

The Life Of Dr. Martin Luther

Content Page



By
Martin Luther

Collected and arranged
By: M Michelet "Author of History of France" Etc

Translated by: William Hazlitt ESQ
Of the Middle Temple Barristor At LAW

Second Edition

London Bell & Daldy
York Street, Convent Garden
1872

Appendix Second Part

LXXXIII. (p. 249.)—"Dr. John Pomer once told me, that in the Town Hall at Lubeck there had been found, in an old chronicle, a prophecy that in the year 1550, there would arise in Germany a great commotion on account of religion; and that if the emperor interfered in the matter, he would lose all his possessions. But I doubt very much whether the emperor will go to war for the sake of the pope; war is too costly."

The editor of the *Tischreden*, Aurifaber, adds, that Charles V. hung the walls of his retreat of St. Just with twenty pieces of tapestry, representing the principal actions of his reign, which he used to amuse himself every day with walking up and down and looking at. And whenever, says Aurifaber, he stopped opposite that representing the taking of the elector at Muhlberg, he would sigh and murmur, *Ah, if I had let him be as he was, I should have remained what I was.*—(*Tischreden*, 6.) This observation, which the editor, perhaps designedly, does not seem to understand, simply expresses Charles' regret at the wholly false step he took in giving the electorate to young Maurice.

LXXXIV. (p. 249.)—"I will anticipate your letters, and tell you myself what is passing at Ratisbon. You have been sent for by the emperor, and he has told you to turn over in your mind conditions of peace. You have replied in Latin as well as you could, but have found yourself unequal to so great a matter. Eck, in his usual way, vociferated: 'Most gracious emperor, I will prove against any one, that we are in the right, and that the pope is the head of the church.' And there's all you have to tell me." (25th June, 1541.)

LXXXV. (p. 250.)—The court sought to exercise a sort of control and superintendence over the works even of Luther. In 1531, he had written a book entitled *Against the Hypocrite of Dresden*, and published it, without first submitting the manuscript to the elector. Having been called upon by the chancellor Bruck for an explanation of this omission, he replied: "If all my minor productions were sent to the court prior to their publication, either they would undergo so many critical revisions and alterations that they would not appear at all, or, if they appeared, our enemies would impute the joint-authorship of them to half a dozen people who were not at all to blame in the matter. If I send them straight to the printers, there can be no question but that they are wholly mine, and I stand the brunt of all objections, as I am quite ready to do."

He had on another occasion, of a more serious character, to contend against the interference of the court. Albert, archbishop of Mayence, had put to death one of his officers, named Schauz, in an illegal manner; and, according to the public rumour, to satisfy private animosity. Luther hereupon addressed to the prince two letters, full of indignation. The first of these, dated 31st July, 1535, begins in the following terms: "I do not write to you, cardinal, in the hope

of producing any effect upon your utterly depraved heart. That is an idea which I have altogether renounced. I write to you simply to satisfy my own conscience before God and man, and that I may not by my silence appear to sanction the terrible deed you have perpetrated." Further on, he designates the prince, *Cardinal of Hell*, and threatens him with the Eternal Justiciary, who will come and demand from him an account of the innocent blood he has shed. In the second letter, dated March 1536, he says: "The paper I send herewith will let you see that the blood of Schauz is not silent in Germany, whatever it may be in your grace's palace, and amidst your courtiers. Abel lives in God, and his blood cries out against the murderers.....I see by your grace's letter to Antony Schauz, that you absolutely seek to throw the guilt of his death upon his family. I have witnessed and I have heard of many a cardinal's villany, but I could not have imagined a viper cruel and insolent enough to outrage in this manner an unhappy family which his own infernal deed had made desolate. I have collected the last words of Schauz, in the moment of his agony. I have down on paper his dying protestations against violence, when your holiness was having his teeth pulled out to extort from him a false confession; I will publish these words, and by God's help, your holiness shall dance to a tune you never heard before.....Cain said, indeed, *Am I my brother's keeper?* but the Lord said, too, *Cursed be thou from the earth.....*I commend your miserable soul to God, if, indeed, in the insolence of the bloody hat of Rome, you do not think it beneath you to be commended to God."

The elector of Saxony and duke Albert of Prussia, the cardinal's relatives, considering the language of this letter somewhat of the most violent, sent word to Luther, that, in attacking the cardinal thus, he would be attacking the honour of their family, and commanded him to modify what he had to say. Luther, notwithstanding, published the menaced statement some time after.

LXXXVI. (p. 250.)—From the very outset of the conferences, Luther foresaw they would lead to nothing. He was distrustful even of the firmness of Bucer and of the landgrave of Hesse. He says, in a letter to the chancellor Bruck: "I fear the landgrave is allowing himself to be enticed too far by the papists, and that he will endeavour to drag us with him. But he has already led us up and down a great deal more than enough, and I shall no longer follow him. I would much rather take the whole burden on my own shoulders, and walk on alone, at my own risk and peril, as I did in the beginning. We know that it is the cause of God; that it is He who has raised us up, who has brought us thus far; He will give victory to his cause. Those who do not choose to follow us can remain behind. Neither the emperor nor the Turk, nor all the devils together, can effect aught against this cause, whatever they

may do to us and our mortal bodies. I am perfectly indignant at their treating this as a mere worldly matter; as a mere affair of the emperor's, of the Turks, of the princes', wherein they may, just as they please, go here, or rest there, or step aside, or come back again. This is a cause in which the devil and his angels are fighting against Satan and his angels. Those who believe not in God may not place themselves in his ranks." (April, 1541.)

LXXXVII. (p. 250.)—"I will go Hagenau, and have a near look at this formidable Syrian, this Behemoth, whom the dweller in heaven laughs at, in Psalm ii. . . . But they will not comprehend that laugh, until they come to the time *when they shall perish by the way, when the Lord's anger shall have been kindled, for that they would not hiss his Son.* Amen! amen! May that time soon come! They have deserved it—they have insisted upon it." (2nd July, 1540.)

LXXXVIII. (p. 253.)—"The secret marriages of princes and great lords are regular marriages before God, somewhat analogous with the concubinage of the patriarchs." (Tischreden, 320.) This affords an explanation of the consultation in favour of the landgrave.

LXXXIX. (p. 254.)—"The ingratitude of man is the test of good works; if what we do please the world, be assured it will not be agreeable to God." (6th August, 1539.)

"Depression and melancholy proceed from the devil; of that I am quite certain. God neither afflicts, nor intimidates, nor kills; he is the God of the living. He sent us his only Son, that through him we might live, through him overcome death." (Tischreden, 205.)

On Sadness.—"You cannot," says one of the sages—"you cannot prevent the birds from flying over your head; but you may readily prevent them from making their nests in your hair." (19th June, 1530.)

John of Stockhausen applied to Luther for a remedy against spiritual temptations, and against melancholy. The Doctor, in reply, advised him to avoid solitude, and to strengthen his will by an active, laborious life. He recommends him, in addition, to have frequent prayer, and to study the work of Gerson, *De Cogitationibus Blasphemiarum*. (27th Nov. 1532.)

He gave similar advice to the young prince Joachim of Anhalt: "Gaiety," says he, "and courage, innocent gaiety and rational, honourable courage, are the best medicine for young men, and for old men too, for all men, against sad thoughts. I myself, who have passed all my former life in melancholy and depression of spirit, now accept joy and happiness wherever they present themselves—nay, go in search of them. Criminal pleasure proceeds from Satan, and is accursed; but the joy we experience in the intercourse with honest and pious persons is agreeable in the sight of God. Get on

horseback and go out hunting with your friends, and partake of all the innocent amusements they suggest to you. Solitude and melancholy are poison to the mind, they are death to man, and more especially to young people." (26th June, 1534.)

Melancthon related the following apologue one day at Luther's table: "A peasant passing through a wood, came to a cavern in which there was a serpent. A great stone which closed the entrance prevented the creature from coming out. He entreated the peasant to roll away the stone, promising him for his compliance a handsome reward. The peasant, induced by this prospect, released the serpent, and then asked for his reward. To which the serpent replied that he would give him the same reward that the world always bestowed upon its benefactors: that he would kill him. The peasant begged and prayed for mercy, but the only concession he could obtain was that they should submit the point to the first animal they met, and abide by his decision. This happened to be an old horse, all skin and bone. His reply was: 'I have spent all the strength I had in the service of man; as my recompence, after starving me almost to death, he is now about to kill me for the sake of my skin.' The serpent consented to refer the matter to one more arbiter. This was an old dog, whose master had just broken half the bones in its body. He gave his decision most emphatically against the peasant. The serpent was then about to kill his benefactor, but the latter induced him to accept one more judge, whose award was to be final. Soon afterwards, they met a fox. The peasant ran up to him, and whispered him that if he would get him off, he would give him all the poultry in his yard. The fox having heard both parties, said that before he pronounced judgment, it was essential for him to see how things had previously stood, and that the serpent must return into the cavern. The animal consented to this, and as soon as he was in, the peasant rolled the stone back to its former position, and there the serpent was fast. The fox came next night to the peasant's to take the poultry that had been promised him, and the peasant killed him for his pains.' When Melancthon had finished his story: 'Av,' said Luther, 'that is just the image of what we see in the world. He whom we have saved from the gallows puts the rope round our neck. If I had no other example of this, that of Jesus Christ would suffice, who after having redeemed the whole world from sin, death, the devil, and hell, was crucified.'" (Tischreden, 56.)

The pleantries, the jests, the puns, which we so often come upon in Luther's letters of former years, now entirely disappear; his correspondence becomes sombre, mournful; we scarcely ever see a smile on his lips. The grotesque description of a military expedition of some citizens against a band of robbers, unwrinkles his brow but for an instant: "Here has been a fresh achievement of Kohlhasc (a famous brigand whose life forms the subject of a curious historical

romance); he has carried off a rich miller of this place. As soon as we heard of the affair, we valorously rushed out into the country, keeping, of course, within safe range of the walls, and, like so many canvas St. Christophers and wooden St. Georges, frightened the crows with sundry musket shots. We have cut down all the trees round about, and carried them into the town, for fear Kohlhasse should make a bridge of them, and so get over our little ditch in the night. We are terrible Achilleses and Hectors, I can assure you, fearing no enemy, so long as no enemy presents himself."

XC. (p. 256.)—In 1541, a citizen of Wittemberg, named Cleeman Schobert, followed Luther down several streets, with an arquebuse in his hand, probably with the intention of killing him; he was arrested and punished. (Ukert, i. 313.)

XCI. (p. 258.)—The *Tischreden* (Table Talk,) whence most of the following passages are derived, was first published in 1566, by John Aurifaber, one of Luther's disciples. They form a folio volume of 1254 pages. Luther at his table was always surrounded by his children and friends, Melancthon, Jonas, Aurifaber, and other coadjutors in his labours, and companions of his leisure. A place at this table was an envied distinction: "I would willingly," he writes to Gaspard Muller, "have received Kegel into my family circle, for various reasons; but as young Porse, of Jena, is on the eve of returning here, my table will be full, and I cannot send away my old and faithful companions to make room for new friends. However, it is possible that, after Easter, we may have room, and in that case I will do as you desire—that is, if my lord Catherine will grant us her permission, of which I have no doubt." (19th Jan. 1538.) *Dominus* Ketha is a name by which he used frequently to designate his wife. He begins one of his letters to her thus, (26th July, 1640): *To the rich and noble dame Von Zulsdorf, madame the doctress Catherine Luther, resident at Wittemberg, but at times taking her pleasure at her estate of Zulsdorf, these from her loving husband.*"

XCII. (p. 258.)—On the 26th August, 1542, we find Luther writing to Mark Cordel: "According to our arrangements, my dear Mark, I send thee my son John, that thou mayst employ him in teaching the children grammar and music, and, at the same time superintend and correct his moral conduct. If thou succeedest in improving him, I will send thee two other sons of mine. For, though I desire my children to be good divines, yet I would have them sound grammarians, and accomplished musicians."

Dr. Jonas observed one day, that the curse of God upon disobedient children was manifest in the family of Luther; the young man just referred to always suffering from illness: "Ay," said Dr. Luther, 'tis the punishment due to his disobedience. He almost

killed me once, and ever since I have lost all my strength of body. Thanks to him, I now thoroughly understand that passage where St. Paul speaks of children who kill their parents, not by the sword, but by disobedience. Such children seldom live long, and are never happy. . . . Oh, God! how wicked is this world! how monstrous the times in which we live! These are the times of which Christ said, *When the Son of Man cometh shall he find faith on the earth?* Happy they who died ere these days came upon the world!" (Tischreden, 48.) It was to this unworthy son, when yet a child, that Luther addressed the following charming letter:—

"Grace and peace to you in Jesus Christ, my dear little child; I perceive with pleasure that you are making good progress in your learning, and that you now give attention to your prayers. Continue to do so, my dear child, and when I return home I will give you beautiful things.

"I know a lovely and smiling garden, full of children dressed in robes of gold, who play under the trees with beautiful apples, pears, cherries, nuts, and prunes. They sing, they leap, they are all joyful; there are also beautiful little ponies, with bridles of gold and saddles of silver. In passing through the garden, I asked a man what it meant, and who were the children. He replied, 'These are the children who love to pray and to learn, who are pious and good children.' I said to him, 'Dear friend, I have also a child, his name is little John Luther: might he not also come here, and eat these beautiful apples and pears, ride on these beautiful ponies, and play with the other children?' The man replied to me, 'If your child, your dear little John Luther, is wise, if he says his prayers, and learns willingly, he may come, and he may bring little Philip and James¹ along with him. He will here find fifes, drums, and other fine instruments to produce music; they will dance and amuse themselves with the cross-bow.' While I was speaking, the man pointed out to me, in the middle of the garden, a beautiful grass park where the children danced, and where the fifes, drums, and cross-bows were all lying. But it was morning; the children had not breakfasted, and I only waited till the dance commenced. I then said to the man, 'Dear sir, I intend to write immediately to my dear little John, and I will tell him to be a good boy, to pray, and learn well, that he may be permitted to come to this garden. He has a dear little sister whom he loves much, her name is Madaline, may he bring her with him?' The man replied, 'Yes, tell him they may both come together.' Be wise, then, my dear little boy; tell Philip and James to be wise also, and you will all be allowed to visit and play in the beautiful garden. I commend my dear child to the protection of God. Salute Madeline, and give her a kiss for me. Your father who loves you, MARTIN LUTHER. 19th June, 1530."

¹ The sons of Philip Melancthon. Little is known of them, and it is supposed that they died in early life.

XCIII. (p. 258.)—"Woman is the most precious of creatures. She is full of grace and virtue ; she maintains the faith.

"First love is violent, it intoxicates us, and takes away the reason. The intoxication once passed away, well-disciplined and pious souls retain the honourable part of love ; the wicked retain nothing.

"Gracious Lord ! if it be thy will that I live without a wife, sustain me against temptations ; but if it be thy will that I marry, grant me a good and pious spouse, with whom I may pass my days quietly and happily, whom I may love, and who will love me." (Tischreden, 329.)

XCIV. (p. 262.)—"A marriage sanctioned by authority, and not contrary to the word of God, is a good marriage, whatever the degree of relationship of the parties." (Tischreden, 321.)

Luther greatly blamed the lawyers, who, "contrary to their own consciences, contrary to natural law, to divine law, to the imperial law, maintain secret promises of marriage to be valid. In this matter every body should be left to the dictates of his own conscience. No one can be compelled to love another."

"Dower marriage gifts, settlements, and so on, are for the consideration of the civil authority, to which I wholly refer them. We are the shepherds of men's consciences, not of body and goods." (Tischreden, 315.)

On being consulted in a case of adultery, he said : "The parties should be cited to answer for themselves, and then if the case is proved, be separated altogether. These things concern the civil authority, for marriage is a temporal matter, which interests the church in no way except as to the conscience. (Ib. 322.)

On the 1st Feb., 1539, he said : "Though these marriage affairs involve us in a great deal of trouble and anxiety, rendering it necessary for us to study the subject every day, to say nothing of additional reading, praying, writing, preaching, yet I am glad that consistories have been established for the settlement of matrimonial questions. . . . We find constantly parents, particularly fathers-in-law, without any valid reason, forbidding their children to marry. The civil authority and the spiritual minister ought to look to these cases, and favour the contemplated union, if they see fit, even against the will of the parents, supposing that will to be arbitrarily and unreasonably exercised. Children ought to remind their parents of the example of Samson. We are no longer in the times of popery, when people were obliged to follow the law, however it was opposed to equity." (Ib.)

XCV. (p. 266.)—"God knows all trades better than the most accomplished artisans here below. As a tailor, he makes for the stag a coat that lasts him all his lifetime, and hundreds of years after, without tearing. As a shoemaker, he gives him a set of shoes that lasts just as long. And will it be denied that he is a fine cook,

seeing how perfectly he cooks, and makes all things ready in the best style, at his great fire the sun? If the Lord were to sell us what he gives us, he would make a large fortune every hour, but as he gives us all things for nothing, we don't even thank him for them." (Tischreden, 27.)

This strange passage, and many others like it, show us in Luther the probable model of Abraham à Sancta Clara. In the seventeenth century, people only imitated Luther's defects.

XCVI. (p. 268.)—"Here have I become a disciple of the Decalogue. I begin to perceive that the Decalogue is the dialectic of the Gospel, and the Gospel the rhetoric of the Decalogue. Christ has all that Moses had, but Moses had not all that Christ has." (20th June, 1530.)

XCVII. (p. 269.)—He thus addresses John Von Sternberg, in dedicating to him his translation of the 97th Psalm: "My reason for placing your name at the head of this little work, was not merely to attract the attention of persons who ordinarily despise all art and all learning; I wished also to afford, in this way, a testimony that there are still pious men to be found among our nobles. Unfortunately, the majority of our nobility at the present time are so insolent and so depraved that they excite the wrath of the poor man. If they desire to be respected by others, they must, in the first place, themselves respect God and his word. If they continue in their present arrogant and wicked course of life, they will soon become lower than peasants; indeed, as it is, they are worse than peasants, though they still bear the name of nobles, and have feathered hats. Let them not forget Munzer.

"I trust that this little book, and others like it, may touch your heart, and that you will, through its pages, make a more useful pilgrimage than that which you heretofore made to Jerusalem. Not that I despise these pilgrimages in themselves; I would readily perform one myself, if I could, and I always hear with pleasure any accounts of them. What I mean is, that they are not made in the proper spirit. I remember, that when I myself went to Rome, I ran about, like a madman, to all the churches, all the convents, all the places of note of every kind; I implicitly believed every tale about all of them that imposture had invented. I said a dozen masses, and I almost regretted that my father and mother were not dead, so that I might have availed myself of the opportunity to draw their souls out of purgatory by a dozen more masses, and other good works of a similar description. 'Tis a proverb at Rome, *Happy the mother whose son says mass for her on the eve of St. John*. How glad I should have been to have saved my mother.

"We did these things then, knowing no better; 'tis the pope's interest to encourage such lies. Now, thank God, we have the

gospels, the Psalms, and the other words of God. To them we can make pilgrimages more useful than any others: in them we can visit and contemplate the true promised land, the true Jerusalem, the true paradise. In them we walk, not amid the tombs of saints, or over their mortal relics, but in their hearts, their thoughts, their spirit." (Coburg, 29th August, 1530.)

/ XCVIII. (p. 270.)—"I sweat blood and water in my efforts to render the Prophets into the vulgar tongue. Good God! what work it is! How difficult 'tis to make these Jew writers speak German. They struggle furiously before they will give up their Hebrew to our barbarous tongue. 'Tis as though Philomela, forgetting her sweet melody, were to imitate the cuckoo's monotonous note." (14th June, 1528.)

He says, elsewhere, that while translating the Bible, he sometimes occupied several weeks in hunting out, and meditating upon the signification of a single word. (Ukert, ii. 337.)

/ To John Frederic, duke of Saxony, on sending him his translation of the prophet Daniel, he says: "The historians relate, to the honour of Alexander the Great, that he always carried Homer about with him, and at night deposited the precious volume beneath his pillow: how much more just that the same honour, and even greater honours, should be rendered to the prophet Daniel by all the kings and princes of the earth? They ought not merely to place him under their heads; they should treasure him up in their hearts, for he teaches great things indeed." (Feb. or March, 1530.)

XCIX. (p. 270.) "The saints often sinned, often went wrong. What insanity to be always holding up to us their acts and their words as infallible rules of conduct. Let these mad sophists, these ignorant pontiffs, these impious priests, these sacrilegious monks—let the whole vile gang know that we were not baptized in the name of Augustine, in the name of Bernard, of Gregory, of Peter, or Paul, in the name of the benevolent faculty of theology of Sodom (the Sorbonne) of Paris, or of the Gomorrhæ of Louvain, but in the name of Jesus Christ, our Master, alone." (De Abrogandâ Missâ privatâ. Op. Lat. ii. 245.)

"The true saints are all the authorities, all the servants of the church, all the parents, all the children who believe in Jesus Christ, who commit no sin, and who fulfil, each in his condition, the duties imposed upon them by God."—Tischreden, 134.

Luther had small faith in the legends of the saints, and regarded the anchorites with profound contempt....."If one has committed an excess in eating or drinking, it is soon to be expiated by fasting, and perhaps a touch of fever."

"The legend of St. Christopher is a fine Christian poem. The Greeks, who were a learned, wise, and ingenious people, desired

therein to show their idea of a Christian. (*Christoforos*, one who bears Christ.) The legend of St. George is of the same character. The legend of St. Catherine is contrary to the whole Roman history."

C. (p. 271.)—In dedicating to Frederick, abbot of Nuremberg, his translation of the 118th Psalm, Luther says, "This is my own psalm, my favourite psalm. I love them all, I love the whole gospel, for it is my sole consolation, my sole life; but I have more especially attached myself to this psalm, and have, in truth, a sort of right to call it my own. It has deserved well of me; it has saved me from many a difficulty, whence neither the emperor, nor kings, nor wise men, nor saints, could have extricated me. It is, my friend, dearer to me than all the honours, all the power of the earth. I would not exchange it for the whole earth, if I could.

"But, it will be said, this psalm is common to us all, and no one has a right to arrogate it to himself. Ay, and so is Christ common to us all, and yet Christ is mine. I am not at all jealous, however, of this my property; I am willing to share it with the whole world. I only would to God that every man would as eagerly claim this psalm to be his own. It would be a contest most pleasing to God, a competition full of union and perfect charity." (Coburg, 1st July, 1530.)

CI. (p. 273.)—In the commencement of 1519, Luther addressed to Jerome Dungersheim a remarkable letter on the importance and authority of the fathers of the church. "The bishop of Rome, it would appear, is supreme by his dignity. It is to him we must refer all difficult cases, all nice questions. I don't know whether I should be able to maintain this supremacy of his in opposition to the Greeks who controvert it.

"If I acknowledge in the pope the sole right of governing in the church, I must, as a consequence of this admission, treat as so many heretics, Jerome, Augustine, Athanasius, Cyprian, Gregory, and all the bishops of the East; none of these having been instituted by him or under him. The council of Nicea was not assembled by his authority; he presided not over it, either in person or by deputy. What am I to say to the decrees of this council? Which of them are we to acknowledge? Any? All? None?.....'Tis a way with you and with Eck to accept as a clear case everything that fell from any of these authorities of yours, and to modify by the fathers' judgment, the words of the gospel, as though the latter were of inferior value to the former. I proceed upon quite a different principle. Like St. Augustine and St. Bernard, while I respect the various authorities, I ascend the stream till I reach the great fountain whence they all take their rise." He then gives several instances of mistakes into which the fathers had fallen, and criticises them philologically, to show that the commentators referred to did not understand the

Hebrew text. "Of how many authorities does not Jerome make abusive application in his controversy with Jovinian; of how many Augustine, in assailing Pelagius! Augustine, for instance, says that this verse in Genesis, *Let us make man in our own image*, is a proof of the Trinity, whereas the Hebrew text is, *I will make man after my own image*. The Master of Sentences affords a sad example of this sort of thing, in his attempt to make the words of all the fathers agree together. The result is that we become the laughing stock of the heretics, when we present ourselves before them with all this obscure or double-meaning phraseology. Eck constitutes himself the champion of the most contradictory opinions. Our dispute will turn upon this subject.' (1519.)

"I always wonder on what principle Jerome has had accorded him the title of Doctor of Churches, and Origen, that of Master of Churches. You could not make a Christian out of all their books put together; they were both too much led away by the pomp of works. Augustine himself would not have been much better, had not the Pelagians run him so hard, and compelled him to do his very best in defending the faith." (26th August, 1530.)

"He who likened monachism to baptism was a sheer madman; rather an utter block, than simply a fool. . . . What! Dost thou heed Jerome, when he speaks so impiously of God?—when he lays it down, that next to one's self, one should have the greatest regard for one's parents? Will you listen to Jerome—so repeatedly wrong—so repeatedly sinning? Will you, in a word, rather believe a man than God? If so, go, and believe with Jerome, that we should pass over the bodies of our prostrated parents to flee to the desert." (Letter to Severinus, an Austrian monk, 6th October, 1527.)

CII. (p. 275.)—"Gregory of Rimini has convicted the schoolmen of a doctrine worse than that of the Pelagians; for, though the Pelagians think that one may do a good work without grace, they do not go the length of affirming, that we can, without grace, attain heaven. The schoolmen say, with Pelagius, that without grace we may do a good work, not a meritorious work; but they go infinitely beyond Pelagius, when they affirm that man has the instinct, the inspiration of right natural reason, to which the will may conform itself naturally, for the Pelagians admit that man is aided by the law of God." (1519.)

CIII. (p. 278.)—On the 2nd December, 1536, we find a letter from Luther to the king of Denmark, formally approving of the suppression of episcopacy, and urging that prince to make a good use of the confiscated church property—that is to say, (according to another letter of his, on the same subject, to the margrave, George of Brandenburg, dated 18th July, 1529,) to apply them to the foundation and support of schools and universities.

“The emperor is devouring all the bishoprics in his reach. The nobles must be on their guard. I have done all I could to secure that ecclesiastical property should not be swallowed up in this way, and that a portion of such of it as belonged to noble families should be retained for the poor members of those families; but I cannot achieve this.” (Tischreden, 351.)

CIV. (p. 279.)—“In the year 1530, Philip, at Augsburg, was six hours together with that swift-brained cardinal of Saltzburg; and, among other discourses, he had much talk with him about religion. In the end, the cardinal said to him: ‘My dear *Domine Philip*, we priests were never yet good; we know that your doctrine is right; but you ought to know, that never yet any man was able to get the better of the priests: you will not be the first to do so.’ This cardinal was the son of a horse-jockey in Augsburg, whose father was of an ancient and good family in that place, but, by reason of poverty, came to be a servant. He was the first cardinal we had in Germany. Through his sister’s influence, he made himself well known in the emperor Maximilian’s court, and was afterwards sent in a legation to the pope to Rome; later, he was made coadjutor of the bishopric of Saltzburg. This cardinal loves his cardinal’s hat better than the divine truth; he fears the loss of it, and of his bishopric. He believes not that God is able to put down the mighty from their seat, and to exalt the humble and meek. He is of a cowardly disposition, he cannot hold out long, his conscience pricks him too sorely. The papists differ among themselves, they cannot agree in their own pedlaries. For, *anno* 1530, in the proceeding at Augsburg, they made no mention, no, not so much as one word was spoken, of the article of the pope’s supremacy, which was wont to be the chief article of popedom. We ought to set upon such an ungodly and insolent creature, we ought to preach and to write against him. If God spare me life and health but only one half year, I will fetch a dance with that bride over block and stone. I never read such fearful examples of hard hearts, as in these cardinals and bishops; they far surpass the Jews, Pharaoh, and others; in a word, they are next neighbours to the devil. My heart trembles when I think on them. Loving Lord and Saviour Christ, give me life and strength that I may shave the crown of this prelate; for he is a crafty derider of thy name, he is a downright knave, he sticks not to boast that very few of his stratagems have failed him. The good and godly princess electrix of Saxony lately asked me, If any hope were to be had of this cardinal’s conversion? I answered: I believe not; however, it would be a great joy unto me, if in time he be won over to the truth, and repent; but there is little hope thereof. I would rather believe and hope the same in Pilate, in Herod, and Dioclesian, who sinned openly.

“I have hitherto prayed for this bishop, *categoricé, affirmativé,*

positivé, with my whole heart, that God might convert him, and I have essayed, by repeated letters, to bring him to repentance. I pray for him now *hypotheticé and desperabunde*. This cardinal wrote often very friendly unto me, thinking to grease my lips, inso-much that I thought he would act upon my advice to take a wife; but he intended with smooth words to deceive me. However, at the diet at Augsburg I learned to know him right; yet, nevertheless, he still pretended great friendship towards me, and in causes of weight would always make choice of me to be an umpire." (Tischreden, 274.)

"At the imperial assembly at Augsburg, in the year 1530, the bishop of Salzburg said unto me, 'Four ways and means there are to make a reconciliation between us and you protestants: One is, that ye yield unto us; to that you say you cannot. The second is, that we yield unto you; but that we will not do. The third is, that the one party, by force, should be compelled to yield to the other; but thereupon a great tumult might be raised: therefore, the fourth way or means were to be applauded and used—namely, that now being here assembled together, the one party should strive to exterminate the other, and that party which shall have the advantage, and be the stronger, the same shall put the other party into a bag.' Whereupon, I answered him, and said: 'This, indeed, were a very substantial course to settle unity and peace, wonderful wisely considered of, found out, and expounded by such a holy and Christian-like bishop as you are;' and thereupon I took letters out of my pocket which, shortly before, I had received from Rome, and gave the same to the bishop to read; which letter related a pretty passage that fell out there, five weeks before, between some cardinals and the pope's fool, as followeth:

"These cardinals had been in serious consultation how, and by what means, the protestants in Germany might be convinced touching their error, or suppressed; but they saw the difficulty of it, in that the protestants, in their books and writings, powerfully cited, against the papists, the sacred Scripture, and especially opposed and withstood them with the doctrines of St. Paul, which were great blocks in the papists' way, insomuch that they found it a business not so easily to be accomplished. Then said the fool unto the cardinals, 'I know how to give you herein an advice, whereby you easily may be rid and quitted of St. Paul, that his doctrines shall not be approved of, as thus: The pope hath power to make saints; therefore let St. Paul be taken out of the number of the apostles, and preferred to be a saint; and then his *dicta*, which are against you, shall be no more held for apostolical.' This and your proposition, I said, are of equal value." (Ib. 19.)

CV. (p. 280.) "The Mendicants alone are divided into several orders, and the Minorites, in like manner, also into seven. All these

sects the holy father takes care to feed and nourish, lest they should unite and come together." (Letter to the Diet at Prague, 15th July, 1522.)

CVI. (p. 286.)—In 1530, Luther translated a selection from the fables of Æsop. In the preface, he observes that there probably never was any author of the name of Æsop at all, and that the fables themselves were collected from the mouths of the common people. (Werke, ix. 1455.)

He writes thus to Wenceslaus Link, of Nuremberg, on 20th March, 1536: "If it be not giving you too much trouble, my dear Wenceslaus, I would beg of you to collect for me all the drawings, books, hymns, songs of the minstrels, and rhymes, that have been printed and published in German, in your city, during the past year. Send me all you find of such things: I am most anxious to have all I can get of them. We manage to write Latin books here, but as to German books, we are mere apprentices. However, we are doing our best to improve ourselves in this respect, and I hope we shall soon satisfy you as to our progress."

Luther was incessant in his efforts to raise the character of Wittemberg in every possible way. Writing to the elector John, 20th May, 1530, he says, seeking to raise his courage, and to console him for the various vexations in which the Reformation had involved him: "See how God has manifested his grace and goodness in the states of your highness. In them the gospel has its most pious and faithful ministers, those who teach its word with the greatest purity, zeal, and fruit. You see growing up around you an excellent generation, of good disposition and good conduct, and who will soon be learned in the holy Scripture. It rejoices my heart to see our young people—boys and girls even—understanding God and Christ better, having a purer faith, and praying with more fervent effect than all the episcopal schools and most famous convents put together. This charming youth has been granted you as a sign of divine favour and mercy. God, as it were, has said to you, 'Dear duke John, I confide to thee my most precious treasure: be as a father to these children. I would have thee protect and guide them: be the gardener of this paradise,' " &c.

The duke does not seem to have adopted the charge here suggested to him, for Luther mentions in several of his letters that there were at Wittemberg a great number of students who had scarce anything but bread and water to live upon.

CVII. (p. 287.)—Heine, in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* for 1st March, 1834, observes: "Not less remarkable, not less significant than his prose works, are the poems of Luther, those stirring songs which, as it were, escaped from him in the very midst of his combats and his necessities, like a flower making its way from between rough stones, or a moonbeam glittering amid dark clouds. Luther loved

music; he wrote, indeed, a treatise on the art. His versification, accordingly, is in a very high degree harmonious, so that under this head, too, he may be called the Swan of Eisleben. Not that he was by any means gentle or swan-like in the songs which he composed for the purpose of exciting the courage of his people; in these he is fervent, fierce. The hymn which he composed on his way to Worms, and which he and his companions chanted as they entered that city, is a regular war-song. The old cathedral trembled when it heard these novel sounds; the very crows flew from their nests on its towers. That hymn, the Marseillaise of the Reformation, has preserved to the present day its potent spell over German hearts, and we may yet hear it thundered forth again under similar circumstances."

CVIII. (p. 288.)—"The doctor was speaking one day of the genius and skill of the Italian painters. 'They imitate nature so perfectly,' said he, 'independently of the exact colour and form of the object designed, they give such admirable expression to the thoughts and feelings within, as it were, that their pictures seem living things. Flanders follows close upon Italy in this matter. The Flemings are very sharp people, altogether; they learn with similar facility all the foreign languages. 'Tis a proverb, you know: Carry a Fleming in a bag through France or Italy, and he will know the language before he's got a hundred miles.'" (Luther, 424.)

CIX. (p. 292.)—He says in his treatise *De Usuris*: "I call those people usurers who lend money at five and six per cent. The Scripture forbids the lending money at interest; we ought to lend money as we lend anything to a neighbour. Even the civil law forbids usury. 'Tis not an act of charity to exchange a thing with anybody, gaining by the exchange; that's robbery. A usurer deserves to be hanged quite as much as any other thief. Here at Leipzig, 'tis monstrous: a man lends you a hundred florins, and at the end of a single year, you've got to give him forty besides for interest. We should not keep engagements entered into with usurers: usurers should not be admitted to partake of the sacraments, nor be buried in consecrated ground. This is the last advice I shall give usurers: they want money, gold: well, let them address themselves to One who will not give them merely 10 or 20 per cent., but who will give them 100 for 10. He has more than enough to satisfy their utmost avidity; His treasures are inexhaustible; He can give and give without lessening his heap." (Op. Lat. Wittemb. vii. 419.)

Dr. Henning proposed this question to Luther: "If I had amassed money and wished to keep it, and a man came and asked me to lend him some, might I with a good conscience say to him: 'I have no money?' 'Yes,' replied Luther, 'you may do so with a perfectly good conscience; for all it means is: I have no money I

wish to part with. Christ, when he orders us to give, does not tell us to give to prodigals and wasters. In this town, the most necessitous people are the students. Their poverty is very great, but their idleness is still greater. . . . I do not choose to take the bread out of the mouths of my wife and children, to throw it away upon people to whom nothing does any good." (Tischreden, 64.)

CX. (p. 303.)—Still Luther preferred it to the Saxon law. "Dr. Luther, speaking of the great barbarism and severity of the Saxon law, said, that things would go on much better, if the imperial law were observed throughout the empire. But it is a fixed opinion, at least, that such a change could not take place without great confusion and detriment to all classes." (Tischreden, 304.)

CXI. (p. 304.) In the last letter but one he sent to Melancthon, dated 6th February, 1546, Luther says, speaking of the jurists "O sycophants! O sophists! O pests of the human race! I write to you in anger; but if I were ever so cool, I could say no less to you."

As to the deserving jurists, he desires that their condition should be ameliorated. "The doctors at law do not get enough money, and so are obliged to turn attorneys. In Italy, they give a priest four hundred ducats a-year and more; in Germany, they only have one hundred. They ought to have competent provision, as well as deserving pastors and preachers. For want of this, they are fain to do all sorts of things to support their families, to meddle in farming, and what not." (Tischreden, 414.)

CXII. (p. 304.)—In writing to count Albert of Mansfeldt, in reference to a matrimonial case referred to him, he says: "The peasants, those coarse, rude people, who seek only the liberty of the flesh, and the lawyers, who always decide against the faith, have so worn me out, that I have altogether declined to burden myself additionally with the settlement of these marriage matters, and have already told several people, in the devil's name, to do just what they please about them: *Sinite mortuos sepelire mortuos*. The world insists upon having the pope; so let it. All the lawyers are for him. I hardly know whether at my death they will have the honesty and courage to let my children have my name and what rags I leave behind me. They decide always according to the pope's law. And whose fault is it that they do so? Why the fault of your lords, who puff them up, who support them in whatever they choose to say and decide, who oppress us poor divines, however much reason may be on our side." . . . (5th October, 1536.)

"There ought to be, in every country, two hundred divines to one lawyer. Meantime, we ought to turn our superfluous lawyers into pastors; and so we shall, as you will see." (Tischreden, 4.)

CXIII. (p. 306.)—"The righteous, which are justified and saved before God only by faith in Christ, do good works willingly of themselves: as St. Paul saith, "Ye are saved by grace through faith, and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God, not of works, lest any man should boast; for we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works," &c.

"But the reason we do not live without sin, according to the state in which man was first created, is, because we have lost the image of God, and are now become the servants of the devil, through original sin."

CXIV. (p. 308.)—"Philip Melancthon's Disputation held with Luther, about the article of Justification, Anno 1536.—"Philip Melancthon: The opinion of St. Augustine of justification (as it seems) was more consistent when he disputed not, than it was when he used to dispute; for thus he says: 'We ought to hold that we are justified by faith, that is by our regeneration, or by being made new creatures. Now if it be so, then we are not justified only by faith, but by all the gifts and virtues of God given unto us. That is St. Augustine's opinion. Hence also that *Gratia gratum faciens* of the school divines, grace which makes accepted. They allege also that love is the same grace that makes us acceptable before God. Now what is your opinion, sir; do you hold that a man is justified by this regeneration, as is St. Augustine's opinion?"

"Luther: I hold this, and am certain that the true meaning of the gospel, and of the apostles is, that we are justified before God *gratis*, only by God's mere mercy, wherewith and by reason whereof, he imputes righteousness unto us in Christ.

"Melancthon: I hold not that a human creature is justified only by God's mercy; our righteousness, which is a good conscience, is needful by reason of works: or, will you not allow me to say, man is justified *principaliter*, principally, by faith; *minus principaliter* (in the least measure) by works? yet, in such a way, that faith be in expectation, and the same expectation remaining, the fulfilling of the law is not required, but faith supplies that which is wanting in the law. You will allow that there are two sorts of righteousness needful before God, namely, faith and a good conscience, in which faith supplies what is wanting in the law, which is nothing else than to say: A man is justified not by faith only. For you never understood (as Augustine) that justification is from the beginning of the regeneration; he holds not that a man is saved merely for nothing, but is saved by reason of the virtues which are given unto him. I desire your grave opinion touching this of Augustine; for his opinion of deserts is directly opposite to your meaning, for he takes not deserts away, but only of the ungodly.

"Luther: I hold that man is, and remains justified only through God's mercy; for that is the complete righteousness which is placed

against God's wrath, sin, and death, and which devours all, which makes a human creature directly holy and innocent, as though he were altogether without sin. For in that God imputes righteousness to mankind *gratis*, the same suffers no sin to remain in the new man: as John, 'Whoso is born of God sinneth not:' for to be born of God, and to be a sinner, the same is contrary the one to the other.

"According to this righteousness of faith, a man is said to be justified, not in the behalf of his works or fruits which God requires, recompences, or rewards; the same I call an external or an outward righteousness, a righteousness of works which in this flesh and life neither can be pure nor holy.

"*Melancthon*: I ask touching St. Paul after he was regenerated, how he became justified in future—that is, accepted?

"*Luther*: For no other cause, but only by reason of the same regeneration by faith through which he became justified, and remains justified everlastingly.

"*Melancthon*: Was he justified only by reason of God's mercy? or (principally) by reason of the mercy, and (in the least part) by reason of his works and virtues?

"*Luther*: No; but the virtues and works were valued by God to be good and upright for the sake of St. Paul's person, who was justified. Like as a work is pleasing or displeasing, good or evil, for the person's sake that performs it. As also is spoken thereof in Terence. For a good work done by an evil person, has no respect by men, neither is it acceptable.

"*Melancthon*: It seems that Paul was not justified only by mercy. For yourself teach that the righteousness of works is necessary, yea, and that before God. And Paul (who believed and did good works) pleased God; but if he had not done them, then he would not have pleased him. Therefore our righteousness (if no more) is a little piece of the cause that we become justified before God.

"*Luther*: It is necessary, but not out of compulsion of the law, but out of the necessity of a willing mind, which follows without let or hindrance; as the sun of necessity shines, if otherwise it be a sun, not by reason of any law, but by nature, or, as I may say, by reason of the immutability; for thereunto it was created, on purpose to shine; even so one that is justified and regenerated does good works, not by reason of any law, or by compulsion (for no law is given to one that is justified) but out of unchangeable necessity. Moreover, St. Paul says, 'We are God's workmanship; created in Christ Jesus to good works,' &c.

"*Melancthon*: Sadoletus lays the fault in us, in that our doctrine is against ourselves in teaching that we are justified only by faith, and yet that we say that the righteousness of works is necessary.

"*Luther*: Yea; for the hypocrites and false brethren make a show as if they believed; for which cause, works are required, to the end they in their hypocrisy may be confounded. Like as Elias required

works of Baal's priests, and said, 'Call upon the name of your God, &c. Whereby Baal was confounded; for God in such things does nothing by reason of necessity, but of his goodness, and without the law.

"*Melancthon*: When you say: We are justified only by faith, do you understand that only from the beginning of the remission of sins? Or, is it your opinion that Paul was regenerated, and pleased God not by reason of his own obedience or virtues, but only for the sake of God's mercy?

"*Luther*: From the beginning, from the middle, and from the end. The obedience pleased God for Paul's sake who believed; for otherwise, his obedience had not been pleasing. And forasmuch as the person is justified, it is and remains justified so long as faith endure. Therefore this dividing of parts is nothing worth when we bring in three several parts, the beginning, the middle, and the end of the person's justification. The works, therefore, shine through the glass of faith, and for the sake of faith they are acceptable to God, not for the work's sake; otherwise the works following were better and more strong than faith which went before, as those which should make one justified longer, namely, in the midst and end of one's life. Even so, faith would only justify in the beginning, but afterwards would vanish, and so should leave the honour to the works, in that it had left off and ceased.

"*Melancthon*: Sir, you say, Paul was justified—that is, was received to everlasting life, only for mercy's sake. Against which, I say, if the piece-meal or partial cause, namely, our obedience, followeth not, then we are not saved, according to these words, 'Woe is me, if I preach not the gospel,' 1 Cor. ix.

"*Luther*: No piecing or partial cause approaches thereunto; for faith is powerful continually without ceasing; otherwise, it is no faith. Therefore of what value the works are, the same they are through the honour and power of faith, which undeniably is the sun or sun-beam of this shining.

"*Melancthon*: In Augustine these words, *Solú fide*, directly exclude works.

"*Luther*: Whether it be so or no, these words of Augustine do sufficiently show, that he is of our opinion, where he says: 'I may well be afraid, but I do not therefore despair: for I think upon and remember the wounds of the Lord.' And further, in his Confessions, he says: 'Woe be to the life of that human creature (be it never so good and praiseworthy) that disregards God's mercy.'

"Hereby he shows plainly, that faith is active and powerful in the beginning, middle, and end, that is, continually. As also the Psalm: 'By thee is forgiveness,' &c. Also, 'Enter not into judgment with thy servant,' &c.

"*Melancthon*: Is it proper to say that the righteousness of works is necessary to salvation?

“*Luther*: No; works do not procure nor obtain salvation, but they are present by and with faith, which obtains righteousness; as I of necessity must be present at my salvation. The opinion of *Sadoletus* may be this: that faith is a work required by God's law, as love, obedience, chastity, &c. Therefore, he that believes has fulfilled the first part of the law, and so has a beginning to righteousness; but when this beginning is present, the other works are required which are commanded in the law, which must be done after and besides faith. Hereby we see that *Sadoletus* understands nothing in this case: for if faith were a commanded work, then his opinion were right, and faith in that sort would regenerate one in the beginning, as other good works would also renew one afterwards. But we say, that faith is a work of God's promise, or a gift of the Holy Spirit, which indeed is necessary to the fulfilling of the law, but it is not obtained by the law nor by works. But this presented gift, faith, regenerates one continually, so that the regenerated person does new works, but new works do not make a new person. As we see that the works of St. Paul were not pleasing to God because they were good works, but because they were done by Paul, who pleased God, which works had not been pleasing to God, in case Paul's person had not first pleased him.

“Therefore, we can attribute to works in themselves no righteousness before God, although they adorn the person accidentally, and make illustrious by certain and sure recompence, but they justify not the person; for we are all justified one way in and by one Christ; we are altogether acceptable and pleasing, according to the state of the person; one star excels another in brightness, but God loveth no less the star *Saturnus* than he loves the sun and moon.

“A faithful person is a new creature, a new tree. Therefore, all these speeches which in the law are usual, belong not to this case: as to say, ‘A faithful person must do good works:’ neither were it rightly spoken to say, ‘The sun shall shine: a good tree shall bring forth good fruit: or, three and seven shall be ten,’ &c. For the sun shall not shine, but it doth shine by nature, unbidden; it is thereunto created. Likewise, a good tree brings forth good fruit without bidding: three and seven are ten already, &c. Insomuch that we speak not of what shall be done, but of what is already done.

“*Melunthon*.—*Whether those that are justified by faith, do good works of necessity?*

“*Luther* answered and said, no; first, because ‘no law’ was or is ‘made for the righteous,’ 1 Tim. i., whereby it follows not that the righteous must or shall do good works.

“Secondly, they err who speak in this manner: the righteous must do good works, *Fallacia consequentie et consequentis*; for they make out the necessity of the cause, or necessity of the law, out of the necessity of the consequence, which already is included; they make a necessity of that which in future shall and must be out of the

necessity which is immutable; they made a necessity of compelling and forcing.

“And therefore it is as improperly spoken, as when they say, ‘The righteous shall do good works; God shall do good; the sun shall shine,’ &c. whereas all these do follow by necessity of the cause, and by consequence of that which is concluded; or, that I may say it more plainly, all these follow by nature and willingly without the commanding of any law, uncompelled and unforced.

“Now in that we do not know how and what we ought to do according to the first creation when Adam and Eve were created in righteousness, therefore God gave the law, thereby to show unto us that both our state and nature are changed, and that we are not now the children of God, but the children of the devil.

“Moreover, God also sent Christ, who hath delivered and sanctified all that believe in him, from the curse, insomuch that now they are justified and saved by faith, &c.

“But those sins and offences which still remain in them, over which they sigh and complain all their life time, the same are not imputed unto them for Christ’s sake in whom they believe; according to this article, ‘I believe the remission of sins.’”

“I do not think there is any quality which is called *faith* or love, as the dreamers and sophists say, but I refer this altogether to Christ, and I say *mea formalis justitia*, certain, permanent, perfect righteousness, in which there is no defect, nothing wanting, that which is as it ought to be before God; that righteousness is Christ my Lord.” (Tischreden, 133.) This passage is one of the many which show us the intimate relationship between the doctrine of Luther and the system of absolute identification.

CXV. (p. 310.)—“The comet gives me a feeling that some calamity threatens the emperor and Ferdinand. It turned its tail first towards the north, and then towards the south, thus pointing to the two brothers.” (Oct., 1531.)

CXVI. (p. 311.)—“Michael Stiefel, with his seventh trumpet, is prophesying the Day of Judgment for us on All Hallows Day, this year.” (26th August, 1533.)

CXVII. (p. 328.)—“’Tis marvellous,” observes Bossuet, “to see how gravely and vividly he describes the devil’s coming to him in the middle of the night, and awakening him to have a dispute with him; how closely he describes the fear which seized upon him, the sweat which covered him, his trembling, the horrible feeling of his heart throughout the dispute; the pressing arguments of the devil, leaving no repose to his mind; the sound of the evil one’s powerful voice, and his overwhelming method of disputation, whereon question and answer came immediately one upon the other. ‘I felt then,’ he tells us, ‘I felt exactly how it is that people so often die suddenly towards the

morning ; it is that the devil can come and strangle men, if not with his claws, at all events with his pressing arguments." (*Variations de l'Eglise*, ii. 203.)

CONFERENCE BETWEEN LUTHER AND THE DEVIL, 1521.

"I awoke suddenly at midnight on one occasion, when Satan began to dispute with me in the following terms : "Listen to me," said the fiend ; "enlightened doctor, you have, as you know, celebrated mass privately nearly every day during the last fifteen years. What would you say if every one of these masses should prove to be an act of horrible idolatry ? What if the body and blood of Christ had never been present, and you had adored, and had induced others to worship mere bread and wine ?" I replied to him : "I have been made a priest, I received unction and consecration at the hands of the bishop, all of which I did by the commands of my superiors, and in conformity with the obedience which I owed them. Why, therefore, should I not likewise consecrate, seeing that I have always uttered the words of Jesus Christ in true and perfect seriousness of heart, and that I have celebrated, as you know, the mass in the utmost sincerity of belief ?" "That is all perfectly true," said the devil ; "but the Turks and pagans perform all the rites of their temples out of obedience, and they conduct their ceremonies in perfect seriousness. The priests of Jeroboam likewise acted in all things with zeal, and with all their heart against the true priests who were at Jerusalem. What if your consecration and ordination proved to be as false and futile as the priests of the Turks, and the Samaritans are false in their lying and impious doctrines ? In the first place," continued he, "you know that before your consecration you had no true knowledge of Jesus Christ, nor of the true faith, and that in so far as the faith is concerned, you were no better than a Turk, for the Turk, in common with all the devils, believes in the history of Jesus Christ, that he was born, crucified, died, &c. But the Turk and we condemned spirits have no faith in his mercy, neither do we accept him for our Mediator or our Saviour. On the contrary, we fear him as an inexorable judge. Such was likewise your faith, nor had you any other at the moment when you received unction at the hands of the bishop ; and not you alone, but all those who bestowed or who received this consecration entertained the same sentiments with respect to Jesus Christ. They had no other. It is for this reason that, estranging yourself from Jesus as from a cruel yoke, you have resorted to the Virgin Mary and the saints, regarding them as the mediators between you and Jesus Christ. Thus it is that honour and glory have been denied to Christ. No papist can deny this. You have, therefore, received unction ; you have received the tonsure ; and you have offered the sacrifice

of the mass as a pagan, and not as a Christian priest. How is it possible for you to have consecrated the host at the mass, or to have really and truly celebrated mass, since there was wanting for this purpose one who had the power so to consecrate; a radical and essential defect even according to your own doctrine

“In the second place, you have been consecrated priest, and you have made an abuse of the mass, using it contrariwise to its institution, and to the intention and design of Jesus Christ, who ordained it. For Jesus Christ commanded that the sacrament should be distributed amongst the faithful who communicated, and that the whole church should partake of it, to eat and to drink it. In fact, the true priest was constituted minister of the church, in order that he might preach the word of God, and administer the sacraments as is declared by the words of Jesus Christ at the last supper, and as also is declared by St. Paul, in his 1st Epistle to the Corinthians, wherein he speaks of the Lord's Supper. It is from this that the ancients were in the habit of calling it the Communion, inasmuch as, according to the institution of Jesus Christ, the priest alone should not reserve the sacraments to himself, but all those Christians, brothers in the faith, present at the time, ought to partake of them with him. And yet you, during fifteen entire years, have kept these sacramental elements to your own self whenever you have said mass, without making those who worshipped with you partake of them! Nay, it was even forbidden you to administer the sacrament completely to them. What sort of a priesthood is that? What is such unction worth? What avail such masses, such consecrations? And what manner of priest are you, who have not been ordained for the church, but for yourself alone? It is most certain that Jesus Christ will neither recognise such sacraments nor this sort of unction.

“In the third place, the thought and design of Jesus Christ, as his words sufficiently indicate, is, that in taking the sacrament we declare and confess his death. ‘Do this,’ says Christ, ‘in remembrance of me;’ and, as St. Paul observes, ‘Continue to do it until the Saviour comes again.’ But you, a mere gabbler of private masses, have never once preached or confessed Jesus Christ in any of your masses. You solely have taken the sacrament, muttering, as if you were whistling between your teeth, the words of the Lord's Supper, keeping them entirely to yourself. Is that the institution of Jesus Christ? Is it by such actions that you prove yourself to be his minister? Is it thus that a Christian priest should act? Was it for this that you were ordained a priest?

“In the fourth place, it is clear that the intentions, the thought, the institution of Jesus Christ were that all Christians should partake of his sacrament. Whereas you have received unction, not in order that you might be duly qualified to administer the sacrament, but for the purpose of offering up a sacrifice. And, contrary to the in-

stitution of Jesus Christ, you have availed yourself of the mass as if it were a sacrifice; for what, in reality, do the expressions used by the bishop in giving unction signify, when, according to the ordinary routine of the ceremonial, he places the chalice in the hands of him who is being consecrated, saying to him, 'Receive power to celebrate and to sacrifice for the living and for the dead.' What means this underhand and perverse ordination? Jesus Christ instituted the Lord's Supper as meat and drink for his whole church, to be given by his priests to all who communicate at the same time with him, and you convert it into a propitiatory sacrifice before God. Oh, abomination surpassing all abomination!

"Fifthly, the thought and intention of Jesus Christ is, as I have stated, that the sacrament should be administered in the church to all the communicants, in order to strengthen and revive their faith amidst the divers temptations proceeding from the devil, to secure them from sin, and to renew in their hearts and to preach to them the memory of Christ's goodness. Whereas you have treated this sacrament as if it were something belonging to yourself only, which you could at any time constitute and make without aid from any other person, and that you might either bestow gratuitously, or for money, as to you seemed fit and proper? What can you, let me ask, deny of all this? Have you, then, been made a priest of in this fashion; that is to say, without the participation of Jesus Christ, and in the absence of his faith? For you certainly have received unction and ordination contrary to the design and the institution of Jesus Christ, and not for the purpose of administering the sacrament to others, but merely to offer up a sacrifice for the living and the dead. You have not been ordained to be a minister of the church, &c. Besides, as you have never yet administered the sacrament to others, you have not preached Jesus Christ whilst performing mass, and consequently you have in no respect done that which his institutions require. Have you, then, been ordained, and received unction in opposition to Jesus Christ and contrary to his institution, in order that you might act in contradiction to all that he has ordained? And if it be that the bishops have consecrated you and given you unction against the institution of Jesus Christ, is it not beyond all doubt that your ordination and consecration are alike impious, false, and anti-Christian? I maintain, therefore, that you have never consecrated (the elements) at the mass, for you had no power to do so, and that you have only offered up, and caused to be adored by others, mere bread and wine. You now perceive that there are wanting in your mass—first, a person who has power to consecrate; that is to say, a Christian man; and, secondly, there is wanting a person for whom the elements are consecrated, and to whom the sacrament is to be administered; that is to say, the church, the people, members of the church, who are there present at the same time.

“ But you, impious man, wholly ignorant of Jesus Christ, you stand at the altar, all alone, imagining to yourself that Jesus Christ instituted for you only the sacrament, and that you have only to utter a few words in order that the consecration may be complete for the mass, and that you therein offer up the body and blood of Christ, being all the while not only not a member of his church, but his enemy. There is wanting, thirdly, in your mass, the end, the design, the fruit, the uses for which Jesus Christ established this sacrament, for it was instituted by the Saviour on behalf of his whole church, and that it might be eaten and drunk in order to strengthen the faith of his flock, that his goodness might be preached and revealed to all who attend at the mass. Whereas every one who is present is ignorant even of what you yourself say at the mass; they receive nothing from you; they learn nothing of you; you alone, in your corner, mute to the congregation, and scarcely saying anything that you yourself can hear, you eat alone, you drink alone, and ignorant as you are of the words of Jesus Christ, unworthy monk—monk without faith!—you admit no one to communion with you; and, following the custom that prevails amongst your class, you sell for money, as if it were some valuable, the thing that you yourself have created. If thus you are shown to be a person not capable of consecrating the elements, and that you ought not to perform that act; if, likewise at your mass there is no person to take the sacrament; if you reverse the whole ceremony; if you change into an entirely different thing the institution of Jesus Christ,—in short, if you have received unction only that you might thus be empowered to act in every respect contrary to Jesus Christ and his institution, in what does your unction consist? and what do you do by virtue of it, in saying your masses, and in consecrating your elements, but blaspheme and tempt God? So that you are neither a true priest of Jesus Christ, nor are your elements the real body and blood of our Lord. I will give you a comparison: suppose some were to begin to read the ceremony of baptism without having any person on whom to practise that rite; like your bishops, who, following the ridiculous custom that prevails amongst the papists, baptize a church bell, a thing that neither can nor ought to be baptized,—tell me, would this be a real and efficacious baptism? You must perforce admit that this would not be such. For who can baptize that which is not susceptible of baptism? What sort of baptism would it be, if I were to pronounce the words to the empty wind: ‘I baptize thee in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost,’ and, in so doing, I were to scatter a little water? Who or what would thereby receive a remission of sin, or the Holy Ghost? Would it be the wind? It is obvious that no rite of baptism has been performed, though the words of that ceremony may have been pronounced, and the water sprinkled, inasmuch as a person capable of being baptized

was not there. What if the same nonentity really occurs at your celebration of the mass! you therein pronounce certain words, you think you receive the sacrament, whereas all you take is bread and wine; for the church, that is, the congregation, which is that which communicates or receives, does not receive anything, nor does it assist at the ceremony; and you, impious, unbelieving man, are no more capable of receiving the sacrament, under such circumstances, than a bell is of being baptised. This is why your act goes for nothing, in so far as the sacrament is concerned. You will, perhaps, observe to me, that, although you do not offer the sacrament to others who are present in the church, it is not the less a sacrament that you administer to yourself, as there are often found amongst those who receive the sacrament, and undergo baptism, persons utterly incredulous, and unbelievers in Christianity, and yet neither the sacrament and baptism are a whit the less true or efficacious on account of their unbelief. Why, therefore, you will say, cannot there be a real sacrament at the mass. This argument, however, will not stand; for there is no parity between the two cases. In the rite of baptism, even when administered under circumstances of pressing necessity,¹ there are, at the least, always two persons present—namely, the baptizer and he who is baptized; ordinarily, there are several persons who take part in the ceremony. Besides, such is the function of him who baptizes, that he is empowered by that act to confer some thing or gift upon the other persons of his church, whereas he possesses no power to take anything away from them, and to apply his powers exclusively to his own personal use, as you do whilst performing mass. Moreover, the rites, and all parts of the baptismal ceremony, are in strict accordance with the commandments instituted by Jesus Christ, whereas the mass is directly contrary to his institution.

“In the second place, why do you not also teach the doctrine that persons may baptize themselves? Why would you reject or disapprove of such a baptism? Why would you reject the confirmation of a person who had confirmed himself according to the forms of the ceremony practised by yourselves? How is it that the consecration of a priest goes for nothing, if a man consecrated himself? Why would extreme unction be denied to have been given, if a dying person administered it to himself, in the same manner as yourselves perform that rite? Why would there be no marriage if a man married himself, or were to violate a female, and to assert afterwards that the act ought to constitute a marriage in spite of the woman's will? for all these are part and parcel of your seven sacraments. If,

¹ i. e., When one person baptizes another in a desert, or at the point of death.

therefore, no person has the power of constituting by himself any one of your sacraments, or of administering them to himself, how is it that you arrogate to yourself alone the sacrament of the Lord's supper? It is certainly most true, that Jesus Christ is himself taken in the sacrament, and also, that the priest, in administering the elements to others, takes them likewise himself. But he does not consecrate them for himself alone; he takes them conjointly with his congregation and with the church, and this is done in conformity to the commandment of Jesus Christ. In speaking here of consecration, I desire to know whether it can be possible for any one to consecrate the elements, and take the sacrament for himself alone; because I am perfectly well aware that every priest can, after the elements are consecrated, take them in common, seeing that the sacrament is a communion, and the Lord's table is for many. As, in like manner, when I asked whether a man could bestow unction, and elect himself thus to the priesthood, I was perfectly well aware that, having been called, and having received unction, he might subsequently enter on his vocation. And, on the other hand, when I asked whether, in the case of a man who had violated a female, it was sufficient for him who had dishonoured her to call this junction a marriage, I knew very well that if the woman consented then to the marriage, the junction which followed after it did in reality constitute a marriage."

In the distress of mind which came upon me during this struggle with the devil, I endeavoured to repulse the fiend with the weapons which I was accustomed to use under the papal authority; I urged, in answer to his arguments, what were the intentions, what the faith of the church, by representing to him that it was acting under the faith of the church, and in the fulfilment of her intentions, that I had celebrated these private masses.

"It may be," said I, "I have not believed as I ought to have believed, and that I am mistaken in my view; the church, nevertheless, has believed, according to the true and right faith; she has not been in error, nor has she been deceived." Thereupon Satan returned upon me with still greater force and vehemence than before. "There it is," said he; "show me where it is written that an impious unbeliever can assist at the altar of Jesus Christ, can consecrate the elements, and administer the sacrament in the faith of the church? Where is it that God has commanded or ordained such an act? How will you prove to me that the church communicates to you her intention that you should say private masses, if you have not the word of God for your act, and if it should happen to be merely men who have enjoined this, without the authority of God's word? The whole of this doctrine is a lie. What audacity are you not capable of? You do these things in darkness. You abuse the name of the church, and then you seek to justify all your abomina-

tions, under the pretext that such is the intention of the church. All you have to say is to allege the intention of the church as your excuse. But the church sees nothing, nor does she entertain a thought beyond the words and the institutions of Jesus Christ; much less does she entertain any schemes against his designs and his institutions, respecting which I have already spoken, for Saint Paul says, in the first epistle to the Corinthians, chapter 2, speaking of the church, and of the assembly of the faithful, 'But we have the mind of Christ.' (v. 16.)

"But how are you to know that a thing is according to the design and the intention of Christ and of the church, unless it be by the word of Christ, and by the doctrine and public professions of that church? How do you know the intention of the church to be that manslaughter, adultery, and unbelief are of the number of sins for which a man may be damned? How do you know many other matters similar to these, save by the word of God? If, then, by the word of God, and by his commandments, we learn what the opinion of the church is respecting good or evil works, is it not still more obviously requisite to resort to the same word, in order that we may learn from it what opinion the church holds with respect to his doctrine? Why then, blasphemer, do you dare to contravene, by your private mass, the distinct words and the commands of Jesus Christ, and how it is that you avail yourself of his name, and of the intention of the church, for the purpose of covering your lies and your impiety? You clothe your inventions in these miserable garments, as if the intention of the church could be contrary to the word of Jesus Christ? What prodigious daring is it that enables you thus to profane the name of the church by such mendacious impudence!

"Since, then, the bishop has not constituted you a sayer of mass by the unction which he has bestowed upon you, save only by enabling you, in repeating your private masses, to utter everything that is most opposed to the explicit words and institutions of Jesus Christ, and also most contrary to the design, the faith, and to the public profession of the church, this unction is an utter profanity, and has nothing in it of holy or sacred. It is in itself more idle, more useless, and as ridiculous as the baptism which is bestowed upon a stone or a bell." And Satan, urging to still greater limits this reasoning, exclaimed: "You have, therefore, never yet consecrated the elements; you have only offered bread and wine, as the pagans do. By a traffic, alike infamous and injurious to God, you have sold your own handywork to Christians—serving not God, not Jesus Christ, but your own belly. What unheard of abomination is this! Unheard of under heaven or upon earth."

"I see from hence the holy fathers, who mock at me, exclaiming, 'Hey! what! is this the renowned doctor, who is dumb-founded, and unable to reply to the devil? Do you not perceive,

doctor, that the devil is a lying spirit?' Spare me, holy fathers, I should have been in ignorance up to the present moment that the devil is a liar, had you not yourselves, learned theologians, affirmed the fact. Doubtless, if you were compelled to bear his rude assaults, and to dispute matters with him, you would not speak as you do of the examples and of the traditions of the church. The devil tilts somewhat roughly, and he would press you so hardly that you would find it difficult to repel him, unless by the special gift of God. All at once, in the twinkling of an eye, he fills your mind with darkness and misgivings : and if he has to do with a man who is not already forearmed with a text from Scripture, wherewith to reply to him, he can upset him with the turn of his little finger. True it is that the devil is a liar ; but he does not lie when he accuses us, for then he attacks us with the double evidence of our own conscience and the word of God. I cannot deny that I am a sinner, neither can I say that my sin is not great, any more than I can deny that I am thereby rendered amenable to death and damnation." [AUDIN, from whose text I derive this narrative. It is not given by M. Michelet. Refer to the following authorities : *De Missâ Angulari* ; Luther, *Op. Lat.* ; (Jenæ,) iv. &c. ; Cochlæus, in Art. p. 67 ; Math. Conc. 32 ; Claude, *Defense de la Reformation*, part ii. ch. 5 ; Basnage, *Hist. des Eglises Reformées*, &c.—W. H.]

CXIX. (p. 339.)—He wrote to his wife, telling her of this attack. "I was all but dead ; I had already recommended thee and our children to God and our Saviour, in the full conviction that I should never see you again ; I was greatly affected when I thought of you, thus on the brink of the tomb, as I thought myself. However, the prayers and tears of pious men who love me have found favour before God. This last night has killed my malady ; I feel quite as though new born." (27th February, 1537.)

Luther experienced a dangerous relapse at Wittenberg. Compelled to remain at Gotha, he believed himself to be near unto death. He detailed to Bugenhagen, who was with him, his last wishes. He declared that he had combated the papacy in a conscientious spirit alone, and asked pardon of Melancthon, Jonas and Cruciger, for any offence which he might have committed towards either of them." (Ukert, i. p. 325.) Luther was attacked very early in life by the stone, from which painful disorder he suffered severely : he was operated on for it about the 27th Feb. 1537.

"I begin to feel myself convalescent ; by the grace of God I resume my drinking and eating, although my legs, my knees, and my frame generally still trembles, supporting myself with difficulty." (21st March, 1537.) "I am," he writes at a later period of the same

year, "without particular reference to age or sickness, little more than a benumbed and frozen carcase." (6th Dec. 1537.)

CXX. (p. 348.)—He had before this endeavoured vainly to effect a reconciliation between the counts of Mansfield. "If you desire to bring a tree into the house, you do not force the branches in, for they will spread out and prevent its ingress; you introduce it by the stem, and the branches will bend and yield in following it." (Tischreden, p. 355.)

CXXI. (p. 351.)—*Martin Luther's Confession of Faith.*—"I, Martin Luther, an unworthy preacher of the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, thus profess and thus believe; that this article—**THAT FAITH ALONE, WITHOUT WORKS, CAN JUSTIFY BEFORE GOD**, shall never be overthrown, neither by the emperor, nor by the Turk, nor by Satan, nor by the Persian, nor by the pope, with all his cardinals, bishops, sacrificers, monks, nuns, kings, princes, powers of the world, nor yet by all the devils in hell. This article shall stand fast, whether they will or no. This is the true gospel; Jesus Christ redeemed us from our sins, and he only. This most firm and certain truth is the voice of Scripture, though the world and all the devils rage and roar. If Christ alone take away our sins, we cannot do this with our works; and as it is impossible to embrace Christ but by faith, it is, therefore, equally impossible to apprehend him by works. If, then, faith alone must apprehend Christ, before works can follow, the conclusion is irrefragable, that faith alone apprehends him, before and without the consideration of works; and this is our justification and deliverance from sin. Then, and not till then, good works follow faith, as its necessary and inseparable fruit. This is the doctrine I teach, and this the Holy Spirit and church of the faithful have delivered. In this will I abide. Amen."

CXXII. (p. 352.)—The funeral procession was arranged in the following order:—Four deacons of the church; Dr. Pomer; the officers of the elector, all on horseback; the two counts of Mansfeldt, with their principal attendants; **THE CORPSE**, in a leaden coffin, covered with black velvet, on a car; Luther's widow in an open chariot, with some female friends; Luther's three sons; his brother James and his wife's two sisters; then, two and two, George and Syriacus the merchant, the chevalier Magnificus and Philip Melancthon, Justus Jonas, Gaspard Cruciger, Jerome Schurf, and other professors and doctors, counsellors, students, men, women, children, of every rank and age, all dissolved in tears. The body being deposited on a bier in front of the altar, Dr. Pomer delivered a funeral discourse, broken by sobs and agonized weeping, preceding one by Melancthon."

The service ended, the body was placed in its final earthly abode,

in front of the pulpit. The grave having been filled up and properly secured, a brass plate was affixed upon it with this inscription:—
 “Martini Lutheri, S. Theologiæ Doctoris Corpus H.L.S.E., qui anno Christi MDLVI., XII. Cal. Martii Evslebii in patriâ S. M. O. C. V. Ann. LXIII. M.H.D.X.”

Some years after this, Wittemberg was besieged and taken. Charles V. on this occasion desired to see the tomb of the Reformer. With folded arms he was reading the inscription, when one of his officers proposed to open the grave, and give the ashes of the heretic to the winds. The monarch's cheek grew red: “I war not with the dead; let this place be respected.”—AUDIN.

EPITAPHIUM THEODORÆ BEZÆ IN MARTINUM LUTHERUM.

Roma orbem domuit, Romam sibi Papa subegit
 Viribus illa suis, frudibus iste suis
 Quanto isto major LUTHERUS, major et illa
 Istum, illamque uno qui domuit calamo!
 I, nunc! Alciden memorato, Græcia mendax;
 Lutheri ad calamum ferrea clava nihil!

EPITAPHIUM PHILLIPPI MELANCTHON, IN MARTINI LUTHERUM.

Occidit omnigena venerandus laude LUTHERUS
 Qui Christum docuit non dubitante fide.
 Ereptum deflet vero, hunc ecclesia luctu
 Cujus erat doctor, verius, imo pater.
 Occidit Israel præstans auriga Lutherus,
 Quem mecum sanus lugeat omnis homo.
 Nunc lactumque suum lacrymoso carmine prodat,
 Hoc etenim orbatos flere, dolore decet.

CXXIII. (p. 353.)—We will insert in this place some particulars touching Luther. Erasmus said of him:—“The private life and conduct of this man are universally commended. It is a great testimony in his favour, that even his enemies cannot find subject matter for calumniating him.” (Ukert, ii. 5.)

Luther was very fond of simple enjoyments. He often joined his guests, in their musical entertainments, and played at skittles with them.

Melancthon was wont to observe of him: “Whoever was familiarly acquainted with Luther, and knew his habits, must admit that he was an excellent man, agreeable and soft in his social moments, and in no respect dogmatic, or a lover of disputes. To these characteristics, add the gravity becoming one in his position. If he displayed any obduracy or harshness in his struggles with his opponents, that did not arise from the malignity of his nature, but

entirely sprung from his ardour and passion for the truth." (Ukert, ii. 12.)

"Although he was neither small in stature, nor of a weakly constitution, he observed the utmost temperance in respect to eating and drinking. I have witnessed him, at a period when his health was excellent, pass four entire days without taking any nourishment; and frequently have I known him to take nothing during the day, save a herring and a morsel of bread." (Life of Luther, by Melancthon.)

Melancthon, in his posthumous writings, observes: "I have on several occasions surprised him by himself in the act of prayer, hot tears streaming down his cheeks, whilst earnestly entreating God for the welfare of the church. He dedicated several hours in each day to the recitation of psalms, and to invocations to the Almighty, uttered in all the fervour of his soul." (Ukert, ii. 7.)

Luther said of himself: "Were I but as rich in eloquence, and endowed with such a treasury of expressions as Erasmus; had I the Grecian lore of Joachim Camerarius; and a knowledge of the Hebrew equal to that of Forscher, what would I not achieve, with a little more youth!" (Tischreden, 447.)

"The licentiate Amsdorf is a theologian by natural endowment. The doctors Cruciger and Jonas are such only by culture and reflection; but it is the doctor Pomer and myself who never threw a chance away in our controversies." (Tischreden, 425.)

To Antony Unruche, a judge at Torgau, he writes thus in the summer of 1538:—"I thank you cordially, dear Antony, for having taken up the cause of Margaret Dorst, and not suffering those insolent clowns to snatch from that poor woman the whole of her means. You are aware that Doctor Martin himself is not merely a theologian and defender of the faith, but that he is likewise the champion of the rights of the poor, who come to him from every quarter, entreating his advice, and soliciting his intercession with the authorities. He willingly gives his assistance to the poor, as you yourself, and those who resemble you, do. All judges ought to be similar to you, who practise piety, fear God, and love his holy word. So, therefore, will not Jesus Christ ever forget you." (12th June, 1538.)

Luther wrote as follows to his wife, respecting an aged domestic who was about to quit his service: "We must dismiss our old John honourably. You know that he has ever faithfully served us, with zeal, and as it behoved a Christian servitor. How much have we not oftentimes bestowed upon good-for-nothing persons, ungrateful students, and others, who have made a bad use of our money? We must not be sordid or parsimonious on this occasion, towards an honest servant; for what we bestow on him, will doubtless prove

acceptable in the sight of God. I am well aware we are not rich; I would willingly give him ten florins, if I did but possess them; under all circumstances you must not give him less than five, for he is not properly clad. Whatever you can do in addition. I beg of you to bestow on him. True it is that the city treasury ought to make him a present, for he has been extremely useful in respect to the church services. However, they may do as they please in the matter. See how it will be best to raise this sum. We have a silver goblet, which you can pawn. God will not forsake us, I am sure Adieu!" (17th Feb. 1532.)

"The prince has given me a gold ring; but, as if to let me see that I was not destined to carry gold, the ring dropped off my finger (for which it was too large), upon which I said to myself, 'Thou art only an earthworm, and not a man; the ring had been better bestowed on Faber or Eck; as for thee, lead and a cord at thy neck would have become thee better.'" (15th Sept. 1530.)

The elector having levied a contribution in aid of the Turkish war, exempted Luther from its payment. The doctor sent him word that he accepted the favour on behalf of both his houses, one of which, (the convent,) said he, cost a good deal to maintain it, and contributed nothing in return; whilst the other was not yet paid for. "But I implore your electoral highness in all submission to permit me to tax some part of my possessions to this contribution. I have a garden, valued at five hundred florins; some land, estimated at ninety, and a little garden, worth twenty florins. I shall prefer doing as others, and fighting the Turk with my farthings, in order not to be altogether excluded from the army which is destined to save us. There are already enough of persons who contribute very unwillingly to this levy: I do not wish to excite envy. Far better will it be to take away all grounds for complaint, and to enable every one to say, 'See how the doctor Martin is obliged to pay his quota, like the rest.'" (26th March, 1542.)

"To the elector John—Grace and peace in Christ Jesus! Serene highness, I have delayed for a long time to offer your highness my thanks for the garments which you were so good as to send me. I now tender them in all sincerity of heart. Nevertheless, I entreat your highness not to credit those who have represented me as entirely destitute. I am, my conscience tells me, only too rich already. It does not become me, a preacher of the gospel, to revel in abundance; I neither require nor wish such a thing. The repeated favours of your highness begin truly to affright me. I do not seek to become one of those to whom Jesus Christ said, *Woe unto you that are rich, for you have received your consolation.*

"I do not desire to be an expense to your highness, whose purse must needs be ceaselessly opened for so many important objects.

There was more than sufficient of the brown stuff which you sent me, but in order not to be ungrateful, I have worn, out of respect to you, the black suit, although far too costly for me. Had it not been a gift from your electoral highness, I would never have consented to appear clad in such garments. I therefore entreat your highness henceforward to permit me to take the liberty of asking when I require anything. Otherwise, this forethought in respect to myself will deprive me of all courage in so far as my intercession with your highness on behalf of others is concerned—others, let me observe, far more worthy of your favour than myself. Jesus Christ will reward your generous spirit. This is my prayer, uttered in all fervency of heart. Amen." (17th August, 1529.)

John the Constant presented to Luther the former convent of the Augustins at Wittemberg; the elector Augustus purchased this site from the doctor's heirs in 1564, in order to bestow it upon the university. (Ukert, i. 347.)

Places in which Luther resided, and objects once in his possession.—The house in which Luther was born no longer exists. It was burnt down in 1689. At the castle of Wartburg there is still shown on the wall of one of the apartments the mark of the inkstand which Luther threw at the devil's head. The cell in the convent of Wittemberg and its furniture are still shown, as Luther left them after his occupation of that dwelling. The walls of the cell are covered with the names of those who have visited the place. Amongst them is that of Peter the Great, written upon the door. At Coburg, the room which he inhabited during the diet of Augsburg (1530) is still shown.

Luther habitually wore on his finger an enamelled gold ring, on which was represented a skull, with these words inscribed: "Mori sæpe cogita." Around the bevil was written, "Oh mors, ero mors tua." This ring is preserved at Dresden, together with a silver-gilt medal, which his wife used to wear at her neck. The chief device of this medal was the serpent rearing itself over the bodies of the Israelites, with an inscription: "Serpens exaltatus typus Christi crucifixi." The reverse represented our Saviour on the cross, with this legend: "Christus mortuus est pro peccatis nostris." On one side may yet be seen the following record: "D. Mart. Luter, Caterinæ suæ dono. D. H. F.;" and on the other, "Quæ nata est anno 1499, 29 Januarii." He had, in his own possession, a seal, of which he gave a description, in the following letter to Lazarus Spengler: "Grace and peace in Christ Jesus! Dear lord and friend, you tell me I shall give you pleasure by explaining to you the meaning of what is engraved on my seal. I will therefore indicate to you what it is that I have had represented thereon, as symbolical of my theology. First, there is a black cross, with a

heart in its centre: this cross recalls to my memory that faith in Christ crucified is our salvation. Whoso believes in Him with his whole soul is justified. This cross is black, in order to indicate the mortification and grief which a Christian must necessarily suffer. The heart, however, preserves its natural colour, for the cross does not change our nature; it does not kill, it vivifies. *Justus fide vivit, sed fide crucifixi.* The heart is placed in the centre of a white rose, thereby indicating that faith bestows consolation, joy, and peace. The rose is white, and not red, inasmuch as the peace it indicates is not worldly peace, but the peace of the spirit. Spirits are represented by the colour of white, as also are the angels. The rose is placed on an azure ground, in order to demonstrate that this joy of the soul and in the faith is a beginning of that celestial joy which awaits us. The latter is already comprehended therein; it exists, even now, in hope, but the moment when it is consummated and made perfect is not yet arrived. In this azure field you perceive a golden circle; this indicates that heavenly joys will endure eternally, and that they are superior to all other enjoyments and all other blessings, even as gold is more precious than any other metal. Our Lord Jesus Christ be with you unto eternal life, is my prayer. Amen." (From my desert at Coburg, this 8th July, 1530.)

At Altenburg there was kept, for a long time, a table glass, out of which Luther drank the last time he visited his friend Spalatin. (Ukert, i. 245, *et seq.*)

SELECTIONS FROM THE TISCHREDEN, AS GIVEN BY MICHELET,

WITH ADDITIONS.

Of Popes: "Julius was excellent in wars and government; he had altogether a worldly brain and understanding. He waged war against the emperor, the Venetians, and the French; and when he heard his army was defeated before Ravenna, he blasphemed God, and said: 'Art thou, in the name of a thousand devils, now on the side of the French? dost thou in this manner defend and protect thy church?' Then he turned his face towards the ground, and said: Holy Swiss, pray thou for us; and presently sent bishop Langen, the cardinal of Saltzburg, to treat with the emperor Maximilian. He aimed at the empire, and grievously plagued Louis, the French king; insomuch, that he wrote to the universities in France, desiring them by public writings to smother the insufferable pride of the pope. If I had been known then, they would, doubtless, have sent for me to Paris with honour; but I was too young, neither was

it God's will at that time I should write against him, to the end people should not think he was thrust from his stool by the strength and power of the French king, but only and alone through God's word. For when God speaks but a word, and says: Jerusalem, fall; Rome, be destroyed, and lie in the ashes; king, yield thyself captive; sir pope, come down from your throne; so is it accomplished immediately. In this sort did God confound that mighty popedom, which was the most powerful of all. Pope Julius would fain have been emperor; pope Alexander would willingly have made his son emperor; likewise pope Leo made his brother king of Naples, but he was destroyed by poison."

Pope Clement was the richest among them all; for he got the great treasure of pope Julius, and was also the craftiest; whatever he took in hand was fraudulent; he was an Italian, and a Florentine, which makes as much as three Italians. Moreover he was a bastard, descended of the house of Medicis, which makes seven Italians. A more offensive knave than pope Clement VII. never was.

"Pope Leo was bribed by the Capuchins with four-score thousand ducats, to the end he might leave them unreformed. When he saw the money they sent lying on the table, he said: 'Who is able to resist so many well-armed potentates?' True it is, money maketh knaves."

"In 1531, the astrologer Gaaric related to the margrave of Brandenburg, Joachim, that some one having reproached Clement VII. with being a bastard, he replied: 'And Jesus Christ?' From that time forth the margrave favoured Luther."

Of Potentates and Princes: "When the people of Bruges held the emperor Maximilian as a prisoner, and thought of cutting off his head, they wrote to the senate of Venice for their advice on the matter. The senate replied: *Dead men don't make war.* The Venetians got up a farce against Maximilian, which used to be played in the streets. First came a person representing the doge; then one representing the French king, with large pockets full of money, which he pretended to throw about him; next came the emperor Maximilian, in a grey coat, and a small hunting-horn round his neck. He had a great pocket too, but when he put his hand in it, his fingers went through the holes. The Florentines had a jest of the same sort against Maximilian. They got a good lesson for it afterwards; the emperor's grandson, Charles V., made them dance to a fine tune. God *put down the mighty from their seat*, in the case of the Florentines, as he has always done for the haughty ones of the earth."

"The emperor Maximilian said that if any one were to put the blood of the princes of Austria and Bavaria into a pot to boil together, it would leap out."

“Maximilian one day suddenly burst out into a great laugh. On being asked the cause: ‘Truly,’ said he, ‘I laughed to think that God should have entrusted the spiritual government of the world, to a drunken priest like pope Julius, and the government of the empire to a chamois-hunter, like me.’”

“In the castle of Prague, there are the portraits of the kings all in a row along the wall; Ferdinand’s is the last, and beyond him there is no room for another. ‘Tis the same with the round saloon in the castle of Wittemberg. This bodes no good.”

“The emperor Maximilian said: ‘The emperor is truly a king of kings, for the princes of the empire do just **what** they please; the king of France is a king of asses, for his people do just what he tells them; the king of England is a king of men, for his people obey him out of affection.’”

“Maximilian asked one of his secretaries how he ought to treat a servant that robbed him; the secretary replied: ‘Hang him.’ ‘Nay,’ returned the emperor, patting him on the shoulder, ‘I have need of thy services just now.’”

“After the election of the emperor Charles, the elector of Saxony asked Fabien Von Feilitzsch, his councillor, whether he approved of the king of Spain’s having been elected emperor. He answered: ‘Tis good that the crows should have a vulture over them.’”

An old prophecy says: “The emperor Charles will subject all Europe, will reform the church under him; the mendicant orders and schismatic sects will be abolished.”

“The news came that Antonio de Leyva and Andrea Doria had advised the emperor to march in person against the Turk, and not to take his brother with him, by reason that his brother was unlucky. The truth is, that Ferdinand is too calculating—refines too much upon every point presented for his consideration; he acts only upon long counsel, endless deliberation—never upon divine impulse.” The emperor himself is getting unlucky. He does not know how to avail himself of opportunities. He has now lost Milan.”

“The king of France is excessively fond of women. Not so the emperor. When the latter was passing through France, in 1544, after a grand banquet that had been held, he found in his bed a beautiful virgin of noble family, whom the king of France had provided for him against his will; but the emperor would not take advantage of her situation, and sent her home in all honour to her parents.”

“The emperor invited to his coronation only Italian and Spanish princes, who carried before him the standards and arms of the German electors. I made my observations upon this in a pamphlet but the emperor bought up all the copies of it.”

"The king of France spends quite as much in bribes as he does upon his armies. In consequence of this, in the war against Julius and Venice, he defeated twenty thousand men with four thousand."

"So long as the French king had German men-at-arms in his service, he conquered. They are, in fact, the best soldiers; they content themselves with their pay, and protect the people. It was for this reason Antonio de Leyva, on his death-bed, advised the emperor to attach his German soldiers to his person; for that if he lost them, he would be undone. They stick together as 'twere one man."

"Whatever the king of France may be in the flesh, I like not to see him vanquished and a prisoner; vanquished, perhaps, but captive, that is monstrous. Perhaps the hour of the kingdom of France is come; perhaps 'tis of France as 'twas said of Troy:—

' Venit summa dies et ineluctabile fatum.

All these are, in my opinion, indications of the coming of the last day. These signs are of graver import than people imagine. There is only one thing pleases me about it, which is the discomfiture of Antichrist, who was beginning to lean upon the king of France."

"The king of France is persuaded that among us Lutherans there is no authority, no marriage, no church, nothing that the world deems sacred. His envoy, Dr. Gervais, assured me positively of this. The reason is, they have not admitted our writings into France, any more than into Italy, while the villain of Mayence pours into both countries as many of his calumnies against us as he chooses."

"There is a Frenchman here, named François Lambert, who two years ago was an apostolic preacher among the Minorites. He has just married a woman of our church, and is going to settle at Strasburg, and make his living by translating my German works into French."

"The kings of France and England are Lutherans in talking but not in giving; they do not seek the interest of God, but merely their own."

"The king of England's divorce has received the sanction of seven universities, but we of Wittemberg, and the people of Louvain, reject it, on the ground of the particular circumstances, the long cohabitation of the parties, there being a daughter," &c.

"Some one who had received letters from England, told Luther that the king had seceded from the gospel. 'I am delighted,' said Luther, 'to be rid of that blasphemer. I am only sorry to see Melancthon wasting his finest prefaces upon the very worst people.'"

“ Duke George of Saxony said he would not compel any one to take the communion in one kind, but those who chose to do otherwise must quit his dominions.”

“ When duke George declared to his brother, duke Henry, that he would allow him to retain his possessions only on condition of his abandoning the gospel, he replied, ‘By the Virgin Mary, (his grace’s usual affirmation,) before I consent to deny my Christ, I will go, with my wife Catherine, and beg my bread through the land.’”

“ I wish the emperor would make duke George pope ; the bishops would like his reforms even less than they do mine. He’d soon make the bishop of Mayence keep fewer horses by some score.”

“ Duke George sucked in Bohemian blood with his mother’s milk. She was a daughter of Casimir, king of Bohemia. He would, I dare say, have ultimately joined with the elector Frederic, in smiting the bishops and abbots, and the rest of them, for he is by nature hostile to the clergy ; but the letters and flattery of the pope, and the kings of France and England, so puffed him up that he followed where they chose to lead him.”

“ When duke George saw his son John in his last agony, he consoled him by recalling to him the article of justification by faith in Christ, and exhorted him to look up to the Saviour only, without placing any reliance upon works or upon the invocation of saints ; thereupon duke John’s wife, sister to the landgrave Philip of Hesse, said to duke George : ‘Dear sir and father, why is not this doctrine preached publicly in the country ?’ ‘My dear daughter,’ he replied, ‘it is a doctrine which we must reserve for the dying ; it is not for persons in health.’ This duke John had been compelled by his father to swear an eternal hatred and hostility to the Lutheran doctrine. I heard this from Lucas Cranach, to whom duke John mentioned it.”

Leipzig being the capital and personal residence of duke George, the protestants, closely watched by the authorities, could not make many proselytes there, a circumstance which made Luther very angry with the town.

“I hate the people of Leipzig more than any other under the sun. They are deformed with arrogance, usury, and wickedness of every description.”—“I hate that Sodom, Leipzig ; ’tis a sink of usury and evil. I would enter therein upon no consideration, except that of saving its Lot.”

“The electorate of Saxony is poor. If the elector had not Thuringia also, he could not maintain forty horse ; but this makes up a good income to him, with its tributes from lords and princes, and

towns—its rights of convoy, customs, &c. His grace has surrendered for money his royal privileges, among others, the prerogative of mercy.”

“The elector Frederic was very economical. He was an excellent hand at filling his cellars and his granaries. He built no fewer than nine castles; and yet he had always money by him. The reason was, he took his fool’s advice. One day he was complaining of want of money. The fool said to him: *Be your own collector*, and he adopted the hint. He exacted the strictest nicety of accounts from all his stewards and servants. When he went to one of his castles, he ate, drank, and had his horses tended in the same way as a guest at an inn, on an established scale of charges, and paid the bill when he went away. This deprived his people of the usual excuse: ‘Oh, there was so much used when his highness was here!’”

“The elector Frederic-the-Wise said, at Worms, in 1521: ‘I find no Roman church in my creed, but I find a common Christian church there.’”

“This prince,” says Melancthon, “had near Wittemberg a tame stag, which for many successive years went away, in the month of September, into the neighbouring forest, returning in October. When the elector died, the stag went away and did not return.”

“In 1525, the elector John of Saxony asked me whether he should grant the peasants their twelve articles. I told him, Not one.”

“Duke John said, in 1525, on learning the revolt of the peasants: ‘If God will that I remain prince, so be it; but I can very well manage as a private man.’”

Luther blamed the patience of this prince, who had been told by his confessor to put up with the disobedience of his people, and followed this advice.

He said to Luther: “My son, duke Ernest, has written me a Latin letter, asking me to let him hunt; but I want him to keep to his studies; he can at any time learn how to hang his two legs on a horse.”

“This prince had for his body-guard six young nobles, who were always with him, and read the Bible to him six hours a-day, each an hour. His electoral grace sometimes fell asleep, but nevertheless, he would, on awaking, repeat some passage that had particularly struck him. At sermon, he used to have persons near him to take down the preacher’s words; nay, he would occasionally do so with his own hand.”

“When Ferdinand was elected king of the Romans, at Cologne, the young duke John Frederic was sent by his father to protest against the election. After executing his order, he mounted his

horse and galloped off, and only just in time, for he had scarce passed the gates, when people were sent to arrest him."

"It is said the emperor intimated, after hearing our confession and apology, that he wished the same were preached and taught throughout the world. Duke George, too, said he knew very well there were many abuses to reform in the church, but he would not take reform at the hands of an unfrocked monk."

"The last time the elector John went out hunting, he missed all the game. The beasts would no longer recognise him as their master; this was a presage of death to him."

"Duke John Frederic, who was so despoiled by the nobles, learned to appreciate them, though 'twas a costly lesson."

"The elector John Frederic is naturally choleric, but he has a marvellous command over himself. He is greatly given to building, and to drinking too, but, then, he is a large-sized man, and takes more to fill him than other people need. He gives a thousand florins a-year to the university, and two hundred to the minister, with sixty bushels of wheat; besides sixty florins a-year for public lectures." He once sent Luther 500 florins, part of the revenue of a suppressed abbey, as dower for some poor escaped nun.

"Though doctor Jonas earnestly entreated him to do so, Luther refused to apply to the prince for a new visitation of the churches. 'He has got seventy councillors bawling at him, enough to make him deaf: *What good counsel can come from the scribe?* Let us content ourselves with praying God to guide the prince's heart.'"

Of the Landgrave Philip of Hesse.—The landgrave is a pious, wise, and happy man; he maintains peace in his dominions, though it is mostly wood and wild country, so that people travel there in perfect safety. The landgrave is a warrior, an Arminius, though small of person. He listens to sound advice, and when once resolved, is prompt in action. If he would forsake the gospel, then he might obtain of the emperor and pope what he pleased; but God hitherto has steadfastly preserved him. The emperor offered to put him in peaceable possession of the county of Katzeelbogen, and duke George would make him heir of all his countries and people, which the emperor promised to confirm, if he would forsake his religion; but he adheres to the doctrine of the gospel. He hath a Hessian brain, and cannot be idle.

"It was a great boldness in him, that anno 1528, he over-run the bishop's countries; but it was a greater act to put the prince of Wirtemberg in possession of his territories, and hunt king Ferdinand out of them.

"He sent for me and for Philip Melancthon to Weimar, for our counsel and advice touching his intended wars; we endeavoured to dissuade him from his enterprise: we made the best use we could of our rhetoric, and intreated him not with wars to bring a blow or

stain upon the gospel; not to infringe and trouble the public peace of the empire; whereupon he grew very red and vexed, although otherwise he was of an upright mind.

“In the colloquy at Marburg, 1539, his highness went dressed in mean apparel, so as no man knew him to be the landgrave; but he had at the same time high cogitations; he asked Philip Melancthon’s advice in his affairs, and said, ‘Loving Philip! shall I endure this, that the bishop of Mayence by force drive away my preachers of the gospel?’ Philip Melancthon said: ‘If the jurisdiction of those places belong to the bishop, then your highness may not resist him.’ The landgrave replied, ‘I hear your advice, but I will not follow it.’ I asked Beimelberg, one of his council, why he dissuaded not the landgrave from his plan. He answered, ‘Our admonition is nothing: what he intends, from that he is not to be dissuaded.’

“Anno 1530, at the imperial diet, the landgrave openly said to the bishops: ‘Make peace, I advise you; we desire it. If ye will not, I will send at least half-a-dozen of you to the devil.’ At which the bishop of Saltzburg said to Albert, bishop of Mayence, ‘I marvel ye so sorely fear the landgrave of Hesse; he is but a poor prince.’ The bishop answered, ‘Loving lord bishop! if you dwelt as near him as I, then you would talk otherwise.’

“God has set the landgrave in the midst of the empire; he has four electors inhabiting about him, and also the prince of Brunswick, yet they are all afraid of him; the reason is, he has the love of the common people, and withal, is a valiant soldier. Before he put the prince of Wirtemberg into possession, he went to France, and the French king lent him much money towards his wars.”

“The Saxons and the Hessians when once on horseback are perfect heroes. The South German cavaliers are mere dancers in comparison. God preserve the landgrave to us. God preserve us, too, from war; mere war-men are devils incarnate. I refer not merely to the Spaniards, but to the Germans as well.

“After the diet of Frankfort, in 1539, about nine thousand picked soldiers were collected at Bremen and Luneburg, to be employed against the protestant states; but the elector of Saxony and the landgrave of Hesse entered into negotiations with them, through Sir Bernard von Mila, and in consideration of a sum of money in hand, they came over to the elector and the landgrave. Duke George died suddenly soon after this.”

“Albert the Unnatural, landgrave of Hesse and Thuringia, was a hard and choleric lord. He was a prisoner to the bishop of Halle, where one night he got out of his window, jumped down a steep descent into the Sals, and swam off. He acted very cruelly towards his subjects. His wife had meat served before him one Friday, and on his refusing to eat any, said—‘Dear lord, you fear this sin, and

yet every day you commit far greater ones.' She was obliged to fly for it, leaving her children behind her. Previous to her departure at midnight, she stooped to kiss her infant son, who was sleeping in his cradle, blessed him, and, in a transport of maternal love, bit his cheek. Accompanied by a young girl, she let herself down from her tower at Wartburg; a servant was in attendance with horses, and conducted her to Frankfort-on-the-Maine. When the landgrave died, he was wrapped in a monk's frock, at which all his old comrades laughed excessively."

Hospitals.—"In Italy the hospitals are well-built, well-conducted, amply-endowed establishments. The beds and linen are perfectly clean and sweet. There are plenty of attentive servants and able physicians. Many of the apartments are even decorated with fine pictures. As soon as a patient is brought in, his clothes are taken off, and put carefully away, an exact inventory of each article being first made, so that nothing may be lost. A clean bed-gown is then put on him, and he is laid in a comfortable bed; two physicians are in speedy attendance, and servants bring everything that is required, medicine, wine, food in clean bright vessels, which they merely touch with the ends of their fingers. There are also lady visitors to these hospitals—persons of condition, who go through the wards veiled, so that none know who they are, and see that the patients are properly cared for. At Florence, the hospitals are admirably administered. There is a foundling-hospital there, in which poor, deserted children are nourished, taught, and brought up to some business. They are all dressed in a particular costume, and are taken the greatest care of."

"I have got some cloth for breeches, but I have not, as yet, determined upon giving it out to be made up. These I have have been mended four times, and shall be mended once more. The tailors here are very bad, and very dear. Things in this respect are much better in Italy. There one particular class of tailors makes nothing else but breeches."

"In Spain, when the empress was put to bed, four-and-twenty men were flogged till the blood came, to obtain a good time of it for her majesty. Two of the men died from the severe lashing they got, but with no effect to the lying-in woman. What more monstrous superstition than this were the heathen guilty of, I should like to know?"

"In Italy and France, the ministers are, for the most part, mere asses. If you ask them—*Quot sunt sacramenta?* They reply: *Tres.*—*Quæ?* The holy water sprinkler, the censer, and the cross!"

"In France, the people are so sunk in superstition, that all the serfs and peasants wanted to turn monks. The king was absolutely obliged to forbid this monkerizing. France, in fact, is a perfect abyss of superstition. The Italians are either sunk in superstition,

or daring freethinkers. 'Tis a common saying there, when they are going to church: 'We must humour the popular prejudice.'"

"A hundred years before Jesus Christ, Rome had a population of four millions; shortly after that epoch, it had nine millions—certainly, this was enough to constitute a nation, if, indeed, the statement be true. At Venice, there are three hundred thousand families; at Erfurt, eighteen thousand; at Nuremberg, half that number. Rome now is a mere heap of ashes; its houses now stand on the roofs of old Rome; the ruins on which they are built are two kanzknechts lances deep.* There is nothing commendable in Rome, except the consistorial court, and the court of rota, where cases are decided with great equity."

"Dr Staupitz heard at Rome in 1511, that, according to an old prophecy, a hermit would arise under pope Leo X., and attack papacy. Now, the Augustines were also called hermits.

"There was in Italy a particular order, calling themselves *Brothers of Ignorance*. They all took an oath to know nothing, and to learn nothing. All the monks, in reality, belong to this order."

"One evening, there was at Luther's table an old priest, who related a great many things about Rome. He had been there four times, and had officiated there two years. On being asked why he had gone there so often, he replied: 'The first time, I went in search of a knave; the second time, I found him; the third time, I brought him away with me; the fourth time, I took him back again, and placed him behind the altar of St. Peter.'"

"Christopher Gross, who had resided a long time at Rome as one of the pope's guard, talked a great deal about the countries which lie in the way to the Holy Land, of Aragon, and Biscay. The people in the latter places have as a sign of baptism a little scar on the nose, just below the eyes."

"The Scotch are a very proud people: a great many of them have taken refuge in Germany, and more particularly at Erfurt and Wurtzburg. They admit none but their own countrymen into their convents. The Scotch are looked down upon by other nations, as the Samaritans were by the Jews."

"The English were driven from France, after their defeat at Montlheri, between Paris and Orleans. They do not allow any one to reside at Calais, unless he can learn to speak English in so many hours.

"The plague still rages in England.—England is a piece of Germany. The Danish and English languages are Saxon, that is to say, true German, but the language of Upper Germany is not true German. The Suabians and Bavarians are hospitable people; not so the Saxons. I prefer the dialect of Hesse to all the other German

* See Montaigne's Journey through Italy, by Hazlitt, p. 572.

dialects, because the Hessians accentuate their words as though they were singing."

"The German language is superior to all others of modern times; its character shows that the Germans are more honest, simple and true than the French, Italians, Spanish, &c. It is honest, clear, and straightforward; while, as to the French, for example, 'tis a proverb: The French write otherwise than they speak, and speak otherwise than they mean. The German is a very complete tongue, and has a great affinity with the Greek. The Latin is dry and thin without double letters. The Saxons and Lower Germans are even more subtle and crafty than the Italians, when they have been a little while with the latter nation. The houses and aspect of countries generally undergo a change every hundred years. Only a short while since, Hesse, Franconia, and Westphalia were mere deserts; on the other hand, round Halle, Halberstadt, and in our own district, you may go three miles and find nothing but heath, where once was cultivated land. God has deprived these districts of their fertility, as a chastisement for the inhabitants.

"We are jolly fellows, we Germans, we eat, and drink, and sing, and break our glasses, and lose at one sitting a hundred, a thousand florins, altogether forgetting the Turk, who yet in thirty days may be with his light horse at the gates of Wittemberg."

"In France, every one has a glass of his own at table. The French are very chary of exposing themselves to the air; if they happen to perspire, they cover themselves all up, creep up to the fire, or go to bed for fear of fever. At their balls, two people dance together, the rest looking on. 'Tis different in Germany. The priests of France and Italy do not even know their own language.

"When I was travelling along the banks of the Rhine, I wanted to perform mass, but a priest said to me, 'You cannot; we follow here the Ambrosian ritual.'"

"George Fægeler, the margrave's chancellor, told me, that in Bavaria there were more than a hundred and twenty-five livings vacant, by reason that no ecclesiastic could be found to fill them. In Bohemia, there are about three hundred livings vacant, and 'tis the same in duke George's territory."

"Thuringia was once very fertile, especially about Erfurt, but now she is labouring under the malediction of God. Corn is dearer there than at Wittemberg. When I was at Schmalkald, a year ago, they had got nothing but very bad black bread. Their vintages are so plentiful, that they sell a pint of wine for a farthing; the quality would be better, if the quantity were less by one half; as it is, they give you the wine for the barrel."

"The electorate of Saxony had twelve Capuchin and Minorite, five Dominican or Pauliner and Carmelite, and four Augustine monasteries. These were Mendicant monasteries, which of themselves are dusted away. Whereupon an Englishman said: 'In England there is

scarce a mile square, that has not its seven-and-twenty Mendicant monasteries.' ”

“ The old elector of Brandenburg, Joachim, once said to the duke of Saxony, Frederick : ‘ How do you manage to coin so much money, you princes of Saxony ? ’ ‘ Oh, ’ replied the other, ‘ we make money by it ! ’ And so they did, by the quantity of alloy they put into their coin. ”

“ The princess of Anhalt, passing through Wittemberg, visited Luther, and insisted upon discussing various matters with him, though he was ill at the time, and it was at an inconvenient hour. He sought to excuse himself, saying : ‘ Noble lady, I am rarely well now, suffering almost incessantly in body or mind, or in both. ’ ‘ I know it, ’ she replied ; ‘ but I want to talk to you as to how it is we cannot all live piously. ’ *Luther* : ‘ Yet you nobility ought, all of you, to live pious and irreproachable lives ; you are few in number, you form a limited circle. We of the commonalty corrupt one another by our multitude ; we are the masses, and it is therefore no way wonderful that there should be so few pious persons among us. ’ And so he went on. ”

“ Luther entertained in his house, for some time, a Hungarian named Mathias von Vai. When the latter returned to his own country, he preached the new doctrine, and was forthwith denounced to the monk George, brother of the Waywode, and who was at this time governing at Buda, as regent. George had two barrels of gunpowder brought into the market-place, and said to the papist who had denounced Mathias, and to Mathias himself : “ Each of you say that your particular doctrine is the right one ; stand up on these barrels, I will fire the train, and we shall see which of the two remains alive. ’ The papist refused the test, but Mathias at once took his stand on one of the barrels ; whereupon, the papist and his people were condemned to pay four hundred Hungarian florins to the state, and to keep, moreover, two hundred soldiers for a certain time, while Mathias was allowed to preach the gospel. ”

“ A Hungarian noble, named John Huniades, being at Torgau, as ambassador from king Ferdinand to the elector John Frederic, requested the latter to send for Luther, that he might see and speak to him. Luther accordingly came. In the course of conversation, the ambassador said, that in Hungary the priests administered the sacraments sometimes in one kind, sometimes in two, and that they pretended it was quite an indifferent matter. ‘ Reverend father, ’ continued the ambassador, ‘ will you permit me to ask what you think of these priests ? ’ *Luther* : ‘ I consider them contemptible hypocrites ; for if they are convinced that the communion in two kinds is a divine institution, they cannot conscientiously administer it in one kind. ’ Luther could not long keep to himself the annoyance he felt at the question thus put to him. After a little while, he turned

towards the ambassador, and said: 'My lord, I have replied to your lordship's question: will you permit me, in my turn, to put one to you?' *The Ambassador*: 'Yes, assuredly.' *Luther*: 'I am astonished that men like you, the councillors of kings and princes, knowing very well that our doctrine is the true one, should continue to persecute it so determinedly. Can you explain to me how this happens?' The ambassador being very confused at this home question, Andrew Pflug one of the guests, extricated him from the embarrassment by turning the conversation suddenly upon some other topic."

The chapter in the *Tischreden*, where we find collected all that Luther said *On the Turks*, is a curious picture of the terror then pervading every Christian family at the movements of the Mussulmans. Every step taken by the barbarians is marked by a cry of terror throughout Christendom. It is quite the scene in *Goetz Von Berlichingen*, where the knight, reduced to inaction himself, has reports brought him every five minutes of what is passing in the plain below the tower in which he lies; there is just the same excitement about a peril constantly increasing, coming nearer and nearer, but which one is powerless either to avoid or to encounter.

"The Turk will go to Rome, and I don't know that I shall be very sorry if he does. We find it all written in the prophet Daniel..... The Turk once at Rome, the Last Judgment is not far off."

"Christ has saved our souls; he must now save our bodies, for the Turk is about to give Germany a good flanking. I often think of the evils that are coming upon us; they make me sweat. The doctor's wife cried: 'God preserve us from the 'Turks!' 'Nay,' said he, 'they must needs come and give us the promised shaking.'"

"Who would ever have said that I should see the two emperors, the kings of the south and of the north, facing each other!

....."O pray, friends, for our war-men are too presumptuous; they rely too much upon their strength and upon their numbers. This cannot have a good ending." And he added: "The German horses are more powerful than those of the Turks, which are active, but very light. Ours will overthrow them easily enough."

"I don't rely on our walls, nor on our arquebuses, but on the *Lord's Prayer*. That's what will vanquish the Turks; the *Decalogue* would not be sufficient."

Luther tells us, that after a long search for the Alcoran, he at last came across a bad Latin version of it, dated 1300, which he translated into German, the more effectually to unmask before all men the Mahometan imposture. In his *Opinions derived from the Alcoran*, he "proves that Mahomet was not Antichrist, (for his imposture was too flagrant and palpable,) but the hypocritical pope. Three years ago, a Mauritanian monk passed this way. We disputed with him by an interpreter, and he was quite confounded on all points by

the Word of God. 'Truly,' he said to us, at last, 'your doctrine is a good one.' "

The Jews, as Jews and as usurers, were in very bad odour with Luther.

"We ought not to permit the Jews to remain amongst us. We ought not to eat or drink with them.' 'But,' said some one, 'it is written that the Jews shall be converted before the Last Judgment.' 'It is written, too, observed Luther's wife, 'that there shall be but one sheep-fold and one shepherd.' 'Ay,' dear Catherine,' replied the doctor, 'but that prophecy was accomplished when the pagans embraced the Scripture.' "

"If I were in the duke's place, I would collect all the Jews together, and I would ask them why they call Christ a bastard, and St. Mary a prostitute. If they made out their case, I'd give them a hundred florins; if they did not, I'd tear their tongues out.' "

"A servant woman had been for a number of years regularly visited by an invisible spirit, which sat down by her at the fire, and talked with her night after night. One evening, the woman asked Heinzchen, as she called him, to appear before her in his real form. He would not, at first, but as she persisted, he told her to come down with him into the cellar, and there he would appear to her. The servant took a candle, and went down into the cellar, where, in an open cask, she saw a dead infant, floating in its blood. Now, many years before, this servant had had a child, killed it, and concealed it in a cask."

Of Forms and Ceremonies.—Luther thus writes to George Duchholzer, an ecclesiastic of Berlin, who had asked his opinion respecting the changes recently introduced into Brandenburg. "As to the chasuble, the processions, and other external matters that your prince will not abolish, my opinion is this: If he allows you to preach the gospel of Jesus Christ in its purity, without any human additions, to administer baptism and the communion in the way appointed by Christ; if he allows you to suppress the adoration of saints and masses for the dead, to relinquish the blessing of water, salt, and herbs; no longer to carry the host in processions, and to sing only the divine canticles, pure from all human doctrine, then I say, Go through whatever ceremonies he requires, whether they relate to carrying a gold or silver cross, to chasuble of velvet, of silk, or linen, to cope, or what not. If he is not satisfied with one cope or chasuble, put on three, after the fashion of the high priest Aaron, who wore three robes, one upon the other, all beautiful and gorgeous garments. If his grace does not think one noisy procession enough, make your progress seven times over, after the fashion of Joshua and the children of Israel, who marched seven times round the walls of Jericho, singing and sounding trumpets. And if his grace has any particular fancy that way, by all means let him himself head the

procession, dancing before the rest to the sound of harps and timbrels, as David did before the ark of the Lord ; I have no sort of objection to his doing so. These things, when kept free from mischievous abuse, neither take from nor add to the gospel. All we need do, is to guard ourselves from deeming them essentials, from making them chains and fetters for the conscience. If I could only achieve this last point with the pope and his adherents, how thankful should I be to God ! His holiness, in that case, might ask me to carry whatever he pleased.

The following are Mr. Roscoe's observations upon Luther's letter to the pope, referred to in page 64 :

"In assigning to the important letter from Luther to Leo X. the date of the *sixth of April, 1520*, I have been accused of having displayed a manifest prejudice against the character of Luther, and even of not having paid a due attention to the authors whom I have cited. From this circumstance some persons have also affected to draw conclusions unfavourable to the general authenticity of my history. How far these charitable inferences would justly follow from the discovery of a single mistake in a narrative of such extent, I am happily not under the necessity of inquiring, as I have it in my power to give the most satisfactory evidence of the correctness of my former statement. If in this vindication I should trespass on the indulgence of the reader, I must beg him to observe that the question is of considerable importance, as it respects the character and conduct of Luther on one of the most trying occasions of his life.

This question commenced with Seckendorf, who, in his Commentary on the History of Maimbourg, has attempted to show that the letter from Luther, which I have considered as bearing the date of the 6th of April, 1520, and as having been the cause of such great offence to the pontiff, was not written until October following, about four months after the issuing of the papal bull, which bears date the fifteenth of June, in the same year. This letter Seckendorf also considers as conciliatory, and as intended to soften the animosity of the pontiff, and to throw the blame on Eccius, and the cardinal of Gaeta. If these conjectures were well founded, it would follow of course, that after the issuing of the bull, Luther still wished and endeavoured to bring about a reconciliation with the Roman see ; and that the character and conduct of the great reformer must, in this instance, be viewed in a different light from that in which they have been placed in the following work.

For the establishment of his proposition, Seckendorf has chiefly relied on the letters of Charles Miltitz, the papal envoy to Luther, of which he had obtained a sight after the publication of the first edition of his work. From these he presumes, that Miltitz had a conference with Luther on the eleventh of October, 1520, in which Luther promised, within twelve days, to write to the pontiff *modestly and humbly*, and to prefix his letter to a book which he was then writing, and intended to send to the pope ; dating his letter on the sixth day of September preceding ; with which date it is

said the letter now under consideration is published in the German edition of the works of Luther. Seckendorf has also stated, that on the twenty-eighth day of August, 1520, a general chapter of the Augustine order was held at Isleben, when a deputation was sent to Luther to prevail upon him to write to the pope in moderate and conciliatory terms, which he promised to do. On the third of October, it seems however that Luther had again changed his mind, and determined not to write to the pontiff; until he was again prevailed upon to undertake that task by the persuasions of Miltitz, as before related.

In the narrative which I have had occasion to give of the early part of the reformation, I have considered the letter which has given rise to this discussion as actually written on or about the sixth of April, 1520, the date which it bears in the Latin edition of the works of Luther. This decision is strongly supported by the internal evidence of the letter itself, which for various reasons, could not have been written by Luther after the issuing of the papal bull.

This letter, it must be observed, contains a sort of history of the opposition of Luther to the Roman see, and of the violent and oppressive measures adopted by his adversaries against him; terminating with an account of the disputations at Leipsic in the month of June, 1519. Could Luther then, in a narrative of this nature, have omitted to notice the proceedings of the papal see from June, 1519, to September or October, 1520, and particularly the bull, which had then been published throughout Europe, and by which his doctrines were condemned and himself declared a heretic, unless he made his submission within a limited time? To advance such an assertion, is to attribute to Luther an absurdity of which he was surely never guilty, and a dereliction of his principles, which would have degraded him in the estimation both of his friends and his foes.

There is indeed great reason to believe, from the manner in which Luther refers in this letter to the disputation at Leipsic, that the application made to him by the Augustine fathers, occurred in the year 1519, and not in 1520, as stated by Seckendorf and his followers. "These disputes," says Luther, (which the reader will please to observe took place on the twenty-seventh of June, 1519,) "having had no other result than the greater confusion of the Roman see; in the third place, Charles Miltitz applies to the fathers of the Augustines, assembled in their chapter, and asks their advice about conciliating matters, which were then in a most deranged and dangerous state. Some of the most distinguished of them, when violence was found to be of no avail, were sent to me, and desired that I would at least honour the person of your holiness, and by humble letters demonstrate both your innocence and my own. That matters were not yet desperate, if Leo X. in accordance with his mild disposition, would endeavour to remedy them." From which it should appear that Miltitz, finding that the disputation at Leipsic had produced no good effect to the cause of Rome, applied soon afterwards to the Augustine fathers, as the next or succeeding measure, probably at their general chapter in the month of August, 1519; and that as matters were not yet desperate, (which could not surely be said after the issuing of the papal bull) Luther might still entertain hopes of a reconciliation. The result of the disputes at Leipsic, and the application of Miltitz to the Augustine fathers, are stated by Luther in the same sentence, as cause and effect; the latter being the immediate consequence of the failure

of the former. On any other supposition it would appear that Miltitz had remained in Germany upwards of a year after the disputes at Leipsic, without any effort to forward the business on which he came, and on which he was only employed about two years in the whole. The letters of Luther which appear without a date, but which Seckendorf, *of his own authority*, refers to the year 1520, apply with much greater propriety to the year 1519, when Luther had frequent meetings with Miltitz, and promised to write in humiliating terms to the pope; and are in perfect unison of sentiment and language with his other letters written at that period; but by no means agree with his temper and circumstances after the issuing of the bull in 1520.

Again, it can scarcely escape notice, that Luther, in his letter to the pope, enters into a vindication of the part which he had taken in the disputes at Leipsic; asserting that he was reluctantly dragged into the debate respecting the supremacy of the holy see, by Eccius, who had taken advantage of an unguarded expression of his on this subject. Admitting this letter to have been written about the time it bears date in the Latin edition, this explanation is sufficiently consistent with the character of Luther, and with his temper at this period; but to suppose that after his doctrines had been condemned by the papal bull, he would have apologized to the pontiff, for an expression which he had used at Leipsic fifteen months before, tending to impeach the supremacy of the Roman see, is not less remote from all probability of truth, than it is derogatory from the character of Luther.

It is indeed remarkable that Seckendorf himself has not pretended to do more than to suggest some doubts as to the real time when the letter in question was written;¹ and it is still more remarkable, that in the second edition of his history, he has not ventured to adopt his own previous suggestions, by giving, or even mentioning this letter in the place where, according to chronological order, it ought to occupy so conspicuous a station, and where it would place the conduct of Luther, after the issuing of the bull, in so very different a light. On the contrary, he has assented to the narrative of Maimbourg, with whom he so seldom agrees in other respects, as to the uniform perseverance, and even violence of Luther after the issuing of the bull, without attempting in any manner to show that Luther endeavoured to effect a reconciliation with the papal see. He refers only to the new appeal of Luther—to a general council, in which Luther personally attacks the pope as *a tyrant, a heretic, an apostate, and as Antichrist himself*,² and to the two tracts published by Luther against the bull, which are dated the first of December, 1520, and are replete with the most violent invectives against the Roman see.³

But independent of either the internal evidence of the letter, or any other conjectural proof, a due consideration of the following circumstances will

¹ "De tempore tamen quo tradita Epistola est dubitationem quandam infra aperiam. (Seck. i. 27, 98.)

² "Sed nunc commotior Lutherus Pontificem ipsum, *ob editam Bullam, pro tyranno, hæretico, apostata, antichristo*, et superbo concilii contemto habet." (Seck. i. 31, 117.)

³ One of these is entitled, "*Adversus execrabilem Antichristi Bullam*;" the other, "*Assertio articulorum Martini Lutheri, per Bullam Leonis X. novissime damnatorum*." These tracts are of considerable extent, and must have engaged the attention of Luther for several months before their publication.

fully decide the question. The letter of Luther was not a separate or occasional production, but was the dedication to Leo X. of the treatise of Luther *De Libertate Christiana*, actually prefixed to, and published with that work in the early part of the year 1520.¹ In this form it is also given in the Jena edition of the writings of Luther, where it immediately precedes the treatise, and is inscribed, *The Epistle of Luther to the Roman Pontiff Leo X. PREFIXED TO HIS BOOK ON CHRISTIAN LIBERTY.*² The dedicatory words to the pontiff at the close of the letter admit of no doubt. *That I may not, says he, approach your holiness with empty hands, I bring with me this tract, PUBLISHED UNDER THE SANCTION OF YOUR NAME. as an auspice of returning peace and favourable expectations.* That this work preceded, in the order of publication, the treatise of Luther, *De Captivitate Babylonica*, is not only apparent from the very different tenour of those writings, but is expressly stated by all the authors on this subject, and even by Seckendorf himself;³ and the latter tract had made its appearance in the month of August, 1520.⁴ The precise time of the publication of the treatise *De Libertate Christiana*, is therefore, most probably, marked by the dedicatory letter itself—viz., the sixth of April, 1520, about two months before the issuing of the papal bull, when such language was not unsuitable to the dignity and character of Luther; but at whatever time it was published, it is evident that as it preceded the treatise *De Captivitate Babylonica*, which was published in or before the month of August, 1520, it could not on its first appearance have been accompanied by a letter which Luther is said not to have written till the ensuing month of October; and further, that the book which Luther is said by Miltitz to have been writing in the month of October, 1520, with the intention of sending it to the pope, could not have been the treatise on Christian Liberty.

Whether Luther did or did not promise to write to Leo X. after the issuing of the papal bull; whether he did or did not actually write to him, are not the present subjects of inquiry. The question is, whether Luther

¹ An edition was published at Wittemberg, in 1520, and entitled, *EPISTOLA LUTHERIANA ad Leonem Decimum summum Pontificem TRACTATUS DE LIBERTATE CHRISTIANA*. The Letter and Tract were also printed at Antwerp in the same year; per *Michael. Hillenium*. And again at Wittemberg, in 1521, under the following title. *DE LIBERTATE CHRISTIANA, Dissertatio Martini Lutheri, per autorem recognita. EPISTOLA ejusdem ad Leonem Decimum summum Pontificem.*

² *Epistola Lutheri ad Leonem X. Rom. pontificem, LIBELLO DE LIBERTATE CHRISTIANA præfixa.* Luth. op. tom. i. 385.

³ Sleidan ii. in prin. Maim. ap. Seck. 28, Seck. ibid. et in Indice, Script. Lutheri, an. 1520.

⁴ "Ad hæc Elector. d. 24 August, respondet. *Lutheri librum jam editum esse; si ia præcivisset, impediturum publicationem libenter fuisse.* Non dubito libellem hunc esse eum, quem *de Captivitate Babylonica* conscripsit." Seck. i. 27. 98. But in the interval between the publication of these two tracts, Luther also published a treatise in German, addressed to the emperor and the German nobility, in terms of such violence against the Roman see "ut etiam amici ejus libellum istum pro classico belli haberent." After noticing the contents of this work, Seckendorf adds, "Alter libellus mensæ Augusto prodiit, titulum habens *De captivitate Babylonica,*" &c. Seck. i. 38. 112.

in the month of October wrote to him the letter printed in his Latin works, with the date of the 6th of April, and this it is apparent he could not have done; the work to which the letter was annexed as a dedication having been published at least before the month of August, and most probably in April, 1520. But as some attempts have been made to impeach the accuracy of the Latin edition of the works of Luther, I shall offer a few remarks which may tend to prove its correctness, and more clearly to demonstrate that the date of the sixth of April is the genuine date of the letter in question.

This edition, which was begun in the year 1554,¹ was superintended by particular friends of Luther soon after his death, and is preceded by a preface, written by his faithful adherent Nicholas Amsdorf. From this it appears that the writings of Luther had been previously collected without any proper attention to their order and arrangement; although it is of great importance, as Amsdorf observes, "to know *at what time* each of them was published by their author." "For many persons," adds he, "not having duly considered *the time*, have erred most scandalously, whilst under the pretext of the writings of Luther, they have undertaken to *reconcile Christ and Belial*. Nor can it be denied that Luther, in the commencement of the controversy, whilst he was still fascinated by the received opinions, imprudently conceded many things to his adversaries."

"These and similar errors," says he, "which deformed the writings of Luther, excited the pious mind of the son of our late illustrious elector to devise some method by which the works of this holy man might be given to the public in a pure, uncorrupt, entire, and regular order, for the general use of the church; and might be transmitted to posterity faithfully, and free from blemish. For this purpose he called from Denmark the venerable and learned Georgius Rorarius, to whom Luther himself had deputed this task, and established a printing-office at Jena, that all his works might be published with exact attention to the order of time, entire and unadulterated, and without any interference from the comments of other persons.

In the subsequent part of the preface, Amsdorf again insists upon the accuracy of this chronological order in the publication of the writings of Luther, as the great excellency of the work. "The reader must be informed," says he, "that by this first volume of the tracts of Luther, published in the years 1517, 18, 19, 20, and 21, a history is formed, which shows the beginning and progress of the disputes about religion, the causes that impelled Luther to the contest, and that the light of the Holy Spirit became gradually stronger and clearer in his mind. After such declarations is it possible to suppose that the letter in question, prefixed to the treatise on Christian Liberty, printed with that treatise, with the date of the 6th of April, and followed in the works of Luther, at a considerable distance, and after several intervening publications by the papal bull, was not written until after such bull had been issued? and even not until after the tract *De Captivitate Babylonica*, which was published in August, 1520, and appears in its proper place in the Jena edition of the works of Luther?"

It is, indeed, surprising that any person who has paid the least attention to the subject, should not have perceived how inconsistent it would have

¹ It was carefully reprinted from the first edition, at Jena, in 1612, in four volumes; to which latter edition the references in this work are made

been with the character of Luther, and how contradictory to his known declarations and conduct, to have addressed himself to the pope, after the issuing of the bull, in terms which could, on any construction, be supposed to have been pacific and conciliatory. From his own letters, it appears that he knew of the bull early in the month of July, and that he then formed a resolution never more to be reconciled, or hold communion with the church of Rome. "The die is now cast," says he; "the Roman fury and the Roman favour are alike despised; I never more will be reconciled with them, nor communicate with them in future. Let them condemn and burn my writings. I, in return, unless fire shall be wanting, will condemn and publicly burn the whole pontifical law; that is, that Hydra-heresy; and there shall be an end of my hitherto fruitless obedience." Whether Luther deviated from this his first resolution, sufficiently appears by his subsequent conduct.

Another striking indication of the disposition of Luther, appears in his treatise, *De Captivitate Babylonica*. At the close of this work he also admits that he had heard of the bull and of the sentence of excommunication issued against him, unless he should renounce his errors; to which he ironically adds, "If this be true, let this book be taken as a part of my retraction; and lest they should think that their tyranny has produced no effect, I shall soon, Christ willing, publish the remainder, which shall abundantly testify my obedience, in such a manner as the Roman see never saw or heard of before."

Thus far the declarations of Luther during the months of July and August next after the issuing of the papal bull. But it is yet more remarkable that in the month of October, and at the precise time when he is supposed to have written the letter in question, he still adhered to his former resolution, never more to be reconciled to the Roman see. In a letter of the thirteenth of that month, he declares that "as to the bull, respecting which others wrote so much to the Roman court, he despised it, and would attack it as false and impious, and in every respect *Eccian*." If the supposition of my opponents were well founded, Luther assured Miltitz that he would write to the pope within twelve days from the *eleventh* of October, *modestly and humbly*, and would date such letter on the sixth day of September preceding, and prefix it to a book which he was then writing, and intended to send to the pontiff. What the sentiments of Luther were on the *thirteenth* of October we have just now seen, and that no alteration took place between the thirteenth and the thirtieth of the same month may be inferred from another letter, said to be nearly in the same words as the former;¹ and yet we are required to believe that during this precise interval Luther wrote to conciliate Leo X.

It must also be observed that from several passages in the letters of Luther at this period, it is evident that he was then preparing his two tracts before mentioned as an answer to the bull, which he published, and which appear in his works, with the date of the first day of December, 1520.² In the preface to the first of these, *Adversus execrabilem Antichristi Bullam*, he

¹ Seck. i. 29, 115.

² It does not appear that Luther wrote any book after the publication of the bull, and before December, 1520, except these two tracts, neither of which could surely be the work which, as Miltitz informs us, he was then writing, and intended to send as a peace-offering to the pope.

treats the bull as a surreptitious production: pretending that he is uncertain whether the papists are mocking him, or whether they are really so insane at Rome as to have issued such a bull. He declares, in the presence of God and of Jesus Christ, the holy angels and the whole world, that he wholly dissents from the damnable doctrines of the bull, which he anathematizes and execrates, as the sacrilegious and blasphemous adversary of our Lord Jesus Christ. He asserts his own articles condemned by the bull, and proposes them to be believed by all Christians, under pain of eternal damnation: declaring that he shall consider all those who assent to the bull as antichrists and as heathens. Nor is he less severe, or less violent, in the work itself than in the preface. He there calls upon the pope and his cardinals to repent of their errors, and put an end to their diabolical blasphemies, "otherwise," he adds, "be it known to you, that I and all other Christians shall consider you as the seat of Antichrist, possessed by Satan himself; which not only will we not obey, nor own ourselves subject to, or incorporated with, but shall detest and execrate, as the chief enemy of Christ: being prepared in this our decision not only to bear with joy your stupid censures, but even to request that you will never absolve us, or number us among your followers, as we would rather fulfil your cruel tyranny by offering up to you our lives. If, then, the spirit of Christ and the vigour of our faith be of any avail, we in return condemn you, if you persevere in your fury, and deliver over you and your bull, with all your decretals, to Satan, that by the destruction of the flesh, your souls may be liberated in the coming of the Lord. In the name of him whom ye persecute, Jesus Christ our Lord—Amen."

In the foregoing passage, Luther again refers to his invariable resolution of committing the bull, with the Roman decretals, to the flames; a resolution which he carried into effect at Wittemberg on the tenth day of December, 1520; and thus accomplished, in their full extent, the threats which, as we have seen, he had thrown out as early as the month of July preceding.

The real feelings and conduct of Luther on this occasion are to be judged of, not from the letters of the papal agent, who might misrepresent him to the pope, but from his own undoubted declarations and writings, which form an almost uninterrupted series, and in which he uniformly attacks the Roman court with a degree of violence wholly inconsistent with the idea that he had ever, from the issuing of the bull, entertained the slightest hope or wish for reconciliation. By this bull it must be remembered that forty-one points of doctrine, asserted by Luther, were condemned as heretical and scandalous. Can it then be supposed that he would have deserted the defence of his opinions, to write, as is pretended, a humble letter to the pope, for the purpose of bringing about a reconciliation? If he could have been guilty of such a dereliction of his principles, it would have subjected him, in reality, to the hypothetical animadversions of Mosheim, which, although applied to Luther after the confirmatory bull of excommunication, in 1521, would have been equally proper on this occasion. "To submit to the orders of a cruel and insolent enemy, would have been the greatest degree of imprudence imaginable; and to embrace anew errors that he had rejected with a just indignation, and exposed with the clearest evidence, would have discovered a want of integrity and principle worthy only of the most abandoned profligate."¹

¹ Mosheim's Eccl. Hist. by Maclean, vol. ii. p. 29.

After this explicit statement, I might in my turn accuse my opponents of having engaged in this discussion without having previously paid sufficient attention to the subject, and of having rashly contended for such a construction of the conduct of Luther as would have led to consequences of which they were not aware; but I am so far from retorting their censures, that I feel gratified by the opportunity which their remarks have afforded me, of obviating the only charge of an error in point of fact, which has been brought against my work; and at the same time of examining, still more particularly, the conduct of Luther, at one of the most critical and active periods of his life, and removing from the records of ecclesiastical history an important error, highly injurious to the great reformer, and to which several protestant writers, subsequent to Seckendorf, have incautiously given their support.

I cannot, however, finally quit this subject without some notice of the charges which have so generally been connected with those before mentioned, and by which it has been insinuated, or asserted, that I have endeavoured to discredit the characters of the early reformers, and to depreciate the beneficial effects of the Reformation, as well by a reference to the well-known persecution of Servetus, as on other occasions. In answer to this I must be allowed to observe, that the idea that the following work is hostile to the Reformation, is a misrepresentation, industriously circulated by those who, under the pretext of a warm attachment to the cause of protestantism, are as adverse to all religious liberty as the most bigoted Roman catholic; and that whoever peruses the following pages with an impartial eye, cannot fail to discover, that so far from depreciating the beneficial effects of the Reformation, I have only had to regret that it was not carried to the full extent for which its promoters originally contended. To this I can add, with great sincerity, that in adverting to the persecutions of which protestants have been guilty, my only object has been to excite that abhorrence of persecution, under every form and pretext, which is the surest safeguard against its return. If it should appear, as has been imputed to me, that I have animadverted with more severity on the protestants than on the papists, it is because better things were to have been expected from them; because they who asserted the right of private judgment in themselves, ought not to have denied it to others; because they who have represented the cruelties and persecutions of the church of Rome as the greatest of her abominations, ought to have been peculiarly cautious how they gave rise to similar charges against themselves; and lastly, because it is more painful to perceive a disgraceful blot among those with whom we are nearly associated, than among those who are further removed from us in principles and opinions. Hence the persecution of Servetus, conducted by Calvin, and approved by Bullinger and Melancthon, has been exhibited in those colours which it so justly merits; and should, if it were in my power, be still further raised up, as a perpetual beacon, to guard mankind against the possible recurrence of an event which outrages at once the feelings of humanity, the dictates of common sense, and the religion of Christ. It is not on the doctrinal tenets of any established church, whatever its adherents may believe that we are to rely for the rejection of those intolerant and persecuting principles which have for so many ages disgraced the Roman see. Luther, Calvin, Cranmer, Knox, the founders of the reformed church in their respective countries, inflicted, as far as they had power and opportunity, the

same punishments which were denounced against their own disciples by the church of Rome, on such as called in question any article in their creeds.¹ To have freed the human race from the dread of violence and persecution, in the exercise of religion and in the pursuit of truth, would have conferred greater honour on Luther than the enforcement of any dogmatical opinions whatever. To his good intentions and incorruptible integrity, the following work bears uniform and ample testimony; but with the restraints of his superiors, Luther could not shake off the trammels of his education; and his highest aim was only to establish another despotism in the place of that from which he had himself escaped. In thus sanctioning, by his opinion and example, the continuance of an exterior and positive control over the consciences of mankind, he confirmed the pretensions of the Roman see; and may more justly be said to have shared its authority, than to have invalidated its unjust assumptions. But the principles of toleration are derived from higher views; from an enlarged idea of the wisdom, the goodness, and the impartiality of the Supreme Being, from the cultivation of generous and social affections; and, in short, from the exercise of the Christian religion as taught by its great founder, and not as perverted by the ambition, the obstinacy, or the ignorance of his erring followers."

¹ Robertson's Charles V., book ii.

TO THE TOP