, *Die Eucharistie*, 178-83. Protestant objections were that the Last Supper was a testament rather than sacrifice, since the latter would seem to render the sacrifice of Calvary unnecessary (Clark, 101). This prompted an eventual large-scale defense of this belief by Catholic theologians prior to Trent, and ultimately was a major factor in the council's reaffirmation of the inseparability of the sacrifice of the cross and the Last Supper (Mansi, v. 33, 128). For a fuller treatment, see M. de la Taille's biased but important study "Coena et passio in theologica apologetica contra pseudo-reformatores", *Gregorianum*, 9 (1928), 177-241.
62. Massa, *Die Eucharistiepredigt*, 110-111.
63. Clark, *Eucharistic Sacrifice*, 326; Iserloh, "Die Wert der Messe", 56, 65-67; for Scotus, it is precisely because of the authority of Hebrews that Christ cannot be the one who offers during the mass. The sacrifice of the cross is unique. Thus, if Christ were *principalis offerens* during the liturgy, this would make the sacrifice of the cross and the sacrifice of the Mass equal (as opposed to unified). The sacrifice of the cross is therefore *represented* in the mass.
64. Clark, *Eucharistic Sacrifice*, 327; cf Aquinas: "...etiam sacerdos gerit imaginem Christi, in cujus persona et virtute verba pronuntiat ad consecrandum, ut ex supra dictis patet. Et ita quodammodo idem est sacerdos et hostia" (*Summa Theologiae*, 3a, 83,1).
65. Faber, *opus*, p 4-q 1; CC, I, 250.
66. Cyprian of Carthage, *Epistola LXIII* (PL, 397); cf. Faber's remark to Luther in 1522: "Et Cyprianus in ii. lib. epistolarum ii. epistola: 'Quotiescunque calicem in commemorationem Domini et passionis eius offerimus, id quod constast Dominum fecisse, facimus'" (Faber, *opus*, p 4; CC I, 250); Theophilactus of Bulgaria, *Expositio Divi Pauli Ad Hebraeos* (PG 125, 186). Eck would later cite the same passage from Theophilactus in his 1526 *De Sacrificio Missae* (CC, 36, esp. 101); Faber, WU, f 1.
67. "Wir haben hie unfälich unnd unparthysch richter, namlich götliche gschrift, die nitt kan lügen noch trügen. Dieselbigen haben wir zegeben in hebreischer, kriechischer und latinischer zungen; die wellen wir zu beyder syten haben zu einem glychen und gerechten richter" (Hegenwald, ZW, I 498).
68. "Besich den frumen cardinalem Toletanum in hispania in seinem biechern [Büchern] die er in der hebraischen grecischen nach der sibentzig ußlegen Latin und Chaldaisch hat lassen ußgon. Besich dein hebraische bibly Deuterono. am sechtzehenden. Such den *schoresch missach* über die wort so wir habent in unser translation *oblationem spontaneam manue tue quam offeres iuxta benedictionem*" (Faber, WU, f 3); Ximénez de Cisneros, *Biblia Complutensis*, 6 vols. (Salamanca, 1514-1517; reprinted, Rome, 1984).
69. Johannes Reuchlin, *De rudimentis hebraicis libri III* (Pforzheim, 1506; reprint, Georg Olms Verlag, 1974), 289. Citation of Reuchlin, under whom Faber had studied at Tübingen, was an astute move by Faber. Ximenes was by no means neutral, since the cardinal-scholar had shared with the future Adrian VI regency for the soon-to-be Charles V, which thus associated Ximenes with the two most visible personalities of Christendom (Staub, *Dr. Johan Fabri*, 16).
70. "Nun sich ob ich war oder unwar hab geredt/ob ich das Bravium verdienet hab oder nit/sich den Targum über das *Ellech hadebarim* ['elleh haDebarîm] so vindest du die

- warheit" (Faber, *WU*, f 3). In so alluding to the Targum, one is given a hint of the atypical nature of Faber's exegetical style in comparison with other Catholic controversial theologians of the early Reformation era. Eck would later use the Targum in similar fashion in his defense of eucharistic sacrifice (Iserloh, *Die Eucharistie*, 75).
71. Faber, *WU*, f 3. Although Faber never undertook the work, his trenchant identification of Zwingli with the larger reform efforts of Luther remained a constant irritant to Zwingli, and was undoubtedly a factor in the Swiss reformer's sudden efforts in his *Auslegung* to go to considerable lengths to differentiate his cause and theology from that of Luther.
 72. The longest is article XX, which discusses the need for no other mediator than Jesus.
 73. Ironically, Zwingli's retort to Faber had employed the same sort of etymological argument used by the latter. Although, virtually absent from his pre-disputation writings, such etymological methodology would henceforth become a familiar part of Zwingli's theological treatises. There seems little evidence to support Bosshard's contention that Zwingli had little use for such etymological arguments, especially given their prominence in his *Auslegung* (Bosshard, *Zwingli, Erasmus, Cajetan*, 11).
 74. For reasons which are unclear, Zwingli has confused Faber with Plantsch.
 75. Zwingli, *Auslegung* (1523); *ZW II*, 118.
 76. Zwingli, *Auslegung* (1523); *ZW II*, 120; for a recent explication of this line of reasoning in a larger context, see Peter Henrici, S.J., "'Do this in Remembrance of Me:' the Sacrifice of Christ and the sacrifice of the Faithful", *Communio*, 12 (1985), 146-57.
 77. Zwingli, *Auslegung* (1523); *ZW II*, 150.
 78. Zwingli, *Auslegung* (1523); *ZW II*, 127-128.
 79. As Zwingli remarks, "We hear rightly that at the very moment it [the blood of Christ] was shed, the testament was brought into effect. Yet, since it has not been shed in our age, it is therefore not a sacrifice but a memorial and a renewal of that which Christ has once poured out and which has made us whole for all eternity (*Auslegung* 1523; *ZW II*, 136)."
 80. It is important to point out that Zwingli did not specifically deny such a unity, but simply ignored this line of argument, perhaps because his theology of such a complete and overwhelming act of redemption on the cross left little room for such an admission; cf. Faber, *WU*, e 4.
 81. Whether Faber's insistence that the real presence was at the heart of the eucharistic sacrifice in the face of Zwingli's adamant rejection of the real presence cannot be readily determined. Nevertheless, it is at least conceivable that Zwingli in fact had seen the logical consistency of Faber's argument, but had become so convinced of the correctness of a completely non-sacrificial mass that logically there was no room left for the corporeal presence of Christ in the eucharist. In other words, Christ *could* not be bodily present if the mass had no sacrificial dimension.
 82. Recent scholarship has argued that it is in the concept of anamnesis united to the one sacrifice of Christ that ecumenical efforts in eucharistic dialogue have the potential to find a true common ground. Furthermore, recent Protestant-Catholic dialogue has revealed a widespread agreement on, and acceptance of, a sacrificial dimension to the eucharist which is based on the notion of an eternally-effective once-for-all sacrifice of the cross, the merits of which are mediated (not repeated) to us in the liturgy [M.

Tillard, O.P., "Sacrificial Terminology and the Eucharist", *One in Christ*, 17 (1981), 306-323; Anglican-Roman Catholic Theological Commission, *The Final Report* (Windsor, 1981), 20; Leonard Swidler, "The Eucharist in Ecumenical Perspective", in *Journal of Ecumenical Studies*, 13 (1976), 338]. Modern ecclesial implications of the defensive context of sixteenth-century doctrinal formulations by both sides have received important attention recently, especially in Karl Lehman and Wolfhart Pannenberg, eds. *The Condemnations of the Reformation Era: Do They Still Divide?* (Fortress, 1990), and in David Power's *The Sacrifice We Offer: The Tridentine Dogma and its Reinterpretation* (New York, 1987).

83. An underservedly negative perception of Faber continues to cast both his theology and his person in a very dim light. A recent and otherwise reputable Zwingli biography describes Faber as "facile, unscrupulous, commonplace, elusive and well-versed in the standard textbooks or orthodoxy," while another Zwingli scholar implies that Faber resorted to theft of documents in an effort to discredit Zwingli at the Baden Disputation of 1526 [G. R. Potter, *Zwingli* (Cambridge, 1976), 101, n. 2; Gottfried Locher, *Zwingli's Thought: New Perspectives*, 72]. An objective and balanced biography of Faber has yet to be written.