

The Trial of Martin Luther

Introduction:

Now that we have learned so much about the Reformation, we are transported back to Worms in 1521. Luther will present himself before the Holy Roman Emperor to address the Church's claims that he is a heretic. Reformation figures will be coming from all over space and time to accuse or defend Martin Luther on the count of: **Development and preaching of heretical doctrine.**

Roles in the Simulation:

Characters will be assigned by lottery (except the lawyers). Each student will be responsible to:

- Research the identity of the person
- Read the primary source provided (associated with your character)
- Develop an understanding of what the person would think about Martin Luther and how he would answer the questions.

Lawyers will receive written briefs from the witnesses on each side about the biography and documents of each.

The Prosecution	The Defense	Neutral (if class size necessitates)
2 Attorneys	2 Attorneys	Charles V
Albert of Mainz -	Martin Luther-	News
Anabaptist-	Ulrich Zwingli-	
Pope Leo X -	John Calvin-	
Johann Eck-	Peasant Revolter-	
John Tetzel-	Erasmus-	
Ignatius Loyola-	Philip Melanchthon-	
Pope Paul III-	John Wycliff-	

Requirements:**Witnesses:**

1. Will testify in court. Must be able to answer questions consistently with their views and life relevant to the Reformation.
2. Will submit a one page biography about himself, a 1/2 page summary and analysis of the primary source document provided, and ½ page analysis of what your figure would think about Luther.

Prosecution and Defense Team (two people for each):

1. Will read the briefs submitted by each witness in advance of the trial.
2. Develop an opening and closing statement (3-5 minutes each). **Outlines need to be turned in.**
3. Develop 4-6 questions for each witness taking the stand. Questioning for each witness may not exceed five minutes.

Charles V

1. Will submit a one page biography about himself, a 1/2 page summary and analysis of the primary source document provided, and ½ page analysis of what is at stake for the Holy Roman Empire.
2. Will preside over the trial, keeping time and order.

News Staff

1. Will observe and report on all events relating to the trial, merging the actual historical events with our trial happenings. i.e. Research on how we got to the trial and who is involved and then report on the events and decision of our court. (2-3 pages)
2. Take notes and pictures during the trial.

Trial Procedure: Charges will be read, opening statements (beginning with the prosecution), questioning of the witnesses, closing statements (beginning with prosecution), deliberation and verdict.

HIST359/EDUC346B Lesson Planning Form for Differentiating Instruction

Teacher Sullivan

Date _____

Subject/ Topic/ Theme Western Civ/The Reformation

I. Objectives
<p>How does this lesson tie in to a unit plan? This lesson is a “tying together” of Reformation events and people in a trial of Martin Luther, a figure most closely associated with the period.</p>
<p>What are your objectives for this lesson? (As many as needed. Indicate connections to applicable national or state standards. If an objective applies to only certain students write the name(s) of the student(s) to whom it applies.)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) To evaluate the charges and accusations of heresy against Martin Luther. 2) To identify key players in the Reformation. 3) To analyze Reformation primary source documents.

II. Before you start	
Prerequisite knowledge and skills.	<p>-Students need to have a solid understanding of Reformation events and ideas to ensure a solid execution. If students lack understanding, the trial will likely not go as well.</p> <p>-Students need to have experience reading primary sources and be able to apply the knowledge so they can “become” the Reformation figure.</p>
Assessment (formative and summative)	<p>Formative: The written briefs of each witness will demonstrate the students’ basic understanding of their Reformation figure and associate document. Teacher will check in with lawyers periodically to gauge their progress in preparing for the trial. Lawyers may also need to fill out a project planning form.</p> <p>Summative: Trial performance will be an indicator of the students’ understanding. A final reflection paper will also help students relate the simulation to class material.</p>
Identify those students (individuals or groups) in your class who will need special attention and describe the level of support you plan on giving them. Refer back to the survey you did of your class.	<p>ESL students will have great difficulty understanding and also applying the primary documents and answering unknown oral questions. Teacher should provide guided questions before the reading to help the student comprehend the material. Teacher should give meaningful feedback on the witness briefs, to help correct any misunderstanding and anticipation of oral questions. Finally, the teacher should do a verbal check-in before the trial. Teacher should also check in with the tutor where applicable.</p>
Materials-what materials (books, handouts, etc) do you need for this lesson and do you have them?	<p>Primary sources for each witness Explanation hand-out Grading rubrics</p>

Do you need to set up your classroom in any special way for this lesson? If so, describe it.	It is best if the classroom can be set up to resemble a courtroom.
---	--

III. The Plan		
Time	Parts	The description of (script for) the lesson, wherein you describe teacher activities and student activities
	Motivation (Opening/ Introduction/ Engagement)	<p>Students will have already been introduced to the basic facts of the Reformation per in-class notes, the textbook, etc.</p> <p>Now it is time to evaluate the actions and decisions made during the Reformation by re-creating the trial of Martin Luther.</p> <p>Students and teacher will go through explanation hand-out together. Teacher will make sure students understand the requirements.</p> <p>Names will be drawn from a cup and students may choose what role they would like to have.</p>
	Development	<p>Students will get the proper primary source. Teacher will discuss tools to help the students understand the document and how it should inform them during the trial.</p> <p>Students will be given research time to gain an understanding of who their figure is, what role they played in the Reformation, and what their figure's opinion of Martin Luther (and h w theology) would have been.</p> <p>Students will prepare their written "witness briefs" for the lawyers. Lawyers will have a short time to meet with their witnesses and brief them on strategy and questions.</p> <p>The trial will be held during a block period.</p>
	Closure	<p>Students will write a one page reflection paper on how the in-class trial proceedings informed their understanding the Reformation, specifically of the continuity and change during this period.</p>

Primary Source Links for Each Witness

Charles V-Edict of Worms and message to rulers before meeting with Luther

<http://www.crivoice.org/creededictworms.html>

Albert of Mainz-*Instructio summaria*

Martin Luther -Writing “Against Catholicism”

<http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/mod/1535luther.html>

Anabaptist-Schleitheim Confession

Ulrich Zwingli-The Marburg Colloquy

Pope Leo X-Papal Bull condemning Luther

<http://www.papalencyclicals.net/Leo10/110exdom.htm>

John Calvin-On the Need for Reform in the Catholic Church

http://www.swrb.ab.ca/newslett/actualNLs/NRC_ch00.htm

Johann Eck- Letter to friend commenting on debates with Luther

John Tetzel-Sermon on Indulgences

<http://www.hol.com/~mikesch/tetzel.htm>

Ignatius Loyola-Rules for Thinking with the Church

Philip Melanchthon-Apology of the Augsburg Confession

Pope Paul III-Encyclical and Convening Council of Trent—*Initio Nostris*

http://www.saint-mike.org/library/Papal_Library/PaulIII/Sublimus_Dei.html

http://www.saint-mike.org/library/Papal_Library/PaulIII/Convening_Council_Trent.html

John Wycliff-On the Sacrament of Communion

<http://www.cartage.org.lb/en/themes/geoghist/histories/histdocts/Biblio14/A14/Wyclif/wyclif-euch.html>

Peasant Revolter-Twelve Articles of the Peasants

<http://personal.ashland.edu/~jmoser1/peasantarticles.htm>

Erasmus-on the Vernacular Bibles and Lay Interpretations of Scripture

not resisted, the poor would necessarily die of famine as previously. Thus the places where the affairs of piety govern have been delegated by good rules. There is the hospital where charity is exercised and close by the hospital, the *collège* where truth is taught.

Considering thus all the aforementioned things, do you know of any reason why Geneva ought not now call itself the true Church of God which has received and protected with all its power that which God first announced by His Prophets and later by His Son and the Apostles? . . .

9.7 Calvin: *Institutes of the Christian Religion*

Calvin 1960 (page numbers are in parentheses after citations)

Moreover, it has been my purpose in this labor to prepare and instruct candidates in sacred theology for the reading of the divine Word, in order that they may be able both to have easy access to it and to advance in it without stumbling. For I believe I have so embraced the sum of religion in all its parts, and have arranged it in such an order, that if anyone rightly grasps it, it will not be difficult for him to determine what he ought especially to seek in Scripture, and to what end he ought to relate its contents. If, after this road has, as it were, been paved, I shall publish any interpretations of Scripture, I shall always condense them, because I shall have no need to undertake long doctrinal discussions, and to digress into commonplace. In this way the godly reader will be spared great annoyance and boredom, provided he approach Scripture armed with knowledge of the present work, as a necessary tool. . . . (4-5)

Nearly all wisdom we possess, that is to say, true and sound wisdom, consists of two parts: the knowledge of God and of ourselves. (35)

Consequently, we know the most perfect way of seeking God, and the most suitable order, is not for us to attempt with bold curiosity to penetrate to the investigation of his essence, which we ought more to adore than meticulously search out. . . . (61-2)

But a most pernicious error widely prevails that Scripture has only so much weight as is conceded to it by the consent of the church. As if the eternal and inviolable truth of God depended upon the decision of men! . . . Thus these sacrilegious men, wishing to impose an unbridled tyranny under the cover of the church, do not care with what absurdities they ensnare themselves and others, provided they can force this one idea upon the simple-minded: that the church has authority in all things. (75)

Synods, one would expect assistance of certain from the Council of the Council of Trent. Marital cases were the bishops previously. Our lay assistants, did the Consistorial Senate signants. Thus, it could were important cases, sent on the following had jurisdiction to were obstinate in Geneva have not done under, then have not us. Knowing that the we have heretofore and Schools as we Next, it is applied to those unable to earn hands; it also supports themselves but cannot treat a number. Thus, ten which they have their own hands. From the possession of the sisters from it. Of it the poor of the city, five revenues. Trans-ere and breakfast the own minister and its. . . . It is true that oved for public uses, defenses of war, which il ecclesiastics wished loved and they were

When we call faith "knowledge" we do not mean comprehension of the sort that is commonly concerned with those things which fall under human sense perception. For faith is so far above sense that man's mind has to go beyond and rise above itself in order to attain it. . . . From this we conclude that the knowledge of faith consists in assurance rather than in comprehension. . . . For unbelief is so deeply rooted in our hearts, and we are so inclined to it, that not without hard struggle is each one able to persuade himself of what all confess with the mouth: namely, that God is faithful. . . .

Here, indeed, is the chief hinge on which faith turns: that we do not regard the promises of mercy that God offers as true only outside ourselves, but not at all in us; rather that we make them ours by inwardly embracing them. . . . Briefly, he alone is truly a believer who, convinced by a firm conviction that God is a kindly and well-disposed Father toward him, promises him all things on the basis of his generosity; who relying upon the promises of divine benevolence toward him, lays hold on an undoubted expectation of salvation. (559-62)

He is said to be justified in God's sight who is both reckoned righteous in God's judgment and has been accepted on account of his righteousness. Indeed, as iniquity is abominable to God, so no sinner can find favor in his eyes in so far as he is a sinner and so long as he is reckoned as such. Accordingly, wherever there is sin, there also the wrath and vengeance of God show themselves. Now he is justified who is reckoned in the condition not of a sinner, but of a righteous man, and for that reason, he stands firm before God's judgment seat while all sinners fall. If an innocent accused person be summoned before the judgment seat of a fair judge, where he will be judged according to his innocence, he is said to be "justified" before the judge. . . . [J]ustified by faith is he who, excluded from the righteousness of works, grasps the righteousness of Christ through faith, and is clothed in it, appears in God's sight not as a sinner but as a righteous man.

Therefore, we explain justification simply as the acceptance with which God receives us into his favor as righteous men. And we say that it consists in the remission of sins and the imputation of Christ's righteousness. (725-7)

Christian freedom, in my opinion, consists of three parts. The first: that the consciences of believers, in seeking assurance of their justification before God, should rise above and advance beyond the law, forgetting all law righteousness. . . .

The second part, dependent upon the first, is that consciences observe the law, not as if constrained by the necessity of the law, but that freed from the law's yoke they willingly obey God's will. . . .

The third part of Christian freedom lies in this: regarding outward things

1. All the members unless it is necessary, under
2. If on a weekday

9.8 Ordinance

Accordingly, those who chosen not in themselves in him, we shall not find in God the Father, if is the mirror wherein our own election. For to be engrated who may hold as sons all have been inscribed (970)

that are of themselves by any religious obligation other times not using that are of themselves created in equal condemnation for

[W]e should contemplate nature of humanity - utterly incomprehensible; ashamed to submit or yield before its majesty, nor lawful to know, nor madness. (957)



that are of themselves "indifferent" [adiaphora], we are not bound by God by any religious obligation preventing us from sometimes using them and other times not using them, indifferently. . . . (834, 836, 838)

No one who wishes to be thought religious dares simply deny predestination, by which God adopts some to hope of life, and sentences others to eternal death. . . . We call predestination God's eternal decree, by which he determined with himself what he willed to become of each man. For all are not created in equal condition; rather eternal life is fore-ordained for some, eternal damnation for others. (926)

[W]e should contemplate the evident cause of condemnation in the corrupt nature of humanity - which is closer to us - rather than seek a hidden and utterly incomprehensible cause in God's predestination. And let us not be ashamed to submit our understanding to God's boundless wisdom so far as to yield before its many secrets. For, of those things which it is neither given nor lawful to know, ignorance is learned; the craving to know, a kind of madness. (957)

Accordingly, those whom God has adopted as his sons are said to have been chosen not in themselves but in his Christ; . . . But if we have been chosen in him, we shall not find assurance of our election in ourselves; and not even in God the Father, if we conceive him as severed from his Son. Christ, then, is the mirror wherein we must, and without self-deception may, contemplate our own election. For since it is into his body the Father has destined those to be engrafted whom he has willed from eternity to be his own, that he may hold as sons all whom he acknowledges to be among his members, we have been inscribed in the book of life if we are in communion with Christ. (970)

9.8 Ordinances Concerning Church Polity in Geneva (December 17, 1546) Hughes 1966: 54-9

Concerning Sermons

1. All the members of each household shall attend church on Sundays, unless it is necessary to leave someone behind to look after children or livestock, under penalty of 3 sous.
2. If on a weekday there is a service ordered by good authority, those who are able to attend and have no legitimate excuse are to attend; at least

tion of the sort
 human sense
 to go beyond
 include that the
 henion. . . .
 inclined to it,
 himself of what
 that we do not
 aside ourselves,
 dily embracing
 ced by a firm
 toward him,
 lying upon the
 an undoubted
 and righteous in
 righteousness,
 nd favor in his
 oned as such.
 vengeance of
 the condition
 he stands firm
 recent accused
 , where he will
 "before the
 ightedness of
 is clothed in it,
 ce with which
 that it consists
 usness. (725-7)
 e first: that the
 fication before
 getting all law
 ces observe the
 freed from the
 outward things

of the holy council now in session, we renew and consider this very same bull to be valid. All this is done for the salvation of believing souls, for the strengthening of the supreme authority of the pope at Rome and of the Holy See, and for the unity and power of the church which has been entrusted to

him.

1.18 John Wyclif (c.1330-1384): "On Indulgences"

Fosdick 1952: 23-4

I confess that the indulgences of the pope, if they are what they are said to be, are a manifest blasphemy, inasmuch as he claims a power to save men almost without limit, and not only to mitigate the penalties of those who have sinned, by granting them the aid of absolution and indulgences, that they may never come to purgatory, but to give command to the holy angels, that when the soul is separated from the body, they may carry it without delay to its everlasting rest. . . .

They suppose, in the first place, that there is an infinite number of supererogatory merits, belonging to the saints, laid up in heaven, and above all, the merit of our Lord Jesus Christ, which would be sufficient to save an infinite number of other worlds, and that, over all this treasure, Christ hath set the pope. Secondly, that it is his pleasure to distribute it, and, accordingly, he may distribute therefrom to an infinite extent, since the remainder will still be infinite. Against this rude blasphemy I have elsewhere inveighed. . . . This doctrine is a manifold blasphemy against Christ, inasmuch as the pope is extolled above his humanity and deity, and so above all that is called God - pretensions which, according to the declarations of the apostle, agree with the character of the Antichrist; for he possesses Caesarean power above Christ, who had not where to lay his head. . . .

1.19 John Hus (c.1372-1415): The Treatise on the Church

Fosdick 1952: 42, 49, 55, 56

If he who is to be called Peter's vicar follows in the paths of virtue, we believe that he is his true vicar and the chief pontiff of the church over which he rules. But, if he walks in the opposite paths, then he is the legate of Antichrist at variance with Peter and Jesus Christ. . . . The pope is the manifest and true successor of Peter, the prince of the apostles, if in morals he lives at variance with the principles of Peter; and if he is avaricious, then is he the vicar of Judas, who loved the reward of

John Wyclif

see by this perpetual first one shall be held seven years after the held every ten years. with the approval and e next council. If the

ay 18, 1460)

has appeared in our the spirit of rebellion, in already committed, the Roman Pontiff, . . . urious to the Christian with law. . . . far from the Church of nem as erroneous and eals have hitherto been clare that they are vain, ary, of whatever estate, be distinguished as of to incur the sentence of the Roman Pontiff and at

arch 16, 1516)

orty, extending beyond councils. This is attested nents of the Holy Fathers but even the councils all Christian believers be res and the Holy Fathers VIII of blessed memory, erefore, with the approval

February of 1527. The meeting was presided over by Michael Sattler (1490-1527), a former prior of a Benedictine monastery who had joined the movement in 1525.

The articles we have dealt with, and in which we have been united, are these: baptism, ban, the breaking of bread, separation from abominations, shepherds in the congregation, the sword, the oath.

i. Notice concerning baptism. Baptism shall be given to all those who have been taught repentance and the amendment of life and [who] believe truly that their sins are taken away through Christ, and to all those who desire to walk in the resurrection of Jesus Christ and be buried with him in death, so that they might rise with him; to all those who wish such an understanding themselves desire and request it from us; hereby is excluded all infant baptism, the greatest and first abomination of the pope. For this you have the reasons and the testimony of the writings and the practice of the apostles. We wish simply yet resolutely and with assurance to hold to the same.

ii. We have been united as follows concerning the ban. The ban shall be employed with all these who have given themselves over to the Lord, to walk after [him] in his commandments; those who have been baptized into the one body of Christ, and let themselves be called brothers or sisters, and still somehow slip and fall into error and sin, being inadvertently overtaken. The same [shall] be warned twice privately and the third time be publicly admonished before the entire congregation according to the command of Christ (Matthew 18). But the Spirit of God before the breaking of bread, so that we may all in one spirit and in one love break and eat from one bread and drink from one cup.

Hans: Unwillingness to be reconciled to one's brother or to renounce sin.

Leon: What does one exclude people for?

Hans: Not for "six schillings worth of hazelnuts" [insignificant trifles], as our papists used to do, but for a grievous sin; and it works to the good of the sinner who looks into himself, knows himself, and renounces the sin.

Leon: How does the church deal with him if he renounces sin, avoids the path which might lead him to fall again, and reforms himself?

Hans: It takes him up again with joy, as the father received his lost son and as Paul received the Corinthians (Luke 15:20; 2 Cor. 2:10); it opens up the doors of heaven for him, and allows him to come again to the communion of the supper of Christ. So, in sum: Where baptism of water according to the institution of Christ is not set up and used, there one does not know who his brother or sister is, there is no church, no brotherly discipline or correction, no ban, no supper, nor anything like a Christian existence and reality. God lives; it is therefore true. Or heaven and earth must break in pieces. . . .

From D. Janz, ed. and trans., *Three Reformation Catechisms: Catholic, Anabaptist, Lutheran* (Toronto: Edwin Mellen Press, 1982), 147-56.

59. The Schleithem Confession (1527)

This first major expression of consensus among Anabaptist leaders emerged from a conference held in the town of Schleithem in

idols, Christ and Belial, and none will have part with the other.

To us, then, the commandment of the Lord is also obvious, whereby he orders us to be and to become separated from the evil one, and thus he will be our God and we shall be his sons and daughters.

Further, he admonishes us therefore to go out from Babylon and from the earthly Egypt, that we may not be partakers in their torment and suffering, which the Lord will bring upon them.

From all this we should learn that every-

thing which has not been united with our God in Christ is nothing but an abomination which we should shun. By this are meant all popish and anti-popish works and idolatry, gatherings, church attendances, wine-houses, guarantees and commitments of unbelief, and other things of the kind, which the world regards highly, and yet which are carnal or fleshly counter to the command of God, after the pattern of all the iniquity which is in the world. From all this we shall be separated and have no part with such, for they are nothing but abominations, which cause us to be hated before our Christ Jesus, who has freed us from the servitude of the flesh and freed us for the service of God and the Spirit whom he has given us.

Thereby shall also fall away from us the di-

bolical weapons of violence—such as sword, armor, and the like, and all of their use to protect friends or against enemies—by virtue of the word of Christ: "you shall not resist evil."

v. We have been united as follows concerning shepherds in the church of God. The shepherding in the church shall be a person according to the rule of Paul, fully and completely, who has a good report of those who are outside the faith. The office of such a person shall be to read and exhort and teach, warn, admonish, or ban in the congregation, and properly to

!!!. Concerning the breaking of bread, we

have become one and agree thus: all those who desire to break the one bread in remembrance of the broken body of Christ and all those who wish to drink of one drink in remembrance of the shed blood of Christ, they must beforehand be united in the one body of Christ, that is the congregation of God, whose head is Christ, and that by baptism. For as Paul indicates, we cannot be partakers at the same time of the table of the Lord and the table of devils. Nor can we at the same time partake and drink of the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils. That is: all those who have fellowship with the dead works of darkness have no part in the light. Thus all who follow the devil and the world, have no part with those who have been called out of the world unto God. All those who lie in evil have no part in the good.

So it shall and must be, that whoever does not share the calling of the one God to one faith, to one baptism, to one spirit, to one body together with all the children of God, may not be made one loaf together with them, as must be true if one wishes truly to break bread according to the command of Christ.

iv. We have been united concerning the separation that shall take place from the evil and the wickedness which the devil has planted in the world, simply in this: that we have no fellowship with them, and do not run with them in the confusion of their abomination. So it is; since all who have not entered into the obedience of faith and have not united themselves with God so that they will to do his will, are a great abomination before God; therefore nothing else can or really will grow or spring forth from them than abominable things. Now there is nothing else in the world and all creation than good or evil, believing and unbelieving, darkness and light, the world and those who are [come] out of the world, God's temple and

ded
for-
who
which
can,
ami-
the
shall
right
and
aken
who
hrist
they
with
and
stant
on of
f the
ce of
y and
cern-
with
o the
alled
p and
ently
twice
mon-
rding
) But
ing of
bread,
e love
: from

preside among the sisters and brothers in prayer, and in the breaking of the bread, and in all things to take care of the body of Christ, that it may be built up and developed, so that the name of God might be praised and honored through us, and the mouth of the mocker be stopped.

He shall be supported, wherein he has need, by the congregation which has chosen him, so that he who serves the gospel can also live therefrom, as the Lord has ordered. But should a shepherd do something worthy of reprimand, nothing shall be done with him without the voice of two or three witnesses. If they sin they shall be publicly reprimanded, so that others might fear.

But if the shepherd should be driven away or led to the Lord by the cross, at the same hour another shall be ordained to his place, so that the little folk and the little flock of God may not be destroyed, but be preserved by warning and be consoled.

vi. We have been united as follows concerning the sword. The sword is an ordering of God outside the perfection of Christ. It punishes and kills the wicked, and guards and protects the good. In the law the sword is established over the wicked for punishment and for death, and the secular rulers are established to wield the same.

But within the perfection of Christ only the ban is used for the admonition and exclusion of the one who has sinned, without the death of the flesh, simply the warning and the command to sin no more.

Now many, who do not understand Christ's will for us, will ask whether a Christian may or should use the sword against the wicked for the protection and defense of the good, or for the sake of love.

The answer is unanimously revealed: Christ teaches and commands us to learn from him,

for he is meek and lowly of heart, and thus we shall find rest for our souls. Now Christ says to the woman who was taken in adultery, not that she should be stoned according to the law of his Father (and yet he says, "What the Father commanded me, that I do"), but with mercy and forgiveness and the warning to sin no more, says: "Go, sin no more." Exactly thus should we also proceed, according to the rule of the ban.

Second, is asked concerning the sword whether a Christian shall pass sentence in disputes and strife about worldly matters, such as the unbelievers have with one another. The answer: Christ did not wish to decide or pass judgment between brother and brother concerning inheritance, but refused to do so. So should we also do.

Third, is asked concerning the sword whether the Christian should be a magistrate if he is chosen thereto. This is answered thus: Christ was to be made king, but he fled and did not discern the ordinance of his Father. Thus we should also do as he did and follow after him, and we shall not walk in darkness. For he himself says: "Whoever would come after me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me." He himself further forbids the violence of the sword when he says, "The princes of this world lord it over them etc., but among you it shall not be so." Further Paul says:

"Whom God has foreknown, the same he has also predestined to be conformed to the image of his Son," etc. Peter also says: "Christ has suffered (not ruled) and has left us an example, that you should follow after in his steps."

Lastly one can see in the following points that it does not befit a Christian to be a magistrate: the rule of the government is according to the flesh, that of the Christians according to the spirit. Their houses and dwelling remain in this world; that of the Christians is in heaven. Their citizenship is in this world; that of the Chris-

tians is in heaven and warfare against the flesh, but the warfare is in the heart, and that which is written in the law is done only not falsely of the law, whether by carnal and that which gives "black" den. We swear, now simple. But because he would if he should source, "abundantly"

will did not change, inserted an oath so that by two immutable things we might have a stronger consolation (for it is impossible that God should lie)." Notice the meaning of the passage: God has the power to do what he forbids you, for everything is possible to him. God swore an oath to Abraham, Scripture says, in order to prove that his counsel is immutable. That means: no one can withstand and thwart his will; thus he can keep his oath. But we cannot, as Christ said above, hold or perform our oath; therefore we should not swear.

Others say that swearing cannot be forbidden by God in the New Testament when it was commanded in the Old, but that it is forbidden only to swear by heaven, earth, Jerusalem, and our head. Answer: hear the Scripture. He who swears by heaven, swears by God's throne and by him who sits thereon. Observe: swearing by heaven is forbidden, which is only God's throne; how much more is it forbidden to swear by God himself. You blind fools, what is greater, the throne or he who sits upon it?

Others say, if it is then wrong to use God for truth, then the apostles Peter and Paul also swore. Answer: Peter and Paul only testify to that which God promised Abraham, whom we long after have received. But when one testifies, one testifies concerning that which is present, whether it be good or evil. Thus Simeon spoke of Christ to Mary and testified: "Behold: this one is ordained for the falling and rising of many in Israel and to be a sign which will be spoken against."

Christ taught us similarly when he says: Your speech shall be yea, yea; and nay, nay; for what is more than that comes of evil. He says, your speech or your word shall be yea and no, so that no one might understand that he had permitted it. Christ is simply yea and nay, and all those who seek him simply will understand his Word. Amen.

The weapons of their battle and warfare are carnal and only against the flesh, but the weapons of Christians are spiritual, against the fortification of the devil. The worldly are armed with steel and iron, but Christians are armed with the armor of God, with truth, righteousness, peace, faith, salvation, and with the Word of God. In sum: as Christ our Head is minded, so also must be minded the members of the body of Christ through him, so that there be no division in the body, though which it would be destroyed. Since then Christ is as is written of him, so must his members also be the same, so that his body may remain whole and united for its own advancement and upbuilding. For any kingdom which is divided within itself will be destroyed.

vii. We have been united as follows concerning the oath. The oath is a confirmation among those who are quarreling or making promises. In the law it is commanded that it should be done only in the name of God, truthfully and not falsely. Christ, who teaches the perfection of the law, forbids his [followers] all swearing, whether true or false; neither by heaven nor by earth, neither by Jerusalem nor by our head; and that for the reason which he goes on to give: "For you cannot make one hair white or black." You see, thereby all swearing is forbidden. We cannot perform what is promised in swearing, for we are not able to change the smallest part of ourselves.

Now there are some who do not believe the simple commandment of God and who say, "But God swore by himself to Abraham, because he was God (as he promised him that he would do good to him and would be his God if he kept his commandments). Why then should I not swear if I promise something to someone?" The answer: hear what Scripture says. "God, since he wished to prove overabundantly to the heirs of his promise that his

eousness, our opponents confuse this doctrine miserably, they obscure the glory and the blessings of Christ, and they rob pious consciences of the consolation offered them in Christ. To substantiate our Confession and to refute the objections of our opponents, we shall have to say a few things by way of preface so that the sources of both kinds of doctrine, the opponents' and our own, might be recognized.

All Scripture should be divided into these two chief doctrines, the law and the promises. In some places it presents the law. In others it presents the promise of Christ; this it does either when it promises that the Messiah will come and promises forgiveness of sins, justification, and eternal life for his sake, or when, in the New Testament, the Christ who came promises forgiveness of sins, justification, and eternal life. By "law" in this discussion we mean the commandments of the Decalogue, wherever they appear in the Scriptures. For the present we are saying nothing about the ceremonial and civil laws of Moses. Of these two doctrines our opponents select the law and by it they seek forgiveness of sins and justification. For to some extent human reason naturally understands the law since it has the same judgment naturally written in the mind. But the Decalogue does not only require external works that reason can somehow perform. It also requires other works far beyond the reach of reason, like true fear of God, true love of God, true prayer to God, true conviction that God hears prayer, and the expectation of God's help in death and all afflictions. Finally, it requires obedience to God in death and all afflictions, lest we try to flee these things or turn away when God imposes them. Here the scholastics have followed the philosophers. Thus they teach only the righteousness of

we believe that Christ suffered for us and that for his sake our sin is forgiven and righteous, our opponents confuse this doctrine miserably, they obscure the glory and the blessings of Christ, and they rob pious consciences of the consolation offered them in Christ. To substantiate our Confession and to refute the objections of our opponents, we shall have to say a few things by way of preface so that the sources of both kinds of doctrine, the opponents' and our own, might be recognized.

From Tappert, Book of Concord, 30.

28. Philip Melancthon, *Apology of the Augsburg Confession* (1531)

After the Augsburg negotiations broke down, Melancthon prepared a lengthy explanation and defense of the *Augsburg Confession*. In its section on justification (printed here), we can see how the most prominent of Luther's followers now understood the heart of his Reformation protest.

[Article IV, Justification]

In the fourth, fifth, and sixth articles, and later in the twentieth, they condemn us for teaching that men do not receive the forgiveness of sins because of their own merits, but freely for Christ's sake, by faith in him. They condemn us both for denying that men receive the forgiveness of sins because of their merits, and for affirming that men receive the forgiveness of sins by faith and by faith in Christ are justified.

In this controversy the main doctrine of Christianity is involved; when it is properly understood, it illumines and magnifies the honor of Christ and brings to pious consciences the abundant consolation that they need. We therefore ask his Imperial Majesty kindly to hear us out on this important issue. For since they understand neither the forgiveness of sins nor faith nor grace nor right-

reason—that is, civil works—and maintain that without the Holy Spirit reason can love God above all things. As long as a man's mind is at rest and he does not feel God's wrath or judgment, he can imagine that he wants to love God and that he wants to do good for God's sake. In this way the scholastics teach men to merit the forgiveness of sins by doing what is within them, that is, if reason in its sorrow over sin elicits an act of love to God or does good for God's sake. Because this view naturally hinders men, it has produced and increased many types of worship in the church, like monastic vows and the abuses of the mass; someone has always been making up this or that form of worship or devotion with this view in mind. To support and increase trust in such works, the scholastics have declared that by necessity—the necessity of unchanging order, not of compulsion—God grants grace to those who do this.

In this point of view there are many vicious errors that would take a long time to enumerate. But let the intelligent reader just consider this. If this is Christian righteousness, what difference is there between philosophy and the teaching of Christ? If we merit the forgiveness of sins by these elicited acts of ours, of what use is Christ? If we can be justified by reason and its works, what need is there of Christ or of regeneration? On the basis of these opinions, things have come to such a pass that many people ridicule us for teaching that men ought to seek some righteousness beyond the philosophical. We have heard of some who, in their sermons, laid aside the gospel and expounded the ethics of Aristotle. If the opponents' ideas are correct, this was perfectly proper, for Aristotle wrote so well on natural ethics that nothing further needs to be added. We see that there are books in existence which compare certain teachings of Christ with the teachings of Aristotle. If the opponents' ideas are correct, Aristotle. If the opponents' ideas are correct, aside the gospel and expounded the ethics of Aristotle. If the opponents' ideas are correct, heard of some who, in their sermons, laid eousness beyond the philosophical. We have teaching that men ought to seek some right- such a pass that many people ridicule us for basis of these opinions, things have come to there of Christ or of regeneration? On the tified by reason and its works, what need is ours, of what use is Christ? If we can be jus- the forgiveness of sins by these elicited acts of ophy and the teaching of Christ? If we merit the forgiveness of sins by these elicited acts of nness, what difference is there between philos- consider this. If this is Christian righteous- enumerate. But let the intelligent reader just vicious errors that would take a long time to

freely receive the forgiveness of sins and rec- mediator and believe that for his sake they oncliation, but should dream that they merit the forgiveness of sins and are accounted righteous by their own keeping of the law before God. This in spite of the fact that the law is never satisfied, that reason performs only certain external works and meanwhile neither fears God nor truly believes that he cares. Though they talk about this disposition, yet without the righteousness of faith man can neither have nor understand the love of God.

When they make up a distinction between merit of congruity and merit of condignity, they are only playing in order to avoid the impression that they are outright Pelagians.

In order not to bypass Christ altogether, our opponents require a knowledge of the history about Christ and claim that he merited for us a certain disposition or, as they call it, "initial grace," which they understand as a disposition inclining us to love God more easily. It is clear, however, what they ascribe to this disposition, for they imagine that the acts of the will before the disposition and those after it are of the same type. They imagine that the will can love God, but that this disposition stimulates it to do so more freely. They bid us merit this first disposition by our preceding merits. Then they bid us merit an increase of this disposition and eternal life by the works of the law. Thus they bury Christ; men should not use him as mediator and believe that for his sake they freely receive the forgiveness of sins and reconciliation, but should dream that they merit the forgiveness of sins and are accounted righteous by their own keeping of the law before God. This in spite of the fact that the law is never satisfied, that reason performs only certain external works and meanwhile neither fears God nor truly believes that he cares. Though they talk about this disposition, yet without the righteousness of faith man can neither have nor understand the love of God.

When they make up a distinction between merit of congruity and merit of condignity, they are only playing in order to avoid the impression that they are outright Pelagians.

down for the lawless." For God wants this civil discipline to restrain the unspiritual, and to preserve it he has given laws, learning, teaching, governments, and penalties. To some extent, reason can produce this righteousness by its own strength, though it is often overwhelmed by its natural weakness and by the devil, who drives it to open crimes. We freely give this righteousness of reason its due credit; for our corrupt nature has no greater good than this, as Aristotle correctly says, "Neither the evening star nor the morning star is more beautiful than righteousness." God even honors it with material rewards. Nevertheless, it ought not be praised at the expense of Christ. For it is false that by our works we merit the forgiveness of sins.

It is false, too, that men are accounted righteous before God because of the righteousness of reason.

It is false, too, that by its own strength reason can love God above all things and keep his law, truly fear him, truly believe that he hears prayer, willingly obey him in death and in his other visitations, and not cover. But reason can produce civil works. It is false, too, and a reproach to Christ, that men who keep the commandments of God outside a state of grace do not sin.

We have proof for this position of ours not only in the Scriptures, but also in the Fathers. Against the Pelagians, Augustine maintains at length that grace is not given because of our merits. In *Nature and Grace* he says:

If natural capacity, with the help of free will, is in itself sufficient both for discovering how one ought to live, and also for leading a holy life, then "Christ died to no purpose" (Gal. 2:21), and therefore also "the stumbling-block of the cross has been removed" (Gal. 5:11). Why then may I not

For if God necessarily gives grace for the merit of congruity, it is no longer merit of congruity but merit of condignity. They do not know what they are talking about. They imagine that after that disposition of love a man can earn the merit of condignity, but they would have him doubt whether the disposition is truly present. How is one to know whether one has the merit of congruity or the merit of condignity? But this whole business is the invention of idle men who do not know how the forgiveness of sins takes place, or how the judgment of God and the errors of conscience drive out our trust in works. Smug hypocrites always believe that they have the merit of condignity, whether or not the disposition is there, because men naturally trust their own righteousness. But terrified consciences waver and doubt and then seek to pile up other works to find peace. They never suppose that they have the merit of condignity, and so they run headlong into despair, unless they hear, beyond the teaching of the law, the gospel of the free forgiveness of sins and the righteousness of faith.

Thus our opponents teach nothing but the righteousness of reason or of law, at which they look as the Jews did at the veiled face of Moses. In smug hypocrites, who think that they are keeping the law, they arouse presumption, a vain trust in works and a contempt for the grace of Christ. Timid consciences, on the other hand, they drive to despair because in their doubt they can never experience what faith is and how effective it is. And at last they despair utterly.

We for our part maintain that God requires the righteousness of reason. Because of God's command, honorable works commanded in the Decalogue should be performed, according to Gal. 3:24, "The law is a custodian," and 1 Tim. 1:9, "The law is laid

gh Christ
by which
ins rather
rits. So if
nents that
stification
be no dif-
Pharisaic
business.
together,
ge of the
r he mer-
r, as they
understand
love God
what they
y imagine
isposition
ype. They
but that
so more
isposition
ey bid us
and eter-
Thus they
e him as
sake they
s and rec-
they merit
accounted
of the law
t that the
performs
neanwhile
es that he
s disposi-
s of faith
stand the
n between
ndignity,
avoid the
Pelagians.

law of God. Meanwhile they do not see the first table, which commands us to love God, to be sure that God is wrathful at our sin, to fear him truly, and to be sure that he hears us. But without the Holy Spirit, the human heart either despises the judgment of God in its smugness, or in the midst of punishment it flees and hates his judgment. So it does not obey the first table. It is inherent in man to despise God and to doubt his Word with its threats and promises. Therefore men really sin even when they do virtuous things without the Holy Spirit; for they do them with a wicked heart, and (Rom. 14:23) "whatever does not proceed from faith is sin." Such people despise God when they do these things, as Epicurus did not believe that God cared for him or regarded or heard him. This contempt for God corrupts works that seem virtuous, for God judges the heart.

Finally, it was very foolish of our opponents to write that men who are under eternal wrath merit the forgiveness of sins by an elicited act of love, since it is impossible to love God unless faith has first accepted the forgiveness of sins. A heart that really feels God's wrath cannot love him unless it sees that he is reconciled. While he terrifies us and seems to be casting us into eternal death, human nature cannot bring itself to love a wrathful, judging, punishing God. It is easy enough for idle men to make up these dreams that a man guilty of mortal sin can love God above all things, since they themselves do not feel the wrath or judgment of God. But in the agony of conscience and in conflict, the conscience experiences how vain these philosophical speculations are. Paul says (Rom. 4:15), "The law brings wrath." He does not say that by the law men merit the forgiveness of sins. For the law always accuses and terrifies consciences. It does not justify, because a conscience terrified by the

Content with this, they think they satisfy the civil righteousness that reason understands. means of the second table, which contain the opponents concentrate on the command-lent and praiseworthy in human eyes. Our even when it produces deeds that are excellent to God's law, it is certainly sinning submit to God, then the flesh sins even when it performs outward civil works. If it cannot tile to God, the mind that is set on the flesh is hostile to God, indeed it cannot please God." These words are so clear that they do not need an acute understanding but only attentive listening—to use the words that Augustine uses in discussing this matter.

If the mind that is set on the flesh is hostile to God, then the flesh sins even when it performs outward civil works. If it cannot submit to God's law, it does not submit to God's law, indeed it cannot; and those who are in the flesh cannot please God." These words are so clear that they do not need an acute understanding but only attentive listening—to use the words that Augustine uses in discussing this matter.

John 8:36 says, "If the Son makes you free, you will be free indeed." Therefore reason cannot free us from our sins or merit for us the forgiveness of sins. And in John 3:5 it is written, "Unless one is born of water and the Spirit, one cannot enter the kingdom of God." But if we must be born again through the Holy Spirit, then the righteousness of reason does not justify us before God, it does not keep the law. And Rom. 3:23 says, "All fall short of the glory of God," that is, they lack the wisdom and righteousness of God which acknowledge and glorify him. And Rom. 8:7, 8, "The mind that is set on the flesh is hostile to God; it does not submit to God's law, indeed it cannot; and those who are in the flesh cannot please God." These words are so clear that they do not need an acute understanding but only attentive listening—to use the words that Augustine uses in discussing this matter.

John 8:36 says, "If the Son makes you free, you will be free indeed." Therefore reason cannot free us from our sins or merit for us the forgiveness of sins. And in John 3:5 it is written, "Unless one is born of water and the Spirit, one cannot enter the kingdom of God." But if we must be born again through the Holy Spirit, then the righteousness of reason does not justify us before God, it does not keep the law. And Rom. 3:23 says, "All fall short of the glory of God," that is, they lack the wisdom and righteousness of God which acknowledge and glorify him. And Rom. 8:7, 8, "The mind that is set on the flesh is hostile to God; it does not submit to God's law, indeed it cannot; and those who are in the flesh cannot please God." These words are so clear that they do not need an acute understanding but only attentive listening—to use the words that Augustine uses in discussing this matter.

John 8:36 says, "If the Son makes you free, you will be free indeed." Therefore reason cannot free us from our sins or merit for us the forgiveness of sins. And in John 3:5 it is written, "Unless one is born of water and the Spirit, one cannot enter the kingdom of God." But if we must be born again through the Holy Spirit, then the righteousness of reason does not justify us before God, it does not keep the law. And Rom. 3:23 says, "All fall short of the glory of God," that is, they lack the wisdom and righteousness of God which acknowledge and glorify him. And Rom. 8:7, 8, "The mind that is set on the flesh is hostile to God; it does not submit to God's law, indeed it cannot; and those who are in the flesh cannot please God." These words are so clear that they do not need an acute understanding but only attentive listening—to use the words that Augustine uses in discussing this matter.

myself exclaim, too—yes, I will exclaim and chide them with a Christian's sorrow—"You are severed from Christ, you who would be justified by the law; you have fallen away from grace" (Gal. 5:4); for "being ignorant of the righteousness that comes from God, and seeking to establish your own, you did not submit to God's righteousness" (Rom. 10:3). For even as Christ is "the end of the law," so likewise he is the Savior of man's corrupted nature, for righteousness to "every one who has faith" (Rom. 10:4).

cannot justify ourselves. Otherwise, why would a promise be necessary? The gospel is, strictly speaking, the promise of forgiveness of sins and justification because of Christ. Since we can accept this promise only by faith, the gospel proclaims the righteousness of faith in Christ, which the law does not teach. And this is not the righteousness of the law. For the law requires our own works and our own perfection. But to us, oppressed by sin and death, the promise freely offers reconciliation for Christ's sake, which we do not accept by works but by faith alone. This faith brings to God a trust not in our own merits, but only in the promise of mercy in Christ. Therefore, when a man believes that his sins are forgiven because of Christ and that God is reconciled and favorably disposed to him because of Christ, this personal faith obtains the forgiveness of sins and justifies us. In penitence and the errors of conscience it consoles and encourages our hearts. Thus it regenerates us and brings us the Holy Spirit, so that we can finally obey God's law, love him, truly fear him, be sure that he hears us, and obey him in all afflictions. It mortifies our lust. By freely accepting the forgiveness of sins, faith sets against God's wrath not our merits of love, but Christ the mediator and propitiator. This faith is the true knowledge of Christ, it uses his blessings, it regenerates our hearts, it precedes our keeping of the law. About this faith there is not a syllable in the teaching of our opponents. Therefore we condemn our opponents for teaching the righteousness of the law instead of the righteousness of the gospel, which proclaims the righteousness of faith in Christ.

What Is Justifying Faith?

Our opponents imagine that faith is only historical knowledge and teach that it can exist with mortal sin. And so they say nothing about faith by which, as Paul says so

free promise, however, it follows that we Since we obtain justification through a useless. keep, it would follow that the promise is our merits and the law, which we never For if the promise were conditional upon heirs, faith is null and the promise is void." the adherents of the law who are to be the action. So Paul reasons in Rom. 4:14, "If it is would never obtain the promise of reconciliation. So Paul reasons in Rom. 4:14, "If it is do not keep the law, it would follow that we by the law, it would be useless. For since we upon our merits and if reconciliation were our merits. If the forgiveness of sins depended freely. Reconciliation does not depend upon 3:21), that is, the forgiveness of sins is offered been manifested apart from law" (Rom. says, "Now, the righteousness of God has longer on the basis of grace." Elsewhere he says (Rom. 11:6), "If it is by works, it is no ness of sins and justification freely. As Paul tional upon our merits but offers the forgive- the propitiator. This promise is not condi- and has been appointed as the mediator and make satisfaction for the sins of the world because of Christ. He was given for us to ness of sins and justification was given or justify us, but the promise of the forgive- this account the law cannot free us from sin and subject to eternal wrath and death. On their own strength, and they are all under sin Therefore men cannot keep the law by been considering.

those errors of our opponents that we have further evidence; this will also help refuse faith, the subject itself will compel us to cite tion of our doctrine of the righteousness of our opponents teach. Later on, in the exposi- the righteousness of law or of reason which givenness of sins. We have said enough about law and by their works they merit the for- error, therefore, for men to trust that by the law flees before God's judgment. It is an

The promise is accepted by faith; the fact that it is free excludes our merits and shows that the blessing is offered only by mercy; the merits of Christ are the price because there must be a certain propitiation for our sins. Scripture contains many pleas for mercy, and the holy Fathers often say that we are saved by mercy. And so at every mention of mercy we must remember that this requires faith, which accepts the promise of mercy. Similarly, at every mention of faith we are also thinking of its object, the promised mercy. For faith does not justify or save because it is a good work in itself, but only because it accepts the promised mercy.

This service and worship is especially praised throughout the prophets and the psalms. Even though the law does not teach the free forgiveness of sins, the patriarchs knew the promise of the Christ, that for his sake God intended to forgive sins. As they understood that the Christ would be the price for our sins, they knew that our works could not pay so high a price. Therefore they received free mercy and the forgiveness of sins by faith, just as the saints in the New Testament. The frequent references to mercy and faith in the psalms and the prophets belong here; for example, "If thou, O Lord, shouldst mark iniquities, Lord, who shall stand?" (Ps. 130:3). Here the psalmist confesses his sins, but he does not lay claim to any merit of his own. He adds, "There is forgiveness with thee" (v. 4). Here he comforts himself with his trust in God's mercy. He quotes the promise: "My soul waits for his word, my soul hopes in the Lord," that is, because thou hast promised the forgiveness of sins I am sustained by thy promise. Therefore the patriarchs, too, were justified not by the law but by the promise and faith. It is strange that our opponents make so little of

often, men are justified, because those who are accounted righteous before God do not live in mortal sin. The faith that justifies, however, is no mere historical knowledge, but the firm acceptance of God's offer promising forgiveness of sins and justification. To avoid the impression that it is merely knowledge, we add that to have faith means to want and to accept the promised offer of forgiveness of sins and justification.

It is easy to determine the difference between this faith and the righteousness of the law. Faith is that worship which receives God's offered blessings; the righteousness of the law is that worship which offers God our own merits. It is by faith that God wants to be worshipped, namely, that we receive from him what he promises and offers.

Paul clearly shows that faith does not simply mean historical knowledge but is a firm acceptance of the promise (Rom. 4:16): "That is why it depends on faith, in order that the promise may be guaranteed." For he says that only faith can accept the promise. He therefore correlates and connects promise and faith. It will be easy to determine what faith is if we pay attention to the article of the creed on the forgiveness of sins. So it is not enough to believe that Christ was born, suffered, and was raised unless we add this article, the purpose of the history, "the forgiveness of sins." The rest must be integrated with this article, namely, that for Christ's sake and not because of our own merits the forgiveness of sins is bestowed upon us. For why did Christ have to be offered for our sins if our merits make satisfaction for them?

In speaking of justifying faith, therefore, we must remember that these three elements always belong together: the promise itself, the fact that the promise is free, and the merits of Christ as the price and propitiation.

asserted that good works are detrimental to

salvation.

2. The second controversy arose among certain theologians concerning the use of the words "necessary" and "free." The one party contended that we should not use the word "necessary" when speaking of the new obedience, since it does not flow from necessity or coercion but from a spontaneous spirit. The other party held with reference to the word "necessary" that the new obedience is not a matter of our choice but that regenerated persons are bound to render such obedience. At first this was merely a semantic issue. Later on, a real controversy developed. The one party contended that the law should not be preached at all to Christians but that people should be admonished to do good works solely on the basis of the gospel. This the other party denied.

Affirmative Theses

The Pure Doctrine of the Christian Church in This Controversy: In order to explain this controversy from the ground up and to resolve it, this is our doctrine, faith, and confession:

1. That good works, like fruits of a good tree, certainly and indubitably follow genuine faith—if it is a living and not a dead

faith.

2. We believe, teach, and confess that good works should be completely excluded from a discussion of the article of man's salvation as well as from the article of our justification before God. The apostle affirms in clear terms, "So also David declares that salvation pertains only to the man to whom God reckons righteousness apart from works, saying, 'Blessed are those whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered'" (Rom. 4:6-8). And again, "For by grace you have been saved through faith; and this is not your own doing, it is the gift of God—not

faith when they see it praised everywhere as the foremost kind of worship, as in Ps. 50:15: "Call upon me in the day of trouble; I will deliver you, and you shall glorify me." This is how God wants to be known and worshipped, that we accept his blessings and receive them because of his mercy rather than because of our own merits. This is the greatest consolation in all afflictions, and our opponents take it away when they despise and disparage faith and teach men to deal with God only by works and merits.



From Tappert, Book of Concord, 107-15.

29. Formula of Concord (1580)

Luther's death in 1546 heralded energetic debate and even factionalism among his followers. What precisely had he meant, especially in his diverse writings about justification? "Lutheran" theologians, or as they called themselves "theologians of the Augsburg Confession," reached a measure of agreement in 1580, and the result was the *Formula of Concord*. In it the movement unified itself around a normative restatement of what Luther had intended.



IV. Good Works

The Chief Issue in the Controversy Concerning Good Works

Two controversies have arisen in some churches concerning the doctrine of good works:

1. The first division among some theologians was occasioned when one party asserted that good works are necessary to salvation; that it is impossible to be saved without good works; and that no one has ever been saved without good works. The other party

the fact shows mercy; because for our as for that we mention at this raise of faith we omitted or save ut only 7. specially and the at teach patriarchs for his as they be the works re they ness of the New mercy prophets Lord, o shall st con- claim to e is for- omforts cy. He for his that is, iveness There- not by h. It is little of

honor to the five wounds of our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom has been enacted our redemption. . . .

For those who are confined to their beds there may be deputed a dedicated image before which or to which they may say certain prayers according to the ruling of the penitentiary. . . .

If anyone for any reason seeks to be excused the visit to the said churches or altars, the penitentiaries, having heard the reason, may allow it: such a visit may be compounded by a larger financial contribution.

This money must be placed in a box. But the contributions for the repository in aid of the construction of the building of the chief of the apostles will be sought as follows: first the penitentiaries and confessors, after expounding the magnitude of such plenary remission and indulgences to those who confess, will ask them how much in money or other temporal possessions their consciences tell them it is worth to make good the lack of such plenary remission and indulgences; they will ask this to facilitate their subsequent inducements to contribute. And since human conditions vary far too much for us to take separate account of them all and lay an appropriate assessment on each, we classify them in general terms and assess the classes as follows. . . . [Albert then assesses at fixed amounts all classes from kings and archbishops down through abbots and barons to priests and merchants and the lesser orders of society concluding with] the penitents, who may make good their contribution by prayers and fasting: for the kingdom of heaven should not stand open for the rich more than for the poor. . . .

The second principal grace is the confessional, carrying with it the greatest, most relevant and previously unknown indulgences.

Plenary remission should avail by intercession for the said souls in purgatory, to win them relief from their punishments—the souls, that is, for whose sakes the stated quantity or value of money has been paid in the manner declared.



11. Albert of Mainz, *Instructio summaria* (1515)

The following are the four principal gifts of grace that have been granted by the apostolic bull: any one of them can be had separately. It is on these four indulgences that the preachers must concentrate their utmost diligence, inflaming them one by one into the ears of the faithful in the most effective way, and explaining them with all the ability they have.

The first principal grace is the plenary remission of all sins—the greatest of all graces, for the reason that man, a sinner who is deprived of divine grace, obtains through it perfect remission and God's grace anew. In addition, through this remission of sins, punishments to be undergone in purgatory because of offense done to the divine majesty, are remitted in full, and the punishments of the said purgatory are totally wiped out. Now it is true that no possible repayment could be sufficient to earn so great a grace, for the reason that God's gift and his grace are beyond valuation; nevertheless, that the invitation of Christians to secure it may be made easier, we lay down the following procedure: First, let every penitent who has made oral confession visit as least seven of the churches appointed for this purpose—that is, those in which the papal arms are installed—and in each church let him say with devotion five Paternosters and five Ave Marias to render

ade their
to have
blessed
from the
is there
inished,
erits of
number
rs appli-
of merits

Its contents and their significance the preachers and confessors must explain and extol with all their power. In the confession-all the following concessions are made for those who pay for it:

The right to choose as a suitable confessor even a regular of a mendicant order who can in the first place absolve them from having to seek a settlement of complaints that other men can bring against them.

He can absolve them once in the course of their lives and also in *articulo mortis* from certain of the gravest sins, even those which are reserved for the apostolic see. He can absolve them from cases not reserved for the apostolic see as often as is necessary.

He can apply plenary indulgence of all sins once in the course of the confessing person's life and in *articulo mortis* as often as death threatens, even if the threat does not materialize.

He can commute any kind of vows for other works of piety, except solemn vows undertaken overseas or of a pilgrimage to the thresholds of the apostles (and of St. James in Compostela) or of the religious life and of chastity.

He can administer the sacrament of the Eucharist at any time of the year except Easter day and in *articulo mortis*.

We order that one of these confessionals must be made generally available to ensure that the poor are not excluded from the graces it contains, . . . the reckoning being a quarter of a golden Rhenish florin which (quite apart from the usual assessment) must be placed in the indulgence-repository. . . .

The third principal grace is participation in all the blessings of the universal church. . . .

The fourth principal grace is the plenary remission of all sins for the souls that exist in purgatory, which the pope grants and con-

12. Dietrich Kolde, *Mirror for Eating, Sleeping, and Dying*

Christians (1470)

From E. G. Rupp and B. Drewery, eds., *Martin Luther* (London: Edward Arnold, and New York: St. Martin's Press, 1970), 13-17.



cedes by means of intercessions, so that a contribution placed by the living in the repository on their behalf counts as one which a man might make or give for himself. . . . There is no need for the contributors to be of contrite heart or to make oral confession, since this grace depends (as the bull makes clear) on the love in which the departed died and the contributions which the living pay.

Dietrich Kolde (d. 1515) was first an Augustinian and then a Franciscan priest who served various constituencies in German-speaking lands and the Low Countries. His catechism was written in German for the instruction of uneducated lay people, and after its first printing in 1470 it went on to become one of the most popular of these pedagogical tools. In it he rehearses and explains the traditional matter of catechesis—the creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments. And along the way he inserts practical advice about how Christians should conduct themselves in the most mundane events of ordinary life. He also adds a section on how to die, a major theme in late medieval devotional literature.



A Lesson About How a Person Should Conduct Himself at Meals

When you are about to sit down to eat and drink at the table, you should bless God first

This pleased the Elector Frederick considerably. After I had spoken, I was granted leave.

WA, TR 5, No. 5344

▶ The morning after Luther's second appearance Emperor Charles V^{as} assembled the rulers and stated his own position.

You know that my ancestors were the most Christian Emperors of the illustrious German nation, the Catholic kings of Spain, the archdukes of Austria, and the dukes of Burgundy, who all were, until death, faithful sons of the Roman Church. Always they defended the Catholic faith, the sacred ceremonies, decretals, ordinances and holy rites to the honour of God, the propagation of the faith and the salvation of souls. After their deaths they left, by natural law and heritage, these holy Catholic rites, for us to live and to die following their example.

I am therefore resolved to maintain everything which these my forebears have established to the present, especially that which my predecessors ordered at the Council of Constance and at other councils. It is certain that a single monk errs in his opinion which is against what all of Christendom has held for over a thousand years to the present. According to his opinion all of Christendom has always been in error. To settle this matter I am therefore determined to use all my dominions and possessions, my friends, my body, my blood, my life and my soul. It would be a great disgrace for you and me, the illustrious and renowned German nation, appointed by privilege and singular pre-eminence to be the defenders and protectors of the Catholic faith, as well as a perpetual dishonour for both us and our posterity, if in our time not only heresy, but the suspicion of heresy and the degradation of the Christian religion were due to our negligence.

After the impertinent reply which Luther gave yesterday in our presence, I declare that I now regret having delayed so long the proceedings against him and his false doctrines. I am resolved that I will never again hear him talk. He is to be taken back immediately according to the arrangements of the mandate with due regard for the stipulations of his safe-conduct. He is not to preach or seduce the people with his evil doctrine and is not to incite rebellion. As said above, I am resolved to act and proceed against him as against a notorious heretic, asking you to state your opinion as good Christians and to keep the vow given me.

Deutsche Reichstagsakten, II, 595-6

In May 1521, Emperor Charles V issued, in the name of the Diet, the following edict against Luther and his followers:

As it pertains to our office of Roman emperor, not only to enlarge the bounds of the Holy Roman Empire, which our fathers of the German nation founded for the defence of the Holy Roman and Catholic Church, punishing unbelievers by the sword, through the divine grace, with much shedding of blood, but also, adhering to the rule hitherto observed by the Holy Roman Church, to take care that no stain or suspicion of heresy should contaminate our holy faith within the Roman Empire, or, if heresy had already begun, to extirpate it with all necessary diligence, prudence, and discretion, as the case might demand;

Therefore we hold that if it was the duty of any of our ancestors to defend the Christian name, much greater is the obligation on us. . . . Certain heresies have sprung up in the German nation within the last three years, which were formerly condemned by the holy councils and papal decrees, with the consent of the whole Church, and are now drawn away from hell; should we permit them to become more deeply rooted, by our negligence, tolerate and bear with them, our conscience would be greatly burdened, and the future glory of our name would be covered by a dark cloud in the auspicious beginnings of our reign.

Since now without doubt it is plain to you all how far these errors and heresies depart from the Christian way, which a certain Martin Luther, of the Augustinian order, has sought violently and virulently to introduce and disseminate within the Christian religion and its established order, especially in the German nation, which is renowned as a perpetual destroyer of all unbelief and heresy; so that, unless it is speedily prevented, the whole German nation, and later all other nations, will be infected by this same disorder, and mighty dissolution and pitiable downfall of good morals, and of the peace and the Christian faith, will result. . . .

And although, after the delivery of the papal bull and final condemnation of Luther, we proclaimed the bull in many places in the German nation, as well as in our Burgundian lands, and especially its execution at Cologne, Trier, Mainz and Liege, nevertheless Martin Luther has taken the account of it, nor lessened nor revoked his errors, nor sought absolution from his Papal Holiness or grace from the holy Christian Church; but like a madman plotting the manifest destruction of the holy Church, he daily scatters abroad much worse fruit and effect of his depraved heart and mind through very numerous books. . . .

Therein he destroys, overturns and abuses the number, arrangement

are eaten, and considered a great delicacy. Such barbarians are they on some islands that a man, wishing to hold a great feast, will ask his neighbour for the loan of his father, if he is very old, to serve him up as a dish, at the same time promising to give his own father when ripe for the purpose and the neighbour is desirous of having a banquet.

10th May 1546. Schurhammer, *Epistolae S. Francisci Xaverii* I, 111

▶ While in the Far East, the most picturesque of the miracles attributed to Francis is supposed to have happened. A chronicler wrote:²⁶

Voyaging one day from Amboina to another island, Xavier in his boat was assaulted by furious headwinds. He took from his breast his crucifix, which was about a finger in length, and from the side of the boat dropped it into the sea by its cord. But the cord slipped from his hands and the waves swallowed up the crucifix. He was greatly distressed by the loss and made no secret of his grief. The following day, twenty-four tempestuous hours after the disaster to his crucifix, he reached the Island of Veranula [old Portuguese name for Ceram]. Accompanied by a man named Fausto Rodriguez, born at Viana de Alvaro [Portugal], he had walked about five hundred paces along the shore towards the village of Tamalo when both he and Rodriguez saw a crab come out of the sea with the crucifix held upright in its claws or pincers. The new standard-bearer of Christ crawled towards the Saint and stood before him with the divine banner hoisted. Xavier went on his knees, and the crab waited until he had taken the crucifix, whereupon it immediately returned to the sea. The Saint kissed his recovered treasure a thousand times and pressed it to his heart. He remained on his knees in prayer for half an hour, as did his companion also, both giving God their profoundest thanks for so illustrious a miracle.

Oriente Conquistado a Jesu Christo pelos Padres da Companhia de Jesus I, 370-1

▶ Off the coast of China, Francis died on 3rd December 1552, aged forty-six.²⁷

Next morning he returned to the island where I had remained, carrying under his arm a pair of cloth breeches which he had been given on the ship as a protection against the great cold, and also a handful of almonds as a remedy for his infirmity. He arrived in so dread a fever that a Portuguese merchant [Diogo Vaz] compassionately carried him to his

Catholic Response and Renewal

but as his guest and begged him to allow himself to be bled, as he was more seriously ill than he imagined. The Father replied that he was not used to being bled, but in that matter as in everything else pertaining to his illness, his friend was to do with him as he thought best. He was bled forthwith and fainted for a brief time under the knife, because, as you know well, dear Brother, he was of the coleric-sanguine temperament. It was a Wednesday, and there followed on the blood-letting so great a nausea that he was unable to swallow anything. Next day, he underwent the operation again, and again fainted. He asked to be purged when he came to, but the fever went on increasing, causing him the most grievous anguish. But he bore it all most patiently, without the slightest murmur or any appeal for relief. His mind began to wander at this time, and in his delirium his words, incoherent though they were, showed him to be thinking of his brethren in the Society of Jesus. . . . With eyes raised to Heaven and a very joyful countenance, he held long and loud colloquies with our Lord in the various languages which he knew. I heard him repeat several times the words: *Jesu, fili David miserere mei; tu autem meorum peccatorum miserere*. So he remained until Monday, November 28, which was the eighth day of his illness. On that day he lost the power of speech altogether and continued silent for three days, until midday on Thursday. During that time he recognized nobody and ate nothing. At noon on Thursday he regained his senses, but spoke only to call upon the Blessed Trinity, Father, Son and Holy Ghost, always one of his tenderest devotions. I heard him again repeat the words: *Jesus, Son of David, have mercy on me*, and he exclaimed again and again: *O Virgin Mother of God, remember me!* He continued to have these and similar words on his lips until the night of Friday passed on towards the dawn of Saturday, when I could see that he was dying and put a lighted candle in his hand. Then, with the name of Jesus on his lips he rendered his soul to his Creator and Lord with great repose and quietude.

Vida del Bienaventurado Padre Francisco Xavier: Monumenta Xaveriana II, 894-6.

▶ On 22nd May 1542, Pope Paul III called for a general council to meet at Trent. His bull 'Initio Nostris' read, in part, as follows:²⁸

Even though there must be, according to our faith, 'one flock and one shepherd of the flock of our Lord' [John 10.16] for the strengthening of the pure Christian community and the hope of heavenly things, the unity of Christendom has been torn apart by division, controversy and heresy. We sincerely wished for a Christendom safe from the arms and wiles of

infidels, but our errors and our guilt (or rather: the wrath of God coming on account of our sins) have caused great damage: Rhodes was lost, Hungary aggressively assailed, war on land and sea planned against Italy, Austria and Illyria. Our godless and merciless enemy, the Turk, never sleeps and considers the hatred and disagreement among us an all opportune moment to carry out his plans.

In the midst of this vehement storm of heresy, discord and war, we are called to guide responsibly the ship of Peter. We put little trust in our own strength, but cast all our cares on the Lord to sustain us [Paulinus 54-23] and equip our hearts with firmness and our spirits with insight and wisdom.

We reflected that our truly enlightened and holy predecessors often convened, in times of great danger of Christendom, general councils and assemblies of bishops as the best and most appropriate means of salvation. Therefore we also considered the possibility of such a council.

We sought the views of rulers whose assent seemed particularly valuable and useful. We found that they did not want to absent themselves from such a holy undertaking. Therefore we summoned an eccumenical council and general assembly of all bishops and other concerned fathers to meet at Mantua on 23rd May 1537, the third year of our pontificate. Our letters and documents will bear this out. We hoped that the Lord, had we there assembled, would be in our midst, according to his promise, and would dispel graciously and mercifully all storms of the time and remove all danger by the breath of his mouth.

But the enemy of man always pursues his good works. Contrary to our hope and expectation we were refused the town of Mantua unless we agreed to conditions which were altogether against the precepts of our predecessors, current practice, and the dignity and freedom of the Holy See, indeed the universal church. This we pointed out in another letter. Thus we had to seek a new site and select another city. Since we were unsuccessful in our immediate efforts, we were forced to postpone the solemn assembly until 1st November.

In the meantime our eternal and cruel enemy, the Turk, attacked Italy with a large navy. He occupied, destroyed and plundered several towns on the Apulian coast and took men away as captives. Fear and danger abounded. We had to fortify our shores and aid our neighbours. None the less, we constantly deliberated with Christian rulers, asking them for their views concerning an appropriate site for the gathering. Since they answered in indefinite and contradictory fashion, we selected with the best intentions and, as we thought, after extensive consideration, Vicenza, a prominent town suggested to us by Venice, whose courtly

reputation and power guaranteed safe travel and freedom and safety.

Time had advanced too rapidly, however, to allow the announcement of the selection of the new town. November 1st was near and winter, which would make any announcement impossible, stood outside. We were therefore forced to postpone the church council again to the first of May of the following year. This having been firmly decided, we proceeded with preparations to have, by God's help, a sacred and good council. We felt that it would be profitable both for the council and entire Christendom if the Christian princes would find themselves in peaceful concord. Thus we asked our beloved sons in Christ, the Roman Emperor Charles, and the Most Christian King Francis, to meet with us for consultation.

With letters, nuncios and legates from the ranks of our reverend brethren we asked unceasingly that after all the enmity and discord they should unite themselves to firm alliance and true friendship and thereby aid Christendom in its shaly state. After all, God had especially given them power, so we asserted, to save Christendom. If they did not act and show concern in their policies for the common good of Christendom, God would demand a strict account of them. Finally the rulers heeded our admonition and proceeded to Nizza where we also, despite our advanced age, travelled, in order to restore peace, with God's help.

When the time of the council approached we sent three virtuous and reputable legates from the ranks of our cardinals to Vicenza. They were to open the council, receive the arriving prelates, and undertake whatever appeared necessary until we, upon return from the peace talks, could ourselves direct everything. . . .

Though no permanent peace was concluded at Nizza between the two rulers, on account of our sins, a ten-year truce was agreed upon. We hoped that one of its results would be that the council could convene unhindered and that a lasting peace could thereupon be brought about by the council by its authority. We admonished the rulers to attend the council themselves, to bring along their prelates, and call the absent ones. They did neither and excused themselves with the necessity to return to their realms and the complete exhaustion of their prelates, who had to recover from their travel and financial obligations. They asked postponement of the council. We refused, but then received word from our legates at Vicenza that even after the day appointed for the council hardly a foreign prelate had arrived at the city. Learning this news, we realized that the council could not possibly be held at this time.

We therefore conceded to the rulers and postponed the opening of the council to the next feast of the Resurrection of our Lord. . . . Motivated by hope for peace and constrained by the will of powerful rulers,

we decided to suspend the general council, in order to avoid the often fruitlessly used word 'postponement', especially since we realized that no further prelates had come to Vicenza for Easter. . . .

In the meantime the situation of Christendom worsened from day to day. The Hungarians called the Turks for help after the death of their king while King Ferdinand was arming against them. The Belgians had been incited to desert the Emperor. To suppress the insurrection the Emperor marched, in agreement with the most Christian King an indication of mutual benevolence—through France to Belgium. From there he proceeded to Germany, where he deliberated with rulers and towns in order to achieve concord. When the hopes for peace disappeared and it seemed that conversations were only leading to more pronounced differences, we felt led to return to the earlier proposal of a general council. Our cardinal legate proposed this for some time to the Emperor, last at the Diet of Regensburg, where our beloved son, Caspar Contarini, Cardinal of St Praxedis, represented us with profound learning and pure motives. As we had feared, the diet demanded the acknowledgment from us that several articles, deviating from ecclesiastical teaching should be tolerated until they had been examined and decided by a general council. Neither the truth of Christ and the Catholic Church nor the dignity of the Apostolic See allowed such a concession. We decided, therefore, emphatically to propose a council to be held as early as possible. Indeed, we never had any other intent than to convene a general assembly of the Church. We hoped that this would give peace to the Christian people and unity to the Church of Christ. However, we wanted to achieve this only in agreement with the Christian rulers. Waiting for their approval, watching for the hidden time, the 'time of thy grace, O Lord' [Psalm 68.14], we were led to the decision that any thing is pleasing to God as long as sacred matters are discussed which pertain to the salvation of Christian believers. For with pain we had to observe that the situation of Christendom worsened daily: Hungary was oppressed by the Turks, Germany was in danger, all the world was in fear and sorrow. Thus we decided not to wait for the consent of the rulers but to trust only in the will of God Almighty and the salvation of Christendom.

Since Vicenza is no longer possible as site of the council, and since we—selecting another place—considered not only the salvation of Christendom, but the difficulties of Germany, and learned that Trent was preferred by the Germans to some other possibilities, we gave in to their demands, even though the deliberations might have been undertaken more suitably in Italy.

Thus we decided that the general council is to convene on 1st November at Trent. We consider this location appropriate, since German bishops and prelates can easily repair there, as can Spanish and French bishops, as well as others, without too much difficulty. We have decided on the date in light of the fact that the time appears sufficient to announce this decision to all Christian peoples and allows enough travel time to the prelates. We did not give the customary year's time for the change of place, as is commanded in earlier pronouncements, since we did not want to delay our aid to oppressed and unfortunate Christendom. We recognize the present difficulties and have no far-reaching hopes. It is written: 'Commit thy ways unto the Lord and trust in him. He will bring it to pass' [Psalm 36.5]. Thus we are resolved to trust more in God's grace and mercy than to mistrust our weakness. In a good work, God's grace accomplished often what human planning cannot do.

Thus we decide, proclaim, summon, order and rule, trusting the authority of God Almighty, Father, Son and Holy Spirit, as well as the Apostles Peter and Paul, an authority with which we are entrusted here on earth, with the counsel and approval of our reverend brethren, the cardinals of the holy Catholic Church, that on 1st November 1542, in the city of Trent, which is a convenient, free, easily reached place, a general, holy council is to begin, continue, and, with God's help, to his honour and glory and the salvation of all Christendom, be concluded and perfected.

Concilium Tridentinum IV, 226-31.

Cardinal Reginald Pole of England delivered a deeply sensitive and searching address to the council on 7th January 1546.

As the matters to be dealt with in this sacred Congress for God's glory and the Church's good increased, we who bore the office of Presidents and Legates of the Apostolic See thought it our bounden duty often to use words of exhortation or of warning. Nor must we change our way in this second session, which, we hope, has been given as a happy beginning to the council.

All the more willingly shall we fulfil this duty because when we exhort you to do what befits so great a gathering or on the contrary warn you, we are exhorting or warning ourselves, who are in the same bark with you, and are exposed with you to the same dangers and the same storms. We bestir ourselves, I say, to watch lest, on the one hand, we run on the rocks which certainly are all too many in these matters, or on the other hand by our sloth we are storm-beaten and wrecked by the very flood of

The Gathering Storm

erroneous. Therefore he had not achieved anything with his proofs. This is how the matter stands.

The third week we debated concerning repentance, purgatory, indulgences and about the power of a priest to absolve. He did not like to debate with Carlstadt and demanded to debate with me. Indulgence was thrown out the window and he agreed almost completely with me. In short, the defence of indulgence became plainly a laughing stock, while I had expected it to be the main point of the disputation. In his sermons Eck conceded all this so that even the common people observed his disregard for indulgences. He is even said to have admitted that he would have agreed with me in all points had I not debated about the authority of the Pope. He said to Carlstadt: 'If I reach the same consensus with Martin Luther as I did with you, I would visit him in his inn.' This is the way he is: erratic and tricky. Although he admitted to Carlstadt that the scholastic theologians teach similarly, he rejected, against me, Gregory of Rimini, who alone of all scholastics agrees with us. For him it is no vice to affirm and to deny the same matter on different occasions. But the people of Leipzig did not even notice this, thereby betraying their stupidity. Even more shocking, however, is the fact that Eck made concessions in the disputation only to preach something different in the pamphlet. When Carlstadt approached him regarding this, the impudent Eck answered: 'One need not tell the common people the same things one would say in a learned debate.' . . .

The people of Leipzig neither welcomed nor visited us, indeed treated us as their mortal enemies. They constantly accompanied my opponent, who left his side, dined with him, and invited him. He received a new gift from them as a gift and went horseback riding with them. In short, everything was done by them to shame us. On top of this they persuaded our Pfug and the prince to give their approval. For us they did only one thing: they honoured us, as is custom, with a gift of wine. Apparently they didn't feel right about even omitting that gift when who were benevolent to our cause visited us secretly.

20th July 1519. WA, Br. 1, 42of.

Johann Eck, Luther's Catholic opponent, likewise commented in a letter to a friend on the debate.

Recently we held a disputation at Leipzig before an audience of the learned people who had gathered there from all places. God be praised and praised that their views have fallen into great disrepute among the common people, while among the learned they are

The Reformation in Its Own Words

him into conceding that this matter would be settled after the disputation. Otherwise they would not have agreed to the disputation at all. . . .

First Dr Eck debated with Dr Carlstadt eight days concerning free will. Carlstadt, who had brought his books with him, presented his arguments masterly and convincingly with the help of God. When Eck's turn came he refused to debate unless the books were left at home. But Carlstadt had only brought the books to prove that he quoted the Scriptures and the Church Fathers correctly and did not treat them as high-handedly as Dr Eck had done. A new tumult arose. Finally a decision was made in favour of Eck, stating that the books should be left at home. If the disputation had truly been for the sake of truth, one would have wished that all books should have been employed. Never did their envy and ambition show themselves more impudently.

Finally this tricky character agreed with all of Carlstadt's assertions. Even though he had earlier vehemently denounced them he announced complete consensus, claiming that he had caused Carlstadt to change his views. He repudiated Scotus and the Scotists, as well as Capreolus and the Thomists, and stated that the other scholastic theologians had taught as Carlstadt did. . . .

The following week Eck debated with me, first of all quite vehemently concerning papal primacy. His entire argument consisted of the words 'Thou art Peter' (Matt. 16.18), and 'Feed my sheep', 'Follow me', 'Strengthen thy brethren' (John 21.17, 22; Luke 22.32). In addition, he referred to many authoritative passages from the Fathers. . . . Then he went to the extreme and emphasized exclusively the Council of Constance where the articles of Huss asserting that the papacy derived from the emperor had been condemned. There he stood quite courageously, on a battlefield, and reproached me with the Bohemians and called me publicly a heretic and a supporter of the Hussite heretics. He is an impudent and foolhardy sophist. . . .

I countered his argument with a reference to the Greeks, and the own tradition of a thousand years, and the early Fathers who were under the authority of the Pope. In this I did not repudiate his eminence. Finally we debated about the authority of councils. He publicly asserted that some articles were condemned at the Council of Constance in a godless manner, since they were taught openly and clearly by Augustine, Paul and even Christ himself. Then this serpent bit itself and accused me as if I had committed a crime and went to exile to please the people of Leipzig. Finally I proved from the words of the Council itself that not all articles had been condemned as heretical

virtually discounted. You should have heard the audacity of these men who are blind and undaunted in their wickedness. Luther denies that Peter was the prince of the apostles. He denies that ecclesiastical obedience is derived from divine Law, but holds that it was created only by human agreement or the concession of the Emperor. He denies that the Church was built upon Peter, despite the words: 'Upon this rock will I build my church.' When I quoted Augustine, Jerome, Ambrose, Gregory, Cyprian, Chrysostom, Leo, Bernard, and even Theophylact, he repudiated them all without a blush, declaring that he would rather stand alone against a thousand because Christ and none other is the foundation of the Church, for other foundation can no man lay. This I disproved with the twenty-second chapter of Revelation concerning the twelve foundations. Thereupon he defended the schismatic Greeks, insisting that they were saved even though they are not under obedience to the Pope.

Concerning the tenets of the Bohemians he said that some of the teachings condemned by the Council of Constance had been most Christian and evangelical. By such foolish error, he frightened and alienated many who had been devoted to him.

I asked him, 'If the primacy of the Pope is derived only of human right and of the consent of the believers, whence do you have the monastic cloth that you wear? Whence do you have the authority to preach and to hear the confession of your parishioners?' To this he replied that he wished there were no mendicant orders. He made also other scandalous and absurd statements: that a council could err because it consisted of human beings; that one could not prove from Scripture that there is a purgatory, etc. . . .

In many matters, however, they hit me unprepared. First of all by bringing along many books with which they were familiar. These they even brought to the place of the disputation, perusing them and always reading from them, though it meant their own derision. Secondly, because they always took the transcript of the debate with them and discussed it at their lodging while I never looked at a single word until the disputation was over. Thirdly, there were many of them: two doctors, Lange, the vicar of the Augustinians, two licentiates of theology, a greatly conceited grandson of Reuchlin, three doctors of law, and a number of masters who supported them at home and in public, indeed even during the disputation itself. I, however, stood all alone only in the company of my good cause. I have asked your monastic brethren to copy the proceedings of the disputation for you and to send it to you as soon as possible. I request, for the sake of him whom I serve with all my power, that you earnestly defend the faith for which you have already

shown concern. Not that I want you to interfere and thus cause hatred upon you and your order. I only desire that you stand by me with your counsel and your learning. The men of Wittenberg took their time with the disputation which they did not wish in the first place. At first Luther did not want to have any university in the world as judge. But the most Christian prince, Duke George of Saxony, would not permit any disputation concerning matters of faith unless competent teachers would judge. Thus Luther was forced into it, urged by his supporters. If he had not debated and agreed to have judges all would have left him. When I left the selection of universities up to him he chose Paris and Erfurt. I do not know the University of Paris, but your order has many good connections with it. I would cordially ask you, Reverend Father, for the sake of the Christian faith, to write to your friends or, if you please, to the entire university so that, upon receiving the disputation from the beloved ruler George with a request for a decision, they do not refuse it, but courageously attack the opponents. We both recognize them as judges. I hope the matter is clear enough that it does not need a long examination. May they at once give their judgment according to the ruler's request and affirm what is in accord with our faith. . . .

The men of Wittenberg left in a fury and virtually without bidding good-bye to their innkeeper. This is already my ninth day here after the debate, which lasted for three weeks. On St Peter's Day, at the place of the disputation, Luther preached, in the absence of the prince, a Hussite sermon full of error. Thereupon I preached both on the day of the Visitation of Mary and on the following day before as large a congregation as I ever have against his errors so that the people became fearful of them. Tomorrow I will do it again and then bid good-bye to Leipzig.

Luthers Sämmtliche Schriften, herausg. Walch. XV, 145f.

► **Duke George of Saxony** approached the universities of Paris and Erfurt for their opinion of the debate. Here is his letter to Paris and the evasive answer from Erfurt.²⁷

Greeting. The Rector and Professors of our University of Leipzig are sending you the recent debate of Johann Eck of Ingolstadt and Martin Luther of Wittenberg, professors of theology, which was held on some matters of theology and the Bible a few days ago with our permission at the University of Leipzig, and which was taken down from the mouths of the debaters by notaries public. Both sides agreed to refer judgment to the canonists and theologians of your ancient university, excluding the

Positions in the Church do not go to the best qualified but to the highest bidder. New indulgences are announced every day for only one reason: to enrich Rome.... Law suits are transferred to Rome when it is clear they should be heard in our courts. Every available trickery is used to cheat us - barbarians - of our money.

Our proud nation, famous for its strength and courage which gave it the Imperial power of Rome and made us lord and master of the world, is reduced to begging, burdened by humiliating demands, cowering in the dirt, whimpering miserably. All because of these abuses. Finally, our leaders have begun to wake up and speak out, to consider how to stop these disasters, break the chains, and restore the ancient liberties which they lost.

5 Jacob Wimpheling on Piccolomini's Response to Mair

Jacob Wimpheling produced a response to Piccolomini's refutation of the 'Complaints of the German Nation'. The intensity of German feeling against the Church is obvious in this extract. The solutions, as proposed, would have had a far-reaching effect on the entire structure of the Church and, perhaps more importantly, its wealth and patronage.

19 May 1515.

[\$1, \$2;]

Church money and jobs go to worthless men and Italians.

The more important and valuable jobs are given to people of unproved ability or character.

Few churchmen live where they have their jobs. They have so many parishes that they cannot live in all of them at once. Most do not even recognise their parishioners' faces. Souls are neglected; the churchmen concentrate on worldly rewards.

Worship services are cut back.

Hospitality disappears.

Church laws are meaningless.

Church buildings are falling down.

The churchmen live scandalous lives.

Good, learned, able priests whose abilities might raise the moral and professional level of the clergy abandon their education because they have no hope of success.

The religious profession is divided by competition and hate. Even death is wished on others as well as hate and jealousy.

People are encouraged to get more than one job.

People use crooked lawsuits to collect multiple posts.

Some get positions by bribery.

Some posts just remain empty.

Qualified youths are left unemployed and to live like vagrants.

Leading churchmen lose their power and authority. The structure of the Church is destroyed....

[The Pope] should ensure that the pure Gospel is preached. False beliefs, blasphemy, and unchristian teachings should be eliminated. The enemies of the faith should be driven off Christian land....

Would not [the Pope] be better off with advisors trained in the Bible and Church laws? By men who can preach? By men who can ease troubled minds in the confessional? Undoubtedly it was inspiration when the Council of Basel was led to order that a third of all Church posts go to men trained in the Bible....

Rome and our gracious Mother Church must reduce the worst of the tax burden placed on our country. She should be gentle and considerate to those men who replace our present Church leaders. The money they have to send to Rome comes from the pockets of poor tradesmen, country pastors, destitute peasants. Many men cannot adequately care for their families because of these taxes. A reduction might prevent a revolution of our fellow countrymen against the Church. I myself, God is my witness, have heard the grumbling, the muttering and the threats of popular revolt.

6 Erasmus on the Vernacular Bibles and Lay Interpretations of Scripture

While it is true that the overwhelming majority of people could not read, the importance of a Bible in everyday language should not be underestimated. Most people would have been within range of someone who could read and therefore able to hear the Bible being read in their own language.

1516.

[OI: 96-8 - 70, 76]

In fact, I strongly disagree with the people who do not want the Bible, after it has been translated into everyday language, to be read by the uneducated. Did Christ teach such complex doctrines that only a handful of theologians can understand them? Is Christianity strong in proportion to how ignorant men are of it? Royal secrets may well be best concealed but Christ wants his mysteries told to as many as possible. I want the lowliest woman to read the Gospels and Paul's letters. I want them translated into every language so that not only will the Scots and Irish be able to read and understand them but even the Turk and Saracen. Clearly the first point is that people understand somehow. Some may mock the Bible but a few may be captured by it. I would like to hear a farmer sing scripture as he ploughs, a weaver to keep time to his moving shuttle by humming the Bible, the traveller to make his journey better by such stories. Let all Christian conversation spring from the Bible. Our daily talk shows what sort of person we are. Each man should understand whatever he can and then share whatever he can. Those people who are a bit slow

should not be jealous of those ahead and those ahead, in turn, should encourage the rest so that they do not give up. Why must we limit this duty, which is placed on everyone, to only a few? This makes sense. Baptism is given to everyone – and here one sees the first confession of Christian belief – also the other Sacraments and (in the end) immortality as well, without distinction. Why then are doctrines kept only for a few whom most people call theologians or monks. They make up only a tiny section of the Christian population – and I wish they lived more like their names! I am afraid that some theologians are very unlike what their name implies for they are concerned with earthly rather than heavenly matters. The monks, too, claim to embrace Christ's poverty and despise the world and yet they are often very worldly. The true theologian, in my opinion, teaches (by a quality of mind, the expression, the eyes, by a life that has no use for wealth, not by complicated arguments) that Christians should not trust in the things of this world, but rely on spiritual supports. For example, that wrongs should not be avenged, that those who wish ill should be wished well, those who deserve ill should get better, that all good men – all part of the same body – should be loved and valued the same. Evil, if it cannot be removed, should be tolerated. Also, people who have lost every possession, or who have given up possessions, or who grieve are blessed and should not be despised. Even death should be welcomed by the true believer since it is really the gateway to eternal life. If anyone, led by the Holy Spirit, preaches or teaches, or exhorts, or spreads or encourages others in such beliefs then that person is a true theologian even if only a manual worker or a weaver. And, if someone's life shows these beliefs then that person is a great teacher of the Church. Some people, even non-Christians, may argue better about angelic knowledge but the duty of a true Christian theologian is to convince us to live like angels without sin's stains.

7 Ulrich Wiest (Master Singer, Augsburg, c. 1450) on Warmongering German Bishops

In Summer 1449, the Archbishop-Elector of Mainz, Dieter von Ebach, along with eighty-six other princes and lords declared war on the town of Hall in Swabia. The high number of clerics in Germany who were also secular lords, the fragmentation of the German political landscape, and the inevitable in-fighting which this produced was a particular problem in the German Church.

[K1: 366-72, *passim*]

The poor naïve Christians are innocent even as their blood flows in this war, confessing sins they cannot name. But the Church leaders who should lead the Church, whose godliness should be an ornament for the faith are at the front of the battle in word and deed. The Prince-Bishop of Mainz loves sword and fire. He

should stay at home and sing in the choir and beg that he himself be spared the rack and the fire. The Bishop of Eichstätt is there beside him. Babenberg relishes war's games. This is the thanks we get for our donations! The faith built up by the churchmen of old which has stood the test of time is frittered away by these profligate churchmen. We cry out to you, O Lord, in our pain. The outcome is all too clear. Revenge will see all the priests killed. All prophets agree that when God's patience is exhausted He will step in and snap the bishops' pride and lust. He will whip up a whirlwind of anger which will blow the Church away like so much dust. Christians do not give donations to see them wasted on unchristian pomp and partying, on lives that offend God and Christ. Charity pays for tournaments and pageants... With donations they gamble and give parties, with donations they buy, invest and sell for profit, with donations they hire mercenaries for war, with donations they finance a splendid court-life, donations give them money to waste on games and sports, to engage in every silly thing, to supply the bishops' free-time with amusements, to allow them to taste every evil pleasure, to fill their pockets with unneeded wealth... Donations are used to produce contempt for truth and good. Donations become tools of greed, pride, gluttony, apathy, abuse of power. O lord our God, hear our plea. Why do Your servants have to suffer while these greedy bishops just get more arrogant? I beg You, O Lord, bend their stiff and proud hearts, turn their minds from pride and teach them humility.

8 The Reformation of the Emperor Sigismund (Basel, c. 1438)

Many Germans saw the evils which came from combining clerical and secular power. However, one should be aware of the extent to which leading nobles were also aware that any reduction of the Church's secular power would inevitably benefit them.

[K6]

Concerning the Bishops

Just look at the behaviour of today's bishops. They start wars and cause general unrest. They act just like regular princes which, of course, is what they really are. Instead of being used for honest work in the parish they use the godly donations for this sort of activity – it should not go to finance wars. I think Duke Frederick was absolutely right when he told Emperor Sigismund at Basel that the bishops were blind and it was up to [the princes] to open their eyes....

Bishops should not own castles. They should live in the main church in their diocese and live there like a Christian should. They should be an example to the priests in their diocese. Instead all they do today is ride about like princes. Peace would stand a better chance if this sort of behaviour were abolished....

stones. They forget whatever they ought to be doing and act as though their calling in life is to slander the character of other men by the violence of their tongue. As the Psalms say: 'they have sharpened their tongues like a serpent; adder's poison is under their lips'. Those who ought to teach Christian piety prefer to attack it in others.

11 Tetzel's 'Sample Sermon for Priests Selling Indulgences'

The various practical abuses which so annoyed Germans were encapsulated in the work of Tetzel (and others) to raise money for the building of the (present-day) basilica church of St Peter in Rome which replaced the building provided by the Emperor Constantine. Here is part of a 'sample' sermon for parish priests given by Tetzel to help them promote and sell indulgences to their parishioners. The sheer brazenness of the sale of indulgences as a form of revenue raising was appalling to many thoughtful observers. There is little doubt that there was significant popular opinion against these sales amongst decision-making and decision-shaping Germans.

[K3: 18-19]

Second Sermon:

Most worthy Lord. I beseech [you] that the people don't fail to take advantage of the great grace offered to them which can save their souls.... Listen to the cries of your parents and the pleading of the lost. 'Have mercy, have mercy on me. You, my friends will surely help me. The Lord's hand is heavy upon me. We are in great pain and torment. You have the power to ease our anguish a little and yet you do nothing'. Open your ears. A father cries out to his son, a mother to her daughter: 'Why is the Lord tormenting me?'

Third Sermon:

Listen! Every mortal sin requires seven years of penance even after confession and contrition. The debt must be paid in this life or the next. How many mortal sins do you commit each day? How many every week? Per month? Yearly? Throughout your life? The total is infinite and infinite is the penance which must be suffered.... Won't you part with even a farthing to buy this letter? It won't bring you money but rather a divine and immortal soul, whole and secure in the Kingdom of Heaven.

12 Account of Tetzel's Preaching

The above, theoretical model for Tetzel's sermon is given reality in a contemporary account of his preaching. Even average church members were able to grasp the inappropriateness of this behaviour. However, there was also a great understandable concern to 'do the right thing' for

been unbeatable, like a curled-up porcupine defended by its quills. These made-up quotations were more difficult for him. It took some fancy footwork but he did manage to get around them. He knew nothing about the Bible and not once did he doubt that the quotations were real. He thought it was a serious sin to refuse to accept the Bible but a greater disgrace to be defeated. This in spite of being surrounded on all sides! Do you know how this clever Proteus finally got out of the trap? Whenever some fake view was put to him, supposedly drawn from the Bible, he said: 'An excellent quotation indeed, sir, but I understand that passage this way'. Then he would give a view based on alternative interpretations. He admitted that in one sense the passage supported his opponent but that the other meaning was his escape route.

10 Erasmus to Marcus Laurinus

Erasmus defends his new (Greek) text of the New Testament against his critics who, in his opinion, are more concerned about protecting their monopoly over religious knowledge than promoting truth. The very conservative nature of many leading churchmen, especially in the universities, is highlighted here. The late middle ages were marked by entrenched philosophical debates which centred, to a large degree, on ideas and issues formulated centuries before. The room for truly new ideas and approaches was, therefore, greatly restricted.

Louvain, April 1518

[A2: no. 3. 263-8, passim]

No one needs my assistance more than those who yap like dogs about my work and their comfort. And none bark louder than those who have never even seen the cover of one of my books. My dear Mark, you try it and see that I am being truthful. Whenever you meet someone like this, let him rant on about my New Testament and when he has made himself hoarse ask if he has read any of it. If he can say he has (without blushing) then ask him to show you one passage he dislikes. You will not find any one of them who can do it. Just look at how Christian this sort of behaviour is. These monks (do they deserve their name) stand up before an uneducated crowd and destroy someone else's reputation. Even if they later tried, they could not undo the damage caused. And yet, they know nothing about the thing they are attacking. Moreover, they forget Paul's warning that slanderers will not inherit God's Kingdom.

There is no charge worse than heresy and yet this charge they level - by a mere nod - at men with whom they disagree. This is like the story about the Swiss. If someone there in a crowd points his finger at someone else everyone else does the same thing. Everyone rushes to get in on it. As soon as anyone in the herd grunts everyone joins in and soon, all grunting together, they incite people to throw

themselves and, especially, their deceased relatives. These indulgences played on the best (and worst) aspects of people's concern for themselves and others. There was always the grave danger that the common people might come to the conclusion that they were being both frightened and fleeced.

[M4: 5.362]

[Tetzl] got an immense amount of money while preaching in Germany, especially at the new [silver] mines at St. Annaberg which is where I, Frederick Mecum, heard him two years ago. There a large sum was collected. All the money was sent to Rome. What this stupid and brazen monk said was incredible. He claimed that if a Christian had sex with his mother and then put some money in the Pope's indulgence chest that the Pope had the power in heaven and earth to forgive the incest and that, if the Pope forgave it, God would have to as well. Also, if they gave happily, buying grace and pardon, then the hills of St Annaberg would turn to solid silver. Also, as soon as a coin rang in the chest the soul, for whom it was paid, would spring up to heaven. This indulgence was so valuable that when the commissioner [Tetzl] came into a city the official letter announcing it was carried on a satin pillow or one embroidered with gold. All the priests, monks, city councillors, scholars, men, women (married and unmarried) and the children met him with banners, candles, songs and a parade. All the bells rang out, the organs played, he was led into the church, a red cross was put up in the middle of the church and the Pope's flag was displayed. Basically, even God Himself could not have got a better reception or been entertained with greater honour.

13 Luther's 'Complaints to Charles V' (Diet of Worms, 1521)

The previous complaints and problems are summed up in this last extract which is part of a series of 102 complaints laid before Charles V by Luther at the Diet of Worms, 1521. One can easily see how the sale of indulgences could be viewed as yet one more proof – in fact, the clearest proof – of the anti-German attitude of the Roman Church, its blatant avarice, and its overweening power inside Germany.

[W2: 670-704, *passim*]

14 The Pope is insatiable. Every day he comes up with some new way to squeeze money out of the Germans....

18 He strives... to stop the free election of churchmen in our cathedral churches. Instead he appoints whomever he wants and ignores a lawfully elected bishop....

19 Popes and bishops say that there are certain sins which only they can remove. When someone commits such a sin he quickly sees that only money will

take care of it. Rome gives out no dispensations except for payment in gold. A poor man will see his case ignored because he has no money. On the other hand, a rich man can get a note from Rome granting absolution for sins he might commit in the future: for example, murder and perjury. This proves that Rome's greediness actually increases the number of sins and vices in the world.

22 We think it is disgusting that the Pope allows so many indulgences to be sold in Germany. This practice confuses and cheats the simple people out of their money. The Pope sends special men to sell these indulgences and allows them to keep part of the proceeds for their expenses.... The local bishops and lords also get a 'cut' for helping to arrange the sales. This money comes from the poor who cannot see the Papal court's con-job.

39 There should only be one reason for people being required to do spiritual penance, that is, to save their souls. But, these days, Church judges make the penalties so difficult that most people are forced to pay a fine as an alternative. This allows an immense amount of money to flow into Rome's pockets.

Ignatius Loyola

2. RULES FOR THINKING WITH THE CHURCH

THE FOLLOWING rules should be observed to foster the true attitude of mind we ought to have in the Church militant.

1. We must put aside all judgment of our own, and keep the mind ever ready and prompt to obey in all things the true Spouse of Jesus Christ, our holy Mother, the hierarchical Church.
2. We should praise sacramental confession, the yearly reception of the Most Blessed Sacrament, and praise more highly monthly reception, and still more weekly Communion, provided requisite and proper dispositions are present.
3. We ought to praise the frequent hearing of Mass, the singing of hymns, psalmody, and long prayers whether in the church or outside; likewise, the hours arranged at fixed times for the whole Divine Office, for every kind of prayer, and for the canonical hours.
4. We must praise highly religious life, virginity, and continency; and matrimony ought not be praised as much as any of these.
5. We should praise vows of religion, obedience, poverty, chastity, and vows to perform other works of supererogation conducive to perfection. However, it must be remembered that a vow deals with matters that lead us closer to evangelical perfection. Hence, whatever tends to withdraw one from perfection may not be made the object of a vow, for example, a business career, the married state, and so forth.
6. We should show our esteem for the relics of the saints by venerating them and praying to the saints. We should praise visits to the Station Churches, pilgrimages, indulgences, jubilees, crusade indults, the lighting of candles in churches.
7. We must praise the regulations of the Church with regard to fast and abstinence, for example, in Lent, on Ember Days, Vigils, Fridays, and Saturdays. We should praise all works of penance, not only those that are interior but also those that are exterior.
8. We ought to praise not only the building and adorn-

Associates themselves we apostolic, granting to them, Constitutions as they shall pray, the glory of our Lord constitutions and apostolic successor of happy memory, withstanding to make profession of this the number of sixty, and ie any of the points herein strengthening, acceptance, to attempt it, let him know the Apostles St. Peter and Incarnation of the Lord, [27], the sixth year of our this limitation of the number the death of Ignatius in 1556 *de Jesuitis*, p. 221), a thousand puts the membership at 'some

ment of churches, but also images and veneration of them according to the subject they represent.

9. Finally, we must praise all the commandments of the Church, and be on the alert to find reasons to defend them, and by no means in order to criticize them.

10. We should be more ready to approve and praise the orders, recommendations, and way of acting of our superiors than to find fault with them. Though some of the orders, etc., may not have been praiseworthy, yet to speak against them, either when preaching in public or in speaking before the people, would rather be the cause of murmuring and scandal than of profit. As a consequence, the people would become angry with their superiors, whether secular or spiritual. But while it does harm in the absence of our superiors to speak evil of them before the people, it may be profitable to discuss their bad conduct with those who can apply a remedy.

11. We should praise both positive theology and that of the Scholastics. It is characteristic of the positive doctors, such as St. Augustine, St. Jerome, St. Gregory, and others, to rouse the affections so that we are moved to love and serve God our Lord in all things.

On the other hand, it is more characteristic of the scholastic doctors, such as St. Thomas, St. Bonaventure, the Master of the Sentences, and others, to define and state clearly, according to the needs of our times, the doctrines that are necessary for external salvation, and that help to refute and expose more efficaciously all errors and fallacies.

Further, just because scholastic doctors belong to more recent times, they not only have the advantage of correct understanding of Holy Scripture and of the teaching of the saints and positive doctors, but, enlightened by the grace of God, they also make use of the decisions of the Councils and of the definitions and decrees of our holy Mother Church.

12. We must be on our guard against making comparisons between those who are still living and the saints who have gone before us, for no small error is committed if we say: "This man is wiser than St. Augustine," "He is another St. Francis or even greater," "He is equal to St. Paul in goodness and sanctity," and so on.

13. If we wish to proceed securely in all things, we must hold fast to the following principle: What seems to me white, I will believe black if the hierarchical Church so defines. For I must be convinced that in Christ our Lord, the bridegroom, and in His spouse the Church, only one Spirit holds sway, which governs and rules for the salvation of souls. For it is by the same Spirit and Lord who gave the Ten Commandments that our holy Mother Church is ruled and governed.

14. Granted that it be very true that no one can be saved without being predestined and without having faith and grace, still we must be very cautious about the way in which we speak of all these things and discuss them with others.

15. We should not make it a habit of speaking much of predestination. If

somehow at times it comes to be spoken of, it must be done in such a way that the people are not led into any error. They are at times misled, so that they say: "Whether I shall be saved or lost, has already been determined, and this cannot be changed whether my actions are good or bad." So they become indolent and neglect the works that are conducive to the salvation and spiritual progress of their souls.

16. In the same way, much caution is necessary, lest by much talk about faith, and much insistence on it without any distinctions or explanations, occasion be given to the people, whether before or after they have faith informed by charity, to become slothful and lazy in good works.

17. Likewise we ought not to speak of grace at such length and with such emphasis that the poison of doing away with liberty is engendered. Hence, as far as is possible with the help of God, one may speak of faith and grace that the Divine Majesty may be praised. But let it not be done in such a way, above all not in times which are as dangerous as ours, that works and free will suffer harm, or that they are considered of no value.

18. Though the zealous service of God our Lord out of pure love should be esteemed above all, we ought also to praise highly the fear of the Divine Majesty. For not only filial fear but also servile fear is pious and very holy. When nothing higher or more useful is attained, it is very helpful for rising from mortal sin, and once this is accomplished, one may easily advance to filial fear, which is wholly pleasing and agreeable to God our Lord since it is inseparably associated with the love of Him.

in according to the
the Church, and be
means in order to
orders, recommenda-
with them. Though
yet to speak against
re the people, would
t. As a consequence,
whether secular or
priors to speak evil
s their bad conduct
of the Scholastics.
agustine, St. Jerome,
e are moved to love
astic doctors, such as
nces, and others, to
es, the doctrines that
rite and expose more
e recent times, they
Holy Scripture and of
ghened by the grace
its and of the defini-
rison between those
us, for no small error
tine," "He is another
odness and sanctity,"
must hold fast to the
eve black if the hier-
t in Christ our Lord,
e Spirit holds sway,
is by the same Spirit
holy Mother Church
saved without being
must be very cautious
nd discuss them with
n of predestination. If

Zwingli

here to investigate scriptural passages, and since the passage in John 6 moves away from the physical repast, we must therefore take it into account. From this it follows that Christ did not give himself in the Lord's Supper in a physical sense. And finally, you yourself have acknowledged that it is the spiritual repast that offers solace. And since we are agreed on this major question, I beg you for the love of Christ not to burden anyone with the crime of heresy because of these differences. The fathers certainly did not condemn one another in this way when they disagreed. . . .

You spoke of taking the Scriptures literally. Much I agreed with, much I did not because it was perfectly childish, like saying, "If God commanded me to eat dung." The works that God commands are for our well-being. God is truth and light, and he leads us not into darkness. Consequently he does not mean "This is my body" in a literal, actual, physical sense, which contradicts the Scriptures. It is the maxims of demons that are obscure, not the maxims of Christ. God does not work in this way. The soul is spiritual, the soul does not eat flesh. Spirit eats spirit.

Do not take offense at my words, for I desire your friendship, not the bitterness of your heart. I confront you willingly, Doctor Luther, and you, Master Philip.

Luther: I promise to control my feelings in deference to God and our gracious prince and lord. What is past is past. Let us look to the future! If we cannot agree on everything, we can still enter into fellowship—as we shall discuss in conclusion. . . .

If you think that God does not confront us with the incomprehensible, then I cannot agree with you. The virginity of Mary, the forgiveness of sins, and many other [beliefs] like this are incomprehensible—even the words "This is my body." . . .

now makes out that he was not beaten. We have, however, achieved this much good, that our agreement on the rest of the doctrines of the Christian religion will prevent the papal party from hoping any longer that Luther will be on their side.

From Potter, *Huldrych Zwingli*, 106-8.

54. The Marburg Colloquy: Another Report

Luther: Your argument comes down to this: Because we have a spiritual repast, a physical one is not needed. I reply that in no way do we deny the spiritual repast, which indeed we consistently teach and believe to be necessary. But from this it cannot be proved that the physical repast is useless or unnecessary. I do not inquire into whether it is necessary or not, for we are not here for this. It is written, "Take, eat, this is my body," and for this reason one must do it and believe it at all costs. One must do this! One must do this! Otherwise I could not be baptized, I could not believe in Christ! In many ways he gives himself to us: in preaching, in baptism, as often as a brother needs consolation, in the sacrament. Again and again the body of Christ is eaten, as he himself has commanded us to do. If he were to command me to eat dung, I would do so, assured that it were good for me. The servant doesn't brood over the wish of his Lord. . . .

Zwingli: It is a prejudice, a preconception, which keeps Doctor Luther from yielding his point. He refuses to yield until a passage is quoted that proves that the body in the Lord's Supper is figurative. It is the prejudice of a heretic. . . . One cannot reason thus from Scripture! Comparison of scriptural passages is always necessary. Although we have no scriptural passage that says, "This is the sign of my body," we still have proof that Christ dismissed the idea of a physical repast. Since it is our task

A Catholic Version (Salat)

Zwingli was found in the front line where the Zurich force had been drawn up. He was lying on his face, which had not been scratched or wounded. A Catholic soldier, not knowing who he was, turned him over and shook him so that he might have air and be able to breathe. He opened his eyes and looked round. Then he was asked if he wished to confess his sins. He shook his head and indicated that he did not wish to do so. Thereupon another warrior standing by struck Zwingli a fatal blow on the neck under the chin with his broadsword. Then a number of men arrived who had known Zwingli when he was alive, looked at him and sought for identification marks on his body. They found that it really was Zwingli. Then they had much to say, rejoicing in his death and calling him a good many entirely suitable names. They added their repeated thanks to almighty God whose vengeance lay there in the blood of the miscreant who had been the true founder, originator, creator, and initiator of all their evils, calamities, and alarms. Even so God had graciously allowed him to die in the presence of, and surrounded by, good, honorable men, perhaps because he had once been a priest. It would not have been remarkable if there had been more devils by him at his end than there were soldiers in the field. For the whole evening more and more Catholics came up to look at the dead body of one who had been responsible for bringing more discontent, disorder, trouble, need, and anxiety than had all the princes, lords, peoples, and cities. He now lay there given by God's instrumentality into their hands, and he had paid the price for his wickedness. There, at last, was the representative of all the Confederates, and (by the grace of God) all his schemes perished with him.

55. Zwingli's Death: Two Accounts

The Swiss Confederacy, made up of relatively independent districts or cantons, functioned throughout most of the 1520s by allowing each canton to determine its own religious policy. This arrangement eventually fell apart, with battles breaking out between Protestant and Catholic cantons. On 11 October 1531, Zwingli himself enthusiastically took up the sword in a skirmish with a neighboring Catholic canton and was killed. The following very different accounts are revealing.

From *Great Debates of the Reformation*, ed. D. J. Ziegler (New York: Random House, 1969), 79-82, 85-86, 105.

I call upon you as before: . . . Give way, and give glory to God!

Zwingli: And we call upon you to give glory to God and to quit begging the question! The issue at stake is this: Where is the proof of your position? I am willing to consider your words carefully—no harm meant! You're trying to outwit me. I stand by this passage in the sixth chapter of John [verse 63] and shall not be shaken from it. You'll have to sing another tune!

Luther: You're being obnoxious! . . . You express yourself poorly and make about as much progress as a cane standing in a corner. You're going nowhere.

Zwingli: No, no, no! This is the passage that will break your neck!

Luther: Don't be so sure of yourself. Necks don't break this way. You're in Hesse, not Switzerland. . . .

Zwingli: You must excuse what I have just said. It is one of the expressions that we use.

Luther: Call upon God, that you may receive understanding.

Oecolampadius: Call upon him yourself, for you need it just as much as we!

99. Leo X, *Decret Romanum* (1521)
Luther and his colleagues burned the bull
Exsurge Domine, together with books of
canon law and scholastic theology, on 10
December 1520, in Wittenberg. On 3 Janu-
ary 1521, Leo issued the bull *Decret Roma-
num* officially excommunicating Luther.

Through the power given him from God, the
Roman Pontiff has been appointed to adminis-
ter spiritual and temporal punishments as each
case severally deserves. The purpose of this is
the repression of the wicked designs of mis-
guided men, who have been so captivated by
the debased impulse of their evil purposes as to
forget the fear of the Lord, to set aside with
contempt canonical decrees and apostolic com-
mandments, and to dare to formulate new and
false dogmas and to introduce the evil of schism
into the church of God—or to support, help,
and adhere to such schismatics, who make it
their business to cleave asunder the seamless
robe of our redeemer and the unity of the ortho-
dox faith. Hence it befits the Pontiff, lest the
vessel of Peter appear to sail without pilot or
oarsman, to take severe measures against such
men and their followers, and by multiplying
punitive measures and by other suitable reme-
dies to see to it that these same overbearing
men, devoured as they are to purposes of evil,
along with their adherents, should not deceive
the multitude of the simple by their lies and
their deceitful devices, nor drag them along to
share their own error and ruination, contain-
ing them with what amounts to a contra-
rious disease. It also befits the Pontiff, having
condemned the schismatics, to ensure their
still greater confounding by publicly showing
and openly declaring to all faithful Christians
how formidable are the censures and punish-
ments to which such guilt can lead; to the end
that by such public declaration they themselves

is not one necessary to salvation, until a univer-
sal council has approved the one view and con-
demned the other.

29. It is open to us to weaken the authority
of councils, freely to contradict their findings,
to sit in judgment on their decrees, and to con-
fess with boldness whatever appears to us to be
true, whether any council has approved or con-
demned it.

30. Certain articles of John Huss, condemned
by the Council of Constance, are most Chris-
tian, true, and evangelical; the universal church
could not possibly condemn them.

31. In every good work a righteous man
sins.

32. A good work perfectly executed is—a
venial sin.

33. To burn heretics is contrary to the will
of the Spirit.

34. To fight the Turks is to resist God, who
is visiting our sins upon us through them.

35. No one can be sure that he is not always
sinning morally, because of the hidden and
secret vice of pride.

36. Free will after sin is a mere name; while
it does what in it lies, it sins morally.

37. Purgatory cannot be proved by the
canonical Sacred Scriptures.

38. Souls in purgatory have no assurance of
their salvation—at least, not all of them.

39. Souls in purgatory sin without intermis-
sion as long as they look for rest and recoil from
punishment.

40. Souls released from purgatory receive
less blessing from the intercessions of the liv-
ing than if they had given satisfaction of them-
selves.

From E. C. Rupp and B. Drewery, eds., *Martin
Luther* (London: Edward Arnold; New York: St.
Martin's Press, 1970), 36-40.



may return, in confusion and remorse, to their true selves, making an unqualified withdrawal from the prohibited conversation, fellowship and (above all) obedience to such accursed excommunicates; by this means they may escape divine vengeance and any degree of participation in their damnation. . . .

[Here the Pope recounts his previous bull *Exsurge Domine* and continues.]

We have been informed that after this previous missive had been exhibited in public and the interval or intervals it prescribed had elapsed—and we hereby give solemn notice to all faithful Christians that these intervals have and are elapsed—many of those who had followed the errors of Martin took cognizance of our missive and its warnings and injunctions; the spirit of a saner counsel brought them back to themselves, they confessed their errors and abjured the heresy at our instance, and by returning to the true Catholic faith obtained the blessing of absolution with which the self-same messengers had been empowered; and in several states and localities of the said Germany publicly burned, as we had enjoined. Nevertheless, Martin himself—and it gives us grievous sorrow and perplexity to say this—the slave of a depraved mind, has scorned to revoke his errors within the prescribed interval and to send us word of such revocation, or to come to us himself; nay, like a stone of stumbling, he has feared not to write and preach worse things than before against us and this holy see and the Catholic faith, and to lead others on to do the same.

He has now been declared a heretic; and so also others, whatever their authority and rank, who have recked naught of their own salvation but publicly and in all men's eyes become followers of Martin's pernicious and heretical sect, and given him openly and publicly their help,

On all these we decree the sentences of excommunication, of anathema, of our perpetual condemnation and interdiction; of privation of dignities, honors, and property on them and their descendants, and of declared unfitness for such possessions; of the consecration of their goods and of the crime of treason; and these

Our decrees which follow are passed against Martin and others who follow him in the obduracy of his depraved and damnable purpose, as also against those who defend and protect him with a military bodyguard, and do not fear to support him with their own resources or in any other way, and have and do presume to offer and afford help, counsel, and favor toward him. All their names, surnames, and rank—however lofty and dazzling their dignity may be—wish to be taken as included in these decrees with the same effect as if they were individually listed and could be so listed in their publication, which must be furthered with an energy to match their contents.

Our decrees which follow are passed against Martin and others who follow him in the obduracy of his depraved and damnable purpose, as also against those who defend and protect him with a military bodyguard, and do not fear to support him with their own resources or in any other way, and have and do presume to offer and afford help, counsel, and favor toward him. All their names, surnames, and rank—however lofty and dazzling their dignity may be—wish to be taken as included in these decrees with the same effect as if they were individually listed and could be so listed in their publication, which must be furthered with an energy to match their contents.

counsel, and favor, encouraging him in their midst in his disobedience and obstinacy, or hindering the publication of our said missive: such men have incurred the punishments set out in that missive, and are to be treated rightfully as heretics and avoided by all faithful Christians, as the apostle says [Titus 3:10-11]. Our purpose is that such men should rightfully be ranked with Martin and other accursed heretics and excommunicates, and that even as they have ranged themselves with the obduracy in sinning of the said Martin, they shall likewise share his punishments and his name, by bearing with them everywhere the title "Lutheran" and the punishments it incurs.

Our previous instructions were so clear and so effectively publicized and we shall adhere so strictly to our present decrees and declarations, that they will lack no proof, warning, or citation.

to be announced by others in their churches, and the other sentences, censures, and punishments which are inflicted by canon law on heretics and are set out in our aforesaid missive, we decree to have fallen on all these men to their damnation.

We add to our present declaration, by our apostolic authority, that states, territories, camps, towns, and places in which these men have temporarily lived or chanced to visit, along with their possessions—cities which house cathedrals and metropolitanans, monasteries and other religious and sacred places, privileged or unprivileged—one and all are placed under our ecclesiastical interdict. While this interdict lasts, no pretext of apostolic indulgence (except in cases the law allows, and even there as it were with the doors shut and those under excommunication and interdict excluded) shall avail to allow the celebration of mass and other divine offices. We prescribe and enjoin that the men in question are everywhere to be denounced publicly as excommunicated, accursed, condemned, interdicted, deprived of possessions, and incapable of owning them. They are to be strictly shunned by all faithful Christians.

We would make known to all the small store that Martin, his followers and the other rebels have set on God and his church by their obstinate and shameless temerity. We would protect the herd from one infectious animal, lest its infection spread to the healthy ones. Hence we lay the following injunction on each and every patriarch, archbishop, bishop, on the prelates of patriarchal, metropolitan, cathedral, and collegiate churches, and on the religious of every order—even the mendicants—privileged or unprivileged, wherever they may be stationed: and on pain of the sentence of excommunication, they shall, if so required in the execution of these presents, publicly announce and cause to be announced by others in their churches, and the other sentences, censures, and punishments which are set out in our aforesaid missive, we decree to have fallen on all these men to their damnation.

We add to our present declaration, by our apostolic authority, that states, territories, camps, towns, and places in which these men have temporarily lived or chanced to visit, along with their possessions—cities which house cathedrals and metropolitanans, monasteries and other religious and sacred places, privileged or unprivileged—one and all are placed under our ecclesiastical interdict. While this interdict lasts, no pretext of apostolic indulgence (except in cases the law allows, and even there as it were with the doors shut and those under excommunication and interdict excluded) shall avail to allow the celebration of mass and other divine offices. We prescribe and enjoin that the men in question are everywhere to be denounced publicly as excommunicated, accursed, condemned, interdicted, deprived of possessions, and incapable of owning them, and so listed in the enforcement of these presents. Three days will be given: we pronounce canonical warning and allow one day's notice on the first, another on the second, but on the third peremptory and final execution of our order. This shall take place on a Sunday or some other festival, when a large congregation assembles for worship. The banner of the cross shall be raised, the bells rung, the candles lit and after a time extinguished, cast on the ground and trampled under foot, and the stones shall be cast forth three times, and the other ceremonies observed which are usual in such cases. The faithful Christians, one and all, shall be enjoined strictly to shun these men.

We would occasion still greater confounding on the said Martin and the other heretics, we have mentioned, and on their adherents, followers, and partisans: hence, on the strength of their vow of obedience we enjoin each and every patriarch, archbishop, and all other prelates, that even as they were appointed on the authority of Jerome to allay schisms, so now in the present crisis, as their office obliges them, they shall make themselves a wall of defense for their Christian people. They shall not keep silence like dumb dogs that cannot bark, but incessantly cry and lift up their voice, preaching and causing to be preached the Word of God and the truth of the Catholic faith against the damnable articles and heretics aforesaid.

To each and every rector of the parish churches, to the rectors of all the orders, even the mendicants, privileged or unprivileged, we enjoin in the same terms, on the strength of their vow of obedience, that appointed by the Lord as they are to be like clouds, they shall

of these presents, publicly announce and cause to be announced by others in their churches, and the other sentences, censures, and punishments which are set out in our aforesaid missive, we decree to have fallen on all these men to their damnation.

We add to our present declaration, by our apostolic authority, that states, territories, camps, towns, and places in which these men have temporarily lived or chanced to visit, along with their possessions—cities which house cathedrals and metropolitanans, monasteries and other religious and sacred places, privileged or unprivileged—one and all are placed under our ecclesiastical interdict. While this interdict lasts, no pretext of apostolic indulgence (except in cases the law allows, and even there as it were with the doors shut and those under excommunication and interdict excluded) shall avail to allow the celebration of mass and other divine offices. We prescribe and enjoin that the men in question are everywhere to be denounced publicly as excommunicated, accursed, condemned, interdicted, deprived of possessions, and incapable of owning them. They are to be strictly shunned by all faithful Christians.

We would make known to all the small store that Martin, his followers and the other rebels have set on God and his church by their obstinate and shameless temerity. We would protect the herd from one infectious animal, lest its infection spread to the healthy ones. Hence we lay the following injunction on each and every patriarch, archbishop, bishop, on the prelates of patriarchal, metropolitan, cathedral, and collegiate churches, and on the religious of every order—even the mendicants—privileged or unprivileged, wherever they may be stationed: and on pain of the sentence of excommunication, they shall, if so required in the execution of these presents, publicly announce and cause to be announced by others in their churches, and the other sentences, censures, and punishments which are set out in our aforesaid missive, we decree to have fallen on all these men to their damnation.

We add to our present declaration, by our apostolic authority, that states, territories, camps, towns, and places in which these men have temporarily lived or chanced to visit, along with their possessions—cities which house cathedrals and metropolitanans, monasteries and other religious and sacred places, privileged or unprivileged—one and all are placed under our ecclesiastical interdict. While this interdict lasts, no pretext of apostolic indulgence (except in cases the law allows, and even there as it were with the doors shut and those under excommunication and interdict excluded) shall avail to allow the celebration of mass and other divine offices. We prescribe and enjoin that the men in question are everywhere to be denounced publicly as excommunicated, accursed, condemned, interdicted, deprived of possessions, and incapable of owning them, and so listed in the enforcement of these presents. Three days will be given: we pronounce canonical warning and allow one day's notice on the first, another on the second, but on the third peremptory and final execution of our order. This shall take place on a Sunday or some other festival, when a large congregation assembles for worship. The banner of the cross shall be raised, the bells rung, the candles lit and after a time extinguished, cast on the ground and trampled under foot, and the stones shall be cast forth three times, and the other ceremonies observed which are usual in such cases. The faithful Christians, one and all, shall be enjoined strictly to shun these men.

We would occasion still greater confounding on the said Martin and the other heretics, we have mentioned, and on their adherents, followers, and partisans: hence, on the strength of their vow of obedience we enjoin each and every patriarch, archbishop, and all other prelates, that even as they were appointed on the authority of Jerome to allay schisms, so now in the present crisis, as their office obliges them, they shall make themselves a wall of defense for their Christian people. They shall not keep silence like dumb dogs that cannot bark, but incessantly cry and lift up their voice, preaching and causing to be preached the Word of God and the truth of the Catholic faith against the damnable articles and heretics aforesaid.

To each and every rector of the parish churches, to the rectors of all the orders, even the mendicants, privileged or unprivileged, we enjoin in the same terms, on the strength of their vow of obedience, that appointed by the Lord as they are to be like clouds, they shall

their
y, or
sive:
s set
ght-
thful
-11].
ght-
camps, towns, and places in which these men
have temporarily lived or chanced to visit,
along with their possessions—cities which
house cathedrals and metropolitanans, monaster-
ies and other religious and sacred places, privi-
leged or unprivileged—one and all are placed
under our ecclesiastical interdict. While this
interdict lasts, no pretext of apostolic indul-
gence (except in cases the law allows, and even
there as it were with the doors shut and those
under excommunication and interdict excluded)
shall avail to allow the celebration of mass and
other divine offices. We prescribe and enjoin
that the men in question are everywhere to be
denounced publicly as excommunicated,
accursed, condemned, interdicted, deprived of
possessions, and incapable of owning them.
They are to be strictly shunned by all faithful
Christians.

We would make known to all the small store
that Martin, his followers and the other rebels
have set on God and his church by their obsti-
nate and shameless temerity. We would protect
the herd from one infectious animal, lest its
infection spread to the healthy ones. Hence we
lay the following injunction on each and every
patriarch, archbishop, bishop, on the prelates of
patriarchal, metropolitan, cathedral, and colle-
giate churches, and on the religious of every
order—even the mendicants—privileged or
unprivileged, wherever they may be stationed:
and on pain of the sentence of excommunica-
tion, they shall, if so required in the execution
of these presents, publicly announce and cause

thing in our aforesaid earlier missive which we do not wish to stand in the way, or by any other pronouncements to the contrary.

No one whatsoever may infringe this our written decision, declaration, precept, injunction, assignment, will, decree, or rashly contravene it. Should anyone dare to attempt such a thing, let him know that he will incur the wrath of almighty God and of the blessed apostles Peter and Paul.

Written at St. Peter's, Rome, on the third of January 1521, during the eighth year of our pontificate.

From Rupp and Drewery, *Martin Luther*, 63-67.

100. Adrian VI to the Diet of Nuremberg (1523)

Pope Adrian VI (1522-1523) differed from his immediate predecessors in that he was Dutch, a theologian by training, and deeply concerned about the church's spiritual welfare. His memorandum to German authorities in 1523 shows that the spirit of self-criticism and reform was by no means dead in the Catholic Church. Had he lived longer, we could speculate, things might have turned out differently.

God has allowed this punishment [the fall of Belgrade and Rhodes to the Turks] to overtake his church because of the sins of men, especially those of priests and prelates. . . . There have been great spiritual abominations and abuses in the holy see for many years. Perversion has grown everywhere, and it is hardly surprising that the sickness has spread from the head to the members. Every single one of us has fallen victim. Not even one of us has done good. . . . We will do everything in our power to reform first this see, from which the powerful evil advanced so that, even as corruption passed

apostolic constitutions and orders, or by any—No obstacle is afforded to our wishes by the exhibition of the original itself.

It would also be difficult to transmit this missive to every single place where its publication might be necessary. Hence our wish and authoritative decree is that copies of it, sealed by some ecclesiastical prelate or by one of our aforesaid messengers, and countersigned by the hand of some public notary, should everywhere bear the same authority as the production and

at every point as decisively as if the missive had been personally made known and presented to them. binding force that Martin and the others we have declared shall be shown to be condemned at every point as decisively as if the missive had been personally made known and presented to them. However, since it would be difficult to deliver the present missive, with its declarations and announcements, to Martin and the other declared excommunicates in person, because of the strength of their faction, our wish is that the public nailing of this missive on the doors of two cathedrals—either both metropolitan, or one cathedral and one metropolitan of the churches in the said Germany—by a messenger of ours in those places, shall have such a binding force that Martin and the others we have declared shall be shown to be condemned at every point as decisively as if the missive had been personally made known and presented to them.

sprinkle showers on the people of God, and have no fear in giving the widest publicity to the condemnation of the aforesaid articles, as their office obliges them. It is written that perfect love casteth out fear. Let each and every one of you take up the burden of such a meritorious duty with complete devotion; show yourselves so punctilious in its execution, so zealous and eager in word and deed, that from your labors, by the favor of divine grace, the hoped-for harvest will come in, and that through your devotion you will not only earn that crown of glory which is the due recompense of all who promote religious causes, but also attain from us and the said holy see the unbounded commendation that your proved diligence will deserve.